

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XVI.

OCTOBER, 1912.

No. 4.

LUTHER AND THE REFORMATION.

Luther and the Reformation! What a subject to be taken under consideration!—a subject that demands the attention of the whole Protestant Church every time the 31st of October approaches, and a subject that is now diligently being studied by the whole Christian Church on earth with ever increasing interest as the four hundredth anniversary of that event is drawing nearer. Luther has been, and is to-day, such a potent factor that the pen and press of friends and foes, of Protestants and Catholics, even at this late day, continually tell about this wonderful man and his work. Stacks of literature that have accumulated for centuries would have to be searched and digested and weighed, the products in every sphere of human activity would have to be taken into view, the history of nations would have to be carefully studied, if we intended to exhaust our subject. Were we educators, we would attempt to point out what wonderful, yea, revolutionary, factors Luther and the Reformation were, are, and will continue to be, on the field of education. Were we students of the sciences, *belles-lettres*, and the arts, we would find it necessary to demonstrate the great impetus Luther and the Reformation gave to these achievements. Were we statesmen, the concomitant political upheaval of the sixteenth century would necessarily demand our attention and prove to be a veritable mine of information. The historian, having noted how the lowly birth of the Child in Bethlehem's manger at the time of Caesar Augustus was the one great turning-point in the history of the world, finds

himself constrained, in order to present the facts in the case correctly, to declare Luther and the Reformation the turning-point in the succeeding history of nearly every nation. As theologians it behooves us chiefly to dwell upon the religious aspect of Luther and the Reformation. Yet, where would we begin and where would we end, if we attempted to elaborate upon the whole amount of material that Luther and the Reformation offer for our consideration?

Despite the fact that our theme has occupied the thought of many thousands, and much precious energy has been expended in presenting it to the world, yet it is one that is understood correctly by comparatively a very precious few. Christianity is often divided into the three grand divisions: Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed. Most people have a vague idea wherein the difference between the Catholic and the Protestant churches consists, but they are unable to say what divides the Lutheran from the Reformed churches. The usual explanation is, that the Catholic Church is polluted with heresies, that the Lutheran Church has made the beginning of a reformation, and has stripped itself of many of the errors of Rome, whereas the Reformed Church is *the* reformed church that has cleansed itself completely of Rome's pollutions, and that tolerates Catholicism in no shape or form. The very nature of the Reformation is not understood, and its grand results are not correctly estimated and appreciated. Luther reformed the Church using the Word of God as the only means. His work was a conservative reformation. When Luther, as the messenger of Heaven, had completed the work for which God had sent him, and for which Providence had equipped him, then the Church of Christ and the apostles was restored to its original purity. The Lutheran Reformation was a complete reformation. Let us make these truths the special topic of our present treatise, and see that Luther's work was a conservative, but, at the same time, a complete reformation.

The Reformation has been called a revolution. D'Aubigné begins his *History of the Reformation* with the words: "The

history of one of the greatest revolutions that has ever been accomplished in human affairs—of a mighty impulse communicated to the world three centuries ago, and whose influence is still visible on every side, and not the history of a mere party, is the object of my present undertaking.” When D’Aubigné, or other writers friendly to the Reformation, employ the word “revolution,” they do not use it in the same sense as when Catholic historians speak of “the revolution.” These writers put the activity of Luther down as a revolt, or rebellion, against constituted authority, to whom obedience should have been rendered. By them Luther is branded as the child of disobedience. D’Aubigné felt that he might be misunderstood. He, therefore, later explains: “The term ‘revolution’ which I here apply to it has of late fallen into discredit with many individuals, who almost confound it with revolt. But they are wrong; for a revolution is merely a change in the affairs of men, something new unfolded (*revolutus*) from the bosom of humanity; and this very word, previous to the end of the last century, was more frequently used in a good than in a bad sense; a happy, a wonderful revolution, were the terms employed. The Reformation was quite the opposite of a revolt: it was the reestablishment of the principles of primitive Christianity. It was a regenerative movement with respect to all that was destined to revive; a *conservative* movement as regards all that will exist forever.” (Preface, V. 1, p. 4.) In this sense of the word we might call the Reformation a revolution, but never otherwise. That Luther did not rise in rebellion against the State hardly needs to be mentioned here. Neither did he have the slightest idea when he nailed his 95 theses to the the church-doors at Wittenberg that he was doing something against the authority of the pope or his church. He appealed his case to the pope, hoping that he would receive expressions of approval concerning his stand against Tetzels, and expecting the blessings of the “Holy Father.” He even dedicated his “Resolutions” to the pope. “However,” writes Luther, “while waiting for the blessings

from Rome, thunder and lightning came upon me. I had to be the sheep which had muddied the water for the wolf; Tetzl was scot-free, and I had to suffer being eaten.”¹⁾ Nevertheless, when the emissaries of the pontiff were sent against them, and Luther was treated in a disgraceful manner, he still believed that he was espousing the cause of Rome and defending it against greedy money-vendors. When Thomas de Vio, or Cajetan, had rejected and condemned him, Luther was not dismayed, nor was his confidence in the pope shaken, for he then appealed “a sanctissimo Domino Leone male informato ad melius informandum.” And a little later he sent his discourse of the *Liberty of a Christian* to the pope and accompanied it with a letter in which the following words occur:—

To the most holy Father in God, Leo X, Pope at Rome, be all health in Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

From the midst of violent battle, which for three years I have been fighting against dissolute men, I cannot hinder myself from sometimes looking towards you, O Leo, most holy Father in God! And although the madness of your impious flatterers has constrained me to appeal from your judgment to a future council, my heart has never been alienated from your Holiness, and I have never ceased praying constantly and with deep groaning for your prosperity and for that of your pontificate.

It is true that I have attacked certain antichristian doctrines, and have inflicted a deep wound upon my adversaries, because of their iniquity. I do not repent of this, for I have the example of Christ before me. What is the use of salt if it has lost its pungency; or of the edge of the sword if it cuts not? Cursed be the man who does the Lord’s work coldly! Most excellent Leo, far from having ever entertained an evil thought in your respect, I wish you the most precious blessings for eternity. I have done but one thing—upheld the Word of Truth. I am ready to submit to you in everything; but as for this word, I will not—I cannot abandon it. He who thinks differently from me thinks erroneously. . . .

And yet, O Leo, you sit like a lamb in the midst of wolves, like Daniel in the lions’ den! What can you do alone against such monsters? . . .

1) Cf. *Wider Hans Wurst*, 1541. “Dr. Luther Tells How the Reformation Was Begun.” (THEOL. QUARTERLY IX, 57.)

Full of affection for you, most excellent Leo, I have always regretted that you, who are worthy of better times, should have been raised to the pontificate in such days as these. . . . O my dear Leo, of what use are you in this Roman court, except that the basest men employ your name and power to ruin fortunes, destroy souls, multiply crimes, oppress the faith, the truth, and the whole Church of God? O Leo, Leo! you are the most unhappy of men, and you sit on the most dangerous of thrones! I tell you the truth because I mean well with you. . . .

Now, then, I come to you, most holy Father, and, prostrate at your feet, I beseech you to curb, if that be possible, these enemies of peace. But I cannot retract my doctrine. I cannot permit any rules of interpretation to be imposed on the Scriptures. The Word of God, which is the fountain whence all true liberty flows, must not be bound. . . .

That I may not appear empty-handed before your Holiness, I present you a small book which I have dedicated to you. . . . I am poor and have nothing else to offer; besides, have you need of any other than spiritual gifts? I commend myself to your Holiness, whom the Lord Jesus may preserve forever! Amen!

