Doctrine and Defense.

Theological and Ecclesiastical-Monthly Journal.

Published
by the

German Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio and other states.

Edited by

Teachers' College of St. Louis Seminary.

Luther: "A preacher must not only feed, so that he instructs the sheep how they should be true Christians, but also ward off the wolves, so that they do not attack the sheep and lead them astray with false teaching and introduce error, as the devil does not rest. Now many people can be found who are willing that the gospel should be preached, if only one does not cry out against the wolves and preach against the prelates. But though I preach rightly, and feed and teach the sheep well, yet it is not enough to keep the sheep, and to keep them, lest the wolves come and lead them away again. For what is it built, if I cast up stones, and I see another cast them in again? The wolf may well suffer the sheep to have good pasture; he likes them the better to find them hostile; but he cannot suffer the dogs to bark in hostility."

Sixteenth Volume

St. Louis, Mo.
Printing office of the "Synod" of Missouri, Ohio, and other states.
1870.

Content.

January.

Page

Preface 1
Materials on Pastoral Theology 13
The "Protestant Ecumenical Council of New York." 18
The Immanuel Synod 20
Literary Intelligences 22
Ecclesiastical contemporary history26

February.

Preface... 33
Materials on Pastoral Theology ..41
The four rich men of Daniel. 46
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history55

March.

Materials on pastoral theology... . 65
The four rich men of Daniel. 69
The infallibility address. 79
Miscelle. 83
From Kurhessen. 84
A recommendation. 89
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 89

April.

Pastoral Theology Materials..... 97
On the history of the Roman Council. 106
Some innocent "open questions" to the General Council, resp. Dr. Krauth, together with a request for an open answer, if he agrees with our answer 114
Recension 122
Request to the "Lutheran " 124
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 125

May.

Materials on pastoral theology... . 129
Communion under both forms.... 134
On the Question of the Infallibility of the Pope.... 145
On the history of the Roman Council. 147
Literary Intelligences 148
Miscellanies. 153
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 155

June.

Antitheses to the Theses of Church and Ministry 161

Lecture, held at the solemn inauguration of our Synodal Printing Office. Inauguration of our Synodal Printing Office. 187
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 191

July.

Page
Materials on Pastoral Theology 193
Calvin 196
On the History of the Vatican Council 209
Miscellaneous 217
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 221

August.

What do we Lutheran preachers have to do in the beginning of the slackening, satiableness and secularization in our congregations, even within our synod, in order to ward off these evils as far as possible and to refresh and lift up the weary congregational life by God's grace and blessing? 225

"On the General Lutheran Conference" 242
Literary Intelligences 247
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 247

September.

Answer to the question: whether or not the marriage of a widower to his deceased wife sister is divinely forbidden? 257
Materials on Pastoral Theology 273
Miscellaneous 275
Literary intelligences 283
Ecclesiastical - Contemporary 285

October.

How do the teachers of the Lutheran Church in the 19th century judge the Antichrist; demonstrated to Prof. Kurtz in Dorpat 289
Materials on Pastoral Theology 304
Miscellaneous 308
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 312

November.

Theological concern about a marriage case 321
Dispositions of the Protestant Texts of the Church Year 334
On the Assembly of the General Synod of Ohio 336
Miscellaneous 339
Literary advertisements 341
Aphorisms 344
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 345

December.

Explanations of the 21st and 22nd from the Theological Axioms of Justification 353
Materials on Pastoral Theology 360
Two German Theologians on the Transformation of the National Churches into Free Church- 364
The usury question 368
Literary advertisements 370
How the General Council defines its position 375
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history 379

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 16. **January 1870.** **No. 1.**

Preface.

Two distinct directions - so say the church communications from North America - are in dispute here within the walls of Lutheran Zion. One direction is based on the conviction that the doctrine of the Lutheran church is finished and neither needs nor is capable of improvement. The goal of the other is: a further development of the doctrine on the basis of the Lutheran confessions.

Not ill expressed! and we take no decency in declaring that we go to battle under the former banner. That may be called un-American, after all. Unscientific, too, if it pleases our opponents. Yet yn)er the name of science, both in geology and in theology, the most wretched antics are sold. Such tawdry folly that our great-grandmothers would have been ashamed to tell them to their children even in the form of fairy tales. Unscientific and un-American, after all; or however many other un-'s you want to invent. Unbiblical our principle certainly is not. For St. Paul writes to his Timothy: "O Timothy, seek to advance Christian doctrine! especially by scientific opposition. Not-? oh no, but he beseeches him as earnestly as he can 1 Tim. 6, 20.: "O Timothy, keep that which is entrusted to thee, and beware of the empty talk and contradictions of false-sounding science." Is not this also said to the pastors of this century? And if so, do we really err so grossly in acting upon it? Could not the Holy Spirit, if He had wished to commend Progress Theology, have spoken the other way around?

Oh how Martin Chemnitz would have been angry if one had come to him with this progress theology! Martin Chemnitz, who wrote the famous Uoetriuns krutsuieniu, of which he was the author, a "repetition of the right general Christian doctrine, as the same is found in God's Word in the Augsburg Confession, Apology and Schmalkaldic Articles.

understood" - has called. And if someone in the year 1600 had had the idea of wanting to develop the Lutheran doctrine further! at that time, when it had just sufficiently established itself to cause concern in foolish persons: boredom would be too great if one did not tinker with it. For how could it have been known then that theological progress from step to step would lead down to the lowest abyss of hell? Now it is known! And those who know it should tremble. Tremble to break down the walls that separate the flickering fire outside from the roof of our church. When children who cannot yet distinguish right from left set fire to their father's hut with small matches of sulphur, it is sad, but always understandable. But when men, whose hair has already been scorched ten times by fire, throw a pitch torch on the roof of their house, that is frenzy. Have you men really learned nothing, like Louis XVss. ? Must the knife be put to your neck to make you prudent? Does not the history of the Lutheran Church bear witness, in all its pages, that the first step towards the development of its doctrine is the beginning of the end?

On all their pages! However, we would tire our readers if we wanted to force them to wander through the history of all the teachings. The principal one is without question that of Christ. As long as there were Christians, the two facts had been believed and testified to, that He was truly God and truly man. Natural God from the beginning, and natural man from the womb of Mary. So taught the holy apostles, so their successors, so St. Athanasius, so Cyril and Bishop Leo of Rome; so also the Concordia formula and Chemnitz. Of course, without imagining that they had understood the mystery of the birth of God. Rather, they were all satisfied to confess repeatedly what the Holy Spirit had taught from the beginning and what His Church had confessed. This can be seen especially clearly from the passage in which the Formula of Concord is spread concerning the communion of the two natures in Christ. For it says on the 546th page of Müller's edition (Epitome VIII): "Therefore we believe, teach, and confess that God is man and man is God, which could not be if the divine and human natures had no communion in fact and truth with one another. For how could man, the Son of Mary, be called or be God, or the Son of God Most High, with truth, if his humanity were not personally united with the Son of God, and thus had nothing in common with him in reality, that is, in fact and truth, but only the name of God?"

"Therefore the Son of God truly suffered for us, yet according to the quality of human nature, which he assumed in unity of his divine person, and made his own, that he might suffer and be our high priest for our reconciliation with God, as it is written.

They have crucified the Lord of glory. And with the blood of God we are redeemed. 1 Co. 2 Act. 20." So the Concordia formula does not reproduce anything, but teaches what is written. Nor has the orthodox Christian church ever confessed otherwise. Only read the Decrees of the Concilium of Ephesus, and all the testimonies which Andreä and Chemnitz have added at the back of the Christian Book of Concord. The Formula of Concord no less clearly testifies that the divine glory was given to Christ according to his human nature, but not in order to develop anything in any direction, but because the Lord says: "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me," and his apostle: "He has passed over all the heavens, that he might fill all things." And the fathers taught the same. Thus Vigilius, in the fifth book of his treatise against Eutyches, says: "The divine nature has no need to be exalted with honors, to be increased with dignity, or to obtain authority in heaven and on earth only by the merit of obedience; therefore he (Christ) obtained such things according to the nature of the flesh, who, according to the nature of the Word, had no need of them. For should not the Creator have had power and dominion over the creature, that in the last times he obtained it only by grace? 1) And St. Athanasius: "God was not changed into human flesh or substance, but transfigured in Himself the nature which He took to Himself, that human, weak, mortal flesh and nature might attain to divine glory, so that it has all power in heaven and on earth, which it did not have before it was assumed by the Word." 2)

And, praise be to God, for a hundred years and more the Lutheran church has remained with this doctrine. What was it that troubled the great Döderlein so that he wanted to continue it? Well, he told us himself, because he was afraid of the word of God. 3) And how enchanting was this training! How tenderly Döderlein reminded us of the bonds of friendship by which the Logos had united himself with Jesus, so that there was no other creature with which the Son of God could live in such intimate relationship.

1) Divina natura non indiget honoribus sublimari, dignitatis profectibus augeri, potestatem coeli et terrae obedientiae merito accipere. Secundum carnis naturam igitur illa adeptus est, qui secundum naturam verbi horum nihil eguit aliquando. Num quid enim potestatem et dominium creaturae suae conditor non habebat, ut novissimis temporibus muneris gratia his potiretur ? In the Catalogus testimoniorum of the Concordia Book. Müller. 742.

2) Deus non est mutatus in humanam carnem vel substantiam, sed in se ipso, quam assumsit, glorificabat naturam, ut humana, infirma et mortalis caro atque natura divi n am profecerit in gloriam.....ita ut omnem potestatem in coelo et in terra habeat, quam, antequam a verbo assumeretur, non habebat. In the catal. test. of the Book of Concord. Müller, 743. the passage is contracted from two.

3) Devenimus in campum, quem dudum horruimus, satis amplum, sed spinis ac difficultatibus obsitum perplexumque - quas intercidere, vel si parcendum est sacrae sylvae, theologis colendas et extricandas relinquere multis bonis viris consultum videtur. Baur: the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, etc. Tübingen 1843. iii. 680. .

relations stood. Yes, Mr. Döderlein was so kind as to speak of a particle of the Godhead, which one had to think of together with the man JEsus. 1) The excellent Henke made a further advance: "Let us remember," he admonishes, "that JEsus is indeed represented by himself and by his own as a man who is quite similar to the rest of us, but always as a person who was related and befriended with God in a special, wonderful, even unique way. Let us remember that he was full of divinity, indeed that he himself could be regarded as a present and visible deity. Let us remember, finally, that he is set before us in such character and greatness to the end that we acknowledge the majesty of this divine messenger and the immense value of the benefit which he bestowed upon men." 2) To be sure, Baur of Tübingen calls this argument hollow, unmotivated talk; but that does no harm, the excellent Henke at any rate did not consider it unmotivated talk. And that is basically all that matters. For there have always been persons without scientific sense; one must not ask about them, if only the theologians of further education are themselves quite firm.

The doctrine of Christ owed a new advance to the famous De Wette. This simple theologian first revealed to the astonished church the true concept of the so-called two natures in Christ. By the two natures, he said, nothing else is to be understood than the rational and the aesthetic view. Christ, viewed intelligently or naturally, is a man; God, on the other hand, is viewed ideally aesthetically. And as both views were essentially one, so there was only one person, the God-man; that is, not two persons, only two natures? Several miles farther on this doctrine was promoted by Schelling, who, as he himself delicately enough intimates, made the eternal original sources of truth and life accessible again, so that "the spirit again played freely and boldly in the eternal stream of life and beauty." Yes, the scientific progress which the doctrine of Christ made through him is astonishing. "God is, as the Absolute, the identity of the Subject and Object, of cognition and being, of the ideal and real, of the infinite and finite. This unity, however, is not an abstracted one, but concrete, living in itself, that is, such a one with which in God both a difference and

1) Baur. III. 681.

2) Meminisse, Jesum a se ipso et a suis propositum esse ut hominem quidem nostri simillimum, ut personam tamen singulari, mirifico et unico cognationis quasi et familiaritatis cum deo vinculo copulatam, plenam Numine, ut ipsum Numen praesens et adspectabile; atque talem nobis et tantum nobis propositum esse illum eo fine, ut legati hujus divini majestatem atque beneficii per illum hominibus impertiti ingens pretium agnosceremus, ut decreta, consilia, praecepta dei, ab illo patefacta, citra dubitationem tanquam vere divina amplecteremur etc. ΠΙ. 794.

3) De Wette, Religion and Theology. 1815. second edition. 1821. pp. 99. 185. 251. cf. Biblical Dogmatics § 255, Ecclesiastical § 64 ff. .

is set as a unity. (1) Christianity, therefore, can only be placed in the perspective of the idea of the general process in which God, as the unity of the finite and the infinite, becomes infinite and becomes man in order to be the infinite in the finite. As long as we do not raise ourselves from external history to the idea, and take historical facts only in their empirical particulars; we cannot connect any sensible meaning with them. If, then, theologians take the Incarnation of God merely from the fact that God assumed human nature at a certain moment in time, nothing at all can be thought of in this. God is eternal and out of all time. Therefore the incarnation of God can only be an incarnation of eternity. 2) But the eternal Son of God, born of the essence of the Father of all things, is the finite itself, as it is in the eternal vision of God, and who appears as a suffering God, subordinate to the conditions of time, who in the summit of his appearance, in Christ, closes the world of finitude and opens that of infinity, or the dominion of the Spirit." 3)

The defender of Judas Ischarioth, Mr. Daub, developed this brilliant doctrine to a finer point. The real height of scientific development, however, was reached by "the greatest theologian since Luther," Mr. Schleiermacher. The purpose of a Redeemer, he says, is quite different from what has hitherto been assumed; for sin is necessary and ordered by God, as is everything that really is. For sin is necessary and ordered by God, as is everything that is real. The only gradual development of the power of God-consciousness, in which lies the necessary reason for sin, is one of the conditions of the level of existence on which the human race stands. Redemption, therefore, can consist in nothing else than an increase in the power of our consciousness of God; and the Redeemer, in order to accomplish this purpose, needed only a particularly pure and high consciousness of God, which he communicated by teaching, and which now lives on in the pious community founded by him as a common spirit, or "holy spirit. Besides this, however, the sinlessness of Jesus must be most zealously upheld. This could not be proved from the Scriptures, partly because of the ambiguity of most expressions, partly because it would only prove that the first Christians believed it. Rather, the sinlessness of Jesus is proved simply from our self-awareness. For we are conscious that all approach to the state of blessedness is rooted in a new common life founded by Christ, in which redemption is effected by means of the sharing of his unsinful perfection. This sharing, however, does not proceed directly from Christ, but from the one who, through him, is enlisted in pious fellowship.

1) Baur. III. 808.
2) Baur. III. 810.
3) Baur. III. 812.

excited spirit. It is true that there is a being of God in Jesus, but there is also a being of God in the Jew Spinoza, whom Schleiermacher himself mentions; in the light of things, this is also only to be understood as the constant power of Christ's consciousness of God. For he knew that God was the indivisible One, on whom we feel ourselves to be par excellence dependent. 1)

A good explanation of the very advanced scientific development of Christology in Schleiermacher's Dogmatics is given in his Lectures on the Life of Jesus, which his faithful admirer, Mr. Rütenik, published in 1864. Our reformer first of all gets rid of the revivals of the dead: Of the daughter of Jairus Christ expressly says that she is only asleep: "This, then, Schleiermacher declares, cannot be regarded as an actual raising of the dead without contradicting Christ's own words. It would also be this, that Christ here addresses the child and says it should rise, for for a dead person the words are nothing. On the other hand, if we suppose that the girl was not dead, the voice can produce an effect. And here the experience comes in handy, that apparently dead persons, when they come back to life, say that they have not lost their hearing, when all other signs of life have gone out. 2) Schleiermacher judges similarly about the young man at Nain and about the stinking Lazarus. 3) The story of the temptation is, of course, a parable. 4) As for the miracles that took place in Christ, the descent of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove was nothing more than an appearance of light from a crevice in the cloud. 5) Furthermore, the transfiguration of the Lord on the mountain is without purpose, and therefore untrue. Moreover, the disciples were then in a state of drunkenness, so that all certainty of the report is lost. 6) The darkness at Christ's death was a natural phenomenon of the atmosphere; the tearing of the temple veil and the coming forth of some of the dead, on the other hand, is simply fictitious. 7) And the resurrection?- First, Schleiermacher declares that it is quite indifferent whether one asserts that Christ really died or not; but it is certain that there is no means at all to assert the one or the other. For the only certain sign of death is decomposition, but this did not occur in Christ. Therefore the action of life cannot have become completely zero in him. 8) This also throws a new light on the resurrection. 9) Some good friend - gives Schleiermacher

1) E. K. Z. 1865. PP. 1132-1134.
2) Schleiermacher, The Life of Jesus. Berlin 1864. p. 233.
3) "That Lazarus was already in decomposition may be based on preconceived opinion." Schleiermacher op. cit. p. 233. note a).
4) Schleiermacher op. cit. p. 162.
5) Schleiermacher op. cit. p. 152.
6) Schleiermacher op. cit. p. 237.
7) Schleiermacher op. cit. p. 448. 449.
8) Schleiermacher op. cit. p. 443. 444.
9> Schleiermacher op. cit. page 471.

helped the seemingly dead man out of the grave. 1) Admittedly, Jesus came to the disciples with the doors locked, but the door of the room was probably not locked, only the door of the house. And that was undoubtedly opened by the person appointed for that purpose. 2) So the process was very simple! At the beginning, the resurrected man seems to have expected an imminent death; later, however, he became more certain of his temporary survival. 3) What end he finally came to cannot be said with certainty. In any case, the story of the Ascension is highly suspect. In general, the facts of the resurrection and ascension of Christ, as well as his return to judgment, cannot be considered as actual elements of the doctrine of his person. 4)

Thus, then, the ground had been won for a truly scientific expansion of the life of JEsu. The path was shown on which Lücke, Nitzsch, Dörner and their comrades made discoveries upon discoveries. It was like in the days of Columbus, one island after another emerged from the shoal of the ocean, and one always more magnificent than the other! How truly scientific that Messrs. Lücke and Nöthe denied the Trinity of God; that Mr. Nitzsch called God the Son a manifestation of God's power. 5) And with how fine a tact Mr. Dörner knew how to combine speculation with orthodoxy in such a way that he taught: the whole fullness of the Godhead was certainly not in Christ. 6) On the other hand, the meaning of Christ is methaphysical and cosmic. For as man is the head and crown of the natural creation, so also mankind is to be regarded as the separated multiplicity of a higher whole, a higher idea, namely, Christ. And as nature does not gather into unity merely in the idea of a man, but in the real man; so mankind also does not gather into a mere idea, an ideal Christ, but in the real God-man, who personally represents its totality and gathers into himself the archetypes or ideal personalities of all individualities. And if the first summary of scattered moments in Adam, though itself still a natural being, yet represented an infinitely higher form than any of the individual natural beings; so also the second Adam, though in itself a summary of mankind and itself still a man, yet stands as an infinitely higher form than all the individual representations of our species. If Adam was the head of the natural creation, but as such already reached over with his being into the realm of the

1) Schleiermacher op. cit. p. 496.
2) Schleiermacher op. cit. p. 474.
3) Schleiermacher op. cit. p. 498. 499.
4) E. K. Z. 1865. page 1173.1174.
5) Baur. III. 947.
6) Baur. III. 964.965.

He is the head of the spiritual creation, but as such he already points from humanity to a cosmic or metaphysical meaning of his person. 1) Thus this sensible man, as he himself says, has in the ethical interest with special zeal and success set his sights on the true humanity of Christ. He has applied to Christum the true concept of compassion, that of the ideal man. Thus the old crooked conception of the impersonality of Christ's human nature, as it is still found in Ouenstädt, is finally overcome. The person-forming in our Saviour was rather the humanity. He did not participate directly in the absolute divine personality, but only indirectly. 2)

A further step forward on the path of Christological science was taken by von Hoffmann and Thomasius. As far as the former is concerned, it is admittedly difficult for persons who understand only ordinary German, the German of Luther and Lessing, to unravel the meaning of the many volumes with which Mr. Hoffmann has delighted his admirers under the name "Schriftbeweis. One hears words such as: divine I, 3) archetypal world goal, 4) inworldly effective reason for life, 5) the Trinity that has become unequal, 6) "since man only as nature was subject to an effect coming from the multiplicity of spirits," 7) and similar words that require a longer study than they deserve in order to unravel them. Meanwhile, with some effort, we have succeeded in ascertaining the following concerning his doctrine of Christ: In the Old Testament there is no mention of a multiplicity, or even of a twofoldness in God. Genesis 3:22: Adam became like our one, God means the dear angels, to whose species God belongs according to Herr v. Hoffmann. 8) Gen. 19, 24. says indeed: God caused it to rain fire and brimstone from God in heaven, but this does not mean so much as: God made it rain fire and brimstone from God in heaven, but something quite different. What, the honored reader may look up for himself on page 87. That further the Logos was God, is indeed found in John, but is by no means true; rather ὁ λόγος means the word of the gospel. 9) And so Mr. Hoffmann concludes quite cheerfully, "The Scriptures, therefore, offer us no Logos doctrine which has been applied to JEsus." 10) By the begetting of Christ, therefore, he understands His coming into the womb of Mary. And this historical moment is the "today",

1) Dörner at Baur. III. 987.
2) Dörner, Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie. Munich 1867. page 875. 876.
3) Hofmann. The proof of the Scriptures. Nördlingen 1852. volume I. Page 45. line 17.
4) Hofmann op. cit. Vol. I. Page 45. line 28 and line 31.
5) Hofmann op. cit. Volume I. Page 45. Line 32.
6) Hofmann I. a. O. Volume I. Page 37. Line 2.
7) Hofmann I. a. O. Volume I. Page 39. Line 4. 5.
8) Hofmann I. a. O. Volume I. Page 86.
9) Hofmann I. a. O. Volume I. Page 162.
10) Hofmann op. cit. Vol. Page 106.

of which the second Psalm deals in its seventh verse. 1) Nevertheless, there was a supernatural Son of God before the birth from Mary. But he "ceased to be God in order to become man." 2) Hoffmann, of course, denies the descent into hell 3) and the vicarious atonement. The wonderful transaction which he substitutes for the latter we have no room to develop here. Prof. Thomasius, for his part, discovered in the second part of his Lutheran Dogmatics that Christ's self-emptying did not refer merely to His humanity, but precisely to His divinity. God the Son had renounced his relative attributes under the reign of the Emperor Augustus. But relative attributes are: Omnipotence, omnipresence, omniscience, and punitive justice. These attributes God the Son had given up when He came into the fold of Mary. 4)

One more step was necessary, and this was taken by the great Geß in his book published in 1856: Die Lehre von der Person Christi aus dem Selbstbewußtsein Christi entwickelt. His keen eye found in the self-consciousness of Christ the strange circumstance that this self-emptying of God the Son also referred to the immanent, that is, to all His attributes. In the manger at Bethlehem, the Son of God extinguished his eternal self-consciousness and his eternal will. And so the eternal influx of the Father's fullness of life into the Son stood still for thirty-three years.

The development of the Doctrine of Christ was thought to have been decided by these poor minds. But that is the great thing about scientific progress, that it is never finished. And so the year 1866 brought, besides the victory on the fields of Sadova, also a spiritual victory. At least it was a great spiritual deed which the brother of the early completer, Mr. Beyschlag, launched. His Christology of the New Testament went further than all previous books. After he had developed the idea of the Son of Man with wonderful clarity, he first examined the sources from which the doctrine of Jesus Christ must flow. There he first treats of the "synoptic self-testimony of JEsu." Then the Johannine, then the Petrine Christology, the Christology of the Apocalypse, the Johannine Christology, and so it goes on to the conclusion. The result of these historical-critical investigations is: "Christ is the archetypal man, in whom the eternal image of God is historically realized." 5) John (1 Epistle 5:20) calls Jesus Christ the true God, but he teaches in the first chapter

1) Hofmann I. a. O. Volume I. Page 112.

2) Duke R. E. 607.

3) Hofmann op. cit. Second? Half of the second part. Page 335.

4) Thomasius. Christ's person and work, exposition of ev. luch. Dogmatics. Erlangen 1853. volume I. page 44. 45.

5) Beyschlag. The Christology of the New Testament. Berlin 1866. page 257.

of his Gospel, that the Word was in the beginning with the Father, and that he was God. But the scientific sense of these sentences is exactly the reverse. 1) Thus it is scientifically established that the person who spoke to the Jews in John 8:58 was **not** before Abraham; that Christ is not the creator of the world and God. 2) But such a kenosis is necessary to make possible a true human life of Jesus.

So rich is progress! And even if his satellites in Germany are not yet all marching with Herr Beyschlag at the head of the column, they are nevertheless all on the way. Professor Kahnis professes the recapitulation of mankind 3) (according to Dörner) and Professor Luthardt the theory of Thomasius. 4)

Even though we are Americans, we need not remain behind in the general scientific race. If an American runs, however, he first of all asks himself the question: to what end? What goal? - Of course we want to understand the person of Christ. For this is what annoys us about the Concordia formula, that it asserts such incomprehensible or at least incompatible things! Thus, for example, that Christ had his original divine majesty even in humiliation (Müller 679). Ah! so! Yes, but there the achievements of Messrs. Dörner and Thomasius and Geß are frightfully tiny! Or should the doctrine of the person of Christ really be rendered more intelligible by our asserting, with the two last-named, that the holy Trinity fell to pieces thirty-one years after the battle of Actium, and that during the thirty-three years which followed there were only two divine persons? Neither does the progress of Dörner help us; for according to him Christ was God, but not God in the manger. Thus, then, he became God, about the same as Domitian or Titus. The only one who really makes the doctrine of Christo more intelligible by a quarter or an eighth of an ounce is Herr Beyschlag. For according to him JEsus of Nazareth was in no way God. At the most he was called so. Poets also call a noble woman a goddess. Mr. Beyschlag himself, however, is still up to his ears in prejudices! For the phrase, which he uses in his book with a certain inclination: "Christ is the ideal man," is almost as incomprehensible as Leo's letter to Flavian, or the eighth article of the Concordia formula. And what is a farmer in the backwoods to think when he is told that Christ existed as a principle before his incarnation? Be serious for once about intelligibility! Let us dispense with these worthless phrases,

1) Beyschlag loc. cit. page 157 ff.
2) Beyschlag op. cit. p. 159.
3) Kahnis. The Lutheran Dogmatics. Leipzig 1864. Volume II. 600.
4) Luthardt. Compendium of Dogmatics. Leipzig 1866. page 155.

where you don't know if it means an "X" or a "U". Either we want to believe what the Bible says, literally, may it be beyond our comprehension or not. Or we want to know. Know, sirs! Really know! We have not put aside the Bible to have the filth of your wretched sayings splashed into our eyes. Your sayings that are a hundred times more incomprehensible than the words of the Holy Scriptures. If we do not want to believe that the carpenter's son of Nazareth was the Almighty God, we will certainly not believe your porridge, which is cooked up out of ungodliness and nonsense. Quite apart from the fact that the word of the Bible will judge us, it is otherwise truly the word of God; whereas after twenty years no fly cares for your miserable antics. But when you are dead, the whole value of your "scientific" artifices is that which the grocer pays. Once more, then: either not at all, or quite. Either believe, even without comprehending, but fully comprehend. But if we want to understand fully, we must turn to quite different sources than you are, to people against whom Beyschlag and Dörner are pygmies. To Bahrdt, David Strauss, Richard Clemens and Renan; but above all to the authors of the history of Rabbi Yeshua Ben Joßef Hanootzri. Either, then, we substitute with Bahrdt for the evangelical account of the life of JEsu one which we ourselves have invented. Or, with Strauß, we declare all the miracle stories of the New Testament to be myths. Or we make of Christ a magnetizer who knew how to utilize his meager knowledge to an unusually high degree. 1) Or we call the Lord our God a deceiver with Ernest Renan. 2) Yes, if we want to climb the lowest rung of progress - for it is progress toward hell - we must, with the devilish slaves of Altona, stain the holy men of God, yes, the very one who made us, with the slobber of beastly malice.

Do you want this! I think not. But if you don't want the goal, - you'd better stay home; you might as well fall in puddles on the way. Once upon a time in Louisiana there lived a farmer. His forty acres were on a hill in the middle of a swamp. For ten years he had tilled them in peace with his hands. Then one day he was driven to go out exploring. He came as far as near the Mississippi; there he sunk. But his wife starved to death with their six children. - We do not want our families to starve! We don't want to sink in the swamp either! Therefore we will not go out on voyages of discovery, but will remain on the forty acres which God has given us. Did not our fathers make us blessed with the doctrine which is sounded in the Concordia formula? And is it

1) Richard Clemens. JEsus von Nazareth oder das Evangelium im Geist und Bewußtsein der Gegenwart. Stuttgart 1850.

2) E. Renan. The life of JEsu. German by Eichler. Berlin 1864. pp. 263-267.

is it not enough that we should lead our wicked to the same end by the same means? What ails you, then, that you are not satisfied with the good word, incomprehensible as it is? If you want anything but to be blessed and to be made blessed, your condemnation is quite right. If only Eve and Adam had been content with being blessed! But they wanted more: they wanted to know what they had not been granted to know. And I think the history of their race is not of such a kind that it should cause us to renew their error,

For our sake, make progress beyond the North Pole; invent machines to fly to the Moon, if you can! But keep your hands off the word of the living God, we beseech you. It will judge you, therefore do not master it! When Christ comes on the clouds of heaven, he will require of our hands the same teaching that he has omitted from us.

We know well that such a man as Thomasius is a hundred miles apart from Dörner and Beyschlag. But how can a Thomasius be so deluded as to call the doctrine that Christ, in the state of humiliation, laid aside all authority in heaven and on earth, even according to the Godhead, - a continuation of the Concordia formula! For the Formula Concordia declares this very doctrine to be a dreadful blasphemy. Here are its words: Formula Concordiae, Epitome, Negativa; Müller, pages 548 and 550: "Repugnant false doctrine of the person of Christ.- Accordingly we reject and condemn as contrary to God's word and to our simple faith all the following erroneous articles, 20. There taught, and the saying Matth. 28.All power is given unto me, etc., is thus interpreted and blasphemously perverted, that Christ was restored according to the divine nature in the resurrection and his ascension, that is, that all power in heaven and on earth was again granted to him, as if he had laid aside and forsaken it in the state of his lowliness, even after his divinity. By which doctrine not only the words of Christ's testament are perverted, but also the way is prepared for the damned Arian heresy, that at last Christ's eternal divinity is denied, and thus Christ is utterly lost together with our blessedness, since such false doctrine would not be contradicted on the constant ground of the divine word and of our simple Christian faith."

We do not doubt for a moment that Thomasius is heartily attached to the teaching of Scripture and the confession of the Lutheran Church. But it is precisely from this that a witness of Christ like him could come up with such lamentable inventions; it is precisely from this that the apparent danger of so-called theological progress is most clearly seen. Let any one therefore depart ten paces from the truth of God's word, or ten thousand miles; he will in no case have us for his followers. For if we are to bring reason into bondage to the obedience of Christ, this has

Either no sense at all, or this: that we should believe what is written, without brooding over it. That is what we do, and that is why we hold so firmly to the one. The truth of the matter between us and our adversaries is not that the one fights for progress and the other against it, but that the one keeps the word of his God and the other does not. For to half keep and not to keep is the same thing in the sight of God. If, therefore, we needed an inscription for our banner, it would be this, "If any man add unto the word of God, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written therein: and if any man do from the words of this book, God shall take away his part from the book of life, and from the holy city." (To be continued.)

Materials on Pastoral Theology,

communicated by C. F. W. W.

(Continued.)

§ 39.

It is the duty of the preacher, not only to administer the means of grace to his congregation as a teacher, but also, as a guardian, bishop, shepherd, overseer, etc. of the congregation, to see to it that the word of God is followed in all things, and that the Christian discipline commanded in God's word is exercised. Match. 18, 15-17. 7,6. Rev. 2, 2. 14. 15. 20. 1 Tim. 1, 20. 3, 5. 5, 20. 1 Cor. 5, 1-5. 9-13. 2 Cor. 2, 6-11.

Note 1.

However, church discipline, especially with regard to life, can sometimes fall into disrepair even in a true church, without it ceasing to be so, because of the predominance that the wicked have gained in it, 1 Corinthians 5:1, 2; indeed, circumstances can arise in which the welfare of the church requires that even a deserved ban should not be carried out. Church discipline fully practiced is not a necessary mark of the true church, according to the "It is enough" of the Augsburg Confession. Article 7.

The sentence is rightly rejected as an error of the Schwenkfeldians in the Formula of Concord: "That there is no true Christian community, since no public exclusion or proper trial of the ban is held." (Repetition. Article 12.)

Ludwig Hartmann, though bitterly lamenting the decay of church discipline, nevertheless writes: "Those who cannot be separated without sedition are not to be put under ban. Thus Augustine (in writing against Cresconius B. 3. Cap. 4.) intends an unjust"

(The same Augustine could not agree that all in Africa who were given to drink should be excommunicated, because he saw that this vice was widespread throughout Africa, and that therefore, if all in Africa were given to drink, they should be excommunicated. The same Augustine could not agree that all in Africa given to drink should be put under ban, because he saw that this vice was prevalent in all Africa, and that therefore, if all given to drink were put under ban, none or few would have the communion of the church. Some we tolerate, he says in the Epistle to Vincentius, whom we cannot exclude or punish; we do not leave the threshing-floor of the Lord for the sake of chaff, nor do we leave the flock of Christ for the sake of goats, which are to be separated in the end. So also, if there be no presbytery skilled for the purpose, or if the people do not consent to the just excommunication, the solemn process may then be omitted; but yet a faithful minister of the church must labor and watch with the rest of the pious and faithful, that public offences may be punished, and that that which is holy may not be cast to the dogs or sows." (Pastoral, ev. p. 474.).

As late as 1533, Luther, Jonas, Bugenhagen, and Melanchthon declared that, for the sake of the circumstances of the time, they could exercise church discipline only by practicing confession and suspension from Holy Communion. Communion. In a concern about the church discipline to be established in Ansbach and Nuremberg, they wrote: "We have erected no other ban at this time, except that those who live in public vices and do not repent are not admitted to the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ; and this can be maintained by giving the Holy Sacrament to no one in our church, unless he has previously received it. This can be obtained by giving the Holy Sacrament to no one here, unless he has first been interrogated by a priest or deacon. Nor can we see how any other ban should be erected at this time, for there are many things which first require a cognitio (investigation and decision by a proper court). Now we cannot see how the cognitio should yet be ordered and arranged at this time." (Letters, etc., collected by de Wette. Berlin, 1827. IV, 388.) When, at a synod at Homburg, a detailed order of banishment for Hesse had been drafted and sent to Luther, Luther wrote to the Hessian theologians, June 26, 1533, among other things, as follows: "I have seen your zeal for Christ and Christian discipline with great joy, but in this time, which is so troubled and not yet fit for the adoption of discipline, I would not venture to advise such a sudden innovation. We must indeed let the peasants drink a little, and let a drunken man give way to a cartload of hay. It will do itself good, for we are not fond of laws. The matter is great, not in itself, but for the sake of the persons, who are able to arouse unrest in us, which we have a root in dry ground and not yet up to

Branches and leaves have grown up. However, I would advise this, that by and by, as we do here, we begin to reject those who are found worthy of excommunication, first from communion (this is also the true excommunication, which is called the small one), and then not to allow them to be godparents at the baptism of children. (A. a. O. p. 462.).

To want to introduce the solemn banishment procedure immediately into a new, still raw congregation would therefore undoubtedly not be in keeping with the spirit of our church. Here, too, the preacher must be guided by the principle: Salus populi suprema lex esto, i.e., the salvation of the people must be the highest law. Before thorough instruction on the nature of right church discipline, to want to compel a congregation to practice it is to want to reap before sowing. And would it not be great folly rather to put a congregation at risk, rather to let it lose the pure gospel, than to omit something that does not belong to the essence but only to the prosperity of a true congregation?

Note 2.

Those who, on the basis of what has been said, think that the Lutheran Church regards church discipline as something indifferent are, however, very much mistaken. The reason that church discipline in the Lutheran churches, especially with regard to life, has been in such low order in so many places is not because the principle was held that church discipline was not necessary for the proper condition of a church, but because of the circumstances of the time that hindered it. Johann Fecht, for example, who is quite unjustly regarded as a one-sided advocate of pure doctrine, who asked nothing of godly life and discipline, writes: "The whole edifice of the church of Christ rests on two supports, on the teaching of sound doctrine and on the practice of church discipline. As the former effects, as it were, the internal life of the church, so the latter governs the external.... . The more strict the ancients were in the latter, the more negligent we have become in it in this latter age of the world. And this want of discipline is the chief cause of the decay of our church. This lack of discipline began with our Reformation. For since before the clergy alone exercised it tyrannically, to the exclusion of the other classes, and as they pleased, and usually in their own interest, we have fallen into the other extreme in the Reformation, and have left to the preachers alone the preaching of the Word, and what belongs to church discipline to the authorities alone. So that in most places the latter thought to lose something of its right when ecclesiastical persons had exercised censure either in the consistories or in some other way. Where, however, a shadow of discipline had remained, there

the hands of the ecclesiastics, even in the consistories, were so tied by the political masters that gradually no discipline at all could be practiced. Righteous theologians of our church have complained over and over again about this lack of ours and have demanded the reintroduction of stricter discipline. This was done in particular by Joh. Saubertus of Nuremberg in a special book in 1636, to which he gave the title "Zuchtbüchlein" ("Little Book of Discipline"), in the first part of which he explains the great need for this discipline both from the Holy Scriptures and from the constant practice of discipline. In the other part he refutes two and fifty objections of the politicians against this discipline, finally he adds in the preface approving testimonies of theologians living at that time, Christoph Schleupner's, J. Gerhard's, Joh. Schmid's, J. Matth. Meyfart's, J. Meelführer's, Lorenz Lälius', J. Valent. Andreä's, Geo. König's, J. Weber's and so on. This booklet has been praised by all who have written on church discipline since that time, especially Dannhauer in his Theology of Conscience." (Instruct. pastoral, p. 164. sqq.). All this is the plain undeniable truth. Thus it is said, among other things, in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession: "So also it is always reported by our preachers that those are to be banished and excluded who live in public vices, fornication, adultery, etc.; item, who despise the holy sacraments. Sacraments." (Art. 11. Of Confession. 64. 68. b.). Thus it is further said in the Schmalkaldic Articles: "The great ban, as the pope calls it, we hold to be a lawful secular punishment, and is of no concern to us church servants. But the small one is the right Christian ban, that manifest, stiff-necked sinners should not be allowed to come to the sacrament or other fellowship of the churches until they amend and avoid sin". (Th. III, art. 9. fol. 148. b.). Luther writes: "We are commanded to be excommunicated, that if any man sin against God's commandment, and will not hear that his sin be bound.... But the world (thank God?) is now so pious that one is not allowed to banish, even though it is overflowing with sins. For it is full of avarice, hatred, envy, deceit, yea, full of shame and vice. There is no sin yet to be put away. All things are now called honest and upright, food is sought, all things must be holy, and all have become pious in the name of the devil. Therefore, for the sake of life, this ban of ours is no more. We cannot lift up this ban. But if we cannot put away the sin of life, yet we put away the sin of doctrine. We have nevertheless kept the ban, that we say: The Anabaptists, Sacramentans, and other heretics are not to be heard; banish and separate them from us. This is the most necessary thing. For where doctrine is false, life cannot be helped.

But where the doctrine remains pure and is preserved, there one can well counsel the life and the sinner. For there one has absolution and forgiveness when it comes to doctrine. But if the doctrine is gone, then one goes astray, and neither banishment nor redemption is found. Then all is lost." (On Matth. 18, 18. Erlanger Vol. XLIV, 94. f.). Although Luther did not see himself in a position to introduce full church discipline also in regard to life, he nevertheless desired it from the bottom of his heart, and he expressed this in innumerable places. Thus, for example, in the 1st of 1543 he wrote to Anton Lauterbach: "You would do well, and I would like it, if you could restore the ban according to the manner and example of the first church. But your intercession would make the lords of the court very lazy and would annoy them greatly, since they are now weaned from the coercion. Our Lord God be with you, and give you his prosperity. But such discipline would be necessary, for the will to do whatever one wants is becoming more and more prevalent and is becoming a loud drudgery. (I.VI, 58. f.). Also in the "Instruction for the Visitators" of 1528, Luther had already declared with Melanchthon: "It would also be good that the punishment of the right and Christian ban, of which it is written Matth. 18, 17. 18, should not be omitted. (Walch's Tom. X, 1965. f.) Also the Wittenberg Consistorial - Ordnung, which Luther helped to draft, contains a long register of sins, for the sake of which, if one persists in them, the ban should follow. S. Porta's Pastorale, edited by Crämer.
P. 692. ff. *)

It would therefore be a grave error to think that because church discipline was not completely brought into pregnancy at the time of the Reformation, one should not be anxious to bring it back into pregnancy now. Dannhauer writes about this: "In the beginning, at the time of Luther and his parastatals, when they began to build again after the Babylonian prison, they had to have sword and building mill at the same time, as in Nehem. 4:17: With one hand they did the work and with the other they held the weapons? At first it could not be so; the

*) In Luther's Table Talks we find the following strange story: "A citizen of Wittenberg had bought a house for 30 guilders; since he had now had it for a long time and had used it, and had not built anything special in it, but had glued and whitewashed four rooms with glue, he then wanted to sell it again for 400 guilders, and he put on the same four rooms and made the calculation that, since they would be rented out, one could take 20 guilders from them. Then said Dr. Martinus: Will the wretch regard a rotten beam and a glued wall of dirt lying grounds alike? If he will do so, then I will put him under ban and excommunicate him, that he may speak and abstain from the sacraments and Christianity. And only do not think that he belongs in heaven. It would be more than enough if he sold it for a hundred and a half gold coins, etc. We must set up the Excommunication again." (XXII, 955.) What should we do now, if we wanted to threaten such exaggeration, such usury, with excommunication?

The heroes of the Reformation had so much to do with the Reformation that they could not continue with the edification and the building of the church. But now that the building has been completed, the patching is necessary.

It would be a wicked steward, to whom a goodly house was given, who would not keep it in repair, and would let it rain on every part of the roof, and no better, and at last let it fall down. So it is badly piled up, if one does not want to prevent the torn down aergernissen and does not want to preserve the church by good cultivation. Fields that have long lain desolate are built up: why should not the fallen discipline of the church also be restored?" (Catechism Milk. X, 291.)

(To be continued.)

The "Protestant Ecumenical Conciliar of New York."

Since Pio nono decided to crown the final act of his hopeless church comedy with the imposing outburst of a so-called "ecumenical council" - and then probably to step down from the stage under its clouds of incense - it seems that even in Protestant camps one suddenly feels no greater need than the holding of a real ecumenical Protestant council. Pio nono at any rate knew what was necessary for the times, what was pleasant, what commanded reverence, indicated strength, and filled the world with admiration. How should not his sublime conciliar ideas find full acceptance among the great men of Protestantism! Decency, honor, taste, and policy dictate it. So above all things a Concil. The gentlemen of the Protestant Alliance on this side and on the other side of the sea are then also moving to bring about the same in New York next year. - Do these gentlemen know what they actually want with and at the Council? - History has not yet reported anything about that. What is certain, however, is that they want great things - great resolutions - great unions - great demonstrations against Pio nono and his Council - great deeds! Great men have been invited. The American Ambassador, Dr. Schaff, has procured the invitations. On November 4, under the auspices of the American Alliance, a meeting was held in the Reformed Church at the corner of 5th Avenue and 29th Street, New York, the final purpose of which was to receive the report of Dr. Schaff, who had returned the previous week from his transatlantic journey in the interest of the Council. In the evening session he said, among other things, that the question arose: "Should the ecumenical Council of the Church of Rome remain unanswered on the part of Protestant Christianity? The Council of Trent, which lasted with several interruptions for more than 20 years (?), was" (55 years later!) "answered by the Synod of Dortrecht and the Western

minster Convocation, both of which control the creed and the dogmas of a large part of Protestant Christianity to this day. What should now be done in this important case?" (This sounds as if every new Roman priestly council made this question necessary). "This question leads us at once to the object and purpose of our meeting. My conviction is," said Dr. Schaff, "that the projected great Protestant church convention in New York, after the conclusion of the Roman council, will attract as considerable a share of public attention as the convention in Rome has hitherto done." Then follows the report of his travels. In England Alliance people, Congregationalists, and other bodies expressed their warmest sympathies with the Conciliar cause, and wished to send delegates. A great many members of Parliament, nobles, Wesleyans, and Baptists, headed by Dr. Spurgeon, wished to come. Dr. Alvard of the High Church wants to send in a treatise on "Christian Union." On the Continent the Hon. Concils-Bitter had at first to contend with great difficulties (the perilous sea voyage - sea-sickness - tenderly anxious wives, - what work may dear Dr. Schaff have had!) - but finis coronat opus - "all these obstacles at last disappeared under the increasing interest in the great work." In Paris, characteristic enthusiasm. Dr. Pressense wants first to listen a little in Rome, and then to be able to explain the more decidedly the relations of Protestantism to that Concil before the Protestant Versammluug. In the Netherlands the matter of the Council was likewise greeted with enthusiasm in an assembly meeting in Utrecht. Dr. Van Osterzee and Dr. Cohen Stuart, Baron Van Loon and other "famous men of Holland" promised to come. In the conviction that the projected New York Council could only have a truly ecumenical character or exert any theological weight on the European mainland if German scholarship was represented in large numbers at it, Dr. Schaff campaigned with special diligence in Germany. In Bonn, the "seat of the famous university," the learned Dr. Lange unfortunately gave a negative answer, although he was to be relieved of all expenses. In Berlin, Dr. Hoffmann delivered two enthusiastic speeches in favor of the Conciliation at a specially arranged "Protestant Assembly," which was also attended by No. Bancroft, our envoy to Prussia. Dr. Hoffmann also wants to give the Council something to do. From Berlin and Halle, Dr. Dörner and Dr. Kraft, Court Preacher Dr. König, Professor Messner, Count Bernstorf, even the 70-year-old Tholuck and others will appear in person. - In Basel and Geneva again great movement and participation. The Doctors Godet, Astie, Pronier, Coulin, Von der Goltz, Stähelin and other great men have promised to visit. Spain sends Dr. Antonio Carrasio and Italy Prof. Reveil. At last also promise

the theologians of the Hanseatic cities of Hamburg and Bremen their support, Nowhere is there any mention of attempts and successes among Lutherans. What a pity - for there are also among them great, learned and liberal men, - men for a New York Ecumenical Council! - Finally, says the report of the "Apologist" of Nov. 15, "Dr. Schaff is of the joyful confidence that the projected assembly, in respect to the interest of the deliberations and importance of the results, will occupy a distinguished place among the great Conciliums of the Church of JEsu Christ during the Christian era." - Really? And only because a crowd of learned indifferentists and ecclesiastical-political erperimental theologians, so often assembled under all kinds of names and titles, are this time gathering again in the great city of New York under the name of "ecumenical council"? We wish the gentlemen of this council that they would first of all turn their eyes away from all "great conciliarities," "great results," and "excellent places," and that they would draw nothing else into the interest of their deliberations than to regulate their doctrine and practice most exactly according to the word of God. We can, however, expect nothing but a longer or shorter coneils talk "in many tongues," but not as at the first Pentecost, but as at Babel. - By the way, it is still interesting that a certain brother Leo . . the reporter of Schaff's lecture, makes the suggestion in the "Apologist" - to issue an invitation to the New York Conciliar also to the Pope, "so that he may use this wonderful opportunity to convince himself of his errors and then join the evangelical Church of JESUS CHRIST (NB. the Methodists)." Truly a successful proposal, a great project! Just think, Pio nono under the work of two brothers.... at the footstool! - Were the Conciliar to make this great Project his, it would be doubly great! - R.

The Immanuel Synod,

(founded by Pastor Diedrich), met last year on September 15-19 in Liegnitz. It consists of 12 pastors and 19 deputies. Pastor v. Kienbusch in Halberstadt reports about the negotiations in his "Immanuel" as follows: "Our synod sees the main purpose of its meetings in the continual striving for complete balance in doctrine on the basis of the Word of God. It may be very edifying for those who like to be enthusiastic when, at the beginning of a synod, the chairman asks whether all the synod members profess all the writings of the Book of Concord and want to conduct all negotiations on this basis - and then a full-sounding 'Amen' resounds through the now completely calmed assembly. This full-sounding, however, becomes a hollow-sounding one, if one admits how few of the confessors have been able to hear it.

The fact is that many people study the Scriptures down to the individual phrases, and how many do not study them at all, but in all difficult questions look 'trustingly' to their spokesmen, and that these have their 'amen' ready at all times. This kind is untrue, and all jugglery in such profound matters punishes itself by ending in complete human bondage on the part of the great multitude under one or a few powerful spirits." What the dear Pastor v. Kienbusch writes here unfortunately finds its application in many cases to local conditions, in that it is now becoming fashionable here to profess with a full mouth all the symbols of the church without ever having compared them with God's Word and having found them to have stood the test. At its last meeting, the Immanuel Synod unfortunately had as its speaker Pastor Meinel, a decided disciple of Löhe, on the question: "Does every doctrinal deviation cancel out church fellowship? The lecture, because it did not want to be latitudinarian, suffered from bad confusion. Pastor v. Kienbusch therefore remarks: "During the discussion in the synod it became noticeable that another brother would have had to work on these sentences beforehand, because of any expositions to be made, in order to direct the debate sharply and strikingly to the contestable points. After the lecture it was clear to the assembly that it was aware of the great importance of the matter. The important terms 'doctrine', 'fundamental and non-fundamental in doctrine', etc. had to be determined; furthermore, an understanding was needed about what should be presented in the confessions as the core point of doctrine, and what only occurs as an incidental statement. The distinction between articles of faith, which are proven in the fight against false teachers with clear words of the holy Scriptures, and articles of faith, which are proven in the fight against false teachers with clear words of the holy Scriptures, must be made. The distinction between articles of faith, which are proven in the fight against false teachers with clear words of Holy Scripture, and expressions, which are made casually, will always assert itself. That the communion of the church and of the Lord's Supper should not be abolished by any and all deviations from the letter of the confessions was - so it seemed to the rapporteur - not a matter of controversy in the assembly; but a certain reticence on account of individual expressions, which had to be thoroughly ascertained, was equally evident. It may be called unsatisfactory that no common declaration was made-but it may also be regarded as satisfactory, if one would be content to postpone a precisely formulated declaration in this highly important matter, until repeated and repeated examination and consideration of it in the fear of God had taken place." Evidently the Immanuel Synod had entered the slippery ground and slope of Iowa, but conscientiousness and a sense of the great responsibility which would be involved in closing before the orthodox church fortunately restrained them from doing so. Regarding their position on the "General Lutheran Conference" (which met in Hanover), it says: "It was pointed out how we went to Hanover without hopes, but only because, in an appeal to all Lutherans

all the less would we have wanted to be absent, as here and there one seemed inclined to think that we were something else. We are always ready to negotiate in free conference with all those who wish to hear from us the reason for our opposition to union and legal church government, whether they are Lutherans of the state church, or Breslau Lutherans, or Verein Lutherans. But since the 'Lutheran Conference' does not want to examine who or what is Lutheran, but in its present composition pretends to be a representation of the Lutheran Church, they do not believe that God the Lord will confess to such a profound untruth. One of the brethren in particular emphasized that if he were to participate in the Conference any longer, he would disavow his fight against the Union." The General Council and Iowa do not seem to have this concern; rather, they will congratulate themselves on being able to receive a testimonium orthodoxiae from so respectable an assembly. W.

Litterary Intelligences.

1. Protestant response to the letter addressed to all Protestants by Pope Pius IX, with a preface to the same. A defense against Rome, presented to the Christian people from all ranks and races for their benefit and piety by the author of "God's Word and Man's Word" (city pastor Dr. A. H. Schick). Erlangen 1869, Deichert (VI, 294 pages gr. 8). Price 1 Thlr.

According to the excerpts which the "Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung" gives from this work, it must be of not insignificant value. According to the "Kirchenzeitung", the author has given a "Protestant answer" to the papal demand, in which he mainly aims to present the foundation of the Roman church, the whole papacy in its baselessness, historically. He divided his work into four sections. 1. "The Pabbacy and its Divine Establishment." - "Are you," asks the preface addressed to the pope himself, "instituted as supreme ruler of the church by God and JEsu Christo, or is it one of your ancestors? Have you been divinely appointed as a living authority to instruct in matters of faith and morals, to regulate all human convictions in knowledge and conduct, in private as well as in civil life? The divine appointment ought to be so clearly demonstrable in the case of nothing at all as in the case of the papacy, since it makes Christian doctrine, custom, and life dependent on itself, since millions look to it as their highest authority? If doubts and misgivings could remain in this matter, it would be an error, an essential defect of the divine revelation in Scripture. Either the

divine appointment claimed by you lie there quite clearly and openly before all the world's eyes, or it does not exist in spite of your assertion, and you then have no right to this letter! So divinely instituted or not divinely instituted, that is the question for the being or non-being of the papacy." It is now most clearly demonstrated, by means of undistorted history, that the whole Christian Church is not at all instituted in the Pabbacy, and at the same time the whole history of the origin of the Roman Curia is traced and demonstrated. We give some of the rich contents: Original equality of bishops and presbyters. Is the letter of Clement a sign of papal power? How does the different time of the celebration of the Passover reconcile with the existence of a papal power? Do we find traces of such in Ignatius? Or in Irenaeus? The bishop begins to be exalted above the presbyters. Do Cyprian's thoughts on unity bear witness to the papacy? Increase of congregations and church offices. Importance of the "mother church" and the related emergence of patriarchs and metropolitans. Rome, as the capital of the Roman Empire, receives the same rank as the other mother churches. Rank disputes among the five patriarchs. Elevation of Rome in ecclesiastical prestige through her secular position. Something about the so-called Rome journeys. Are they a sign of the papacy? E.g. the journey of Justin to Rome? Or that of Polycarp? Or that of Origen? And in this luminous manner the whole history is traced down to the present time, with constant reference to the pertinent Doctors of the Church. S. 36-54, starting from Matth. 16, the clear Scriptural proof against the papacy is given. All of the censorial moments that one would like to smuggle into Scripture do not stand up to the truth, and one bulwark of the falsely famous art after another collapses. In this connection, the author sees four levers in particular in history which aided the emergence and promotion of the papacy: 1. the pseudo-clementions; 2. the declaration of the Emperor Phocas; 3. the secular power of the popes; and 4. the pseudo-isidorean decrees. Finally, the author allows the results of his research to be confirmed by other scientific fields, such as exegesis, liturgy, canon law, literary history, poetry, and even by the Roman court itself. Thus the work arrives at the unshakable conclusion: the papacy is not divinely instituted; with it also falls its infallibility, and completely justified is the subsequent admonition to the papacy, reinforced by Catholic voices. - In the second section, "The Pope and the Council," the whole council system from the beginning is briefly and succinctly discussed according to its various phases and changes, and gives everyone a clear picture of the actual conditions that existed at the time. We see the relationship of the Roman bishops to the concilia, that of the Roman emperors, then of the German kings and emperors to the same, the relationship of the concilia to the synods, the

The following questions are answered: Is the synodal principle at all compatible with the papacy; what did the Roman synods do, what did the Tridentine Council do? This is followed by the answer to the questions: is the synodal principle at all compatible with the papacy; what have the Roman synods done, what has the Tridentine Council done, and what will the forthcoming one do? Strange confessions, at last, of a papal secretary on the Conciliar system, close this section. - "The Pope and his love for the Protestants" forms the third section. The whole papal letter is full of assurances of love; but what this love is about is historically attested by the Albigensians and Waldensians, by the Inquisition and its rages in Spain and Portugal, by the persecutions of the Protestants in England, Ireland, Bohemia, France and the Netherlands, in Thorn, Dresden, Sweden and Italy. But as little as the Pope's alleged love for the Protestants justifies him in writing this letter, so little do the conditions of his own church; and so "The Pope and the Conditions of his Church" make up the fourth and last part of the work. First, the spiritual life within the Roman Church in general is treated, then the Bible prohibition, the Roman Church doctrine, the celibacy, the Latin language in the divine service, the Roman divine service in general, the religious-moral life, the associational life, the political and the commercial life, and finally the unity in the Roman Church itself. - It should also be mentioned that all the truths throughout the book are accompanied by testimonies from the Catholic Church itself, by which the author incidentally succeeded in proving that the so highly praised unity of the Roman Church does not exist at all. And the more difficult it may have been to seek out this Roman polemical literature, which is almost everywhere suppressed, to follow it, and to live into it, the more the author is entitled to our thanks for the trouble to which he has submitted himself, and he would probably deserve it still more if he had given the proofs taken from it everywhere with exact indication of the sources. Therefore, while we highly recommend his rich writing, we conclude with the words which he himself gave to the whole as a conclusion: "We therefore invite him (the Pope) to humbly renounce the delusion of infallibility, to give honor in doctrine and life to the infallible word of the Lord alone, and to submit to the clear, unadulterated Gospel of our Lord JEsu Christ! Let all decrees be rejected, for they are and remain, whether genuine or spurious, human statutes. The Pope is not afraid to declare openly that if the Roman Church is to be saved and experience a reformation, it must come closer to the evangelical Church. On the return to the evangelical truth depends not only his own salvation, but also the salvation of the whole Christian society."

2. The Pope and the Concil of Janus. A further elaborated and source-referenced reworking of the articles published in the "Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung": The Concil and the Civilta. Leipzig 1869, Steinacker (XIX, 451 p. 8.) Price 1 Thlr.

About this writing, the "Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung" says: "Among all the writings produced by the Council, this one will remain one of the most important. As its author, a well-established rumor names men who occupy an outstanding position in the Catholic theology of Germany, and the reader will only be more inclined to believe what he encounters at every turn of the most comprehensive scholarship and an uncommonly secure historical judgment. *) According to the preface, the writing is intended to offer a historical orientation on the questions which will probably come to a decision at the Council. But this is not the sole purpose, rather only a means to an end. It is primarily intended to be "an act of emergency defense, an appeal to the thinking among believing Christians, a historically justified protest against a threatening future, against the program of a powerful coalition." The authors profess to be of the liberal tendency in the Catholic Church, i.e., that which is called by the Jesuits the liberal . .. .

*) Of all the different conjectures, which immediately from the publication of the articles in the "Augsb. Allgem. Ztg." about the authorship of the same, the one which, as the otherwise well-informed "Historisch-politische Blätter" recently did, names the Provost Dr. v. Döllinger in Munich as the main author, is probably the most probable. The somewhat clumsy polemic, which, however, is found in the preface against the same, cannot prove anything against this assumption, since it is to be regarded only as a move, which is to divert the attention to another side. What importance, by the way, is attached to the writing - of which an English translation has just appeared (London, Ringtons), which is causing a great stir in the learned world of Great Britain, while a French and an Italian one are among the press, both of which will appear before the beginning of the Council - can best be seen from a judgment of the "Kölner Pastoralblatt," which calls it "the most dangerous work" that has been written against the Church for many years; so dangerous that it can cause serious temptations against the faith not only to the laity, but even to educated and well-behaved clergymen who read it without special care and preparation. The ordinary laity must be warned all the more against reading the book, since they are absolutely incapable of untangling the snares which are here laid for them. For "Janus" knows how to cite falsely (which would still have to be proven) and interpret so exemplarily, and in doing so knows how to present the matter so finely and skillfully and to blind it with historical erudition, that even educated clergymen and laymen, who cannot always read the sources, are led into great temptations". Thus it is only to be wondered at that until now there has been a complete lack of counter- and refutation writings, and that only at present the editor of the "Kölner Pastoralblatt", Prof. Dr. Scheeben in Cologne, is busy with a shorter and Prof. Dr. Hergenröther in Würzburg with a longer refutation of the "Janus".

The authors distinguish between the Catholic Church and papism; they want to serve the latter, but fight the latter. And since they fear that he, with the help of his most distinguished squires, the Jesuits, only wants to use the Council to strengthen his rule in the long run, they raise their voices in time to awaken public opinion and to inform it of the danger.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The German Lutheran Synod of the State of New York (the so-called Steimle's Synod). Pastor Dr. Mohldenke gives a eulogy to the same in the "Lutheran Herald" of Nov. 27. In it is said, among other things: "By an association with that part of the Buffalo Synod which is under the leadership of the Rev. von Rohr" (a Mohldenkeian euphemism), "it has made its ecclesiastical position plain enough, as well as its opposition to the doctrines advanced by the Missouri Synod on the church and preaching ministry." (Of course, reason enough for a panegyric on her). "It is natural that in the continual contacts with members of the old New York Ministry" (from which Steimle's Synod separated in 1866) "the question arose more and more frequently, and was also submitted at a meeting, whether a union with the New York Ministry would not be timely and beneficial." It was "resolved to effect the union offered and desired by the Ministry, as soon as the New York Ministry would also expressly place itself in its Constitution upon the profession of all symbolical books." Mr. Mohldenke complains in his apologia of the "legal dogmatism" of certain people. In this he ranks himself worthily with Iowa, which also querulous about a "legal standpoint." It almost seems as if it were generally the case that people think they can come to terms with every demand of the divine Word in doctrine and life by simply saying: "That is legal; but not to walk strictly according to God's Word (be it Law or Gospel) is evangelical! W.

"A Petition of American Priests to the Conciliar Council." Under this heading we read in the Louisville "Katholischer Glaubensboten" of Dec. 1 of this year the following: "In "Freeman's Journal" in the course of this year a number of articles have been published in which it is demanded as just and equitable that canon law be introduced here in America, since America is no longer to be regarded and treated as a 'mission field. This demand must be called a most just and equitable one. - It must be desirable for bishops and priests that a 'legal relationship' be established between them. In this way the boundary is precisely marked for the priest and for the bishop, and each knows how far he has to go. In this way, incidents - which are not to be denied - that a priest is suspended and thrust into the world at the bishop's discretion become impossible, and the relationship between bishop and priest can only improve if it is based on law and justice. - In the petition submitted by some priests to the Council, it is requested that in the future it be permitted and decreed: 1. that any priest who has been active in the pastoral care for seven years, without being censured, may not be transferred without cause; 2. that any priest who has been suspended for seven years, without being censured, may not be transferred without cause; 3. that any priest who has been suspended for seven years, without being censured, may not be transferred without cause.

That no priest may be punished. (2) That no priest shall be punished except by temporary suspension, unless the "Judices causarum" of the diocese have pronounced judgment against him. 3rd, That the Judices causarum singulatim shall be appointed by the Ordinary of the diocese every year, according to the provisions of the Council of Trent. But as our bishops have no chapter of diocesans, those priests who have exercised the pastoral care of the church for seven years without any offence shall have the right to approve or reject in the annual synod any of these judices causarum appointed by the bishop. - For these points the signatures of the priests are requested, and also a contribution of money to defray the expenses of those priests who will bring the matter before the Concil and there defend it. Contributions and signatures will be procured by Mr. McMaster, editor of "Freeman's Journal" in New York." - Now, as apostates are always more fanatical for the newly adopted religion, so is the case here with Father Oertel. The latter writes in his "Katholische Kirchen-Zeitung" of Dec. 2: "Freeman's Journal seems for some time to have been the organ of certain personalities who find fault with the bishops in many ways. It recently announced that some priests from New York will soon travel to Rome to present a petition to the Concilium so that no priest in this country will again be exposed to the 'arbitrariness and whim of the bishop' as before. This petition against the bishops can produce no good effect. It is reprehensible in my eyes. I myself, if I were Episcopus, would no longer like to have a priest in the diocese who assented to this petition." - We see from this, apostates only hope to find in the newly elected Church what they have been looking for, if they dog-wag the influential in it. W.

In the December 8 issue of the **Lutheran** Visitor, a correspondent of the Lutheran **Synod of North Carolina** defends it against the accusation that it was intentionally divided on doctrine. The correspondent proves that the Synod unanimously declared that it "believes that the unaltered Augsburg Confession in all its parts agrees with the Word of God and is a correct exposition of doctrine;" further: "That the Apology, Luther's Catechism, the Schmalkaldic Articles, and the Formula of Concord are a faithful development and defense of the doctrines of the Word of God as set forth in the Augsburg Confession." - This is certainly a most gratifying manifestation from the Lutheran Church of the South. W.

Judgment about the difference between Iowa and Missouri. Such a judgment is given, among others, by Inspector Bauer in Neuendettelsau (Germany) in the "Kirchliche Mittheilungen aus, über und für Nord-America" (1869. 1. Jahrg. Neue Folge. Nro. 9). We report the following from it: "In the Missouri Synod and the Iowa Synod there are two points of opposition, each of which represents a distinct direction. Hence the vehemence of the opposition and the burning controversy. This, however, has its afflictive side, because so much humanity and party passion interfere. But there is also a light side to it, and it is only properly understood when this is also grasped. Whoever does not remain merely on the surface will see that this controversy is a necessity and has its full justification; indeed, that this question, which only does not enter into life in this way, is being agitated everywhere in the Lutheran Church and must necessarily be brought to a decision. It is a question of whether the Lutheran doctrine and dogmatics of the fifteenth (!) century must be preserved unchanged down to all particulars through all times, or whether it should be changed in "less essential" (i.e., "essential, nevertheless") "individual" (i.e., "essential, nevertheless") "particulars" (i.e., "essentials").

The Church is in need of improvement and supplementation on the basis of the Holy Scriptures. Scripture. The former view is based on the conviction that the doctrine of the Lutheran Church is finished, complete in all respects, and therefore neither in need of nor capable of improvement and addition. He who has the pure doctrine and the whole of it cannot want to make it still purer and add to it. What is added to it can only be a corruption of what is pure and an added disfigurement. The aim, therefore, can be no other than to keep what one has. But the aim determines the direction. This is what the Missouri Synod wants and strives for. What the Synod of Iowa, on the other hand, strives for is: "a healthy (?) further development on the basis of the Lutheran confessions" (which it does not accept without a clause!) "in the light of the Holy Scriptures" (which it sees as the basis of the Lutheran confessions). Scripture" (which she does not consider clear enough in important points!) "to create space. Missouri represents the activity and Iowa the mobility or rather the activity with the mobility." (Yes, if by mobility is meant "moving.") "If the Missouri Synod prides itself on 'pure' doctrine, i.e., that it holds fast the Lutheranism of 1580 unaltered and does not take up and add any other component, the Iowa Synod can pride itself not only on 'pure' doctrine, but also, which is no less important, on 'sound' doctrine" (A sharp distinction, indeed! It is to have pure doctrine, and yet to desire to make the same purer and better!) "Doctrine boasts." . . . . "Should the holy. Should the Holy Spirit have stopped this activity all at once since 1580 and left no gleaning at all for the following centuries? Should there now be nothing more to decide in the Church from the Holy Scriptures? No more open questions at all? All finished and closed in doctrine, like a crystal,-or finished, but not quite, not quite full-grown, like a plant, which, notwithstanding many blossoms and fruits, still puts forth new blossoms and fruits: that is the question." (That is not the question! But whether of what Scripture clearly teaches, and what the confession clearly states according to God's Word, may be an open question among Lutherans.) "Now one would think that this would not be too difficult to decide. Even a less learned reader could. Yes, one might think it self-evident and not to be disputed at all." (Certainly, if that were really the question.) "Now one might become unwilling and begin to scold those who, for the sake of such things, disturb the peace and start a quarrel. Who, then, will object and resist a better knowledge?" (Certainly, no one will, no one should, but the question is whether what is presented is a better knowledge). "Yes, that is precisely where the fear lies that freedom might be abused and that erroneous doctrines might be blackened under false names. That is the main reason why Missourians prefer to stick to what they have. This is what the authority of the greatest teachers stands for. It is also right and good that there should be people who keep a sharp watch to see that no errors creep in. But since the holy Scriptures are still a greater authority But since the Holy Scriptures are still a greater authority than the greatest teachers, others demand that we should not look to the authority of the great teachers alone, even if it were Luther himself," (it is not true that we appeal to Luther's or any man's authority, the Iowans to the Scriptures - the opposite always takes place) "but that we should examine according to the Scriptures the disputed questions which are involved here, the questions which concern the doctrine of hope" (chiliasm) "and the holy ministry. The Church is to be examined and decided according to the Scriptures. But as long as the Church has not come to a general and public decision, it is necessary to leave room for discussion of the questions." (This is permitted even before the Church has "decided"; but in any case he is not yet a true Lutheran who still questions the correct doctrine of the Lutheran Church.) W.

Harvard University" near Boston is becoming more and more rationalistic. The election of Elliott to the presidency is a victory for the rationalistic direction, as it is expressed in the so-called liberal circles in the New England states. Soon after his inauguration Elliott eliminated morning worship from the school; now comes the news that a chair will also be established for the so-called positive philosophy." This we read in the "Christian Messenger." It agrees with our own experiences and observations. It almost seems as if America, too, like Germany, were still to live through its rationalistic period. Unitarianism is seizing more and more of the sects of New England, and threatens from thence like a flood to pour itself over all America. W.

Infallibility. For a long time the papists have resisted admitting that a man like Döllinger could stand against the doctrine of Jnfallibility. Now writes the "Kathol. Glaubensbote" of Louisville (of Dec. 1): In the "Augsburger Postzeitung" one reads under Nov. 8: "Herr Stiftspropst Döllinger has, as I hear from a sure source, sent to the German Episcopate a pamphlet, the author of which is the learned Provost himself, wherein he, as a historian and theologian, is decidedly opposed to the Jnfallibility Declaration."

Congress of Freethinkers. As is well known, such a congress was to oppose the Roman Council during its sessions in Naples. Even several local newspapers hostile to religion find this absurd. The Cincinnati "Volksfreund" writes: "Resolutions of a convention of freethinkers, which establish any view, are in and of themselves absurd, as all so-called freethinking congregations are absurdities, and all the religious programs of the same are in their birth either conscious or unconscious lies; for they presuppose an abandonment of the individual view." The local "New World" writes: "It must be evident to everyone that the Congress of Freethinkers, since it cannot establish creeds, cannot stamp the falsehood of existing dogmas as a creed either."

Verdict on the General Council. From what height the American

The fact that the Lutheran Church in this country is looked down upon by many sects is evidenced by a verdict which the New York "Independent" passes on the General Council. The former writes, among other things: "The claim that Lutheranism will yet become the religion of America was boldly made in the Convention. For though it does not induce anyone to convert, it still has thousands of recruits from Europe. It has no revivals, but emigrant ships fill its statistical columns. These Northwestern states are stuffed full of hard-working, sturdy farmers, heartily devoted to the Lutheranism of their forefathers. And if the Lutheran church body were not so antiquated, so hopelessly un-American, it might become the leading Protestant church in the land. But it has too little spirit, too little life, too little love of conquest; it has too much of the flabbiness of a state church to hold its own in the dense throng of American life. But, on the other hand, it will be generations before a large portion of its members will be reached by the intellectual life of this country; and therefore it must long be of great importance in the calculations of the constituent parts of our religious movements, although its importance is that of a dead weight. "

J. W.

Chinese. News about the Chinese in America undoubtedly belong to the ecclesiastical and contemporary history, since, next to the Indians, the activities of the heathen mission must certainly be directed toward them. From a secular newspaper we take the following notes: Up to now, no less than 138,536 Chinese have been sent to the

States of the Union; 38,000 of these have already returned to China, 10,000 have died, 41,000 are in California, 12,000 in Montana, 10,000 in Idaho, 8,000 in Oregon, 7,000 in Nevada, 8,000 along the Pacific railroad, the remainder in Colorado and Utah, 12,761 arrived during the present year. A large proportion of them speak English, others French or Spanish; some, according to an official report, even speak "fluent German .

II. Abroad.

Dr. Münkel and the Bindingness of the Symbols. In the "Neues Zeitblatt" of March 5 of last year (which we have unfortunately only just received) Dr. M. gives an essay with the heading: "The Difference in the Teachings. In it, the Doctor proceeds as he has been wont to do for some time, first taking a strictly Lutheran standpoint, and finally overturning everything by a clever twist. Thus, for example, in that essay he concludes his discussion with the following words: "One should not forget especially Melanchthon, who, in spite of his Calvinizing doctrine of the Lord's Supper, was not only tolerated in the community of the church, but was honored as the teacher of Germany. One will have to convince oneself that, although the confessions were asserted with possible severity, they could not prevent many weeds from sprouting among the wheat. (As if it were a question of that!) "The two questions are therefore: What is binding in the confessions? and when is deviation from the confessions to be treated as apostasy from the confessional community?" (Quite so!) "Binding is all doctrine in the confessions which is publicly valid each time in a church." So, if certain confessions and doctrines of the confessions do not apply publicly in the church, as now most do not apply to them publicly, they are not binding either! O rejoice, Iowa! A doctor of theology has thus delivered thee at a blow from the oppressive yoke of symbols! Of course, Melanchthon was not considered faithfully Lutheran by the resolute Lutherans with his "Calvinizing doctrine of the Lord's Supper," but the Philippists were, who could not be rid of him for 30 years and were not denied church fellowship until 1577. That is enough! Even before this, Dr. Münkel had declared: "That the pope is the great anti-Christ is not found in Scripture, but is only asserted because the prophecy of the anti-Christ fits the pope exactly. The Jews may thank Dr. M. for this explanation, for he thereby gives them the excuse that it is not written in the Old Testament that Jesus is the Christian, but that the Christians assert this only because the prophecy of the Christian fits Jesus of Nazareth exactly. Thus, according to Dr. Münkel's own explanation, it is not a "doctrine of Scripture," but only an "application of the doctrine of Scripture to an individual case." Now, of course, we can explain it to ourselves, why Dr. Münkel and his kind met at Hanover even with the Arian Kahnis and with the Pantheist v. Hoffman" in such a brotherly way of faith. -W ..

Prussia. By order of the Minister of the Interior, a deaconry of Franciscan nuns from Salzkotten in Westphalia has been granted the proceeds of a house collection ordered in the province of Saxony, the latter being expressly extended to the non-Catholic population. The objection which was raised against this on the part of the Protestant Union Society of the Province, the Provincial Consistory, and even the Oberkirchenrath through the intermediary of the Minister of Culture, was completely disregarded by the Ministry of the Interior. Prussia remains the stronghold of Protestantism!

Hengstenberg's successor, Prof. Dillmann in Giessen, is a collaborator on Schenkel's Bibellexicon für's Volk. After this appointment became known, even the "Protestantische Kirchenzeitung" exclaimed: "Miracles really do happen.

Hesse. The number of those preachers who have refused to participate in the synod ordered by the King of Prussia, and remain in resistance, has swelled to one hundred. The Allg. Luth. Kirchenz. writes: In the meantime the church regiment has not allowed itself to be deterred by this in the pursuit of its way. The preparations for the elections continued even without the participation of the pastors. The Bl. (1869, No. 42) described how it happened with the words: "The whole police and state machinery is set in motion to bring about the elections to the presynod. Riders and mayors are the main protagonists. According to the decree of the consistory, ecclesiastical proclamations, speeches and prayers are not necessary during the election, but the mayor's bell must be used to announce the election. If this has not taken place, the election is invalid; indeed, a true irony on the independence of the church!" In the meantime, the elections for mayors took place on Oct. 21. The failure of these elections can only have a devastating effect on their organizers. If one wanted to enforce elections at all costs, one has now obtained them, but such elections as one must be ashamed of. The temporary result, however, is that, whatever the final outcome may be, a peaceful church in a state of calm development has been violently startled, its development disturbed, confused, fissured, and torn asunder for a long time to come. Poor church! Poor Hesse! - After Metropolitan Pfr. Hoffmann of Felsberg had been deprived of his Metropolitan office since Aug. 9 of this year, he has now also been suspended from his parish office until further notice by a rescript of the Consistory of Cassel, namely because of gross "defamation of the Consistory and disobedience of its order. According to information, the reason for the suspension is to be sought in the fact that he objected to the passage in the first prayer of this year's Day of Prayer liturgy (on Nov. 1) - as it is said by the (from the outset synod-friendly) Sup. Berger in Großnenndorf: "we have succumbed to it (the challenge), soon ... with our indifference to thy Church and its eternal ground, and soon with our perverse zeal for its temporal supports," as an attack on those clergymen who have sustainedly stood up for Church Order and for ecclesiastical right, lodged a protest, and refused to express that passage in the prescribed manner in worship, concluding his petition with the words: "I can only see in this a grave injury, justified by nothing, to all the faithful servants of the Lord in our Hessian Church, a degradation of the prayer intended for ecclesiastical use, and a deeply deplorable occasion for an annoyance disturbing edification, which is thereby given from high authority to the Christian congregations. Such a use of the authority to issue liturgical forms for the celebration of the day in question cannot be permitted by any authority, since it is downright contrary to the Church Order, which alone is authoritative. By virtue of my office, which empowers me to object to everything that is contrary to the Word of God and our Church Order, and in the name of the Lord from whom I received this office, I hereby object to the sentence extracted from the first prayer.... I hereby protest, adding that nothing can determine me to read this sentence at the holding of the service in question."

Lower Hesse. As has already been reported, a royal Prussian decree has been published on August 9, 1869, by which the appointment of an "extraordinary synod for the Protestant congregations of the administrative district of Cassel" is ordered.

for the consultation of a presbyterial and synodal order to be introduced. All confessional Lutherans of Lower Hesse protested against it, especially those who professed the theology of the blessed Vilmar. Of these, it is reported in the "Evangelische Kirchenzeitung" on October 2 of this year: "The party gathered around Vilmar is, following its head, in favor of episcopal government of the church and regards the spiritual office as the only one called to church government by virtue of divine endowment . . I will not deny that from this side, under the influence of the party leaders who came in after A. Vilmar's death, the metropolitans W. Vilmar and F. Hoffmann, sentences have been issued which cannot stand before a prudent and evangelically sober criticism. They are the three often-repeated assertions: 1. That the Presbyterial-Synodal Constitution is contrary to the Word of God and incompatible with the Conf. Aug. and, on the contrary, is founded on the Confessio Helvetica; 2. That the confession and the spiritual life of the church are so inwardly inseparable from its constitution, like soul and body, and so bound to it, that every change in the church order necessarily entails the death and destruction of the spiritual life; that therefore, for us Hessians, the eternal life given to us is so contained in these rightly existing church orders that it ceases to flow when they are taken from us; 3. That, after the church ordinances which have arisen from the time of the Reformation have come to a conclusion in our country in 1657, these may not be changed by any means, not even by the rightly existing organs and powers, until a new ecumenical council (a new, creative time of Reformation)." If this is really a faithful rendering of what the men of Vilmar's persuasion profess, the conflict in which this Romanistic conviction of theirs comes into with that royal decree would show in the saddest manner how dangerous it is to speculate in matters of doctrine without concern for the practical consequences and to make one's own system. As justified and necessary as a protest of the Lutherans may be against a decree whose aim is obviously union, all those who protest because they cherish the stated principles, however much they may suffer for it, would not be consessors. May God purify these men from all the dross of Romanizing views and tendencies in the hot fire of challenge and temptation that has come upon them! W.

Brunswick. In Germany, people are now everywhere trying to give the regional churches a different form. In Brunswick, too, a "pre-synod" was held in October of last year for this purpose. The Superintendents Wolff and Guthe proposed that the Synod and its committee be bound in their activities to the church confession. However, since the motion was supported by only four votes, and not by at least five, as was necessary, it was not even discussed, and thus failed. On the other hand, the motion passed: "The Synod is entitled to decide on the participation of the Regional Church in a larger union of the Protestant Church in general," by which nothing else was meant than a merger with the Prussian Church. Finally, however, the motion was removed by the protest of the ministers, as it appeared to them "national-liberal." These proceedings give a clear picture of the sad ecclesiastical conditions even of "Lutheran" Brunswick. W.

Würtemberg. Pros. Dr. von Heseln, the newly elected Bishop of Rottenburg, has suddenly been cited to Rome instead of being confirmed by the Pope. There one will want to teach the man episcopal mores first.

Misprint.

In the previous issue read page 355 line 1 from the bottom instead of "ehrunionistlsche" - doctrinal unionist.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 16. **February 1870.** **No. 2.**

Preface.

(Continued.)

Facing us are the men of progress. Not the men of progress to the New Jerusalem. For that is where we are going. But the men of progress in the production of new doctrines. For the Christian Church, since the first Pentecost - as the theologians of Dorpat have had the kindness to reveal - has been continually engaged in the production of new dogmas. The symbols, they say, are, as it were, the landmarks of the course of development of the Church^. . Accordingly, our confession also contains, in addition to the already symbolically developed and fixed articles and dogmas of the faith, such elements of the general Christian and ecclesiastical creed, that is, of the apostolic symbolism, which are in part still in the midst of development, in part have not yet entered, or have only begun to enter, into the historical dogma-forming movement, because the Church has hitherto been prompted to speak about them only from one side, or because they have not yet at all become the object of its closer explanation and determination. In both cases, what has already been symbolically won and established will be the regulating prerequisite and basis for further ecclesiastical confessional activity, but during the latter, differing opinions and convictions are not only unavoidable, but also justified and permissible. They are so, however, only on condition, first, that they submit to the conditions to which the symbol-forming movement of the church itself is bound, i. e. that is, that they do not contradict the Word of God and the ecclesiastical consensus doctrinae; and that, furthermore, they do not claim for themselves the dignity of publicly recognized dogmas, that is, of church-forming or church-dividing truths, but only want to be valid for what they are at present only - private and individual Christian convictions, however well founded they may be in themselves, and present results of conscientious and faithful scriptural research.

Yes, even relative errors, which are unavoidable in this state of affairs, the church will be able to endure without endangering its doctrinal unity; and it will have to do so already because in this case it is not yet in a position to ecclesiastically declare the error as such. Only after this exposition of the historical nature of the confession, which is in a state of constant growth and development, from which the contrast between fixed and developing, not yet completed dogmas and between Christian and theological convictions has emerged, do we see ourselves in a position to settle our question definitively. .. For the church and its existence, and this is the only thing that matters in our question, the only fundamental thing at present is that which it has hitherto gained in the knowledge of salvation from Scripture and has laid down in its symbols as a confession. .. An articulate and explicit unanimity in such doctrines, which have not yet become dogmas of the Church, but which do not contradict the consensus fidei in the dogmas hitherto established, cannot possibly be demanded; simply because there is as yet no recognized standard for their ecclesiasticism, and the question of their scripturality is still an undecided point of controversy. ..... If we now look at our entire controversy, we can, on the basis of it, answer your first question only as follows: 1. that it not only does not contradict the spirit and nature of the church and the strict confessional unity which it demands for church fellowship, but that it is quite in accordance with them to distinguish between fundamental doctrines, i.e., doctrines which are fixed here in confessional terms, and doctrines which are not yet fundamental, i.e., doctrines about which the church has hitherto declared itself only on one side or not yet at all." (Opinion of the Dorpat Theol. Facultät on the questions submitted to it by the German Lutheran Synod of Iowa in North America, concerning the ecclesiastical doctrinal consensus. Pages 12-16.)

Hopefully the doctrine of the angels' battle is one of the not yet fundamental ones, Professor Kurtz? At least, as far as we know, the Lutheran Church has not yet explained itself about it at all. The matter is still in flux. The Tohu Wabohu 1 Mos. 1. has perhaps another meaning than that which is attributed to it in the excellent work: Bible and Astronomy. And the bones in the Tertiary mountains perhaps do not come from a pre-Adamite Sadovah after all. - But if someone were to come and say that the Kurtzian book is a novel and the battle of the angels a farce, he would arouse the highest wrath of His Reverence. For the dogma in question is still in the midst of development, has so far only rudimentarily entered into the historical dogma-forming movement. It is quite similar with the millennial kingdom of Herr Christoph Hoffmann and his comrades. Also

No consensus has yet emerged in the Lutheran Church on these matters. Only the dogma-forming movement of the future will finally decide whether the Central Railroad Depot of the world will really come to stand between Zion and Moriah, or a few miles further north. So far, in fact, the dogma-forming drive of the Church has taken but a small approach in this matter. This is attested by the writings of Messrs. Rink and Boegehold, which are not written by inmates of a lunatic asylum, but by Protestant pastors.

But the most amusing thing about the principles of the Dorpat Opinion is undoubtedly this: that the gentlemen represent the principles of the Roman Church, while they believe themselves to be Lutheran. They are like the soldier who defended a flag with great zeal. And when the moon went out, he noticed that it was an enemy one, indeed that he himself was in the midst of an enemy regiment. We want to be that moon, want to try to show the gentlemen with their permission that they are not fighting for the Wittenberg Reformation, but for Rome. For - no offense - but the principle of the Dorpatians is developed with wonderful clarity in the widely famous writing of the papist bishop and monk Melchior Canus. This excellent man shows on the 725th page of his writing De locis theologicis (Lovanii 1546) that a doctrine only becomes a Catholic truth when the Church declares it to be such through the mediation of a council or in some other way. The doctrine of the two wills in Christ was created by a conclusion of the sixth general synod. It was only the Council of Lyons under Gregory X that raised to dogma the opinion that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son as from one Principe, and the Lateran Council of 1215 the proposition that the bread is changed into the body of Christ and the wine into his blood. From this the Costnitz Assembly drew the conclusion that the bread did not remain after the blessing, but only the properties of it, without the object to which they had originally attached. In the same way, it was not until the Synod of Alcala, whose conclusions were confirmed by Pope Sixtus IV, that the proposition was elevated to dogma: that the sacrament of penance and the regulation of confession are contained in the words of Christ: "As the Father has sent me, so I send you," etc. 1) How much richer would your record of dogmatic history have been if you had lived 300 years later, O most excellent Canus! There you would have had the noth-

1) Item synodus Complutensis Sixto quarto in Extravag. sua corroborante certo theologiae argumento confecit ex illo Joannis testimonio: Sicut misit me pater, et ego mitto vos; quorum remiseritis peccata, remittentur eis, et quorum retinueritis, retenta sunt, - non solum sacramenti poenitentiae institutionem haberi, sed confessionis etiam praeceptum. Melchior Canus De locis theologicis. Lovanii 1546. pag. 726.

The dogma of the need for the episcopal blessing of the oil with which the dying are anointed is also included in your consideration! A dogma which came into being only on January 13, 1655. Nor would you have failed to mention the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, which His Holiness Pope Pius IX proclaimed infallibly on December 8, 1854. And with what suspense would you have listened to the telegrams from Rome, which in 1870 proclaimed the dogma , but we want to lift the veil of the

Do not air future. The noble bishop of the Canary Islands has said enough. Let us lay a wreath on his tomb at Toledo, for he was consistent. - Really, when Roman theologians speak thus, they stick to their banner. For the Roman Church keeps in its treasury all that the imagination of its saints has brought to light since the days of Sylvester. But how do Lutherans come to quarrel in her wake? If dogmas are always in the making, then bow confidently under all the twenty-one conciliar churches which bear the name of ecumenical ones, including the Roman one of today. For it is ridiculous to assert the dogma-forming activity of the Church while rejecting the fifteen synods from the second Nicene onward. Who then tells you that doctrinal formation in Christendom ceased with the third Constantinopolitan? Why on earth do you not confess the conclusions of Ephesus and the Lateran ones? The Lateran ones - you say - dispute with the sacred Scriptures! Now then, the dogmas of Scripture are older than the Conciliar of Pope Innocent III, yea, than that of Nicaea! But if they are older, they needed no church and no council to come into being. As little as Christ needs our Easter hymns to come out of the grave. But as the office of the Church of God on earth, with respect to the resurrection of the Lord, is no other than the confidence of the heart and the confession of the lips, so their profession with respect to all Christian doctrines is no other than this: to believe them with childlike simplicity and to confess them with manly courage. - Wretched thieves, you who dream that the church develops dogmas! What do you say to the time of Gottfried Arnold, Semler, and Bahrdt? Did the Church also develop dogmas then? Or does this happen only in synods? O how lovely dogmas the Prussian General Synod of 1846 developed! We would also mention our good Lutheran so-called General Synod, which has become somewhat sickly of late, if we did not have to fear that the gentlemen of Dorpat would not regard us backwoodsmen as equal partners in the great business of forming dogmas. In general, the question would be of no small interest - and perhaps the gentlemen would be so kind as to answer it in a future report: which body is actually entrusted at present with the business of dogma formation? Above all, probably, the Dorpatians themselves, although they are, through their position in the Russian Regie-

The first thing that the faculty of Rostock had to do was to give the task of dogma formation to the faculty of Rostock. Should the Rostock faculty now be entrusted with the formation of dogma? Then at least a most peculiar doctrine, that of S. Dieckhoff vom Amte, would have a chance of becoming dogma. Leipzig and Erlangen remain; for our Dorpat friends will probably not want to count Schenkel's lamentable shenanigans among the approaches to dogma any more than we do. But how will the doctrine of the Holy Spirit fare when Professor Kahnis brings it into the river? And the sacraments of the old covenant, if Delitzsch, who is otherwise dear to us, takes possession of them? As far as Erlangen is concerned, of course, we always have our excellent Zezschwitz (apart from Herr Hofmann). At least his lecture on justification is without doubt a true developmental knot in the dogma-forming movement of these troubled times. So if anyone has an appetite for such knots, let him eat them. We, for our part, give thanks. For, seriously speaking, does it not border on frenzy to speak of a perpetual dogma-formation in the face of the miserable condition of the so-called national churches in Germany?

Only our friends turn their eyes away from this. They look neither at the Roman apostasy nor at the misery in Germany. Rather, they point us to the Old Testament: "There you can clearly see how the dogmas gradually develop! For of the Holy Trinity, as is well known, the prophets knew nothing, less than nothing of eternal blessedness and hell. Irrefutable proof indeed! As irrefutable as the proof of Pelagius, who, in his Epistle to Demetrias, points out to us the fact that a great number of pagan philosophers were chaste, patient, modest, generous, abstemious, kind, self-denying, and lovers of righteousness. And who from this draws the irrefutable:! Conclusion, that human nature is not corrupted by the Fall, but is good. 1) Yes, excellent Pelagius, if only your preface were correct! But thou dost indeed conclude from things which, though they have a certain appearance of truth, thou hast meanwhile invented thyself! As well, however, as Hon. Pelagius invented the righteousness of the heathen philosophers precisely for the purpose of proving therewith the alleged goodness of human nature; - so well have the gentlemen in Germany poured into the shoes of the saints of the old covenant a truly horrifying measure of spiritual ignorance, in order thereby to give a semblance of truth to their fabrication of the gradual emergence of dogmas. For the old

1) Quam multos enim philosophorum et audivimus et legimus et ipsi vidimus castos, patientes, modestos, liberales, abstinentes, benignos et honores mundi simul et delicias respuentes, et amatores justitiae non minus quam scientiae. Unde'quaeso hominibus alienis a deo ista, quae deo placent? Unde illis bona, nisi de naturae bono ? Pelagii Epistola ad Demetriadem cap. 3. ed. Sender pag. 16. 17.

The Second Testament is full of passages that indicate the Holy Trinity. Does not David say: "The Spirit of the Lord has spoken through me, and his word is on my tongue. The God of Israel hath spoken; unto me hath the Rock of Israel spoken; he reigneth among men; he, the righteous, reigneth in the fear of God." 1) "Here David begins to speak of the high holy Trinity of divine being," - Luther remarks. "First, he calls the Holy Spirit, to whom he gives all that the prophets prophesy. And on this and similar sayings St. Peter 2 Epistle 1, v. 21: No prophecy has ever been produced by human will, but the holy men of God have spoken by inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Hence, in the article of faith, we sing of the Holy Spirit, thus, Who spake by the prophets. We have (but) three speakers. David says above that the Spirit of the Lord spoke through his tongue; thus the person of the Holy Spirit is clearly indicated to us Christians. What the Turks, Jews, and other wicked men believe, we regard as nothing. Thus we have heard that the outward effect is ascribed to the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures and in our faith, in that he speaks, baptizes, and rules with us bodily through the prophets, apostles, and church ministers. Therefore these words of David are also of the Holy Ghost, which he speaketh by his tongue: of two other speakers. What then doth he speak of them? First, he speaks of the God of Israel, who spoke to David, that is, who promised him. Now who God is, this speaker, we Christians know from the Gospel of John; namely, it is the Father, who spoke in the beginning Genesis 1:3, Let there be light; and his word is the person of the Son, by whose word all things were made, John 1:3. The same Son is called by the Spirit through David here "Zur," the stronghold of Israel and righteous ruler among men. He also speaks. So all three persons speak, and yet is one speaker, one promise, one promise, as it is one God. (Thus David confesses the two highest articles, that in God there are three distinct persons, and that the one, the Son, should become man, and receive the kingdom and glory from the Father above all things; and that the Holy Ghost should write these things in men's hearts by faith, who also declared them before by the mouth and tongue of the prophets." 2) - And does not Isa. 48:12 say, "Hearken unto me Jacob! I am the first and I am the last! My hand has founded the earth! And then, "God the LORD hath sent me, and his Spirit?" Are there not palpably three? First the Creator of the earth, and then God, by whom he is sent; and at last the Spirit? And what

1) רוח יהוה דבר־בי ומלתו על־לשוני : אמר אלהי ישראל לי דבר צור ישראל משל באדם צדק משל יראת אלהים :

2) Luther von Walch. Theil III. page 2797-2800.

What do you do with the wonderful passage Gen. 3, 21: "Adam became like one of us"? And with the other: Genesis 19:24: "Then God of God rained down upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire"? Open the Helvicus, you will find a few dozen more. 1) - And as to the doctrine of retribution in that life, Daniel 12:2, 3, should meet, and even exceed, all our expectations: "And many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to everlasting reproach and shame. And the teachers shall shine as the brightness of heaven, and they that have brought many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever." 2) To this God declares by Isaiah, "As the new heavens and the new earth which I make stand before my face, so shall your seed and your name stand ..... and they shall go forth, and look upon the dead bodies of men that have sinned against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched, and shall be an abomination to all flesh." 3) But if it be said that the resurrection of the flesh is not taught with desirable distinctness in the Old Testament, the example of the mother, 2 Macc. 7, shows that it is the contrary. For she declared to her sons in the face of the great cauldron in which one of them was already roasted: "I am your mother, and have given you birth, but I have not given you breath nor life, nor have I made your limbs so. Therefore He who created the world and all men will graciously restore to you the breath and the life, as you now dare and let go for the sake of His law." 4)

But what do we heap passages upon passages? Does not St. Paul declare Ap. hist. 26, 22. expressly, He saith nothing save that which the prophets said should come to pass, and Moses? Now if he said nothing but what was written in the Old Testament, yet was everything in it? Or is Paul a liar? - Let that be far off! - Son-

1) Christ. Helvici Elenchi Judaici. Lugduni 1702. page 1-28 and page 151-192.

2) ורבים מישני אדמת־עפר יקיצו אלה לחיי עולם ואלה לחרפות לדראון עולם׃
והמשכילים יזהרו כזהר הרקיע ומצדיקי הרבים ככוכבים לעולם ועד׃

3) כי כאשר השמים החדשים והארץ החדשה אשר אני עשה עמדים לפני נאם־יהוה
כן יעמד זרעכם ושמכם׃ . . . . . ויצאו וראו בפגרי האנשים הפשים בי בי תולעתם לא
תמות ואשם לא תכבה והיו דראון לכל־בשר׃

4) . . . *ουδέ ίγώ τδ πνεύμα χα} την ζωήν υμϊν Ιχαρισάμην, χα'ι την ίχά- ατου ατοιχείωσιν ουχ έγώ διερΰ^μιαα. Totyapow ό του χόσμου χτίατης, δ πλά- σας ανθρώπου γένεβίν, χα'ι πάντων έξευρών yivs^tv$_f$ χα} τδ πνεύμα χα'ι την ζωήν ύμιν πάλιν άποδώσει μετ' έλέους, ως νυν ύπεροράτε ^αυτους διά τους αυτου νόμους.* 2 Macc. 7, 22. 23.

For in the Old and in the New Testament one doctrine resounded, and the dear saints of old were saved by the same grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, just as we are. 1) Therefore it is ridiculous to want to take a reason from the nature of the Old Testament in order to support the fiction of the gradual emergence of the dogmas. Rather, the Old Testament clearly testifies that the revelation of God has been the same since the days of Adam, namely, law and gospel. But the task of the church has always been to know both thoroughly and fruitfully. In this knowledge she was to grow and increase. But the dogmas, that is, the divine truths which formed the object of this knowledge, always remained the same.

But the fantasy of the gradual formation of dogmas is not only contrary to the teaching of Scripture that the Church of all times is only one, but also to the canonical authority of the Word of God itself. of God himself. If the Bible is so clear that every one can recognize the articles of faith contained in it; if it is so perfect that all the dogmas necessary to salvation are clearly and powerfully contained in it, it is nonsense to say that the dogmas are not finished as long as the church has not yet spoken; it is silliness to speak of doctrines that are undone, unfinished, still hanging in the balance, still in the midst of development. Rather, we have a firm prophetic word, and we should look to it as a light shining in a dark place until the day dawns and the morning star rises in our hearts. The Christian church has no power to establish any articles of faith, never has, never will.

What is the Christian church, then? This, praise God, a child of seven years knows, namely, the holy believers and the little sheep who hear their shepherd's voice. 2) This church is not a corporation for the production of new doctrines. Nor is it a scientific school of those who are always learning and can never come to the knowledge of the truth. But it is a pillar of the truth. But pillars do not fabricate, but carry. So then the congregation of the living God must always bear the old truth once given to the saints. The truth, the sum of which the apostle thus states: God revealed in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, appeared to the angels, preached to the Gentiles, believed by the world, received up into glory.

So let us do no more and be no more than our God has granted us. As a piece of lime or stone, let us help to support this pillar. He that will abide by it cannot help it.

1) Ap. Gesch. 15, 11.
2) Art. Smalcaldic!, Pars III. art. 12. Mueller pag 324.

For a stone that is not satisfied with the simple roof it bears; that desires-a higher, more ornamented one; - must of it.

In truth, there are only two points of view: Rock and swamp. Step here, on the rock of Scripture, and be quietly mocked as overanxious. Or there into the swamp! But I tell thee, the black waters shall beat down upon thy head, and thou shalt be lost sooner than thou thinkest.

Materials on Pastoral Theology,

communicated by C. F. W. W.

(Continued.)

§ 40.

The necessary foundation of a true Christian church discipline is that the order of Christ Match. 18, 15-17, is not only violated by the individual members of the congregation and by the congregation as a whole, but also by the preacher himself.

Note 1.

About the fact that the practice of fraternal punishment within the congregation is the necessary basis of true Christian church discipline, Luther writes: "What hinders the ban now in our times? Nothing, except that no one in this piece does what is due and proper to a Christian. You have a neighbor whose life and conduct you are well aware of and know, but your pastor is either not aware of it at all, or not so well aware of it; for how can he know the life of anyone in particular as it is? Therefore, if thou seest thy neighbor become rich by unrighteous dealing or commerce; if thou seest him committing fornication or adultery, or his servants industriously and carelessly breeding and governing, thou shalt first admonish him and give him a Christian warning, that he may perceive his blessedness and avoid trouble. And how good and blessed a work you have done if you win him over in this way! But, my dear, who will do it? For in the first place truth is a hostile thing; he who tells the truth is hated; therefore thou wouldst rather keep thy neighbor's friendship and favor, especially if he be rich and powerful, than that thou shouldest anger him and make him thine enemy. Likewise, if the other neighbor, or the third, or the fourth, do likewise, with the first admonition the other and the third fall into the pit, wherewith the neighbour might have been able to

If thou wilt but do with exhortation what thou owest and art bound to do, thou shalt be restored to the right way. (On Joel 3, 17. VI, 2404. f.) *)

That the ban must be preceded by the gradual punishment of the brothers according to Christ's order is also testified to in our Confession, when it says: "But this would be the right way, if one kept the order according to the Gospel, Matt. 18, where Christ says: If your brother sins against you, go and punish him between you and him alone. There thou hast a precious and subtle doctrine, how to govern the tongue well, which is well to be remembered against grievous abuses. Now follow it, so that you do not immediately bear your neighbor's grudges elsewhere and persecute him, but secretly admonish him to improve himself. Likewise, if another brings to your attention something that he or she has done, teach him to go and punish him himself if he has seen it, and if not, to keep his mouth shut. You may also learn this from the daily rule of the house. For this is what the master does in the house: if he sees that the servant is not doing what he ought, he speaks to him himself; but if he were so foolish as to let the servant sit at home, and went out into the streets to complain to his neighbors about him, he would certainly have to hear it: Thou fool, what is it to us? why dost thou not tell him thyself? Behold, this would be rightly done in a brotherly way, that the wicked should be counselled, and thy neighbour (nevertheless) remain in honour. As Christ also saith there, If he hear thee, thou hast won thy brother. Thou hast done a great and excellent work, for dost thou think that it is a small thing to win a brother? Let all the monks and holy orders come forward in crowds, whether they can take credit for having won a brother. Christ teaches further: "If he will not hear you, take one or two more to yourself, so that all things may stand on the testimony of two or three witnesses; so that one may deal with him himself whom it concerns, and not slander him behind his knowledge. But if this will not help, then bear it publicly for the community, whether for the secular or ecclesiastical court.**) For here you do not stand alone, but have those witnesses with you by which you can overcome the culprit, on which the judge can base, judge, and punish. In this way one can properly and rightly come to the end that one may ward off or amend evil," i.e., that one may practice wholesome church discipline. (Green Catechism, interpretation of the 8th commandment.)

*) In Germany it was often the secular authorities who hindered church discipline and excommunication, as they still do there. Of this Luther writes: "Where it (the authorities) hinders the censure and punishment of the churches, and will not permit or allow the ban, as Christ has instituted and commanded it, it promotes, fosters, and thus helps to cause offence: so it becomes the servant of God, the servant of the wretched devil in hell. (Op. cit. p. 2406.)

**) Luther speaks here according to the constitution of the Church in his time, when "the right kind of evangelical order," which Luther so much desired (X, 271.), had not yet been able to be introduced.

If, therefore, a preacher wishes to introduce Christian church discipline into his congregation in accordance with Christ's precepts, he must begin by introducing Christian brotherly punishment.

Note 2.

The preacher may not accept complaints about the private sins of others that are brought before him, if these sins have not already been punished in private and then also before witnesses; rather, he must point out to the plaintiff his revelation of a still hidden and unpunished sin and the transgression of the divine order that has been committed with it, and urge him to observe it with all seriousness. What Luther says in regard to every Christian in the quotation of the preceding note: "If another brings to your attention something that this or that one has done, teach him also to go and punish him himself, as he has seen it" - this applies in a heightened degree also to a pastor. Before the pastor, as a public person, only such sins belong of which he has either been a witness himself or which fall into the third degree of brotherly punishment. It is a disgrace to the preacher if he lends an open ear to conspirators. *)

Above all, however, the preacher must bear in mind, as far as the practice of church discipline is concerned, that in no case has he power to execute the ban on any person alone and without the prior trial and knowledge of the congregation. Here, without doubt, the well-known axiom applies: Quicquid omnes tangit, maxime in re salutari, ab omnibus debet curari, i.e., What concerns all must also, especially in matters of salvation, be concerned by all. **It is contrary to all reason and justice that one person should decide the relation of a member to the whole, and of the whole to a member, especially when it is a question of the brotherhood of faith. In the Word of God, not only the preacher, but the whole congregation is punished for not keeping the ban, and it is said to them, "Put away from yourselves them that are evil. (1 Cor. 5:1, 2, 13.) For more detail on this subject, see "Voice of Our Church," etc. Th. II, Thesis 9. C. Of the many testimonies which are collected on this subject in this Scripture, only the following may find a place here.

*) Of course, it is even more disgraceful when the preacher brings what he has learned through concessions during the week even to the pulpit on Sunday. Luther therefore writes: "Which spirit does not keep this order (Matth. 18.), he is up to no good." (XXI, 167.)

**In accordance with this principle, the Roman bishop Leo I wrote: "Quae ad omnes pertinent, cum consensu omnium fieri debent" i.e. What concerns all must be done with the consent of all. "Qui praefuturus est omnibus, eligatur ab omnibus" i. e. He who is to preside over all (in a church) must also be elected by all. (Epist. 95. Cf. Gerhard's loc. de mimst. § 286.)

Thus it says first of all in the Schmalkaldic Articles: "The officials *) have done unpleasant willfulness with it" (with the ban) "and have plagued the people either out of avarice or other willfulness and banished them without all preceding legal knowledge" (in the Latin text: sine ullo ordine judiciorum, i.e. without all order of the courts). But what kind of tyranny is this, that an official in a city should have the power to plague and force the people with such a ban, solely according to his own will and without legal knowledge? .. Because such an accusation is very important and grave, no one should be condemned in the case without a legal and proper judgment" (sine ordine judiciali, i.e., without judicial order)." (Appendix: Of the Bishops' Power and Jurisdiction, fol. 158.) The bishop Deotrephes, who exercised the ban in his own authority, proved himself thereby to be a forerunner of the Antichrist already in apostolic times. 2 John 9:10.

Luther therefore writes: "You hear here (Matth. 18.) that there must be certain public sins of certain known persons, where one brother sees the other sinning, in addition to such sin, which are previously punished fraternally and finally publicly convicted before the congregation; therefore the bulls and letters of excommunication, therein thus stand: 'Excommunicamus ipso facto, data sententia, trina tamen monitione praemissa; item: de plenitudine potestatis,' **) that is called in German a Sch . . bann. I call it the devil's ban and not God's ban, because people are banished with a wicked deed before they are publicly convinced before the congregation against Christ's order. Likewise are all the banishments, so that the officials and ecclesiastical magistrates are deceived, and that people are banished with a note before a congregation for 10, 20, 30 miles away, when they are never punished, accused, and convinced in the same congregation and before the priest; but therefore a bat comes out of an official's corner without witnesses and without God's command. Before such a sh... ...you must not fear. If a bishop or official wishes to put someone under ban, he should go or send him to the congregation or to the parish priest, where he will be put under ban, and do to him what is right according to these words of Christ. And I say all this for this reason: for the congregation that is to hold such a one in banishment must know and be sure how he deserves to be banished and how he has come to be banished, as Christ's text gives here; otherwise it might be deceived and accept a false banishment, and thereby do wrong to its neighbor. This then would be blaspheming the keys, and blaspheming God.

*) An official was a vicarius of the bishop in secular court matters.

**) German: "We hereby banish thatsächlich after the verdict, but after prior three times admonition" (which, however, as if in mockery, was mentioned in the bull of banishment, but had not really happened before); "likewise: out of our authority".

and the love of one's neighbor, which is not to be suffered by a Christian congregation. For even if a man is to be banished from it, says Christ here, he is not bound to believe the official's notes or the bishop's letters; indeed, he is bound not to believe here, for men are not to be believed in the things of God. So a Christian community is not the official's servant, nor the bishop's cane-master, that he may say to it, "Here, Grete, here, Hans, hold this one or that one in check for me. Awe, yes, be welcome to us, dear Official! In worldly authority such a thing would have an opinion, but here, since it concerns souls" ("in re salutari" see above), "the community should also be with judge and wife. *) St. Paul was an apostle, yet" (and yet) "he would not put under ban him that had taken his stepmother; he would have the church also with him. 1 Cor. 5:1, 5." (Scripture of the Keys of the year 1530. XIX, 1181. f.)

Finally, we recall the following later testimonies. J. Fecht writes: "The final judgment about the ban is by no means with the sole church minister, but with the whole congregation, which is represented either by the consistory or by some other convent, as is the custom in every place. **This is proved by the passage Matt. 18:17, and by the example of Paul, who, with the consent of the Corinthian congregation, put the incestuous man under ban, 2 Cor. 2:6, 1 Cor. 5:4. And in this sentence and judgment the whole Lutheran church is unanimous, and all the theologians of it, therefore the minister has all the less reason to presume anything in this matter alone." ((Instructio pastoral, c. 15, § 7, p. 169. f.) At last, writes Val. Ernst Löscher: "In our church no one has ever said that banishment and discipline belong only to the clergy, but it is commanded by Christ to the church; this recognizes and decrees, and Christ's servants, as os ecclesiae" (mouth of the church), "announce this to the sinners and have, according to Christ's order, the exercitium clavis ligantis," i.e. the exercise or execution of the key of binding. (Continued. Collection of a. u. n. theological things. Jahrg. 1724. page 476.) (cont., follows.)

*) Luther here, in accordance with the German language, takes the word "woman" to mean "mistress of the house."

**Of course, Fecht is speaking here only of such "conventions" which really represent the whole congregation, not of a so-called ministry which, consisting only of preachers, also represents only a part of the congregation, namely, not the audience, but only the teachers. J. Gerhard therefore writes: "The bishops or teachers alone cannot represent the church, since the audience also belongs to the definition of the same; but a presbytery can represent the church, to which belong not only those who work on the word, but also seniors who are presided over by the direction of ecclesiastical business in the name of the whole church." (Loc. de minist. eccles. § 87.)

The four kingdoms of Daniel.

Daniel Cap. 2. u. 7.

(Continued.)

4. the Roman Empire.

In the further description of the fourth beast it says: "It was also much different from the previous ones, and had ten horns. Cf. Rev. 13:1, 2, where there also appears such a wonderful beast, which has no other like it, ten horns. This difference is also pointed out in Dan. 7:19. In what way was Rome unlike all other kingdoms? Vulture finds the dissimilarity in the different forms of government, that Rome was sometimes a democracy, sometimes an aristocracy, sometimes a monarchy; sometimes kings, sometimes consuls, sometimes decemvirs, sometimes consuls again with a dictator, sometimes triumvirs, finally emperors with consuls and tribunes. And, indeed, we do not perceive such changes of government in any of the other three empires. Furthermore, all the other empires symbolized here were monarchies, but Rome was a republic at the time when she extended her rule the most. In the case of the other empires, the subjugated countries stood in much the same relation, but not so in the case of Rome. Even the subject peoples and cities of Italy stood in a very different relation to Rome. Among the peoples, some were Roman citizens, some with and some without the right to vote; others were confederates; still others were subjects, with or without personal freedom and the honor of arms, and so on. The cities were partly municipios, partly prefectures, partly colonies. Outside Italy there were provinces, feudal principalities, confederates. Even if riots broke out in one of the other empires, they could not be compared to the bloody civil wars of Rome.

As a special piece of dissimilarity, our text still emphasizes the ten horns. What do they symbolize? Horns in general mean power and strength; for they are the means of attack and defense, compare 1 Kings 22:11, Ezek. 34:21, Micah 4:13. 34, 21., Micah 4, 13. But then also according to Caspari: a. Kings, Dan. 8, 5. 8. compare with 8, 21. and 8, 9. compare with 8, 23.; b. small kingdoms or kingdoms, which constitute parts of a greater world-kingdom, Dan. 8, 8. compare with 8, 23.; 6. nations, which belong to a world-kingdom and together form the same, Dan. 8, 20.; while world-kingdoms are always represented by animals. Now how are we to understand the ten horns here? They are thus interpreted in v. 24: "The ten horns signify ten kings, which shall arise out of the same kingdom." But are only individuals understood by the "kings" here? According to Dan. 8, 21. this is not impossible, but there could also be ten kingdoms. The word "king" often stands for "kingdom". Cf. 7, 17.

("four kingdoms," Heb. "four kings," though according to v. 23. kingdoms are meant), 8, 21., ("king in Greece"; while the verse itself teaches that the Macedonian-Greek empire is meant.) -

Our ancients, according to Luther's processes, probably mostly understand the ten horns of ten main parts of the Roman Empire. Luther says in his preface to the prophet Daniel: "These are the ten horns, as: Syria, Egypt, Asia, Grecia, Africa, Hispania, Gallia, Jtalia, Germania, Anglia." But such a division of the Roman empire cannot be proved historically. Under Trajan, the empire already had 46 provinces, and under Constantine the Great, it was divided into four prefectures, with a total of 13 dioceses, which again fell into smaller provinces. We will therefore have to understand the horns differently.

Hengstenberg, op. cit. p. 210 f. understands this to mean the European empires that emerged from the Roman Empire. We agree with this opinion. The ten horns are ten empires in what was once Roman territory. Thus, like the feet and toes of iron and clay, Cap. 2, a division of the tribal empire.

Here now arises the question whether we have to grasp the number "ten" urgirically or only as a round number. If Geier does not consider the latter to be impossible, he nevertheless considers the former to be the more probable, as is also the case with our ancients, since it is immediately followed by quite definite, non-round numbers: one and three.

A further question is whether these horns and the realms symbolized by them must all be at the same time or whether one may assume that one or more of the earlier horns had already disappeared when the eleventh was created. The latter is not immediately obvious when one reads the text, but is not in itself impossible and contrary to the text. In any case, however, three of the horns must be simultaneous with the small one; for only after the ten does the same arise. However, it seems simplest and most in keeping with the text that at the time of the emergence of the small horn, those ten earlier horns were still standing, and this can also be proven to be true.

Let us now for the present only assume that our ancients were right in their judgment when they understood the Muhammadan kingdoms by the little horn (the proof of which shall follow below), what then are the ten symbolized kingdoms? Let us for the present assume the year 623 as the year before or in which the kingdoms in question must have existed, when in that year Muhammad became master of Arabia and had the plan to carry the weapons of conversion over Arabia's borders. There we find, then, 1. still the Eastern Roman Empire, which, as a part of the original Roman Empire, may well be regarded as one of the horns; 2. the Western Gothic Empire, which was founded in 419 in the province of Aquitania sccunda, and which existed until the year 711, sometimes with narrower, sometimes with wider borders; 3. Britain, where as early as the year 287 the

Menapter Carausius, a Roman commander, supported by Saxon and Frankish warriors, assumed the title of emperor. Several of the following emperors even extended their rule over Gaul. But the Britons were too weak against the Picts and Scots, and called to their aid the Saxons, who, united with the Angles, now established their dominion in Britain about 429, and there founded seven kingdoms, whence the whole is called the Heptarchy or Seven Kingdoms. "Frequently one of the kings in these kingdoms had a suzerainty over the rest. For a considerable time the supreme power was with the rulers of Kent, as the first founded and most powerful state, later usually with those of the western states, at last it came to Wessex." (Becker.) Egbert of Messer united the different kingdoms into one in 827. The appropriate symbol for this empire would thus be a horn just bursting forth, as the empire itself was still in the making. We find 4. the Avar kingdom, which was founded about 555 in Dacia, embraced also Pannonia and Dalmatia until the end of the century, and was overcome by Charlemagne in 796; 5. the Longobard kingdom, which was founded in Italy by the Longobard king Alboin in 569, ruled for a time even over central and lower Italy, and came to an end by Charlemagne in 774; 6. the Slav kingdom in Dalmatia, which was founded by the Longobard king Alboin in 874, and ruled for a time even over central and lower Italy. 6. a Slavic empire in Dalmatia, which territory the Slavs took from the Avars about 620 and founded a state in it, which existed until the beginning of the 11th century, at which time it was partly united with Croatia, partly placed under the protection of the then powerful Republic of Venice; 7. the Serbian empire, founded about 636 in Mosia and Pannonia, which under Stephen Dushan (1336-1356) encompassed Macedonia, Albania, Thessaly, northern Greece and Bulgaria. The beginnings of this empire may easily date back several years earlier than 636, so that we can list it here without objection. But we still lack three empires, where will we find them? These are: 8. the Burgundian empire; 9. Neustria or France; and 10. Austrasia or Germany. Although we find these three empires united in the Frankish empire just about 632 under Dagobert I., they could quite well be represented as three different empires, partly because they were really already separated before, partly because just at this time the relationship of these parts of the empire loosened, so that the government passed into the hands of three house-mayors, who even warred with each other, partly finally because they later appear separate and independent of each other. To explain this further, let the history of the Burgundian Empire follow. This was founded in Gaul as early as 407 and existed under various internal and external struggles until 534. Although it now became a Frankish province, it was still administered as a whole and retained its rights and liberties and its own duke. As early as 561 it received its own king in Guntram, the son of Chlotar I, and again in 596 in Dietrich II, and even though Chlotar II.

ruled again over Austrasia and Neustria not only, but also over Burgundy, so he had to swear to the Burgundian majordomo Warnachar never to depose him, consequently to allow him the co-regency in Burgundy. When later the dynasty of the Carolingians became weaker and weaker, Burgundy became independent again around 880 and became a powerful empire around the beginning of the 10th century. - Let us now proceed to the history of Neustria and Austrasia. The Frankish empire, founded in Gaul about 486, was divided among his four sons after Clovis' death in such a way that one of them received Austrasia, the other three Neustria, which the latter conquered from Burgundy in the years 523-534. The whole empire was united again under Chlotar I, but at his death in 561 it was divided first into four and then into the three kingdoms: Burgundy, Neustria, and Austrasia, ruled by three brothers, between whom bloody wars raged. "In this 'wild' struggle," says Dittmar, "of the Merovingian kings against each other, the result of which was the separation of a West Frankish empire of Neustria and an East Frankish empire of Austrasia, is shown at bottom the bloody contest of the Salian and Ripuarian tribes, which had remained continually the foundation of those two parts of the kingdom," and of which the former had their abodes more in Gaul, the latter more on both sides of the Rhine. "The Merovingians, as the original founders of Neustria, belonged to the Salian tribe, and since this tribe, as the overcomer of Roman Gaul, was the more powerful as long as it resisted the attraction of the first calm that followed the victory and still kept away from mingling with the Gallo-Roman population, the Ripuarian tribe at first appeared to be the weaker and more dependent. But when the Salians gradually began to cultivate the soil, and the Gallo-Romans joined their armies, and the senators of the cities were admitted to the royal households, and in this way the enervating Roman character penetrated into the language, customs, and legislation of these Germanic peoples, and by its preponderance brought about the moral degeneration of the Neustrians, then the Germanic peoples, who for the most part remained Germanic, became their own: The Austrasian tribesmen, most of whom remained Germanic, became superior to them, especially since the latter immediately drew continual renewal of courage and blood from the connection with the Upper Rhine tribes they had conquered, whose efforts for freedom they had to supervise and whose frequent pushes against the Rhine they had to repel. Thus, notwithstanding the outward union of the two tribes into a whole, there developed early among them an antagonism rooted in their moral character, which later led to an even sharper outward separation of the two". This happened already under Chlotar II,-who not only had to accept the Burgundian majordomo as co-regent in Burgundy, but also had to recognize the Austrasian majordomo as deputy in the exercise of feudal power, indeed he

was even forced to give the Austrasians his young son Dagobert as king. After Dagobert's death, who had also ruled over Neustria, each of these two kingdoms received its own king in 683. These, however, did not rule, but the three house-meyers of Burgundy, Neustria, and Austrasia, who, like the kings before them, warred with each other. These kingdoms were finally separated permanently when Charles the Fat was deposed in 887, shortly after Burgundy had again become independent. This separation of the Frankish empire, which had long been widespread, and which at times had already been carried out earlier, as well as the earlier and later independent existence of Burgundy, probably justifies the assumption that we have to understand three horns of the three parts of the Frankish empire.

These, therefore, are the ten horns by which the fourth beast was distinguished from all the others; for none of the other kingdoms was divided into so many as the Roman.

The text continues: "When I looked at the horns, another small horn came out from between them, and three of the first horns were torn out. The beast already had ten horns, but after them (v. 24) an eleventh came forth. Small at first, it becomes larger than all the others (v. 20), and three of the horns fall before it; the kingdom, small at first, becomes larger than the others and conquers three of them. Our ancients understand by this kingdom the Turkish kingdom, to which, of course, all that has been said fits, but in which a twofold question arises.

Is the Turkish empire really the one begun by Muhammad? It is true that many changes have taken place, but it can still be regarded as essentially the same empire. Under the rule of the Umayyads the Muslim empire stood as one. But from 750 onwards, under the Abbasids, it increasingly dissolved. Among the smaller empires of the Umayyads, Fatimids, Aglabids, and Abbasids, the latter is to be regarded primarily as the continuation of the original empire. It flourished under Harun al Raschid. It gradually weakened, and in 935 Muhammad IV Radhi transferred secular rule to the commander of his Turkish bodyguard, Abu-Bekr Ebn Raik, while he contented himself with spiritual rule. The Seljuk rule that followed was thus again only a continuation of the original Muslim empire. But the empire disintegrated again and came under the power of the Khovaresmians in 1195, leaving free the sultanate of Iconium, which had already been founded under the Seljuk prince Malek Shah (1063--1072) by his nephew Soliman in Asia Minor, which the latter had conquered. Here the Turkish Seljuk rule continued. When finally around 1215 the Mongols, among whom by the way Islam had already many followers at that time and won more and more, overthrew the Khovaresmians, escaped from

Khorasan a Turkish horde of 50,000 men, which entered the service of Alaheddin I of Iconium and received a tract of land in Old Phrygia with the obligation of the guardianship against the Greeks. This small district became "the cradle of their future dominion." Already Osman I became feudal prince of Alahadin III, and even attached to himself the title of sultan about 1300. The Ottoman empire named by him is the Turkish empire that still exists today and is a continuation of the original Moslem empire, since that Turkish horde was first under Khovaresm and then under Seljuk rule, over whose territory it later extended its territory. By the way, perhaps such proof would not even be necessary. These different rulers could be represented by one horn, because they were all in the service of Islam, an anti-christian power.

But how can this empire be symbolized by a horn on the head of the animal? Should not the empire symbolized by this horn also arise from the Roman empire? Here a remark of Gerhard's (LI. th. I. de mag. pol. § 137) is to be observed, where he says; "Of the origin of this little horn, v. 8. and v. 20, the Wart sslskutü is used, which also v. 3. of the origin of the animals, from which it is to be concluded that that horn will not rise from the fourth animal, but directly from the sea, that is, that he who is signified by the little horn will not attain to dominion by succession, but by a new rising." This salek, however, is not otherwise used of horns, e. g., Cap. 8, v. 8 and 9; it may therefore have its special reason here. Even if one does not have to assume that the little horn rose directly out of the sea, it may still be implied by that word that this horn grew directly out of the head, while the other ten perhaps grew out of an original horn, just as the empire was one before it was divided into the ten kingdoms. But did the Moslem empire grow up on Roman soil? Trajan penetrated deep into the interior of Arabia about 107, and subsequently at least the northern princes were dependent on the emperors and were regarded as their governors, while later the Arabs were under a Persian governor. Originating in a country no longer belonging to the Romans, this empire could not appear on the head of the fourth part in the same way as the other empires, hence its origin is described by salek. But having emerged from a territory that formerly belonged to the Roman empire, it could all the more appropriately be represented by a horn on the head of the fourth beast, since it was also to fight with three of the ten horns and exterminate them.

Is then fulfilled in the Moslem kingdom what is prophesied of it in Daniel 7? Let us now see.

Small is the horn after the text. If this is particularly mentioned,.

If it is a small beginning, then it has a special meaning; for otherwise every horn is small at first. The small beginning is also a peculiarity of the Muslim empire compared to the others. These, consisting of larger peoples, immediately encompassed a larger area; the Muslim empire began very small under Muhammad, for he had to recruit his followers one by one.

It says further: "Before which of the foremost horns three were plucked out". What Luther here translates "foremost" means "before" (v. 24: "after the same"). Three horns are plucked out before this horn, i. e., "it shall humble three kings" (v. 24.), overthrow three of the ten kingdoms. This was fulfilled; for in 711 the Arabs overthrew the empire of the Visigoths; in 1389 the Turks conquered the empire of the Serbs, and in 1459 made it a province; at last in 1453 they put an end to the Eastern Roman empire.

In verse 20 it is said of this empire: "It was greater than those who were next to it," which can be said of the Seljuk empire under Malek Shah Jelaleddin 1072-1092, whose empire stretched from the Mediterranean to China's borders, from Samarkand to the southern tip of Arabia. From the later history belongs here the empire under Soliman II.

We read v. 24: "But after him shall arise another, mightier than the former. What Luther here renders "mightier" actually means "different from." As the fourth beast was different from all the others, so this horn from the ten former ones. This, too, is true of the Muslim empire, whose peculiarity was the religion of Islam, a mixture of paganism, Judaism, and Christianity, while the other empires were Christian. In this, too, there is perhaps a difference in the fact that it had so many different rulers: Arabs, Seljuks (Turks), Mongols (who for a time held almost the whole empire), Turks. This, too, is not found in the other empires.

This horn is further described to us: "The same horn had eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things." "Eyes like the eyes of man," we do not find such an expression again in Scripture; what is it supposed to mean? We read of angry, sparkling eyes, Job 16:9. which meaning might well take place here, since the horn contends against the saints (v. 21.); of watchful, Ps. 10:8.; attentive, Ps. 123:2.; understanding and enlightened eyes, Pf. 19:9.; and so also do some of our ancients interpret the "eyes like men's eyes" here: The Turk was watchful to spy out every opportunity for the increase of his kingdom; finally, of hopeful, Ps. 131, 1.; Prov. 21, 4.; 30, 13.; Es. 10, 12.; and mocking eyes, Prov. 31, 17.; Ps. 35, 19. This latter meaning we would probably prefer to hold-

because it is immediately followed by: It had "a mouth speaking great things," and then because in the interpretation only such arrogance and mockery is referred to: "It will blaspheme the Most High" (v. 25.). - But who would not know how the Moslem empire blasphemes God by its Koran, which book it substitutes for the Bible; in which it rejects the triune God and teaches an idol; in which it finally exalts the lying prophet Muhammad above our Lord Jesus Christ?

We also hear of this horn in v. 21: "And I saw the same horn fight against the saints, and prevail against them"; and in v. 25 we find the interpretation: "It shall disturb the saints of the Most High; and shall presume to change time and law. But they shall be given into his hand a time, and some times, and half a time." In the battle against the saints of God appears the horn, the Moslem empire has fought and overthrown Christian kingdoms. "It will disturb the saints of the Most High," and it is not for nothing that the Turk is called the arch-enemy of Christendom. Under Abu Bekr, its commander Kaled destroyed 80,000 Christians in Syria in 636. When Jerusalem fell in the following year, the Christians were granted free religious practice, but the Christian churches were no longer allowed to have a cross or bells; the Christians were no longer allowed to ride on horses, but only on donkeys or mules; they had to accommodate every Muslim traveller and provide him with food free of charge for one day; they had to wear mourning clothes and a leather belt in the city and on journeys; a mosque was built on the site where Solomon's temple had once stood. Under Omar I, who also took Jerusalem, 36,000 towns and oerters were devastated and 14,000 Christian churches burned or turned into mosques. - When North Africa was conquered at the end of the 7th century, Muhammadan rule was consolidated by the extermination of Christianity and Christian education. - The Fatimid Chalife Hakem, who ruled in the early 11th century, claimed divine worship for himself. Under him the Christians were persecuted, imprisoned, burned and otherwise maltreated. In particular, destruction of Christian churches and mistreatment of Western pilgrims was the order of the day. - Under the Mamluks' rule in Egypt around 1249, Christians who were prisoners of war were partly killed and partly sold into slavery. The same happened to the inhabitants of Palestine. - About 1389 Serbia became a Turkish Sendschak. Hundreds of thousands of Serbs were dragged into slavery, and every five years the youth of Serbia was pressed into the service of the Janissaries, where they were conscripted to oppress their own brothers. - When Bajazeth I was victorious over the Hungarians around 1400, he had 10,000 common prisoners executed, the others in

Slavery. - Murad II dragged 45,000 from Transylvania into slavery in 1438. - When Constantinople was conquered in 1453, all the inhabitants who could not break away were made slaves, the houses were plundered, the churches were robbed of their ornaments and desecrated in a ghastly manner, and from the dome of St. Sophia's Church the cross was thrown down to give way henceforth to the Turkish crescent. - In the war with the Venetians, which ended in 1479, all the Venetians there were speared, quartered or sawn to pieces during the conquest of Negroponte. - Soliman II had the garrison of Ofen cut down in the first half of the 16th century, despite the most solemn promise of free departure. - When Cyprus was seized from the Venetians in 1570, 20,000 Christians were massacred and the most horrible atrocities were committed. - Before Vienna in 1683, 30,000 captured Christians were cut down by Kara Mustapha. - When the oppressed Greeks rose up in 1770, 80,000 fell partly to the sword, partly to slavery. - And still today the Turk is an enemy of the Christians, as his behavior against them teaches, e.g. a few years ago in the Syrian persecution of Christians.

Of the little horn it says further; "It shall presume to change time and law". It is still a matter of conduct against the saints of God, that is, of changing holy times and holy laws. This horn will be subject to changing, overturning, and substituting others for the festivals and laws of faith and life of the children of God, as the Moslem Empire does in its Koran.

It goes on to say: "The saints of the Most High will be given into his hand for a time, and some times, and half a time. The children of God will therefore be subject to this kingdom and will have to feel its pressure, which was probably fulfilled in the case of the Moslem kingdom. But how is the determination of time, one time, and two times, and half a time, to be understood? We find just such a determination in Daniel 12:7 and Revelation 12:14. By "a time" we must understand a year. Cf. Daniel 4:13, 20, 22, 29, Revelation 13:5, (42 months), Revelation 12:6, (1260 days, almost four and a half years, comprising more exactly 1277 or 1278 days). That we have here to understand actual solar years, is asserted by many moderns, and would not in itself be impossible. But as the 70 weeks in Daniel are weeks, so these four and a half years can also be years. So the time for Christians to fear the pressure of the Mohammedan power would amount to about 1277 or 1278 (or according to the number of Revelation, 1260) years. If we take as our starting point the year 632, in which year Muhammad became master of Arabia, or the year 636, in which 80,000 Syrian Christians were destroyed, the time when this pressure must end would be between 1892 and 1914. But herewith we do not want to be pro-

phelen. It might please God to give the Christian enemy a still longer time, although, since the days are to be shortened for the sake of the elect, the end of the three and a half times is very near to us.

When the hour appointed of God is come, the day of our redemption shall dawn. "After that judgment shall be executed, and his power shall be taken away, and he shall be destroyed and destroyed. But the kingdom, and the power, and the authority under the whole heaven, shall be given to the holy people of the Most High, whose kingdom is eternal, and all authority shall serve and obey him" (vv. 26 and 27).

(Conclusion follows.)