These words permit us to look into the depths of Luther's heart. It was not his remotest intention to revolt against the authority of the Church and to establish another order of affairs better suited to his fancy, welfare, and position. In the whole work of reforming the Church, Luther never consulted his own safety or benefit to determine a course of action. It was, at the beginning and at all times, his firm determination to combat error, to bring the doctrines of the inspired Word of God to light, and to let them have free course, to have his Lord Jesus rule, no matter what had to be encountered, or what had to rise or fall in the effort. Luther's work, therefore, is not a rebellion. It is a reformation.

In order to show the conservativeness of the Lutheran Reformation, we could take many things into consideration which would all throw light upon the spirit that prompted Luther to action, and that characterized his work. We will, however, confine ourselves to the formal principle of this work, and see how Rome, the radical reformers, and Luther each conducted

themselves towards the Holy Scriptures in their respective activities, regarding both the source and norm of Christian doctrine, and the means by which these doctrines and the Church of Christ should be propagated and defended.

It is hardly necessary to mention the outspoken Catholic dogma on the source of Christian doctrine. There are expressions in Catholic catechisms and similar books declaring both the Scriptures and the traditions as the source and rule of doctrine. In reality, however, the Bible does not come into consideration at all. Bishop Keane, of Wyoming, in an address at Houston, has declared the position of his church when he said: "The Scriptures make no profession of being an adequate and complete record of the truths taught by Jesus Christ. . . . It cannot . . . be the depositary of the truths revealed by Jesus Christ or the organum of its propagation." In 1415, the Council of Constance that condemned John Huss resolved most solemnly that this council had received its power immediately from Christ, and that everybody was in duty bound to obey it. In the year 1870, Pope Pius IX decreed: "We teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in the discharge of his office as Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, by the divine assistance promised him in Blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals, and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church." Although this declaration of infallibility was published as late as 1870, it nevertheless was practiced from time immemorial.

The very first official Roman opponent of Luther, the Dominican Sylvester Mazzolini of Prierio, or Prierias, Master of the Sacred Palace, who filled the office of censor, in this capacity first became acquainted with the 95 theses of the

Saxon monk and published a writing which he dedicated to Leo X. He speaks very contemptuously of Luther, of course, declaring, "that he should like to know whether this Martin had an iron nose or a brazen head, which cannot be broken." He then, with Roman pride, assures Luther: "Whoever relies not on the teaching of the Roman Church, and of the Roman Pontiff, as the infallible rule of faith, from which the Holy Scriptures themselves derive their strength and their authority, is a heretic." (D'Aubigné I, p. 308 f.)

In the year 1518, Cajetan was sent to persuade the monk of Wittenberg to retract his errors. Cajetan, the inventor of the saying that "the Catholic Church is the born handmaid of the pope," tried to convince Luther by the decretals of the popes, to which the Reformer replied: "I cannot receive such constitutions as sufficient proofs on matters so important. For they pervert Holy Scriptures, and never quote them to the purpose." Whereupon De Vio responded: "The pope has power and authority over all things." When Luther interposed, "Except Scriptures!" De Vio, sneering, said: "Except Scripture! . . . Do you not know that the pope is above councils?"

Eck, who confronted Luther in the following year, took exactly the same stand as Cajetan, and when Luther continually referred to Scriptures for the proof of his statements, Eck interrupted him with the declaration: "If you believe that a council, regularly assembled, can err, you are in my eyes nothing better than a heathen and a publican!"

Not the Scriptures, but the decrees of councils, the traditions, and, above all, the infallible mouthings of the "Man of Sin" are by Catholics considered the source and rule of doctrine. To these they must humbly and blindly submit. No matter how preposterous, how unreasonable, how anti-Scriptural they be, Catholics must put their faith in them.

In opposition to this Catholic principle all reformers have taken their stand. In the Protestant Church there is hardly a teacher that accepts as a Christian doctrine the resolutions

of Catholic councils and the *ex cathedra* appointments of the Roman Pontiff. It by no means follows, however, that the whole Protestant Church is unanimous in its view as to what constitutes the source and rule of faith. The founders of the Reformed Churches did not coincide with Luther when they set themselves to purify the Church of Rome's impurities in the answer to the question where they were to go for the pure evangelical doctrine. There is a vast difference, therefore, in the reformation of the radical reformers from that of the conservative Luther.

This is not generally admitted. Zwingli, Calvin, and the Reformed Churches are loud in their claims that they accept the Word of God, and all of it, and nothing but it. When it comes to the point, however, their allegiance to the Scriptures is not as loyal as their professions pretend. We shall not take the so-called Heavenly Prophets, Muenzer, *et id omne genus*, into our consideration, who openly confessed that they cared little what the Bible said, when they had a dream, or a revelation, that gave them "superior light." We shall confine ourselves to Zwingli and Calvin and their kin.

No matter how much these reformers, and with them the so-called Reformed Churches, have to say of the Bible, their regard for it is not what it ought to be. And if men with no deeper reverence for the Holy Scriptures than we will show them to have, essay to reform the Church, we can expect a reformation that is far from being ideal and satisfactory. The whole Reformed theology denies the efficacy of the Word of God and the Sacraments, claiming that the Holy Spirit works regeneration without, and independently of, the means of grace, that the Holy Spirit is not in need of a vehicle to enter man's heart, that He upholds all things and is not upheld by anything. The Roman Church taught that these means of grace work *ex opere operato*, and that, in reality, the seven sacraments are the only means. These reformers antagonize the *ex opere operato* idea and throw it overboard; but while they are throwing this Roman view into the waters, they lose their hold

on the efficacy of the means of grace and, therefore, they throw overboard too much. They are too radical in their procedure.

This disrespect for the Word of God these reformers plainly manifested by their view on the source and rule of Christian doctrine. The pope and his faithful mention the Bible, but in practice they declare the man-made commandments of the hierarchy as the norm and fountain-head of their religion. The radicals also mention the Scriptures, but in reality they place human reason as the dispenser and judge of those things that we are to believe for our souls' salvation. According to them, Holy Writ cannot be taken in its literal sense if the statement made is not in conformity with human reason. Scriptures must be expounded and explained according to the demands of reason. Instead of having it: "*Quod non est biblicum, non est theologicum,*" the reformedists would rather have this axiom read: "*Quod non rationis est, non est theologicum.*" Clear Biblical statements have ever, by men of this stamp, been contradicted and refuted by philosophical principles and deductions. Zwingli, for example, reasons thus: "A thing that is not infinite by nature cannot be omnipresent; whatever is infinite is eternal; Christ's humanity is not eternal, therefore it is not infinite; and since it is not infinite, it must be finite; and if it is finite, it cannot be omnipresent." At the Marburg Colloquy he asked whether it was wrong to ask in matters of doctrine, "How shall this be?" since Mary herself asked this question of the angel. He argued against Luther: "You maintain then, Doctor, that Christ's body is locally in the Eucharist; for you say that Christ's body is really *there*—*there*—*there*. There is an adverb of place. If it is in a place, it is in heaven, whence it follows that it is not in the bread. . . . I oppose you with this article of our faith, *Ascendit in coelum*—He ascended into heaven. If Christ is in heaven as regards His body, how can He be in the bread? The Word of God teaches that He was like His brethren in all things (Hebr. 2, 17). He therefore cannot be in several places at once." (D'Aubigné, IV, p. 85 f.) In treating any passage of Scripture which does not fit into

their theology, these opponents of Luther were, and up to the present time are, at hand with their shibboleths: "*Finitum non est capax infiniti. Impossibile est, unum corpus simul in pluribus locis esse. Quare necesse est Christianis, tam difficilia et impossibilia credere? Nihil esse credendum, quod ratione comprehendendi nequeat, quia Deus nobis non proponat incomprehensibilia.*" Zwingli himself characterizes his followers as "*turba ista, quae nihil credit, nisi quod verum esse videt.*" That Calvin shared Zwingli's views on this matter, he evidenced by similar expressions in his writings, as well as by deliberately subscribing, in 1549, the twenty-six articles of the Zurich *Consensus* which united Zwinglians and Calvinists in one Reformed body in opposition to Bucer's endeavors to unite them with the Lutherans at Wittenberg. Thus these leaders of the Reformed Church, though they did not in so many words make such a statement, though they claimed to regard the Bible as the only rule of faith, yet in practice place human reason above the clear and unmistakable Word of God.

In turning to the stalwart Saxon of Eisleben, in order to learn the principle according to which he proved himself to be "the one real prophet of the Reformation," we might mention that Luther did not underestimate human reason or the right use of it, as has often been mentioned unfavorably to him. In discussing the Marburg Colloquy, McGiffert, for example, writes: "His contempt for human reason, avowed in his early attacks upon Aristotle and repeated over and over since, was never more strikingly exhibited. Rational considerations, drawn from the nature of the physical body, counted for naught, and were peremptorily brushed aside as heathenish. Nothing could have better shown the diversity of interest between the two men than this colloquy. Luther was right in declaring Zwingli's spirit different from his. For Zwingli, with his more advanced views and broader outlook, it was easy to tolerate his antagonist and cooperate with him; for Luther it was impossible." (*Martin Luther, the Man and His Work*, p. 331.) That Luther, however, did not hold such advanced ideas as

Zwingli did, and that he could not cooperate with Zwingli and his *turba ista*, was not because Luther had a smaller amount of reason than his opponent, nor was it that Luther did not appreciate the proper use of it. The reason must be looked for elsewhere. For Luther expresses himself very highly with regard to human reason. He speaks of it as the fountain from which all civil jurisprudence must be drawn. In explaining the First Article, he makes mention of it as a precious gift of God. He writes: "It is true, indeed, that reason is the chief and foremost of all things, and among all the things of this life the best, and something divine. For she is the inventress and governess of all arts, of medical science, of jurisprudence, and of all wisdom, power, virtue, and honor, that men possess in this present life, so that she must be rightfully called the essential difference by which man distinguishes himself from animals and other things. Holy Scriptures, too, constitute her as a mistress over the earth, birds, fish, and animals, and say: 'Rule . . .,' *i. e.*, that she should be a sun and a sort of a deity, that are set for the government of the things in this life. And of this glory God did not deprive reason after the Fall, but rather established it." (St. L. XIX, 1462 f.) The thing that made it impossible for Luther to cooperate with Zwingli was that Luther could not make himself guilty of a *μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος* by using his reason to correct the Bible. He rather looked upon and used his reason as the servant of the divine revelation which he found the Scriptures to be. Luther's theology was no broader than the Word of God. His views did not advance beyond this *regula fidei*. He could not work in harmony with Zwingli, because he acted in conformity with the Lutheran principle: "*Propter absurdum rationis humanæ non est discedendum a regula fidei*," and "*Quod non est Biblicum, non est theologicum*."

It was the guidance of divine Providence that led Luther to the Bible. We all know the story too well how Luther in his twentieth year at the University of Erfurt found a copy of the much neglected Bible, that when, for the first time in

his life, he here had opportunity to get acquainted with this remarkable Book, he found it to contain vastly more than he thought, how he pored over its pages, ever and again returning to it for further perusal. "The first glimmerings of a new truth were then beginning to dawn upon his mind. Thus had God led him to the discovery of His Word. . . . This book, deposited upon the unknown shelves of a gloomy hall, is about to become the book of life to a whole nation. In that Bible the Reformation lay hid." (D'Aubigné, I, 157.) When at the monastery at the same city, he again found the chained Bible, and though dissuaded to waste his time on it, he read it with increasing interest. And when, October 18, 1512, he was made a Licentiate in Divinity, and pledged himself by an oath to his well-beloved Holy Scriptures, he was not in such inexcusable ignorance as some of his contemporaries, who too had become Doctors of Divinity, without ever having seen a Bible, but he accepted his degree fully aware of what he was so solemnly promising and determined to carry it out. It was, therefore, a new ring in the customary theological propositions that sounded in the 95 theses which Luther nailed to the doors of the Castle-Church of Wittenberg when he began them, citing as his authority: "Our Lord and Master Jesus Christ says."

Soon after this stirring event the pope's legate was upon the heels of Luther, with authority and power to bring Luther to Rome if he would not retract. Yet, at this very first time that Luther got into conflict with Rome, he interrupted De Vio when he claimed, "The pope has power and authority over all things," quickly by saying, "Except Scriptures." No matter how much the cardinal remonstrated, no matter how angry he was and how much he showed his anger, no matter whether Cajetan intimated that if Luther would not retract he would execute the pope's orders, or promised that he would reconcile him to the holy Father, Luther maintained that the pope was not above the Word of God, but below it, and that, as long as these passages of Scriptures were not explained differently, he would not retract.

In the year following, at Leipsic, Luther had to encounter the formidable Dr. Eck. It is unnecessary to remind ourselves of the way how Eck tried to roar Luther into submission, how Eck juggled with extractions from the church-fathers, how Luther always took recourse to the proper source and norm of doctrine, and how he closed the disputation with these words: "The reverend Doctor flees from the Scriptures, as the devil at the sight of the cross. As for me, with all due respect to the Fathers, I prefer the authority of Holy Writ, and this test I would recommend to our judges." (D'Aubigné, II, 62.)

The next year, 1520, brought the papal bull *Surge Domine*, excommunicating Luther. The bull was greeted with contempt at Wittenberg. Luther cared little what the pope had to say in the matter. Appealing to a future council, to which he committed his cause, he used the following words: "I appeal from said pope, first, as an unjust, rash, and tyrannical judge, who condemns me without a hearing, and without giving any reasons for his judgments; secondly, as a heretic and an apostate, misled, hardened, and condemned by the Holy Scriptures, who commands me to deny that Christian faith is necessary in the use of the sacraments; thirdly, as an enemy, an antichrist, an adversary, an oppressor of Holy Scriptures, who dares set his own words in opposition to the Word of God; fourthly, as a despiser, a calumniator, a blasphemer of the holy Christian Church, and of a free council, who maintains that a council is nothing of itself." And on the 10th of December, at a public demonstration, he threw this bull into the fire with the words: "Since thou hast vexed the Holy One of the Lord, may everlasting fire vex and consume thee." Thus he at all times relied on the Word of God as his only authority when in conflict with the pope and his emissaries. With the same courage with which he defended himself and his position at Augsburg and at Leipsic, and on the same principle, he also stood in the face of Charles V, Cardinal Aleander, and the whole host of his bitter enemies at the Diet of Worms, in 1521, and ever afterwards.