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

About the meetings of the General Synod of Missouri we find" in the "Evang.-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung" of Luthard, number 49, the following notice by an author unknown to us. We were struck by the assertion that the reasons of the unconditional opponents of the taking of interest "lie in good part not on biblical, but on national-economic ground". We would be eager to hear the proof of this strange assertion. The report is as follows: "From September 1-11, the general synod of Missouri, under the presidency of Prof. Walther, held its fourteenth convention at Fort Wayne. It numbered about 450 members, and by the objects and character of its proceedings we believe it proved that it carries high the standard of the Lutheran Church, and is the great focal point of it in America. The opening address was delivered by Rev. Schwan, of Cleveland, the president of the middle district, on Nehemiah 4:17, after which the president gave an account of the events which had occurred in the synod during the past three years. In addition to the practical questions before it, the Synod also deals with doctrinal questions that move the minds in its midst, and so it was no coincidence that the usury question also formed a prominent part of the proceedings. It may be that "passion" has also had its share in the previous debates on this subject; American theologians are, after all, human beings, but who would therefore claim that passion has emigrated entirely from Europe across the ocean to America? - The discussions at the Synod, we believe, provided proof that the members were judged too harshly in many cases. For the merchants of New York and the theologians of St. Louis proved to be the best of friends, and in the negotiations on the burning question at the Synod they seem to have given us a model of how to treat such matters. Both sides were represented, and unreservedly they spoke their minds. The subject and substratum of the discussion, however, were formed by Rev. Brohm, of St. Louis, in behalf of the opponents of usury; but, considering the importance of the matter, they scarcely got as far as the fourth, after having reached unanimity on the first three. Thus the whole matter, not being in itself an article of faith, was again adjourned for three years until the next synod, and the charge of a hasty judgment and urging-

The question of the right to ecclesiastical recognition can therefore, as it seems to us, not well be raised in this question. The discussion itself proceeded from the commandment to love one's neighbor; but there was no hint of any desire to decide on the basis of the Old Testament law of usury. Agreement was reached on the concept of charity, which demanded that in all contracts the risk be shared equally by both parties. So the question was left as it stood, and it was decided to discuss the matter further in the Synodal Papers until the next Synod. In order to indicate the position of the opponents of usury, we will quote only the words from one of Walther's letters: "Do not fear that we will act hastily in this matter, that we will proceed with church discipline, banishment, etc. because of it. After this doctrine has lain so lukewarm in the mire, it is necessary to show the greatest leniency. After all, the point is not an article of faith, but only a moral dogma, in which nothing decides who judges this way or that, but the position he takes against God's commandment, and the love he notoriously violates his conscience." For our part, we too cannot agree with the unconditional opponents of the taking of interest, and we cannot acknowledge their reasons, which lie in good part not on biblical but on national-economic ground; but we do not wish to deny the importance of the matter, especially in America. - Besides this doctrinal question, some practical matters of general interest were discussed, among which the most important were the relations of the Missouri Synod to other Synods. The agreement reached in October 1868 with the Wisconsin Synod was ratified, according to which both Synods grant each other the fullest ecclesiastical fellowship and send delegates to each other's General Synods. Furthermore, the agreement of both Synods of May of this year was confirmed, according to which each has the right to employ a teacher, paid by itself, in the theological institutions and grammar schools of the other, and to see its students placed on an entirely equal footing. The cordial and fraternal intercourse with the deputies of the Wisconsin Synod, as well as the joy on both sides over the agreement won, may well be regarded as proof that the principle of building ecclesiastical fellowship on full doctrinal unity alone is the right one, and that if anywhere, certainly here, unreserved conscientiousness is not only the right love, but at the same time the highest prudence. Negotiations for ecclesiastical unity had also begun with the Illinois Synod, and the mutual delegates had come to an agreement in St. Louis on the same basis on which the union with the Wisconsin Synod had been concluded, and likewise, as a result of a negotiation among the delegates in Columbus, the relationship with the Ohio Synod, both of whose delegates were present at the general Synod, was at the same stage. In the negotiations themselves, however, some doctrinal differences and misunderstandings arose, for which reason it was fraternally agreed to suspend the formal union for the time being, in the certain hope that it would soon be consummated. From such events we believe that one can learn what church policy is in a good sense, just as, on the other hand, they perhaps also give an inkling that the points of crystallization of the Lutheran Church in America are to be sought in the connections emanating from the Missouri Synod. - Of the internal matters of the Synod, which were also discussed, it is interesting to note that it was decided to add new buildings to the seminary in St. Louis, which were no longer sufficient for the approximately 130 students, and to grant $45,000 (?) for this purpose; furthermore, to establish two new professorships and (as already reported in 1869, No. 45) to appoint Lic. Dr. Preuß, who had made himself available to the Synod, to one of them. A new professorship was also created for the high school at Fort Wayne, which has 160 pupils, and the Emigrant Mission under Rev. Keyl in New York, as well as the seminary in Steeden.

The synod pledged an active shell. With regard to the mission to the heathen, it was decided to send all future gifts for this mission to Leipzig and Hermannsburg, without determining the donors in the area of the Synod. Finally, the Synod does not intend to continue its own Indian mission, which at present has an endowment of about $14,000, because of its total lack of success. - In this way, we believe, the accusations which were previously made against the Missouri Synod in the Gazette (1869, No. 40) will certainly be settled. While Germany is often torn in doctrinal questions, we see here the compact mass of the Missouri Synod bravely and successfully going its way in enviable doctrinal unity. Under these circumstances, we do not think that the accusation of quarreling should be brought against it, and that it so manfully wields the sword as well as the mason's trowel is certainly not to be blamed. On the contrary, her successes with the Buffalo, Wisconsin, Ohio, Illinois, and Norwegian Synods give her proceedings a splendid justification! But if it be still urged against her that she tolerates no "open questions," she stands by the assertion that nothing which the Scriptures teach and the Confessions pronounce may be an open question in the Lutheran Church, and we think it is not evident what is wrong with this principle."

"Pulpit - Communion." After the "Lutheran" of January 20 has expressed its agreement with those who reject the exchange of pulpits with non-Lutherans in only five points, it continues: "6. Nevertheless, one asks whether it is right for a Lutheran pastor and congregation to invite the preacher of another denomination to preach in their pulpit those doctrines and opinions of Christian ethics in which he and his particular confession agree with the confessions of the Lutheran Church? Our answer is clearly and decisively yes. Under the guards and limitations expressed above, **it is right"** (so the "Lutheran" underlines the words themselves), "and a right which cannot be denied them, though one which must be used with caution. Here we differ with the Missourians and perhaps with others who insist on the strict exclusion of all non-Lutherans from Lutheran pulpits. But we deny that such strict exclusion is required by any reasonable interpretation of our confessions or by any duties of Christianity, and maintain that there is no lawful power on earth to bar the pulpit of a Lutheran congregation to an approved, though in name non-Lutheran, pastor, whom the faithful preacher of the congregation and she herself knows to hold the truth of God in sufficient (!) purity to edify them in faith and life, and of whom they judge that they may well hear him under certain circumstances." - The reader sees from this as clearly as he can wish that the "Lutheran," who herewith assures the sense of the resolutions of the Council, does not want to and cannot give up the pulpit exchange with non-Lutherans under all circumstances. As commendable as the honesty is with which the "Lutheran" publicly presents this view, it is nevertheless beyond all doubt a thoroughly erroneous one. First of all, it is erroneous to foresee that the preacher of an unbelieving community will in any case preach only the pure truth. God's Word expressly says: "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump," Gal. 5:9; therefore such a preacher, even if he promises not to present anything against Lutheran doctrine in the Lutheran pulpit, even if he may have the best will to do so, cannot help being influenced by his system in the presentation of every doctrine. On the other hand, even in the event that the preacher of an unbelieving community might preach a truly Lutheran, that is, purely biblical sermon,

it would be no less against the duty of a Lutheran preacher to allow him into his pulpit. For not only would indifference to the diversity of the churches, disregard for the pure doctrine of one's own church, and disregard for the errors of the other churches be fostered in the congregation, but also an obvious mixing of churches would be practiced, and finally the preacher of an erroneous community would himself be strengthened in his error; not to speak of the grave, irresponsible annoyance that would thereby be given to all resolute Lutherans, especially the weak ones. If the If a Lutheran who is in union with false teachers and unbelieving congregations believes himself to be in harmony with our confessions, this is only possible if he has accepted the Lutheran symbols in the Iowa manner with a reservatio mentalis. We only recall the following passages: "We also believe, teach, and confess that no church shall condemn the other, that (propterla quod = because of this) one has less or more outward ceremonies, which are not commanded by God, than the other, when otherwise in doctrine and all the articles thereof, as also in the right use of the holy sacraments, there is agreement with each other. Sacraments, have held one accord with another." (Formula of Concord. Summarical Term. Art. 10.). Hereby is unequivocally clearly rejected any ecclesiastical communion with a church and its teachers who are not in agreement with the orthodox in all the articles of doctrine. In the "repetition" of the seventh article of the same confession, it is said: "Dr. Luther, who understood the true opinion of the Augsburg Confession for others, and who constantly adhered to and defended it to the end, recently, before his death, in his last confession, reiterated his belief in this article with great zeal in the following words, when he wrote: I reckon them all in one cake, that is, for sacramenters and reprobates, as they are, who will not believe that the Lord's bread in the Lord's Supper is his true natural body, which the ungodly, or Judas, as well as St. Peter and all the saints, receive orally; whoever, I say, will not believe this, let him leave me alone, and hope for no communion with me; nothing else will come of it.'" - Hereafter we must say that if the Council really holds the doctrine of pulpit fellowship which, according to the above, the "Lutheran" holds, we cannot acknowledge the Council to be faithfully Lutheran, but must regard the same as a body still infected with the Union spirit of our time. Oh, only tear down the barriers which separate our orthodox church from the irreligious communities, and blur the boundaries, and it will be impossible for our church to hold what it has, and to be a light and salt to those who are still in error. From such irresponsible unfaithfulness God preserve all teachers, congregations and members of our church in grace! W.

Necessary Consideration of English. Prof. Loy writes in the Lutheran Standard of January 1: "We have little respect for those who look down with contempt on the Germans and German; we cannot go along with those who want to substitute the English language for German simply because they prefer it, whether it is convenient or not; but we can just as little make common cause with those who act on the principle that the Gospel is exclusively German and that those who desire it must learn that language. We are convinced that the Church of the Augsburg Confession has no future in this country unless provision is made for English. If the English preachers and congregations ^are exposed to greater temptations to forsake the truth than the German ones, this certainly cannot be a cause

...why we should give up the field and leave all to the enemy." - These words are certainly as true as they are worthy of heeding. So long, of course, as the German Lutheran Synods stand so isolated, with one German seminary each, so long it will hardly be possible for anything righteous to be done by them for the English.- Thus just now we read in the "Lutheran Magazine": "Some years ago we were called to the deathbed of a young Pennsylvanian-German, and when, after a brief examination, we found that he knew little of God's Word, he said: 'Yes, German I could not read, and English I did not understand,' and so he just remained to his end in the saddest ignorance. Thus hundreds and thousands of young people are still growing up today in the German counties of Pennsylvania," etc. What a pity! W.

"From the General Assembly of Presbyterians." Under this heading we read in the "Reform. Kirchenzeitung" of Dec. 23rd the following: "On the second day of the meeting held in Pittsburg (Nov. 12th) a resolution was presented by Dr. Knox with reference to the Heidelberg Catechism. Since this Catechism undoubtedly sets forth and defends the doctrines of God's Word, as we confess them in communion with other Reformed bodies, and since the (Dutch) Reformed Church in America, by resolution of its General Synod, has placed the little Westminster atechism as equal to its own, permitting its congregations to use one or the other at their pleasure: be it resolved, That it is the opinion of this General Assembly, should churches desire to adopt the Heidelberg Catechism, let them be permitted to do so. - The speaker then remarked that the same courtesy must be shown. He did not think that the Reformed Church was in favor of merging with the Presbyterian; but he thought it most timely to pass the resolution." - This is a fresh proof of how the Presbyterian community is more and more losing its former so serious attitude. It is true that the Presbyterians do not contradict themselves by accepting the Heidelberg Catechism, since the same was declared by the Dortrechter Synod to be "in all things consistent with God's Word" (Sess. 148) - hence the German Reformed Church, which acknowledges the Heidelberg Catechism, pretends without reason that it does not share the strict Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, whereby it can only coincide with the tendentious ambiguity of the Catechism -: but it is deplorable that a Presbyterian in public general assembly can call the acceptance of a confession an act of guilty "courtesy." W.

The most recent solution of the question of office is as follows: "The office and the congregation relate to each other like the entripedal (sic!) and the centrifugal force. If both are in the right relation to each other, the motion that drives the world comes into being, which does not proceed without order, but keeps all in their courses and prevents the collision. If, however, the right relation to each other is broken and dislocated, then inhibition, standstill or destruction takes place. So it is also in the sphere of the church. If we place the centripetal (sic!) force in the office, and the centrifugal force in the congregation, and make a historical test, we see that the relationship of both forces, founded in nature, is repeated in the sphere of the church. We take before us the Protestant Church and the Roman Church. In both, the originally orderly relationship of the two forces, factors, has been upset. In the first, the centrifugal force gained the upper hand, and the consequence is perpetual separation and fragmentation; while in the Roman, the centripetal (!) and an imposing hierarchy has come into being, which holds the gigantic body together, but which, with all its apparent unfolding of life and astonishing activity, hinders the true life of the church.

and under this outwardly busy bustle and movement stagnation and sepulchral peace are concealed. If we hold fast to this principle of construing the nature of the church, instead of from a point of unity, from that of the two-ness united to unity, then, in our opinion, all difficulties, etc., will be solved." This solution was presented by Pastor Hinterleitner of Pottsville, Pa. to the Pennsylvanian Ministerial Assembly at Reading in the week before Trinitalis 1869, and Pastor Brobst now shares it in the "Theologische Monatshefte".

General Synod. The "Lutheran Observer" of 14 January gives a List of all the glorious characteristic qualities which the General Synod is said to have. He says it is 1. Scriptural, 2. Confessional, 3. Liturgical, 4. Catechetical, 5. Ceremonial, 6. Commemorative (because of the memorial feasts it celebrates), 7. Eclectic (concerning the constitution), 8. Progressive, 9. Catholic, and 10. Lutheran. Probably the "Lutheran Observer" only forgot to add finally; "Summa Summarum, English, Celestial, Divine, and Supergodly." Indeed, we know of no sect in the world, except, say, the Roman, which praises and extols itself so disgustingly as the so-called General Synod, while it has not one of the qualities which it ridiculously sees and extols in itself. It is true that it cultivates "ecclesiastical, sacramental, and pulpit fellowship" with all the so-called "orthodox" (!) sects, as the "Observer" praises it under No. 9, but this is not catholicity, as he thinks, but Laodiceanism. But when the "Observer" closes the eulogy which he gives to himself and his kind by saying that the General Synod "will eventually be counted worthy to be the army of Christ which will take up the last fight against Antichrist and victoriously fight the last battles," it almost seems as if the writer must already have gone mad with arrogance. W.

In Chicago, a citizen has given $250,000 to build a Free Universalist Church there and to pay a preacher for it. - In the same city, the president of the Board of Education, in his annual report, has advocated the exclusion of the Bible from the city's day schools. He cites the opposition of the Catholics to the free schools as the reason for his proposal; by banishing the Bible he hopes to make them more favorable to the state schools. (!) (Ref. Kz.)

II. foreign countries.

"In Denmark," writes the Ref. Kz., "the Free Congregation Law has been passed in both chambers and has received royal confirmation. According to it, free congregations may form within the national church without leaving it; if 20 families come together, they may elect their own pastor, if they only continue to pay the dues to the legal one; the congregations are to participate in the election of pastors, but they must elect one of those proposed to them by the ministry; if the election is ambivalent, or if too few participate in it, the ministry decides. It is in substance what the well-known Grundtvig and his followers have long sought. Against this law 407 petitions with 40,009 signatures had been received; for the same only 4 with 319 signatures." - What a ghastly, Babylonian confusion must be produced in the Danish 'national church' by this 'free church law,' is indeed beyond all description. ' W.

Uninvited (?) Guests to the Concil. Under this inscription we read in Dr. Münkel'S N. Ztbl. of November 18 of last year: The tourist-politician of the "Post" writes from Switzerland r "While one at church congresses, in the Protestant-

While the Catholic Church, with the most serious face in the world, fronts the direction of the Roman clergy, the pilgrims to Rome pass me in whole crowds over the Simplon. And what pilgrims! They are not pilgrims in their harem robes, with a string of shells around their pilgrim's hats; they are not devotees who stop before every image of the Mother of God and sing a psalm. Nothing there! These pilgrims wear heavy silken robes, diamonds, murderously large chignons, makeup often as thick as a finger from their cheeks. In a word, they are whole caravans of Parisian coquettes with their male appendages, modernized and blown boor-whores, suitiers, soldiers of fortune, and similar peoples, who have set out on their Roman journey and occupy quarters in good time, so that the pious may have to bivouac in the Campagna. Rome has come in train with the Parisian demimonde. The ecumenical Concil is like a season at Homburg, etc., only grander. A nice company this! What an audience when the Pope gives his blessing! But also what an opportunity for the fabrication of penitent Magdalenes on a grand scale!" - So that would go similarly to the Concil at Costnitz.

The Jndexrongregation also banned the following work by means of decrees on December 4: Janus, The Pope and the Council, Leipzig 1869. Leipzig 1869, certainly an excellent recommendation of the same. There must be light in the book, otherwise the gentlemen in Rome would not fear it for their darkness. W.

Roman Catholics in Protestant countries continue to complain that they are the oppressed ones. This is a blatant falsehood. The so-called Protestant princes, on the contrary, almost universally fondle them. These complaints reveal that the Romans themselves are not satisfied with being put on an equal footing with the Protestants in Protestant lands: there, too, they want to rule! - After the news had reached Wurtemberg that Pius IX had complained to Queen Olga about the "discrimination of the Catholic citizens of Wurtemberg in ecclesiastical matters," the following was written from there on Nov. 20 of last year: "It would be interesting to see these complaints of the 'Holy Father' formulated more precisely. It would be interesting to see these complaints of the 'Holy Father' formulated more precisely. Here in this country one knows nothing of a preferential treatment of the Protestants, of a relegation of the Catholics. If the present system of government has any maxim at all, it is that of anxiously avoiding anything that might remind the Catholic population that they live as a minority in an old Protestant country. There is no end of consideration and attention, and the opportunity for it is assiduously sought. The Court participates with a certain Ostentatkon in the Catholic demonstration, as, for example, recently in the bazaar for the Catholic Journeymen's House. When the Protestant state synod was opened, the king first of all impressed upon the president that everything should be avoided that might unpleasantly affect the Catholics; as often as he takes the oath from a newly appointed Protestant general superintendent, he first and foremost urges him to 'maintain confessional peace,' a wish that, always addressed to the same person, acquires a peculiar coloration. It has virtually become a standing expression of King Charles."

Abolition of the right of patronage in Saxony. After the second chamber at Dresden had improved the church council and synodal regulations on its own authority, it could not have been difficult for it to lay the kind at the root of the patronage by 54 votes to 16. "The right of patronage is abolished," is the brief, comprehensive provision. Neither the royal government, nor the church regiment, nor any other patron, has the right to confer a school or church position. With the Synod, where the preponderance of the liberal laity is assured, a new

Electoral Act agreed. How it should be with the previous burdens of the patrons, nothing is said about that. Perhaps a peaceful division is advisable, that the municipalities get the right to vote, and the patrons keep the burdens. In justification of this, it was said: "The historical origin of the patronage right is no different than that of the other privileges, which, like serfdom, etc., have long since been abolished. This is a very insinuating, but resounding reason. (Neues Zeitbl.)

Prussia. While the Prussian Minister of Culture, von Mühler, is doing everything possible to lead the Lutheran Church in the newly annexed states toward its dissolution and to make it a department of the Prussian-unified national church, the unbelievers reproach him for being so gentle with the Lutheran Church, especially in Hanover. In the latest issue of the Farmer-Zeitung, we read from F. Gerhard: "In the Prussian House of Representatives, the Minister of Culture is being seriously attacked. In particular, the deputy Miguel sharply attacked the Ministry of Culture with regard to the ecclesiastical conditions in Hanover. The Minister of Culture declared on this occasion that the government did not have the duty to stand up with its authority also for the so-called 'enlightened Protestantism,' which had distanced itself from the fundamental views of the Lutheran Church." - A new proof of what hypocrisy it is when the enlightened perorir so much about intolerance of the "orthodox" and boast about their tolerance. If it were up to these heroes of tolerance, the Lutheran congregations would long ago have no church. W.

As is well known, **Pastor Frank** in Arenshorst, in the Principality of Osnabrück, refused several years ago to exchange the church-ordained renunciation with the new baptismal form popularized by the Hanoverian presynod, not (?) as if he cared so much about the latter, but because the new baptismal form was forced upon him by a member of the congregation in order to get rid of the doctrine of the devil. According to his great conscientiousness, Pastor Frank did not want to drop a single doctrine of Scripture with his will. The father of the child was given the opportunity by the regiment to have the child baptized by another pastor. But he demanded baptism not only from his pastor, but also in the public church service, so he was aiming at more than just getting rid of the devil. If he did not want to get rid of his pastor, he wanted to bring him into his obedience. He used every means at his disposal, and after exhausting them he went as far as the House of Representatives in Berlin, but to no avail. He was to have his children baptized by another pastor, but as an enlightened man who was more interested in his perseverance than in baptism, he left his children unbaptized for five years. What should be done with him who despised baptism? Everyone knows what is right. But the regiment was in no small straits. Since it had itself approved the new baptismal formula and had appointed a collaborator at the expense of Pastor Niemack in Kirchwehren, a no less faithful and conscientious clergyman, in a similar situation, it gained the reputation of harshness and partiality. This matter damaged the regiment on both sides. The same has therefore decided on a different information. It has transferred Pastor Frank from Arenshorst to Wietzendorf, in the Lüneburg Haide, to a congregation which gladly and with open arms receives such a faithful and blessed clergyman. The transfer is at the same time an improvement, and Pastor Frank has reserved the right to act according to his convictions, and if he drops the old renunciation, (?!) to be unbound for the future. In Wietzendorf, by the way, the old renunciation is currently in use. Thus the Landes-Consistorium has taken precautions in time, so that the thorny deal does not also cause him embarrassment at the Synod; and what is even more important,

Pastor Frank has been preserved in office. - The foregoing is taken from Dr. Münkel's Neuem Zeitblatt of October 1 of last year. We take the liberty of remarking on the following. As far as we know, Pastor Frank did not only refuse to omit the denial of the devil according to the new form, "because he was forced to do so by a member of the congregation in order to get rid of the doctrine of the devil," but because the baptismal form in Hanover was only changed at the insistence of those who, unbelieving as they are, are ashamed to answer the question: "Do you renounce the devil" etc.? At least this alone would have been the right position; which, however, according to Gal. 2, 3-5. and according to the 10th article of our Formula of Concord, not only Mr. Pastor Frank and Niemack, but all the pastors of the Hanoverian Regional Church, including Dr. Münkel, should have taken, without "yielding one hour to the false brethren, so that the truth of the Gospel might stand with them." -

' W.

Lay representation in the Royal Saxon Synod. The law on this has long since been completed and approved by the Landtag. The diocesan or district synods have met thereafter and are heading for the state synod. Then some members of the Landtag make the unpleasant discovery that the district synods are not liberal enough, or, as it is called, are under the tutelage of the clergy. What prospects these are for the Land Synod! Therefore, while there is still time, a remedy must be found. Dr. Gensel moved that as many seculars as clergy should be elected to the Synod by an electoral body which should likewise consist of twice as many seculars as clergy. He justified this, after a warning side glance at Hanover, by saying that the Apostle Paul had told the clergy "Not that we are lords of your faith," and concluded from this that the seculars must be lords, I understand, the liberal seculars. It would have been more correct to propose that liberals should be elected in double numbers, without distinction of rank, if liberals were not preferred. But they did not like to come out so nakedly, although it was clear enough from the negotiations that they meant something like that. The clergy were thought to have too little sense of freedom, so they were not wanted. Uhle said: "If the clergy, or at least a part of them, could do as they wished, they would still be building funeral pyres today to conjure up the dark spirit of past times. Who would have thought that there were such wicked clergymen in good Saxony! The Minister v. Falkenstein took pains to make the enlightened gentlemen understand that, apart from anything else, the mere sense of justice ought to prevent them from attacking a law which they themselves had passed, and by this attack to overthrow the independence of the church which they had just created and which they were constantly talking about. All this was of no avail. They gave it to be understood that the new law was created by them, and could therefore be improved by them, as Saturn has the power to consume his own children. The- independence of the Krrche is another expression of the continued domination of the Liberals over the Church. Dr. Gensel's motion was carried by 60 votes to 12.

(Newspaper.)

In response to the petition of the Breslau city authorities concerning the establishment of a non-denominational secondary school, a decree was issued by the Minister of Education. It divides the higher schools, which go beyond the elementary school, into two classes: **1.** those which, in addition to the purpose of imparting knowledge and skills, also have a pedagogical purpose (grammar schools, secondary schools and higher middle schools), 2. those technical schools which are limited only to imparting knowledge and skills. The former must, according to the principles in force, be Christian in any case (de-

neither confessional nor simultaneous), the latter can be mixed. There are also exclusively Jewish institutions. There is no reason to deviate from these principles. May the government only remain firm in this reasonable practice! - (Ev. Church Chronicle.)

In Wuerttemberg, too, the question of communion with members of other confessions has become a burning one through the successful missions of the Methodists there. The influential, very mild "Christenbote" declares itself quite definitely against mixed communion. (N. Zeitbl.)

The Austrian bishops protest under § 14 of the Concordat against the right of the secular authorities to initiate criminal proceedings against the person of the princes of the church. This protest has been dismissed by the Higher Regional Court; the courts are entitled not only to substantive, but also to personal criminal proceedings, the paragraph invoked is consequently to be counted among those abolished. - (Ev. K.-Chronik.)

In Vienna a Christian Unitarian congregation has arisen and held its first public service on November 30, 1868. It is not yet recognized, but recognition is in prospect. The Lord's Supper was served with the formula: Take away and eat, which means, etc., etc. (Allg. Kz. No. 4.)

The ultramontane Czechs have suggested the idea of applying to the Council for a revision of the trial of Huss at Constance and for its rehabilitation. The radical Jungczechen party, however, very eagerly opposed the plan, because such an appeal would have involved a recognition of the Council, which would have been very inconvenient for them in their anti-church endeavors.

(Evangelical Church Chronicle.)

The Hungarian Reformed Church protests in a petition to the Ministry of Culture against the appointment of the Lutheran Dr. Szeberinyi as military superintendent, namely, because the election was not carried out ecclesiastically, but was octroir from above, and because the Reformed soldiers were placed under a superintendent A. C. and provided with the Lutheran Lord's Supper. - (Ev. Church Chronicle.)

How one wants to bring about union. In Hagen there is a small Reformed congregation and a larger Lutheran congregation. The former has an old little church, and has been collecting money for a long time to build a new one, and has already collected 20,000 Thaler. Since these are not yet sufficient, some (who is not said), for whom things were going too slowly, made the attempt to proceed to a union, and the congregations were suddenly surprised with the news: on a certain day the vote on this was to take place. The Reformed congregation, which voted first, rejected the project by all votes against 11. The vote in the Lutheran church was then omitted. (Elberf. Ztg. June 6. Volksbl. f. St. u. Land. No. 53.)

The "Ev. Kirchen-Chronik" speaks of **"guest-like" admission to Holy Communion** as follows: "As a rule, one speaks of guest-like admission of members of other confessions to confessional Communion. We cannot really be friends with this view," since we ourselves, in partaking of Holy Communion, are only guests of the heavenly King, who feeds and waters us with His body and blood. Has one guest also the right of partaking to grant to another? How far does the profession of the ministry extend in this matter? The ministry receives its calling from the church, but the church cannot grant a calling beyond its own competence, which extends only to its members. A church cannot grant a profession to a minister for members of other churches. The so-called 'guest' admission is therefore, from the ecclesiastical point of view, an absurdity, which must be without blessing and without effect, because the admitting clergyman exceeds his sphere of profession."

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 1S. March 1870. No. 3.

Materials on Pastoral Theolagy,

communicated by C. F. W. W.

. (Continued.)

Note 3.

If the sin of a member of the congregation is so evident that the whole congregation knows it, and therefore the whole congregation is offended by it, it is not in itself necessary to stop at the steps of admonition given in Matt. 18, since in this case the congregation is the very person of whom the Lord says, "If thy brother sin against thee, go and punish him between thee and him alone." Matth. 18, 15.*) Hence we read that Paul also, after Peter had given a public offense, known to all, did not first punish by degrees, but immediately "before all publicly." Gal. 2, 13. 14. Of such a case Paul also writes expressly: "Let them that sin be punished before all, that the rest also may fear." 1 Tim. 5, 20. Christian Kortholt therefore speaks of this as follows: "Above all, a distinction is to be observed between hidden and manifest sins. But we do not call hidden sins those which are by all means known to no one, for God alone judges them (Rom. 2:16.), but those which are known to a few, and are not connected with a public vexation of many; but manifest ones, which are publicly known, and therefore connected with vexation of many. Now as to hidden sins, the minister of the church, as well as every sincere Christian, is to observe the rule of the Saviour, Matt. 18:15 and following. But manifest sins are to be punished publicly. Augustine saws: 'What is committed before all is to be punished before all.'

*) Augustine therefore writes: "If thou alone knowest sin, he alone hath sinned against thee. But if he wronged thee in the sight of many, he sinned against these also." (Serm. 16. de verbis D.)

And this is the precept of the apostle himself, who thus addresses his Timothy: 'They that sin' (that is, with public vexation), 'punish them before all, that the rest also may fear? 1 Tim. 5, 20." (Pastor fidelis. Hamburgi 1696. p. 92. 96. f.) There may even be cases in which it is not only not necessary in itself to observe the different degrees of fraternal punishment, but in which it is rather necessary not to observe them. Osiander writes of this: "These degrees do not apply to more serious crimes, such as murder, adultery, and the like. For how bad taste it would be not to bring a murderer to trial until he had murdered two or three. Paul also commanded the church to put him immediately under ban who had lived in incest with his stepmother, without first observing the stages of admonition." (Paraphras. ad Matth. 18.)

As always, however, love is the highest law here too. If, therefore, love for the fallen person demands that he first be admonished privately, despite the fact that his case is a public one, then the use of the right to punish the publicly fallen person publicly at once would involve a grave injustice. Therefore, L. Hartmann writes quite correctly: "Even public sins that can be denounced by anyone are not to be punished publicly at the first time. For all punishments are to be administered in such a way that the punished are brought to a true knowledge of their sins and to a stirring of their hearts. For this reason, everything must first be tried that serves the salvation and change of heart of one's neighbor. If, then, according to the nature of the person, you immediately bring the offense before the public, you will, by this severity and public harshness, harden rather than mend the heart of the neighbor, and soften the ulcer, 'out of shame he will begin to defend his sin, and whom you wish to mend you make worse,' as Augustine rightly reminds us in the sixteenth hermon of the words of the Lord. 'He that seeth that he is borne out, will straightway resolve to deny his guilt, and so thou not only dost not help sin, but doth double it,' as Origen writes on Deut. 3." (Pastoral. ev. p. 856.)

Note 4.

Hartmann sets forth the following eighteen rules concerning the proper manner of fraternal punishment: "1. The punishment of one's neighbor is to be administered in such a way that it brings honor to God and salvation to the neighbor, and that therefore the neighbor is not exposed to ridicule and scorn in the eyes of the world for his own sake, but that it is evident that the admonisher is not doing this out of malice, hatred, and vain honor. 002 Every punishment must be based on some knowledge of a sin committed. (3) The punisher, in his punishment, must always have in view the general weakness as well as his own, and so punish himself also. 004 He that reproacheth his neighbour must beware lest he himself be reproached.

with the same sin, or with a like sin. 005 Hidden sins, or sins known to thee only, or to a few, are not to be remitted openly, but only between thee and the offender. 006 Whosoever therefore shall bring the hidden sins of their brethren before the church, without observing the steps prescribed by Christ for such brotherly proceedings, shall not be heard, but shall be punished, and called back to the laws of love. (7) Even sins which are public and known to all are not to be punished publicly the first time." (Note 3.) "8. The reproof given to one's neighbor should be neither too cold and too mild, nor too severe and too serious, but so tempered and weighed, that by means of it the brother may be led to true repentance through the recognition of his sins and the consideration of God's wrath with a bruised heart. 009 In punishment, therefore, the middle way is to be taken, so that the mildness of the spirit may be mixed with the severity of the rebuke. 010 The punisher will reprove his neighbor with fruitfulness, if he consider the nature and condition of him whom he wishes to reprove. 011 The rebuke is to be established according to the nature of the sin, and to be given differently according to it. 012 In the punishment of one's neighbor, time and place are also to be considered. (Prov. 25:11, Sir. 22:6, 1 Sam. 25:36, 37.) 13. If the crime committed by the neighbor is detrimental either to the church or to the state, or if there is imminent danger, and if, moreover, he who knows of the crime and does not discover it is considered guilty of the crime, or if there is little hope of preventing it, then the private admonition should not be insisted upon, but the crime should be made public and reported in due form, either by complete omission or by an application of the same appropriate to the circumstances. (14) If a crime to be committed is greater and more serious than the loss of the good name of him who intends to commit the evil, it shall be readily discovered, especially to those who can avert it by their authority and power. (Acts 23:13, 14.) (15) If a man repents of his error or crime, or if, without some rebuke, he would be immediately corrected, or, finally, if he would punish others for whom he is more responsible, either no rebuke at all is to be given him, or at least a very mild one. (16) If it is evident beyond doubt that all punishment is in vain, and, as they say, is preached to deaf ears, then punishment and admonition may be wholly dispensed with. 017 The witnesses used in the second degree of exhortation must be able to win over the brother, and at least not hateful to him who is to be punished; for if you have either disputants, or those who are hateful to him who is to be punished, or even those who are not discreet, and whom he does not like, you must be able to win over the brother.

If the person who has been punished is not able to confess his sin, then nothing will be done, but the punished person, either out of shame or out of hatred, will want to heal sin with sin and remain obstinate. Relatives or familiar friends may therefore be called in, before whom the one who has erred is not ashamed to confess his sin, and who by their authority may induce him to confess and amend in due manner. (18) All the steps of exhortation are to be repeated a few times, if necessity requires it, and to work on the convert until he mends his ways, or until his continued obstinacy becomes manifest through contempt of all exhortations. For Christ, Matt. 18, shows the order and degrees of exhortation, not how many times it should be given. That each of these is to be applied several times is already evident from the 22nd verse of this chapter, where Christ teaches that the sinning brother is to be forgiven seventy times seven times. Cf. Luk 17, 4." (Pastoral, ev. p. 853-862. Compare the excellent exposition of these Canons there.)

About how the punishment should be, Dann-. Hauer writes: "Every Christian, as the bishop of his neighbor, is bound to punish him in a brotherly way, Ex. 19, 17. Matth. 18, 15. But it is necessary: 1. the truth, that one first be sure of the things. 2) Prudence, that one may know the right time. Often a man punishes his neighbor at the wrong time, and would be wiser to keep silent. Sir. 20, 1: He that would pull a shoot out of a man's eye must be very tender with the thing. The censure of one's neighbor must also be conducted with equal tenderness and care. 3 Kindness. The righteous smite me kindly, etc., is written in Psalms 141:5. 4. sincerity, that no unseemly affections or dishonorable mockery appear in such work. (5) Epieikeia and equity, which do not magnify a small fault, and, as they say, do not make a mountain out of a molehill. In doubtful cases, out of Christian love, she always believes the good rather than the evil; considers man innocent rather than guilty. Excuse, says Bernard, the neighbor's intention and opinion, you cannot excuse the work; saying it was done through ignorance, he was hurried, it happened to him about, he ssei otherwise not so evil." (Catechism Milk. II, 352.)

Kortholt also says, concerning the two first stages of exhortation: "That this rule of Christ concerning the punishment of hidden sins is not to be understood both as two exhortations to be given only thus above and indifferently, but rather as a twofold rule of order and stage, at each of which one is to dwell for a time before proceeding further, this he himself shows shortly after v. 22. by answering Peter's question how often the sinning brother is to be forgiven: Not seven times, but seventy times seven." (Rev.

fidei. p. 94. f.) Whoever therefore thinks that he has satisfied the rule of Christ, Matt. 18, if he can only prove that the one who had sinned was reminded of his sin three times before his final expulsion without success, no matter how hastily, superficially, and recklessly he may have proceeded against love, is in great error. Here, too, the following applies: Summum jus summa injuria.

(To be continued.)

The four kingdoms of Daniel.

Daniel Cap. 2. u. 7.

(Conclusion.)

II. the three interpretations opposed to the ecclesiastical one.

The ecclesiastical interpretation of the four kingdoms of Daniel is opposed, as already mentioned, by a number of other interpretations, which are primarily advocated with the intention of suspecting the authenticity of the Book of Daniel. Only three of these interpretations deserve consideration, namely, those which retain the first three of the kingdoms mentioned in the ecclesiastical interpretation and, with the exclusion of the Roman Empire, seek to establish the quadruple number by dividing one of these three kingdoms. Thus some divide the Macedonian-Greek empire into the empire of Alexander and that of his successors; others divide the Medo-Persian empire into the Median and the Persian; still others divide the Chaldean-Babylonian empire into the empire of Nebuchadnezzar and that of his successors. In examining these interpretations, we shall follow the order just indicated.

1. The division of the Macedonian - Greek empire.

The division of the Macedonian-Greek empire into two kingdoms was advocated earlier by Grotius, and more recently by Bertholdt, Zahn, and Rosenmüller. Now, of course, we may well concede with Caspari that such a division of this empire is not a priori inconceivable. The death of Alexander the Great divides the time of this empire into two periods (Dan. 8, 8.; 11, 3. 4.) and in each of them this empire had its particular form. Nevertheless, such a division is not justified in our prophecy, as Hengstenberg and v. Lengerke have proved. Let us follow the former. He adduces ("Contributions to the Introduction to the Old Testament. The Authenticity of Daniel") the following proofs:

1. Daniel 7, 6. by the four wings the extension of the kingdom to all four winds is indicated (although, as we have already seen, the speed of the conquests is symbolized), but the four heads are to be interpreted in the same way as the four horns,

Dan. 8, 8. which, according to v. 22, signify four kingdoms that arise from the first unified empire. Now, if the kingdoms of Alexander's successors are already symbolized in the third animal, they cannot be symbolized again as a fourth kingdom. Thus also speak themselves: Calov on Dan. 7, 7; and Gerhard, LI. th. 1. de mag. pol. § 136 and Lilienthal, Die gute Sache u. s. w. Vol. 2. p. 816.

2. We also read Dan. 11, 4. about the division of Alexander's empire into the four winds, so that his and his successors' empires are considered as one. Nowhere in Scripture do we find a distinction between the empire of Alexander and his successors as between the Chaldean-Babylonian empire and the Medo-Persian empire or between the Medo-Persian empire and the Macedonian-Greek empire. On the contrary, according to Bertholdt's concession, Daniel 10, 20, the kingdom "Javan" summarizes the kingdom of Alexander and all his successors. The same is found in Daniel 8, 21, as Delitzsch states in Herzog Real-Encycl. vol. 3, p. 276.

3. Daniel 2:44 teaches that the reason for the division of these kingdoms is not a change of dynasties, but of ruling peoples, which did not take place between the kingdom of Alexander and those of his successors. This reason for division is also emphasized by our ancients.

4. The whole description of the fourth kingdom does not fit the kingdoms of the successors of Alexander. The fourth kingdom, according to Daniel 2:33, was originally undivided, and that of Alexander's successors divided; the fourth kingdom appears to be incomparably stronger and more terrible than the three preceding ones, according to Daniel 2:40; 7:7, 23; but even if the kingdoms of Alexander's successors are to be regarded as a whole, were they more terrible than the Chaldean-Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, or the Macedonian-Greek kingdoms until Alexander's death? Could it be said of them that they would consume, crush, crush the whole earth? And these words are to be urged, as the repetition of them teaches Cap. 7, 7. 19. 23. Or is the dreadful representation of these kingdoms only due to the words taken from Cap. 2, 40. from the image of iron? Surely we are not wrong in asking why the author chose the image of iron? Or is this empire, after Alexander's death, only regarded as so terrible because it was so destructive to the people of Israel? No, compare Daniel 8:22, 11:4, where Alexander's empire appears more powerful than that of his successors. Nor is there any trace of such fearfulness and power in Cap. 11, where the kingdoms after Alexander's death are described. - Gerhard, loc. cit. § 137; Calov, Daniel 2, 40; and Lilienthal, loc. cit. p. 816, also point out that the description of the fourth empire does not fit the empires after Alexander's death.

5. Hengstenberg, As also our ancients, teaches that the ten

The first is that the horns of the fourth beast cannot be interpreted by the kingdoms of Alexander's successors. However, this reason also applies to the division of the Medo-Persian Empire into two kingdoms, which we will discuss in more detail below. - Apart from these reasons given by Hengstenberg, several others may find room here.

6. The fourth empire, after all, is to endure to the end of the world, which cannot be said of the empires under Alexander's successors. Thus Gerhard loc. cit. § 137; Calov on Daniel 2, 40.

7. The description Revelation 13, 1. 2. is very similar to that of Daniel 7, 7. 8. 19. 23. and is to be understood according to Revelation 17, 9. of the Roman empire. Gerhard, op. cit. § 138.

8. Finally, how can those ever-fighting empires be conceived as one after Alexander's death, except in so far as they belong to Alexander's empire? Torn off from this, where do we find the point of unification to grasp them as one empire? - Let us now examine

2. The division of the Medo-Persian Empire.

Since, for the reasons given, it is not possible to divide the Macedonian-Greek empire into two kingdoms, this has been attempted in the case of the Medo-Persian empire, but with equally poor success. - In refuting this division, we follow primarily Caspari, who wrote about our subject in the "Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche, von Rudelbach und Guericke" 1841, issue 4!

To divide the Medo-Prussian empire into a Median and a Persian one was already undertaken earlier by Ephräm the Syrian and Cosmos Indikoplaustes, in more recent times by Eichhorn, Jahn (on Cap. 2.), Dereser, Gesenius, Bleek, von Lengerke, Maurer, de Wette. Against this, however, the following reasons are to be asserted:

1. Even according to the profane history we cannot regard this empire as two empires, because already in the short reign of Cyaxares II. because already in the short reign of Cyaxares II, which lasted about two years after Babylon's fall, the rule was more in the hands of Cyrus, and therefore the Median reign is passed over by almost all profane writers; because further, according to Schlosser, the Persian monarchy can hardly be regarded as different from the Median, since with the change of dynasties only other tribes of the same empire received precedence; because finally Cyrus, as the rightful heir, succeeded to the throne of Cyaxares. - The just remarked v. Lengerke well recognizes, but makes just therefore a historical error of Daniel to the reproach that he let follow the Babylonian empire the Median, while at that time the supremacy had already passed to the Persians.

2. But this assertion is a mistake. Daniel does not consider the Median and the Persian reigns as being in two different

Rich. He knows, as Caspari proves in detail, only of one empire. - Caspari leads

a. The passages found outside the symbolic representations, namely: 1) Daniel 5:28, which passage contains a threefold proof. The Babylonian empire, it says, is to be given to "the Medes and Persians. Both peoples, as Hengstenberg remarks, are regarded as together constituting the ruling nation, and both are at the same time to follow the Chaldeans in the dominion of the world. It is further said: "Divided is thy kingdom". By what is it divided? According to the territory, that one part fell to the Medes, the other to the Persians? No, not only history, but also our book, would contradict this. Cf. Daniel 31; 6:8, 12, 15. Now how was the Babylonian empire divided? According to the dominion. This was divided between the Medes and the Persians, both of whom ruled the territory together, thus forming one empire. Finally, remarks Caspari, "the circumstance that the Persians, by allusion of 'Parsin' (v. 23. 25.) and 'Peres' to their name, stand out more than the Medes, proves that Daniel could not possibly have considered the monarchy that followed the Babylonian empire to be a mere Median one," even if, on that account, the Persians are not ascribed a higher importance and power than the Medes. - 2) Daniel 6, 9. 13. 16. (German Bible v. 8. 12. 15.). Hengstenberg has already referred to this passage. In it there is already mention of a law of the Medes and Persians, while Darms the Mede still reigned. Both nations, therefore, appear to be united under him into one kingdom, the Medo-Persian kingdom, and Darms is a king of the Medes and Persians. - 3) Daniel 8, 3. ff. The ram signifies the Medo-Persian empire, the two horns the Medes and Persians. Here, too, both nations are regarded as belonging to one empire. - Caspari goes on this

b. to the passages found in Daniel 7, which also show that Daniel understands the Medo-Persian empire as one. He leads 1) to Daniel 7, 6. The four heads point to a fourfoldness of the empire symbolized by the Parder, which fourfoldness, however, cannot be proven with the Persian, but with the Macedonian-Greek empire. It is of the latter, in fact, that the division is emphasized. Cf. Daniel 8:5, 8, 21, 22, and 11:4; but if the third empire is the Greek, then the second is the Medo-Persian. - 2) Daniel 7, 6. also points to the Macedonian-Greek empire by the four wings; for these symbolize here the extreme swiftness, which according to Jerome and Lucan and Daniel 8, 5. 6. is a characteristic of this empire under Alexander. But if the third empire is the Macedonian-Greek, then, again, we conclude, the second is the Medo-Persian. - 3) Daniel 7, 5. The three ribs cannot be, besides another people, the Medes and

The three ribs must represent three subjugated peoples or kingdoms, the Persians, for the former were the ruling or at least the co-ruling people, the latter had been under them from the beginning, so both are already symbolized by the bear itself. The three ribs must represent three subjugated peoples or kingdoms. As such, the Babylonians, Lydians and Egyptians present themselves to us. These, however, were subjugated not by the Medean, but by the Medo-Persian empire. But even if we had to grasp the triple number only as a round number, the bear would not be able to represent the Median empire. This was not so voracious as a bear. The Medes only subdued, and that with the Persians, the Babylonians (Daniel 5:28.). It is different with the Medo-Persian empire, cf. 8:4, where the thrusting of the ram, which symbolizes the Medo-Persian empire, corresponds to the voracity of the bear in our passage, while the three cardinal points there correspond to the three ribs here. The conquering lust of the Medo-Persian empire found its corresponding symbol in the voracity characteristic of the bear. These reasons should be sufficient to show how unjustified it is to divide the Medo-Persian empire into two kingdoms.

Let us now hear what reasons are given for such a division. We follow Delitzsch, who, loc. cit. p. 279 ff. gives these reasons, without, of course, suspecting the authenticity of Daniel:

1. Between chap. 8 and 11, on the other hand, there is a very great similarity, and the circle of vision of the book is everywhere the same. The first similarity concerns the little horn of which we read Cap. 7, 8. and Cap. 8, 9. In the latter place it is evidently a prince of Alexander's successors, who is further described Cap. 11, 21-25. It is this, even according to the ecclesiastical interpretation, Antiochus Epiphanes. Should now the little horn in Cap. 7. be another king arising out of the Roman monarchy? The description of the character of both in their conduct towards Jehovah, his people, and their religion, agrees; the colors are equally strong, and exclude the pre- and counter-image of two persons. The symbolism also coincides in chapters 7 and 8, in so far as the arch-enemy is a small horn, which rises above three others. Is it probable that these three others in Cap. 8. are post-Alexandrian, Greek rulers, but in Cap. 7. Roman? - So Delitzsch, similarly Bleek and Dereser. Against this, however, Hengstenberg already rightly says: Antiochus represents the Antichrist. What is said of him in Cap. 8 and 11 should be fulfilled once more. The apostle compels us to this assumption in his description of the Antichrist, 2 Thess. 2, 3. Even the article "the apostasy" and "the man of sin" looks back to the book of Daniel. The similarity of the description, therefore, by no means leads to the assumption that, like chapters 8 and 11, chapter 7 also deals with Antiochus, and by no means excludes a model and counter-model relationship between two persons, if one were to suppose that such a relationship was intended. -

A more distant similarity is found in the determination of time: "One time and two times, and half a time. Dgl. 7, 25; 12, 7; further 9, 27 (half a week). Without needing to go into a more detailed examination of these passages, we can assume, in spite of the similarity in time, that they refer to different events; for we find the same time in Revelation 12:6, 14, which refers to an event that is still in the future.

Finally, Delitzsch emphasizes that the prophecy that goes back to Antiochus, chapter 8, is introduced with the words: "Behold, I make known to you what will happen at the last end of the wrath, because it falls into the last days. Now, if Daniel already regards the time of Antiochus as the time of the end, can another time of the end be supposed, in which still another horn, which oppresses the church of God, rises up and is destroyed? This, in Delitzschen's opinion, is the less possible, since the prophecies Cap. 2. and 7. fall not after, but before, Cap. 8. and 9. Whatever may be the reason for the translation of Cap. 8, 19 (for Luther translates differently than Delitzsch), in any case, the extreme limit of the time about which Daniel received revelations is not to be thought of. The proof is found in chapter 9, where the time to the appearing of Christ is given, the nature of the New Testament economy is exactly described, the death of the Son of Man, as well as the following destruction of Jerusalem, as the Lord Himself describes the fulfillment of this prophecy as imminent at the conquest of Jerusalem. We shall therefore have to understand Cap. 8, 17: "For this vision belongs to the time of the end," of the end which God has appointed for the third kingdom, the kingdom of Alexander, of which the chapter treats; v. 19. however, we shall remain with Luther's translation: "The end has its appointed time."

2. As a second reason for the assumption that the second animal is the Medes, but the third is the Persian Empire, one cites: The book of Daniel distinguishes throughout between Medes and Persians, and indeed the Medes always go first. Cf. 5:28; 6:8; 12:15; it is emphatically said, "Darius the Mede," 6:1; 9:1; 11:1; and, on the other hand, of Cyrus, that he was a Persian, 6:29. Just so, the reigns of Darius and Cyrus are not regarded as one, but as two different ones. Although Cap. 8. the ram represents the Medo-Persian empire, yet both empires are again separated by the two horns. Finally, Cap. 11, 1. also shows how important Darius' reign was in spite of its short duration.

Here is what follows: This subject has already been discussed above, but some remarks here will not be useless. Daniel does, however, distinguish between the Medes and the Persians, but this does not prove that he describes a purely Median empire.

after the fall of Babylon, as little as it follows from Esther 1, 19. and other passages that the author of that book knows a mere Persian empire. - It is certainly emphasized in Dan. 5, 31 (or 6, 1) that "Darius the Mede" had ruled, which is also pointed out by v. Lengerke, Maurer, and De Wette; it also seems that, as in Cap. 5, 30. with the death of the "Chaldean king Belshazzar" the downfall of the Chaldean empire, so with the capture of this empire by Darius the Mede the beginning of a Medean world empire is indicated: however, Cap. 5, 28. serves us for the right understanding, according to which also the Persians had a share in the domination of the overthrown Babylonian empire. Thus, Cap. 5, 31 only teaches that the first king of the united Medo-Persian Empire was a Mede by birth. - The argument taken from Cap. 5, 31. also proves too much. If it follows from the expression "Darius the Mede" that at that time there was only a Medean world empire, then it also follows from passages, such as Cap. 6, 29, which Delitzsch himself cites, further from Cap. 10, 1. 14. 20.; Cap. 11, 2. that the Book of Daniel afterwards knows only a Persian and thus no Medo-Persian empire at all, whereas Cap. 8, 20. as well as the whole of Cap. 8. compared with Cap. 11, 23. speaks against this. Cap. 6, 29. does not prove a mere Persian, then also Cap. 5, 31. not a mere Median empire. - Further, the two horns Cap. 8, 3. do not point to two separate world empires, but to two main parts of one empire, the Medes and Persians. Cf. v. 20: The earlier existence of one horn and the growth and expansion of the other indicate the history partly before and partly after the conquest of Babylon. Yes, if the little horn should represent the Median empire as an independent one, then it must have already disappeared before the arrival of the goat, just as there was no longer an independent Median empire when Alexander made his conquest. And yet Cap. 8, 6. emphasizes the presence of both horns as something distinguishing the ram from the one-horned he-goat (v. 5.). - Furthermore, we find nothing strange in Cap. 6, 28. that the governments of Darius and Cyrus are treated as two and not as one. - Finally, the importance of the reign of Darius, Cap. 11, 1, does not prove that Daniel knew of a special Median kingdom after the fall of Babylon.

3. Finally, it is argued, as Delitzsch does, that the description of the second, third, and fourth empires fits especially well to the Median, Persian, and Alexandrian empires. It is said that Daniel 2:9 calls the second empire "inferior" to that of Nebuchadnezzar, which fits the Medean, but not the Medo-Persian empire. The latter had only passed from the Chaldean to the Persian empire and also appears to be weaker in Zech. 6. It is true, Daniel 2. treats the second empire with few words and calls it "weaker",

But in chapter 7 it is described as a dangerous empire, even if it appears to be lesser than the first, like the bear compared to the lion. The Medo-Persian empire was also "lesser" not only according to its Median beginning, but according to its entire nature. Cf. what has been said above under the ecclesiastical interpretation of the Medo-Persian empire. - As for the symbolism of the three last kingdoms, Delitzsch's interpretation of them is not at all satisfactory. Of the second animal and empire, the aforementioned says: The first world power is described entirely according to Nebuchadnezzar's person, so important to prophecy is the rule of even one king. Therefore, no long line of kings is necessary for the second empire. The bear was Darius the Mede, whose kingdom lacked full independence, which is why the bear was erected only on one side. His empire was divided into three main satrapies, Cap. 6, 2, and this was indicated by the three ribs. The command, "Arise and eat much flesh," points to a great future of the empire, without its being able to realize the same for itself alone; it remained with the conatus. Against this the following is to be remarked: According to Cap. 7, 24. the four beasts do not signify four kings, but four kingdoms, the nature of which, however, will in many cases be according to the nature of the kings who rule them, and therefore may well be described according to these. Therefore, the first kingdom is described with special reference to Nebuchadnezzar, and yet it is not a description of his person, but of his whole kingdom and the destinies of it. We maintain that the animals symbolize empires, here as elsewhere in our book. Cf. Cap. 8; therefore, the bear does not denote Darius the Mede, but his empire. If his rule lacked full independence, this is true only of his person, since he ruled more by Cyrus' indulgence than by his own power, but his kingdom, in so far as Cyrus was actually its master, was nevertheless an independent one. But whatever else might be said about this, at any rate the words, "He stood to (on) the side," cannot well be explained by a one-sided being set up. It is unfounded to interpret the words of command, "Arise and eat much meat," from a mere conatus. Rather, this command is intended to proclaim what will happen. Cf. a similar commanding prophecy to the Medes and Persians, Es. 21:2. The three ribs at last between the teeth signify, as we saw above under the ecclesiastical interpretation, not parts of the original empire, but spoils, conquered lands. The trinity of the kingdom, as indicated in Daniel 6:2, does not belong here; it is an accidental coincidence of the three numbers.

Concerning the symbolism of the third animal, Delitzsch thinks: The nimble Parder represents the Persian empire better than the bear, which is so ponderous. The parder is Cyrus; its four wings are Persia,

Media, Babylonia, Egypt; his four heads were the four successors of Cyrus (cf. Cap. 11,2.), namely: Cambyses, Smerdis, Darius Hystaspis and the last one, whereby the persons of Xerxes and Darius Codomannus blur into one in the prophetic distant view. Now against this it is to be said: the Parder is not the symbol of a person, but of an empire. The four wings do not symbolize a four-sidedness of the empire, which cannot be proved even in the Persian empire (apart from the fact that besides Persia, Media, Babylonia and Egypt, Lydia would also have to be mentioned), but great speed, as we have already seen above, which attribute belongs to Alexander's empire even more than to that of Cyrus. The interpretation of the four heads of the Parders at last of four successors of Cyrus is untenable. To be sure, Cap. 11, 2. only four kings of the Medo-Persian empire are named after Cyrus, but the following verse does not now teach that immediately after this fourth Alexander would come. The following Darius Codomannus is probably not described precisely because the clash with Greece begun under Xerxes was continued under him. "The intervening period, in which Persia's relationship with Greece, which began under Xerxes, only developed more and more, is passed over by him; to give a recensus of all Persian kings was not at all in his mind. He mentions those three kings in verse 2 only in order to come to the fourth, and he does not speak at all of the last Persian king, because he was completely powerless and insignificant. The starting point of the Persian world monarchy is called Cyrus (Darius the Mede was only its forerunner and, so to speak, an intermediate regent), the turning point of the same Xerxes, the end point not Darius Codomannus, but its opponent Alexander the Greek. Just the great summary and apt subtlety in the apocalyptically short, dark and mysterious drawing of the Persian and Persian-Greek relations, which is revealed in vv. 2-4, testifies, like many similar subtleties in the book of Daniel, that this book is of divine origin and not the apocryphal work of an ignorant Falsarius." (Caspari op. cit. p. 147). But if in our prophecy the successors of Cyrus should have been symbolized, then also Darius Codomannus should have been represented as the fifth by a fifth head. In Daniel 11:2, Persia was to be described only in its relation to Greece, but here the empire was to be symbolized according to its nature and its entire history.

Finally, concerning the fourth empire, Delitzsch thinks: The difference of the fourth animal points to the first western empire of Alexander, which was quite different from the Asiatic dominions. The small horn is Antiochus Epiphanes. The ten horns are, according to Cap. 7, 24. cf. 8, 20. ten kings. The little horn brings down three horns. How so? According to Cap. 11, 25. probably by stealth. The ten kings are as follows:

1st Seleucus Nicator (312-280 B.C.), 2nd Antiochus Soter (279-261), 3rd Antiochus Theos (260-246), 4th Seleucus Callinicus (245-226), 5th. Seleucus Keraunus (225-223), 6. Antiochus the Great (222-187), 7. Seleucus Philopator (186-176), 8. Heliodorus, who after the latter's poisoning held the throne in effect, 9. Demetrius, who was a hostage at Rome, and was the heir apparent to Seleucus Philopator, 10. Ptolemy IV Philometor, for whom his mother claimed the Syrian throne. These latter three thrust Antiochus Epiphanes down from the throne on which they wished to establish themselves, Cap. 7, 24. Against this now briefly the following: Delitzsch himself, who, with Prideaux, Bertholdt, v. Lengerke, understands by the ten horns only Seleucids, admits that this explanation is only "needily satisfactory," because then we are not dealing here with Ptolemies at all. This explanation is even less satisfactory because, as already objected by our ancients and as Hengstenberg (loc. cit. p. 207 f.) proves from history, only seven Seleucids ruled before Antiochus Epiphanes, but those three others were only crown pretenders, while those three horns, like the other seven, were supposed to symbolize real kings, if we were not to understand the horns of empires. - We now treat

The division of the Chaldean-Babylonian empire.

Since, as shown above, it is not possible to divide the Medo-Persian empire into a Median and a Persian one, one has finally, in order not to agree with the ecclesiastical interpretation, attempted such a division in the Chaldean-Ba-ylonian empire and wanted to divide it into the empire of Nebuchadnezzar and that of his successors. Hitzig and Redepenning have taken this most unfortunate way out. They refer to Cap. 2, 38: "Thou art the golden head." But here we must not forget that in the person of Nebuchadnezzar, the founder of the empire, "the whole power and greatness of the Babylonian empire, which had reached the summit of its splendor under him, was concentrated, and that the founders and greatest rulers of the world empires in the book of Daniel are also representatives of them elsewhere, as especially in Cap. 7:17. Nowhere more than in the Orient did and does the l'etat e'est moi apply, and therefore instead of the: "this is thy kingdom," it might as well be said, "this is thou, O king," as in v. 39. it is said, "after thee shall another kingdom arise," not, "after thee shall another king arise, or shall other kings arise. But if "thou king" is the same as "thy kingdom," then it is clear that Daniel does not mean to describe the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar's person as separated from the kingdom of his people and his lineage, but his kingdom and himself as the kingdom in which the kingdom of the Chaldeans and the individual in whom the Chaldean ruling dynasty was concentrated. The analogy of the other kingdoms and

the passage Cap. 2, 44., in which it is said that the Messianic kingdom will not be left to any other people (cf. 5, 30.; 9, 1.), by the way, necessarily demand that the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar is identical with that of his people". (Caspari, op. cit., p. 151 f.) - One further refers to Cap. 7, 4, where Nebucadnezzar's person is completely described. But even if he were symbolized here himself, he would still only be the representative and center of his world-dominating people and lineage. - Finally, one also refers here to the "lesser", Cap. 2, 39. 2, 39. But how this could be said of the Medo-Persian empire is already demonstrated above.

Thus none of these three interpretations of the four kingdoms, excluding the Roman one, can be upheld. The ecclesiastical interpretation alone really corresponds to all parts of the prophecy. It is therefore without a doubt the correct one, and confirms that the Book of Daniel is not a fabricated work, but the Scripture of a divine prophet, and that God's Word endures forever. C. K-r., P.

The Infallibility Address.

A local political newspaper received in these days from Vienna, on January 17, the text of the Infallibility Address in German translation, which the purely papist party of the Roman Council, Manning and Deschamps at the head, addressed to the Assembly. We, too, believe that we should share this document with our readers. It shows that the true Papists of the nineteenth century still repeat with the same insolence and impudence all the lies, already refuted a thousand times, on which the authority of the Papal See is founded. That they lie, of course, these Advocati diaboli know as well as we do, but some do it as atheistic Epicureans, because they regard this as the means of attaining and maintaining honor, power, wealth; others as Satanically blinded, because they have so often sinned against their conscience that they finally consider it right to lie "in majorem Dei gloriam et ecclesise commodum" as well.

The wording of the address is as follows:

"To the holy general Vatican Conciliar.

The Holy General Vatican Synod humbly and imploringly request the undersigned Fathers to affirm in open words, excluding all doubt, that the authority of the Roman Pontiff is supreme and therefore free from all error, since in matters of faith and morals it decides and commands what is to be believed and held fast by all believing Christians, and what is to be rejected and condemned.

Reasons why this proposal is considered timely and necessary:

In the sacred Scriptures the supremacy (primatus) of the Roman Pontiff, the Successor of Peter, is clearly taught, both in regard to jurisdiction over the whole Christian Church, and in regard to the supreme Magisterium.

The general and constant tradition of the Church, both according to the acts and sayings of the holy fathers, and of most general conciliarities, teaches in word and deed that the sayings of the Roman Pontiff concerning the doctrine of faith and morals are incorrigible.

At the Second Concilium of Lyons, the Greeks and Latins agreed on the formula of faith in which it is declared: "Disputes of faith must be decided by the decision of the Roman Pontiff. At the General Synod of Florence it was established that "the Roman Pontiff is the true Vicar of Christ, the head of the whole Church, the father and teacher of all Christians, and that in St. Peter he has been given full power by our Lord Jesus Christ to pasture, rule, and govern the whole Church." Common sense also teaches that no one can be in communion of faith with the Catholic Church who does not agree with her head, since it is not permissible even in thought to separate the Church from her head.

But there have been, and still are, men who boast of being Catholics, and use this name to ruin the weak in faith, who take the liberty of teaching that it is enough, as they say, to submit tacitly to the orders of the Roman Pontiff in matters of faith and morals, without the inner consent of the spirit; they may be regarded as provisionally holy, until the consent or opposition of the Church is decided. That by this perverse doctrine the authority of the Roman Pontiff is undermined, the liberty of faith damaged, error given the widest latitude, the dragging of time abetted, is seen by every one. Therefore, the bishops, the guardians and protectors of Catholic truth, strive, especially in the present time, that the supreme doctrinal authority of the Apostolic See be preserved by synodal decisions and common witness.*)

*) The Plenary Council of Baltimore, assembled in 1866, teaches in the decrees signed by 44 Archbishops and Bishops, among other things: "The living and infallible authority exists only in the Church, which, built by our Lord Jesus Christ on Peter, the Head, Prince and Shepherd of the whole Church, of whom he promised that his faith would never waver, always preserves her lawful Popes, who without interruption find their origin in Peter himself, and, upon

The more convincingly the Catholic truth is taught, the more fiercely it is combated, both in pamphlets and in the daily papers, in order to stir up the Catholic people against the true doctrine and to send the Vatican Synod itself away from defending it.

Therefore, if formerly several in this general council could doubt whether the proclamation of this doctrine was in keeping with the times, it now seems almost necessary to expose it. For the Catholic Church is almost again attacked on the same grounds that were once used against it by men who condemned their own judgment; men who, in the throng, doubted even the primacy of the pope and the infallibility of the church, and often mixed in the most vexatious accusations against the apostolic see. Yea, the fiercest enemies of the Catholic Church, though they call themselves Catholics, are not afraid to assert that the Synod of Florence, which declared the supreme authority of the Pope unconditional, was not a general one.

If the Vatican Council, thus challenged, were to remain silent and refrain from bearing witness to Catholic doctrine, the Catholic people would of their own accord begin to doubt the true doctrine, but the innovators would boast that the Council had remained silent because of the reasons they had put forward. They would abuse this silence by publicly refusing to obey the judgments and decisions of the apostolic see and the doctrines of faith and morals, under the pretext that the Roman Pontiff might err in such judgments.

The public good of Christendom therefore seems to demand that the most holy Vatican Council should again pronounce the Florentine decision concerning the Roman Pontiff and explain it more expansively, and should resolve in straight words that exclude all doubt: The authority of the Roman Pontiff is supreme and therefore free from all error, since in matters of faith and morals he decides and commands what is to be believed and held fast by all believers in Christ, and what is to be rejected and condemned.

There is no lack of those who think that one should refrain from establishing this Catholic truth, lest the schismatics and heretics

placed in his chair, are heirs and representatives of the authority, dignity, honor, and power of Peter. And because, where Peter is, the Church is, Peter speaks through the Roman Pontiff, He is always living, and He always exercises His judgment through His successor, and imparts the truth of the faith to those who ask for it, the divine words must be understood in the sense in which this Roman Chair of St. Peter has taken and is taking them, who, as the origin and teacher of all the churches, has always preserved untouched and inviolable the faith delivered to him by our Lord Jesus Christ, and has taught it to the faithful, pointing out to all the way of salvation and the unchangeable truth of doctrine."

would be further distanced from the Church. But the Catholic people have, above all, a right to be instructed by the general synod as to what they should believe in a question so important and recently so ungodly fought against, lest a dangerous error corrupt the simple and imprudent minds of the multitude. Therefore the Fathers of Lyons and Trent decided to establish the correct doctrine, even though the schismatics and heretics were annoyed.

Those who sincerely seek the truth will not be deterred, but attracted, if they are shown on what foundation the freedom and strength of the Catholic Church rests for the most part. But if, when the true doctrine is established by the general conciliar, some should fall away from the Church, it will be only a few, and only those whose faith has long since been shipwrecked, and who are only seeking a pretext for separating themselves also outwardly from the Church, to which inwardly, according to their public attitude, they have long since become unfaithful. These are the same people who are not afraid to constantly disturb the peace of the Catholic people and from whose deceitfulness the Vatican Synod will have to protect the faithful sons of the Church. For the Catholic people are instructed about this and accustomed to render the most unconditional internal and external obedience to the decisions of the Roman Pontiff, and they will receive the pronouncement of the Vatican Council on its supreme authority, free from all error, with a joyful and believing mind."

So much for the address.