Luther's attitude in dealing with other Protestants as to the rule which is to determine doctrine and conduct was exactly the same as when he dealt with the papists. He opposed and corrected Carlstadt's orgies of iconoclasm at Wittenberg by preaching eight sermons from the Word of God. The most notable example, however, is that of Marburg. The cause of the Reformation seemed in a very precarious condition at that time. Charles V had pledged himself solemnly to Pope Clement VII, saying that he would do all in his power to exterminate the Lutheran heresy. Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, was anxious to consummate a union of the Protestant states, wishing to include the Swiss. The only obstacle in the way was that the Swiss theologians did not agree with the Lutherans in certain controverted doctrines. To bring about a unity of faith, Philip invited the theologians of both sides to the famous colloquy. After some discussion they had agreed on most points in controversy. The discussion led up to and centered finally on the real presence of the Lord's body and blood in the Sacrament. If they could unite on these points, the coalition would be complete. We have already referred to the mode of argumentation of Zwingli and his coworkers, Oecolampadius, Bucer, and others. When Luther entered the place of discussion on this point, he approached the table at which he was to sit, removed the velvet cloth that covered it, and with chalk wrote, before the eyes of all, the words of the Savior: "*Hoc est corpus meum.*" These were clear and unmistakable words of Christ. From these Luther would not deviate. All the protestations of Zwingli that the words could not be taken literally, since reason could not comprehend such a thing, were of no avail. Zwingli and the Swiss reformers could not bring sufficient proof that these words could be understood in a different sense from the literal one, and therefore Luther would rather follow Christ than reason.

The description that D'Aubigné gives of the final parting of the ways characterizes Luther's position as well as Zwingli's and also the almost unanimous verdict of the reformedists up to the present time. D'Aubigné says:—

A final meeting took place, and undoubtedly the Church has seldom witnessed one of greater solemnity. Luther and Zwingli, Saxony and Switzerland, met for the last time. . . . Charles V and the pope were uniting in Italy; Ferdinand and the Roman Catholic princes were preparing to tear in pieces the Protest of Spires; the thunder-cloud became more threatening every day; union alone seemed capable of saving the Protestants, and the hour of departure was about to strike—an hour that would separate them perhaps forever.

“Let us confess our union in all things in which we agree,” said Zwingli; “and as for the rest, let us remember that we are brothers. There will never be peace between the churches if, while we maintain the grand doctrine of salvation by faith, we cannot differ on secondary points.” (!) Such is, in fact, the true principle of Christian union. The sixteenth century was still too deeply sunk into scholasticism to understand this. (!) Let us hope that the nineteenth century will comprehend it better.

“Yes, yes!” exclaimed the landgrave; “you agree! Give them a testimony of your unity (!), and recognize one another as brothers.” “There is no one on earth with whom I more desire to be united than with you,” said Zwingli, approaching the Wittenberg doctors. Oecolampadius, Bucer, and Hedio said the same.

“Acknowledge them! acknowledge them as brothers!” continued the landgrave. Their hearts were moved; they were on the eve of unity. Zwingli, bursting into tears, in the presence of the prince, the courtiers, and divines (it is Luther himself who records this), approached Luther, and held out his hand. The two families of the Reformation were about to be united: long quarrels were about to be stifled in their cradle. But Luther rejected the hand that was offered him: “You have a different spirit from ours,” said he. These words communicated to the Swiss, as it were, an electric shock. Their hearts sunk each time Luther repeated them, and he did so frequently. He himself is our informant.”

McGiffert, in his recent publication, *Luther, the Man and His Work*, introduces the chapter on this colloquy with the following words:—

Hand in hand with the organization of the Lutheran movement went its segregation from other and parallel movements. The radicals were repudiated in the early twenties, the break with humanism soon followed, and later came the split between the Swiss and the German Protestants, for which Luther was solely responsible. His intolerance appeared most clearly not in his attitude toward Catholic doctrine

and worship, but in his dealings with other evangelicals who disagreed with him or walked in different paths. As time passed, he grew more impatient of dissent and more insistent upon complete agreement.

Further on he has this to say:—

In reading the reports of the Marburg Colloquy, we are inevitably reminded of the great Leipsic of eleven years before. As Eck then insisted upon blind and unquestioning submission to the authority of the Church, Luther now insisted on the same kind of submission to the authority of the Bible. The servant should not question the will of his Master; he should simply shut his eyes and obey. No wonder Oecolampadius complained that he was a second Eck. The role of conservative was now his instead of Eck's, and though the authority to which he appealed was different, his attitude to it was the same. . . . Characteristically, it seldom occurred to him to promote peace by waiving any of his own principles or prejudices. Peace was to be had, as a rule, only by all of his followers and associates accepting his opinion and living by his ideals. His general attitude in the matter appears clearly enough from the following passage of the "Table Talk":—

They have plagued us in their books and writings with the word "charity": "You Wittenbergers have no charity!" When we ask what charity is, they say "that we should be harmonious in doctrine and abandon these quarrels over religion." Yes, do you hear? There are two tables, the first and the second. Charity belongs to the second table; there it is above all works. But it is said, "Fear God and hear His Word." About this they care nothing. Christ says, "He that has loved mother and father more than me is not worthy of me." Charity you ought to have towards relatives and servants. Love, love, and be kind to mother and father. But "he that has loved them more than me"! When the "me" comes, charity ceases. And so I am glad to be called obstinate, proud, pig-headed, uncharitable, and what they please, so long as I am not a participant with them. And from that may God preserve me!

Both D'Aubigné and McGiffert need no commentary. We could heap no greater praise on Luther than their criticism.

Thus we see how the papists deviate from the only rule of faith to the one side, to the side of human authority, the councils and, above all, to the pope; the radical reformers diverge to the other side (which is, in fact, the same error), to human reason; and since Luther strayed neither to the right

nor to the left, but adhered to the one rule laid down by the Master when He said: "If ye continue in my Word, ye are my disciples indeed, and shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," Luther's work is justly called the Conservative Reformation.

In describing the spirit and character of the Reformation, however, and in declaring the work of Luther conservative, we must take other things into consideration. The work of a reformer does not consist only in going to the right source for his doctrines and religious views, but in order to reform the Church he must correctly urge these views and doctrines upon the other members of the Church. Had Luther attempted to gain a right knowledge of Christian doctrine for himself only, but had hidden this knowledge in his own heart, he would never have carried out the work of the Reformation. His doctrines, or rather, the doctrines of Holy Writ and of Christ, which were nearly forgotten, had to be disseminated. Those who accepted these doctrines had to win others over to their conviction. How was this to be done? How is Christian doctrine to be disseminated? How is the Church of Christ to be propagated and defended? These were important questions that Luther had to answer. We claim that the successful labor of Luther was a conservative Reformation also on account of the *modus procedendi* he assumed in spreading and defending the evangelical doctrine. In this, too, there is a great difference between the Lutheran and the Roman and Reformed Churches.

That the pope and his church do not confine themselves, and never have confined themselves, to the Word of God as the only means of getting others to espouse the cause of Catholicism is so manifest that it hardly is in need of proof. Still it is most necessary, especially in our day of Roman arrogance and propaganda, to keep these facts in mind. Catholics are ever busy expunging their awful deeds from the records of the past, and only too many Protestants permit themselves to be duped into the conviction that Rome has not only buried the hatchet, but the sword as well. But to relate all the inci-

dents where Rome has used the sword to persuade those of non-Catholic opinions that there is salvation only to those to whom the pretending successor of St. Peter dispenses it would be to write volumes upon volumes. The whole history of the Roman Church is one catalogue of crimes committed against those who would not worship the image of the Beast.

The fact that Rome intends to propagatè its cause with the sword is emphasized in a most emphatic manner at the solemn consecration of every pope, when the sword of St. Peter is laid upon the altar, and when he swears to use it to defend the Church. And that the popes have made conscientious use of this oath is a historic fact. It is claimed by reliable historians that Pope Innocent III, for example, used this sword to dispatch 100,000 heretics. In relating the lives of the popes, the truthful historian is nearly in every case constrained to sum up the grand total of those who had to be killed on the gallows, or on the pyre, for not submitting to the authority of the pontiffs. The much extolled Inquisition needs only to be mentioned, and all that know what the term implies will be reminded with what shocking effect the "Holy Father" has wielded the sword of Peter. It is said that the first inquisitor-general, Torquemada, during the first year of his exalted office, burned 2,000 people, and that during the fourteen years of his blessed (!) activity burned alive more than 4,250 heretics, besides countless numbers that were put to death in other ways, and those who disappeared as if the earth had swallowed them up never to return again. Savonarola, John Huss, Jerome of Prague, and others died by Rome's consent and at Rome's instigation. The darkest page of history, one that is covered with gore and never will be cleansed of its blood and outrage, its Satanic cunning and havoc, is the one on which the massacre of St. Bartholomew's night is written, when the princes of French Protestantism were mercilessly and cowardly murdered. A conservative estimate places the number at 40,000. That this massacre caused unbounded joy at Rome, and met with His Holiness's approval, is evident from the fact that the pope

rushed to the cathedral to have the *Te Deum* sung, that Rome was illuminated for three nights, that solemn masses were held, that a medal was struck in commemoration of the successful event, and by other expressions of satisfaction. This bloody feat has been unanimously endorsed by the Roman hierarchy to the present time.

It was by the protection of divine Providence that Luther escaped the fate of Huss. It certainly was not because Rome had changed her tactics. Luther was often summoned to appear before the pope at Rome, and the purpose was sinister. Rome's emissaries that were sent out to subdue the untractable monk came as ambassadors plenipotentiary, empowered to use violence, if violence was needed. At the Diet of Augsburg, in 1518, when the cunning De Vio could not get Luther to retract, he was ready to use main force. The councilors of the emperor informed the legate that he could not use violence against Luther, since the emperor had provided Luther with an imperial safe-conduct. At this the legate lost his temper and declared, "It is well; but I will execute the pope's orders." It is not difficult to surmise what they were.

It will be interesting in this connection to recall the papal bull by which Luther was excommunicated, the notorious *Exsurge Domine*:

"Arise, O Lord!" said the Roman pontiff, speaking at this solemn moment as God's vicegerent and head of the Church, "arise, judge Thy cause, and call to mind the opprobrium which madmen continually heap on Thee! Arise O Peter; remember thy Holy Roman Church, mother of all churches and queen of the faith! Arise, O Paul, for, behold, a new Porphyry attacks thy doctrines and the holy popes, our predecessors. Lastly, arise, ye assembly of saints, the Holy Church of God, and intercede with the Almighty!"

Then the 41 propositions are mentioned and condemned that Luther had taught in opposition to the "mother of all churches," among which is also found the thesis: "To burn heretics is contrary to the will of the Holy Ghost." The bull concludes with the admonition that Luther and his partisans were to be seized and sent to Rome. The pope did not intend

to banquet Luther, nor to canonize him as a saint. The pope would have disposed of the arch-heretic in a different way. The friendly disposition of Rome can also be learned from the imperial edict of Worms which the emperor published at the instigation of the pope:—

“We command that all ye . . . shall not . . . offer to Luther either shelter, food, or drink, nor help in any way with words or deeds secretly or openly. On the contrary, whenever you should get possession of him, you shall at once put him into prison and send him over to me, or at any rate inform me thereof without any delay. For that holy work you shall be recompensed for your trouble and expense. Likewise you ought, in virtue of the holy constitution and of the ban of our empire, to deal in the following manner with all the partisans, abettors, and patrons of Luther. You shall put them down and confiscate their estates to your own profit. . . . Nobody shall buy, sell, read, keep, copy, or print any of the writings of Martin Luther.” (D’Aubigné, II, 272.)

Such was the way Rome converted those to her cause that were not in the fold. Verily, the popes have not the sword in vain!

But that was four hundred and more years ago. Has the “*semper idem*” assumed a different attitude to-day? Has she condemned the orgies and massacres and murders she has committed in the dark Middle Ages? Does Rome really love, for instance, our American institutions so dearly as she would have us believe? Would she never think of bringing such pressure to bear on us erring Protestants if she had the power and privilege to do so? Not with a single syllable has the “infallible” pope ever retracted the claim or denounced the procedure of the Middle Ages. On the contrary, every pope endorses the official acts of all his predecessors. Pope Leo XIII denied “that liberty of conscience is the right of every man,” called it an insanity, and “a great error to think that the Church has not the right of using force.” Let us not be deceived by the assurance of Catholics that they would not use force if they had the power to do so. That is the very spirit of Catholicism. Rome is the woman drunken with the blood

of saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus. We have not yet determined and never intend to change our Lutheran hymn, but earnestly continue to sing and pray:

Lord, keep us in Thy Word and work;
Restrain the *murderous* Pope and Turk
Who fain would tear from off Thy throne
Christ Jesus, Thy beloved Son.

All Protestants are loud in their disapproval of Rome's bloody persecutions, although, sad to say, not all Protestants have remained guiltless of their opponents' blood. The proud Carlstadt made a sad beginning at Wittenberg during Luther's absence at the Wartburg. The Reformation progressed entirely too slowly for him. Luther, who had held the envious position of leader of the Reformation, was at that time in confinement. His was the opportunity to show that he meant to clean up with Rome's pollutions. Celibacy was denounced in a most decided fashion. Monasteries were emptied. The worship was changed. The altars were stripped. Statues were hewn down. Pictures were demolished, and all Catholic paraphernalia had to be swept out of the sanctuaries of the Lord. Both Zwingli and Calvin, to put it very mildly, connived at similar iconoclastic proceedings in their reformatory endeavors.

Had these men confined their iconoclastic spirit to paint and wood and stone, the blemish on their work could easily be overlooked. The radical reformers, however, used the instruments of death against their Catholic opponents. Zwingli, after he had left Marburg, in 1529, entered into an alliance with Landgrave Philip of Hesse to withstand the onslaughts of the papacy. Zwingli had never come to see the great evil of papocaesarism and the great disaster it brought upon mankind. Or if he did, he saw the principle in a different light when adopted by himself. From the very beginning he had placed the government of the Church into the hands of the State. Zwingli knew of no separation of Church and State. So when he arranged for a closer union with the landgrave, he justified himself by saying: "No doubt it is not by human strength, it is by the strength of God alone that the Word of

the Lord should be upheld. But God often makes use of men as instruments to succor men. Let us therefore unite, and from the sources of the Rhine to Strassburg let us form but one people and one alliance." On the 2d of November, 1529, he wrote a letter to Philip in which he used the following words: "Most gracious prince, if I write to you as a child to a father, it is because I hope that God has chosen you for great events. . . . I dare think, but I dare not speak of them. . . . However, we must bell the cat at last. . . . All that I can do with my feeble means to manifest the truth, to save the universal Church, to augment your power and the power of those who love God—with God's help I will do." In this spirit Zwingli agitated with untiring zeal for nearly two years, declaring: "That man must either be a traitor or a coward who is content to stretch and yawn when he ought to be collecting men and arms on every side to convince the emperor that in vain he strives to reestablish the Romish faith, to enslave the free cities, and to subdue the Helvetians," until the hour had come when the Five Cantons arose against the Protestant domains so fatal to the Swiss reformer. It was on Pentecost Sunday when this reformer preached his notorious war sermon in which he made the following edifying remarks: "He who fears not to call his adversary a criminal must be ready to follow the word with a blow. If he does not strike, he will be stricken. Men of Zurich! you deny food to the Five Cantons as to evil-doers. Well, let the blow follow the threat rather than reduce poor innocent creatures to starvation. If, by not taking the offensive, you appear to believe that there is not sufficient reason for punishing the Walstettes, and yet you refuse them food and drink, you will force them by this line of conduct to take up arms, to raise their hands, and to inflict punishment upon you. This is the fate that awaits you." Not long after, Zwingli is seen in the forefront of the battle, ending his career in a most disgraceful manner. Thus Zwingli employed the sword in order to carry out his reformation.