The Catholic Messenger of the Faith writes from Rome on 10 Jan: "About 400 Fathers of the Council have signed the postulate, because on the part of the bishops it was desired that this postulate be signed by more than half of the Fathers of the Council. It is certain, however, that in addition to the signatories of the postulate, a few hundred bishops are in complete agreement with the proposal. Of the rest, several also agree with the substance of the decree, but think that the decree is inconvenient. But even of these several will probably give their 'placet' on the day of the vote, and only add that they do not approve the publication of such a pronouncement for the present. It therefore becomes more and more probable that the definition of infallibility will take place through the Conciliar." - You see, things are going on in the Concil as in the legislatures here. One needs all kinds of arts and practices in order to trick an imposing majority of votes for one's resolutions. And this is then called the proclamation of a dogma which was not a new one - God forbid! - but a dogma always and everywhere believed in the church by all orthodox believers! - O of the antichristic lies and deceit!

We have just found in a magazine the address which Cardin alArchbishop Rauscher has addressed to the pope against the address for the dogma of infallibility. This counter-address is indeed very carefully worded, and it is careful not to cut off any retreat, but it contains a passage which betrays, with a clarity one can only wish for, the evil conscience with which, on the part of Rome, one intends to decree the new dogma in defiance of all the stubborn facts of history. The passage is as follows:

"It is not permissible to conceal the fact that great difficulties remain, arising from the sayings and actions of the Fathers of the Church, from the documents of history, and even from Catholic doctrine, before the thorough solution of which it would in no way be permissible to present the doctrine recommended in that letter to the Christian people as revealed by God. However, the mind is reluctant to dispute this question, and that the duty of such a trial may not be imposed upon us, we implore, trusting in Thy goodness."

One sees clearly, Cardinal Rauscher is completely convinced that the reasons against the Znfallibilitäts-Dogma are devastating from history, which are laid down in the German writing by Roman Catholic theologians: "Der Pabst und das Concil von Zanus. Leipzig, by Steinacker. 1869."

Another "Protest of the Bishops against the Rules of the Council", signed also by the Archbishop of St. Louis Kenrtck, which particularly emphasizes that one now aims at abolishing all episcopal independence and importance and at elevating the papal power to the sole church power at the expense of the latter, should become most dangerous to the efforts of the Jesuit-Papist clique. For as much as it is in the interest of the bishops to elevate the papal dignity, they are undoubtedly equally concerned not to be reduced to zeros and mere professions of the pope. W.

Miscelle.

In the speech with which the Pope opened his Concilium on 8 December last, he declared: "Be mindful of the words of Isaiah: Ini consilium, coge concilium (Care for the Council!). Assemble a Concil I resolved to convene the Concilium." Now the Vulgate freely translates Isaiah 16:3. as the Pope says. According to the basic text, on the other hand, the prophet cries out to the Moabites, "Send the lamb tribute to the Lord in the land, from Sela through the wilderness, to the mountain of the daughter of Zion!" And then continues, "Apply understanding! Use wisdom! Give cool

Shadow at noon! Hide the exiles! Do not betray the fugitive!" The Moabites are thus exhorted to come to their senses, and not to utterly destroy the fugitive Israelites. There is no mention of a concil here in any syllable. - If, however, the passage in question is to be applied to Pio nono, it can only be done in this way: The words which Isaias speaks to the Moabites, the pope draws to himself. Consequently Moab is the Pope. Israel, however, as we know, is the Church. So the prophet exhorts the pope as the enemy of the church: not to corrupt the members of God's people. An admonition, which however - according to verse 6 - is completely in vain.

(From the "Freimund" of Feb. 23rd of last year)

From Kurhessen.

To the dear Lutheran brethren outside Hesse.
Reply to the letter in No. 48 of the "Freimund."

We heartily thank the dear believing brethren, who think we are on the wrong path, for their loving admonitions, even though we cannot adopt them. Rather, we ask them to reconsider their view of our chosen method of struggle before the face of the Lord. We fight and suffer for the Lutheran Church, we strive for a single, independent Lutheran Church; it is hard to see ourselves misjudged by our own fellow believers. Part of the blame may well fall on the sources from which the brethren in other countries receive news about our struggles, political newspapers, which themselves draw from the Hessian dailies, which are all either national-liberal or democratic. That a distorted picture of our conditions emerges is natural; the only paper that reflects them in the right light is the "Hessisches Kirchenblatt" published in Darmstadt. There is a suspicion against us that our ecclesiastical opposition is consciously or unconsciously connected with political motives; but for my own part I can sacredly assure you that such motives are quite far from my mind, and I hope to God that it is the same with all recalcitrant pastors.

The very word: "Pray to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's" should be our guiding star and banner in battle. We also want to give our support to the unlawful*) authorities, as long as they, according to God's permission

*The editors think they must remind us of Romans 13:1 and 2 against this expression: "There is no power but of God; but the powers that exist are ordered by God. What is ordered by God is not unlawful to me. Let those who have the power answer for it, how they have come to the power;

and rule over us, give her what is due to her according to God's word: bosom, duty, fear and honor. But when it touches the sanctuary of our God, the church, then obedience ceases, then we want to step into the breach and want to stand and fall for our Lord and Saviour. But the church is already touched by the appointment of the presynod. According to the provisions of the Peace of Westphalia, Art. VII. and the generally recognized church law based on the same (Richter K. R. 3. A. § 82, Mejer Institutionen des gemeinen deutschen K. R. § 83), the sovereign of a foreign confession has no right to interfere with the church orders or the church property; the former, however, has happened, since the presynod imposed upon us already contains an eclatant breaking through of our church orders, and to anyone who is only somewhat acquainted with the circumstances, makes itself clearly known as the first step toward the introduction of the Union. Even Professor Heppe, who is a zealous friend of the Synod, advised in his report that the continuity of law should be preserved and that the Synodal Constitution should not be introduced without the consent of the constitutionally existing organs of the Church; but on the advice of Br. Oetker, the well-known Hessian deputy, who is one of the leaders of the Protestant Association, the Minister of Culture decided to take a different course. By means of a Cabinet Order, a hitherto unknown representation of the Church, the Presynod, is created, and its approval of the newly to be introduced Synodal Order is to suffice to give it legal existence. That the right of our church is thereby damaged is obvious; the arbitrarily appointed and composed presynod has no authority at all to decide on any ecclesiastical matter. It is precisely by rejecting the same from the outset that we stand on the ground of law; if we were to have entered into it, we would thereby have left the actually legal path. Nor is it the case, as Mr. v. Mühler subsequently asserted in one of his letters, that the Presynod has a purely advisory, not a constituent character. If he only wanted to question confidants about the mood and conditions in Hesse, there would be no need for a presynod, which is composed and elected in the same way as, according to the bill to be presented, the later ordinary provincial synods. Now, one wanted to create in this presynod a new body representing the church, whose decisions should bind the church itself. Even Mr. v. Mühler has not denied this; he bases his assertion that the presynod is merely advisory solely on the fact that the king is not bound by its resolutions, but is also authorized to order constitutional matters at his own discretion in contradiction to them.

But since they are in power, this power is not unlawful for the subjects. That the King of Prussia, on the other hand, has not acquired any power over the Church, in this we are of one mind with the brethren in Electorate Hesse. - (Fr.)

was. It is obvious that this explanation could not have been the least reassuring for us.

When the Union was to be introduced in Prussia in the years 1830-40, it was also said that no one was to be forced to accept it; only the new Agenda, which the king was authorized to introduce by virtue of the so-called liturgical right of the sovereigns, had to be accepted without fail. And how many congregations that have accepted the agendas have escaped the Union? Just so it goes now with the Constitution. We shall see what Lutheranism will remain where it is accepted. In the decree of August 9, it is expressly stated as the purpose of the same to unite the Lutheran congregations of the province of Hesse into a "uniform provincial church congregation". The decree no longer recognizes a Lutheran church in Hesse, only individual atomized Lutheran, Reformed, Uniate congregations, which are now to be merged by Cabinet decree into a unified "Protestant" provincial church congregation, in order to join the projected German national church in a short time. We, however, do not want to know anything about provincial and national churches, but only about confessional churches; we must consider participation in a synod, in the composition of which the confessional difference is deliberately ignored, to be a betrayal of our church. An "itio in partes" is not provided for in the preliminary synod, but only in the bill for the later ordinary synods, but even if it were, this would give us no guarantee, since one knows from the practice of the Oberkirchenrath how illusory this measure is for the protection of the confession.

We are told: "The pure Word and Sacrament have not yet been touched; everything else may, indeed must, be tolerated. To this we reply: If we permit a regime hostile to the pure confession to be established in the church, how long will the pure Word and Sacrament remain? *) The people of Israel were forbidden to set a stranger as king, Deut. 17, 15. and the Lord says: You shall not give the holy things to the dogs, and you shall not cast your pearls before swine, Matth. 7, 6. In the case of the adiaphoristic disputes, many have calmed themselves by saying that it was not a matter of Word and Sacrament, and yet this thought was quite wrong, and the Concordia Formula, in reference to the dispute over this, declares in the 10th Article: "We reject and condemn as unjust when the commandments of men are imposed by force as necessary upon the church of God.

*The Consistory at Marburg, which is made up of Lutherans and Reformed, and whose president is a Unirter from Old Prussia, is already taking action with reprimands and disciplinary measures against Lutheran clergymen who polemicize in their sermons against the Union and the teachings of the Reformed.

We also reject and condemn as unjust those who hold that in the time of persecution the enemies of the Holy Gospel (which serves to break off the truth) should be indulged in such means or compared with them. When Emperor Charles V. wanted to impose the Interim on the Protestants, he also pretended that it was not a matter of doctrine, but only of church customs. But our fathers would not be deceived; 400 pastors preferred to be driven into misery with wife and child than to have consented to the Interim. In the same way Scheibel and the few faithful Lutheran pastors acted in the thirties of this century. We also want to follow in the footsteps of these faithful witnesses, and we are sure that just as the Lord confessed Himself to them, He will also confess Himself to us; just as He then preserved His Church and gave it victory, so He will do now. We are a poor company, but the LORD of hosts is with us; therefore we fear not. The waves of the sea are great and terrible, but the LORD is greater in the highest.

Yes, dear brethren, pray with us to the Lord that He may help us. Whoever knows the situation of things here in Hesse knows that our struggle against the synodal constitution is a struggle with the Lord and for the Lord. He is well on the plan with us with His Spirit and gifts. He has also visibly led us to the way of fighting which we have chosen, and even if we now had the intention of changing our battle plan, it would be purely impossible. Therefore, fight with us in prayer that the Lord may stand by us as we fight, and give us the victory, though after severe trials. When one member of the body suffers, all the members suffer with it; therefore our affliction is your affliction, and our victory your victory. And may the Lord of glory be with us and with you, and keep us all in everlasting blessedness. Amen. G.

Litterary Intelligences.

At Schlawitz in Berlin appears at present:

This is an interpretation and explanation of the Sunday and most important festival gospels over the whole year, as well as of several beautiful sayings of holy scripture, primarily directed to help us recognize God's love and Christ's good deeds, and also to increase our happiness in the inner man. In addition to the explanation of the history of the suffering and death of our Lord Christ Jesus, according to the four evangelists. Written by Johann Gerhard, because. Doctor of the Holy Scriptures and Professor at the University of Jena. After the original edition of 1616. in five parts about 98 sheets, small 4. 3 Thlr. 27½ Sgr. - First part.

From Advent to Pentecost. 49 sermons, ca. 34 sheets. 1-1/3 Thlr. The first half of this first part with 22 sermons from Advent to Sunday Estomihi (price 20 Sgr.) has already been issued, the second larger half of the same with 27 more sermons from Sunday Invocavit to Pentecost will, God willing, appear at the beginning of next year. - The other four parts of the Postille are to be issued in the course of the next year. They contain: Second Part. From the Sunday of Trinity to the 27th Sunday after Trinity. 28 sermons ca. 21 sheets. 25 Sgr. - Third Part. The ordinary feast days of the Apostles and others. 16 Sermons c. 10 Sgr. 12½ Sgr. - Fourth Part. Appendix of beautiful and exquisite sayings from the Old and New Testaments (Free texts). 29 sermons ca. 16 bows. 20 Sgr. - Fifth Part. Passion Book: Explanation of the History of the Passion and Death of our Lord Christ Jesus. 24 sermons 17¼ sheets. 20 Sgr.

Conciliar literature includes the following writings in addition to those previously mentioned:

Peter and Paul at the Jerusalem Council. By Dr. Volkmuth. Leipzig. 1869 - The author is a Catholic who raves syncretistically about a future church.

Call to a German Church - Concil in Erfurt. Leipzig. 1869.

The purpose of this writing is to be an exhortation to the "union of the entire German people into an Old Catholic church community". Therefore, the author wants to have deleted "all learned theologians, all old scholasticism and scholastic definitions and distinctions", about which the pious fathers had argued. Such things belong to the school, not to the church.

At the beginning of the year 1870, a regional church newspaper, the "Lutherische Kirchenzeitung" (Lutheran Church Newspaper) for Prussia, came into being under the editorship of Gustav Schlawitz in Berlin, with the collaboration, as it says, of "well-known Lutheran theologians". The preface is by Dr. Carl Scheele, the well-known author of the writing: "The Drunken Science". This church newspaper appears in the type and format of the former Ev. Kirchenzeitung (Hengstenberg's), which the latter ceased to appear in bookstores on Jan. 1 of this year. J., and, like the latter, in two numbers weekly or, depending on the order, in brochirten issues monthly. The price for each semester is 2 Thaler Preuß. Cour. - As an organ for the production of a Prussian Lutheran regional church, this new church newspaper must have set itself a goal that can hardly be achieved.

W.

A recommendation.

Our dear brethren in the ministry will still remember that our dear Prof. Walther mentioned in "Lehre und Wehre", July issue, the writing published by Dr. Ed. Preuß: "Die Rechtfertigung des Sünders vor Gott" (The Justification of the Sinner before God). Prof. W. says there: "That this writing is without doubt the most excellent thing that has been written about justification in this century. This is certainly much to say, but not too much. - As we suppose that many brethren have not yet had an opportunity of becoming acquainted with this writing, we feel bound to recommend it strongly. Ye brethren of Missouri, of Ohio, of Wisconsin; yea, all ye Lutheran pastors: buy this writing! You shall not be sorry for the money, and had you turned your last cent upon it. -

If an important order were received by Mr. Barthel in St. Louis, he would certainly not hesitate to send a consignment; and it would perhaps be somewhat cheaper to obtain it in this way than through the expensive book trade. X.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Secret Societies. On Nov. 16, a number of respectable citizens of Philadelphia held a meeting in the hall at the intersection of Chesnut and 18th streets, which was called to order by Dr. R. D. Pease. As the purpose of the meeting he set forth the initiation of a series of public meetings to be directed against the workings of the secret societies so numerous in our country. Dr. Pease then spoke at some length on the secret society system, and concluded by pointing out the National Christian Association, of which he is an agent, and which has its own organ in the "Christian Cynosure." After Messrs. Stevenson, Wiley, Dr. Cooper, and a few others had spoken, the following resolutions, among others, were adopted. the following resolutions were adopted: That, in our judgment, the time has come for the friends of light and liberty to bear public witness against the increasing evils of the secret society, and that we hereby express our satisfaction that an orderly movement is in progress, that, in the judgment of this assembly, the swearing in or the obligation of members of any society to secrecy makes such a society essentially different from, and in conflict with, the Church of Christ and a republican state, both of which call for examination and seek the light.

(Evangelist.)

Division among Jews. The Rabbinical Conference in Philadelphia has led to a split in the Israelite community in Washington. Thirty-some Orthodox have left to form a new congregation. The occasion for the rupture

gave the acquisition of an organ for the synagogue and the keeping open of the shops on Saturdays practiced by the reformers. The new congregation has already purchased 6 acres of land for a special burial ground. (Christi. Botsch.)

Methodism among the Swedes. As the'"Ref. Kz." reports, the Methodists are at present founding a seminary for the training of Swedish preachers near Galesburg, III. The Swedish Methodists already have their religious organ. Incidentally, the Norwegian Methodists now also want to publish one.

Jesuitical Criticism of the Book of Janus. In order to give the readers an idea of how wretched wretches in America yelp against the irrefutable book of Janus Spitzhündchen like against a tramp in a torn beggar's coat, knowing well that their public is partly fanatical, partly indolent enough not to read such a book at all, partly much too ignorant to be able to examine it and compare it with criticism, if they do read it, - we let the following follow from a submission of the well-known Jesuit missionary F. L. Weninger for Oertel's Kirchenzeitung of Jan. 17. L. Weninger for Oertel's Kirchenzeitung of Jan. 17: "The main argument of 'Janus' and consorts is the accusation of 'forgeries'. We counter and say: most of these alleged forgeries, which 'Janus' cites, the readers have to accept as such merely on his word". He cites no sources to prove them, (?) and where he does cite the sources from which he has drawn, they are as a rule of a highly suspicious nature. "Janus' and his associates are very much mistaken if they think that they can invalidate the authority of a fact or legal sphere recognized by Rome and the vast majority of bishops and theologians through the course of time by the utterance of one or another scribe. Nothing is easier than to write history as one pleases with coloured glasses and to present facts as fables, especially when the events to which one refers lie in the distance of centuries, or even reach beyond a thousand years. We know, however, in what a false light even the daily events of the present are presented. To prove this, we need only recall the reports of English tourists about Rome and Italy. If someone were to draw from such sources after a thousand years, what could he not assert and doubt?" - According to this, either that well-known puffer Weninger has not read Janus' book at all, or he is such an impudent liar that he has hardly any equal; for Janus, of all people, has drawn only from sources which even every so-called Catholic acknowledges and which he always cites in the most exact manner. W.

Altar-Community. On this point Mr. Harkey, Professor of the Augustana Synod, has published an article in the Ev. Keview, on which the Lutheran Observer of Feb. 11 rightly writes: "If we of the General Synod did not know that the writer of the article in the Review belonged to the General Council, we would suppose that these opinions came from a warm friend of the General Synod .

Rev. Ambrosius Henkel, born July 11, 1786, not far from New Market, Va. known as a zealous co-translator of the Concordia Book and Luther's Church Postilion into the English language, died January 6, 1870.

New York. The Roman Church has had significant appropriations of public funds in New York approved by its political supporters. In an orderly manner, the taxpayers of New York have for years been plundered in the interest of confessional purposes. The Union League Club recently held a meeting to consider these matters and appointed a committee of ten members to investigate the matter and to investigate the doings of the New York Legislature.

The committee has published a detailed report detailing how much of the public funds have been used for the purposes of individual religious societies. - This Committee has published a detailed report, in which is stated exactly how much of the public funds of the State are appropriated for the purposes of individual religious societies. Attached to the report is a table according to which the sum of K528,742.47 is distributed among denominational institutions in the following amounts: **1)** Roman Catholic schools and so-called "mild foundations" receive $412,062. 29; 2) Protestant-Episcopal $29,335.09; 3) Jewish $14,404.49; 4) the [Dutch] Reformed Church $12,630.76; 5) Presbyterian $8,363.44; 6) Baptist $2,760.34; 7) Episcopal-Methodist $3,073.63; 8) German-Evangelical $2,027. 24; 9) various other private schools and institutions $44,085. 13 [among these the Turnverein school is listed at $3,800]. The report is chiefly directed against section 10 of the New York Legislature of 1869, which, in the last moments before adjournment of the previous Legislature, was cunningly and rather fraudulently smuggled into the Tar-Levy Bill for the city. This section 10 reads: "Henceforth, an annual sum equal to 20 per cent. of the accise fees received for said city in the year 1868 shall be distributed under the direction of an officer to be appointed for that purpose by the board of education of said city (whose remuneration shall be paid out of said sum) for the support of schools which in said city teach children free of charge for whom no provision is made in the public schools, (?!) with the exception of such schools which draw contributions from the city treasury for their maintenance." (Christi. Botsch.)

II. Abroad.

Germany. From a correspondence dated January 25 of this year from one of the countries annexed by Prussia, we report the following: "In our poor, oppressed and raped homeland, things continue to look sad. The atrocious alliance of the Berlin robber baron with the riffraff in and outside Germany has borne its fruits, the bitterness of which is growing ever more bitter. An intolerable mental bondage makes itself more and more felt. "Pay and serve," as was derisively said in the Berlin Herrenhaus at the time of the annexation, these are the chief happinesses which the semi-Slavic robber state has brought us. Even the drunkest are beginning to sober up and to convince themselves that Prussia has brought us nothing, but nothing, and could bring us nothing, because in the despised small states everything, but everything, was better than in the state of schools and barracks, even these, not excluding the schools and barracks. For the Prussian schools are much lower than ours, and the Prussian barracks are so greasy that our recruits sing: Even the dog in the dog-house has better quarters'. The Prussian constitution, whose paragraphs, like those of a tapeworm, no one knows or demands to know, although even the schoolmasters have to swear to them, is summarized by popular wit in the following four paragraphs: "'1.
To feel as unpleasant and uncomfortable as possible. § Every man is a rascal who does not prove the contrary. § 3. Everything cheap! § 4. Except the military."" And the Prussian creed reads: ""Art. 1. On the first day God created the chosen people of Prussia. Art. 2. On the second day, the rest of the Lumpies were created. Art. 3. These remaining Lumpies were ordained by God to serve the chosen people of Prussia."" This creed is most zealously defended by the Prussian court and Union theologians, as then the

Union is the very root of annexation. With the same sophisms with which yes and no are united in union theology, with the same sophisms the unholy is transformed into the sacred in politics. With a tremendous torrent of words one passes over the facts and sings pious lullabies in order not to let the conscience awake. The Old Lutherans, too, are skilled in this art, for they are Prussians first and Christians second. None, however, understands this art better than a certain Prof. Scheele, the chief cock of the Lutherans within the Union. He has written against 'drunken science,' and eschews again and again the same declamations against the Union. But how little serious he is about striking at the heart of the real sin of the Union, which consists in Prussia exercising violence, robbing and stealing for the sake of political interests, is evident from his political raisonsonnements. He is really a political theologian, and yet he dares to condemn anyone who bears witness against Prussia's policy; for that is to 'bring foreign fire to the altar'. And yet nothing is more necessary than that our whole theology should turn against a policy which threatens all the moral foundations of the State and of the Church. But so far everything is silent. Silence all around. Everywhere powerlessness and despondency! One no longer has faith in Germany's future and in the future of the Lutheran Church, because one no longer has the faith of the Lutheran Church."

Regarding the position of the so-called Lutherans in the Prussian-United Church in relation to the separated Lutherans, Pastor Kober from Cunau spoke at the Gnadenberg Conference on July 7 of last year as follows: "Our position in relation to the separated Lutherans is conditioned by our position in relation to the Union, and has not changed a hair's breadth from what it was before. We are not closer to each other, but neither have we come further from each other. They are still waiting for us to finally come over to them, but they are waiting in vain: we will not come voluntarily unless, which is not very likely, the Cabinet Order of 1834 is repealed. They do indeed consider it a sin for a Lutheran to remain under an unchurched regime; but they misjudge and overlook the fact that, according to Romans 13, all authority, wherever it exists, is ordained by God, whether for blessing or for chastening, that is, in every case for blessing. The very opposite of what the separated count sin to us, we must count sin to them, namely, the unauthorized detachment from the given unchurched church government in order to make a church government for themselves. A Christian should not escape from a state of emergency on his own authority, but leave it to the Lord in prayer, when and how he will put an end to the state of emergency. Yes, even if we were in Babel, as the separated think, - but we are under Christian rule, thank God - we would have to remain in Babel until it pleased God to turn the prison. Until then we would have to keep the word of the Lord Jer. 29: Build houses to dwell in, plant gardens to eat the fruit of them, multiply so that you will not be few, seek the best of the city where I have led you away, and pray to the Lord for it, for when it is well with it, it will be well with you.'" - Is this not blindness upon blindness? (Behrend's Monatsschrift.)

Communion. In a paper on the Cammin Conference, it says: "The Lutherans who keep themselves separate from the national church stand on the principle that communion is church communion. Cf. Feldner's brochure. In *practice, there* is a complete ban on communion between us (the so-called Lutherans within the Prussian Regional Church) and the separated ones, so that even those of their number who partake of our communion are subject to church penance. 60 to 80 Saxon clergymen have

gave themselves the word to deny communion to unbelievers without exception. Petrich explained: "I certainly share the view that 'communion is Christian communion'. But - and this does not seem to be sufficiently taken into account by the Reformed brother - our congregations are not general Christian congregations, but Lutheran congregations; communion, as desirable as it may be from that side, must never lead to the denial of the special confession, and this is the character of communion in our Union. - Our question concerns above all the conduct of our church against the dangers of the Union. There must be guarantees that at this altar the Lord's Supper is to be understood only Lutheran." (Very good!)

The Prussian papers describe the **state of affairs in Hoffen** as follows: "The liberals are agitating (for the Synod) with all their might. A formal agitation committee sends out its forms for approvals to the Wilhelmshöhe resolutions and for thank-you addresses to the regional bishop, with enclosed postage stamps for return. The notorious (Oetker's) Hessische Morgenzeitung pursues the confessional opponents with. undisguised wrath and publishes a continuous Denuwciations-Chronik (about all the bitter expressions of opposition to the deplorable decrees). Excerpts from sermons, notes on private conversations, etc. must be used. "We have now the sight to pity that men whose whole existence was founded on the premise of sedition and treason for 30 years, bring the charge of sedition against those who for conscience' sake resist the idol of temporal violence." "The whole quarrel stirred the country mightily, and had consequences scarcely thought of in Berlin. Under the aegis of alleged agreement with the government, the National Liberals are not only agitating against the opponents of the Synodal Constitution, but on this occasion against all 'muckers and parsons,' against all church-minded people. No village is spared meetings and inciting speeches, and, like some opponents, these gentlemen spare neither lies nor denunciations." "The people who have not attended any church since their confirmation, and who have feasted all their lives on mockery of the church and its institutions, have suddenly become the most enthusiastic for the good of the church, and at the same time the most zealous supporters and defenders of Minister Mühler; although the Morgenzeitung is honest enough to declare that later it should go to the latter's head. (Kreuzztg. Ev. Kchz. Volksbl. f. St. u. L.) Whether the ministry's eyes will not finally open through such alliance and the abomination arrive? (Ev. Kirch en-Chronik.)

In Nassau there is such a shortage of young theologians that several pastorates must remain unfilled. The Consistory has turned to the ecclesiastical authorities of neighboring countries for help. I wonder if confessionalism or faith is to blame here? The Lutheran Kz. writes: "The Lutheran congregations of the country now have to defend themselves against the fact that the designation Lutheran in the judicial documents is not to be tolerated by the authorities; apart from Catholics, these only want to recognize Protestants without further distinction. Thus a kind of union by the state authorities. The Oberconsistorium is everywhere opposed to the faithful pastors who resist such impositions. A pastor who refused to remove the designation Lutheran is even threatened with dismissal, in the same country in which a Mitzenius was protected in office, although now the school authorities have also filed a complaint against him because of poor administration of the same! ,

Luther's birthday (Nov. 10) is to be commemorated according to a royal decree to the Minister of Culture, with reference to the present great movements in the religious

The Protestant Churches of Prussia will henceforth celebrate this day as a general holiday in the life of the nations as well as of the individuals. Most of the so-called Protestant churches should be no less than entitled to such a celebration, if they do not want to associate the celebration with a conversion to Luther's faith. By the way, the church does not celebrate the birthdays of such men as Luther, but their deathdays, for their birth was a sinful one, like that of all men, but the work which they accomplished and sealed with their death in the Lord would be worthy of a common church celebration, according to Ebr. 13:7: "Remember your teachers who have told you the word of God, whose end" (not birth) "look upon, and follow their faith."

W.

In the last (5th) issue of last year, the "Ev. Kirchen-Chronik" writes about **the Humboldt cult**: "The free-minded" have invented a new idolatrous cult in order to bring the time, which is moving too slowly for them, to a state of mind. The new idol is Alexander von Humboldt, whose 100th birthday has been used for all kinds of forced demonstrations. The same people who recently apotheosized Schleiermacher (in Berlin Mr. Kochhann again at the head) now cheer his despiser. Humboldt is a decided opponent of spiritualism; he is a materialist of the purest water, who only ever knows how to hide his nakedness under a certain propriety. He is too much a courtier and aristocrat to expose himself in a plebeian manner. Schleiermacher is to him, as he bluntly expresses it, a cunning priest who outwardly professes the Christian myths and goes along with the religious customs out of accommodation. With regard to accommodation, Humboldt would really have no one to reproach; courtly hypocrisy is the weakest side of his character, if he had any at all. This aristocrat, who was not a pope, but a courtly aristocrat, the hero of antichambrian science, is now to be stamped with all his might as a man of the people, the man who wrote his works in French, as a German man of the people! We understand that in the learned world Humboldt's memory is honored and celebrated because of his scientific merits; an academic celebration was quite appropriate. But these tendentious popular festivities in his honor are proof to us that the liberals will resort to any means to promote their cause, and that they consider the German people stupid enough to let any sand and dust be thrown into their eyes. Humboldt a redeemer! One makes at least very few moral demands on the redeemers of modern times (Lasalle is also stamped as such); thus they have nothing shameful for their worshippers. Above all, it is necessary to persuade the crowd, easily blinded by phrases, that redemption is not a moral but a scientific moment. The natural sciences, as soon as they have renounced the first article of the Christian faith (and this they have done in a number of their most eminent representatives, building kings as well as day-laboring farmers, among whom Humboldt stands at the top) bear in themselves the least, in fact no moral moment at all; it is characteristic of the time that it is precisely they and their representatives who are elevated by it to the throne. The immoral powers of the time (down to the love of the original) all refer to the latest scientific research and (alleged) results.*)

*) It is certainly a characteristic proof of this assertion of ours that the untiring literary defender of the physical (and consequently also moral!) justification of Urnism, whose writings were indignantly rejected as "filth" by the Jurists' Congress, was able to have some of the main representatives of modern materialistic natural science imprint their book with approving, or at least not rejecting, letters of opinion! According to newspaper reports, Zastrow in Berlin has made up his own scientific system (based on Darwinian principles) to justify his crimes, which is in any case identical with the one just mentioned!

Hanover. By the majority of the members of the board in question, the Protestant Association has been granted the Market Church of the city of Hanover for its meetings. In a Lutheran area, one is thus more lax than even in an un-Irish one, for, as is well known, the Berlin Ober-Kirchenrath rejected a similar request. - At the state synod, Oberconsistorialrath Uhlhorn declared "that arbitrary doctrine had broken down in the state churches, that one must bear this with patience until God improves it!" According to this, the defect seems to be blamed on God. W.

The Munich magistrate awarded honorary citizenship to **Stiftsprobst Dr. v. Döllinger by** 22 votes to 6. According to this, the wind in Munich no longer has to come from ultra montes. The aforementioned is, in any case, co-author of the quite excellent writing against the Concil, "Der Pabst und das Concil von Janus" ("The Pope and the Concil of Janus"), which appeared in the January issue of the present volume of this monthly paper, p. 25. This writing should be read by every preacher and educated layman. It is all the more a powerful armory from history against the Pabacy, as it contains what is historically irrefutably certain against the Pabacy, even after the admission of all historically knowledgeable Catholics. W.

In Norway there have been tumultuous demonstrations in various places by the lower classes of the population against Freemasonry. In Norway and Sweden this is spreading very widely among the higher classes. The Allg. Ztg. says that superstitious ideas about the nature of Freemasonry prevail among the lower classes; we would prefer to say that honest Scandinavians have preserved a healthy instinct against secrecy and the ecclesiastical and political danger of this order, which has unfortunately disappeared in our country.

(Ev. Church-Chronicle.)

The pope and the Turk seem to be advancing farther and farther in their good understanding. Not only has the Sultan promoted the Roman bishops to the Conciliar, but he has also certified a special envoy to Rome. Thus reports Dr. Münkel.

Lord Byron. The "Ev. Kirchen-Chronik" reports about the well-known controversy concerning Byron as follows: "The well-known American novelist Mrs. Beecher-Stowe has put the educated world of England into a tremendous excitement by allegedly describing Byron's marital history on behalf of her friend's wife. Besides the already known facts that Byron treated his wife very badly and led the life of a libertine, she accuses him of having lived in incest with his stepsister Augusta. The journals of England have for the most part gone into a veritable berserker rage over this, and are falling upon the poor, somewhat broad and garrulous writer with scorn and derision, in order to cleanse "the greatest poet in England" of this stain attached to him by an "old sister in prayer". It is a formal literary scandal; refutations rain down, but all of them produce nothing certain against the accusation. Certainty will come only when Byron's memoirs come to light. These have been destroyed in the original by Thomas Moore (why?), but are said to still exist in a copy in Lord Broughton's estate, which, however, may not be opened until 1900. Whether to Byron's notorious debaucheries a bit of incest is added, changes little at bottom the verdict on his morality (or rather immorality); he was accustomed to let his passion shoot the reins everywhere, and towards it he knew neither divine nor human commandment."

Spain. The infidel propaganda in Spain is very active in the press as well as in speech (in the republican clubs); one of its leaders spoke its program

recently to Barcelona: Man means science, God means unscience. If the scale of God rises, that of mankind sinks, and vice versa. The means to raise the sufferings of society is socialism. The centre of infidel propaganda is Barcelona. (Evangelic Church Chronicle.)

France. Count Bourgnoy, a rich Catholic whose fortune is said to amount to several million francs in annual income, has converted to Protestantism and is studying theology to become a Protestant preacher.

(Ev. Church-Chronicle.)

Turkey. A new law on public education has appeared in Turkey; school attendance is henceforth compulsory. The primary (elementary) schools are to be either Christian or Muslim, depending on the main population of the place; the preparatory schools (i.e., the higher schools for preparation for instruction in the lyceums) are to be mixed, accepting both Christian and Muslim pupils. An Imperial Council of Education will be appointed as the highest authority over the entire school system. (Ev. Church Chronicle.)

Russia. According to the new ukase, in the future the lower clergy will rank not with the nobility, but with the higher bourgeoisie. The Russification propaganda consists of two main factions, the national one, headed by the publicist Katkov and the ministers Miljutin and Salernä; the latter is content to make the Russian language the dominant one in church services and in the school instruction of all confessions, without caring about the doctrine of the faith. Next to it works an ecclesiastical orthodox one, at the head of which are the imperial confessor Bashanov and two fanatical ladies, the Countess Bljudov and the former court preacher Tutschew. The latter has for two years been the wife of the Slavomaniac Aksakov, who edits the journal "Moskva." This party is engaged in converting Catholics, Protestants, and Raskolniks to the Orthodox Church with much zeal and rich means. The Empress herself takes a lively part in these efforts. Internal and external missions are the means to an end. - There is a "Society for the Promotion of the Orthodox Faith in the Northwestern Holy Lands," confirmed by the Emperor himself. Its center is Vilnius, and its leader is Metropolitan Joseph. Each member must contribute at least 10 silver rubles. It has set itself the task of providing pecuniary support to those who convert to the Orthodox Church. - The fanatic Aksakov fights in the Moskva against the assertion of freedom of conscience. Promulgated only, he says, freedom of conscience, and half of the orthodox peasants profess the Raskol, because they have no understanding of the essence of the faith. Half of our nobles, however, will throw themselves into the arms of the Catholic Church. In fact, in spite of all countermeasures, the number of Raskolniks has grown in a short time from 5 to 15 million. - In a German colony in southern Russia, several hundred Russian families took part in the devotional meetings held there, reading the German Bible and singing German songs. The police interfered, threw them into prison, and took them in for investigation. - More than 2000 Russian elementary school teachers are already employed in the Lithuanian elementary schools. - In several dioceses of the Gradno and Kovno governorates the inhabitants are being escorted to church by the military because they do not attend voluntarily because of the forced introduction of the Russian language. Thousands of children are being forcibly baptized according to the Russian rite. A blacksmith has taken it upon himself to marry couples who do not want to be married in Russian. He was thrown into prison, the marriages declared invalid, and some of the husbands thus separated placed among the soldiers. (Schles. Ztg.)

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 16. April 1870. No. 4.

Materials on Pastoral Theology,

communicated by C. F. W. W.

(Continued.)

§ 41.

Those who, after a serious public fall into sin or error, repent either immediately or after having received final admonition from the congregation, are not to be excommunicated, but must, as far as possible, atone for the offence they have committed by means of public apology or so-called church penance, and thus reconcile themselves with the angry congregation. Match. 18, 15. 5,23. Luc. 17, 3.4.

Note 1.

Since a public fall into sin is at the same time a sin against the whole congregation, just as a non-public fall into sin before individuals is a sin against them according to Matt. 18:15, so in the former case, as in the latter, reconciliation by deprecation is necessary, and it must be public. If a man who is about to offer his gift on the altar, and there think that a single brother, against whom he has sinned, has something against him, should, according to Matt. 5:23, 24, leave his gift there before the altar, and first go and make reconciliation with this single brother, such reconciliation with a whole congregation is undoubtedly equally obligatory, and of equal necessity, when a Christian thinks that a whole offended and angry congregation has something against him. This reconciliation with the whole congregation, or so-called public penance, is therefore not necessary because in the church, as in the state, a man expiates his sins by suffering a corresponding punishment and receives satisfaction for them.

The church would not be obliged to do so, but partly so that the relationship of trust with his brethren, which had been disturbed by the fall of a brother, might be restored, and partly so that the public offense might be remedied as far as possible. If those members of the congregation who have sinned grievously in public, when they have only secretly confessed their sin to God and repented of it, were to be absolved by the preacher without further ado, communicated, and treated like other righteously walking members, this could not but have a most corrupting effect; the congregation would then stand as a society of men, in which the members could live in sin and shame without repentance, and yet remain members. As a public sinner is to be punished publicly according to God's word, 1 Tim. 5:20, so also according to God's word, if he wants to be regarded as a penitent, that is, as a brother again, and to have the forgiveness of the whole community, he must also publicly acknowledge his repentance, and as a necessary sign that he has "reformed," according to Luc. 17:3, 4, also publicly declare expressly: "I repent."

That this is not a punishment in the true sense, even if the deprecator was already in the ban, Nikolaus Rebhahn, General Superintendent at Eisenach, died 1626, writes about this in his booklet "Von der Kirchenbuße" as follows: "Where more is not done than a public confession of their sins, apology, and reconciliation with the vexed and offended church, it is not really a punishment, but a work of the fifth commandment in the law of God, an act and a virtue, nod a suffering or a punishment. Although it happens to be a punishment, in that he who is to be reconciled suffers himself to be publicly called by his baptismal name and surname before the congregation, and his crime (as if he had caused trouble and deserved God's wrath and temporal and eternal punishment) is openly suggested, which bites him in the heart and hurts him, as some (though out of ignorance) consider it a greater disgrace and harsher punishment than that he had previously been denied absolution and the sacrament. And because in secular courts this is considered a kind or piece of punishment, when one must make public abjuration before the authorities to another whom he has offended, so also the abjuration which takes place in the church may be and remain to some extent a church punishment on our part; just as for this reason we should keep the more watch over it as over a nerve of church discipline, and so that others may fear the more and beware of sin. Reconciliation, however, is a part of church discipline, since a baptized Christian (who, contrary to his baptismal covenant, divine law, and Christianity, has committed a gross public sin, thereby grieving the church and causing a common offense, but who recognizes this with a penitent heart) then accuses himself, publicly confesses his sin to God and to his church for himself or through the mouth of the ordinary church minister, and manfully confesses his sin to the church.

asks that the same be forgiven for God's sake and out of Christian love, and that he be received back into the community and as a member of the church; also promises that he will henceforth, by God's grace, amend his life; whereupon the churchwarden admonishes the audience to grant the request, and that only men should beware of such and such sins; All of which is directed to the end, so that the offense may be controlled, and the delinquent and others may therefore have cause to fear, to lead a Christian, quiet life in the true fear of God, and to avoid sin as diligently as possible. It appears from this that this piece of church discipline, when a public sinner is received back into the fellowship of the church, contains, as far as the sinner's person is concerned, a public confession of sins, coincidentally a public punishment of sins, and a public apology against the offended church." - (Citirt in Hartmann's Pastoral, ev. p. 852. f.)

Note 2.

In answer to the question of who is to be required to make public atonement or so-called church penance, Rebhahn, loc. cit., answers as follows: "Nevertheless, not all public sins belong here under this church discipline (of public reconciliation by means of atonement), but only those which also have the other characteristics in themselves, that they are enormia et atrocia peccata seu lapsus graviores cum publico scandalo conjuncti, gross, terrible, annoying cases of sin. Because we have a corrupt, sinful flesh and blood, which lusts against the Spirit, it now happens that all kinds of weaknesses, infirmities, and shortcomings occur in us daily; we think, speak, do, and leave off daily what we ought not; soon an oath, or even a curse, or an unseemly word escapes one; He misses the sermon, comes somewhat carelessly to the confessional and sacrament, does not always do what parents and superiors want, is not as diligent in his profession as he ought to be, behaves somewhat unseemly, is moved to anger, is over-hasty with a drink, and what is more of the same; These are grievous sins, both in themselves and in the sight of God; and if God should enter into judgment with us for them, and act according to his strict justice, we should thereby deserve not only temporal, but also eternal punishment; wherefore we are daily bound to call upon our Lord God for pardon of our sins. But inasmuch as such cases do not occur out of deliberate malice and stubbornness of neck, nor do they cause great public trouble, or, if anything ever happens, it is again restrained by the good conduct and other virtues of the same man, it is not proper to call such a sinner to public repentance, confession, contrition, and reconciliation. As it could not be done, since otherwise one would have to go to church every day.

a large note full of such persons would have to indicate, also at last a habit would become of it that one did not respect it at all any more. But, as reported, what are unusual, gross, abominable cases, which are done out of spite and malice, and in which one has persisted for some time, or if it has not lasted long, yet by some deed many pious Christians' hearts and in them the Holy Spirit have been grieved, a manifest vexation has been wrought, by which others are offended, and are thereby also tempted and seduced to think, what goes to him I have power to do, what is right for him is right for me, etc.: against such sinners let them be judged, and let them be judged.This piece of church discipline is to be used against such sinners. Now here belong those who have been excommunicated, and afterwards have been converted again, or if they have not already been excluded, have nevertheless given public offence, as those who have practised sorcery and have publicly confessed it, who have fallen away from the true religion, have blasphemed and persecuted it, who curse abominably and blaspheme God, either before the whole congregation, or in the presence of many people, who for some time or years have not gone to church, to the confessional, or to the Lord's table; who have not done such things as beaten to death, fornicators, adulterers, incestuous persons, and drunkards, but have drunk to their fill every day, and lie in a whorehouse, and have defrauded their wives and children, and are thieves, and public usurers, and perjurers, and such like. To whom it is said, Call with confidence, spare not, (Isa. 58.) and to them that sin, punish before all, 1 Tim. 5." (Hartmann. Pastorale ev. p. 925-29.) Concerning such engaged couples, who lived together in marriage before the church or civil blessing, Johann Gerhard writes: "Some decidedly deny that such sin, but it is more correctly held that such sin against a church law, which was introduced after salutary counsel, against public respectability, and against the very praiseworthy example of godly married couples. From this assertion flows the porisma: that ecclesiastical penance or public contrition is justly imposed on those who have thus sinned against the church and given offence to others.... However, the ecclesiastics are to be admonished that, when church penance and public contrition are to be imposed on such betrothed persons, they proceed with caution and moderation, and correctly interpret to their hearers the nature of this sin, namely, that it may not be considered fornication, but an offense against honorable church laws with public offense." (Loc. de conjugio § 475. 476.)

Note 3.

Hartmann rightly testifies that in the cases described, when a fallen person immediately shows himself ready to repent, not only no banishment, but also no suspension can take place. He writes: "In

The truly penitent sinner is to be accepted for public notorious crimes, but not to be suspended for long. For also here the Pauline: And so it is not advisable to postpone absolution for a time, either as a punishment or as a trial of the penitent, since the advantages which this delay seems to have may bring greater disadvantages. Nor has it any ground in Scripture; but to suspend fallen penitents, who are ready to repent, for a longer time without necessity, is a kind of torture of conscience; Nathan, at least, did not first suspend the penitent David for a long time, but immediately announced to him forgiveness of sins." (L. c. p. 864.) In the case of repeated cases of habitual drunkenness, deceitfulness, etc., a temporary suspension is probably the first thing to be done, in order to test the sincerity of the apparent repentance and to prevent serious offence. Acts 8, 18-24.

Note 4.

The question arises here whether a person must be excluded from Holy Communion because of a crime committed in another place. Is it necessary to exclude a person from Holy Communion for a crime committed in another place until he has made public apology? To this question the Lutheran canon lawyer Benedict Carpzov, in his Jurisprudentia ecclesiastica, answers the following: "It very often happens that those who move from the village or town where they have been guilty of a crime, and settle there, ask to be admitted to Holy Communion, to whom the crime committed elsewhere and not atoned for by public absolution is then held up; whereby it tends to be disputed whether they are to be excluded from the use of Holy Communion because of the crime committed elsewhere. It seems at first sight that this is the case, but it is not the case. And at first sight this seems to be answered in the affirmative; for if public contrition be reckoned among the kinds of penalties, there is nothing to prevent it being imposed upon the guilty person for a crime committed elsewhere.... However, even if this is the case, it cannot be applied to public penance, as Nic. Rebhahn well remarks, who holds that for the sake of a crime committed elsewhere, the same is by no means to be imposed on the guilty. (S. Report of Public Penance, Cap. 10, p. 138. 139.) And we are left with the decision of the same: 1. For although, in a certain respect, and accidentally, in view of the customs and ceremonies by which the good name of the guilty is somewhat stained among the people, public contrition is called a punishment, yet, in itself, and according to its nature, it is not such, but rather an exercise of the fifth commandment, an act and virtue, not an affliction or a punishment; no more, indeed, than reconciliation with one's neighbor itself, which is but a nonsensical

Man will call a punishment. (See Rebhahn, supra, Cap. 2, p. 7.) Hence, also, from criminal cases, the act of public contrition is inverted. (2) And since ecclesiastical absolution is imposed, and is to be imposed, solely for the sake of public crimes, I do not see by what right the guilty person can be charged with it on account of a crime committed elsewhere; for a crime cannot be called a public one which, because it was committed elsewhere, has not become known in the place where the guilty person is, or has come to the knowledge of only the very few, and is thought there to be a secret crime. Rebhahn therefore well remarks: "'Among the secret sins also belong those which are committed outside the community. If one commits a gross public abuse and misdeed in another place, he turns away from there to another place, where one knows nothing of his crime, etc."" And after that: "For, as Augustine writes: Wherever evil occurs, there it shall die." "(Cap. 10, p. 139.) (3) Nor can an offense, which in fact alone gives rise to a public apology, easily arise from a crime committed elsewhere, for it is unknown to most; where, therefore, the cause of it ceases, the apology itself also ceases. If, however, a crime committed elsewhere had become so well known that it would be feared that it would cause trouble in the congregation, then my advice would be that the people should only be publicly assured from the pulpit, without public apology from the guilty party, that he has repented and that he should be admonished not to cause trouble; by which means not only is every misgiving met, but also the parishioners are stimulated to godliness and a Christian life. Thus the Oberconsistorium rescribes to the Superintendent at Oschatz on May 18, 1625: "We have heard your report, enclosed with that of the pastor at Borna, concerning the church penance of Marien, Paul S.'s daughter at N.". If she then does not commit this offence, but here in Dresden, then you will inform the said priest that he should spare the delinquent the church penance in the case of such a condition, etc."" Furthermore, in a rescript to the superintendent at Leisnig, Nov. 19, 1619, it says: ""We have heard your report sent in concerning Johann K. of Leipzig. If it can be determined from this that he has not committed any delinquency in Leisnig and therefore has not committed any scandal in this congregation, then we have good reason to have him expelled from the congregation or forced to undergo deprecation at this time. "(A. a. O. page 820. 821.) - It is still less necessary that, if the fallen person moves elsewhere, the deprecation that has already happened once should be repeated in the other place. The same Carpzov writes about this: "It can also happen that the guilty party, after having made public apology for a crime committed, moves elsewhere and stays there, whereby the

Doubt arises whether the church penance does not have to be repeated in the new place of residence. For it will not be easy for someone to deny that even a crime committed elsewhere, if it becomes known, will cause trouble. But public penance must not be extended too far, much less, if it has already been made once, repeated and doubled, as Nicolaus Rebhahn says in ""Report of Public Church Penance"" Cap. 10. p. 138, with these words: "If a person commits a gross public abuse and misdeed in another place, turns away from there to another place, where one does not know of his crime, and brings testimony to the ministry that he is reconciled with the church in which he caused the trouble, then he may well be admitted to the other place and his case may not be publicly remembered. If, however, it should ever be made public, and if it should cause offence and malicious gossip, it could only be publicly announced that this person had been reconciled to the church which he had offended, so that no one should be offended by it. This is quite true: 1. Because the guilty person, when the apology has once been made, is already reconciled to the whole church of Christ; why, therefore, is it necessary that he should again be exposed to the abhorrence of the people, and that in every place the apology should be specially demanded? Since purposeless acts are to be avoided. (2) Nor can the objection be made that it is necessary for the sake of the offence, since when the removal of it has taken place in one place, this extends to other places also. For as soon as the public penance done is known, the matter is settled, and no one may suspect that the guilty party will persist in such a crime. (3) Also, because public penance is considered a penalty, it may never be doubled, because it would be inequitable to impose a double penalty on someone for the sake of one and the same crime. The Oberconsistorium therefore rescribed the following to the Superintendent at Annaberg on Nov. 6, 1616: ""We have heard from your report that H. H. von E. Marien, Hansen R. zum Fenichsberg's wife, notwithstanding that she has already been publicly depreciated in D., now also wants to have her publicly depreciated in O.. If then it is not customary that a person is subjected to public deprecation in two different places, then instead of our most gracious lord we herewith request that you order the priest of O. that he shall not impose any further deprecation on the reported R. wife etc.". Furthermore, on the request of Caspar S. of T., Sept. 21, 1613, it reads as follows: ""Has your daughter Anna entered into a marriage engagement with Joh. E. a short time ago; however, these two engaged persons have come together before the wedding and marriage ceremony and have kept to each other in a carnal way, therefore it has come about that in the third month after the wedding your daughter is reported to have gone to another village, called A., where she is to take care of her business and to be married.

The priest at T. also wants to impose public penance on her, and does not want to allow her to use Holy Communion before and before she has done so; however, since she has already done penance at A., she is now spared from doing so at T. V. R., and the priest at T. has not allowed her to use Holy Communion at all. Because she has nevertheless done all the church penance in A., she is now spared this in T., V. R. W."" (By right.) S. a. a. O. page 821. 822.

Note 5.

The form of the apology depends partly on the severity of the offense, partly on the nature of the victim, and partly on the level of understanding at which the congregation stands. Therefore, depending on the circumstances, the apology may be made either personally by the victim before the altar, or by the preacher from the pulpit, or by one or another of the congregation, or before a committee (e.g. in the case of women), orally or in writing, and so on. When in 1539 a burgher's son in Wittenberg had fallen in murder, Luther gave an admonition, in which it is said, among other things: "Because it is a public act, the reconciliation must also be public, otherwise it is no good. If he brings word from the council (that the matter has been reconciled) and asks forgiveness of sins, he should kneel publicly before the altar, and the priest should say that he is absolved; for the whole church is offended." (XXII, 961. f.) Once, when a parishioner wished to take Holy Communion, another, who was offended by him, spat before him publicly in the church, and said, that all might hear it, "Thou wretch art not worthy that the earth should bear thee; go, that thou mayest receive the devil." About this case, a preacher requested counsel from a member of the Ministry of Hamburg, which, with the latter's approval, replied on October 13, 1614, etc.: "This public sin is not to be counted among the common public sins, but among the grossest, as a peculiar abomination and high blasphemy against God. Even if public repentance were not in use, this offense should, in my opinion and that of others, be publicly expiated and prayed over to the congregation, both because of the terrible abomination contained in the detestable words, and because it (the offense) was publicly committed before the whole congregation. As long as he refuses to do so, he testifies that he is not in earnest about his repentance; how, then, could he knowingly be admitted? Against this I know nothing, how such a delinquent could be dealt with more gently, especially (unless), since there would be considerable cause for this, he should, next to reconciliation with

to his opponent for etzlichen the most distinguished estates and members of the church in the name of the whole congregation (a committee) cordially depreciren, and the gentleman (pastor) showed then the same to the whole church publicly. Which pardon I would not easily accept." (Dedekennus' Thesaurus II, 462. f.)

Above all, caution is necessary here, lest the fallen regard the so-called public penance of the church as something that replaces the true penance of the heart, while the latter is supposed to be only an outward testimony to the existence of the latter and without it is an empty charade. All the more carefully must everything be separated that could give rise to the thought that church penance is a punishment that expiates guilt. In the Apology of the Augsburg Confession Confession, it says: "Of the outward ceremony of public penance, the word satisfactio or satisfaction is also of origin. For the fathers did not want to accept again those who were found guilty of public vices without a penalty. And this had many causes. For it served as an example that public vices should be punished, as the gloss in the decree also says; so it was also unwise that those who had fallen into open vices should soon be admitted to the sacrament untried. All of these ceremonies have now recently ceased, and it is not necessary to perform them, for they do nothing at all to make atonement for God. Nor has it been the opinion of the fathers in any way that men should thereby obtain forgiveness of sins, though such outward ceremonies easily lead the inexperienced to think that they help something to salvation." (Art. 12.) With these latter words the Apology evidently intimates that the renewal of the strict penitential discipline of the ancient church was not only unnecessary, but would itself be dangerous and harmful. Heshusius therefore writes: "Since the brother accepts such admonition, no further punishment should be imposed upon him. For the ministry of the gospel does not seek payment for sin, but only correction; if it obtains this, it is satisfied; and Christ says: If he hears you, you have won your brother; he does not want anything to be laid on him, as happened in the unholy papacy. For the ministry of preaching seeks no more than the correction of man, and has power and command to forgive, remit, and dissolve sin freely and without abatement. In the old church, the bishops decreed several ceremonies and imposed on public sinners, such as murderers and adulterers, what was called correctiones, chastisements, but later, in the papacy, satisfactiones, pardons for sin. For example, a murderer had to stand in church for several days in a mourning garment with a sword in his hand, and an adulterer with a rod, and so had to confess his sin with such a sign and stand there as an example to the others. But it is to be known for all things, that such punishments or chastisements

(which have been impudently called satisfactions) in no way merit the remission of sins. It is also to be known that such chastisements are not necessary in the church, nor were they instituted by the Lord Christ and the apostles, lest the doctrine of the gospel be obscured. For my own simplicity, I think it better and have less of a rule, especially where there are no great signs of hypocritical repentance in the sinner, that no public chastisement (e.g. suspension) should be inflicted on those who give way to admonition and promise correction. For how can a priest, who is appointed by God to comfort sinners, justify imposing on a penitent (who has promised correction, and of whom one can hope that he means what he says from the heart) something that God's bright word does not interpret for him? So also the temporal government is ordained to deter others from preaching by corporal punishment of honor, money, and body." (On the Office and Authority of the Pastor. Erfurt 1561. G. 1. 2.3.)

(To be continued.)

On the history of the Roman Council.

Döllinger. The ultramontanes seem to fear the testimony of this eminent historian against the infallibility theory from history much more than all clear proofs against it from Scripture. Döllinger's influence seems to become more and more dangerous to the tendencies of the Jesuit party, especially in Germany, but not only here. The great majority of Roman Catholic scholars throughout Germany side with Döllinger and express this through public addresses addressed to him. This was done, among others, by 13 professors of the University of Prague - among them 5 clergymen; likewise by the Catholic professors of the University of Bonn through an address of approval signed by 25 men; furthermore, 9 professors of the University and other Catholic scholars at Breslau; furthermore, 150 from Cologne who signed a vote of thanks, "all men," it says, "of academic education, among them the notables of the civil service, the municipal administration, most members of the court of appeal, the heads and teachers of the public schools. From Coblenz, Kreuznach, Münster, the same voices have been raised. Döllinger did not accept the honorary citizenship offered to him by the Munich magistrate. In a "statement" sent to the Allgemeine Ztg. for this reason, he writes, among other things: "I published the article in question because, as a public teacher, as the senior of the theological professors of Germany in a tense time and truly frightening situation, I believed myself called to do so. I

I have done so in the reassuring awareness that I am in agreement with the great majority of the German bishops, to which my own venerable Chief Shepherd also belongs, in the essence of the question, and in the urge to openly confess what I once received as a teacher of the Church, what I presented as such for 47 years, now in the evening of my life in a moment of threatening obscuration or disfigurement. At last also - why should I not say it? - in the hope that my word, my pointing out the errors of a document guaranteed by 400 signatures, will perhaps find some consideration even there, where at present the whole future of the Church is to be decided, even before the die is cast. But this is a purely internal matter of the Church, and I must by no means offer my hand to it, or even, so far as it depends on me, allow it to happen, that this thoroughly religious question should be removed from its natural position within the Church and dragged over into an area foreign to it. Munich, January 27, 1870, J. v. Döllinger." Since, as a result of the appearance of Döllinger, a large part of the Catholic Church in Germany is now ready to become renitent. Since, as a result of Doellinger's appearance, a large part of the Catholic Church in Germany seems to want to become recalcitrant, and Doellinger's historical statements also evidently serve as bullets with which some members of the opposition in Rome fill their guns, an opposition which, with its pretended mere misgivings because of the "opportuneness" of the intended decree, indisputably only masks its struggle against the dogma itself, then, of course, with the sympathy for Doellinger on the one side growing from day to day, the anger against him on the other increases. Especially strange is a counter-declaration which Baron v. Kettler, Bishop of Mainz, published from Rome against Döllinger on February 8. In it it says, among other things, after quoting Döllinger's statement above: "There was a time when I was a grateful disciple of the Provost von Döllinger and sincerely revered him. For several years I followed all his lectures in Munich. At that time I was in agreement with him on almost all great questions of church history. Later, in 1848, we participated together as delegates in the parliament in Frankfurt. Even at that time, when all the great questions of the day were so often discussed, I believe I was in agreement with him on the questions of public life. Unfortunately, however, I must now assume that there is a profound contrast between the views of Provost v. Döllinger and my own 'in the essence' of the questions which now occupy us. Mr. Stiftspropst v. Döllinger has been publicly described as a comrade-in-arms of the authors of that well-known diatribe (?!) against the Church which appeared under the name Janus, and he has not yet seen fit to declare that he, as a faithful son of the Catholic Church, does not share the attitude which inspired Janus. But Janus is not only against the infallibility of the pope, but against the primacy of the Church.

selb st, against this great divine institution in the Church, to which, in unity, we so actually owe the victory of the Church over all opponents through all centuries. It is at the same time a tissue of innumerable distortions (?!) of the facts of history, to which perhaps only the Lettres provinciales of Pascal can be placed alongside in terms of inner untruthfulness." (Indeed!) "Herr Stiftspropst v. Döllinger has not only not yet rejected the connection with the authors of Janus, but, as is well known, he is also the anonymous author of the writing 'Considerations for the Bishops of the Council on the Question of Papal Infallibility,' which is admittedly much more moderate than Janus, but which generally agrees with the train of thought of Janus in such a way that it suggests all the more that he is close to the authors of Janus, or at least that he approves of their direction.... The above-mentioned words of the Provost v. Döllinger, in which he calls the possible explanation of a doctrine which contradicts his views "a threatening obscuration or defacement* of the doctrine of the Church, are also filled with this spirit. He who has the conviction that the Spirit of truth supernaturally assists this assembly cannot believe in threatening obscurations and defacements of the doctrine of the church through the pronouncements of a general church assembly. The Lord Provost, however, before this pronouncement is made, may assert his objections to a doctrine which has not yet been established; but as a Catholic he has no right to speak of threatening to obscure and disfigure the true doctrine by the pronouncements of the general Church Assembly. There was a time when many enthusiastic young men from all parts of Germany, who were preparing for the priesthood, belonged to the pupils of Döllinger, and who are now, at a ripe old age, the most faithful sons of the Church, and are called Jesuit pupils by the enemies of the Church. To that time the Provost v. Döllinger owes it without doubt that even now many overcome the feeling of old piety only with great reluctance and renounce their old teacher." - From the foregoing it is evident that Bishop v. Kettler considers Provost v. Döllinger, if not the direct author of the excellent writing "The Pope and the Conciliar of Janus**, nevertheless the indirect author and in any case representative of the same. The "Kath. Kirchenzeitung** of New York, however, at least pretends not to believe this. In order not to have such a weighty name as Döllinger invoked against it, it praises him and scolds "Janus** all the more. In the number of March 3, under the subheading "Dr. Döllinger," she writes, among other things, as follows: "This famous Catholic scholar of Germany, as is well known, has had to make much of himself in the press for some time. Since he has cast his theological vote against the Pope's declaration of infallibility in this present Concilium (the authorship of the infamous

However, 'Janus' has been wrongly attributed to him), there was tremendous jubilation in the anti-clerical army camp. But these strange comrades, who now yodel and cheer so foolishly, are providing themselves with Döllinger. The old man may sometimes become whimsical, and then probably also wield a whimsical pen; but he still stands firmly on Catholic ground (?!), and we are convinced of him that at any moment - if demanded - he would submit to the judgment of the Apostolic See." (We shall see.) "God strengthen him in his old days, and keep him from going astray!" In all probability, this wish comes too late. Döllinger has already gone astray in the sense of the Catholic Church, and so deeply that he can hardly go back. Our wish, therefore, is rather this: Would that the learned man, as he has recognized the contradiction of the papal presumptions with the facts of history, would likewise recognize the contradiction of the entire Roman doctrinal system with the Gospel! - By the way, there are many who are decidedly against the means of public addresses of approval and therefore do not participate in them, but who nevertheless take the same standpoint as Döllinger. In regard to Prof. Dr. Berlage at the Academy of Münster, the Louisville "Messenger of the Faith" himself admits it, and that the well-known Dr. Hefele, now Bishop of Rottenburg, even two German Cardinals (Rauscher and Schwarzenberg) belong to it, is a public secret. That even those who belong to the opposition are against the address system is undoubtedly quite in order; it would be an unpleasant scandal for any religious community, all the more so for such a one as the Roman, which counts external unity among the indispensable marks of the Church.

Method of Voting in the Roman Concilium. As is well known, the question of whether to vote according to nations or according to heads at the conciliar meetings had already caused dangerous friction on the occasion of earlier conciliar meetings. The popes were always in favor of voting by heads, because in this form they could more easily procure a majority of votes for their projected resolutions than in the other case. In the present Council, too, the old controversy has arisen. In one of the "Roman Letters" sent to the Allg. Ztg. we read, among other things, with reference to this: "With regard to the representation of the individual nations and churches at the Council, instructive observations can be made here. French and Germans must practice the virtues of humility and modesty here. There is the diocese of Breslau with 1,700,000 Catholics; its bishop is not elected to a single commission, whereas the 700,000 inhabitants of the present Papal States are represented by 62 bishops, and the Italians form half or two-thirds of all commissions. For the kingdom of God, in which the least is greater than John and all the prophets, lies, as is well known, between Montefiascone and Terracina, and he who is in Sonnino

If a bishop has seen the light of day in Belletri, Ceccano, Anagni, or Riett, he is already predestined in the cradle to imperio regere populos. It is true that the 62 bishops of this chosen land and people have not yet succeeded in establishing even the most modest measure of morality in their country towns and villages; whole villages and districts are still notoriously in agreement with the brigands; but even the Conciliar does not have to worry about such things. There are the archbishops of Cologne with 1,400,000, of Cambry with 1,300,000, of Paris with 2,000,000 Catholics; but of the Neapolitan and Sicilian bishops at the Council, four are enough to nullify these prelates with the 5,000,000 Germans and French behind them. Thus the 12,000,000 Catholics of Germany proper are represented at this Council by fourteen votes. One could also express the ratio in this way: in ecclesiastical matters, twenty Germans do not count as much as one Italian. And if a German should imagine that his nation, with its numerous theological colleges and its learned theologians, is justified in addressing a council, let him come here only to be soon thoroughly cured of this delusion. In the whole of Italy, with the exception of Rome, there is not a single true theological faculty; Spain likewise manages without higher theological schools and without theology; but here at the Conciliar a few hundred Italians and Spaniards are the masters and the appointed teachers and dictators of the faith for all the nations belonging to the Church."

Döllinger's "Some Words on the Infallibility Address", which he asked to be published in the "Allg. Ztg.", are, according to the Allg. Luth. Kz., the following in their essential content: "You have brought the strange address, which from the bosom of the Vatican Council asks the Pope that he may take the necessary steps to have his own infallibility elevated to an article of faith by the present assembly. 180 million people - this is what the bishops who have signed the address demand - are to be forced in the future by the threat of exclusion from the Church, deprivation of the sacraments and eternal damnation to believe and confess what the Church has not believed and not taught up to now. Has not believed - for even those who have hitherto held this papal infallibility to be true, could not yet believe it, this word taken in the Christian sense. Between faith (fide divina) and between the intellectual acceptance of an opinion held to be probable, there is an immeasurable difference. The Catholic can and may believe only that which is divinely revealed to him, belongs to the substance of the doctrine of salvation, and is communicated to him by the church itself, only that to the confession of which membership in the church is tied, that the opposite of which the church does not believe.

as manifestly false doctrine. In truth, therefore, from the beginning of the Church to the present day, no man has believed in the infallibility of the pope, i.e., believed as he believes in God, in Christ, in the Trinity of the Father, Son, and Spirit, etc., but many have held it probable, or at most humanly certain (fide humana), that this prerogative belongs to the pope. Accordingly, the change in the faith and doctrine of the Church, which the bishops of address want to see carried out, would be a unique event in the history of the Church; nothing similar has occurred in eighteen centuries. It is an ecclesiastical revolution which they desire, all the more sweeping because it concerns here the foundation which is to carry and hold the religious faith of every man in the future, as in the place of the whole Church, universal in time and space, a single man, the pope, is to be placed. Hitherto the Catholic said: I believe this or that doctrine on the testimony of the whole Church of all times, because it has the promise that it shall always exist, always remain in possession of the truth. But in future the Catholic would have to say, I believe because the pope, who has been declared infallible, commands it to be taught and believed. But that he is infallible I believe because he claims it of himself. For it is true that 400 or 600 bishops decided at Rome in 1870 that the pope is infallible; but all bishops and every council without the pope are subject to the possibility of error; infallibility is the exclusive prerogative and property of the pope, his testimony can neither be strengthened nor weakened by the bishops, many or few; that decision, therefore, has only as much force and authority as the pope, by appropriating it, has given it. And so everything finally dissolves into the pope's self-testimony, which is admittedly very simple. Here it is only to be remembered that 1840 years ago an infinitely higher man once said: If I bear witness to myself, then my witness is not credible' (Joh. 5, 31.). - First, it limits the infallibility of the pope to those pronouncements and decrees which he addresses to the whole body of the faithful, that is, which he issues for the instruction of the whole Catholic Church. From this it would follow that if a pope addressed himself only to individual persons, corporations, particular churches, he was always exposed to error. But for twelve or thirteen centuries the popes never carried out the condition to which the freedom from error of their decisions or teachings is supposed to be attached: all the pronouncements of the popes on questions of doctrine before the end of the thirteenth century were addressed only to certain persons or to the bishops of a country, etc. The whole Oriental Church was never addressed by a pope to a particular person, body, or particular church. During the millennium of unification, no general decree of a pope was ever communicated to the entire Oriental Church; only to individual patriarchs or emperors, and only in long intervals.

the popes addressed dogmatic letters. It is therefore clear that the popes themselves had no idea of this condition, on which the certainty and infallibility of their decisions were supposed to depend, for at least a thousand years, just as this assertion was only conceived very late and was unknown to the Church before 1562. In that year, the theologian Johann Hessels of Louvain presented it for the first time, from whom Bellarmin borrowed it and supported it with passages from the false Isidorean Decretals and with the fictitious testimonies of St. Cyril. By a single superior word, by the mere inscription, the popes could have conferred upon their dogmatic pronouncements, according to this theory, the supreme prerogative of inerrancy. They have not done so, have placed persons and congregations in danger of falling into error by accepting their decisions given without the guarantee of divine certainty. - Secondly, it is untrue that "according to the general and constant tradition of the Church, the dogmatic judgments of the popes are irreformable". The contrary is before everyone's eyes. The Church has always first examined the dogmatic letters of the popes, and as a result of this examination has either approved them, as the Conciliar of Chalcedon did with the letter of Leo, or rejected them as erroneous, as the fifth Conciliar (553) did with the Constitutum of Vigilius, and the sixth Conciliar (681) with the letter of Honorius. - Thirdly, it is not true that at the second Council of Lyons (1274), by the consent of both Greeks and Latins, a confession of faith was adopted in which it is declared "that disputes about the faith must be decided by the judgment of the pope. Neither the Greeks nor the Latins, i.e. the Western bishops assembled at Lyons, adopted this creed, but the late Pope Clement IV had sent it to the Emperor Michael Palaeologus as a condition of his admission to the Church community. The latter himself, however, at home in Constantinople, declared the three concessions which he had made to the pope to be illusory. - Fourth: The decree of the Florentine Synod is cited in a mutilated form. For the pope and the cardinals persistently demanded that, as a more detailed provision as to how the pope's primacy was to be understood, the following be added: juxta dicta Sanctorum. The
the Greeks rejected with equal insistence. They knew well that among these "testimonies of the saints" were a considerable number of very extensive, fictitious or forged passages. The Latins at last gave way, the dicta Sanctorum disappeared from the draft, and in their place were set as the standard and barrier of papal primacy the negotiations of the ecumenical conciliaries and the sacred canons. This excluded any thought of papal infallibility. - The address declares itself with special indignation against those who do not consider the Florentine Synod ecumenical. The facts may

speak. As is well known, the Synod was called to destroy the Conciliar of Basle, when it had begun to enact several reforms that were inconvenient to the Roman Curia. On April 9, 1438, it was opened at Ferrara. Nine tenths of the Catholic world at that time did not participate in the synod, because they considered it illegitimate in relation to the Basel assembly, and everyone knew that for the most urgent matter, the reform of the church, nothing would happen there. In all, there were 62 bishops who signed. The Greek prelates with their emperor had been drawn thither in the extreme danger of ruin by the promise of money, ships, and soldiers; the pope, moreover, had promised to bear the expenses of their stay at Ferrara and Florence and of their return journey. When they proved intransigent, he withdrew the subsidies from them, so that they fell into bitter distress, and at last, compelled by the Emperor and urged by hunger, signed things which they afterwards almost all revoked. The remaining text of the address deals with the explanation that the establishment of the new article of faith is just now timely, even urgently necessary, because some persons who claimed to be Catholics have recently disputed this opinion of papal infallibility. What the address here partly says, partly presupposes as known (in Rome), is essentially the following. In and of itself, it thinks, it would not have been absolutely necessary to increase the number of doctrines by a new dogma, but the situation had developed in such a way that this was now unavoidable. For several years now the Jesuit Order, supported by a group of like-minded people, has begun an agitation in favor of the new dogma in Italy, France, Germany, and England. A religious society of its own, for the purpose of praying and working for the attainment of the new dogma, has been founded and publicly announced by the Jesuits; its chief organ, the 'Civilita', published in Rome, has declared in advance that the chief task of the Council is to bring the gift of the missing article of faith to the waiting world; its 'Laacher Stimmen' and Viennese publications have discussed the same subject widely and in untiring repetition. With this agitation it would now have been the duty of all dissenters to remain in reverent silence, to let the Jesuits and their following quietly have their way, not to subject to any scrutiny the arguments they put forward in numerous writings. Unfortunately, this has not happened; some people have had the unheard-of impudence to break the sacred silence and to make known a dissenting opinion. This annoyance can only be atoned for by an increase in the creed, a change in the catechisms and all religious books, Dr. J. v. Döllinger. " W.

Some innocent "open questions" to the General Council, resp. Dr. Krauth, together with a request for an open answer, if he agrees with our answer.

It is sufficiently known that Dr. Krauth is a connoisseur and lover of Lutheran theology and at the same time one of the most distinguished doctrinal spokesmen of the General Council. As chairman of the committee which was to pass judgment on the questions submitted to the General Council by Mr. Pastor Sieker, as president of the Minnesota Synod, concerning the well-known 4 points, he submitted the following report: "With respect to the point that heretics and fundamental errorists cannot be admitted to our altars as communicants, nor to our pulpits as teachers of our congregations, there can be no question as to the general adherence of this Council to the full and entire faith of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. On the other point, whether the General Council understands fundamental errorists to be those who are not in pure harmony with the word of God as known and taught in this church concerning the distinctive doctrines of the church, it was stated that the Council means to make a distinction between fundamental errorists and heretics, as between the greater and lesser. All heretics are fundamental errorists, but not vice versa. By heretics we mean those who reject our common catholic Christianity; by fundamental errorists we mean those who reject any part of the pure Word of God as set forth in our Confessions."

That is where the first question arises:

1 .) For is there not a contradiction in this distinction between heretics and fundamental errorists? For above it is asserted that the latter relate to the latter as the greater to the lesser, which necessarily presupposes something in common between the two, which is then also expressed in the words that every heretic is a fundamental errorist. But below it is asserted that the heretic, the heretic, rejects the whole general Christian faith. As such, however, he would stand quite outside the Christian church, like pagans, Jews, and Mohamedans. But heretics are never outside, but always within the Christian church. Who, for instance, would ever have called a Mohamedan a heretic? Yes, even those who are still baptized at the present time, who evidently and in express words, whether individuals or whole communities, deny the general Christian faith, are not heretics, but apostate, lying Christians, who thereby completely separate themselves from Christendom.

have separated and are outside of it, such as the Unitarians, between whom and the Jews and Mohamedans there is no essential difference.

But that the heretics, the heretics, are just within the church, St. Paul testifies with express words 1 Cor. 11, 19, when he writes thus:

"For there must be (even χαϊ) rottennesses (αιρέσεις, heresies, heretical communities, that is, not mere divisions σχίσματα, comp. v. 18.) among be to you, so that those who are so righteous (the proven, the orthodox, δόκιμοί) may be revealed." Likewise he writes to Titum Tit. 3, 10: "Avoid a heretical (αίρέτικον) man, when he is once and again admonished. And know that such a one is perverse and sins as he who has condemned himself," that is, sins against his own conscience, and out of satanic pride continues to spread his heresies. But Titus and other orthodox believers had, of course, only to exercise this profession of exhortation on those who were still within the Christian congregations. Furthermore, Hymenaeus and Philetus certainly belonged to these heretical people who were admonished in vain. They by no means overthrew the whole foundation of Christian faith, but (2 Tim. 2, 18.) testified that the resurrection had already happened. They denied the bodily resurrection of the believers; and because they persisted in their false doctrine against all reproof and conviction, they were excluded from the Christian community.

Accordingly, that stated difference between heretics and fundamental errorists would hardly be valid.

2 .) Is the Reformed Church or the Presbyterian ecclesiastical community here a sister church of the Lutheran Church, as it is often called by the Unionists here and there, or are the Calvinist Presbyterians fundamental errorists, as the orthodox Lutheran Church has always regarded them? For though they do not evidently, downright, and directly overthrow the whole ground of faith, deny the deity of Christ, and therefore also the triune God, and thereby, like the Unitarians, entirely tear themselves away from the fellowship of the Christian church, yet it is evident that they assert so many and grievous soul-corrupting and damnable heresies, and, against all reproof from our orthodox theologians, have obstinately held and spread them for more than 300 years, that they thereby overthrow the foundation of the saving faith and plunge the souls, in whom this error becomes and remains strong, into eternal perdition. For they teach quite contrary to Scripture and false in the following doctrines: 1st, Of the use of reason in matters of faith; 2nd, Of divine providence; 3rd, Of the divine majesty and glory communicated to the human nature of JESUS CHRIST by virtue of personal union; 4th, Of the almighty and his church.

5. of the general grace of God; 6. of the general merit of Jesus Christ; 7. of the general earnest call of the gospel; 8. of the eternal election of grace; 9. of the rejection of the ungodly; 10. of the grace of conversion; 11. of the perishableness of faith; 12. of baptism; 13. of the Lord's Supper; 14. of all kinds of means and ceremonies.

Is not this a fearful register, and is there but a little leaven here, though even this the orthodox church should not suffer? For example, what is the use of the Presbyterians confessing the divinity of Christ, if they, as followers of the heretic Nestorius, deny that for the sake of the personal union of the Son of God with human nature the whole Christ, the Son of God and Mary, suffered and died for us on the cross? It is true that the Scriptures say, "Ye have slain the Prince of life;" "They have crucified the Lord of glory;" "The blood of JESUS CHRIST, the Son of GOD, maketh us clean from all sin;" "God hath purchased his church by his own blood;" and in these words the Holy Spirit, for the sake of that personal union, attributes to the whole person that which is proper to human nature. But the Calvinists, in opposition to God's word, rob poor sinners of this certain consolation, by letting in their stupid light of reason, which says, God cannot suffer, he has no blood, and cannot die; consequently only the man Jesus of Nazareth suffered, shed his blood, and died; the Son of God is not in this at all.

Truly, if this were so, we would all still be in our sins, there would be no Christ, Son of God and Son of Man, no reconciler and redeemer from sin, death and the devil, there would be no gospel, no faith, no church, no justification of sinners before God, no sanctification, no eternal life, the whole of Christianity would only be a great deception and deception of the devil, like Mohamedanism.

Since the Calvinistically minded and thus teaching Presbyterians do not really believe in the personal union of the Son of God with human nature in Christ, and consequently deny that the God-man suffered and died for us, they naturally also deny that the God-man is exalted and glorified, that, according to his human nature, he rules heaven and earth with the Father in infinite omnipotence, majesty, and glory, and that, with his presence, he fulfills all things and is glorified, that the God-man is exalted and glorified, that, according to his human nature, he rules heaven and earth with the Father in infinite omnipotence, majesty, and glory, that he fills all things with his presence, and is especially present in a gracious way where he has joined himself by his word and promise, as, for example, in the Lord's Supper. For example, in the Lord's Supper.

Here, too, they, as scripture-defying tearing apart of the person of Christ, let reason speak, which, after all, never and nowhere in matters of faith is even partially a source of knowledge, but always and everywhere only a source of knowledge.

can be a means of knowledge. For reason says, then, that Christ was a true man, and as such had a true human body. But such a body can only be present in one place at one time; consequently Christ with his body cannot be present everywhere where Holy Communion is celebrated at the same time.

How terrible and desolate, how utterly contrary to Scripture and heretical, and inspired by Satan, the liar and murderer, is not their accursed doctrine of God's unconditional eternal counsel of election and reprobation, in which they renounce Christ; for in Him alone, according to Scripture, election is possible and real, and only persistent unbelief against Him naturally entails reprobation. Here again they let reason have its say and teach, which thus says: "If it is because God, by a counsel taken in accordance with the free good pleasure of his will, has predestined from eternity a small portion of men to eternal blessedness out of free grace, in order to show his grace in them, he has in like manner predestined from eternity the greatest portion of sinful men to eternal damnation, in order to show his righteousness in them. Likewise: If it is true that God sent his Son into the flesh only for the sake of the elect, as a necessary consequence of his election, in order to reconcile this elect to God through his suffering and death and to purchase eternal life, then it is clear and evident that those predestined to eternal damnation have no part in Christ and his merit, and that they neither can nor should believe in him.

Thus, through this blasphemous, contrary to Scripture, and also permeated with pagan fatalism, the Scriptural doctrine of the universal grace of God, of the universal merit of Christ, of the universal calling through the gospel to work true faith in Christ in all who are called, is pushed to the ground, trampled underfoot, and one part of men is driven to presumption, the other to despair.

3) Can a minister of the orthodox, that is, Lutheran church, which in all articles of faith childlike and simple adheres to God's word, as it reads, and does not allow reason to speak into its knowledge and confession, but rather, according to 2 Cor. 10, 5, "takes all reason captive to the obedience of Christ," that is, of his Gospel - can such a minister offer his pulpit to a minister of the Presbyterian Church, in order to preach God's Word loud and pure to his Lutheran congregation? No! and again No! A Lutheran minister who would make such an offer would either be most ignorant of the pure doctrine of his church and that so terribly corrupted of the Presbyterians-and such ignorance would be altogether sinful and criminal for a teacher of the church-or the cursedness and damnableness of every

If a Lutheran pastor did not know that a Presbyterian preacher, with whom he might be on friendly or kinship terms, was not fighting the false doctrines of his church, he would not be convinced that the false doctrine was contrary to God's glory and man's salvation, or that human considerations, carnal love and false brotherhood were the leading motives. But even supposing a Lutheran pastor knew that a Presbyterian preacher, with whom he might be on friendly or kinship terms, did not share the false doctrines of his church, but was a true believer, he would have no call to allow him into his pulpit. He would then only have the profession of love to encourage this friend of his to testify against the false doctrines of his church in its assemblies orally and, according to his gifts, also in writing, and of course also to preach the pure Word of God to his congregation. There would be only two cases. Either he would omit this testimony out of fear and complacency, in which case it would be a proof that his orthodoxy was only froth on the beer, but neither lived in his heart nor was in his conscience; or he would do this testimony, but would find no acceptance, or would even be expelled from his ecclesiastical body and deposed from his congregation. If, then, in this testimony against heresies, he has at the same time testified to the pure doctrine of the Lutheran church and declared himself in its favor, he is certainly a precious martyr of Christ; and then it is time for the Lutheran pastor to offer him his pulpit.

Otherwise, however, such an offer is and remains absolutely unconfessional and unionistic, sinful and reprehensible. For in the first place it is contrary to the honor of God and his word, which Romans 16:17 commands all right-believing Christians, and even more so the public teachers of the church, to depart from, that is, not to seek out, and to cause to preach, those who cause division and trouble, besides (that is, also contrary to) the doctrines they have learned. Likewise God commandeth in his word, Judg. 3, that all Christians, and much more the preachers, should fight for the faith that was once given to the saints (for all the world), that is, to attack and refute the false doctrines orally and in writing. The word of God is thus virtually struck in the face when a minister of the Lutheran church invites a Presbyterian preacher to his pulpit or admits him if he should desire it. For by such invitation or admission the Lutheran preacher gives the appearance that there is now good peace and cordial harmony between his church and that of the Presbyterians, while it is evident and in the open that even the present Presbyterians have never recanted the heresies of their fathers, but still hold them, teach them, and confess them, even if they now and then assume a milder form. It is likewise evident that they now as little as formerly acknowledge the Lutheran church as orthodox, but declare it to be half papist, and are far from seeking agreement with it in a straight and simple way, that is, to reject their

to accept our doctrine. But the fact that they no longer use the blasphemous words of their fathers to show their dislike for us is by no means due to their affection for our doctrine. Rather, it comes from the fact that, in part, the Presbyterian blood has now become somewhat watery, in part, that the soporific poison of unionism, which the devil is now pouring or dripping into all non-papist churches in order to prepare them for entry into his papal church, has also penetrated into the Presbyterians, in part, that they want to transfer American civil liberty, equality, and fraternity to the ecclesiastical sphere and be polite fashionable and popular here as well.

On the other hand, this offering and allowing is also contrary to the conscience of a minister of the Lutheran church, which should also be caught and bound in the above words of God and therein be quite free from human considerations. To be sure, he can and may preach in all kinds of erroneous churches, if he is called to do so; for he brings the pure doctrine, which alone is wholesome and consoling; and without preaching a sermon of contention and defense in the actual sense, he may nevertheless succeed, by God's grace, in healing many a wounded and confused conscience, e. g., through his pure evangelical doctrine of justification, which the devil aims at nearer or farther with every false doctrine. And only then would he have to refrain from this preaching, if he thereby gave his own congregation, which, moreover, would still be weak in evangelical knowledge, an annoyance, as, for example, when a pastor of the so-called separated Lutherans in Prussia should preach in an unchurched church. The reverse, however, is quite hurtful to the conscience of an orthodox Lutheran preacher. For the Presbyterian preacher, as such, brings not the pure, but the counterfeit doctrine; and even if for his own person he were inclined to the Lutheran doctrine, or even were a secret Lutheran and a bosom friend of the Lutheran preacher, this does not in the least change the state of the case. For as long as he is and is called a minister of the Presbyterian Church, which in doctrine persists in open contradiction with that of the Lutheran Church, it must be expected by right that every one of his sermons be in accordance with the confession of his church; otherwise he would belong to the mules who are neither ass nor horse, but hybrids of both. If a Lutheran preacher were to offer the pulpit to a Presbyterian preacher or, at the latter's request, allow him to use it, he would be presuming that he was preaching against the confession of his church or, out of complacency, concealing that which he was urged to preach by his conscience, even though he was mistaken. In so doing, however, he violates his own conscience; for it is a false and reprehensible love affair and humanity, and contrary to the true love of one's neighbor, that the Lutheran preacher thereby puts the Presbyterian preacher in a tempting position, either to preach unfaithfully to the confession of his church, or to annoy the Lutheran congregation by its teaching.

No less does the Lutheran preacher, by offering the pulpit in this manner, violate his conscience, because, as already indicated above, he actually declares himself in favor of the Union and against the confession of his own church, even though he speaks out against it and in favor of it. For by such a course of action he irrefutably indicates that the erroneous doctrine of the Presbyterians is not much to him, that both churches, which is not true, are in agreement in the most important main and fundamental doctrines, and that this agreement far outweighs the previous disagreement in other less important doctrines, that it is time that the old quarrels were put away by a loving rapprochement and by "the spirit of moderation and gentleness," and so on.

But such a Lutheran preacher proves that he does not believe the apostle who says that even "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. And that the Presbyterians do not speak of a little leaven has become quite evident from the above register. Such a preacher proves that every article of faith and sound doctrine does not adhere firmly to his conscience and live in his heart, and that he is not willing not only to put the love, favor, and friendship of all men on every doctrine of the holy Scriptures, and to draw their hatred, enmity, and persecution upon his neck, but also, if it were necessary, to risk property, life, and limb on it. Such a Lutheran preacher further proves that he is not in righteous, great, and holy earnestness about every single article of the confession of his church, which is founded on God's Word, and that he is also ready to give everything for it. And therefore there is little to be said for his recognition, however often repeated, of the church confession and its obligatory power on the whole; for he who does not take the individual articles, as, for example, the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, very seriously, and in consequence of this communicates, for example, Reformed people, as such, and makes a false distinction between the individual articles, on whose obedience to the whole confession, because everything is founded on God's clear word, one can hardly place a right trust. Such a Lutheran preacher finally proves that he does not bear in his heart a holy hatred against the devilish deception of the so-called ecclesiastical union between the Lutherans and the Reformed. For even though there may still be many truly faithful Christians in this gauze bag out of ignorance, this union is nevertheless of the devil. And he has nothing else in mind than to blunt the conscience of the Lutherans for unity and purity of doctrine more and more under the pretence and behind the figurehead of love, and to produce a prevailing indifference to doctrine, in order then either to win the deceived and seduced for his papal church or to sink them into the mire of unbelief. Accordingly, every

righteous Lutherans, whether they are teachers or hearers, should wholeheartedly hate this union, which is contrary to Scripture, false and deceptive, sometimes cunning, sometimes violent, just as they hate the papacy and the devil himself; And especially every minister of the Lutheran Church, who knows what he is and ought to be, should avoid even the appearance of being secretly inclined to this Union, even in this or that ecclesiastical way, or of being indifferent to it and not hating it from the bottom of his heart. This evil appearance, however, is undeniably given by a Lutheran preacher who gives his pulpit to a Presbyterian preacher, even for one sermon.

Third, this behavior of his is a sin against the love of one's neighbor in three ways, despite the appearance of the opposite. First, against his own congregation, for it wants to be a Lutheran congregation and has called ibn only to hear the pure Lutheran doctrine from his mouth in each of his sermons, based on the divine word and in accordance with the confession of their church. Who, then, gives him the right, out of some misanthropy and false lovingkindness, to have the teacher of a false-believing church preach to his congregation instead of him? For even if the latter abstained from deliberately letting the leaven of his false doctrine flow into it, this would not make the wrong right. But he also sinned against the love of his congregation by, on the one hand, angering and weakening the confidence of those in his faithfulness to the confession who have a more accurate knowledge of Lutheran doctrine and rightly hate both false doctrine and the charade of union, and, on the other hand, strengthening the weakly discerning, pietistically-minded members of the congregation, who, as such, are more inclined to union, in this pernicious inclination.

On the other hand, the Lutheran preacher sins against the love of his neighbor with regard to his orthodox brethren and their congregations. How can they still have confidence in his confessional integrity and be sure that he will continue the good fight of faith for the pure evangelical doctrine of their church and against the false doctrine of the Presbyterians and other unbelieving communities, as well as against the shameful union with them as one man?

Third, the Lutheran preacher, in such conceding of his preaching chair, again sins the love of his neighbor in regard to this presbyterian: preacher himself. For partly he brings him into that objective position of which the above has already been said; partly he also encourages him in the unionist delusion that there is no considerable difference between the doctrine of the Lutheran and that of his church, and thereby also fosters in him the inclination to the great factual lie of the present-day union; partly he thereby actually deprives him of punishing love, in order to convert him, where possible, from your error to the truth; partly, if the latter is really the preacher of the Lutheran church, he also deprives him of the love of his church, in order to convert him, where possible, from his error to the truth.

If the man in question were inclined to the pure evangelical, that is, Lutheran doctrine, he weakened him precisely by this conduct of his, in the earnest striving to become certain of the matter by researching the holy Scriptures, and by diligently calling upon the Holy Spirit for enlightenment through his word, to become certain of the matter and, after thorough conviction in his conscience of the sole purity of the Lutheran doctrine, then to raise the testimony of truth against the heresies of his church and to command it to God, what effect this testimony of his will have, whether he will win these and those of his hitherto erring brethren for the truth, or whether they will harden themselves against it in their heresies and cast him out.

Fort Wayne, in March, 1870. W. Sihler.

Recension.

We hereby communicate the following interesting review by Lic. Ströbel from the 2nd issue of the Guericke'sche Zeitschrift of 1870:

Lic. Dr. Ed. Preuß (now Lutheran Prof. of Theology in St. Louis), Die Rechtfertigung des Sünders vor Gott. Presented from the Holy Scriptures. Berlin (Schlawitz) 1868. XII and 205 p. gr. 8. 1 Thlr.

A masterly work which may stand on a par with the best what has been written about the subject in old and new times. But the author has also taken precautions right from the start to ensure the success of his work. He has not, as modern travellers do, merely consulted his own genius as to route and destination, but has joined the most knowledgeable and reliable travelling party. His procedure is simply this. Before he utters any dogmatic assertion, he first inquires in the most exact manner what is said about it a) in the basic text (critically ascertained and understood according to the scriptural analogy, according to the most proven exegetes) of both A., as well as the N. T.'s; b) by the German Reformers, especially by Luther; c) in the Lutheran confessional writings, not only in the symbols of the "Christian Book of Concord", but also in the Corpus doctrinae Julium, in the "Confession Book" of Duke Ulrich of Mecklenburg, in the Repetitio corporis doctrinae ecclesiasticae, in the visitation articles of 1592, in the Examen ordinandorum, in the Consensus repetitus fidei vere Lutheranae, and so on. a.) by the most renowned faithful Lutheran dogmatists: Balduin, Mentzer, Brochmand, Burk, Calov, Carpzov, Chemnitz, Cundisius, Feustking, Flacius, F. H. R. Frank, Fresenius, Gerhard, Hollaz, Höpfner, Hülsemann, Aeg. Hunnius, Löscher, Lütkens, Lyser, Osiander, Philippi, Quenstedt, Scherzer, Seb. Schmid, also Spener and many others;

e) from the Fathers of the Church, Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Irenaeus, Origen, Eusebius, Augustine, Theophylact, etc. Only after he has allowed himself to be instructed by these masters does our author proceed to answer dogmatic questions, to solve intricate knots, to refute opposing objections and hypotheses. Now, whoever proceeds according to this method can never go astray, for he would have to imagine himself superior to all those authorities in a mad arrogance of wisdom, - which is not remotely the case with Dr. Preuß, in spite of his excellent intellectual talent, his not everyday scientific efficiency, and especially his eminent knowledge. He is and remains a modest, grateful student, and by his undemanding thoroughness does full honor to the incomparable school which formed him. - The main content of the book is indicated by the headings of the individual sections: 1) (after "Preface" and characteristic "Introduction") the doctrine "of salvation"; 2) "imputation"; 3) "of faith"; 4) "the means of grace"; 5) "full forgiveness"; 6) "constant forgiveness"; 7) "certain grace"; 8) "the marks of justification"; 9) "good works"; finally 10) "justification and sanctification". Hengstenberg's well-known statements (in the Evang. Kirchenz.) concerning the stages of justification and the views connected with them unmistakably gave the impulse to write the book, which then also spreads a most thankful light over these and related contemporary questions and opinions. However, the author has by no means limited himself to the immediate occasion; he treats the highly important subject completely and in depth, namely also with reference to the relevant errors of Tertullian, Bellarmin, Calvin, F. Socin's (Rakau Catechism), Perrone's, Martensen's, de Wette's, etc. In general, the doctrine of justification is so brightly illuminated on all sides that hardly any of the questions here, least of all those now being discussed, would have remained without consideration. The abundant excerpts from sources, which constantly run alongside the simple quotations, are especially worthy of thanks - as it were, living voices from all peoples and times of evangelical truth as well as of unevangelical error. An index of the "explained biblical passages" and an "index of facts and names" facilitate the use of this delicious book (dedicated to the Imperial Count and the Imperial Countess Bentinck), - which will probably not have to wait long for a second edition. "But, but! May a book by Preuß, say von Preuß, be recommended even now?" Answer: That goes without saying, for three simple reasons. Namely, 1) we do not write testimonia morum for the authors, but advertisements of their books, and for this task we know no other standards than 1 Thess. 5, 21. and Jas. 2, 9. Then 2) Dr. Preuß, when he was still called "Docent at the University and Senior Teacher at the Friedrich-Wilhelms-Gymnasium in Berlin," belonged just so

As his condemnation of the Union, so not of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. All the less do we have a right to judge his acta and facta. The personal details of this man, who is a stranger to our faith, are of absolutely no concern to us. And 3) as far as the main matter is concerned, we have been told by equally credible and well-informed men, jurists as well as theologians, that, for the sake of truth, we can only testify that there is "no trace of facts" against Dr. Preuß; he has merely fallen victim to a party intrigue that has been going on for years. When this was explained to us in more detail, we felt for the first time in our lives a beginning of reverence for the Roman Jesuits and Inquisitors, who, as is well known, never presume any cognition over the Internacordis. They must therefore stand very high above their nihilistic guild mates. What a tragicomic fate! A seculum whose ruling planet is called Epicurus,-an era of orgies and bacchanalia,-a time when the birds sing on the roofs: "nothing sacred is any more, all bonds of pious timidity are loosened; the good gives way to evil, and all vices reign free", gets all at once the raptus moralis, cuts for a whole five minutes one of the rigoristic grimaces which even Zeno did not tolerate in his Stoa, and holds court over hidden thoughts which hitherto belonged exclusively before the heart's annunciator's tribunal. O Democritus and Heraclitus! Is it true? It is said that the saints of the modern worldview wanted to make the moral trial of that heavenly sinner who made the hypocritical confession of Rom. 7:7-25 after the fact. That would truly be the most terrible blow against the "muckrakers" if one of their most distinguished were to be "unmasked" by the spotless virtue heroes of the 19th century, stripped of his almost 2000 years of glory and "morally destroyed. Then, infallibly, the turn would come to us poor thieves as well. Horrible! Call the wealthy old president of the strict kidney researcher court to intercede for you. Saint Simon Pharisee, pray for the poor sinner of Tarsen! pray especially for the immoral (Joh. 8, 7.) and impudent (Matth. 23, 23. 24.) Nazarene! (Str.)

Request to the "Lutheran".

In the "Lutheran" of Jan. 20, we found an article (we assume from the pen of Dr. Seiß) which set forth the principles according to which pulpit fellowship is practiced in the General Council. We were pleased and praised to see in this article at last, honestly, without any dodges and unequivocally, the concession that in the General Council it is, however, considered right.

The Lutheran Church has been willing to open the Lutheran pulpits to non-Lutherans, subject to certain restrictions. In response to our criticism of this position, an anti-critique has now appeared in the "Lutheran" of March 3, which again shrouds in fog the explanations given, which according to our presupposition are clear. Since we are not willing to enter into a mock battle with an opponent, we take the liberty of asking the writer of the articles of January 20 and March 3, before we reply once again, to answer the following two dialogical questions with yes or no:

1. Are the non-Lutherans to whom the Lutheran pulpits are to be opened under all circumstances meant only those who agree with the Lutheran Church even in all the so-called doctrines of distinction, who therefore, in order to be true Lutherans in the ordinary sense, lack nothing but the name and outward affiliation with our Lutheran Church?

2. Are these only those meant who, though they themselves are orthodox, yet preachers of unbelieving communities, stand in them as witnesses of the truth, and therefore take a public stand against the errors of the same?

A round answer to these questions will enable not only us, but also others who take an interest, to make a safe and just judgment as to the practice which is considered by the General Council to be the only just one in regard to pulpit fellowship. A refusal of a round answer, not expected by us, would, of course, be a sufficiently clear answer to us. W.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Usury. A Chicago political paper reports that the "Workingmen's League of New England" has recently drawn up a program, the first sentence of which reads as follows: "Taking interest in all its forms: Interest, dividend, annuity, profit, etc., is in all cases unlawful, sinful, unchristian, immoral, and must soon be abolished." The second proposition is, "There is no right to property except that created by labor or free gift. All other forms of property are legally and morally untenable." The "Workers' Union" of New York pronounces on this program that it is "suffused with the true spirit of the nineteenth century and contains world-shaking ideas." The truth, however, is that this program throws out the baby with the bathwater, that it does indeed contain "world-shaking" ideas, but at the same time ideas that overthrow the world and only increase the already prevailing confusion with regard to the principles of justice. True as it is that, in the case of an alleged loan contract, the stipulation of interest apart from the restitution of the capital, whereby the debtor must contractually assume the risk of the loss of capital and interest alone, and the creditor contractually stipulates nothing but profit, is an unequal and therefore unjust contract, in a word usury, it is nonsensical to consider any kind of "interest," any "dividend" from a transaction in which the debtor is not entitled to the return of the capital, as usury.

which all share-holders unite in bearing profit and loss, to declare every "rent," every "profit," etc., to be "inadmissible, sinful, unchristian, immoral. It has, of course, always been thus: when the haves in power had long enough oppressed and sucked dry the defenseless workers, the latter at last not only demanded justice, but reversed the matter and repaid like with like. It is therefore not without reason to fear that, if the "usury" of the capitalists continues as before, the end will be a socialist revolution, which will reclaim the interest paid up to now just as terribly as it will reclaim it abundantly. W.

Unionist Toleration. The Evangelist reports that Spurgeon, who was invited to the Ev. Alliance meeting in New York, would not come, not only because his health would not permit it, but also because the secretary of the Alliance privately asked him to decline, since he (Spurgeon) had preached a sermon on Baptismal Regeneration. - This doctrine, then, is such a grievous discord that it would break up the harmony of the alliance. Very comforting to us Lutherans; for according to this we shall not be missed in the assembly of the Alliance, although it desires to be as complete a representation as possible of the evangelical elements of Christendom. W.

The Roman Catholic bishops of America are often mentioned in the newspapers as those who, out of the Roman Council, also leaned towards the so-called liberal direction. It is probably not without reason to doubt the truth of this report and to attribute it more to the intention to maintain the popularity of these bishops in America as much as they have. At the Provincial Synod at least, which the bishops here held at Baltimore in 1866, they already decreed: "Idcirco divina eloquia eo plane sensu sunt accipienda, quae (quem?) tenuit ac tenet haec romana cathedra," i.e.: "Therefore the divine sayings are by all means to be accepted in the sense which this Roman See has held and holds." So much may be true that some American bishops are not exactly willing to help build the Pabsttrohn on the ruins of their episcopal chairs,

W.

Otherwise and now in the Lutheran Church of the South. The "Lutheran Visitor" writes about this in its issue of February 23: "The gospel was not (formerly) preached in its purity in many a church that called itself Lutheran; the sacraments were not administered according to the divine word. There was also a lack of means by which our English-speaking people could gain a correct knowledge of their church. The catechism had been laid aside; the most unlearned preachers thought themselves wiser, better, and greater men than Luther and Melanchton; the confession was never thought of; it had, it was said, done its work, and every pastor made his own confession, every church member his own faith, and the people joined the church which was the most convenient to them, or the most influential, or which most corresponded to the image of the church of Christ which they had made for themselves in their ignorance, pride, and self-deception. But, thank God, things have now changed among us. The catechism is used; the confession is studied; the church returns to its first love; it becomes again truly Lutheran, not only in name, but in word and deed, in doctrine and practice, in faith and works. This the Lord has done, and it is a wonder before our eyes. What a great and glorious change has taken place among us since the last twenty-five years." -C.

"Anathema sit." With these words the sentences in which the teachings of those of other faiths are rejected are usually concluded in the Roman Church. Recently again 21 such sentences have been published, which have been submitted to the Roman Concilium for solemn condemnation, all of which conclude with the words, "Anathema sit!" Now since these words have been quite correctly translated by many as: "Let him be accursed!" so many have been appalled that the Roman Church should throw curses about so horribly. Even many Catholics have become afraid that this will take away much of the popularity of the Roman Church. Even the "Catholic Messenger of the Faith" of Louisville declares that "the ecclesiastical formula Anathema sit! must not be translated as 'let him be accursed'; whoever so translates 'let him be accursedly stupid.'" But the "Catholic Church Newspaper" in New York of March 17 chastises the "Messenger of Faith" about this. It writes: "But we must firmly contradict this opinion. By anathema, according to biblical usage, is meant separation from God, and he who is separated from God is accursed. The apostles already teach this, and if St. Paul had written in German, he would certainly have translated the word anathema which he uses as - let him be accursed!" One sees from this again what a great difference there is between those who are born in the Roman Church and those who have fallen away to it. The latter are still ashamed to curse everything that in some respect does not agree with the pope, but the apostates have taken off all shame. W.

Public State Schools. It is reported in the "Lutheran Magazine" that only a few years ago the Presbyterians of the old school were in favor of the establishment of parochial schools in place of the public state schools: now, since the union of the same with the Presbyterians of the new school, they support and defend the state schools as an essential support of our republican form of government. Strange! To be sure, public state schools, in which no particular religious instruction is given, are necessary for the republic, and every good citizen has to provide for them as much as he can; but these state schools are not for Christians, but for un-Christians, who would otherwise send their children to no school at all. For Christian congregations, however, it is a disgrace if they do not establish congregational schools for their children, in which they are instructed in God's Word; it is a disgrace if, out of avarice and religious indifference, they consider themselves to have been relieved by the state schools of the trouble and care of establishing schools themselves, and of the costs connected therewith. W.

II. Abroad.

The following Canones de ecclesia. are submitted to the Concil:

Canon 1 If anyone says that the religion of Christ does not exist and is not expressed in any particular community founded by Christ himself, but that it can be properly held and practiced by individuals on their own, without regard to any community which is Christ's true church, let him be accursed.

Canon 2: If anyone says that the Church has not received from Christ a definite and unchangeable constitutional form, but that, just like other communities of men, it has been or can be subject to changes and transformations according to the diversity of the times, he is accursed.

Canon 3: If anyone says that the church of the divine promises is not an outward and visible community, but a thoroughly inward and invisible one, let him be accursed.

Canon 4: One of these says that the true Church is not a unified body in itself, but is made up of various and scattered communities of Christian name.

and be poured out upon them; or: the different communities, differing from each other in their creeds, and separated from the union, form, as it were, as members or parts, the one and general church of Christ - let him be accursed.

Canon 5: If anyone says that the Church of Christ is not a community that is absolutely necessary for the attainment of eternal salvation, or that people can be saved through the practice of any religion, let him be accursed.

Canon 7: If anyone says that this same Church of Christ can sink into darkness or be infected by abuses by which it strays from the saving truth of faith and morals, deviates from its original institution, or finally ceases to be degenerate and corrupt, let him be accursed.

Canon 8: If any man say that the present church of Christ is not the last and highest institution for the attainment of blessedness, but that another is to be expected by a new and fuller outpouring of the Holy Spirit, let him be accursed.

Canon 13: If anyone says that the true Church of Christ, outside of which no one can be saved, is other than the one holy Catholic and Roman Apostolic Church, let him be accursed.

Canon 14: If anyone says that the holy apostle Peter was not appointed by the Lord Christ as the first of all the apostles and as the visible head of the whole contending Church, or that he received only the primacy of honour, but not the primacy of true and proper authority, let him be accursed.

Canon 15: If anyone says that it is not according to the Lord Christ's own appointment that St. Peter should have permanent successors in the primacy over the whole Church, or that the Roman Pontiff is not by divine right the successor of Peter in this same primacy, let him be accursed.

Canon 16: If anyone says that the Roman Pontiff has only the office of supervision or direction, but not the full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church, or that this power of his is not a regular and immediate one over all and any Churches, let him be accursed.

Canon 17: If anyone says that an independent ecclesiastical power, as according to the doctrine of the Catholic Church it was given by Christ, and a supreme civil power cannot coexist in the world so that the rights of both are preserved, let him be accursed.

Canon 18: If any man say that the power which is necessary for the government of the civil state is not of God, or that we owe it no submission according to God's own law, or that the same is contrary to the natural liberty of man, let him be accursed.

Canon 19: If anyone says that all rights between men are derived from the political state, or that there is no authority except that which is given by the political state, he curses his own.

Canon 20: If anyone says that in the law of the political state or in the public opinion of men is the supreme norm of conscience for public and social acts, or that the pronouncements of the Church do not extend to these acts, by which she pronounces what is lawful and what is unlawful, or that something is permitted by civil law which is unlawful by divine or ecclesiastical law, let him be accursed.

Canon 21: If anyone says that the laws of the Church have no binding force except in so far as they are confirmed by the sanction of the civil power, or that this civil power, by virtue of its supreme authority, is entitled to give judgment and decision in matters of religion, let him be accursed.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 16. May 1870. No. 5.

Materials on Pastoral Theology,

communicated by C. F. W. W.

(Continued.)

§ 42.

Only those who are still alive and sane, 2. who call themselves a brother (sister) or want to be called so (1 Cor. 5, 11.), 3. a communicating member of the church (1 Cor. 5, 13.), 4. only those who have committed an obvious, grievous sin (1 Cor. 5, 11.). (1 Cor. 5, 13.), 4. only he who has committed a manifest, grievous sin against God's commandment (1 Cor. 5, 11.), or who harbors a basic error and is clearly convicted of it (Tit. 3, 10. 11. Rom. 16, 17. 2 Joh. 9-11.), 5. 5. in spite of all admonition and punishment has hardened and hardened himself in his sin or in his error and thus has become evident as an incorrigible unchristian (Match. 18, 17. Tit. 3, 10. 11.), finally 6. whom the church (or its appointed representatives) has unanimously declared worthy of the ban or "under ban" (1 Cor. 5, 1-5. Match. 18, 17.). Therefore the ban cannot be enforced 1. on already dead and insane persons (madmen, idiots, physically possessed etc.), as well as on children (Ephes. 6, 4. Deut. 21, 18-21.), 2. who are not members of the church (1 Cor. 5, 13.), 3. who, not wanting to be brothers anymore, leave the church themselves and thus, depending on the circumstances, put themselves under ban (1 Joh. 2, 19.), 4. whose sin or error is not obvious or not so obvious that it can be clearly shown to them and the church (Joh. 13, 21. ff. Tit. 3, 10. 11.), 5. whose sin or error only belongs to the human frailty and weakness even of a Christian (Gal. 6, 2. Jak. 3, 2.), 6. whose sin is not a transgression of divine law (Gal. 6, 2.), 6. whose sin is not a transgression of divine law (Gal. 6, 3.), 6. whose sin is not a transgression of divine law (Gal. 6, 3.), 6. whose sin is not a transgression of divine law (Gal. 6, 3.), 6.

(Rom. 14, 1. ff.), 7. who have not yet been fruitlessly convicted of their error or sin, admonished and punished according to the divine order, and have not yet been revealed as stiff-necked and incorrigible false spirits or sinners (Matth. 18, 15-17. 2 Thess. 3, 14. 15. Tit. 3, 10. 11.), 8. about whose ban worthiness the church cannot agree (1 Cor. 5, 13.), finally 9. not at whole churches (Gal. 1,2.comp.5,4. 2Sam. 15, 11.),

Note 1.

To the question, "Who is conscientiously subject to church discipline?" Dannhauer answers, "1. who is called a brother, (1 Cor. 5:11.) 2. who is powerful of his understanding; 3. who is a member of the visible church; 4. who is still alive; 5. who is an impenitent sinner. But the man himself who has sinned, without it extending to his posterity (Ezek. 18:4.). The brother, not the brotherhood, not a whole congregation of brothers; as to the last head of church discipline, namely, the ban. For this would not only be to cast a fellowship out of fellowship, which is impossible, but also to weed out the wheat with the tares, since there is no visible particular church in which the invisible is not hidden. But 1. every brother, the highest as well as the lowest, for it is said, Whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained unto them, Joh. 20:23; and, If any man be called a brother, 1 Cor. 5:11. To those who only attack the doves with church discipline, but dare not touch the eagles, fits what J. Valentin Andreae wrote in his book, "The Church of the Holy Ghost. Valentin Andreae wrote in his Apologus, p. 146. To this, therefore, belongs also the bishop and superior of the church, also the patriarch, also the pope, also the king, and every one else who is the highest in a Christian republic. (2) A brother who has the power of his mind, but a madman or a man possessed by the flesh is not the subject of this key, because he does not do what he does of his own accord, but is driven by his black guest. (3) A brother who is a member of the visible church, whether he be already excluded from the invisible, is a Christian from the baptismal covenant in root, though not from the true faith in essence. On the other hand, this key does not apply to one who has become a member of an alien community, e. g. a declared apostate and enemy, a convicted heretic, an incurable sinner in the Holy Spirit; such a sinner, if he has gone out from us, both in mind and in place, is no longer a brother, and for this very reason, because he has gone out from us and is in the enemy's country, he is no longer a brother.

is no longer capable of being excommunicated by us ecclesiastically, but is to be shunned, Titus 3:10, not to be tolerated, and is to be considered an enemy and treated as such. Therefore,' says Jerome to Titus 3:10, 'a heretic is called one who has condemned himself, because a fornicator, an adulterer, a murderer, and other vices are driven out of the church by the priests, but the heretics themselves pass judgment on themselves by departing from the church of their own free will,' which departing seems to be the condemnation of their own conscience. It is different with a schismatic who is 'spenstlich' (as Luther speaks), who is still within the bounds of the church. I have spoken of the heretic after he has gone out from us, for before he goes out he is to be admonished (Tit. 3:11.) and punished. 4. A brother who is still alive. Both keys extend equally; as absolution does not actually take place in the case of one who has died, so neither does excommunication. Nor are those who have died in sin to be condemned unadvisedly, since what divine grace wrought in them in the last struggle and breath cannot be known to us. It was enough for Petro to have said of Judas: He went to his place. 5, A brother that is an impenitent sinner, going behind, stiff-necked. I say, a sinner. As there is no law given to the innocent and righteous, so there is no discipline. In fact, Christ and his apostles were subject to curses, but not so in law. I say, an impenitent, that is, one who has been convicted of the sins mentioned just before, 1 Cor. 5:11. Here belong those who are disgraced by shameful things, or who have no honest name, who do not want to know about repentance, bawds, public whores, comedians, murderous fighters, who make a trade out of such sins. To these must be added the unforgiving, who are aflame with unquenchable flames of anger and hatred (Matt. 5:23, 24), as well as those who do not want to be punished, who, as Avianus says, "do not let a humble word come out of their mouths, and begin to quarrel with the priest in confession as if they had sat down with him on the ale-bench. They do not come to confession because they are hungry and thirsty for the holy absolution and the body and blood of the Lord Christ, but only want to try the priest to see if he will also repel them from confession, as they call it in a hostile manner, so that they may afterwards make a complaint to the authorities; which their ungodly sense must therefore be noted, because they do not otherwise press for the confessional, but now, in the disagreement that has arisen, they do. Then I consider it right not to communicate absolution to them until they come to terms with their pastor.'" (Liber conscientiae. I, 1127-38.) Compare the testimony from the Schmalk. Articles and Luther's above § 40. note 2.

Note 2.

To the question, "What sins are subject to church discipline?" Dannhauer answers, "In general, sins 'against thee,' that is, either against thee, in that they offend thee by some wrong, which, if it be more trifling than the dispute about the first rank in the apostolic college, Matth. 18:1, and every other dissension among individuals, friends, members of families, husbands, colleagues, neighbours, &c.' belongs to general and extra-judicial punishment; or before thee, publicly before thine eyes, before thine ears, whereby thou mightest be either provoked or seduced to evil. Thus sins which break out, and do not remain inwardly, fall to this rod, which are referable, which may be punished, by conscience notorious, vexatious, and contagious sins, committed with impunity, Deut. 27:15, which either go unpunished in the secular court, such as was the Corinthian incest, in the punishment of which the authorities did not discharge their office, or which are only outwardly and superficially, not inwardly and in the bottom of the conscience affected. If there is a lack of such notorious and public reproof, censure has as little place as in the case of the traitor Judas, when he had not yet been revealed, who was still admitted to the last sacrament. The Schmalkaldic Articles expressly say, Nota crimina, so lying in public vices, pag. 352." Hereupon Dannhauer asks, "How then, if a careless disciplinarian lacks not the right, but the proof; if he were quite certain in his conscience that a certain person had committed adultery, nay, if he himself had caught him in the act of theft, but there were no witnesses, but the latter brought an action of iniquity against the censor, and moreover demanded recantation, apology, and either a fine or a corporal punishment?"He answers: "A witness is not a witness, Num. 35, 30. Therefore the punisher (according to Hülsemann on punishment, p. 315) is obliged, according to the judge's verdict, not only to suffer the undeserved punishments, but also to purchase the recantation and the apology, which he is not allowed to make against his conscience, by any fines imposed. For sin, which is a lie, and the retraction of a word or work that is done, is not lawful for the sake of any temporal evil that can be avoided. 1 Pet. 3, 15-17. 4, 15." Dannhauer continues, "Especially sins which are either expressly mentioned in God's Word as subject to discipline, as not suffering the private punishment and rejecting it Matth. 18, 17., which is to be esteemed equal to a grosser crime, if the person also esteems the auctority of the church to be nothing, disorderly being (ἀταξία), disunion, and arousal apart from doctrine; or such as, though not named as such, are included among them for the sake of equal validity (implicita per aequivalentiam). For it is the

It is the custom of the divine law to indicate in the noblest kind of action what is to be observed in other things, but with due regard for moderation. 1. ungodliness, dog-like and acid contempt of the word, and neglect of the sacraments, of such men as either bark at the pearl, and bite at him that giveth it them, as dogs do, or tread it down, as swine do, Matt. 7:6, 2 Pet. 2:21.For they attack their benefactor like the Molossian dogs attack Actaeon" (who, according to mythology, was turned into a deer because he had seen Diana in the bath), "Herod, Porphyrius, Julianus, Hymenaeus, Alexander, 1 Tim. 1,20. 2 Tim. 4, 14. or who desire nothing but acorns to fatten themselves with, seek nothing but dung to roll and sleep in, and so die in filth. When such contempt turns into stubbornness, it deserves to be cut off from the people of God. (Gen. 17:14) Heresy, when it has not yet completely fled from outward fellowship, has not yet grown to the utmost hardening, but is covered over with delusion, as if its opinion, or that of the opposing saints, were not contrary to the foundation of faith; with which opinion Meletius, bishop of Thebais, first discovered and refuted the errors of Arius to Peter of Alexandria, but did not want to exclude him. If one has hardened himself in such an opinion and has not given any sign of congenial displeasure, he is liable to church discipline. Neither can the Nicodemists, the hypocrites, or the libelists escape this discipline, who nowadays, under the papacy, use money to get rid of the necessity of confession by taking a security bribe. 3. sorcery, superstition, vain observation. Hence Aquila, formerly a Jewish proselyte, then a Christian and Bible expositor, was expelled from the church because of his persistent devotion to stargazing. (4) Syncretism, whether it be in communion with heresy (which syncretism the Council of Laodicaea delivers to the ban: that one should not pray with heretics or schismatics, see canons 32 and 33. To hate such Shechemian Samaritans, Syrach 50:28 confesses.(That is, as Mathesius declares, he pronounces and proclaims them herewith in the ban); or if he exist in civil-marital union, by virtue of which a Christian mingles with a Jewish, Turkish, heathen woman. *) Tertullian, in his epistle ad uxorem, says that these also are to be kept away from all fellowship of the brotherhood, according to the apostle's epistle, saying, With such a one neither shall ye eat. 5. blasphemy, perjury, desecration of the Sabbath. 6. obstinate rebellion against the threefold hierarchy, viz.

*) This case might have been so annoying only in former times under other circumstances that it subjected to the church discipline up to the ban.

against parents, against lords and wives, and rebellion against authority; whore-dealing, robbing people by secret betrothal, irreconcilable enmity, especially between husbands and wives, divorce without just cause, duelling, gnawing usury, unjustly avaricious and filthy avarice, a biting tongue, making a pasquill and spreading it, unnatural lustfulness, adultery, incest, known sodomitism, feasting Luc. 15, 13., desolate disorderly being 1 Pet. 4, 4. the mother of drunkenness, the grandmother of corruption; and therefore all the hardening, delusion, spiritual possession of Satan." (Op. cit. pp. 1122-26.)

(To be continued.)

The Communion under both gestures.

Wouldn't the most holy Vatican Synod also like to show some consideration for us Bushmen? - After all, we are Christians! The Basel Council also had the kindness to consider the wishes of the poor Hussites. And - let us just say it at once - we have a proposal quite similar to that of the Bohemians in the days of Eugene. -

For should it not be expedient, instead of the dogma of infallibility, rather to discuss anew the question of Communion under both forms?

It is not as if we were unacquainted with the very sensible reasoning by which the scholastics tried to prove that those who were deprived of the cup also received the blood of Christ. For even if this were so, it does not in the least follow that we may deprive the greater part of Christendom of the communion wine intended for them. Or do we baptize without water, because the Holy Spirit is also present under the word? Certainly not! But though it be one Holy Ghost, which we receive with the word and with the water, yet both must be done: the speaking of the word, and the sprinkling of water. And that for no less a reason than because Christ so commanded. -

But we can by no means put up with this scholastic reasoning ourselves. Because Christ's body is not without blood, they say, even those who receive only the host receive the most holy blood. - For if this be so, we conclude further: "Since Christ's body is not without his blood, neither is it without his soul. But his soul is not without the Godhead. It follows further: that his Godhead is not without the Father and the Holy Spirit. From this it follows that in the sacrament, even under one form, the soul of Christ and the holy trinity are both present.

And it follows that, because the Godhead is not without the creature, heaven and earth must also be in the Sacrament. From this it follows that since the Godhead is not without the creature, heaven and earth must also be in the sacrament; from this it follows that the devils and hell are also in the sacrament; from this it follows that whoever eats the sacrament (even in one form) eats the bishop of Meissen with his mandate and his letter; from this it follows that the bishop of Meissen must have a greater body than heaven and earth: and who will tell all the consequences more and more? But last of all it follows that all such followers are fools, blind, mad, senseless, furious, foolish, and raving: this consequence is certain.')

It is therefore advisable to abstain from such conclusions, and to abide by the testament of Christ. For our Lord Jesus Christ, on the night that he was betrayed, took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat; this is my body. And when he had taken the cup, he gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it: for this is the blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.

This is Christ's testament! And we should change it? If a man's testament be proved, let it not be despised, neither let it be taken away. But a will is made firm by death.

Now would it not be disgraceful if Mr. Peabody had left a dollar to every orphan in America, and his executors wished to confine this gift to the orphans of Massachusets? - See this is how you act!

But, interjects Bellarmin, "Drink ye all of it," says Christ, not to all Christians, but to the apostles alone! - To the apostles alone? Now this is also true: "Receive and eat" to the apostles alone! Yea, the whole holy supper to the apostles only. For to those to whom He said, "Receive and eat," He also said, "Drink ye all of it. The Jesuit's objection, therefore, is a miserable excuse. Yes, if Christ had said: Take and eat! Take and drink! But henceforth divide only the bread! - But until a Bible manuscript is found in which it is thus written, let us confidently abide by the words of Christ, which are attested by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and St. Paul. -

And where would the holy sacrament be today if the words of institution had been for none but the apostles? For the body of St. John rests under the ruins of Ephesus, and that of St. James in the caves of Jerusalem. The testament of the Son of God would in that case be coffined and buried with them. - But I see you are not so ignorant! Let it be to the apostle-successors! - Now who are these apostle-successors? Are they the bishops? But it is

1) Luther von Walch, XIX. 1689. 1690.

then you are offending the priests! Or the priests? - Let it be the priests. But now get serious about this too! Give the priests the supper, and the laity the watching. Do you hear me? Watching. For Christ hath not ordained half a supper for any man. And yet you do otherwise. - So whether we understand by the successors of the apostles: the bishops or the priests or the laity, with the Roman practice we always come into conflict. Christ once ordered only one supper, and that was a whole one.

By the way, the Holy Spirit has also made sure that we are not in doubt as to who is entitled to partake of the evening meal after the death of the apostles. For St. Paul testifies that it is due to all his Corinthians. And that entirely, and under both. Form. He does not teach this as something new and strange; rather, he takes it for granted everywhere. As a clear sign that this was the right and original understanding of the testament of Christ. Thus he says in 1 Cor. 10:21, "Ye (Corinthians) cannot at the same time **drink the** cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils." He does not say, drink the blood of the Lord; for if he had said so, the Papists would immediately object: "Yea, the blood of the Lord is received, even he that receiveth the host. - But he says, drink the cup of the Lord. So the recipients of the letter - and these were the Corinthian Christians in general - also drank the cup. But an ordinary cup cannot be meant; for the apostle says, the cup of the Lord. See, the Holy Spirit has walled up all the gaps for you, through which you are otherwise so skilful to escape. There is nothing left for you but to admit that St. Paul taught the Corinthians both to drink the cup of the Lord and to eat the bread of the Lord. But if he taught it, then this and this alone is the right understanding and the right use of the words of institution. - Nor would it be of any use if you were to gnaw the passage just cited. For there are others. Thus the apostle says in the eleventh chapter of the same epistle, "As often as ye eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye shall proclaim the death of the Lord, until He come." This exhortation is not merely to the Corinthians who lived in the apostle's time. For none of them lived so long until the Lord came. But it is to the Corinthians of all ages. Paul's contemporaries and their latest descendants. Yes, to all Christians until the last judgment. For no one would be such an eccentric as to say that the Corinthians should do so, but the Galatians should not. By the same token it might be said, Only the Galatians ought to walk in the Spirit, and not the Corinthians. [Gal. 5:25]. - All Christians, then, are to proclaim the death of Christ until the last day. And that every time they eat of the blessed bread, and drink of the blessed cup. So they must nevertheless until the last day speak of the

See how little regard St. Paul had for the decrees of the general synod at Kostnitz! Is it really so great a crime that we should rather keep the apostle's company than the Kostnitzes'? that we should do as the Scripture wills? that we should always do all three things: eat the body of Christ, drink the blood of Christ, and proclaim the death of Christ; until the Son of man comes on the clouds of heaven?

And after St. Paul had told his Corinthians: that in eating the bread, and in drinking the cup, they should proclaim the death of Christ; he goes on to say, "Whosoever therefore eateth unworthily of this bread, or drinketh of the cup of the Lord, is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." He does not say, "Which apostle;" still less, "Which priest;" - but, "Who at all." And in the 28th verse, "Let man [that is, every one] examine himself, and so eat of this bread, and drink of this cup: for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, that he may not discern the body of the Lord." Man, i.e. every man, shall thus eat and drink. Every man should examine himself. For the apostle continues, "therefore (because) so many examine not themselves, eating unworthily the body of Christ, and drinking the blood of Christ^ therefore also are so many weak and sick among you, and a good part sleep." [1 Cor. XI, 30.]

But in the 12th chapter the apostle again declares, "As one body is, and yet hath many members; and all the members of one body, though they be many, yet are they one body: so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and are all made to drink into one Spirit." -

And as the apostles went before, so their disciples followed them. Writes St. Ignatius to the Philadelphians, "Be diligent to use a night-mark: for the flesh of our Lord JESUS Christ is one, and it is but one cup to the unity of his blood." 1) - And how faithfully the Christians obeyed the word of their Saviour and the example of the Apostles is shown by the second Apology of Justinus. For there the martyr describes to the Emperor Antoninus the Christian service: "After the conclusion of the prayer we greet one another with a kiss. Then the chief of the brethren is brought bread and a cup in which wine and water are mixed. As soon as he has received this, he gives praise to the Father of all things through the name of the Son and the Holy Spirit. In particular, he gives thanks that he has made us worthy of these gifts of his. After the conclusion of the prayer and the

1) *Σ-πουδάζετε οὖν μία. ευχαριστία χρησ^αι* μία γάρ σάρζ του κυρία ημών 'Ιησού Χρίστου, χαΙ §ν ποτη'ριον εις ένωσιν του αίματος αυτοῦ.* Epistola ad Philadelphenses cap. IV.

But in thanksgiving the whole congregation present affirms (everything) with one: Amen. Amen is a Hebrew word and means: yes, yes, it shall be done. ...(after that) the deacons, as they are called among us, give to **each of those present a** share in the blessed bread, and **in the wine** and water." 1) And this is how the whole Christian Church, both Western and Oriental, has kept it ever since. As for the Oriental Church, Basil testifies: "What is proper to a Christian? To purify himself from all defilement of the flesh and spirit, to accomplish sanctification in the fear of God and in the love of Christ, and to have no blemish, nor wrinkle, nor any such thing; but to be holy and undefiled, and so to eat the body of Christ and drink his blood." 2) And St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in his 4th Catechesis, calls out to the baptized elders (not priests) who came to Holy Communion, "Therefore let us partake of the Body and Blood of Christ with all confidence. For under the form of bread the body [of Christ] is given to you, and under the form of wine the blood [of Christ] is given to you." 3) And another time, "If therefore thou hast received the body of Christ, come also to the cup of his blood. But stretch not forth thy hands, but bow down, and say reverently and adoringly, Amen. And sanctify thyself, receiving also of the blood of Christ." 4) Yes, St. Chrysostom declared to his congregation, "There is no difference between the priest and those whom he presides over. Nor where the sacred mysteries are concerned. For we are all made worthy of them. Not as in the Old Testament, when something else was eaten by the priest, by those under him; when the people had no right to enjoy what the priest enjoyed. It is not so now [i. e. under the New Testament].

1) *Ευχαριστήσαντος δε του προεστώτος χα} ίπευφημήσαντος παντδς του λαοϋ, ο[χαλούμενοι ταρ ή μϊν διάχονοι, διδόασιν έχάστω των παρόντων μεταλαβειν άπδ του ευχαριστη- &.έντος αρτε χαι oev& χαι υδατος.* Justinus Apologia II. opera coloniae 1686. fol. Page 97 0. v. L.

2) χα} *ούτως έσδίειν τό σώμα του Χρίστου χα} πίνειν το αίμα.* Basil. Moral. Beg. 80. c. 18. Basil died in 378 A.D.

3) *ώστε μετά πόσης πληροφορίας ώς σώματος y. a} αίματος μετα- λαμβάνωμεν Χρίστου* & τΰπω γάρ άρτχ δίδοταί σοι τδ σώμα, χα\ Iv τόπω οϊνβ δίδοταί σοι τδ αίμα.* Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus. Cat. mystag. IV. St. Cyril died in the year 386.

4) μετά *τδ χοινωνησαί σε του σώματος Χρίστου, προσέρχα χολ τίρ ποτηρίω του αίματος, μη άνατείνων τάς χέϊρας,* αλλά χΰπτων*, χαί τρόπω προσχυνήσεως χα} σεβάσματος λίγων τδ Άμην. άγιάζα χα} ίχ του αίματος μεταλαμβάνων Χρίστου.* Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus Catech. mystag. V.

But to all is given one and the same body, **one and the same cup.**" 1)

But as to the Occident, Cyprianus writes: "How do we teach or how do we exhort [Christians] to shed their blood in the confession of the name (of JESUS), if, while they are about to go to battle, we refuse them the blood of Christ? Or how do we make them fit to drink the martyr's cup, if we do not first admit them to drink the cup of the LORD in the church by virtue of the right of communion?" 2)

Therefore also the emperor Theodosius required the holy supper under both forms. And Ambrose refused him, not because he was not a priest; but because the blood of the men of Thessalonica was on his hands. "How wilt thou - he cried to the Emperor at the threshold of the Cathedral of Milan - how wilt thou stretch forth thy hands still dripping with the blood of the unjustly slain? How wilt thou receive the most holy body of the Lord with such hands? How wilt thou bring the precious blood to thy **mouth,** since by thy angry word thou hast shed so much blood contrary to the laws!" 3)

St. Augustine speaks no less plainly. "What then, says he, of those who had applied to be received into the Church, what then is the whole time during which they have the place and name of catechumens; what is its object but this: that they may hear what the faith of the Christian is, and what his life ought to be; that, when they have examined themselves, they may thus eat of the table of the Lord, and drink of his cup." 4)

1) *ὁμοίως γάρ πάντες ἀξιούμε& α των αυτών, ου χαόάπερ ίπΊ της πα- λαιάς τα μεν ύ lερείς ησ& ιε, τα δε ό άρχόμενος, χα} ΰ-δμις ουχ ην τω λαω μετέχειν, ών μετεϊχεν ό lερεός* άλΧ ου νυν, άλλα πάσιν £ν σώμα πρόχειται χολ* ΤΔ *ποτήριον ^ν.* Chrysostom, homilia XVIII. in post. ep. ad Corinthios. St. Chrysostom died in the year 407.

2) Nam quomodo docemus aut provocamus eos in confessione nominis sanguinem suum fundere, si eis militaturis Christi sanguinem denegamus? aut quomodo ad martyrii poculum idoneos facimus, si non eos prius ad bibendum in ecclesia poculum Domini jure communionis admittimus ? Cyprianus, Epist. 54 ad Cornelium Romanum Ep. de admittendis lapsis ad communionem.

3) πως *δε τάς χεΊρας έχτενεϊς άποσταζούσας ετι του άδίχβ (ρόνα τδ αίμα-, πως δε τοιαΰταις ύποδδςη χερσι του δεσπότη τδ πανάγιον σώμα- πώς δε τίρ στόματι προσοίσεις τδ αίμα τδ τίμιον, τοσοΰτον διά τδν του ΰ-υμου λόγον Ιχχέας παρανόμως α\μα-ί* Theodoretus, Historia ecclesiastica lib. V. c. 18.

4) Quid autem aliud agit totum tempus, quo catechumenorum locum et nomen tenent, nisi ut audiant, quae fides et qualis vita debeat esse Christiani; ut, quum se ipsos probaverint, tunc de mensa Domini manducent et de calicebibant. Augustinus, De fide et operibus ca. 9.