To see Calvin at work reforming the Church, we must only take a look at his efforts in Geneva, where Church and State were most lamentably mixed up, where the government was forced by Calvin to enforce his reformatory rules and regulations, lest it would be excommunicated and deserving of the wrath of God. The pictures were removed out of the churches, the music was reduced to the smallest possible minimum, and the whole worship was made as bare and as cold as it was in his conception to have it. The severest ordinances were passed and also executed in the severest manner according to the principle: "Whatever is punishable before God is punishable before man." A farmer's daughter that had called her mother a "diabesse" and had thrown stones at her, was publicly whipped while being suspended from the gallows as an indication that she deserved to be hanged. A child was actually beheaded for doing violence to its parents. One Gruet, for posting an insolent placard on Calvin's pulpit, was put on the rack for a month, tortured every morning and evening, and finally beheaded. Calvin was determined to have the orthodoxy of the Church established and maintained by an *auto-da-fé*. Michael Servetus was burned at the stake for heresy. Calvin explained that, if the papists avenged the apostasy of their faith so vigorously, then a Christian government must be ashamed of itself if, in defending the unalterable truth, it would show less courage. We see that Calvin's spirit was not much different from that of Zwingli. Oecolampadius reigned in a similar manner at Basel where the churches of St. Peter, St. Ulric, and St. Alban were defaced. Similar scenes were enacted under Farel at Val de Rug and Neuchatel. The propagandas of these reformers cannot be called conservative, but radical.

This characteristic of these radical reformers has so indelibly impressed itself on their followers, on the Reformed churches, that it can be plainly recognized in them at once to-day. Most pastors of these churches are ever on the lookout for some moral and religious reforms in their communities,

and they are ever seeking the arm of the State to espouse and to further their cause. The separation of Church and State is an unknown quantity to most of them, and they have absolutely no regard for it. To them the paragraph in the Constitution of our country that safeguards this separation is a thorn in the flesh, a fossil from the brain of some of the free-thinkers that framed the Constitution. Political, governmental, moral questions and reforms are constantly uppermost in their minds. Religion and the Bible in the public schools, prohibition, Sabbath laws to prevent all sorts of evils and pastimes, such as baseball and the like, in short, to make the city, state, and country a Christian government, is the aim and object, as they see it, of their existence. In order to accomplish these ends, laws and ordinances of every description are being introduced and urged in the halls of legislation, and the prosecuting attorney and constable are humored or intimidated to enforce these ordinances to the letter. And when by such efforts the baseball parks and saloons and other eye-sores are closed, the Church of Christ has won a great victory! It is the spirit of Carlstadt, Zwingli, Calvin, that haunts these reformers.

If ever a man was tempted to make similar use of the sword, it was Martin Luther. We must bear in mind that at his time the sword had been wielded in such a fashion by the Church for centuries. People hardly knew that it was not proper for the church officials to do so. Luther grew up in the papacy and had no intention, in the earlier part of his career, of opposing the pope in any way. Nevertheless, in his 95 theses was to be found a clear statement opposing the prevalent view on the use of physical force to bring heretics to terms. It reads: "To burn heretics is contrary to the will of the Holy Ghost." This Biblical principle Luther upheld through his whole life. Luther at many times was in a desperate condition as far as human eye could see and human help could prevail. It at times seemed that there was no other course to pursue than to embrace the help that the princes urged upon him. This was true at that crisis when Luther was banished by the

pope and interdicted by the emperor. The two most powerful forces of the world had conspired to crush him, powers before whom kings and nations trembled. Luther's cause seemed to be doomed. His grave appeared to have been dug. Ulrich von Hutten and Franz von Sickingen at this hour offered their legions to aid him and his cause. Luther opposed the well-meant project and said: "I desire not to fight for the Gospel with violence and bloodshed. By the Word the world has been overcome; by the Word the Church has been preserved; by the Word also it will be restored. And Antichrist also, as he rose without hand, so will he be destroyed without hand, by the Word." (XV, 2506, 2. — THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY XV, 232.) This was his opinion a few years later at the Marburg Colloquy, which was called chiefly for the purpose of establishing an alliance of the princes against the pope and the emperor.

In the sermons which he delivered at Wittenberg on his return from the Wartburg against the extreme measures and proceedings of Carlstadt, he has many things to say that do not only exhibit his views on the use of physical force in the interest of the Gospel, but which our reformed contemporaries, as well as we ourselves, ought ever to bear in mind. He says in part as follows:—

The mass is an evil thing, and God hates it, in that it is celebrated as if it were a sacrifice and meritorious work. Therefore it ought to be abolished. Nevertheless, love should not proceed harshly in this matter, removing the mass by force. It should be preached . . . that the mass is a sinful thing. . . . Since faith cannot be poured into the heart, no one can nor should be forced or compelled to it; for God does that alone, quickening the Word in men's hearts when and where He wills, according to His divine knowledge and good pleasure. Hence we should give free course to the Word, and not add our efforts to it. We have *jus verbi* and not *executionem*, that is, we should preach the Word, but leave the result to God alone. . . . And the compulsory law produces merely a sham, an outward show, an apert, and human ordinance, which begets seeming saints, hypocrites, and dissemblers. . . . I would, however, make no laws for them, nor insist on a common order. Whoever would be willing to follow would follow; whoever would be unwilling would stay away. . . . For by the Word God conquers the heart. When the

heart is conquered, you have won the whole man. . . . Follow this rule and none other! By such storming and violence you will not effect your object; mark my words! In brief, I will preach it, I will declare it, I will write it, but none will I force or constrain by violence; for faith must be voluntary and unconstrained, and must be embraced without compulsion.

In his discourse on Temporal Government, and at scores of other places, he draws a clear line of distinction between the functions and duties of the State and those of the Church. Nowhere has Luther ever taught otherwise than here stated.

Nevertheless, we hear the reproach that Luther, later on in his life, changed his view on this matter. At the end of 1524, "Luther suddenly abandoned his views on the freedom of conscience," says A. F. Pollard, in "Cambridge Modern History" (Vol. II, p. 194.) And an English socialist writes: "Before the Peasants' War, when struggling to assert himself, Luther taught that heresy could not be repressed by force, that no fire could burn it, and that no water could drown it. Yet so soon as Luther saw other sectaries springing up around him, and claiming the same privilege as himself, he declared that as rebels to the State they deserved punishment, even banishment and death. This, then, is the doctrine of Luther: The State is the head of religion, and all sectaries are rebels to the State." (Vide THEOL. QUARTERLY, XV, 244.) — W. Hobhouse in "The Church and the World in Idea and in History" (according to the *Lutheran Church Review*, XXXI, 176) gives Luther credit for no "consistent vindication of religious toleration," citing as proof the above example. These people, however, do not bear in mind that Luther urged the government to use its power against the peasants and Anabaptists, not on doctrinal grounds, but because they had given themselves over to lawlessness and immorality. These violations of the civil laws done under the cloak of religion had to be punished by the State. That was one of the functions and duties of the government. That this was still his position at and after the Peasants' War can be distinctly seen from the following excerpts (THEOL. QUARTERLY, l. c.):—

In a letter to Lazarus Spengler, of Nuremberg, dated February 4, 1525 (St. L. Ed., XXI a, 715), Luther says: "In reply to your question as to how they [Thomas Muenzer and his followers in Nuremberg] should be punished, I, too, hold that they are not guilty of blasphemy, but I regard them just as the Turks and apostate Christians on whom secular magistrates are not to inflict punishment, particularly no corporal punishment. But if they should refuse to recognize and obey the secular magistrate, then everything is forfeited whatever they are and have; for in that case they assuredly meditate revolt and murder, and it is the duty of the secular magistrate to take cognizance of the matter."

Letter to John Brismann in Koenigsberg, August 16, 1525 (St. L. Ed., XXI a, 772): "The unhappy fellow [Carlstadt] has been kept in my house in secret and safety [eight weeks]. Now the wide world is too narrow for him: he is everywhere so pursued that he has been compelled to beg his enemy for protection. I have treated the fellow as humanely as I possibly could, and have assisted him; however, he persists in his opinion, although convicted, as is the wont of this sort of spirits. Do you, therefore, beware of him and his doctrine!"

Letter to Elector John, November 22, 1526 (St. L. Ed., XXI a, 779): "I write this, because I sincerely pity the poor man, and Your Electoral Grace well knows that mercy is to be shown to the miserable, especially to the innocent" (Carlstadt's family).

"Against the Anabaptists," February 1528 (XVII, 2188): "Still it is not right, and I am sincerely sorry, that those wretched people [the Anabaptists] are so miserably murdered, burned, and cruelly slain. Everybody should be allowed to believe what he likes. If his belief be wrong, he will receive sufficient punishment in eternal hell-fire. Why, then, do they want to inflict on them temporal tortures also as long as they merely err in faith, and are not seditious withal or otherwise resist the powers that be? Good God, how easily does it not happen that a person errs and falls into the snares of Satan! They should be resisted with Scriptures and God's Word; with fire little will be achieved."

The accusation that Luther changed his mind as soon as other sectaries sprang up around him who claimed the same privilege as himself, is absolutely unfounded and false. The right to punish heretics physically Luther always condemned as wrong and denied it both to the State and to the Church. The Word of God alone should be employed as the only means

of bringing unbelievers and those of a false belief to a better mind, so to promote the welfare of the Church.

Therefore, since Luther went to the Bible as the only fountainhead for Christian doctrine, and since he at all times would consider the Bible as the only norm and rule of religion, and since he considered the Bible as the sword of the Spirit which alone could be used to promote the cause of the Cross and the salvation of souls, Luther's work, which he accomplished by the assistance of the Lord Omnipotent, is the *Conservative Reformation*.

So far, so good, is the rejoinder of the Zwinglian type. We will admit that the Reformation of Luther was a conservative one. But the trouble is, that it was too conservative; it is not complete. "If Luther sometimes permitted the chaff to remain with the wheat, Calvin appeared later, and more thoroughly purged the Christian threshing-floor." (D'Aubigné, IV, 37.) To all that take this reformedist as their authority there is too much Catholicism about Luther's work and in the Church named after him.

Indeed, in the days of the one divinely called Reformer his radical contemporaries saw too much of the leaven of Rome still clinging to the partly cleansed Church, leaven that was fermenting to such an extent that their delicate sense of smell could not tolerate it any longer, leaven, however, which could not be discovered by the coarser senses of Luther. They found Roman leaven fermenting on the altars and in the churches; and therefore the old leaven had to be purged out. With the hammer they approached the altars and "cleansed" them of the crucifixes, statues, and candelabras, until the whole lump of leaven was cast out and the altar entirely demolished. They discovered the pope's leaven on the walls, and the pictures were torn down and the frescoed walls whitewashed. Firewood was made of the organs. All ceremonies were abolished, and the whole order of service, being Rome's pollution, received due attention. When all seemed to be cleansed, there came a bad odor from the towers. So they climbed up into the steeples and

threw the bells out. And when all this iconoclasm and havoc was finished, these self-constituted reformers rested easy, thinking that they had effected a complete reformation. With pride and satisfaction they viewed the ruins, congratulating themselves that the results of their effectual efforts were far superior to the Reformation of Luther and his coworkers.

D'Aubigné describes with great satisfaction the great progress the Reformation made at Zurich under the leadership of Zwingli, how on a certain day set by the city council,

Twelve councilors, one from each guild, the three pastors, the city-architect, blacksmiths, carpenters, builders, and masons, went into the various churches, and having closed the doors, took down the crosses, defaced the frescoes, whitewashed the walls, and took away the images, to the great delight of the believers, who regarded this proceeding (says Bullinger) as a striking homage paid to the true God. In some of the country churches the ornaments were burned "to the honor and glory of God." Ere long the organs were taken down on account of their connection with many superstitious practices.

The historian then proceeds to compare this reformation with the work of Luther as follows:—

The Swiss Reformation here presents itself under an aspect different from that of the German Reformation. Luther had risen up against the excesses of those who had broken the images in the churches of Wittenberg; and in Zwingli's presence the idols fell in the temples of Zurich. This difference is explained by the different lights in which the two reformers viewed the same object. Luther desired to maintain in the Church all that was not expressly contrary to the Scriptures, and Zwingli, to abolish all that could not be proved by them. The German reformer wished to remain united to the Church of the preceding ages, and was content to purify it of all that was opposed to the Word of God. The Zurich reformer passed over these ages, returned to the apostolic times, and, carrying out an entire transformation of the Church, endeavored to restore it to its primitive condition.

Zwingli's Reformation was therefore more complete. The work that Providence had confided to Luther, the restoration of the doctrine of justification by faith, was doubtless the great work of the Reformation; but when this was accomplished, others remained to be done, which, although secondary, were still important; and to

these Zwingli's exertions were more especially directed." (D'Aubigné, III, p. 242 f.)

So our opponents to-day rejoin: "But you Lutherans continue to use Catholic rites and ceremonies in your churches. You talk about Lent and Advent as special seasons of the church-year; you build churches with a cross on the tower, and your pastors even sing the liturgies; you allow pictures on your walls and in your windows, have altars at which you pray, and crucifixes; and we have even seen candles burn on your altars; and then you have organs and even bells in your towers. All of this, however, is as Catholic as Catholic can be. How can you claim that you have completely broken away from Rome? What right have you to proclaim the work of Luther as a complete reformation?" Then they turn to their "meeting-houses" with a smile of self-complacency, look at the cold and bare walls and stunted architecture, and enter these places to worship God with self-crippled powers and with all lack of liturgical decorum. Yet, in their opinion, they feel themselves repaid by the thought that theirs is the complete reformation.

Not only on account of the outward rites and ceremonies do these good people consider the reformation of Luther incomplete. They are of the persuasion that Luther tolerated Catholic doctrines. They place the stigma upon our doctrine of Confession and Absolution, the Lord's Supper, the efficacy of the means of grace, etc. That our communicants go to confession and absolution; that the general confession is read from our pulpits or at our altars; that we believe in the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the holy Eucharist; that we believe that the Holy Ghost calls, enlightens, sanctifies, and keeps us by the Gospel; and that a child can be born again by the washing of regeneration, etc.,—is ascribed by the reformedists to Luther's guilty lack of completely reforming the Church. And then there are so many things that the reformed churches have and do, too numerous to mention, that prove conclusively how unreformed the Lutheran Church really is!