Even the old Roman bishops were faithful to the Scriptures. Thus canon law has Bishop Julius of Rome say 1): There were people who gave the common bread dipped in wine instead of the bread and the cup. 2) But this is not to be approved, for it is contrary to the Gospel, in which Christ gave his body and blood to the apostles. The gift of the bread is mentioned separately, and that of the cup separately. 3) But if Pope Julius the First did not tolerate such a relatively insignificant change in the testament of Christ, what would he have said to a mutilation such as is common in his church today! But what do we debate about the "if" and the "dignity"? Do we not know what the Roman bishops said when the mutilation of the sacrament first knocked at the doors of the Church. "We have learned," writes Pope Gelasius to Bishops Majoricus and John, "that certain people take only of the Holy Body, but abstain from the chalice containing the Holy Blood. These people, because they are held captive by who knows what superstition, are to receive the sacraments either completely or not at all. For the certification of one and the same mystery cannot take place without great desecration of the sanctuary. 4)" - With this Gelasius means the Manichaeans (not the Kostnitzers), Bellarmin objects. Not the Kostnitzers, of course, but the people who mutilated the sacrament at that time! But does that do the least to the violence of those words? Is not the sentence: "The certification of one and the same mystery cannot take place without great desecration of the sanctuary" - quite general? Is it not for the sake of this proposition that all, that is to say, also the present mutilation of the sacraments, must be rejected as contrary to divinity? In particular, the defenders of papal infallibility should hold their peace here for a moment. Think of it: a pope declares here ex cathedra that the confession of one and the same mystery cannot take place without great desecration of the sanctuary or wickedness!

1) Decreti Pars III, Dist. II, c. 7.

2) Alios quoque intinctam eucharistiam populis pro complemento communionis porrigere. A. a. O.

3) Illud vero, quod pro complemento communionis intinctam tradunt eucharistiam populis, nec hoc prolatum ex evangelio testimonium recipit, ubi apostolis corpus suum et sanguinem commendavit. Seorsum enim panis, et seorsum calicis commendatio memoratur. loc. cit.

4) Decreti Pars III, Dist. II, ca. 12. Comperimus autem, quod quidam, sumta tantummodo corporis sacri portione, a calice sacri cruoris abstineant. Qui proculdubio (quoniam nescio qua superstitione docentur obstringi) aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur; quia divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire.

But that the sentence of the Roman bishop Gelasius was valid through centuries, even beyond the zenith of the Middle Ages, is shown by a cloud of witnesses. Thus Paschasius Radbert, Abbot of Corvey, declares: "It is Christ alone who breaks this bread and distributes it to the faithful by the hand of his servants. He says, 'Receive and drink from it, all of you, both you servants and the rest of the faithful. This is the cup of my blood, the cup of the new and enduring testament!" 1)

And Oecumenius, "If the Lord offer thee in like manner the table and cup of his own body and blood, as he doth to the poor man; - how dost thou then exclude him (the poor man) from thy table, and despise him?" 2)

As late as the twelfth century, the Abbot Peter of Clugny declared: "If it be certain that the apostle said this (1 Cor. XI.), not of any man, but of every man; it is false what you assert, that it was said only of those who were present at the banquet of the Lord. Rather, it is true, as the apostolic authority teaches, that not only those of whom you admit it, but any one, absolutely any one, may eat the bread of the Lord and drink the cup of the Lord, that is, according to the same apostle, enjoy the body and blood of the Lord." 3)

About 100 years later, that is, at a time when some were already beginning to make use of a mutilated Communion out of superstition, Albert the Great wrote: "Christ gave (his disciples) his body under one form, that of bread, and under the other form, that of wine, his blood; and so he instituted it for our consideration. And since Christ's act is our law, he hath surely given us this

1) Et ideo hie solus est qui frangit hunc panem et per manus ministrorum distribuit credentibus, dicens: accipite et bibite ex hoc omnes, tam ministri quam et reliqui credentes, hic est calix sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti. Paschasius Radbertus De corpore et sanguine Domini can. XV. nr. 2. Paschasius Radbertus died in the year 851.

2) *El δ χῦριος Επίσης σόι χαΧ.* τω πίνητζ *του οιχείπ σώματος χαΧ αίματος την τράπεζαν χαΧ τον χρατηρα παρατϊϋ-ησί, συ τολμάς τούτον της σης άποσχίζειν τραπίζης χαΧ ύπερο ραν',* Oecumenius Bet Chamier, Panstratia catholica IV.452.

3) Si constat hoc non de quolibet homine, sed de omni homine ab apostolo dictum ; falsum est, quod a vobis dictum est, de his tantum, qui cocnae Domini interfuerunt, hoc dictum. Sed verum est, auctoritate apostolica hoc docente, non hos tantum, de quibus conceditis, sed quemcunque, hoc est, omnem hominem posse manducare panem Domini et bibere calicem Domini, hoc est, secundum eundem apostolum, corpus et sanguinem Domini. Petrus Cluniacensis eontra Petrum Bruis, art. IV. Petrus, or, as he is called by his full name, Petrus Mauritius became abbot of Clugny in 1123, and died in 1156.

commanded both. And therefore under one form we divide the body, and under the other the blood." 1) -

The liturgies also agree perfectly with these testimonies of the ancient church teachers and scholastic theologians. As little as we believe that the orders of worship, which are spread under the names of the apostles, really have the holy apostles as their authors, it is nevertheless strange that all these documents show most clearly how the Christian people communicated under both forms at the time when they were used. One only has to read the so-called first liturgy of St. Peter 2), the liturgy of John 3), and that of Marcus 4), which was much used in the Orient. The orders of worship of St. Gregory of Nazianzus 5), St. Cyril 6), and St. John Chrysostom 7) are of the same nature. Yes, in that of St. Basil it is expressly said: "'Then the priest shall commune and give the body and the precious blood to his fellow priest, then to the deacons and the people in turn'" 8). For this reason, even Cardinal Bona feels compelled to make the confession: "Indeed, in ancient times, all without distinction, clergy and laity, men and women, received the sacred mysteries under both forms when they were present at the sacred celebration of them and offered and received their share of what was offered. No one can deny this who is even superficially acquainted with the history of the Church. For the faithful have always and everywhere, from the beginning of the Church to the 12th [only to the 12th?] century, communed under the form of bread and wine." 9) -

1) Christus sub una specie panis corpus suum tradidit et sub altera sqecie vini tradidit sanguinem, et sic servandum instituit. Et quum Christi aetio nostra sit instructio, pro certo haec duo nobis servanda praecepit. Et ideo sub una specie corpus et sub altera tradimus sanguinem. Albertus Magnus in Rerum concilii oecumenici Constantiensis III. 484. 485. Albert died in 1280.

2) Liturgiarum orientalium collectio ed. Euseb. Renaudot. Parisiis 1716. 4to. Tom. II. pag. 152.

3) Renaudot II. 164. 167.

4) Renaudot I. 164. 165,

5) Renaudot I. 35.

6) Renaudot I. 47.

7) Chamier IV. 447.

8) Tum communicabit sacerdos, corpusque et sanguinem pretiosum sacerdoti socio distribuet, tum ministris et populo deinceps. Renaudot I. 24.

9) Certum est, omnes passim, clericos et laicos, viros et mulieres, sub utraque specie sacra mysteria antiquitus sumsisse, quum solemni eorum celebrationi aderant et offerebant et de oblatis participabant. " . Nec negare potest, qui vel levissima rerum ecclesiasticarum notitia imbutus sit. Semper enim et ubique ab ecclesiae primordiis usque ad saeculum duodecimum sub specie panis et vini communicarunt fideles. Jo. Bona, Rerum liturgic. lib. II, ea. 18, g 1.

It is true that in the thirteenth century bishops sometimes halved the holy supper, supposedly because they feared that imprudent laymen might spill some of the wine. Here and there there must have been the desire to elevate the priests in relation to the laity. - For both reasons, and out of hatred for the Bohemians, the Conciliar of Costnitz elevated this practice, which was still frighteningly new at the time, to the status of church law. The words of its decree are strange enough. S o, namely, on June 15, 1415, it was decreed: "Because in some regions certain people lightly undertake to assert that the Christian people must receive the Sacrament of the Supper under both forms, that of bread and that of wine ... contrary to the laudable custom of the Church, which is confirmed on good grounds; - therefore the holy Council of Kostnitz, intending to provide for the salvation of the faithful against this error, ... declares the following: Although Christ instituted and administered to his apostles this venerable sacrament under both forms, that of bread and wine, after the meal; notwithstanding this, the laudable and confirmed custom of the Church holds that such sacrament is not to be celebrated after the meal. And as this custom is instituted for the avoidance of certain dangers and aversions of sensible ordinances, fo similar or more important reasons the other custom might be instituted and more sensible ordinances observed, that although in the ancient Church this sacrament was received by the faithful under both species, yet now it is received only by the performing priest under both species; by laymen (on the other hand) only under the species of bread." 1) - Alfo the time of institution and the objects instituted are one and the same!!! One really does not know, is it more silliness or is it more wickedness? Christ did not fix the time of the celebration; but the two constituent parts He did fix. Ordinary

1) Quum in nonnullis partibus quidam temerarie asserere praesumant, populum Christianum debere eucharistiae sacramentum sub utraque panis et vini specie suscipere; et non solum sub specie panis, sed etiam sub specie vini populum laicalem communicare . . contra laudabilem ecclesiae consuetudinem rationabiliter approbatam . . . ; hinc est, quod sacrum Constantiense concilium adversus hunc errorem saluti fidelium providere satagens . . . declarat, decernit et definit: Quod, licet Christus post coenam instituerit et suis apostolis ministraverit sub utraque specie panis et vini hoc venerabile sacramentum, tamen, hoc non obstante, sacrorum canonum auctoritas, laudabilis ct approbata consuetudo ecclesiae servavit ct servat, quod hujusmodi sacramentum non debet confici post coenam ... Et sicut haec consuetudo ad evitandum pericula aliqua et scandala rationabiliter introducta est, sic potuit simili vel majori ratione introduci et rationabiliter observari, quod, licet in primitiva ecclesia reciperetur hoc sacramentum a fidelibus sub utraque specie, tamen postea a conficientibus sub utraque specie et a laicis tantummodo sub specie panis suscipiatur. Rerum concilii Constantiensis Tom. III. 646, 647.

Mortals would conclude: Therefore one may change the time of the celebration, but not its constituent parts. These saints, on the other hand, inspired by whom I do not know, would conclude the other way around: "So it is permissible to change both the time and the parts of the ceremony. - According to this excellent principle, one may also baptize in the name of Noah or Abraham. For while Christ has determined the form of baptism (in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit), he has not determined the nature of the water (whether cistern water or river water). But from this it follows, according to the logic of the Costnitzers: that it is evidently possible to change both, that which is fixed and that which is not fixed. - Truly an honest heathen would be ashamed to support an untenable cause with such wretched mirror-images.

And how exceedingly clumsy is the stratagem by which the gentlemen try to swindle their way past the two mighty rocks that lie in their fairway (Scripture and Tradition)! Why do you not simply say: It is true that we have the Bible and the old church against us, but we are more than the Bible and the church. We therefore declare that it is to be held the other way around, as Christ ordained and His Church practiced. There, that would be honest! - But instead of this, they first fence against those who would celebrate the Lord's Supper after the meal, as Christ did! On this occasion they also mention in passing that Christ certainly instituted the Lord's Supper under both forms. Then they make another canon. Only then do they come to the question of controversy, whether one figure or both. Hopefully the reader has already forgotten that Christ instituted both species. Now it is mentioned in passing that the ancient Church celebrated the Last Supper under both figures. - But an ecclesiastical custom can be changed without hesitation. And that happens herewith. Should the Costnitzers perhaps have gone to school with that Irish boxer who never handled two opponents at the same time? He always slipped one and threw the other to the ground.

Not so, dear sirs! But you have both against you: Scripture and Tradition. Your Canon, then, ought by right to read thus, "'Though Christ instituted the holy supper under both forms, and though the Christian Church, obedient to her Founder, has so celebrated it for a full millennium; yet we hereby declare all this to be invalid, void, and to be committed to the future.'" -

And we are to follow the Costnitzers? Follow them more than the apostles and Christ? And why? Because they met at Lake Constance, or because they burned Huss alive? -

Now if the fathers of the Society of Jesus really have such a raging tenderness for Mr. Gerson and Mr. D'Ailly, let them eat their other decrees. Also that of the 4th Session: "A General Council representing the contending Catholic Church has its authority directly from Christ. Every one, therefore, of what rank or dignity he may be, must be a member of it.

be obeyed, even the Pope, in things pertaining to the Reformation and the faith." 1) - But as soon as their eyes fall upon these strong sentences, the splendor of the holy general Kostnitz Concilium pales in their eyes; their tenderness diminishes, until at last it turns into disgust. In general, they care very little for church meetings; they care all the more for the defense of their rule. That is why they praise the Concilium at Lake Constance when it burns Huss and mutilates the evening meal. If, on the other hand, it touches the triple crown of their pope, they cry foul.

But has not the church power to order ceremonies and to change ceremonies? So also that of the Holy Communion. Yes! Let her change what she has ordained! But what Christ has ordained, that shall she never change. - That she has had the physical power to mutilate Christ's testament, she has certainly shown. But in showing this, she has stamped herself with the stamp of antichristianity. Antichristianity, which exalts itself above God's word and order. Woe to the poor souls who allow themselves to be blinded by this! - For it is not we who will judge the Word of God on the last day, but the Word of God will judge us.

On the question of the infallibility of the Pope.

The Memorandum for the Infallibility of the Pope issued by the Conciliar Group Manning and Comrades (printed in No. 15 of the Kreuzzeitung) has already been criticized in many ways, which should certainly arouse some concern among the signatories of that document as to whether it is advisable to continue on the path they have trodden. Nevertheless, this criticism is by no means exhaustive; indeed, one main point has not yet been addressed. Thus, in view of the great importance of the question raised, a few additions and supplements to that critique should not seem superfluous.

The historical instances against the assertion of the Memorandum that "the general and constant tradition of the Church shows by the deeds and words of the Holy Fathers, as by the decisions of the Councils, that the decisions of the Pope in matters of faith and morals are unalterable" - would, on the basis of the most incontrovertible

1) Synodus in Spiritu sancto congregata, legitime generale concilium faciens, ecclesiam catholicam militantem repraesentans, potestatem a Christo immediate habet, cui quilibet, cujuscunque status vel dignitatis etsi papalis exsistat, obedire tenetur in his, quae pertinent ad fidem et . . . reformationem generalem ecclesiae Dei. Carranza, Summa conciliorum ed. Sylvius et Schram, III, 473.

duels can easily be increased considerably. We might refer first to the saying of Dr. Christianissimus Gerson, the famous chancellor of the University of Parts († 1429), who in his book De modis uniendi et reform, eccl. says: "Quia angelus Papa esse non potest, ergo Papa est Papa ut homo, et] ut homo sic est Papa, et ut homo potest peccare, et ut homo potest errare; fuerunt enim multi eorum, qui - ut legitur in Chronicis - non penitus spirituales, sed eorum actus civiles, contentiosi et carnales ac temporales, sequentes actus hominum, qui possunt. . . detrahere, diffamare, in haeresin cadere ceteraque committere scelera."

But we will content ourselves with citing a few undoubted examples where the Pope, as head of the Church, has publicly erred both in his own faith and in his judgment of the orthodoxy of others.

Tiberius professed Semi-Arianism by subscribing to the Sirmian Creed, so that even Bellarmin (de Rom. Pont. IV., 9) admits: "Liberium etsi non expresse, tamen interpretative inhaeresin consensisse." Zosimus protected Pelagius and Cölesttnus, and approved the Pelagian Creed, as the learned Jesuit Labbe († 1697)testifies in his Conciliorum collectio maxima (17 vols. fol.) vol. III. p. 401 sq. Vigilius showed the most offensive inconstancy in the Three Chapters Controversy, where he condemned e cathedra the three Doctors of the Church as heretical and impious, and recanted what he had written (also e cathedra) in defence of them (Labb. VI. p. 239. 281.). Honorius I. was anathematized at the 6th ecumenical synod as a monotheletic heretic, an instrument of the devil (Labb. VII. p. 978. 1058. 1079). Paschalis II. ceded the right of investiture to the emperor by a writing, which was both by himself ("sicut prave factum cognosco, ita prave factum confiteor, et omnino corrigi Deo praestante desidero". Labb). XII. p. 993), than was anathematized by the subsequent Third Lateran Conciliar in 1112 (Labb. XII. p. 1165.). John XXIII. was at the same time accused of heresy at the Kostnitz Synod, besides other crimes (Labb. XVI. p. 142.), and Eugene IV. by the Basle Concilium as "fide devius, pertinax haereticus" (Labb). XVII. x. 391.) deposed. Yea, it was a principle adopted at this Concilium by the fathers of all parties, that the pope might be deposed for heresy (Labb. XVII. p. 273: "Ecclesia Cath. saepenumero [!] summos pontifices, sive a fide delirantes sive pravis moribus notorie ecclesiam scandalizantes, correxit et judicavit, neque, ubi de fidei periculo aut scandalo religionis Chr. agebatur, Romanis pontificibus pepercit"); and in putting this principle into practice, the Conciliarities followed exactly the Gratianic Decree, which expressly commands the Pope to be deposed if he should fall into one heresy or another.

After such evident data, the only question of special interest with respect to the above assertion of the memorandum in question could be whether we do not perhaps possess a relevant confession from the Pope's own mouth?- We do indeed possess such a confession, and to draw it out of the dust of undeserved oblivion in these critical times - that is precisely the main purpose of these lines.

Hadrian VI, the successor of Leo X., the last pope of German blood, born in Utrecht - thus from the same city, on whose Conciliar Resolution of 1865 the Memorandum for the Justification of the Infallibility Dogma refers - an honest, scholastically learned Dutchman, Doctor and Professor of Theology at Louvain, the Emperor's teacher, twice Regent of Spain and under Charles V.'s influence raised to the Papal See - a pontiff of undisputed (Roman) orthodoxy. A pontiff of undisputed (Roman) orthodoxy, who had Luther declared a second Mohamet by his legate Franz Cheregati at the Imperial Diet of Nuremberg in 1522 and urged the strictest execution of the edict of Worms, - made such a confession in all candor:

Si per Romanam Ecclesiam intelligatur caput eius, puta Pontifex, certum est quod possit errare etiam in iis, quae tangunt fidem, haeresin per suam determinationem aut decretalem asserendo (quaest. de sacr. confirm. Rom. 1522 p. 26).

To be sure, the learned Fea, one of the more recent defenders of papal infallibility (Effemerid. letterar. di Roma. N. 21. p. 293.) has replied that this statement belongs to our author not as pope, but as a teacher at the university of Louvain, and that the Roman edition of his works was organized without his knowledge, even against his will. But, let us say with Clausen (Protestantism and Catholicism I, 41.), a statement such as the above is certainly too dangerous not to have required - according to Pius II's example - a public retraction after his elevation to the papal chair, and since this did not take place, one will be fully justified in considering the Pope's conviction in this article as unchanged. -e-

On the history of the Roman Council.

The Opposition. It is written from Munich that the Bishop of Regensburg has forbidden the Catholic students to attend Döllinger's lectures. - The N. P. Ztg. is informed that the Primate of Hungary, Timor, and four Hungarian bishops have left the side of the opposition and joined the party of the infallibilists. This will be the end of most of the heroes of the opposition at Vatican II.

Additional Chapter to the Decree on the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, according to which it is determined that the Roman Pontiff cannot err in the definition in matters of the doctrine of faith and morals: "The holy Roman Church possesses the highest and full primacy and supremacy over the entire Catholic Church, which she truly and humbly acknowledges to have received from the Lord Himself through St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, whose successor the Roman Pontiff is. And as she is bound before all others to defend the truth of the faith, so also any questions that may arise concerning the faith must be decided by her judgment (from the Creed made by the Greeks at the Second Ecumenical Council of Lyons (1274)).

And because the saying of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be ignored, where he says: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church* (Matth. 16, 18.), what is said here is proved by the consequences, in that with the apostolic See the Catholic religion is always preserved undefiled and the doctrine kept holy (from the formula of St. Pope Hormisdas signed by the Fathers of the VIII Ecumenical, the IV Constantinopolitan Council (536)).

Therefore, with the consent of the holy Council, we teach and define it as a dogma of faith, that, by virtue of divine assistance, the Roman Pontiff, of whom, in the person of St. Peter, it was likewise said by our Lord Jesus Christ: "I have prayed for you that your faith may not waver" (Luk 22:32), cannot err as soon as he, appearing as the highest teacher of all Christians, defines with his authority what is to be held by the whole church in matters of faith and morals.), could not err, as soon as he, appearing as the supreme teacher of all Christians, defines with his authority what is to be held by the whole Church in matters of faith and morals, and that this prerogative of inerrancy or infallibility of the Roman Pontiff extends to the same sphere to which the infallibility of the Church is extended. - But if any man, which God forbid, should presume to contradict this definition of ours, let him know that he has fallen away from the truth of the Catholic faith and from the unity of the Church."

Literary Intelligences.

What is the Union? The burning church question of the present day, with special reference to the Hannöversche Landeskirche, answered by Ludwig Grote. Hary near Bockenem. Self-published by the author. 1867. price 1 Thlr. 10 Gr. The author of this book is a pastor in the Kingdom of Hanover who was deposed for his Lutheran loyalty, a man who knows the Union not only from hearsay. His

History is well known. On June 24 and October 14, 1866, he preached two sermons to his congregation at Bönnien, which had the misfortune to arouse the anger of the Prussian government. As a result, he was suspended from office by decree of the Prussian General von Voigt-Rheetz of January 31, 1867, and then deposed. In fact, the two incriminated sermons were exceedingly terrible! In the first one he had said: "The feast of St. John was otherwise a feast of joy, but today it is a day of repentance, because a wanton enemy has taken the land." Thus he spoke on June 24, that is, three days before the battle of Langensalza; at a time when King George was still at the head of his victorious army. By doing so, however, he had made himself guilty of a manifest disloyalty to his future sovereign, the King of Prussia! This had to be punished!!! For had not Pastor Grote the duty: to foresee the battle of Langensalza, the capitulation which followed, and the Peace of Präg? Surely Prussian theologians have the duty to foresee the direction of a coming ministry and to send themselves into it at the proper time. - And in his Reformation sermon, Pastor Grote had said: "Ah, you know that our lawful king, who has so often and so decidedly professed the Lutheran Church and its doctrine, has been forcibly driven out of the country, and that God in his wrath has given us into the power of a foreign king , whose ancestors exchanged the Lutheran faith for the Reformed, and whose father forced his subjects, sometimes by force, to abandon the Lutheran faith and enter the so-called Union, which is the beginning of the great world brotherhood, with which we too would like to be blessed. You will perhaps reply that the foreign conqueror has promised to protect us in our Lutheran faith. But have you never read in the Scriptures, "Trust not in princes?" And have you not seen from the newspaper, which is exerting all its pernicious influence in our very province, that they are already thinking of founding a German National Church, which will be as similar to the Babylonian tower-building as one egg to another?" - Appalling! The ancestors of the Prussian king are said to have exchanged the Lutheran faith for the Reformed one! True, it is so written in all the history books; but how does this rebellious pastor come to recall it just now? Yes, he even takes pleasure in claiming that King Wilhelm's father, Frederick William III, forced his subjects, in part by force, to abandon the Lutheran faith and enter the so-called Union. To be sure, the pastor of Hönigern claims that this was indeed the case, and Church Councillor Lasius even believes that he was imprisoned on this occasion. But a subject should be prevented from recalling scenes of this kind by his love for the princely house he has been entrusted with! The height of insolence is

but the assertion of p. p. Grote that one should not rely on princes! In all schools imbued with the spirit of High Prussia, this is above all impressed on the hearts of tender boys: they should rely on their princes! For it is through these glorious princes that Prussia has become what it is! At last Pastor Grote has even taken the trouble to call the German Church of the Future, which Court Preacher Hoffmann will have the goodness to found, a Babylonian tower!!! Terrible, quite terrible! Pastor Grote really doesn't seem to have a cent of the foresight that is so necessary for every North German! Otherwise he would know that Herr Hoffmann will also be his authority in the near future. But these hyperorthodox possess neither loyalty nor foreboding. They can really do nothing but quote the Bible!

So this Pastor Grote has written a book in which he gives an answer to the question: What is the Union? No doubt our readers will agree with him in the main. For the Union is an invention of the devil to deprive Christians of their faith. Of shape it is very different; as different as the seducibility of the people to be deceived. Where the devil has to deal with the wicked of the massive sort, he unfurls his Union banner freely. On it is written in gold letters: We all believe in no God, Christians, Jews and Muhamedans, and selfishness unites us all. When this principle will have become full truth, all quarrelling about dogmas, even all disagreement about them, will cease altogether! Then mankind will occupy itself only with truly practical objects, that is, with eating and drinking. Then every exclusiveness, every exclusion of other believers, will belong to things past, because faith itself will belong to things past. When the Baptist dances fandango with the Zwinglian and the Chinaman round Brigham Young's tabernacle, and the King of Dahomey eats the Great Sultan for breakfast;-then the golden age of this Union will have become a truth. -

If the devil wants to seduce more tender souls, he does not barge in like this, but says: "We must hold fast to the core of Christianity. But the core of Christianity is: its sublime morality and the archetypal person of Jesus. This is the union of the Protestant Association, the union of Schenkel and Beyschlag. These little swindlers may not throw away the Christian faith altogether; otherwise they would drive the students from their lecture halls to the bartenders. But the dose of Christian faith with which they still handicap is homoeopathically small! Just large enough to cook up that shameful porridge which they peddle in the book-markets under the name of German science. -

But there are people of even more delicate nerves, people for whom the Schenkelian antics are too coarse and the Beyschlagian soup too stinking; after all, the eyes on it come from several hundred years old socinian fat! To catch these people, Satan uses another earthworm. For he wants to leave them as much of Christianity as comes out if one leaves aside the doctrines in dispute between the Lutherans and the Calvinists. For he knows well that one need only take from men one half of their faith in order to be sure that after a time they will also give the other half to it without much fuss. This is the Union of the firm of Dörner and Hoffmann. This Union has been used by the Hohenzollern family as a handy weapon for the subjugation of Germany under their scepter.

And it is this union that Pastor Grote deals with most extensively. He rightly describes as the actual beginner of the Union the country-hungry Johann Sigesmund, who in 1613 broke the vow made to his father and became Calvinist. No doubt mainly to pocket the Jülich-Klev inheritance. Following in the footsteps of this apostate, in 1619, came George William, the wailer. With more consciousness and with greater determination still his son Friedrich Wilhelm. His plan was to place himself at the head of the German Protestants, and in order to be able to do so, he sought to bind Lutherans and Reformed to himself in the same way. Therefore he forbade all religious controversy in the pulpits. People, like Paul Gerhard and Reinhart, who obeyed God more than him, he had chased away. Here and there he even had churches taken from the Lutherans by force. Such was the case with the Church of St. Nicholas in Frankfurt on the Oder. In 1656, five battalions of infantry and a princely council seized it from its rightful Lutheran owners and handed it over to a small group of reformers. [At the same time, the noble lord sought to make use of his position as the highest bishop of the Brandenburg church in another way. Thus an edict of March 5, 1685, ordered that no preacher should marry a couple unless the bridegroom could prove that he had grafted at least 6 fruit trees and planted 6 oaks. -

As limited as the son of the Elector Frederick William Frederick I was, he had enough sense to realize that the Hohenzollern eagle could only gain dominion over Germany if Reformed and Lutherans united under its wings. Therefore he founded the University of Halle and filled its chairs partly with rationalists, partly with pietists. -

As is well known, Frederick I was followed by the king of the thrashings. He - Frederick William I - built in 1739 the Trinity Church in Berlin, which should serve Lutherans as well as Reformed. Has he nevertheless in a

In his letter to Provost Rolof of September 10, 1726, he declared that the difference between the two confessions was nothing more than a mere clerical quarrel. But in order to bring about the union in a more vigorous manner, he simply ordered, by virtue of royal authority, the abolition of private confession, the singing of the benediction and the words of institution, the elimination of the choir robes, lights, and altar cloths, and the introduction of common bread in the celebration of the holy night meal. The service was to be held everywhere as in Potsdam. When the Lutheran city ministry at Frankfurt on the Oder remonstrated against this in the most respectful manner, the king declared: "We herewith emphatically refer you to your completely unauthorized conception of the punishable disobedience witnessed under it, and at the same time order you in all seriousness to abolish such ceremonies without decency after receiving this, or to expect a decree because of your irresponsible disobedience.

How his worthy son, old Fritz, stood to the Union, our readers will easily guess. Under his scepter, everyone could go to hell (or, as the king called it: be blessed) at his own will. The great union of unbelief drew nearer and nearer.

It is true that many a sleeping conscience was awakened under the terrible strokes of Napoleon's disciplinary routine; but only a few were converted to the Word of God. Unfortunately not with Frederick William III. For what has been blathered of his conversion at Königsberg in Prussia is vain wind. The old, so-called, Archbishop Borowski, who is said to have converted him, himself cared so little for Christian doctrine that he was not in the habit of teaching his confirmands even one of the principal pieces of the catechism. And the old king, after his supposed conversion, went to church as before to Ancillon! Ancillon over was nothing more and nothing less, than a miserable rationalist. In addition to this, the old gentleman fell into the hands of swindlers like Eylert, who had the impudence to let himself be called a bishop. So the Hohenzoller fabricated his own agendas, the most miserable work of this kind that the sun has shone upon. Whoever did not want to accept it was reprimanded. Thus the pastor E. G. Kellner. He was torn from the midst of his congregation and dragged to prison, but his church was broken up, and the faithful congregation was partly ridden down and partly beaten by 400 infantrymen, 50 cuirassiers and 50 hussars. This is the spirit of mildness and moderation from which the Union was born, according to the declaration of its princely fathers! -

Since the battle of Königgrätz the reasons to make union have understandably doubled. And the godlessness of the masses suits the intention of the princes. It is truly high time that the few Lutheran-minded people should quickly

leave. But we advise our fellow believers in America to buy the above-mentioned book, from which many of the data given here are taken. Even if they will find a passage here and there (such as page 11, lines 10 to 13 and page 26, lines 16 to 23) with which they do not agree, the reading of the aforementioned book will give them great pleasure. We should also not forget that with the 1 Thlr. 10 Sgr. to be spent for it, not only the valuable book is paid for, but also the dear author, who for the sake of his faithfulness had to give his office to it, is supported.

Published by the Stiller'sche Hofbuchhandlung in Rostock and Malchin:

Scripture and Tradition. A Refutation of the Roman Doctrine of the Infallible Magisterium and of the Roman Designs against the Protestant Principle of Scripture, with special reference to the writing of Frh. v. Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz: "Das allgemeine Concil rc". By A. W. Dieckhoff, Doctor and Professor of Theology at Rostock. Price 1 Thaler.

Three thousand pamphlets by Luther and his contemporaries will soon be published in a catalogue, collected by Arnold Kuczynski, by T. O. Weigel in Leipzig. Weigel in Leipzig, and this catalogue will offer a very interesting bibliographical contribution to the history of the Reformation. There are 555 writings by Luther alone, including the first edition of the 95 Theses. The collection itself is of a richness that hardly any public library possesses.

"The Pope and the Concil of Janus" is now also published in a Russian translation by B. Behr (E. Bock) in Berlin.

Miscellencies.

The old orthodox dogmatics. Even Lessing, the well-known editor of the Wolfenbüttel Fragments, wrote: "I know of no thing in which human ingenuity has shown itself more than in the old system of religion. A patchwork of bunglers and half-philosophers is the system of religion which one now wants to put in the place of the old one. I am also very convinced of such vapid minds, that if they are allowed to arise, they will in time tyrannize more than the orthodox ever did."-The rationalist Dr. Karl Hase confesses in reference to his study of the old dogmatics: "The dogmatic system of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries seemed to me like one of our old German cathedrals, with its heaven-striving pointed arches and whimsical sensible ornaments.... A cathedral like our ancestors can

not build again in our time, a few decades ago one even considered it an old gothic barbarian building; but one gets quite especially courageous in it as in a house of God". (Dedication of his Hutterus redivivus of 1833.)

Natural science. Menzel writes in his work: "Kritik des modernen Zeitbewußtseins" (Frankfurt a. M. 1869. IV, 344 S. gr. 8. 1? Thlr.) among other things the following: "The natural scientists of the newer time have put a spell and curse on it, one should not want to find anything purposeful in the whole of nature. This timidity and fear of the functional is truly ridiculous. It is intimately connected with the fear of Christianity, with the hatred of the Bible. The Creator, a creation according to God's wisdom for the purposes of his love, for the good of his creatures, is not to be accepted. Pure chance is said to have decided in the coming into being of things; one does not want to be indebted to a creator and father in anything. - From the angle of inclination of the ecliptic to that of the animal tooth, everything in nature is purposeful, yes, only purposeful; but this must not be said at any price. Otherwise one would be suspected of believing in a God who had made everything. - One admits no wisdom of God in the works of nature, but only a glory of the explainers" (p. 57.). "From the lofty forest-tree, which we make into a ship's mast, to the smallest medicinal herb, which delivers us from disease, everything in nature is calculated for man, intended by divine wisdom for man's use" (p. 59.). "In the midst of the animal world man finds himself as in a concave mirror, and sees himself everywhere only distorted. He sees eyes, ears, forehead, nose, and mouth, but they are no longer his own. Nowhere does the immortal spirit look out, everywhere only the transient form of the earthly, which does not cross the threshold of death. The very fact that all animals, in their forms and internal organs, have something akin to man, and appear only as one-sided outgrowths of a human form, organ, sense, and instinct, should have led to the conclusion that they are not something independent, but exist only in relation to man." At the same time, too, "they all serve more or less as reflections or symbols, in which man may see what manifold good and evil impulses, amiabilities and uglinesses, caprices and follies lie in his soul" (p. 89.).

The answer

to our inquiry in Lehre und Wehre page 124 f. is in the "Lutheran" of April 21 twice "No!" So all the concessions were a mere sham! - So much for the present.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The "Vice - God". Of the Antichrist the holy apostle Paul says: "He that is vile, and exalteth himself above all things that are called God, or God's service, so as to sit down in the temple of God as a god, pretending that he is God." 2 Thess. 2, 4. From this we see that the Antichrist is not the one who says that he is the dear God, for whoever would say this would be brought into the fool's house, but the one who behaves "as a god," that is, like a god or as if he were a god. This is completely true in the case of the Pope of Rome. For he really does behave and act as if he were a god, e. g. by changing the divine ordinances, such as the Holy Communion, and pretending that he has power to do so, and by giving laws of which he says that one must keep the same as the divine commandments for the sake of his soul's blessedness. Genuine papists are not at all ashamed to confess openly that they consider the pope a "vice-god." Thus, for example, Mamluck Oertel writes in his "Katholische Kirchenzeitung" (Catholic Church Newspaper) of April 7 of this year: "One may speak of a 'Vice-God' as much as one likes. Our Pope is indeed the Vicarius of Christ, and since Christ, as is well known, is not only man but also God, one may call the Pope Vice-God for all I care. No proper Catholic who has sense can give a damn about such silly talk. In the Old Testament the persons in authority were called gods, and we in the New Testament should not be allowed to call our High Priest and Vicar of Christ on earth, who has the highest office on earth, a vice-god? The more one from the unbelieving and Protestant side rushes against this 'Vice-God' of ours, the Pontiff, and seeks to strip him of his dignity, the more firmly we Catholics want to hold on to him, the holy father and infallible teacher in the 'confusion' of this world." - There you have it, dear reader. The papists themselves admit it, that the pope is their vice-god! It is true that the wretched Oertel is afraid to refer to the fact that in the Old Testament the authorities are called gods (Ps. 82:6. Cf. Jn. 10:34); but he knows quite well what a vast difference it is when the holy Scriptures call the authorities gods, and when the papists call the pope their vice-god. As one may give the name of a thing which has a resemblance to it, for the sake of this resemblance (analogice), as, for instance, a believing Christian may be called a king according to the Scriptures (Rev. 1:6.), because the believing Christian is similar to a king in that he rules over sin, death, and the devil. In the same way, the authorities are called gods in Scripture, because they are similar to God in that they can also give men laws that bind their consciences (Rom. 13:5). But they are no more vice-gods than Christians are vice-kings. The word vice-god is something quite different from a figurative god. A vice-god is not one who in certain respects resembles God, but one who, without being God himself, possesses divine power, dignity, and honor. A vice-king, for example, is not the president or governor of a free state, although they have a certain resemblance to kings, but only he who, although dependent on the actual king, nevertheless really has royal power, dignity, and honor in his territory. The apostles and all true preachers are, of course, "ambassadors in the place of Christ" (2 Cor. 5:20), but that does not make them vice-Christians! If, then, the pope were not a false prophet and a ravening wolf, but a true preacher of the gospel, he might well call himself an "ambassador in Christ's stead.

but it would be a rebellious act in a worldly kingdom if a mere royal ambassador or envoy wanted to raise himself to the rank of vice-king, so **it is** an antichristian rebellion in the kingdom of God if the pope himself wants to be not merely an ambassador in Christ's stead, that is, in God's stead, but a vice-god. Not only does the wretched Oertel declare him to be such, but the pope also wants to be such, for he arrogates to himself divine power, dignity, and honor, and thus proves that he is the antichrist of whom St. Paul proclaimed in advance that he would sit in the temple of God, that is, in the church, that is, that he would set up a chair or throne as a god, that is, as a ruling vice-god. May the Lord soon make an end of him by the appearing of his future! 2 Thess. 2, 8.

W.

The problem is solved! The General Synod is doing extraordinary things. One of the latest great achievements is a scholarly proof which the Rev. N. Weiser in Pennsylvania has delivered. He writes in the "Lutheran Observer" of April 8: "We, as (of course American) Lutherans, believe no less than other denominations in an apostolic succession, and think that we can trace our pedigree to the apostles in a direct and unbroken line." Rev. R. Weiser, however, not only asserts this, but proves it through all the centuries. As the progenitor he names St. Peter, and from this he then in the 1st century makes St. Paul descend. In the 2nd century he names first the coarse chiliast Papias, and lastly Tertullian, of whom Luther famously says that he was "a right Carlstadt among the church teachers." In the 3rd century the learned gentleman gives second place to Origen, of whom Luther writes, "Origen I have already put under ban." In the 4th century he first names Sactantius, a quite new-found, at least we know only one Lactantius. Then follows Eusebius of Caesarea, who is inclined to Arianism, and Tiberius, the latter again a quite new one; for Liberius would be meant, who, as is well known, stood up for Arius and helped to condemn Athanasius, so that even the Papists, although they have him in their succession, prefer to pass him by in silence. The 5th century closes with the Semipelagian Cassianus. In the 8th century even the zealous image-worshipper Tarasius must give up a link in the chain which connects the General Synod with the Apostle Peter. In the 12th century even Peter of Bruys, the forerunner of the Münster Anabaptists, must be included; but in the 13th, among other papal scholastics, Thomas Aquinas, whom Mr. Weiser calls "one of the most heavenly-minded men of the age," and the Jesuits the "princeps theologorum." The worthy conclusion is made by the Doctors Benj. Kurtz and S. S. Schmucker and the "hundreds who studied under the latter at Gettysburg." Who would have thought that the American Lutheran Church could so easily dispute the glory of the Papal and Episcopal Churches, that they alone possess the true succession? It is only a pity that Mr. Weiser has forgotten so many ancestors, e. g. the whole family of the "Sacramentirers" and all the chorages of the Prussian-United Church. The immortalized Dr. Benj. Kurtz, in his booklet, "Why are you a Lutheran?" expressly declares that "with a few isolated exceptions" the "great body of the (American) 'Lutheran Church'" believes of Holy Communion what those have held "who have been termed Sacramentarians," and the same Kurtz, together with Dr. S. S. Schmucker, has published in the year 1912 the booklet, "Why Are You a Lutheran? S. S. Schmucker, signed the famous document in 1845, in which the church of Germany, in the name of the General Synod, was given the official declaration: "We stand here, as in general in most of our ecclesiastical principles, on common ground with the united church of Germany .

Progress in the Papal Church. The Papal Church also has its progress. Having hardened herself against the thundering voice of the Reformation striking at her conscience, she continues to advance step by step along the chosen path of falsehood and iniquity. We were reminded of this in these days by the following remark of the "Cath. Messenger of the Faith," of Louisville, March 23; "At the former General Confraternities the State was always represented by Emperors, Kings, Princes, and their Envoys. This is not the case now. The pope has not summoned the high secular lords, and the Concilium Vaticanum is as free from all secular (?!) influence as any general concilium ever was before. There are only spiritual, ecclesiastical votaries. The Concil has rightly rejected any real influence, all the more so since there are actually no more Christian Catholic states!" - So only "all the more"! If, therefore, there should still be such "Catholic" States, it would be quite right, according to the "Messenger of the Faith," if these States had no business in the Council, but had only to carry out its decrees obediently. To be sure, the "Messenger of the Faith" adds, almost supererogatorially: "The Church does not have to do with the state entities, but only with the peoples, with the Catholic part of the inhabitants of the many different states," - but where is the representation of these "peoples"? They are not represented in the Vatican Council. Only the so-called "spiritual" state is represented. Hence the council is nothing but a priestly council of Annas and Caiphas; not an apostolic one, in which the "people," or the "church," or the "brethren," were present, spoke with, voted with, and passed resolutions, Acts 15. The present Vatican Council is but a miserable farce of an ecumenical council, while former councils, influenced by the pope, sought to create the appearance of being ecumenical, at least in so far as in them, if not the household, yet the magistracy was represented along with the so-called clergy. Incidentally, the whole theory that at least "ecumenical" councils were certainly led by the Holy Spirit rests on sand in two respects; first, because there has never been an absolutely ecumenical council, for the members of a council were never commissioned by all the members of the Christian church to represent them; secondly, because, even if this impossible had ever been the case, not such an Ecclesia repraesentativa of the clergy, but the Ecclesia synthetica of all the faithful alone, has received the promise of being guided into all truth, and the latter cannot confer this privilege given to her upon a committee. The whole Church cannot lose the foundation of the truth that leads to salvation, for it cannot perish according to the promises made to it (Ps. 48:9, 72:5, Dan. 2:44, Matt. 16:18, 28:20), but the ministers of the Church can. Of the priests it is indeed written that "their lips shall keep the doctrine" (Mal. 2, 7.), but only the enemies of truth, who once wanted to strike the prophet Jeremiah dead with their tongues because of his testimony of truth, established the principle: "The priests cannot err in the law." Jer. 18:18, W.

Can an unbeliever appear as a witness? that is, a person who believes neither in a supreme being nor in the immortality of the soul? A secular paper in New York writes about this: "Judge Curtis is of the opinion that such a person cannot give valid testimony in court. The case in which this came up was that of Caverty v. Cooke for breach of contract. The only question here was which of the two parties was to be believed. The defendant's counsel contended that the plaintiff was an infidel, lying about the existence of a God, and not believing in the immortality of the soul, his testimony could be

therefore have no validity. Judge Curtis, in his address to the jury, said: "'Opinions like the plaintiff's justly cause terror and the condemnation of the civilized world. I am of opinion that the plaintiff may give sworn testimony that it is for the jury to decide whether he really entertains such pernicious views, and if so, whether they will believe a man who calls down upon himself the wrath of the Almighty by blasphemies."" The jury declared for the defendant, thus held that no credence was to be given to the infidel." - Whoever thinks that such judicial verdicts are the harbingers of a "state religion" is seriously mistaken. A State itself without the foundation of natural religion is an absurdity. Only those who regard men as refined apes and the State as a menagerie can demand that the State itself must renounce natural religion. It is therefore with full justification that the new Constitution of Tennessee says: "No man who denies the existence of a God, or an afterlife in which men receive reward or punishment, shall hold any office in the civil government of the State." Similar provisions are found in most constitutions. Thus in the "Pennsylvanian" it is said: "No person professing to believe in the existence of a God, and in a state of reward and punishment after death, shall be disqualified from holding any office in this state, on account of religious peculiarities." This, of course, is at the same time a declaration that he who does not profess this belief is incapable of holding office. W.

Communion. In the "Luth. Zeitschrift" we read under the heading "Gettysburg" the following: "An article in the latest number of Professor Stöver's Quarterly Review on pulpit fellowship, with which we do not agree

Among our German brethren, who are the spokesmen against pulpit fellowship with preachers of other faiths, it may be best in some cases to refrain from it. We quite readily admit that they should do their duty in their own way; but we object that their peculiar local practice should be made a law for the whole church and a principle of decision about Lutheran communion. It is a stumbling block in the way of those who seek the old territorial boundaries, the old faith (!). The

congregation sees in it a remnant of that incompatible, imperious spirit which in times past burned and banished men for the sake of mere opinions (!). - Strict confessional exclusiveness, as a characteristic feature of the most fanatical sects and the grossest heretics among us (!), has lost all moral effect for good (!) and has become simply a violation of the law of Christian brotherly love. - As little as we would like to compare ourselves with Festus and the author of the above article with Paul (see Gal. 1, 8. 11.), we nevertheless feel reminded of the exclamation of the former, which can be read in Acts 26, 24."

The "American Ambassador." As long as this unionist paper only rejected Lutheran doctrine, we Lutherans were considered bigoted half-papists, because we warned our Lutheran fellow Christians against that paper. Now, however, the "American ambassador" has also attacked Methodist doctrine, namely the doctrine of sanctification. What are the Methodists doing now? In their "Christian Apologist" they say: "Get the American ambassador out of our houses, he has nothing to do with us! Hey, hey, that's just like us, you Methodists! Haven't you become bigoted half-papists, too? Yes, says one, "Peasant, that's something quite different!" O you hypocritical peelers! W.

Columbus. The Treasurer for the Education Fund, from which the indigent students in Columbus are to be received, complains greatly in the Standard of April 15 of the embarrassment in which the committee in question finds itself. He writes, among other things: "The fact is that we have been compelled to contract a debt of a few thousand dollars, and at present have nothing to meet the daily expenses of feeding five and thirty Beneficianten in our Institution." It is to be hoped that a lively account of the urgent distress in which the administrators of the Institution find themselves in this respect, will rouse the pastors of the Synod, with their congregations, to remedy the same without hesitation. W.

"Does not the priesthood then belong to the teaching Church?" To this question is answered in the Louisville "Catholic Messenger of Faith" of March 16: "No! Every theologian, nay, every well-instructed Catholic knows it: though they (the Roman priesthood) preach the doctrine of the Church, yet they do not belong to the 'teaching Church.' The official teaching authority of the Church is constituted only by the pope and the bishops."

The Methodists have discovered that among their preachers the doctrine of the destruction of the ungodly is very popular, and it is urgently demanded by many who do not pay homage to this doctrine, that one should seriously proceed to investigate this matter. Thus reports the Luth. Kirchenzeitung.

"Descended to hell." This piece of the Apostolic Symbolum is declared by the Luth Observor of April 8 to be a "fraudulent interpolation.

Dr. R. Dulon, formerly a rationalist preacher at Bremen, died at Rochester, N. Y., April 11, as principal of a secondary school there.

II. Abroad.

Closed Communion in the Regional Churches. Dr. Münkel writes about this in his N. Ztbl. of March 18, among other things as follows: "Who is the man who could carry out the old Lutheran discipline of the Lord's Supper in our regional churches? Buddeus says (1712): "'The brotherly communion of Holy Communion cannot be where there is not a communion of faith, or where all points of doctrine are not correct, which are necessary for faith to be brought forth and preserved in us.'" This is well Lutheran, if consideration was given to the weak, and Dr. v. Z. should not have punctuated it with an exclamation mark. Somebody carry out the principle! Let him begin with our Lutheran theologians, who surely do not want to belong to the weak. How many will he allow, even if we want to look up one or two deviations in the main articles? Let him then proceed to the ecclesiastical regiments, the superintendents and pastors. I fear the great proud forest will be mightily thinned, and a boy will be able in a few moments to count the trees that are left standing."

Greek Church. The former Catholic professor at the University of Bonn, Dr. Overbeck, is entertaining the adventurous idea of restoring the old Church of undivided Christendom, as it existed before the separation of the Occident from the Orient, and which is preserved pure in the Orthodox Church of the Orient, by gathering together the non-ultramoutane members of the Roman Church and uniting them with the Greek Church. Dr. Overbeck reported from Reading, England, on February 2, 1867, that he had drafted a petition to the Holy Synod of the Russian Church on the basis of this idea, and had presented it to the Synod in September 1869.

Under the heading "Roman" one finds in the Allg. Luth. Kz. of March 25 the beginning of descriptions in which it says, among other things: "We have never been able to consider Pope Pius IX a great light, neither in spirit nor in learning. But his present insistence on his declaration of infallibility strikes us as more than questionable. It testifies to a state of mind that is only possible from the papal chair, without any effort being made to try to find a remedy for it." (The writer evidently means something like douche baths on the visible head of the church and temporary exchange of the "cathedra Petri" with a swivel chair). "Admittedly, who can calmly put up with what is solemnly shouted to the Pabst Lei at his coronation: 'Take the tiara adorned with three crowns, and know that you are the ruler of the earth (rectorem orbis), the father of princes, and from earth the representative of Jesus Christ' - whoever can be told such things without shuddering, may well go further in this direction."

From England. (The Athanasianum.) Anglican clergymen in considerable numbers have petitioned the Archbishop of Canterbury at York against the retention of the Athanasian Creed in the Liturgy. The petitioners propose either to make the recitation of this creed in future subject to the discretion of the clergy concerned, or to remove the condemnatory clauses from it, or to restrict them by declaration. They are convinced that such a step would bring to the English Church many Dissenters who have hitherto been separated from it by this barrier (?). The fact that the petition is communicated by the chaplain of the Archbishop of Canterbury suggests that the Primate himself is favorable to the proposal.

Prussia. When the last (regional church) synod held in Berlin congratulated the King through a deputation, he spoke out just as sharply against the "Orthodox" as against the Protestant Unificationists and said that these two parties were the misfortune of the church and the stumbling block of the constitution. A truly royal Prussian judgment!

Saxony. Dr. G. Baur, pastor at Hamburg, has been appointed university preacher and professor of practical theology in Leipzig in place of the unionist Brückner, who has been called to Berlin. Theology in Leipzig. Baur was for a time a contributor to Schenkel's magazine. A sad sign for Saxony!

Augsburg. Since last autumn H. W. J. Thiersch has moved to Augsburg and has taken over the leadership of the small Irvingian congregation there.

Necessary improvement.

On page 125 of our April number, lines 9 and 9, the typesetter has gone against the clear text of the manuscript, which read thus:

Are among the non-Lutherans, to whom the Lutheran pulpits are to be opened under certain circumstances, only those meant, etc.'" thus set;

"'Are only such meant under the non-Lutherans to whom the Lutheran pulpits are to be opened under all circumstances, etc.'"

and I'm afraid I've neglected to correct that oversight.

Now that this necessary improvement has already been communicated by letter to the editor of the "Lutheran" and "Missionary," to whom this article was primarily addressed, on the 4th of April, it is - in order to avoid misunderstandings - also communicated publicly here.

The corrector of the synodal printing office.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 16. June 1870. No. 6.

Antitheses

on the theses of church and office, which are contained in the writing: "Die Stimme unserer Kirche in der Frage von Kirche und Amt" (The voice of our church in the question of church and office). Erlangen by A. Deichert. 1852 and 1865?)

First part.

From the church.

I. Thesis.

The church in the true sense of the word is the congregation of the saints, i.e. the entirety of all those who, called out of the lost and damned human race by the Holy Spirit through the gospel, truly believe in Christ and are sanctified and incorporated into Christ through this faith.

Antitheses to I. Thesis.

In the alleged refutation of the Augsburg Confession read by the papists in 1530, called the "Confutation," it says: "The seventh article of the (Augsburg) Confession,

*These antitheses have been requested by dear fellow believers and confessors in Germany, partly for orientation with regard to the opponents, partly because in many cases the punctum saliens and the implications of a thesis only come to light from the antithesis. In accordance with the expressed wish of some readers of this journal, we are sharing here the collection of antitheses of writings published in Germany, which was initially made for Germany. For those who desire American antitheses, we refer you to the publications of the then Synod of Buffalo and its electors. A striking collection appeared already in the 9th volume of the "Lutheraner" under the title: "Auszügliche tabellarische Uebersicht einiger offenbaren Irrthümer Pastor Grabau's, mit den eigenen Worten desselben vorgelegt und mit der falschen römischen, sowie mit der reinen lutherischen verglichen." (S. No. 10 to 26.)

In which it is said that the church is an assembly of saints, cannot be admitted without detriment to the faith, if thereby the wicked and sinners are entirely excluded and separated from the church. For this article, condemned in the Concilio of Costnitz, is among other errors of the condemned John Hus, and wholly contradicts the Gospel." (S. Luther's Werke herausg. von Walch. XVI, 1227.)

The Jesuit Canisius answers the question, "What is the Church of Christ?" as follows: "It is the assembly of all who confess the faith and doctrine of Christ, who are governed under the One and Supreme Head and Shepherd on earth according to Christ." (Catechismus catholicus. Leodii, 1682. x. 26.)

Dr. Franz Delitzsch: "Whoever is baptized and participates in the Lord's Supper is a member of the body of Christ. The body of Christ is the totality of all those who have been baptized into one body and watered into one spirit. Let it be Hengstenberg or Wislicenus - by virtue of the act of God, which faith does not produce and unbelief does not frustrate, they are both members of one and the same body. Whether they are Protestants or Romans, Socians or Unitarians, they are all one in Christ by virtue of baptism. Thus God Himself has given to the Church, which He called into existence by the power of His grace, its limits recognizable to every simple eye." (Four Books of the Church. Dresden 1847. p. 33. f.)

Dr. Th. Kliefoth: "It is an error and a practically confusing error to take the common congregation for the church; and it makes no difference in this error whether one thinks of all the called and faithful, or only of all true believers; in the former case one receives only the concept of the mixed common congregation, and in the latter case only the concept of the true common congregation, but in neither case does one get beyond the concept of the congregation to that of the church. The pieces, the great limbs, of which the church consists, are not the individuals, and the local congregations, and the common congregation; but they are Christ the head, and the means of grace, and the office of the means of grace, and the congregation, and its diakonia; and the church is not the whole, which complicates itself out of individuals, congregations, and associations of congregations, which rather is the common congregation; but the church is the whole, which complicates itself out of the head Christ, and the means of grace with their office, and the congregation with its diakonia (the individuals, the congregations, the common congregation).** (Eight Books of the Church, Schwerin and Rostock, 1854, Vol. 1, p. 348).

The same: "It is precisely in this way that not one but two polar opposites pass through the Church, the dualism of docentes et audientes (teachers and hearers), which belongs to the Church as a divine institution of salvation, and the dualism of regentes et obedientes (governors and obeyers), which belongs to the Church as a structured and

The two opposites may well be interlocked in the whole of the church, but they are not one and the same. (Ibid. p. 455.)

"The Lutheran Church in PrussiaLutheran Church in Prussia": "Accordingly we reject, if it has been taught or is still being taught: a. that the outward appearance of the church is excluded from the essence and concept of the actual church; b. that the church according to its outward appearance, that is, as a visible institution, is a work of faith or of the faithful, but not directly founded by God; c. that the ungodly are in no sense members of the right church or body of Christ; d. that the constitution and worship of the church are not merely uniform. That the ungodly are in no sense members of the true church or of the body of Christ; e. That not only the uniformity of the constitutional and divine institutions adopted by the church, but also such a constitution and order in general and par excellence are to be excluded from that which constitutes the essence of the church." (Public Declaration on account of the disputed doctrines of the Church, etc.). From the submissions and on behalf of this year's General Synod, communicated to all congregations by the Upper Church Collegium of the Lutheran Church in Prussia. Breslau by Dülfer. 1864. S. 21.)

Consistorialrath Dr. L. Kraußold: "Only in contrast to the office does the community become a congregation and in the unity of both a church. A sine congregatio sanctorum (assembly of the saints), even if it were possible without an office, would not be a church." (Amt und Gemeinde in der ev.-luth. Kirche. Erlangen 1858. p. 9.)

Vilmar: "All who now take the doctrine of the church to heart must therefore progress from the concept of a community, which is always something subjective and only the result of the planting given by Christ, to the concept of an institution, as the object that first produces the community. (Theology of Facts. p. 47.)

Superintendent Münchmeyer: "She (the Church) is and remains only something on the ground of the real, visible Church, forming one great body, consisting of all the baptized." (The Dogma of the Visible and Invisible Church. Göttingen by Vandenhöck. 1854. S. 117.)

Pastor L. Räthjen in Neu-Ruppin: "We reject... that the church is the sum of believers scattered to and fro in the world and known only to God." (Luth. Dorfkirchenzeitung of 1858. p. 10.)

II. Thesis.

To the church in the true sense of the word belongs no ungodly, no hypocrite, no unregenerate, no heretic.

Antitheses to the II Thesis.

The Roman Catechism: "In the contending Church there are two kinds of men, good and bad; and the bad are of the same Sacra-.

The good, however, are called those in the Church who are united and bound together not only by the confession of faith and the communion of the sacraments, but also by the Spirit of grace and the bond of love. The Church, therefore, comprehends good and evil in herself." (Cat. Rom. I, 10, 7. 8.)

Dr. F. Delitzsch: "Even dead members - still members of the body of Christ. But how, I hear it asked in wonder, dead members in the body of Christ, dead, and yet belonging to Him? This question is already asked by our older teachers of the Church. The baptized, who lead a life unworthy of baptism, belong (?) in their opinion to the visible Church, but not to the Church in the proper sense, to the invisible or catholic. They may be parts, even organs, of the visible church, but members of the church, which is the body of Christ, they are not. We cannot acknowledge the legitimacy of these distinctions.... The body of a baptized person is a member of Christ through the act of God; if, then, a person in whom such an act of God has been done commits fornication, his body is a "member of Christ made a whore" (not merely having been, but still real!). He that is once baptized is a member of Christ, that cannot be changed." (Four Books of the Church. pp. 42. 43. 44.) Cf. Delitzsch's Antithesis to the I Thesis.

III. Thesis.

The church in the true sense of the word is invisible.

Antithesis to III Thesis.

The Roman Catechism: "The Church is visible, and includes in her bosom good and evil." (I, 10, 7.)

The Jesuit Cardinal Bellarmin writes: "The difference between our opinion and all other opinions is that all other opinions require inward virtues for one to belong to the church, and that they therefore make the true church an invisible one; but we also believe that all virtues, faith, hope, love, etc., are found in the church. But we also believe that all the virtues, faith, hope, charity, etc., are found in the church; but we hold that, in order that any one may be said to be a part of the true church, of which the sacred Scripture speaks, no inward virtue is required for this, but only the outward profession of faith, and the communion of the sacraments, which are perceived by the senses. For the Church is as visible and tangible a coetus of men as the coetus of the Roman people, or the empire of Gaul, or the Venetian republic." (Eccles. Milit. c. 2.)

Dr. F. Delitzsch: "The New Testament Scriptures know of no -visible and invisible church, which related to each other like shell and core, like body and soul, not of a church of the called and pure church of the elect, not of a church of the born-again.

and a church of the unregenerate - it only knows of one single church*), and this is the One Body which clings to Christ as its One Head and is animated by His One Spirit. It is not at all Scriptural to make a distinction between the body of Christ and the members of the visible church.... Invisible is the foundation of its life with the divine roots of its unity and holiness, invisible is the spirit that governs it, invisible is the life begotten by it and hidden with Christ in God, invisible and only God can unmistakably know in what innumerable manifold mixtures and gradations down to zero point it pulsates in the individual members - but visible is the church itself as the entirety of the baptized and partakers at the table of the Lord: These all are in the proper sense, and not merely inauthentic (aequivoce) members of the church, with their visible bodies both (1 Cor. 6, 15.), as well as with their invisible souls; and this church, and no other, because there is no other here, is the una sancta catholica apostolica ecclesia (the one, holy, universal, apostolic church), which we believe and profess." (Four Books of the Church. pp. 34. 35. 36.)

IV. Thesis.

It is this true church of believers and saints to which Christ has given the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and it is therefore the proper and sole owner and bearer of the spiritual, divine, and heavenly goods, rights, powers, offices, etc., which Christ has acquired, and which exist in his church.

Antitheses to the IV. Thesis.

Pope Pius VI. In his bull of condemnation against the bishop of Pistoja and against the synod held there in 1794, Pope Pius VI writes the following under the heading: "Of the authority given to the church by God, so that through it (the church) it may be communicated to the pastors: "The proposition which determines that the authority of the church is given by God, that it may be communicated to pastors, who are its ministers for the salvation of souls - understood in this way, that the authority of the church office and regulations is derived from the community of believers, and thus passes to the pastors: is condemned and rejected as heretical." (Concil. Trid. ed. Smets, p. 285.)

*Of course there is only One Church; when we speak of the visible and invisible Church, we do not speak of two Churches, but always of the One, which, however, when it is considered, as hypocrites are also mixed with it here, is called the visible, but as it is in itself in its real members, the invisible.

(Thesis writer.)

Superintendent Münchmeyer: "It is the doctrine of Christ that the Lord has given the office to certain persons, his apostles, not to the whole church. " (Rudelbach-Guericke's Zeitschrift of 1852. p. 105.) Elsewhere the same writes: "Yes, to the whole church the office is given according to Scripture, but it is given to her in full concrete reality, borne by certain living persons." (S. 53.)

Pastor W. Löhe: "The office stands in the midst of the congregations like a fruitful tree that has its seed by itself; it supplements itself, - a sentence that remains true even with the participation of the congregations in the election and calling of the elders, which has been granted above." (Aphorisms on the New Testament Offices and their Relation to the Church. Nuremberg, 1849. p. 71. f.)

The Immanuel Synod in Prussia: "What the Synod positively rejected is expressed in the following sentences: 1. The office of preaching is given by God to the congregation; the congregation confers it upon one of its own number to administer it in its stead and on its behalf. (2) Because the church has the office of the keys, it has, as an outflow of the same, and by the same token, the outward power of the church." (Synodal report of 1865. Kirchl. Zeitblatt of August 15 of this year).

Consistorialrath Dr. L. Kraußold: "The common view, as if Matth. 18, 18. the keys were given to the congregation, is to be decisively rejected on the basis of the text (!)." (Amt und Gemeinde in der ev.-luth. Kirche. Erlangen 1858. p. 84. f.)

Dr. A. W. Dieckhoff: "By the way, we have the Confessio Augustana for us (!), if we call it an error, when Luther overlooked that the words Joh. 20, 22. f. and Matth. 16, 18. f. are addressed to the apostles as such, and thus thought to be able to say that in Peter the keys were given to everyone who believes like Peter. Matthew 18:17 ff, to which passage Luther rightly ascribes the decisive weight in this question, and in which Lutheran dogmatics has followed him, shows that the keys do not belong to the ordo (the spiritual estate) to the exclusion of the rest of the church, that even in the exercise of the power of the keys apart from the spiritual office the rest of the church is not without share. Luther is not so simply right in the way he positively proves, on the basis of Matt. 16:18 ff, that the church is the holder of the power of the keys. By not taking into consideration that Peter personally, as an apostle, receives the keys of administration through his faith (Joh. 20, 21. ff.), he unilaterally considers Peter to be a believer alone and substitutes every believer for him as the recipient of the keys. In this way, what is the right of the church*) is not only principally made the individual right of the believer....

*) If not every believer has the keys, neither have they, as our

This is also not justified by Matth. 18, 17. ff. For what is there ascribed to the church cannot annul the meaning of it, that the keys are given to the apostles as such, thus still in another way than to the church in general, and besides, the concept of the church Matt. 18:17 ff. does not exclude the spiritual office in the congregation with its special right, but undoubtedly includes it." (Luther's Doctrine of Ecclesiastical Authority. Berlin by Schlawitz. 1865. S. 58-60.)

V. Thesis.

Although the true Church, in the proper sense of the word, is by its very nature invisible, its existence is (definitely) recognizable, and its characteristics are the pure preaching of the Word of God and the administration of the holy sacraments according to the institution of Christ.

Antitheses to the V. Thesis.

The Jesuit Peter Canisius: "In what way can the true Church be known and distinguished from the erroneous sects? From the characteristics and marks by which the divine Scriptures designate it. What are these marks? The first is unity in the faith and in the Christian religion. - What is the second characteristic of the true church? The holiness both of doctrine and of those who follow its teaching. - Now what is the third mark of the church? It is the universal extension over the whole earth and all the centuries, for the sake of which it is called the Catholic Church. - What is the fourth characteristic of the church? It is that, founded by the apostles, she perseveres in the doctrine of the apostles, and that, from that time on, she has had the uninterrupted succession of bishops. - What is the fifth characteristic of the true church? The headship of the true church, which is supreme after Christ and visible on earth. - What is the sixth characteristic of the true church? This is the power to perform true miracles. - What is the seventh characteristic of the true church? The seventh is the conversion of unbelievers to Christ. - Now what is left of the marks of the true church? The eighth may be called the apostasy of heretics who separate from her." (Catechismus catholicus. Cap. I, § 4. p. 27. sqq.)

The Socinian Catechism: "Since the essence of the Church of Christ is to have salutary doctrine, the same, when actually spoken, cannot be the mark of that, since the mark must be distinct from the thing of which it is the mark." (Cateches. Racoviens. ed. G. L. Oederus. 1739. Q. 489. p. 1018. 8.)

Confession says the whole church principaliter et immediate, originally and immediately. The ring on the finger is the whole body, but the whole body is not original and immediate, but the finger. (Thesis writer.)

The Reformed Belgian Confession: "The marks by which the true church is known are these: when the church has the pure preaching of the gospel, when it has in use the unadulterated administration of the sacraments according to Christ's command, when it practices church discipline to control sins." (Conf. Belg., prout in Synodo Dordrechtana fuit recognita et approbata. Art. 29.)

Dr. F. Delitzsch: "Pure word and sacrament are recognizable, but whether, where these are found, believers are also gathered, only the heart's announcer has an infallible judgment. (Four Books of the Church. p. 4.)

VI. Thesis.

In a non-genuine sense, according to sacred Scripture, the visible totality of all those who are called, i.e., all who profess and hold to the preached word of God and use the holy sacraments, which consists of good and evil, is also called the church (the general (Catholic) church), and the individual divisions thereof, i.e., the congregations that are occasionally found in which God's word is preached and the holy sacraments are administered. The individual divisions of the same, i.e., the congregations found from time to time in which God's word is preached and the holy sacraments are administered, are called churches (particular churches); for this reason, because the invisible, true, actually so-called church of the faithful, saints, and children of God lies hidden in these visible groups, and no elect are to be sought apart from the group of the called.