Did Luther, however, find any Word of God that enjoined

him to do his work in the manner that these radicals prescribe for him? Or did the radicals up to the present time show that Luther—or any one else—has any Biblical warrant for iconoclasm? Did God anywhere tell us how to build churches in the New Testament? Is there any way prescribed how the hymns and spiritual songs to which we are urged by the Word of God should be rendered? Is there any order of worship prescribed to be used in the amiable tabernacles of the Most High? Are the services not to be beautiful? Are the services of Pietism and Rationalism really more impressive than an ably rendered full Lutheran worship? What superior Christianity do the combined Reformed churches offer? Do they teach a better way to salvation? Have they a better understanding of Biblical principles, a higher regard for the verbally inspired Word of God, when they attempt to set it aright with their little reason? Is more good accomplished by the toleration of error at the side of truth, and by asserting equal rights for both, in conformity with the Reformed principle: “We agree to differ”? Is a better and more earnest Christianity trained in the many union services which are held so universally by these churches? Is their system of revivalism, of which they themselves are growing weary and disappointed, more efficacious than simple Gospel preaching? Have these churches a better way of indoctrinating their young than the way which Luther has taught us? Is there a better Christian knowledge to be found among the followers of Zwingli and Calvin than among those who are satisfied with the work of Luther? Where is their superiority? What higher achievements have they accomplished? We know that there is no superiority to the Church of the Reformation; we are certain that all these churches must take a great stride, yea, several strides, forward, to reach the level where by the grace of God we are permitted to stand.

Luther acted and worked in full conformity with the rule the apostle laid down: “Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.” As we have seen, Luther had the right rule by which he proved all things, not his own perverted reason, but the in-

fallible Word of God. According to this only rule of faith he proved all things, every doctrine as well as all rites and ceremonies. He held fast to all that was good. There is nothing maintained in the Lutheran Church to-day that can be condemned by adducing Bible proofs. The Church of the Reformation is, as we firmly and most positively know, the restored Church of Christ and the apostles. Luther has brought all the doctrines of the Bible to their pristine purity. From these doctrines he could not and would not deviate. These doctrines he taught, these he defended, these he restored to the Church. Therefore, Luther's work is the *complete Reformation*.

The first of the 95 theses declares: "When our Lord and Master Jesus Christ says, 'Repent!' He means that the whole life of believers should be a constant and perpetual repentance." Thus did Luther, at a time when morality was at a low ebb, admonish all men to lead holy lives. He did not, however, teach a heathen morality, a morality that is based on nothing else than a code of laws and stipulations, and that is prompted by nothing but what man does and can do. Luther went to the mainspring of a godly life, to the living faith implanted and kept by God's Holy Spirit in a believer's heart, as the source and fountain of good works. Indeed, faith alone justifies before God. But this saving faith, worked by God's Holy Spirit, has regenerated us to newness of life. Holy Baptism is, according to the Bible and Lutheran doctrine, an efficacious means of grace by means of which faith is worked in our hearts and the forgiveness of sins is imparted to us. Yet, those of us who have been baptized do not willfully continue in sin, but crucify the flesh with the lusts thereof, and our baptism reminds us of our solemn duty daily to drown the old man by contrition and faith, and to let a new man come forth who lives in righteousness and purity before God forever. The Lord's Supper to us is not a mere ceremony and function, nor is it a charm that works by merely applying it and using it in a prescribed manner, but an offering conveying and sealing unto us the grace of God which Christ has merited. At the same time,

however, all participants are admonished to sincerely repent of all their sins, and, by the assistance of God's Holy Spirit, to amend their sinful lives. This holy life, as Luther has correctly brought to light, consists neither in the purchase of indulgences, in monasticism, asceticism, and any self-invented sanctity, as pilgrimages, celibacy, and the like, nor in the abstinence from certain meats, in the observance of certain days, and in the total abstinence of certain beverages. Luther proved all these things and found certain commandments of men to be in conflict with Col. 2, 16: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days," and already condemned 1 Tim. 4, 1 ff.: "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of the devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth," and for this reason Luther did not hold fast to these commandments of men. Neither does the Lutheran Church to-day, which still proves everything according to Scriptures, hold fast to these whims of human fancy. Luther has taught the Church of Christ anew how to lead holy lives, that is, how to lead lives that please God. Of the rest we say what Christ says: "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

Not only to believe according to the Word of God, however, nor only to believe and live according to the Bible, but the boon that Luther brought back to the Church is also to teach its members how to die peacefully according to the blessed promises of the infallible Book. The Lutheran Christian on his deathbed does not need the intercessions of the saints. He has an open and free access to the throne of mercy, Christ being the efficient Advocate with the Father. Neither must he dread the agonies of purgatory, nor is he brought to the brink of despair on account of the damnable fallacy that we can be sure

of our salvation only when we feel the Spirit working in our hearts, nor is he dismayed at the horrible Calvinistic doctrine which claims that Christ did not die for all sinners, nor that God wants all men to be saved, that He, to magnify His glory, has predestinated many to eternal damnation, and so instills the doubt into the heart of the dying Christian that he perhaps will not be saved; but the Lutheran relies entirely on the un-failing assurances of the Bible which bring the firmest confidence, and thrill him to immortal hopes in that darkest hour. And since he has learned to base his whole salvation upon the Scriptures, on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone, he will find these hopes and consolations and assurances as grand and as powerful in death as they have been in life, and sufficient to comfort him on his dark way through the valley of the shadow of death, and to usher him into all the glory and splendor of that morning when the Sun of Righteousness shall rise in all His majesty and bring life and everlasting salvation.

What more shall we look for? What else did the prophets and Christ and the apostles teach? We know how and what to believe; we know how to lead godly lives; we know how to die peacefully and blessedly. Luther restored all this to the Church. His is not only a conservative, but, at the same time, also a COMPLETE REFORMATION.

“And how instructive is this to us in the struggle of our day for the perpetuation of the truth restored by the Reformation! Not alone by Rome, but also by heretical or fanatical Pseudo-Protestants, is it still assailed—and when we see the guilty passions, the violent and odious spirit of misrepresentation excited, and feel them directed upon ourselves, we may be tempted to give up the struggle. But we are untrue to the lessons of the Reformation if we thus yield. . . .

“And shall we despond, draw back, and give our names to the reproach of generations to come, because the burden of the hour seems to us too heavy? God, in His mercy, forbid! If all others are ready to yield to despondency and abandon the

struggle, we children of the Reformation dare not. That struggle has taught two lessons which must never be forgotten. One is, that the true and the good must be secured at any price. They are beyond all price. We dare not compute their cost. They are the soul of our being, and the whole world is as dust in the balance against them. No matter what is to be paid for them, we must not hesitate to lay down their redemption price. The other lesson is, that their price is never paid in vain. What we give can never be lost, *unless we give too little*. If we give all, we shall have all. All shall come back. Our purses shall be in the mouths of our sacks. We shall have both the corn and the money. But if we are niggard, we lose all—lose what we meant to buy, lose what we have given. If we maintain the pure Word inflexibly at every cost, over against the arrogance of Rome and of the weak pretentiousness of Rationalism, we shall conquer both through the Word; but to compromise on a single point is to lose all and to be lost.” (Krauth, *Conservative Reformation*, pp. 20. 21.)

Therefore, as Luther did and as it behooves all true Lutherans to do, we take our stand on the firm foundation of the apostles and prophets, on the verbally inspired and infallible Word of God, and say:

Though devils all the world should fill,
 All eager to devour us,
 We tremble not, we fear no ill,
 They shall not overpower us.
 This world's prince may still
 Scowl fierce as he will,
 He can harm us none,
 He's judged, the deed is done;
 One little word can fell him.

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