Antitheses to the VI Thesis.

The Jesuit Vitus Ebermann writes: "From the time of the Apostles until now, all baptized persons who do not adhere to any sect or innovation have been called and considered believers and members of the Catholic Church, without regard to the life and customs of the same, and the assembly composed of all of them has been called and considered the true and proper Catholic Church". (Parallela ecclesiae verae et falsae. p. 25.)

Dr. Th. Kliefoth: "Our church has always correctly taught that the visible mixed church and congregation is a church and congregation of God, not because and when there are at least two or three believers in them, but because and when there is rightly Word and Sacrament *) in them, and thus a place of the presence and grace of God." (Eight Books of the Church. p. 316.) Hence, in what follows, the same declares for a

*Our church does not teach that a congregation is a church because and when there is "right word and sacrament" in it, but that the church is there when there is right word and sacrament. Our church, then, declares Word and Sacrament to be the marks of the church, not, as Dr. Kliefoth and others do, its constituent parts. Compare the antithesis of the same to Thesis I-,

(Thesensteller.)

The pietistic error is the doctrine: "That the name of a church of Christ belongs to the mixed church of reality only because some believers are found in it; for for the sake of its believing part, the church mixed of believers and merely called is synecdochically called the church of Christ, by taking pars pro toto (the part for the whole), and is treated as such". (S. 340.)

VII. Thesis.

Just as the visible communities, in which Word and Sacrament are still essential, bear the name **church** because of the true invisible church of true believers that is found in them, according to God's Word, so also for the sake of the true invisible church that is hidden in them, even if these were only two or three, they have the **authority that** Christ gave to his whole church.

Antit broom to the VII Thesis.

The Tridentine Concilium: "If anyone says ... that those who are neither lawfully ordained nor sent by ecclesiastical and canonical authority*), but come from elsewhere, are lawful ministers of the Word and Sacraments: let him be accursed." (Session 23. Cap. 4. Can. 7.)

The Benedictine Virvesius cries out to the Lutherans, "Since you cannot have the (true) Church without us, how can you have the right calling and ordination- of the ministers of the Church?" (Menzeri Exeges. A. C. p. 637.)

The Jesuit Vitus Ebermann: "A community whose public confession is tainted with even one heresy is not a bunch of wheat that has not yet been purified, but nothing but chaff that has rashly flown away from the threshing floor of the church and is kept for the unquenchable fire. Their confession is not gold mixed with copper, but a mass thoroughly corrupted by infernal leaven, or yet a poisoned nectar, which brings the most certain death to all who drink it." (Parallela ecclesiae verae et falsae, p. 57.)

Pastor Könnemann wrote in 1861 the book: "Word and Sacraments, the Means of Grace of the Church" (Neu-Ruppin by Oehmigke), of which Dr. Münkel and others report the following: "Here Könnemann presents the doctrine, which to my knowledge is also shared by Diedrich, Pistorius and others, that the church is only there where the Word of God is taught purely and unadulterated. So there is no church apart from the Lutheran church." (Neues Zeitblatt, Sept. 13, 1861. p. 191.)

*) By the ecclesiastical and canonical power the Tridentine Concilium understands, of course, only the power of the papal-Roman, as the allegedly only true Church of JEsu Christ. (Thesensteller.)

VIII. Thesis.

Even in unbelieving, heretical congregations there are children of God; even there the true church is revealed by the pure Word and Sacrament still remaining in them.

Antitheses to the VIII Thesis. X.

The Jesuit Vitus Ebermann writes: "Who may believe, if he is not nonsensical, the (Lutheran theologian) Musaeus and his comrades, when they cry out with Luther: even where the Antichrist and the swarm spirits reign, there also remain, as long as baptism remains with the Bible, a seed peculiar to the true church and consequently secret saints, because nemlich das Wort nie leer wiederkomme, Jes. 55, 11.? Woe to the wretched Saxons who are in such a dark night that they do not see through these revealed depths of Satan." (Parallela ecclesiae verae et falsae, p. 57.)

The papal theologian Augustin Gibbon: "It is impossible that a heretical church, or one corrupted in fundamental doctrines, should be a mother of true believers and righteous men*); unless it be admitted that true believers are permitted to have communion with heretics." (De Luthero-Calvinismo schismatico. Erfurt. 1663. Disp. I, § 3.)

Pastor Räthjen in Neu-Ruppin reported about the teachings of the former Prussian Lutheran church councilor Pistorius and his party in his village newspaper of 1860: "In addition, this party denies the word 'church' in every way to all false churches, i.e. the Roman, reformed and unchurched churches, because not baptism nor other pieces of apostolic doctrine make the church, but the pure doctrine and the organism around it. The baptized children together with their Anabaptists, for example, in the Roman church, were not yet to be regarded as parts of the church, even if they were both heartily believers in Christ." (S. 9.)

Pastor Räthjen: "We also say, like Pistorius: only the Lutheran church is to be called the church of Christ; but we understand by it the congregations which really have pure doctrine, and say: so far do we see Christ's church; but it goes further before God than we can see and name it in time." (There.)

The same: "We believe, teach, and confess: a. That in the sight of God those alone belong to the church who believe with their hearts and confess with their mouths the true gospel, that is, who stand in the congregation of all believers according to their whole being, with

*Gibbon, of course, knew quite well that we Lutherans do not regard an irreligious church as such for a mother of true believers, but insofar as the same still essentially retains God's Word and administers holy baptism according to Christ's institution. (Thesensteller.)

to whom the gospel is taught purely and unadulterated, and the sacraments are administered according to the gospel.... (6) That even those who believe with all their hearts but do not yet profess either the pure gospel or the church of all believers, where the gospel is taught purely and correctly, do not yet belong to the church on earth before God and man.... By denying the sacrament to the Roman, Reformed, Uniate ... we uphold the excommunication which the Church (!) has pronounced before us against them or their fathers. (6) We believe, teach, and confess that in our time we have recognized as the congregation of all believers, in whom the gospel is taught purely and unadulterated, and the sacraments are administered according to the gospel, the church which has received the name of the Evangelical Lutheran since the sixteenth century. The Church which has inherited the name of the Evangelical Lutheran Church since the sixteenth century and has remained faithful to the confessions of the Fathers are: the three ecumenical symbols, the unaltered Augsburg Confession, its Apology, the Schmalkaldic Articles, Luther's Small and Large Catechism, and the Formula of Concord. Note: Those churches (parts of churches) which from the time of the fathers, not out of opposition to the pure doctrine, but for other reasons, have not accepted one or the other of these confessions, and have remained with the originally accepted symbols, we count as the Protestant church of our time. 8. (8) We believe, teach, and confess that the evangelical (Lutheran) church is entitled to all the figurative designations which the Holy Spirit in God's Word has given to the church, that it is therefore to be called, for example, the body of Christ in our time. Note: Since (!) this designation of the church (e. g. in the Apology) occurs only of the true believers, i. e. of the living members of the body of Christ, (!) it is not thereby excluded that the church, to which also the hypocrites and wicked belong, is likewise so designated. We therefore reject ... 7. that confessors of the Lutheran faith, who have not given up their outward fellowship with an irreligious multitude, or do not wish to give it up, are to be counted as belonging to the church for the sake of their confession.... Note: Therefore let us not speak among ourselves: All believers in erroneous religious communities are Lutherans *) or church members, or actually belong to the church." (Luth. Dorfkirchenzeitung of 1858. p. 10.)

VIII Thesis. B.

Each one is bound in his blessedness to flee all false prophets and to avoid fellowship with erroneous churches or sects.

*) And yet the Lutheran church is to be the congregation of all believers and the body of Christ! (Thesensteller.)

Antithesis to VIII Thesis B.

Dr. F. Delitzsch: "In every Reformed man you see a brother and a member of one body with you, for, like you, he is partaker of the bath of regeneration and has been implanted in Christ. All special churches are but parts of the one church of Christ, and though their commonwealth is held together by different confessions, yet they all form one circle, in the midst of which stands the Lord, and are all united by the holy sacraments. This mysterious, divine union is unbreakable, but the state-like human unions are flaxen bonds." (Four Books of the Church. p. 157. f.)

VIII. Thesis. C.

Every Christian, in his blessedness, is bound to profess and hold to the orthodox churches and to their orthodox preachers, where he finds such.

Antitheses to VIII Thesis. C.

The Socinian Catechism: "He who has the wholesome doctrine is in the true Church itself, therefore it is not necessary that he should ask for the marks by which the Church is known." (Catechesis Racov. Ed. Oederus. Q. 490. x. 1020.)

Dr. F. Delitzsch: "Sin is the ultimate cause of all discord within and without us, including the discord of the Church. But we also have the consolation that this discord of the confessions will be fought through to the victory of triumphant unity by the power of the Spirit who rules in the universal Church.... But let us patiently await this glorification, without obscuring the wounds which it seeks to heal. Let the Church of the German Reformation hold fast to her confession, so long as she knows herself in it as the mouth of the church of Christ, and let the Church of the Swiss Reformation hold fast to hers, so long as she does not recognize it as the will of God to sweep out the leaven of error which has penetrated it. As long as she does not know how to do this, let us be content with the unions of God." (Four Books of the Church. p. 157.)

IX. Thesis.

The only thing absolutely necessary for the attainment of blessedness is communion with the invisible church, to which alone all those glorious promises concerning the church were originally given.

Antitheses to the IX Thesis.

The Roman Tridentine Catechism: "Generally it" (the Roman Church) "is also called because all those who have the eternal

If they desire to attain salvation, they must hold on to it and accept it, not unlike those who entered the ark so as not to perish in the flood." (I, 10, 16.)

Cf. the antitheses to Thesis VIII. X.

Second part.

Of the sacred office of preaching or parish ministry.

I. Thesis.

The sacred office of preaching, or parish ministry, is an office distinct from the priestly office, which all believers have.

Antitheses to I. Thesis.

The Socinian Catechism: "Do not those who teach in the church and watch over the preservation and preservation of order need to be sent in a special way? Not at all. For these do not now bring new and previously unheard teaching." (Catechesis Racoviensis. Ed. G. L. Oederus. Q. 505. p. 1031.)

The Socinian Ch. Ostorod: "It is therefore not necessary to think as if a man were doing wrong when he takes upon himself the teaching office without a mission, since such a work comes from true Christian love. Now if the Adversaries would say that the present teachers of the commonwealth not only preach, but also baptize, and administer and perform the Lord's supper, which cannot be done without a special vocation and mission: We answer that this cannot be proved, namely, that no one can do the thing unless he is called and sent to do it; for since Christ instituted the supper, he said nothing about it, but commanded his own only to do it afterward, which, that it concerns all believers in general, and not the apostles alone, is plainly evident from 1 Cor. 11." (Instruction on the Main Points of the Christian-Socinian Religion. Cracow 1625. cap. 42. S. 437.)

II. Thesis.

The office of preacher or pastor is not a human order, but an office instituted by God Himself.

Antitheses to the II Thesis.

The Socinian J. Volkel writes: "The ministers of the church may administer the Lord's supper and baptism in the established churches, as Paul and others may have done, for the preservation of order and decency, but not because they are necessarily and solely obliged to do so." (Resp. ad. van. refut. dissolut. nodi Gordii. 6. 21, p. 169.)

Dr. J. W. S. Höfling: "The difference, therefore, between the clergy and the laity, which our church also has and must assert, is... merely one, albeit with inner necessity, belonging to the human order of church and worship." (Principles of Lutheran Church Constitution. 3rd edition. Erlangen -ei Bläsing. 1853. S. 76.)

The same: "But, we ask, ... do we not see from the Acts of the Apostles and the Pastoral Epistles that the Apostles and their delegates partly themselves ordained presbyters and deacons, and partly ordained those elected by the congregations for their office by prayer and the laying on of hands? .. To this question we can only answer that we know the real facts as well as the opponents, and, far from denying them or even wanting to ignore them, we only deny a false conception of them and false conclusions which are built upon them. We deny that the apostles did what they did in this respect in consequence of a special commandment of the Lord." (Op. cit. p. 274.)

The same: "The sanctity of the Sunday celebration must, according to our correct, confessional Protestant view, dispense with an external ceremonial-legal necessity and be content with the reason for its internal necessity.... Should not everything that applies to the ecclesiastical celebration of Sundays, whose sanctity we do not wish to diminish, but to preserve in an evangelical manner, also apply to the ecclesiastical appointment to office? Should the latter be able to claim for itself a right of existence different from that of the former?" (A. a. O. p. 278.)

The same: "Only our Lutheran Church maintains itself rightly on the standpoint of evangelical freedom and equality, in that it makes a definite distinction between the spiritual office in and for itself and the same as a duly and constitutionally appointed common office, and, in the most decisive assertion of the divine appointment of the former, does not at the same time claim for the latter a special divine appointment and a special divino jure (by divine right) existence in the sense of a special divine institution of salvation". (Op. cit. p. 75.)

Pastor Crome (in Rade vorm Walde): "You (Missourians) violate this truth because you want to explain the existing reality of the public office by a supposed command of Christ..., instead of recognizing the natural order in the world based on God's creative institution, out of which God does not lift His church, in which He rather seeks us through the gospel." (Lutheran Synodal Gazette, edited by R. Lohmann. 1861. May issue.)

The same: "The teaching community under its teacher forms a righteous moral relationship, and the teaching office in it is one that is founded in God's (namely, natural) order, just as the

political community and the magisterial office, that is enough.... I do not shrink from the confession that all that science does and teaches, according to God's will, and the true nature of the matter, should be a state and order, but its summit and crown the teachers and shepherds of the church." (Op. cit.)

Pastor Ebert (then in Danzig), in an article in the aforementioned Synodalblatt, states: "That the pastor vocirte according to Augsb. Conf. 14. i-ito vocirte Pastor in his difference from the bearer of the Augsb. Conf. 5." (i. e. which all Christians have) "is nothing but a product of natural conditions." (Op. cit.)

III. Thesis.

The office of preaching is not an arbitrary office, but such an office as the church is commanded to establish, and to which the church is ordinarily bound until the end of days.

Antihesis to the III Thesis.

The Socinian Andr. Radeck writes: "We concede that church ministers could not only have been called in former times, indeed, that they were called, but that they can also be called now. But whether what once happened, and can happen nowadays, is necessary for the establishment of an ecclesiastical office, that is and remains the question"-(Not. ad refut. dissolut. nodi Gordii, p. 3.)

IV. Thesis.

The office of preaching is not a special, sacred office, like the Levitical priesthood, which stands in contrast to the common Christian state, but an office of service.

Antitheses to the IV. Thesis.

The Tridentine Concilium: "If anyone says that in the New Testament there is only a ministry and mere service of preaching the Gospel, or that those who do not preach are not priests at all, let him be accursed! If any man say that in the New Testament there is no visible and outward priesthood, let him be accursed!" (Sess. 23. Can. 1.)

The same: "If any man assert that all Christians without distinction are the priests of the New Testament, and that all are endowed among themselves with equal spiritual power, he seems to do nothing but confound the ecclesiastical hierarchy, which is like an army standing in battle array, as if, contrary to Paul's teaching, all were apostles, all prophets, all evangelists, all pastors, all teachers." (Sess. 23, c. 4.)

Löhe: "The ministry stands in the midst of the congregations like a fruitful tree that has its seed with itself; it replenishes itself." *) (Aphorisms etc. of 1849. p. 71.)

The same: "He who is ordained to the ministry is no longer a layman. From this it follows that there can be no such thing as lay elders or lay presbyters. Either they are laymen, in which case they are not presbyters; or they are presbyters, in which case they are not laymen. Ordination makes the difference between them and the congregation (the people = the laity)." (Op. cit. p. 79.)

The same: "Either ordination is a ceremony of induction into a particular office, in which case it may be repeated; or it may not be repeated, in which case it is more, namely, the conferring of the presbyterate and its powers for ever, the separation and sanctification of the ordinands for the office, the granting of power and authority to do the office, wherever a particular profession entails it. Consider and see well what one chooses." **) (Ibid. p. 111.)

Vilmar: "Only from this certainty, from this certainty that the office is represented directly by Christ,... flows for us ... the power to split the head of sin with a single word.... All this the church cannot do, not even the church of the saints, so neither can it give power, commission, mandate, and strength to do it." (Erlanger Zeitschrift. September issue of 1859.)

V. Thesis.

The ministry of preaching has the power to preach the gospel and administer the holy sacraments, and the power of spiritual judgment.

Antitheses to the V. Thesis.

Zwingli writes: "Christ's words, when he says John 20:23: 'Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them') have by no means this meaning, as if Christ, in speaking this, intended to give his disciples power to remit sins, for no creature is so exquisite as the one who remits sins.

1) Hereby Löhe obviously makes the preachers a class like the Levitical priesthood. At the Leipzig Pastoral Conference in 1851, Huschke quite rightly explained: "Class is a. a class of people with the same occupational activity, lasting as long as the activity of the occupation; b. a community that is only inherent in certain persons and regenerates itself. In the latter sense, the Catholic Church takes the spiritual state. The symbolic books speak against this. The office is activity, not personal nature." (Rudelbach-Guericke'sche Zeitschr. XIII, 109.) Löhe's view is thus the Roman error.

(Thesis writer.)

2)) Since Löhe rejects the former, he naturally opts for the latter.

(Thesis writer.)

and excellent to forgive sins." (Resp. ad confess. Luth. Tom. II, x. 430.)

The Socinian J. L. Wolzogen: "The apostles have no successors in this their power and authority to forgive sins, but this authority has returned to God and Christ with their departure from this world." (Comment, ad Matth. 16, 19. Dom. I, 513.)

VI Thesis.

The office of preaching is conferred by God through the congregation, as the holder of all church authority or keys, and by their divinely prescribed profession.

Antitheses to the VI Thesis.

The Tridentine Concilium: "The Most Holy Synod teaches that in the ordination of bishops, priests, and other ministers, neither the consent, nor the calling, nor the authority of the people, nor of any temporal power or authority, is so necessary that without it the ordination would be invalid." (Sess. 23. c. 4.)

Löhe: "The leeway of the congregations is great or small, depending on the circumstances; but the placing" (of the preachers in office) "itself, the last decisive vote should nevertheless belong in the end to Timothy, Titus, Paul, for it is said of them that they placed. The congregation could err palpably, vote passionately, be seduced, be swayed in favor of heretics.... The last discretion and the final decision about the person to be elected lay with him who had the commission to 'set'. After all, the work was his, and to his love, wisdom, and responsibility was left the measure in which the congregations were to be consulted. An unconditional suffrage of the congregation is not only unapostolic, but also highly dangerous, a way to drive Christ out of the congregations by a majority and to open door and gate to the Baal of this world.... Let it be left to the setting presbyter (bishop), recommended, even commanded, to heed the reasonable wishes of the congregations; let the congregations be permitted and unhindered to assert their "testimony" of the one to be elected, to express their wishes, but let them also recognize that it is not **their** right to strive against the wise discretion of the setting presbyter (bishop). The appointor may be absent, and his proceedings may be brought before the synod. Everywhere in the New Testament we see that the sacred office produces the congregations, nowhere that the office - even in its definite version as the office of the eldest - is only a conferral of congregational rights and powers. The ministry stands in the midst of the congregations like a fruitful tree which has its seed in itself; it supplements itself, - a proposition that

The above-mentioned participation of the congregations in the election and appointment of elders also remains true. As long as the presbytery retains the examination and ordination of the presbyters who have been called or are to be called (and when should it lose this?), it is right and can be defended that it supplements itself and reproduces itself from person to person, from generation to generation. Those who have it pass it on, - and to whom it is passed on by the owners, he also has it for God's sake. One comes here to the truth of the idea of succession held by most Christian churches" (the Roman, Greek, and Espicopal churches) "on the face of the earth. It is not enough for an elder to be properly elected and called; those who were elders before him must recognize him as competent and approve his election, conferring their office upon him with prayer and the laying on of hands. Only then is he what he ought*). The ministry is a stream of blessing which pours down from the apostles to their disciples, and from these disciples weather and so down through the ages..... Notice how quite different the installation of deacons is from the installation of presbyters" (pastors) "! To this the multitude of the faithful', the congregation, is not called in; it is entirely in the hands of the appointing apostles and evangelists, who call in the congregation and members of the congregation at their discretion and according to their need. On the other hand, for the introduction of the diaconate, the multitude is called together, the plan is presented to them - though in the imperative, for (!) the apostles are the Lord's representatives - they give and show their approval. And now how are the deacons brought up? They are chosen by the congregation, presented to the apostles, and ordained by them, according to the standard of necessary character determined by the apostles. One might call the presbytery a holy aristocracy of the church, **) while in the election of the deacons there is something democratic. Where the office of the Lord is to be perpetuated, the Lord's chosen servants rule,

1) Löhe thus counts the cooperating activity of the ministry, which is also outside the congregation, in the appointment of a pastor not only to the legality, but even to the validity of the assumption of office, makes it itself not only to the conditio sine qua non, but to the only actual factor of the office. (Thesis writer.)

2)) Melanchthon and others also call the church an aristocracy, but in a completely different sense than Löhe, namely, because in the church the votes are not counted, but weighed, and the actual government of the church is not determined by official powers, but by a gift of proof based on clear and thorough knowledge from Scripture. Now even to call the presbyterate a 'holy aristocracy' is Roman error. (Thesis writer.)

the bearers of his office, according to their authority and divine power. Where the voluntary mercy of the congregation requires an office for its most holy operation, the congregation may also participate in its election." (Aphorisms on the New Testament Offices. pp. 58. ff. to 87.)

Dr. L. Kraußoldr "As is well known, this passage" (from the Schmalkaldic Articles, namely: "Just as the promise of the gospel certainly and without means belongs to the whole church, so the keys belong without means to the whole church, for the keys are nothing else than the ministry," etc.) "is the main support of the theory of transmission.... Three things should be noted in addition to what has been said. First, that nowhere in this passage is the 'potestas' (power) clavium (the key) mentioned, but only the 'claves,' while the office is still specially mentioned.*) For the second, that not (!) the congregation is mentioned, but constantly the church, **) and that not "nude" (without all addition) "'the church,' but the whole church, i.e. (!) the church with the Episcopis and Pastoribus vis-à-vis the pope, thus the church in its totality, i.e. in its summary of congregation and office." †) (Office and congregation, etc. 35. 38. f.)

VI Thesis. B.

The ordination of the called with the laying on of hands is not a divine institution, but an apostolic ecclesiastical order, and only a public solemn confirmation of the profession.

Antitheses to VI Thesis. B.

The Socinian Theophilus Nicolaides writes: "Since nowadays it can easily happen that, when this ceremony (ordination) is observed, the one who gives it to others also believes that he is endowed with that power with which those who gave it to others were once endowed, it is not necessary, however, that this ceremony be used; indeed, it may even be useful that it be omitted altogether. For from such ceremonies superstition is apt to arise, that pestilence of all true religion; inasmuch as the people (according to their custom

*) The truth is rather that in the relevant passage of the Schmalk. Article the Olaves or the keys are declared to be synonymous with office, thus also with potestas clavium, power of the keys. (Thesensteller.)

**) To distinguish between the congregation and the church is purely a matter of fudging. (Thesis writer.)

†) When the Schmalk. Articles speak of "the whole church," they mean, as the context teaches, not only this and that, but all the members of it. (Thesensteller.)

to) more than to true piety itself." (Defens. tract. de miss. ministr. c. 11. p. 176.)

The Tridentine Conciliar: "If anyone says that the Ordo or Holy Ordination is a human contrivance devised by men inexperienced in ecclesiastical matters, let him be accursed! If any man say that the ordo or holy ordination is not truly and actually a sacrament instituted by the Lord, or only a use to elect the ministers of God and of the sacraments, let him be accursed!" (Sess. 23. can. 3.)

Superintendent A. F. O. Münchmeyer: "In regard to ordination, we are nothing less than to derive from it a character indelebilis of those who have received it, nor are we at all disposed to ascribe to it the bestowal of a specific grace, only apart from this,that, because of the difference in the fundamental view, we consider ordination to be more than an "ecclesiastical declarative act," namely, an admission by the Lord, in the manner ordered by him, by means of the organized church, into the state of special pastors founded by him, which, of course, does involve a specific capacity." (The Office of N. T. Attempt at a Refutation of the Provisions on the Office Given by Prof. Dr. Höfling. Guericke's Zeitschrift of the year 1852. p. 50.)

Löhe: "One will have to admit that ordination is more and applies more than is usually assumed, that it gives the ability and authority to administer office of a more general kind, that a charisma, an official grace and gift comes through it, that the sentence: sine titulo ne quis ordinetur ('No one should be ordained without having found a certain sphere of activity *) must be exploited in this way: 'No one should receive the general authority and gift before he can use it somewhere. **Conversely, however, the installation to the special sphere of activity will present itself in such a way that it will become a kind of development and outpouring of the ordination for the special spheres of activity, a continuation of the stream of grace which sprang up in the ordination, - and herewith it would also cease to be a mere ceremony.** (Aphorisms, etc., p. 76).

The same: "They (the Lutheran teachers) are right when they ascribe this gift not to the laying on of hands per se, but to prayer; but they will have to admit (!) that the prayer is an ordination prayer and is different from a prayer of the same content (as far as one can tell by generalizing-.

*) This doctrine of an "ability to administer office," "grace of office," and "general authority and gift" brought about by ordination irrefutably includes the Roman doctrine of a special privileged spiritual state.

(Thesis writer.)

The Lutheran teachers, however, who can concede that they are not ordained), have on other occasions spoken of, differed greatly as to power and hearing. (A. a. O. p. 106.) Löhe had already written above: "They (the Lutheran teachers) do not deny the ministerial grace, nor that it is given at ordination; they maintain that it is not given by the laying on of hands, but by the hearing of prayer. But the prayer is, after all, an ordination prayer, said by ordaining presbyters, and it is not asserted that ministerial grace is also given as an answer to other prayers offered outside of ordination." *) (S. 75.)

According to Vilmar, the laying on of hands is not a sacrament, "but still less an empty ceremony; in the New Testament it is supposed to be a granting of power, which the Lord granted to the apostles, an exercise of power, by means of which the Holy Spirit with his charisms was distributed." And this grant of power, according to Vilmar, was propagated by the apostles. And he goes on to say that in order to exercise this power, we ourselves must possess the Holy Spirit: "In this case we are not ministers of the sacraments, on whose worthiness or unworthiness the efficacy of our action does not depend; this time the Holy Spirit is not, as in holy baptism, given to the element, to the word (of institution), or, if you will, bound, but is united with our spirit and passes through the organs of the spirit, the soul and the body, over to the spirit of the other. This time our I is involved in the most personal way in the communication of the Holy Spirit through the laying on of hands." (Erlanger Zeitschrift. September issue of 1859.)

VII Thesis.

The sacred office of preaching is the power conferred by God through the congregation as the holder of the priesthood and all church authority to exercise the rights of the spiritual priesthood in public office of communal ways.

Antitheses to the VII Thesis.

Pastor J. Diedrich: "What about the transfer? The Missourians think that the priestly congregation delegates its preaching duty to the preacher as a priest under and beside them. I'm having a hard time

*Löhe herewith quite obviously ascribes a sacramental character to the act of ordination; for if the prayer spoken at the act of ordination is heard, but remains unheard if the rite of ordination is not connected with it, then ordination is a sign connected with words of command and promise, that is - a kind of
Sacrament. (Thesensteller.)

to such superficial and childish views." *) (Luth. Dorfkirchenzeitung of 1863. p. 40.)

Pastor Crome: "With this much moved theory of transfer it is a very fragile thing. First of all, who gives a man, to whom God gives an office, as to the Christian the office of the keys, the right and authority to lay it aside from himself and transfer it to another? I know how you will answer, that the Lord himself hath commanded it. But first this other thing: How can a Christian cast off his key office and put it on another? He has it through baptism and faith. He must wash away baptism and pluck out faith, and then he would be rid of the keys, but not otherwise. See, dear brother, what a dead mechanical thing you make of the office of the keys with your theory of transmission. And what then a Christian does and practices daily, when he carries the gospel in his mouth, is not this the office of the keys? How comes he to have it after all, when he hath delivered it? Has he divided it? According to what measure and proportion?" (Lutheran Synodal Gazette by R. Lohmann. Issue 5.) **)

VIII. Thesis.

The preaching office is the highest office in the church, from which all other church offices flow.

Antithesis to the VIII Thesis.

The members of the Ober-Kirchen-Collegium in Breslau, Director Dr. Huschke, Kirchenrath Lasius and Pistorius, professed the following: "In that § 13 (of the Instruction for the Ober-Kirchen-Collegium, Syn.-Beschluss p. 11) recognizes that the Ober-Kirchen-Collegium is an 'organic member of the church government', its existence is not based on the Synod, which established it (or perhaps better: established it out of itself), but it is precisely

*It must be assumed that Pastor Diedrich herewith rejects and mocks the doctrine of the transfer of priestly rights, which the congregation of the saints possesses, in the appointment of a preacher, as (this doctrine) the Missourians really have with Luther, although it would not be so bad, although bad enough, if he meant here a completely different theory, invented by himself, and only mocked this as a doctrine of the Missourians. (Thesis writer.)

**The solution of all the difficulties and contradictions mentioned by Pastor Crome, into which the doctrine of transfer is supposed to entangle, lies simply in the fact that the preachers are servants of the congregation. As a housewife is not thereby "released" from her authority when she employs servants to whom she delegates her authority, so neither is the church of the faithful; only that, while it is at the discretion of the housewife to employ such servants, the church has a mandatum divinum to do so. The question, "according to what measure and proportion" the Christian has and retains the office of preacher, is answered by the 14th article of the Augsburg Confession. Confession. (Thesis writer.)

with the whole church, which is an organism, *) as an organic member, and that, like the church itself, by God.... That the church as a whole carries within itself a supervisory office which extends further than the sphere of office of a pastor, organically endowed **) by God, is attested to by the apostolate of the first and the episcopate †) of the following centuries of the church after the birth of Christ, as well as by the entire older period of the existence of the Lutheran church, which has always rejected reformed Jndependentism. We note this, however, merely because you" (Ehlers) "seem to regard the Synod as nothing more than an 'accidental union of a number of congregations' - a view which you yourself would certainly not be inclined to hold in all its consequences." (Written statement of the aforementioned entered under October 3, 1861. S. The Negotiations of the Commission for the Discussion of the Principles of the Church Constitution, which took place in Berlin in 1861, submitted to print by L. Feldner. Halle by Petersen. 1862. S. 324.)

IX. Thesis. X.

The preaching ministry is due reverence and unconditional obedience as the preacher leads God's Word.

Antithesis to the IX Thesis. A.

The enthusiast Valentin Weigel writes: "The apostle has a twofold ministry, as the ministry of the Spirit, where the minister, taught and sent by God, preaches the Spirit, power and life, and leads the way, teaching and life, like Christ; and the ministry of the letter, where the minister, learned and taught by men, preaches only the bare, dead letter, without power and juice, without spirit and life. He therefore that heareth the learned of God, or the messengers of God, with a good heart, cometh not again empty: for the saying of Paul is true, Fides ex auditu (faith cometh out of preaching, or hearing), that is, from the inward hearing. But he that heareth the minister of the letter will bring nothing of it, and there faith cannot come out of the hearing, for the outward testimony will not agree with the inward." (Talk of Christianity. p. 27.)

1) It is already evident from the context of the citation that the church is here declared to be an external organism. (Thesis writer.)

2)) At the end, the signatories declare the expression "eingestiftet" to be a "misunderstanding" and lament the resulting "misunderstandings". (Thesis writer.)

†) The assertion that the alleged divine appointment of a supervisory office over several parishes is also attested by the episcopate of the earliest post-apostolic times, shows that this error is 'contrary to the doctrine that God has appointed only One office in the Church, the office of the Word, and that this is therefore the highest. (Thesis writer.)

IX. Thesis. B.

The preacher has no dominion in the church; he has therefore no right to make new laws and to arbitrarily establish the middle things and ceremonies in the church.

Antitheses to IX Thesis B.

Superintendent Münchmeyer: "As far as ordinationes (ordinances) are concerned, ut res ordine in ecclesia gerantur" ("so that things happen properly in the church" Augsburg Conf. Art. 28.), "so also here the bearers of the church government have jure divino" (by divine right) "the permission to make them, only that they always distinguish them properly from what is commanded by God's word and necessary for salvation, and beware of the illaqueare conscientias" (entanglement of consciences). Certainly the common people are also bound to obey here, as the apostle demands to be subject to all human order for the sake of the Lord 1 Pet. 2, 13.*). The writer of these lines already believes ... to have led the convincing proof that the symbols count 5 pieces to the potestas ecclesiastica, i.e. to the God-given authority of the one church office, namely ... 5. the right ordinationes facere, ut res ordine in ecclesia gerantur" (to make ordinances, so that things may be done properly in the church, "ordinances concerning cultus, etc.)". (The Ministry of the New Testament. S. Guericke's Ztschr. Jahrgang 1852. p. 66. f.)

Pastor J. Diedrich: "God "acts through the office of preaching, and that alone in such a way that the preachers remain entirely responsible to Him for what they do and do not do in this office; princes and powerful people, individuals or large groups may say what they want about it. No one can take away from them the responsibility for doctrine, church discipline, pastoral care, and the administration of the sacraments, whether it be a prince, a consistory, or a congregation. Therefore this, to make church ordinances, is ascribed to the pastor alone." (Citirt in Dr. Münkel's Neuem Zeitblatt of 1860.)

The same: "The actual church action is all with the pastor." (Luth. Dorfkirchenzeitung of 1860. p. 40.)

Dr. Kliefoth: "Perhaps, however, the church regiment... comes to the congregation?... The question is often answered in the affirmative.... It also seems really

*) If, according to Sup. Münchmeyer^ doctrine, the congregations are "bound to render obedience, to be subjects for the Lord's sake," when the preacher makes outward ordinances, the consciences are already entangled. By "human order" (ανθρώπινη *χτίσις* = creation among men), of which God's Word 1 Pet. 2, 13. speaks, to understand institution made by a preacher, is a bad confusion beyond all measure. (Thesensteller.)

nothing is clearer than this. If it is true that in the church there are only ... docentes et audientes (teachers and hearers), then one need only take as an aid ... that the office of government does not belong to the docentes as such, and one arrives at the concise conclusion that the office of government can belong to no one but the congregations, the laity, the audientes.... In the concept of audientes, as it is here conceived, it is not at all implied that they cannot be full of all Christian knowledge, power, and wisdom. But if we look more closely, this conclusion is based on the simple circumstance that the church is not only an institution of salvation, but also an organism, and therefore does not consist only of docentes et audientes, but also has within itself the dualism of regentes et obedientes (governing and obeying), which does not belong to the church order, in which the pastors as well as the laity are in themselves counted among the obedientes. Hence, from the fact that church government does not belong to the ministry of the means of grace, it only follows that it must be found somewhere and somehow among those who do not bear the ministry of the means of grace, but it does not follow that it belongs to those who do not bear the ministry of the means of grace in toto (in their totality) and as such.... The result, then, is that the church government belongs as little to the church, as such, as to the means of grace, as such." (Eight Books of the Church. p. 463. ff.) "It only remains, therefore, simply to acknowledge that the church government is an office in the church, given by the Lord to the church, with the governmental power decided in it, distinct and peculiar, both from the office of means of grace, and from the church office (of diaconia in all forms)." (Op. cit. p. 489.)

IX. Thesis. C.

The preacher has no right to impose and exercise the ban alone, without the prior knowledge of the whole congregation.

Antitheses to the IX Thesis. 6.

Pastor Räthjen: "The ministry of preaching alone is the actual and highest church government and has the power of the ordo and the jurisdiction, i.e. the administration of the means of grace and church discipline. The preachers practice it well or badly: it is entrusted to them by Christ; God will also require it of them. They can do nothing to anyone, nor should they do it in any other way than by word; and if they preach falsely, everyone should leave them.) Moreover, secondly, de jure humano, because order must be, and a multitude of men cannot, as a multitude, make order for themselves, the preachers ought to make the necessary order..., to whom all

*) To this someone made the remark: "That the church and the parsonage alone should remain to them!

for the sake of love and good manners. *) Such are the ways of the churches of Christ, as our symbol teaches. (!) But we add: about this one can fraternally compare with authorities and insightful members of the church, because it concerns human things." (Luth. Dorfkirchenzeitung of the year 1860. January to April.)

The Roman Catechism: "Sometimes also by the name of the church are signified its superiors and pastors. 'If he hear thee not,' saith Christ, 'tell the church'; in which place the superiors of the church (the pastors) are signified." (I, 10. Fr. 9.)

X. Thesis.

According to divine law, the office of preaching also includes the office of judging doctrine, but the laity also have the right to do this; therefore they also have a seat and a vote in the church courts and councils with the preachers.

Antitheses to the X. Thesis.

Superintendent Münchmeyer: "In the acts of the regiment at a higher level, the Christian people should also be heard. Therefore I demand synods. I would not even object if the number of laymen who appeared, led by their pastor, were greater. Only that these synods should neither become constituent, nor ever receive a right of decision. The actual decision-making must necessarily remain in the hands of the pastors, otherwise they are deprived of their office." (The Office of N. T. etc. Guericke's Zeitschr. of 1852. p. 68.)

Pastor Löhe: "In consequence of what has already been said, I would recommend the following conclusions for application to the organization of our synodal system: I. The nucleus of a Synod is the Presbytery, i. e. the entire Presbyters or Aeltesten present.**) It is they to whom the questions are put, - it is they who assemble (i. e. the Synod) and decide. II. The synods are public, i.e. no member of the congregation who wishes to be present can be turned away; also every one, according to his gift and zeal, must have the right - understood according to the existing order - to make motions and to participate.

1) "Have all to follow for the sake of love and good morals" at all times, and "can" the preacher only let others also consult, so the ekngeräümte difference between a violence de jure divino and de jure humano is only a triigliche appearance. (Thesensteller.)

2)) Pastor Löhe understands by presbyters or elders only pastors, not so-called lay elders, and by presbytery only the ministry, not, as our old teachers, the church council, to which also lay elders belong. (Thesensteller.)

speak, as (?) was the case at Jerusalem. III. Every Christian belonging to Synod alSprengel may be present, but the congregations as such, in their separation from and towards the presbyters, have no representatives. The shepherds represent the flock which they feed,-and the flock trusts them to do so.... VI. the simple counsel of the apostles or elders is simply accepted, pervades the multitude, is made a ready conclusion by the apostles.... VII. the synods do not merely advise the congregations, but they decide in the name of the congregation, and no individual congregation may evade the decisions without withdrawing from the diocese." (Aphorisms, etc. pp. 118-120.)

The Cardinal Bellarmin: "To decide in concilia what is to be believed and done is the proper office of pastors. For pasturing is really teaching, and teaching in such a way that others are obliged to believe. Jer. 3. Ephes. 4. but the laity are not pastors." (Lib. I. de concil. c. 15.)

Lecture delivered on the occasion of the solemn inauguration of our Synodal Printing Office.

We have heard before *) what mighty? The promotion of literary traffic preceded the blessed Reformation. How the art of printing was in the hand of God the means to give free way to his word in the 16th century. And indeed, if the Bible remained as rare and precious as it had been in the Middle Ages, and if the opposition to the arrogance of the popes was as scattered as that of Huss, it was not possible to overthrow Roman antichristianism.

To this highly important consideration I would like to add only one parallel. The introduction of Christianity was preceded by a quite similar extraordinary upswing in intellectual, even book - traffic, 'like the Reformation. Admittedly not by the means of the printing press, but - but let me first state the fact.

If we ask about the distribution of the most widely read writings in imperial times, we are surprised. Not only were the Roman newspapers eagerly studied in all provinces and in all quarters, by old and young, noble and lowly, down to the common soldiers; but even poems like those of Properz and Ovid were found in every man's pocket from the Sahara to the Grampian mountains. The Xenia of Martial were read by the English non-commissioned officers with no less eagerness than

*The actual inauguration speech was held by Prof. Walther. It has been published by the "Lutheran" at the request of the congregants.

188 Lecture, held at the solemn inauguration of our Synodal Printing Office. The first of these is the "Synodalruckerei".

the ladies of Rome and Vienne. - Even tasteless fantasies like the pseudo-Sibylline books were spread in such an enormous mass of copies that Augustus once confiscated 2000 of them in the city of Rome alone. Let us now assume that the number of non-confiscated, privately owned copies is only 10 times greater than the number of confiscated ones; - and this number is certainly not too high for a book that has been circulating for years. - Thus, in the city on the Tiber, no less than 2,000 copies of this one book were in circulation at the time!

From the time of the younger Pliny, we are also told that a certain Regulus wrote a eulogy for his recently deceased son, a (14-year-old) boy. A eulogy which, in the opinion of the younger Pliny himself, was so tasteless that it aroused laughter rather than mourning. And yet it went through the cities of Italy in an edition of 1000 copies. - How many copies would be printed today of such an insignificant occasional publication? In Germany certainly not more than 200. -

As far as book prices are concerned, they should have been higher than they are today. Already because no book could be sold raw at that time, but all bound. Often - if they were parchment books - on rolls of cedar wood. East stitched, like the papyrus leaves and trimmed with purple. Nevertheless, the books in the time of the first Roman emperors were not more expensive than today, but cheaper! A copy of Martial, for instance, cost 25 cents. Today 50 cents! The cores, which contained a total of 274 verses and 127 superscriptions, were bought bound for 12 cents! And yet the poet himself assures us: the price is extortionately high! The publisher could very well sell the copy for 6 cents and still make a profit!!! -

But how on earth was that possible? Simply by the same means by which newspaper publishers are now able to sell their papers at 2 cents per copy. The crowd had to bring it.

But how did one bring about such a quantity? By means of slaves, and that by dictating to a majority of scribes at the same time. For example, if a publishing company, like the Sosii, the publishers of Horace, had 100 scribes at its disposal; it placed a dictator in the middle and the 100 slaves around him. - A small book, such as that of the Epodes, a good calligrapher wrote in 12 hours. But ten hours was the daily working time of such people. Thus 100 scribes could deliver about 600 copies in a day and 4200 in a week. Of course, thick books could not be reproduced quickly in this way. Thin ones, on the other hand, could be reproduced extraordinarily well. Yes for the first day the result of the slave-room surpassed that of the printing-press. -

After all, the slaves were mostly Greeks, and thus by birth and education sent to the writing work. For this, their masters needed to give them nothing more than food and clothing. How cheaply they could work! How cheaply - and how quickly! For since the days of Cicero one used the so-called tironic notes, in order to save oneself the tedious copying of endings. Even the older prints of the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries have retained them. -

The reproduction and distribution of books was now as much a matter of business in imperial Rome as it is today in America. The first to establish a formal publishing business in Rome was Cicero's friend: Atticus. He employed all his slaves with writing. In his print shop, which surpassed everything that was known of institutions of this kind until then, it swarmed - as in our print shops today - with workers of all kinds. Some of them fixed the paper and the instruments. Others dictated. Most of them copied. Still others corrected. Still others bound. - Thereby he made the best bargains. Especially with Cicero's speech for Ligarius, as Cicero himself testifies.

Of course, he found many followers. Under Tiberius, all the quarters of Rome were full of booksellers. Their shops occupied whole squares. Especially in the vicinity of the Curie. Among the most notable were the Sosii, Cn. Pompey Phrixus, who also held the title of doctor, and Tryphon.

The public and private libraries, however, corresponded to such a lively business. Private men of some literary interest had about 700 books. Grammarians, as Epaphroditus: 30,000; scholars, as Sammonius Severus, 60,000. - As to public libraries, that of Alexandria had, as is well known, 700,000. Those at Rome contained a still greater number of volumes. And yet there were these in the time of Trajan: 29.

But to this enormous intercourse, mediated by writing, there was now added an equally widespread oral intercourse. - Already since the days of the Grachen, people in Rome had become accustomed to negotiate matters of state in the halls of the temples or in the open streets. From Augustus onwards this was transferred to literary matters. Declamations, historical works and poems, everything was read out in public - and regularly. Admittedly, a certain caution had to be exercised in the case of politically insinuating passages. Thus the historian Titus Labienus, under Augustus, read his contemporary history aloud in public; but the most outspoken passages he skipped over and put off the audience until they could read them after his death.

If, then, we must at least equate the intellectual intercourse mediated by books and newspapers in the imperial period with that of the sixteenth century, that mediated by public speeches delivered in streets and squares surpassed that of the Reformation period.

190 Lecture, held at the solemn inauguration of our Synodal Printing Office. The first of these is the "Synodalruckerei".

But how beneficial such a comprehensive and widespread spiritual intercourse must be for Christianity is obvious. Or how else could Paul have preached the gospel in the streets of Athens? The Berlin or St. Petersburg police would undoubtedly have arrested him.

Admittedly, as far as literary intercourse in the narrower sense was concerned, the Christians did not have hundreds of slaves at their disposal, as once the Sosii and Tryphon had. But a - certainly not small - number of willing hands. And the method of reproduction was at least at the beginning the same with them. Thus Origen alone had 14 scribes of the male sex at his disposal, apart from the female ones. The Gospels were most frequently copied. Therefore, already in the 3rd century, there was an extraordinarily large number of such manuscripts. Especially of the Gospel of Matthew. The dissemination of the sacred, and indeed of Christian writings in general, received a new impetus from Emperor Constantine. With Eusebius of Caesarea alone, this emperor once ordered two mail wagons with splendid copies of the New Testament at once. -

It is true that the manuscripts of the Scriptures that have come down to us from that time are not numerous. But that does not surprise us. - For five terrible floods have successively swept over Asia Minor: First, the persecution of Decius, who destroyed the Christians along with their books. Then Diocletian, who took pride in destroying God's word down to the last leaf. Barely a century later came the so-called migration of nations, that is, the terrible raids of the Germanic and Slavic pagans, which lasted two ages. Then came the flood of Islam, which devoured Jerusalem in 634 and Constantinople in 1453. Finally the Mongols, who swarmed over Asia Minor like swarms of locusts.

But how all these God-hostile peoples were accustomed to deal not only with the Bible, but with books in general, is shown by the example of Amr the commander of Omar. For when the grammarian John asked him to spare the world-famous library in the city of Alexandria, which he had conquered, he wrote to the Chaliph in Mecca. But the Chaliph replied, "If what is in the books there [be it the same or less] is true with the Qur'an, it is superfluous. If it is not true, - useless and harmful. So let them be destroyed!"*) Amr now heated the Alexandrian baths for 6 months with the 700,000 books. -

The innovators in Germany, who blaspheme the Christians wherever they can, but excuse, adorn, and praise the Muhamedans and pagans in every way,-deny the course of events narrated in the text. It rests, however, from Abulpharadsch Historia dynastiarum, dyn. IX. pag. 180. 181.

Is it not rather a miracle that from these terrible floods, which buried so many and highly famous writings of antiquity completely and forever, still more than 700 Greek manuscripts of the New Testament have survived? -

Thus God watched over his holy word. And so, as described above, he prepared the circumstances of the time to let his gospel wander from the beginning to the end, from the Indus to the Pyrenees. This he did in the days of Tiberius, this he did in the days of Melanchton and Luther. So also did he order American liberty, that under its shadow his church might flourish and bear fruit.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Pittsburg - Synod. In the Iowa Gazette of May 1, there is a letter from a member of this Synod, F. C. H. L. (Lamp in Wheeling?), in which we read, among other things, the following: "It is very important to me that the decisions of the General Council concerning the four points not only stand in our negotiations, but are carried out as soon as possible in the congregations, and that the brethren in the West come to the full conviction: The members of the General Council know what **they** want and will do what they decide. Perhaps I am the first in my Synod who has dared to take a bold step in the full sense of the word. - Others will dare it too." - Unfortunately, however, it is only too evident that men like Dr. Krotel and Dr. Seiß understand the resolutions quite differently from that correspondent, and therefore think that they have carried them out, although they do the opposite of what the latter "dared" to do.

The Lutheran Visitor of May 13 writes from Alabama: "I have made two visits to our brethren in southwestern Georgia. I found them well up and much encouraged at the prospect of a church of their own faith. Those brethren who went there some years ago and united with the Methodist Episcopal Church, intend to return to the church of their first love. This will not involve any unfriendly feelings on the part of their Methodist brethren, for it had been so expressly understood that they should have the privilege of returning to their own church as soon as opportunity presented itself. Last Sunday we had Communion. A number of our Methodist brethren attended it." The editor, Rev. Rude, remarks: "The communication is a private one; but the contents are of such an interesting and pleasing character, that all will read it with thanks." - Should this communication really contain only pleasant things? The syncretism that confronts us here, far from pleasing us, can only sadden us.

W.

II. Abroad.

Infallibility. The Louisville "Kath. Glaubensbote" of May 18 writes: "The opponents of the declaration of infallibility are immensely busy at work. Half a dozen pamphlets have again appeared. Only one bears the name of the author, that of Bishop Hefele of Rottenburg." As is well known, however, it was precisely

Hefele has an outstanding authority among the Romans, especially in patristics and in history in general. The "Messenger of the Faith" also received the following letter from Rome on May 14: "The debate on infallibility begins today. About 100 members have formally declared that they will more or less oppose the declaration of infallibility." Even von Ketteler is reported to the Augsb. A. Z. of Rome under the 24th of April that the same had issued a writing which was directed against the dogma of infallibility and went beyond the mere question of expediency. - Cardinal Rauscher, in his writing against the new dogma, remarks: "The whole Christian world will then have to accept, with Boniface VIII and his bull Unam Sanctam, that the popes have received from Christ the power to dispose of the whole civil and state territory. The whole medieval theory of the unconditional right of the popes to depose monarchs, to dissolve all political oaths, to annul laws, to intervene in all state affairs, etc., would have to be declared an inviolable doctrine of faith. The Christian emperors would have treated such a doctrine as high treason. The same is written by the American bishops, except for Späulding.

Hanover. Dr. Münkel writes in his N. Zeitblatt of April 15: "It will not occur to the government to forcibly introduce a union among us, especially as long as the political opposition lasts. It will not give us any opportunity for martyrdom at all, and yet prepare everything so that after years the ripe fruit can fall into its lap." - In the Ev. Kirchen-Chronik (1870. Heft 1.) we read: A danger to the Hanoverian Church lies in the fact that the unirite officials from Prussia are regarded without further ado as parishioners of their respective congregations. A civil servant in the Osnabrück congregation of St. Catherine had refused (in fact quite correctly) to contribute to the Lutheran congregational tax as an unirite. In the last instance, however, he was sentenced to do so: because everyone who resides as a Protestant Christian in a community is to be considered a member of the community and therefore is also to be called upon to pay the church taxes of this community.

Hesse. Pastor Witzel in Grebenstein (Sup. Cassel) had refused to administer Holy Communion to the unchurched soldiers of the garrison. The Consistory asked the Ministry of Culture to appoint him an assistant to be paid from the state treasury for this official act. However, the Ministry of Culture decreed that the assistant was to be paid by the pastor himself!

Saxony. (Ko'nigr.) The second chamber adopted on January 7 the dissident law proposed by the ministry, with the emergency civil marriage. The motions for complete exemption from the formation of new religious societies and for the introduction of compulsory civil marriage were rejected by 33-31 votes.

Italy. The new Italian Minister of Culture wants to save 80,000 francs in his budget by abolishing all professorships of theology. They are in fact useless, for the liberal and the unbelieving do not study theology, and the believers do not go to the unbelieving state universities, but study in the seminaries.

The Stuttgart Bible Society has decided to publish from now on the German New Testament Bible text with the changes recommended by the Commission of German Theologians assembled in Halle. The Canstein Bible Institute in Halle does the same.

Russia. The University of Dorpat is also to fall victim to the Russification mania currently prevailing in Russia and be stripped of its German character.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 16. July 1870. No. 7.

Materials on Pastoral Theology,

communicated by C. F. W. W.

(Continued.)

Note 3.

If it is clear to the great majority of the congregation from God's Word that a sinner is to be put under ban, but a member protests against this, but without being able to give and state valid reasons for his refusal to consent to the ban, for example, either obviously out of disregard for God's Word and command, or out of obvious partiality for the sinner, or out of pure obstinacy and willfulness and the like, the person lodging the protest is to be disciplined before the ban is carried out, and the ban is not to be carried out until unanimity has been reached by removing the objection (whether the person lodging the protest withdraws his protest or whether he is obstinate and has to be expelled as an unchristian who has become obvious). Since, according to God's Word, the ban is a matter for the congregation, it cannot be carried out properly by a mere majority of the members, no matter how large; and since Christ commanded the ban, and the apostle severely punished the Corinthians for failing to ban in an obvious case, 1 Cor. 5, 1-13, he commits a manifest and grievous sin against the divine commandment, who, notwithstanding all instruction, reproof, and admonition, obstinately resists the execution of the ban in a manifest case, and therefore himself falls under church discipline.

It is different when the congregation or some of its members cannot be convinced from God's Word that a sinner is worthy of banishment. That this is not possible,

is a factual proof that the case is not one in which banishment can be taken. The moral conviction of neither the preacher nor a majority of the members of the congregation can decide here. Quite correctly, Ph. J. Spener wrote in a case where "one had wrongfully withheld something from church property, but thought he had the right to do so," as follows: "Though I consider the man's procedure in the matter quite unjust, and the other members' complaint just against him; yet it is a useful thing that such a praeconcepta opinio (preconceived opinion) should be with him that he thinks he is right; for which in ignorance committing, though unjust deed, the exclusion cannot be made, as that alone is deserved by manifest wickedness and vice." (Theological Concerns, Part IV, p. 275.) In another place he writes: "The preacher may consider something to be sin or offense, which not only the other person does not truly recognize as such and has not committed it out of malice, but also that other impartial persons do not find the thing unjust or ever so grave as it appeared to the preacher in his zeal. Thus, since the one thinks one thing sinful and the other not, they are, as it were, parties in it, and a third person must judge of it; but the preacher, for the sake of his opinion, which is nevertheless uncertain, may not, on his earnest persuasion and other testimony of repentance, deny him that to which he otherwise has his established right as a member of the church. Which is also in accordance with the wisdom of our Savior, that he has not placed the judgment to whom the goods of grace belong in any congregation, in the condition of a man or in the condition of a state, as if it had not been well advised, since we preachers can not only let ourselves be taken in by malicious affections and thus easily abuse our power of exclusion against innocent people out of enmity, but also the best of us are subject to human errors and can sometimes take a well-meant but not sufficiently well-founded zeal in a matter, by which, if the execution were in their hands, they would do injustice to others. Therefore it is a wise order that, since they have to distribute the treasures of grace, nevertheless the knowledge" (the last judgment) "to whom alone they are to be given, should not belong to them alone, but the congregation or its committee should have a say in the matter. In which order no one can so easily be wronged.... In these matters, then, the preacher who communicates to such a person as he thinks unworthy, has no sin to fear; for though he is not assured in his conscience that this person is penitent, yet he can and ought to have this assurance in his conscience, that it is his office to bestow the treasures of grace on those who request it, who still belong to the household of God, and are tolerated among them, but to no one, except from the knowledge of those to whom it belongs,

to exclude. If, therefore, a man partakes of Holy Communion in an unworthy manner, he who deprives him of that which is not useful to him sins, and not he who performs his office according to the prescribed rules. And as, according to the rule, De occultis non judicat ecclesia, the whole church is innocent in admitting persons whose unworthiness is hidden, so he is also innocent in admitting those whose unworthiness cannot be proved, or has not yet been proved; for our Lord admitted Judas, whose terrible wickedness he well saw, but had already begun to reveal to others, because it had not yet broken out." (A. a. O. Part I, Art. IV. p. 297. f.) In another place he writes: "Where there are sins which the preacher in his conscience considers sin, but cannot demonstrate the matter from God's Word in such a way that the conscience of the other may be convinced, or all excuse may be taken from him; as, for example, whether this or that garment, Art. For example, whether this or that kind of dress, costume, etc., is to be regarded as unchristian splendor or annoying frivolity, whether this or that kind of pleasure may be passed off on a Christian, and the like, to which those sins belong altogether, where the question is of things which are in themselves average things, but may be used for the annoyance of others, and then it comes to a dispute whether it is truly an annoyance or not: there, I think, one must proceed with great caution, that one does neither too much nor too little to the matter. In my opinion, the confessor may and should present to the person that which he considers sinful in him, and state his reasons, whether he would also like to be convinced in his conscience of the sins and be brought to recognize them. If he finds himself moved in this and recognizes it as a sin, then it is one thing, as with others, since the sins are known (admitted). But if she be not persuaded, but think it not unjust, but a sinful splendor, vexation, and the like, with testimony that she is sure of it in her conscience, and forsooth... If she does not do the thing out of such a heart as she is accused of, it should indeed be reasonable that such a person, for the very sake of her preacher who is offended by it, should refrain from and discard that which she does not otherwise consider unlawful, but in this she should show her love and reverence (however one may finally urge this); but one must not proceed in the same way against the same as against those where the sins can be clearly shown in Scripture, since they have nothing apparent to object to. But I thought it enough that the confessor testified his sorrow at this, that she could not understand it, but would not allow herself a mere dominion over conscience, and after a sufficient remembrance of her conscience and warning of the danger, since her heart would be as skilful as he should suppose it to be from the exterior, but she showed otherwise of herself, he let her enjoy the goods which he would not allow any one to enjoy.

whose sin cannot be proved to the conviction of conscience from God's word." (A. a. O. IV, 63.) *)

As often as it is a question of a sin for the sake of which, after all, the sinner could not be banished, the preacher should also be careful not to initiate church discipline proceedings for it and to demand an absolute confession of repentance; for if the one who has sinned refuses to do so, and if the preacher must then nevertheless drop the further church discipline proceedings, evil has only become worse. In such cases it is sufficient for the preacher to admonish and punish the one of whose sin he is himself convinced, and, if there is public offense, to do so publicly, without, however, pressing for or waiting for a public confession of the one who has sinned. We find, indeed, that while in certain cases of sin the apostles urge church discipline and banishment (1 Cor. 5), in others they leave it at mere admonition and punishment. 1 Cor. 6, 1-8, 1 Tim. 5, 20. This is a rule that cannot be overlooked, without the observation of which church discipline is overstretched and the whole Christian church life is transformed into a life under constant church discipline, that is, under the law, contrary to the gospel.

(To be continued.)

Calvin.

. In the twentieth issue of the "Evangelist" (May 25, 1870) the question is raised how to heal the undeniable damage of the Reformed Church. The main damage consists in the lack of understanding of Calvin. This should - so the "Evangelist" explains - cause every faithful Reformed member to see what his personal position on Calvin's teaching is. This lack of understanding of Calvin - the "Evangelist" continues - eats away at us like a cancer, clings not only to thousands of our church members, but also to many among the preachers, and must rightly be called our greatest enemy. "The fruits of this evil, some of which are very alarming, have long since become apparent and can be seen more and more clearly. I mention: liturgy controversy, inhibited book system, loss of congregations and preachers, German hymnal, doctrinal division between East and West. Our Church lacks that confessio-

*) In the foregoing, Spener had already remarked: "But such power (of judgment) of the preachers is not in a jurisdiction and own judgment over the confessors, but in the preaching of the law and gospel, that they inform the consciences what is required for the fitness for holy communion, and how they find such in them or not; therefore they make the conclusion more logice, aid judicialiter, upon them, whether they, as far as the preacher can discern, have such fitness or not." (S. 61.)

nal consciousness, that vigorous church government, that German unity which, as the venerable Dr. Stern rightly thinks, only the Presbyterian church body possesses.

"This body is not ashamed to stand faithful to Calvin's doctrine and precepts. Hence the unity among it, the sacrificial life, successful work. We call ourselves reformed. Everyone who is familiar with the existing special confessions will reasonably expect that the common confession, and only that confession, will be practiced by us Reformed in church, school and home, which was expressed in 1. the two Swiss Confessions of Faith in 1565; 2. the Scottish Confessions of 1560, 1581, 1648; 3. the French-Dutch Confession, compared and then established in 1619; 4. the Geneva and Heidelberg Catechism. Here in America, however, this is not always the case. It is not uncommon for Lutheran heresies to be presented in Reformed pulpits. What can be expected for the youth? What can be expected in circles of domestic edification? There one has only to hear from Luther what he spoke here and there. Zwingli and Calvin are less thought of. Where lies the root of this desperately wicked damage? Only in the lack of understanding of Calvin. All those Swiss, French, Scottish, Dutch confessions show us Calvin in the splendor of his greatness, in the sublimity and immortality of his alone pure doctrine, truly reformed according to God's Word. Through them Calvin still speaks to us, even though he has long since died. But he is no longer heard. Therefore one evil follows another, and it will remain so until our whole special church returns in all earnestness to that doctrine full of truth which God was pleased to suggest to us through Calvin. Return to Calvin is the only remedy that can be proposed to our church at the present time. And how is this return to be accomplished? The remedy is simple. Read Calvin's writings, write and preach to the people only in Calvin's spirit. This alone brings acquaintance with Calvin and clarity about his pure doctrine, which can justify blessed hopes. So I call reading, writing. Preaching.

"To be able to read Calvin's writings, the Buch-Anstalt should help. As far as I can see, not much has happened in this respect. This association has existed for years, but still limits itself far too much to the generally popular edifying writings of certain men and institutions of the Lutheran confession. There is no lack of excusing objections. I am aware of them, but they are impossible to satisfy. To obtain Lutheran writings, I at least do not need a reformed book society. As long as it does not limit its capital exclusively to well-reformed writings, its cause will not flourish.

"After reading, I call writing, and say, Write in Calvin's mind. Where? In the Evangelist. Especially the editorials of the editors should

consistently contain Calvin's courageous spirit of witness. This is not always the case, and therefore much to be sneezed at, considering that 4000 eyes are fixed weekly on the editors. I recall (citing from memory) only "The Saturday before Easter" (stand Evangelist No. 15, April 13), where the editors discuss the infernal journey of Christ. But one looks for Calvin's courageous spirit of witness in vain in it. It does not deny Calvin's doctrine at all, but when one calmly reads through that article, one misses the editorially joyful, courageous adherence to Calvin's doctrine that one would reasonably expect.

"The third I call preaching, and say, Preach to the people only in Calvin's spirit. His doctrine demands a strict adherence to the eternal election of grace. It leaves the sinner in his unconverted state utterly dead in sins, unable to do anything in the least that would be good and pleasing to God. The Lord must first open the heart to willingly do what is spiritually good.

"He does this only to the elect, and only to them, in such a degree that from the opening of the heart to the burning of the heart, and from the burning of the heart to beatitude, comes. In truth, the non-elect never come to Christ and are therefore lost. We reformers owe this doctrine to the people. Those who curtail it and yet want to be reformed do injustice to our church and should by all means have no access to reformed pulpits. This is a point that must also be settled in the reformed church. Time will be pressing. Whoever lives under the Reformed roof and wants to administer the ministry of reconciliation in it should have to submit to the teachings of our church in all points, otherwise the house will become at odds with itself through smuggled-in false doctrine, as it is in the day, and the fall of the house is near. It cannot and must not be concealed that in our church the preachers are allowed to preach too much at will, whether it be in exact accord with those confessional writings or not. If this is to run, then do not complain. But if one wants to complain, then one should be minded to radically heal the disease that has come to light. The evil is in the day, it cries aloud, and the current of the times commands us to do justice to the faithful, original confession of our fathers, and to deliver to the people the pure doctrine, as it alone is contained in the confessions of faith reformed according to God's Word."

In one respect we rejoice in these declarations. For it is always better to be all that one is than to sail with the wind. If one compares in particular the principles and exhortations presented above with the principles which govern the reformers of Germany for the most part, one cannot help feeling a sense of respect for the American ones. Obviously, we are dealing here with men who have a firm system and proceed according to it; while the German reformers, with a few exceptions, have chosen their faith for the line.

of so-called ecclesiastical offices. These miserable avengers never believe more or less of Calvin's teachings than the reverend Lord High Consistortal and real Privy Councils deign to allow. Indeed, they cannot meet the most natural demand of the "Evangelist" to be guided by the confessions of 1560 and 1565, for the very reason that they would thereby lose all prospect of making a career. For in order to make a career, one needs above all that docility and suppleness which well observes the signs of the times and never fails to copy the peculiar mixture of faiths of the respective rulers with greater or lesser skill.

How much more manly and humanly honorable is the standpoint of the "evangelist's" co-worker whom we mentioned earlier. He has a faith! A faith whose content can be grasped! A faith whose limits can be determined without difficulty, because they coincide with the limits of Calvin's books and those of three Swiss, three Scottish, one French and one German confessions.

Of course, the question now is whether the limits stated are those of Holy Scripture, so that we can wholeheartedly applaud them. For as widespread as Calvin's activity was, our Reformed correspondent will not want to place him on the same level as the Lord or his apostles. We would therefore humbly ask for permission to compare Calvin's teaching with that of the Holy Scriptures. From such a comparison alone can it be determined whether we are guilty of placing ourselves under the banner of our reformed neighbor, or whether he would do better to combine his respectable earnestness with the modest gifts that God has given to our church.

For should all the criminal acts of men also proceed from the Lord our God, as Calvin asserts in the Consensus Genevensis of 1554? 1) And if he asserted this only of the sins after the fall of Adam! But he went further and declared in his famous textbook (Institutio Christianae religionis) that God ordered the fall of Adam long before. "No one will be able to deny - these are his own words - that the Lord knew beforehand what would be the end of man before he created him. And he foreknew it because he had so decreed it by his decree..... But what I say here must not appear to be tasteless to anyone: that God not only foreknew the fall of the first man and the resulting misery of his descendants, but that He also foreknew the end of the human race.

1) Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum, Lipsiae 1840. p. 307: Ergo quum justa de causa, licet nobis ignota, a domino procedant, quae scelerate ab hominibus maleficia perpetrantur etc..

but also by virtue of his will. For as it is to his wisdom to know all things that are to come beforehand, so it is to his power to order and govern all things with his hand." 1)

As far as baptism is concerned, Calvin did not consider it to be a bath of regeneration. In spite of Tit. 3. and Joh. 3. It is strange how he tries to resist the passage Tit. 3, 5. (Institutio religionis Christianae Cap. 17. Nro. 2.) An attempt which fails on God's unmistakable word, "By the bath (*διά λάτρου*) he hath made us blessed, as on a rock. Still more peculiar is the evasion which Calvin seeks to secure for himself in the face of John 3:5. As is well known, the Lord says there, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," and the Christian Church has from the beginning believed that baptism is meant by this. But Calvin could not admit this without violating his system. Therefore he says, "By water and the Spirit. This is just the same as if He had said By the Spirit, who performs the business of water in the cleansing and refreshing of believing souls. By water and Spirit, then, I understand simply the Spirit, which is water." 2) To give some probability to this strange interpretation, Calvin appeals to the words of the Baptist concerning the baptism with the Holy Spirit and with fire. But the fire which appeared on the heads of the disciples at the first Pentecost was true and real fire; and the water which unites itself with the Spirit for the bath of salvation is true and real water.

As a result of this move, which was hostile to the holy sacraments, Calvin also disputed the efficacy of infant baptism. He wrote to the Frankfurt senator Johannes Clauburg: "Infants do not receive baptism in order to become God's children and heirs. But because they are already considered as such before God, the grace of filiation is sealed on their flesh. Otherwise, Anabaptists would be fully justified in keeping them from baptism." 3) Basically, Calvin held the sacred

1) Inficiari ergo nemo poterit, quin praesciverit Dominus quem exitum esset habiturus homo, antequam ipsum conderet, et id?o praesciverit, quia decreto suo sic ordinarat. Nec absurdum videbitur, quod dico, Deum, non modo primi hominis casum, et in eo posterorum ruinam praevidisse: sed arbitrio suo dispensasse. Ut enim ad eius sapientiam pertinet omnium, quae futura sunt, esse praescium: sic ad potentiam, omnia manu sua regere ac moderari. Institutio rei. christ. Geneva. 1554. S. 699.

2) Per aquam et Spiritum, quasi diceret, per Spiritum, qui purgando et irrigando fideles animas vice aquae fungitur. Aquam ergo et Spiritum simpliciter accipio pro Spiritu, qui aqua est. Institutio rel. christ. Geneva, 1554. p. 828. [c. XVII. nro. 45.]

3) Atque ut melius tollatur omnis dubitatio, semper tenendum hoc principium est, non conferri Baptismum infantibus, ut filii Dei fiant et heredes: sed

He considers baptism to be nothing more and nothing less than a solemn confirmation of the grace already conferred by bodily birth. 1) Therefore he is so zealous against baptism administered by women, even in cases of necessity. "Of baptism administered by women," he declares in a Geneva report of 1561, "we judge differently. For since it was an outrageous impertinence (prodigiosa audacia) for women to interfere in this against the law of nature, we do not doubt for a moment that such an outrage (flagitium) is certainly not to be recognized (repudiandum sit)." 2) Yes, of emergency baptism administered by midwives, he writes: "To permit midwives to baptize is an ungodly and shameful desecration. Therefore I believe that such a request must not only be rejected, but if the prince continues to urge you beyond measure, you must rather resist to the point of blood than consent to this intolerable superstition. Christ asked the Pharisees whence the baptism of John was, from heaven or from men? For if they had confessed the latter, it was easy to conclude: So it was vain and powerless. From whom will the baptism of midwives be? Certainly not from him who commanded this office to the apostles. So nothing remains but that it comes a contrario auctore (from the devil)." 3) In 1559 he even declared, "The permission to baptize which women arrogate to themselves is nothing but crass superstition. Therefore such a foolish and frivolous act is not to be considered anything..... The little children who are baptized by
quia jam eo loco et gradu censentur apud Deum, adoptionis gratiam Baptismo obsignari in eorum carne. Alioqui recte eos a Baptismo arcerent Anabaptistae. Calvini Epistolae et responsa. Lausannae 1576. p. 377.

1) Caeterum ut concedam de Baptismo verba fieri, non tamen praecise urgetur necessitas, sed vitae novitati externum signum additur tanquam accessio, ac si dictum esset, non patere ingressum in regnum Dei absque vitae novitate, cujus symbolum est Baptismus. Calvini Epistolae et responsa. S, 377.

2) De mulierum Baptismo, aliud est nostrum judicium. Nam quia prodigiosa fuit audacia, ut se praeter naturae legem mulieres ad hoc munus ingererent, minime dubitamus quin secure tale flagitium repudiandum sit, Calvini Epistolae et responsa. S. 540.

3) Baptismum obstetricibus permittere impia et sacrilega est Baptismi profanatio. Ergo hoc caput non tantum repudiandum judico: verum, si urgere vos princeps ultra modum pergat, usque ad sanguinem resistendum potius, quam huic non tolerandae superstitioni consentiatis. Rogabat Christus Pharisaeos: undenam Joannis Baptismus foret: e coelo an ab hominibus? Nam si hoc secundum confessi essent, promptum erat colligere, vanum igitur esse et nullius momenti. Jam obstetricum baptismus unde erit? certe non ab eo, qui hoc munus peculiariter Apostolis mandavit. Superest igitur, ut a contrario auctore. Calvini Epistolae et responsa, 99. 100.

so senseless and untimely zeal, are not otherwise than defiled, (!) are to be consecrated (anew) by a lawful baptism." 1)

The superstition of the poor women was, without question, that they considered Holy Baptism to be a means of grace by which their children should be made blessed. Were they really so wrong, and does the hand of the pastor really belong to the essence of the sacrament? - Here we must now decide. Either one must confess of baptism with St. Peter (1 Pet. 3, 21.) and with St. Paul (Tit. 3, 5.): that it makes blessed, - and then one will be satisfied if he has only the word and the water. He will also gladly suffer laymen, or women, and even midwives, to baptize in case of need. Or one holds, with Calvin, that baptism is merely a ceremony of admission into Christian society, which, however, can only be performed by a legitimate person commissioned by the same. And then children who have been baptized without the assistance of these holy hands must be quickly baptized a second time as those defiled by the devil.

Just as little as of Holy Baptism did Calvin admit that Holy Communion was a means of grace. He most vividly denied the presence of the body of Christ in the Lord's Supper. "Christ is to be sought in heaven - so he declares in the 25th article of the Consensus Tigurinus. But this expression denotes a local distance (locorum distantiam). For although, to speak philosophically, above heaven there is no place; yet the body of Christ, being bounded - as the nature and kind of a human body entails - and being in heaven, as in its place, must necessarily be as far from us spatially as heaven is from earth." 2) And in another place of the same confession, "Christ is removed from us according to the body." And, "he abideth wholly in heaven according to the body." 3) But in what sacramental communion with the Lord Christ consists, Calvin explains in another place. For after he had asked the question in his Catechism, "How then do we enjoy Christ?

1) Quoniam baptizandi licentia, quam sibi foeminae arrogant, nihil aliud est quam crassa saperstitio, stulta illa et temere suscepta actio pro nihilo ducenda est.... Interea legitimo Baptismo consecrare infantes, qui stulta et praepostera aemulatione nihil aliud quam polluti fuerunt. Calvini Epistolae et responsa.

454. 455.

2) Ac ne qua ambiguitas restet, quum in caelo quaerendum Christum dicimus, haec locutio locorum distantiam nobis sonat et exprimit. Tametsi enim, philosophice loquendo, supra caelos locus non est; quia tamen corpus Christi, ut fert humani corporis natura et modus, finitum est et caelo, ut loco, continetur, necesse est a nobis tanto locorum intervallo distare, quanto caelum abest a terra. Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum. S. 196.

3) Abest igitur Christus a nobis secundum corpus Totus secundum corpus in coelo manens. Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum. S. 215.

He replies: "That souls should rise up to heaven, where Christ is to be found. In these earthly elements (bread and wine) they seek him without reason and in vain."') Finally, as to the words of institution, which, after all, deserve some consideration in a sacrament, Calvin rebukes all those who hold their understanding of the word. "Those - so he declares in the 22nd article of the Zurich Consensus - who in the solemn words of the supper (This is my body, this is my blood) absolutely insist on the understanding of the word, as they call it, we disdain as perverse interpreters. For we do not dispute that the words of institution are to be understood figuratively, so that the "is" of the bread and of the wine means as much as "signified: Signified." 2) And in the fourth chapter of his "*Institutio*" (edition of 1536) he declares: "When we see that the bread is given to us as a sign of the body of Christ, then we must immediately note this similarity: As bread feeds, sustains, and protects the life of our body, so let the body of Christ be the food and protection of our spiritual life. When we receive wine as the symbol of his blood, we are to think that the blood of Christ brings us spiritually the benefit that wine brings to our bodies. Others, to show their cleverness, have added to the simplicity of Scripture: (in Holy Communion) the (body and blood of Christ) are essentially and truly present. Others have gone still further, and have asserted: it is present in the sacrament in the same measures in which it hung on the cross." 3)

1) M. Verum qui hoc fieri potest, quum in caelo sit Christi corpus: nos autem in terra adhuc peregrinemur ?

P. Hoc mirifica arcanaque Spiritus sui virtute efficit: cui difficile non est sociare, quae locorum intervallo alioqui sunt disjuncta.

M. Ergo nec corpus in pane inclusum esse, nec sanguinem in calice imaginaris?

P. Nequaquam. Quin potius ita sentio, ut veritate potiamur signorum, erigendas esse in caelum mentes, ubi Christus est, et unde eum expectamus judicem et redemptorem: in his vero terrenis elementis perperam et frustra quaeri. Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum. 166.

2) Proinde, qui in solennibus Coenae verbis, Hoc est corpus meum, Hic est sanguis meus: praecise literalem, ut loquuntur, sensum urgent, eos tanquam praeposteros interpretes repudiamus. Nam extra controversiam ponimus, figurate accipienda esse, ut esse panis et vinum dicantur id quod significant. Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum, p. 196.

3) Sic quum panem videmus nobis in signum corporis Christi exhibitum, haec statim concipienda est similitudo; Ut corporis nostri vitam panis alit, sustinet, tuetur; ita corpus Christi vitae nostrae spiritualis cibum ac protectionem esse. Cum vinum in symbolum sanguinis, cogitandum, quos corpori usus vinum afferat, ut eosdem spiritualiter nobis Christi sanguine afferri reputemus. . . . . .

This was none other than Zwingli's doctrine, a doctrine that flowed less from the duel of the Word of God than from the reason of its authors.

We could still put here many a peculiar piece of teaching from Calvin's writings, his public and private ones. Some that our dear neighbor has already declared himself willing to sign. We might recall Calvin's peculiar doctrine, or actually non-doctrine, of Christ's ascension into hell. For he asserted, in fact, that the Lord Christ did not go to hell at all. The apostolic symbol does indeed teach that he descended into hell. But by this is meant only, that he was afflicted of God, and felt the terror and severity of the divine judgment, in order to propitiate the wrath of God, and to do his justice enough for us. "He has experienced all the signs of God's wrath, so that he was compelled to cry out under the pressing anguish: My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? This is the meaning of the sentence: descended to hell. To any particular place Christ has not gone.' 1)

It is very strange how Calvin tries to deal with the passage 1 Petr. 3, 19 and 20. According to Luther's essentially correct translation, it reads as follows: "And was slain in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit. In the same he also went and preached to the spirits in prison who did not believe, since God once waited and had patience in the days of Noah, when the ark was prepared, in which a few, that is, eight seleniums, were kept by water." Calvin remarks on this, "No doubt Peter is here describing a revelation of divine grace which has become to the pious."... But one might ask why Peter puts the selas of the pious, after they have left their bodies, in prison? To me, indeed, he writes, prison *[φυλαχή]* means rather a place where one keeps watch, or even the activity of keeping watch itself.... And the sense will flow excellently (if one assumes) that the pious selenia were directed to the hope of the promised salvation, as if they had already seen it from afar

Alii, quo se argutos probarent, addiderunt ad scripturae simplicitatem, adesse realiter et substantialiter; alii ultra etiam progressi, iisdem esse dimensionibus, quibus in cruce pendebat. Gerdesius Scrinium antiquarium, Groeningen, 1748. tom II, pars I, p. 456.

1) Quod vero ad inferos descendit, id significat afflictum a Deo fuisse, ac divini judicii horrorem et severitatem sensisse, ut irae Dei intercederet, ac ejus justitiae nostro nomine satisfaceret. . . Omnia irati Dei signa expertus est, ut coactus fuerit urgente angustia exclamare: Pater mi, Pater mi, ut quid me dereliquisti? id sane dicitur: ipsum descendisse ad inferos, non autem in locum aliquem certum. Institutio Of 1536 bet Gerdesius Scrinium antiquarium Tom II, pars I, page 456. Essentially the same thing is taught by Calvin in the edition of 1554 p. 301.

seen.... If, however, someone prefers to keep the meaning: prison, then it also fits to some extent. For as the law, when they were alive,... ...a kind of close prison; so after their death they had to be held by a fierce desire for Christ, because the spirit of freedom was not yet fully given to them. Thus the anxiety of expectation was to them as a prison." 1) Peter, to be sure, speaks of unbelievers, and not of the pious.

The great Genevan also treats the Old Testament prophecies in a unique way. Concerning Genesis 19:24 (When the Lord rained down brimstone and fire from heaven), he remarks: "That the ancients wanted to prove the divinity of Christ through this passage was extremely weak. In my opinion those scandalize without reason who urge the Jews more vividly, because they do not admit such a kind of proof ..... I say that those prove little thoroughly who elicit from this passage several persons." 2) - The second Psalm he explains in the light of Apost. 4, 25-28. and Apost. 13, 33. not of Christ. "Thou art my son - he writes -. To be sure, according to royal law, David could be considered the son of God, as we know that princes, because they stand out before others, are called partly gods, partly sons of God. But here God adorns David with a special praise, exalting him not only above all mortals, but even above the angels." 3) Admittedly, Calvin subsequently remarks that David is also a type of

1) Ego itaque non dubito, quin generaliter dicat Petrus, gratiae Christi manifestationem ad. pios spiritus pervenisse: Sed quaeri potest, curnam piorum animas postquam e corporibus migrarunt, in carcere collocet? Mihi quidem φυλακή potius speculam significat, in qua aguntur vigiliae : vel ipsum excubandi actum. Et sensus optime fluet, pias animas in spem salutis promissae fuisse intentas, quasi eminus eam considerarent. Neque enim dubium est, quin ad hunc scopum sancti Patres, tam in vifa, quam post mortem, suas cogitationes direxerint. Verum si cui placeat retinere Carceris nomen, non male conveniet. Sicuti enim, dum vivebant, lex illis quaedam arctior fuit custodia; ita postmortem sollicito Christi desiderio constringi oportuit: quia nondum Spiritus libertatis plene exhibitus erat. Ergo expectationis anxietas illis fuit veluti carcer. Jo. Calvini commentaria in epistolas Genevae 1551 folio. II. 39.

2) Quod veteres Christi divinitatem hoc testimonio probare conati sunt, minime firmum est; ac sine causa, meo judicio, tumultuantur, qui acrius Judaeos exagitant, quia non admittant tale probationio genus. Parum solide ratiocinari dico, qui plures inde personas eliciunt, quum Mosis consilium expresse fuerit, lectorum oculos ad spectandam Dei manum erigere et acuere. Calvinus a. h. 1. Hunnius Opera, II. 640.

3) Pilius meus es. Potuit quidem David regii juris intuitu censeri Dei filius, quemadmodum scimus, principes, eo quod prae aliis excellant, tam Deos, quam Dei filios vocari. Sed hic Deus singulari elogio Davidem ornans, eum non modo supra cunctos mortales, sed etiam supra Angelos extollit, Calvin a, h. 1. Hunnius Opera II, p. 641.

Christ. This, however, does not establish the prophecy, but rather completely destroys it. Mr. von Hofmann in Erlangen has at least in this way disgraced all the prophecy of the Old Testament. For therein lies its very essence, that it has in view not contemporary persons, but future things. If this is denied, the prophecy ceases to be conclusive, or even prophecy at all.

Calvin also claims that the 45th Psalm is about Solomon. Yes, of verse 7, (God thy throne abideth for ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a straight sceptre,) he declares, "Let its plain and original meaning be, that Solomon rule not tyrannically, as most princes do, but according to just and equitable laws." 1) And this is what Calvin says in the face of Heb. 1, verse 7 to 9. Though of the angels he speaks: "He maketh his angels spirits, and his servants flames of fire." But of the Son, "God, thy throne endureth for ever and ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre: thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity: therefore, O God, thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." -

Even more striking is Calvin's explanation of the Protevangelium (I will put enmity between thee and the woman, between thy seed and her seed): "I declare this simply thus - these are his own words - that there shall be a continual enmity between serpents and the human race; as indeed is to be seen at this day." 2) Of this enmity he also declares the following: The same shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. But his chief ground against the declaration of Christ is this: that the word seed ought not to be understood of any one. "For - says he - who will admit to us that a collective term is meant of one man only." 3) - And Calvin says this in view of Gal. 3:16, where the Holy Spirit proves precisely from the (so-called collective term) seed used in unity, that only one, namely Christ, is meant.

The 22nd Psalm also declares the Genevan of David. Despite verse 17. with his: "They have digged through my hands and feet;" despite verse 19.

1) Simplex et genuinus sensus est, Salomonem non tyrannice dominari, ut plerosque reges sed rectis et aequis legibus, Calvinus ad psalm 45, 7. et Hebr 1, 8. Hunnius Opera II, 644.

2) Simpliciter interpretor, hostile semper fore dissidium humano generi cum serpentibus, quale hodie cernitur. Calvinus a. h. 1. Hunnius Opera II, p. 655.

3) Eorum sententiam libenter meo suffragio approbarem, nisi quod verbum Seminis nimis violenter torqueri vides. Quis enim concedet, nomen collectivum de uno tantum homine accipi? Calvinus a. h. 1. Hunnius Opera II. 655.

with his, "They divide my garments among them, and cast lots for my vesture." But it is especially curious how he remarks on the evangelists, who, as is well known, explain these two verses of Christ. "The passage which they adduce from Psalm 22."-he writes-"seems to be improperly referred to the present matter (namely, Christ's garment-healing). For since David there complains that he has become a prey to his enemies, he metaphorically denotes by the expression garments all that belongs to him; as if he had said in a word, that he had been plundered and robbed by the ungodly. By neglecting this figure, the Evangelists depart from the original sense." 1)

Calvin also does not like the fact that St. John, Revelation 19, verse 15, refers the famous passage Isa. 63, 3 (about the winepress) to Christ. "This chapter (Isa. 63.) - so he judges - the Christians have forcibly twisted, as if it referred to Christ; since the prophet simply speaks of God himself. And so they have invented here a red-colored Christ, who is said to be wet with his own blood, which he shed on the cross." 2) Yes, in the following he calls it ridiculous to refer the passage about the winepress [as John Revelation 19, verse 15. does] to Christ. 3)

Even less than these interpretations of Scripture, however, will our Reformed compatriots like Calvin's views on state and church. While, according to his principles, the authorities are to purify the church 4), the leaders, in turn, are to submit to them 5). Yes, the constitution of Geneva was, according to the judgment of its praiser, half religious, half political. And because every heresy disturbed the peace of the commonwealth, all heretics were consequently punished by the state. In 1536, anyone who did not adhere to the accepted doctrine was deprived of his Geneva citizenship.

1) Locus tamen, quem adducunt [Evangelistae] ex Psal. 22. videtur intempestive ad praesentem causam trahi. Nam cum illic queratur David, se hostibus praedae fuisse, metaphorice sub nomine vestium sua omnia designat, ac si uno verbo dixisset, spoliatum se ac nudatum ab improbis fuisse. Quam figuram dum negligunt Evangelistae, a nativo sensu discedunt. Calvinus ad Jo. XIX Hunnius Opera II. 674.

2) Hoc caput violenter torserunt Christiani, quasi ad Christum haec pertinerent: cum Propheta simpliciter de ipso Deo pronuntiet; atque finxerunt hic rubicundum Christum, quod sanguine proprio madidus esset, quem in cruce fuderit. Atqui nihil tale vult Propheta. Calvinus Commentarii in Isaiam Genevae 1570. p. 530.

3) Ridiculum esse referre ad Christum. Calvinus Commentarii in Isaiam Genevae 1570. p. 530.

4) At quemadmodum magistratus, puniendo, et manu coercendo, purgare debet Ecclesiam offendiculis: ita etc.. Institutio rei, christ. S. 440.

5) Institutio rei. christ. S. 441.

The church had the right to compel the authorities and the people to remain obedient to their church doctrine as well as to the moral laws. 1)

As is well known, Calvin wrote a special book in defense of the punishment of heretics with death 2). In it he proceeds from the principle that he must be put to death who comes too close to the honor of God 3). He also advised Duke Edward of Somerset, Lord-Protector of England: "To strike those who have so hardened themselves in the superstition of the Antichrist that they cannot suffer its destruction, with the sword of vengeance which God has given him, since they do not only exert themselves against the king, but against God Himself, who has appointed the king. 4)

And according to these principles he also acted. For when the well-known Unitarian Servet came to Geneva, Calvin induced one of the Synedics to throw him into prison. For he thought it his duty to prevent so obdurate and unruly a heretic from further spreading his heresies. Yes, he scolded the slothfulness of those to avenge God's honor, whom God nevertheless arms with the sword. The papists were so zealous in defending their superstition that they could not keep from shedding even innocent blood. Christian authorities ought to be ashamed of themselves for being so weak in defending the truth. 5) This had an effect. The council really sentenced the heretic to death. Servet was bound to a stake, his two

1) Henry, The Life and Times of John Calvin, New York 1851. vol. I, p. 351.

2) Fidelis expositio errorum Mich. Serveti, et brevis eorundem refutatio; ubi docetur, jure gladii coercendos esse haereticos [in Calvini Opusculis p. 686. sq.].

3) Henry, The Life and Times of Calvin, I, 353. II, 241.

4) Alii vero in superstitionibus Antichrist! ita obduruerunt, ut earum revulsionem ferre non possint. Ac merentur quidem tum hi, tum illi, gladio ultore coerceri, quem tibi tradidit Dominus: quum non in Regem tantum insurgant, sed in Deum ipsum, qui et regem in regia sede constituit. Gerdesii Historia Reformationis. Groeningen 1752. tom IV. pars II. p. 216.

5) Tandem huc malis auspiciis appulsum, unus ex Syndicis, me auctore, in carcerem duci jussit. Neque enim dissimulo, quin officii mei duxerim, hominem plusquam obstinatum et indomitum, quoad in me erat, compescere, ne longius manaret contagio. Videmus, quam licentiose passim grassetur impietas, ut subinde novi errores scaturiant, quanta eorum ignavia, quos Deus gladio armavit, ad vindicandam nominis sui gloriam. Cum tam acres sint et animosi superstitionum suarum vindices Papistae, ut atrociter saeviant ad fundendum innoxium sanguinem; pudeat Christianos magistratus in tuenda certa veritate nihil prorsus habere animi. Calvin to Sultzer Sept. 1553 in: Calvinus Epistolae et Responsa. Lausannae 1576. 8°. S. 262. 263.

He had a wreath of sulphur around his head, and so he died a slow death by fire. It was the 27th of October in the year 1553, and his agony had lasted half an hour. -

Should all the misery of the American Reformed really have its root only in the lack of understanding of Calvin? Should a return to Calvin really be the only remedy to be counseled to the Reformed Church? Should it really bring blessing upon blessing to speak, write, and act only in Calvin's spirit? -

On the history of the Vatican Council.

I. Document from the Conciliar. The following is taken from the Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung: The following is the wording of the Constitutio de ecclesia Christi, which was distributed to the members of the Council on May 10. This document, in dogmatic as well as in political respect of the highest importance, forms the pivotal point of the whole activity of the Council, around which in the shortest time that great controversy will arise, which threatens to divide the episcopate of the Catholic Church into two irreconcilable hostile camps.

First Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ, submitted to the examination of the venerable Fathers.

Pius, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, with the approval of the Holy Council. Conciliar to his eternal memory. The eternal Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, in order to make the salvific work of his redemption permanent until the end of the world, has decided to build the Holy Church. The eternal shepherd and bishop of our souls decided to build the holy church in order to make the salvific work of his redemption last until the end of the world. In this church, as in the house of the living God (cf. 1 Tim. 3:15), all believers are to be united by the bond of one faith and one love. For for this cause, before his transfiguration, he besought the Father, that they which believe on him should all be one, even as the Son himself and the Father are one (John 17:1, 21 ff.). The most wise master builder (cf. 1 Cor. 3:10), in order to preserve this unity of faith and fellowship in his church, created in the holy apostle Peter the best possible foundation for the unity of the church. Therefore, in order to preserve this unity of faith and fellowship in His Church, the most wise Master Builder (cf. 1 Cor. 3:3) has established in the Apostle Peter the constant principle and visible foundation of both units, on whose strength the eternal temple was to be built, and the sublimity of the Church, reaching up to heaven, was to rise in the firmness of this faith. (S. Leo the Great, Serm. IV. [al. III.] cap. 2 in diem natalis sui.) But because against this foundation set by God the gates of hell are rising from all sides with daily increasing hatred, we deem it necessary for the protection, inviolability, and growth of the Catholic army entrusted to us, with the approval of the Council, to reaffirm the doctrine of the institution, continuance, and nature of the holy apostolic primacy, of which the whole Church is to be made aware.

The church is to present the faith that depends on the strength and salvation of the faithful, according to the old and constant faith of the church, as it is to be believed and held by all believers, and to outlaw the contrary errors, which are therefore so pernicious to the host of the Lord, by the due sentence of condemnation.

Chapter 1.

Of the institution of the apostolic primacy in St. Peter. Peter.

We therefore teach and declare that, according to the testimonies of the Gospel, the primacy of authority over the whole Church of God was directly and immediately promised and conferred by the Lord Christ upon the Holy Apostle Peter. The primacy of authority over the whole Church of God was promised and conferred directly and immediately by the Gospel to the Holy Apostle Peter. For Christ, the Son of the living God, said only to Peter: "And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it: and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matt. 16:18, 19). And only to Simon Peter, after his resurrection, did JEsus confer the power of supreme shepherd and ruler over all his sheepfold, saying, "Shepherd my. Shepherd my lambs, shepherd my sheep" (Joh. 21, 15. 17.). This teaching of the Holy Scriptures, so clear. This clear teaching of Scripture, as it has always been understood by the Catholic Church, is openly opposed by the damnable opinions of those who, perverting the form of government instituted by the Lord Christ in His Church, deny that Peter alone, before all the Apostles, whether separately from each or all together, was invested with the true and proper primacy of authority by Christ, or who maintain that this very primacy is not directly and immediately vested in St. Peter himself, but in the Church and in the Church itself. The first is that the Church has been entrusted with the primacy of the Church, and through the Church with the primacy of the Church.

Chapter Two.

Of the continuance of the primacy of Peter in the Roman popes.

But what in St. Peter is the arch shepherd and great shepherd of the sheep, the Lord Christ Jesus. Peter, the arch-shepherd and great shepherd of the sheep, the Lord Christ Jesus (1 Pet. 5:4; cf. Heb. 13:20), for the lasting salvation and good of the church, must necessarily last under the same founder in the church, which is founded on the rock until the end of time. For no one doubts, and it is known to all centuries, that the holy and most blessed Peter, the firstborn and head of the apostles, the pillar of faith and the foundation of the catholic church, which was founded by our Lord Jesus Christ, the Savior and Redeemer of the world, is the only founder of the church, the Saviour and Redeemer of the human race, the keys of the kingdom, lives and presides and exercises judgment until this time and always in his successors, the bishops of the Holy Roman See founded by him and consecrated by his blood.

(cf. Labbe, Coll. conc. III, 1154; Ephesini concilii act. III. orat Philippi sed. ap. legati; S. Petri Chrysostomi epist. ad Eutych. presbyt.): so that whoever succeeds Peter in this chair, he also, by Christ's own arrangement, possesses the primacy of Peter over the whole Church. There remains therefore to him the administration of the truth, and St. Peter, insisting on the received strength of the rock, has not abandoned the assumed helm of truth (S. Leo the Great, Serm. III. [al. II.], n. 3.).

Third Chapter.

Of the meaning and nature of the primacy of the Roman Pontiff.

Therefore, adhering both to the decrees of Our predecessors, the Roman Pontiffs, and to the clear and distinct definitions of the General Councils, We renew the Creed of the Ecumenical Council of Florence, according to which all believers in Christ must believe that the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff hold primacy over the whole world, and that the Roman Pontiff himself is the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and the true Vicar of Christ and Head of the whole Church, and Father and Teacher of all Christians. And that the Roman Pontiff himself is the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and the true Vicar of Christ, and the Head of the whole Church, and the Father and Teacher of all Christians. He is the true representative of Christ and head of the whole church and father and teacher of all Christians, and that in St. Peter he has been given full authority by our Lord Jesus Christ to shepherd, guide and govern the whole church, as is also contained in the negotiations of the ecumenical councils and in the holy canons. Canons.

We further teach and declare that this authority proper to papal jurisdiction is a proper and immediate one, to which the pastors and faithful of all particular Churches of every rite and rank, each individually and all together, are bound by the duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, not only in matters of faith and morals, but also in that which pertains to the discipline and government of the Church spread over the whole world, that the unity of communion as well as of profession of faith with the Roman Pontiff may be preserved, and that the Church of Christ may be one flock under one supreme Pastor.

This is the teaching of Catholic truth, from which no one can deviate without harming faith and salvation. But this power of the supreme Pontiff is not at all opposed to the ordinary and immediate power of episcopal jurisdiction, by which the pastors of the individual churches, each of which feeds and guides the flock assigned to him; the latter, on the contrary, is asserted, strengthened, and claimed by the supreme and universal pastor, as St. Gregory the Great says: "My glory is the glory of the whole Church. St. Gregory the Great says: "My glory is the glory of the whole Church. My honor is the full strength of my brethren. Then am I truly honored, when each one is not denied the honor due" (S. Gregory the Great, Ad Eulog. Alexandria., epist. 30.).

It follows from the supreme jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff that it is a necessary right of this Pontiff, in the exercise of his office, to communicate freely with the pastors and armies of the whole church, so that they may be taught and guided by him in the way of salvation. Therefore we condemn and reject the opinion of those who say that this intercourse of the supreme head with the pastors and hosts can justly be prevented, or who want to subject it to temporal power in such a way that they maintain that what is decreed by the apostolic see or by its authority for the government of the church has no force and validity unless it is confirmed by the consent of temporal power.

And since, by virtue of the divine right of apostolic primacy, the Roman Pontiff presides over the whole Church, we teach and declare that he is the supreme judge of the faithful (Pope Pius VI, "Super soliditate," Nov. 28, 1786), and that in all matters pertaining to ecclesiastical examination an appeal may be made to the judgment of the same (Concil. oecum. Lugdun. II.); but that a sentence of the apostolic see, on whose authority there is no higher, can be rejected by no one, and that no one is authorized to judge on a sentence of the same (Epist. Nicolai I. ad Michaelem imperatorem). Therefore, anyone who claims that it is permissible to appeal from the judgments of the Roman popes to an ecumenical council as an authority above the Roman pope is straying from the right path of truth.

Fourth Chapter.

On the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff.

But that in the supreme power of apostolic jurisdiction, which the Roman Pontiff, as the successor of the Prince of the Apostles Peter, possesses over the whole Church, there is also implied the supreme power of the Magisterium, this Holy See has always held to be true, and the constant custom of the Church has confirmed it, as it has also been taught by the ecumenical Concils themselves. Therefore, following in particular the solemn creeds of the ecumenical councils, in which the East and West came together in the unity of faith and love, we believe with the fourth council of Constantinople: "The first salvation is to keep the guide of the right faith, and not to depart in any way from the determinations of the fathers. And because the saying of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be transgressed, which is, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church" (Matt. 16:18), this word is proved by the effects which have followed, in that in the apostolic see the Catholic religion has always been preserved undefiled, and the holy doctrine has been proclaimed, which apostolic see the faithful in Christ are bound to follow in all things, that they may live in communion with that same see.

in which is the perfect and true strength of the Christian religion. (From the formula of St. Pope Hormisda, as presented by Hadrian II to the fathers of the eighth ecumenical council, the fourth held at Constantinople, and signed by the same). And with the second Conciliar of Lyons we confess: "The holy Roman Church possesses the highest and full primacy and principate over the whole Catholic Church, which she truly and humbly acknowledges to have received with full power from the Lord Himself through St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, whose successor is the Roman Pontiff. And as she is bound before the rest to defend the truth of the faith, so also any questions which may arise concerning the faith must be defined by her judgment." (From the Creed of the Greeks at the Second Ecumenical Council of Lyons.) And with the Conciliar of Florence we repeat: "The Roman Pontiff is the true Governor of JEsu Christ, the Head of the whole Church, the Father and Teacher of all Christians, upon whom in the person of the blessed Peter was conferred the full power to shepherd, govern, and administer the universal Church." (Cf. John 21:15-17.)

Therefore, with the consent of the holy Council, we teach and define as a dogma of faith that, in virtue of the divine assistance promised to him, the Roman Pontiff, of whom, in the person of St. Peter, it is likewise said by our Lord Jesus Christ and others: "I have prayed for you that your faith may not cease, and if you should one day be converted, strengthen your brethren" (Luc. 22:32), cannot err when, acting as the highest teacher of all Christians, he defines with his apostolic authority what is to be held by the whole Church in matters of faith and morals.), cannot be mistaken when he, appearing as the supreme teacher of all Christians, defines with his apostolic authority what is to be held by the whole church in matters of faith and morals, as well as what is to be rejected as contrary to the faith, and that such decrees or judgments, independent in themselves, are to be accepted and held by every Christian, as soon as they become known to him, with the full obedience of faith. But since the infallibility is the same whether it is to be seen in the Roman Pontiff as the head of the church, or whether it is to be seen in the whole teaching church united with the head, we also determine that this infallibility extends to one and the same sphere. But if any man, God forbid, should presume to contradict this definition of ours, let him know that he has fallen away from the truth of the faith.

First Canon. If anyone says that the holy apostle Peter was not appointed by the Lord Christ as prince of the apostles and head of the whole contending church, or that he received this primacy directly and immediately from our Lord Jesus Christ only as an honor and not as the true and proper jurisdiction, let him be accursed.

Second Canon. If anyone says that it is not Christ's appointment that St. Peter should have constant successors in the primacy over the whole Church, or that the Roman Pontiff should not, by divine right, be Peter's successor in the same primacy, let him be accursed.

Third Canon. If anyone says that the Roman Pontiff has only the office of supervision or direction, but not the full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church, not only in matters of faith and morals, but also of discipline and direction of the Church spread over the whole world, or that this power of his is not a regular and immediate one, over the Churches as a whole or individually, as well as over the pastors and faithful as a whole and individually, let him be accursed.

In this connection we also report the following from a local political newspaper:

In the recently communicated document about the first dogmatic constitution of the Church of Christ, only three canonical sentences were contained, which referred to the primacy of the jurisdiction of the Roman See, while no such canons corresponded to the infallibility of the Magisterium, which was discussed in the fourth chapter. A correspondence of the Köln. Ztg. from Rome gave a brief indication of the contents of the missing sentences, and the following five canons, which must be appended to the three above-mentioned, are found in the Pall Mall Gazette. We communicate them here translated back from the English:

1) If anyone says that the episcopal see of the Roman Church is not the true and infallible see of St. Peter, or that it has not been chosen by God as the firmest, most imperishable and indestructible rock of the whole Christian Church, let him be accursed.

2) If any man say that there is any other infallible See of the truth of the Gospel of Christ our Lord in the world, besides and apart from the See of St. Peter, let him be accursed.

3) If anyone denies that the divine Magisterium of the See of St. Peter is necessary to the true way of eternal salvation for all men, unbelievers and believers alike, laymen and bishops alike, let him be accursed.

4) If anyone says that any Roman Pontiff legitimately elected is not by divine right the successor of St. Peter even in the gift of the infallibility of the Magisterium, and denies to any of them the prerogative of infallibility to teach the Church the Word of God free from all error and corruption, let him be accursed.

5) If anyone says that general conciliarities are instituted by God in the Church as a power to nourish the divine host with the word of faith, which is above the Roman Pontiff, or equal to him, or necessary by divine appointment, so that the teaching office of the Roman bishop may be infallibly preserved, let him be accursed.

"Freimund," who communicates the foregoing decree, makes the following remarks on the subject:

This is the wording of the decree. In order to understand it correctly, it must be remembered that the Roman Catholic Church has always taught that it possesses the infallible Magisterium. In former times it was supposed that this infallible magisterium was exercised by the assembled bishops. The pope was regarded as the supreme of the bishops, to call them to decide in matters of faith, and to proclaim their unanimous opinion as infallible doctrine. Note, only that was considered infallible truth which the whole body of the bishops of the Church declared to be so. But it happened at the great church assemblies, e. g. at Kostnitz, Basle, and especially later at Trent, that there were often so many heads, so many senses; the bishops were not usually unanimous, and the pope had to decide. Later, therefore, the Jesuits, striving for a firm unity of the Roman Church, urged more and more that the pope as such should exercise and represent the infallible magisterium of the Roman Church. What had already been prepared for a long time was now to be decided.

Those bishops who resisted at the present council did not do so in the evangelical sense. They, too, maintain that the church is infallible; by the church they understand the bishops, while the Jesuits understand the pope. Those bishops do not argue for the truth, for then they would have to say: God's word is infallible, and true is only what is proved from God's word. But thus they also reject the word of God as the sole guide of life and faith, and only want the bishops, namely, when they are assembled, to be the mouth of infallible truth. So the bishops argue for themselves, not for God. Or else, they contend whether now is the time or not to pronounce such a doctrine. But such a struggle, which is not from conscience, but from self-interest or human prudence, has no great power, nor has it any promise.

II A Conciliation Scene. Such a scene is described in a German newspaper as follows:

In the Schema de fide, as is well known, materialism, atheism, pantheism, etc. are briefly derived from the heresy of Protestantism. Stroßmayer now declared that with such an assertion one would betray the greatest ignorance and distort the truth in the worst way, since everyone knew that long before Protestantism there had been materialists, atheists, and pantheists. An indescribable clamor arose over this, and many demanded that the speaker be deprived of the floor. Stroßmayer, however, exclaimed, in spite of all the noise and grumbling

he would not let himself be deprived of adding this, that he knew many Protestants who were very strict in their morals, very devout, that perhaps there was even more firmness of faith in Protestantism than in Catholicism. At this four Cardinals at once rose from their seats and forbade him to speak further, and many called out to him with all signs of disgust: Tu es protestans. Only Cardinal Schwarzenberg manfully took up the cause of his colleague Stroßmayer, but was likewise called to order. We will give our readers an excerpt of the dialogue during which the infallibilists stamped their feet. Stroßmayer: He only wants to point out, for example, Leibnitz and Guizot, who already defended the divinity of the Savior and in their writings showed such a hot love for Christ. Cardinal d'Angelis interrupts the speaker, but stuttering with excitement, he reaches for the bell and leaves the floor to Cardinal Capalti, who is also presiding. Stroßmayer: He would like to enter into a closer dispute with him (Capalti), because he was convinced of the truth of what he had said. Great noise on the infallibilist side: "Down!" "No more talking!" The most and most zealous dogma-men were- on their feet. Many made threatening gestures with clenched fists. The Patriarch of Jerusalem was the fiercest of one. Stroßmayer against the most agitated: "I wish you would read daily in the meditations of the Protestant Guizot, then you would see that you are not capable of writing three such lines as he." The tumult increases to such an extent that the speaker can no longer continue. From the presidium, through the chaos, comes the call: he should descend - he has spoken enough. Stroßmayer: "I protest! You are not the Concilium!" High-pitched bitterness, furious noise, passionate cries, like "Damnamus eum! Damnamus istum!" Tumultuous confusion. The President closes the session. Bishop Stroßmayer hastily leaves the speaker's platform. The gates of the assembly hall open. - The audience waiting in St. Peter's had become agitated by the noise in the hall. The servants of the fathers were of the opinion that infallibility had been voted inside. The people, believing this, took sides for and against it; cries were raised, here: "Eviva l'infallibilita!" and there: "l'infallibilita a basso!" If the Conciliar gates had not opened in time, who knows what would have happened among the people. Mind you, in the first cathedral of Catholic Christendom! Even among the servants it was said: "The bishops are scuffling inside!" Even some of the bishops themselves are said to have said that it might have come to violence in the assembly hall if the meeting had not been closed abruptly. So great was the bitterness among the infallibilists.

Miscellany.

The Reformed Lord's Supper. Prof. Dr. v. Zezschwitz writes in his writing directed against Pastor Rietschel: "Die kirchlichen Normen berechtigter Abendmahlsgemeinschaft" (Leipzig by Hinrichs. 1870.).): "Rietschel is content to present the much cited letter to the Frankfurters of 1533 as not pertaining to the matter, since Luther does not speak there of the admission of those of other faiths, but only of the deception experienced by those who go to the Lord's Supper with Zwinglians, because there they do not receive the body and blood of the Lord at all. But it may be remembered that the Confession has directly appropriated Luther's statement on this point. (R. 734, 32) *) But the testimony of that letter to the Frankfurters themselves cannot be dismissed as it is attempted there. It will always remain that the main question, which was expressly put to Luther, was: "Whether they should go with the multitude to the Sacrament," where the preachers "neither teach nor believe how the body and blood are truly in the bread and wine,"-"or avoid and abstain from the same for such a cause. (W. W. XVII, 2436.)" (p. 23. f.)

Doctrinal Development. In the Ev. Kirchenz. by Tauscher (formerly by Hengstenberg) of April of this year, there is an essay: "Ueber die Principien und Grenzen einer berechtigten Lehr - Entwickelung auf dem Grunde des Offenbarungsglaubens und der Bekenntnisse" (On the Principles and Limits of a Justified Development of Doctrine on the Basis of the Faith of Revelation and the Confessions), which contains many quite good things. For example, near the end of the article it says: "Although we agree in principle that there is a legitimate development of doctrine and that this justification must never cease in the present age, because in this age nothing at all can attain absolute perfection, we must nevertheless say that the present age, with its theological and ecclesiastical discord, is least suited for the development of church doctrine. Are even the most ecclesiastical (!) theologians of modern times, a v. Hofmann, a Thomasius, a Hengstenberg even, have pretty much - sit venia verbo - failed with their attempts to develop this and that doctrine of the Church." Finally, as the summa of his argument, the writer gives the following sentences: "1. Unauthorized is every development of doctrine which destroys or blurs or obscures the confession of the Church; for the confession is the soul of the Church. (2) Only a knowledge of the truth imparted by the sacred Scriptures and the ecclesiastical confession, which assimilates the existing symbolic substance, is capable and justified.

*v. Zezschwitz means here the words of Luther, in which it is said of the Zwinglians: "Who certainly have vain bread and wine, for they have not even the words and established order of God, but have perverted and changed the same according to their own conceit," which words the Concordia formula has directly appropriated.

To develop the true and pure doctrine, for the symbol is the banner of the contending church. 3. 3) To uncover more and more the glory of the Lutheran Confession, to exploit more and more the abundance of treasures of wisdom and knowledge contained therein, to bring to bear more and more the hidden powers of true godliness and healthy Christianity for the salvation and good of the congregation, this seems to us to be the highest goal and the most beautiful ideal of all doctrinal development; for the Lutheran Confession is the highest and most beautiful jewel of the entire church. In a postscript, the writer shares, among other things, the following from a letter received from "friends": "Those who speak so much of doctrinal development and of its justification are generally not satisfied with the Scriptures as they are, and even less with the confession born of them. Noth teaches to pray, and Noth also teaches - to make confessions. Today, in spite of all one's efforts, one does not make a confession. The doctrine is developed. Luther and the men of the Augustana confess this expressly against the theology of the Roman Church, which is always addicted to development. I do not know where one gets the courage to develop the doctrine in view of the devastating events of the day. Also, the doctrine already developed is good and gives the poor sinners the right comfort, - from Luther to the formula Concordiae. On the other hand, from Schleiermacher to Schenkel it is bleak. So it is not called progression, but reaction! The Reformation, too, is at its core a reaction, like every great doctrine, like Jesus' teaching itself. In the beginning was the Word. - 'Ye have heard.' - "Ye know the Scriptures. - "How readest thou?" - What do they do in our day? They put away the biblical Christ, they do not punish the devil, and they develop the doctrine. One remains in the uncertainty of unionism, in the dishonesty of mediatorial theology, and does not see that the cornerstone is rejected. - If one wanted to write a history of the development of doctrine, one would have to state as a result of it that, due to the decision of the "church authorities" or due to the undertaking of individual luminaries to further develop articles in need of development, nothing has ever come out that could be placed even approximately alongside those pieces of doctrine that arose out of necessity and in the struggle The Lutheran Catechism as well as the Heidelberg Catechism (?) indicate this. The fruits of these in life are Christian morality and virtue. But these little books were nothing but a return to the old. On the other hand, the new impulse which the development of Christian doctrine received through Schleiermacher has become just as pernicious for doctrine as for life; for apart from the consistent disciples of Schleiermacher, who naturally deny God and idolize themselves, even the believing theologians of the present time, no matter how loudly they cry out about the obsolete dogmatics, have neither accomplished more in the explanation of Scripture than Luther

and Calvin - as even a Tholuck confesses - nor even created any Christian custom or improved the unchristian customs." - As much as one has to rejoice in such testimonies even from within the Union, it is nevertheless to be deplored that just such theologians of our time who long to return to the orthodox church, while they place church and confession under God's word in Thesi, as a rule leave this thesis again in their disputes. Thus, for example, the author of the essay writes, among other things. also the following: "If something is found in the utterances of the divine Word which has remained untouched and unconsidered in the Confessions, the believing Scripture researcher can form his definite view of it according to his insight and understanding, and may well clothe it in the form of a doctrine, But he must be humble in the fact that it is his own personal opinion, and he may not claim infallibility for the Church, nor may he therefore expect the Church to recognize and accept as objective truth what is subjectively true and certain to himself." One can scarcely think of a less Lutheran omission. According to this, the Christian can become certain of the truth only by means of the church and its confession, not by Scripture alone. If he wants the latter, he declares himself papally infallible! - O of the poor Christians who, even before our symbols existed, bled for their doctrine! They died hereafter for a "little personal fief." And Luther - how papally he acted, who, long before there was an Augustana, opposed the whole named church with the doctrine of the Augustana, basing himself on Scripture alone! - There is no question that the newer faithful theology, just where it wants to be more ecclesiastical, has mostly left the old Scriptural principle of the Church in good opinion. But there can hardly be a more diametrical opposition to our Church. W.

Calvinism. In the Brunswick-Hanoverian "Kirchenblatt" of April we read, among other things, the following: It is our deepest conviction, based on historical facts, that the penetration of Calvinism into Germany was the greatest ecclesiastical and national misfortune. After all, the whole of Protestant Germany, also as a result of the Wittenberg Concord, which was honestly accepted by the cities of the upper states, represented for a long time a great confessional church unity; and this church was, after all, the church of the pure word, which for this very reason still had to fight a whole series of internal battles, but in this pure word also had the power to lead the battle out with its own means to the happy result which is present in the Formula of Concord. If one adds to this the friendly position which German Catholicism took towards the Lutheran Church in Ferdinand I and Maximilian II, the still renewing victories of the Gospel, especially also in the Austrian hereditary lands - what prospects and hopes do not arise then! These prospects are be-

The Protestant Church in Germany was destroyed for centuries by the Jesuit principle that came into effect, but just as much by the invasion of Calvinism. With the Calvinization of the Palatinate, etc., Protestant Germany fell into two hostile halves. Just as Jesuitism cannot deny its Italian origin, Calvinism cannot deny its French origin, and the clash of the two powers and spirits then gives rise to the Thirty Years' War.... One need only remember how faithfully the Lutheran princes, on the whole and on a large scale, stood by the Emperor and the Empire, even after Jesuitism had already gained power, and one must say: without Calvinism in German lands, the Thirty Years' War would never have come about, Lutherans and German Catholics would have kept peace with each other, and this political peace, what ecclesiastical peace might it not have brought about? They could have learned from us in the main matter, and we also from them in secondary matters; Augustinianism, which is still not completely suppressed there, could have grown stronger in us; as far as we are concerned, perhaps this crude, spiritually deadly territorialism would never have come about.... No thing stands still, least of all Calvinism, whose conquering tendencies can be traced everywhere. Calvinism, by virtue of its absolute decree, which disregards every historical fact, is the father of abstract thought and thus also of all centralization, of all mediations and forms of mediation, of all practices which mediation entails. He was the father of all abstract thought, of all mediations and forms of mediation, of all practices that mediation entails.

Clarity of Scripture. In a review of Dieckhoff's writing "Scripture and Tradition" (see Lehre und Wehre in the May issue) it says in the Braunschweiger Kirchenblatt of April: "The highlight of his writing is the defeat of the attacks on the clarity of Holy Scripture. If Rome wants to hold on to anything, it must deny it, and it does so through the mouth of von Ketteler, with whom Dieckhoff mainly negotiates, in such a way that no other side has spoken more humiliatingly of the Holy Scriptures, indeed of the God of Revelation Himself. Holy Scripture, says von Ketteler, is dumb, a letter, an empty form; only the interpreter makes it speak, gives it thought and content. - To such blasphemy stoops the will to preserve an auctority founded on itself for the episcopate culminating in Rome. God would thus have appropriated Talleyrand's principle: Language is there to veil thought. The meaning and purpose of every word is to reveal the thought of the speaker, and it is a sign of the clear possession of his thoughts to hit the word that reveals the thought - and he before whom everything is clear and uncovered is now supposed to have been incapable of hitting the right word in his word - Rome herself calls the holy Scriptures God's word,

to reveal his thoughts! - But Rome must use such blasphemies to bring God's word and God himself under her, and to remove man from her sight, that she may take God's place. - And just as it destroys God, that it may exist in its claims, so it destroys man in his rational nature, in order to rule, solely rationally, over the unreasonable. For what is man if he is not able to recognize the thought from the word, to recognize with well-founded certainty the thought really given in the word! if he must always stop at this: Thus I think to myself the meaning and thought of the word, but whether it really is, I cannot know! Then man is not capable of any objective truth at all - but then he is not what we call man either, a moral being. - The argument against the sacred Scriptures evidently overlaps here; for if man is not capable of recognizing objective truth, but what he has is always only his thought, which does not meet the object, then Rome also does not reach man, so men also do not grasp Rome's thought, the meaning of Rome's words, which it speaks to them, is then also only the hearer's and not Rome's thought. - One comes to this when one is not afraid to want to settle serious things with phrases.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Pulpit Community. After the "Lutheran Visitor" of June 2 published an article under this heading, which advocates keeping the Lutheran pulpit clean, the editor makes the following comment: "Closed communion and the exclusion of other Lutheran servants of the Lord from our pulpits can neither be nor may be prevalent among us. Such measures are not evangelical, but pharisaical. They are inconsistent with the faith of the third article, wherein we profess to believe that there is one holy Christian church and one communion of saints. If we exclude all others from working and serving in the house of God, we plainly declare by such exclusion that we alone are the holy Christian church and alone the saints. This is what the Romanists, Espicopals, and Baptists do, and shall the Lutherans go and do likewise? God forbid! 'What is thy servant, the dog, that he should do such a great thing?'"-We confess that we would have given the editor of the "Luth. We confess that we trusted the editor of the "Luther Visitor" first of all with more knowledge than that we should have drawn such erroneous conclusions from him, and secondly at least with more reverence toward a Luther and a whole cloud of godly servants of God within our church in former times, who were so far removed from all Pharisaism, than that we should have expected from him the accusation of Pharisaism against them. It is becoming more and more evident how deeply the unionistic spirit of most of the sects here has penetrated the American Lutheran Church, and that it will take more than many would have us believe before the American Lutheran Church becomes a truly evangelical Lutheran Church. "Pharisaical" is not "evangelical," to be sure, but evangelical is also something quite different from syncretistic.

By the way, let the American Lutherans not think that by their bold throwing around of "This is Pharisaism" they will intimidate the old, truly Lutheran church that has come into being again in America by God's grace and move it to leave the old good ways of the fathers shown by God's unchanging Word. What God has begun, He will also continue in defiance of all opposition which human reason and softness of heart oppose to His holy work. W.

A St. Louis resident, Mr. C. Lüdeking, who had been a delegate, reported on the **Freethinkers' Congress** in Naples in the hall of the free church here on May 15. In it it says, among other things: "If I am to speak of the results of the Congress, I believe, to be brief, that it has achieved everything that could be expected under the circumstances. The delegates have formulated a program which lacks only the execution to mark a new era in the cultural history of our race." - According to this, what the Congress of Freethinkers has accomplished is indeed tremendous, the creation of a world-transforming program! And since the program only lacks execution, as the delegate remarks, there is evidently so tiny a detail missing for the attainment of the great goal that **it** must not be considered here, according to the well-known In magnis voluisse sat est. W.

"Kanzelgemeinschft". Under this heading there is an article in the Iowa Church Gazette of June 1, in which it says, among other things: "In a leprosy in the "Lutheran & Missionary" of April 21. April, it is again, however, quite emphatically emphasized, which is always the main thing, that the admission of non-Lutheran preachers to Lutheran pulpits can only be made by way of exception under special circumstances, how this article can be reconciled with the recent clear declaration that the exceptional cases in mind here are those preachers 'who by God's providence have grown up in other external connections, but whose system is not only not anti-Lutheran, but in reality is the Lutheran system itself'. In the last article of April 21, it seems, indeed, as if the exceptions were to be stretched further, but the opinion and scope of this remark are not sufficiently transparent and clear to us." - This is just the pity that especially those who do not take the confession of their own church very seriously, and yet want to be considered faithful members of it, all too often use language not to reveal but to conceal what they think and believe. Hence it often seems as if they had once spoken out quite clearly, while shortly afterwards a new declaration again shrouds everything in clouds. Much a thousand times better than such mum-mum-sayers are open but honest deniers of certain truths. Incidentally, Mr. Iowans have the least cause to complain about ambiguity of speech in the Confession, since they have always developed a true mastery in this, which has often baffled and beguiled even staunch Lutherans. We recall only the Milwaukie Colloquium. In the above article, too, the writer builds a bridge for the "Lutheran" to retreat into the fog-land of Aequivocation by the word "seems"; and when he says that the consideration of possible exceptions is always the main thing, he thus proves that he is basically in agreement with the "Lutheran." He who, when he establishes a rule, is always ready with his exceptions, is not serious about his concession. Otherwise, what is the use of anxiously emphasizing the exceptions? That there are always such exceptions in practice is already known to everyone, and therefore does not need so serious a safeguard. W.

Pulpit Fellowship. After Dr. Moldehnke had stated in his article "Five Years in America" that the "Lutheran & Missionary" had published views, especially on pulpit fellowship with dissenters, which no decided German Lutheran could approve, the latter paper replied: "This passage raises the question whether we must have a German and an English side in regard to this and other points. We have evidently taken a very moderate and just position in this paper on the pulpit-community question; and if what we have asserted and recorded on this subject cannot be approved by a 'decided German Lutheran in America', what then? We have said what our ground is; we claim that it is a Lutheran one; and we do not intend to abandon the same. If it is too lax for 'decided German Lutherans in America,' they must go their way; we cannot go with them, for we have not learned Christ thus, nor the principles and peculiarities of our Church. We have always deplored the confusion of questions of language and nationality with these doctrinal questions; but if this is to be the turning point, as seems to be indicated, the result is clear, and a more distant separation on the basis of language must occur. " W.

The Usury Question. Prof. G. Fritschel continues his historical investigation of the usury question in the "Theologische Monatshefte," edited by Pastor Brobst (see March and April issues). This is a field in which it is certainly pleasurable to romp about, and the work that is done on it is all the more grateful, the more certain the writer can be in advance of the approval of his readers, even if there is a great deal of difficulty with what is actually to be proved. The main questions remain, whether what the prophets say of usury in interpretation of the law is declared by Scripture itself to be a temporary positive law, since a Lutheran recognizes only Scripture interpreted from Scripture, and whether he who wants to have his loaned capital salvaged in any case, as lending requires, has in this case a right also to demand the salvage of the interest. Hic Rhodus, hic salta! W.

The Conciliar Opposition. We read the following in the Louisville Catholic Messenger of Faith: "A French bishop conversed the other day with Msgr. Dupanloup on the question of infallibility, the latter declaring that once infallibility had been decreed by the Council, he would be the first to submit to the decision and defend the doctrine. All considerations of opportunism would also vanish from his mind as soon as the Holy Spirit had deemed the dogmatization of infallibility opportune." - Nothing, however, is more probable than this. He who opposes error without the light of the gospel cannot possibly overcome it, but, if he does not fall into another error, will yet at last be overcome by it.

Complaint from Ohio about preferential treatment of secret societies on the part of civic officials. Thus we read in the "Luthcran Standard" of June 1: "The civil officials at Columbus have so little regard for the rights of people who differ from themselves in matters of morals and religion, that to observe silence about them would hardly be a virtue. At the dedication of the Hall of Odd Fellows in this city, the governor of the state and the city officials took part in a manner as if it were a natural part of the duties of their office. The latter took it upon themselves to prohibit traffic in the main street of the city and in the principal places of that street, just as if the citizens had no right to comply with the duties of their profession when such a society was holding a great feast and ball. So also a few weeks ago, at a laying of the foundation-stone to

In a Jewish temple, on a Sunday, the governor of the state and the mayor of our city took part in ceremonies conducted by the Masons, at which an infidel made a speech mocking the Christians. A Methodist. A Methodist preacher said the prayer, the contents of which are unknown to us, but which must have sounded strange enough in such a society, if Christ was known in it. Civil officials, as far as we understand, are not chosen to use the influence of their high position in favor of institutions and movements which appear to many to be inimical to the best interests of the common good, and which injure the religious feelings of a large portion of the people. Christians have rights, too, and they ought to be respected." We think so too. -C.

The Radical Party in General Synod and the Observer. Concerning the latter, we take the following from the Lutheran Standard of June 1: "The radical party in General Synod, which is using its influence to eradicate all distinctive Lutheranism and to build up a broad Reformation church in which all sects would find a home, is evidently not enjoying much success. The Observer is too conservative in its inclination to join this party, though it holds principles which lead logically to such latitudinarianism. But notwithstanding that inclination, the 'Observer' is after all easily satisfied again. He says concerning the Rev. S. P. Sprecher, one of the leading spirits among the Radicals who dared to advise the abandonment of the Lutheran name, that he has now graciously accepted the ecclesiastical situation, has voted with the other members of the Conference for the general adoption of our order of worship and church discipline, and declares that as soon as he would be convinced that our English churches could do the most good by practicing our Lutheran usages, he would be willing to hold the services in perfect harmony with the worship of the Lutheran Church. - That is to say, Mr. Sprecher will do anything Lutheran as readily as any other, provided he is convinced that he can most easily accomplish his purposes in this way. In other words, he is not so disposed against Lutheranism that he should not himself resort to Lutheran usages, if he were persuaded that this would be expedient. This is what the Observer calls a 'sober reflection .

II. Abroad.

Tad. Pros. Dr. Wuttke in Halle died on April 12 of this year, as did Dr. J. E. Osiander, Dean in Göppingen in Würtemberg, on April 3, as did F. A. B. Westermeier, the well-known founder and zealous promoter of the Gnadau Conference and the "Christian Association for Northern Germany", on April 5 in Elbei. On May **19,** the well-known Prof. Carl-Eduard Schwarz died in Jena, and on April 20, Dr. G. von Polenz, a longtime contributor to the Hengstenbergische Kirchenzeitung.

To the Cancils literature belongs also the writing: "Is Döllinger a heretic? By P. H. Munich, Oldenbourg (23 p. gr. 8.) n. 6 Sgr." The writing is by the Carmelite monk Petrus Hölzl, who has been cited to Rome for the sake of this defense of Döllinger, but does not want to follow the citation.

England. On 19 May the House of Lords decided, unfortunately only by 73 votes to 67, to maintain the ban on marriage to the deceased woman's sister.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 16. August 1870. No. 8.

(Sent in by Dr. W. Sihler.)

What do we Lutheran preachers have to do in the beginning of the slackening, satiableness and secularization in our congregations, even within our synod, in order to ward off these evils as far as possible and to revive and lift up the weary congregational life by God's grace and blessing?

The outward growth of our Synod is indeed a wonderful grace of God. From the mustard seed of 10 congregations and 15 pastors in Chicago in 1847, it has now grown by God's grace and blessing into a mighty tree; for it numbers over 350 pastors with 200 assistants in the feeding of their lambs in 18 states of the Union *).

But it is an even greater miracle of grace that this growth came about mostly under opposing circumstances. For by far the greatest part of our present congregations consisted of people who were nothing less than true Lutherans and truly evangelical Christians. Some of them had very little or no Christian knowledge at all and had emigrated to America on the off chance, in order to make their lives better here and to acquire money and property without great effort. Others had a certain amount of Christian knowledge, but

*) In Riga in Lievland, Prof. S. Fritschel pretended on his trip to Riga that the Iowa Synod was the actual Mission Synod. Here in Germany, however, we know better. For while this Synod would hardly have preachers enough to visit and supply the spiritually stunted Lutherans in the North and West, it does have preachers left over to send them occasionally among our congregations.

The Lutherans were not healthy, i.e. Lutheran; for they were morbidly emotional, pietistic and unionistic; law and gospel, repentance and faith, justification and sanctification were mixed up in their heads; but they were mostly sincere people who later formed the core of some congregations and became decided Lutherans. Opposed to these, there were others who wanted to transfer civil liberty to the ecclesiastical sphere and did not like the punishing Word of God, partly where it seriously attacked the moral corruptions within the congregations, partly where it was directed against the false teaching of other churches, especially when they lived among members of the same. These people, of course, did not want a pastor in their pastor, but an ecclesiastical businessman who baptized, preached, confirmed, communicated, copulated, and buried for so much money and in kind each year, while leaving the old Adam of the individuals undisturbed in his stinginess, drinking, etc. Many from Germany were also like this. From Germany, many were accustomed to this old Adam of theirs not being particularly disturbed by their pastors; and besides, it was the custom there from time to time that they went from the inn to the church, and from the church to the inn.

Almost all, however, even those who were otherwise Christian and receptive to God's Word, had, at the time of the founding of our congregations, either an obvious reluctance or a fearful timidity or suspicious misgivings about the personal registration before partaking of Holy Communion. By the ignorant or malicious, this registration was sometimes called Papist auricular confession, and thus made hateful. Here, too, one referred to the old customary way in Germany. There the pastors - which, however, was not to their glory as conscientious pastors - did not take any further care of the individuals after Confirmation; and personal registration before the Lord's Supper and a confessional conversation of the pastor with his parishioners who registered was not the custom and usage at home.

Is it not truly a miracle of God's grace that in the course of these 23 years hundreds of congregations have grown out of 10 congregations, which at that time formed our synodal body, in which the pure Lutheran doctrine and the unadulterated sacraments, confession, also private confession from time to time and mostly also the brotherly admonition and church discipline according to Matth. 18, 15-17. and God's grace has preserved us in unity of spirit until now? Is it not an object of heartfelt thanksgiving to the gracious God and of high spiritual joy that the same Christ is preached on Sundays in more than 300 pulpits and that many thousands are fed with the same bread of life? Where is now a Lutheran church that could show the same?

Of course, this success would have been impossible if the same gracious God had not provided us, first almost exclusively from Germany and later also from our own congregations, with suitable workers to serve in His vineyard. These were young brothers to whom God had given a living faith in their Saviour, orthodoxy, confessional faithfulness, self-denying love, flexibility and firmness of character, and at the same time noble and fine gifts, and after their training also the right teaching ability. After taking over the congregations which called them - and their number grew more and more, in spite of the fact that our synod was made to stink from all sides - they continued to found and build up the armies of Christ commanded them in the right Lutheran way, i.e. "in all patience and doctrine" on the basis of the holy Scriptures and according to the confession of our church. And in this they did not allow themselves to be misled or weary, nor to be made soft or bitter, however many and various crosses and afflictions the devil and the flesh of their ecclesiastics prepared for them; for through the comfort and power of the Holy Spirit in his word they persevered in this work of faith and labor of love, and did not allow themselves to be endured in it by poverty, much running through thick and thin in the heat of summer and the cold of winter, by all kinds of hatred, persecution, and slander, even from neighboring papists and swarming spirits. To her faithfulness and efficiency in the management of her equally difficult and sweet office, in which she received God's grace, it is then to be attributed under divine blessing that the congregations of our synod gained more and more Christian and ecclesiastical form and spiritual congregational life got going and pregnant. And this lovely and pleasant reality actually refuted the predictions of these and those Lutheran preachers in other synods who were born here or immigrated earlier. For they claimed that our way of forming Lutheran congregations was too much at odds with the local political conditions and the civil freedom of the individual, and that we would not be able to do it in the long run, especially if we worked on confession and church discipline. But, as I said, their prophecy did not come true; for the pure and loudly preached Word of God proved, as in the apostolic and reformation times, so also now and here in this country, its old and ever new power to work the true faith in the Lord and to call Christian congregations into being, which are also heartily devoted to the orthodox confession of their church.

Out of the power of this word, through the faith and love of the congregations, have grown our four ecclesiastical teaching institutions with their fourteen teachers for the preservation of our church in the present and future; and from the same root, places of caring love, such as orphanages and hospices, spring up from time to time. And indeed, the founding and preservation of all these institutions have been more

This is of greater value than what happened at the time of our fathers by the Protestant and Christian-minded princes through the confiscated monastery and abbey estates. For although these were thereby restored to their original purpose, our church nevertheless came into a certain dependence on the secular sovereigns. It is well known how the latter, in the course of time, turned their original auxiliary and emergency office of love into a pretended historical right, raised themselves up as prince-popes, introduced the compulsory marriage between state and church, and set in motion a tyrannical, unevangelical territorialism. And compared with these later restraints, entanglements, and rapes of the Church by the secular princes, as self-aggrandizing chief bishops and usurpers, the earlier favors and outward promotions of the Church by individual godly princes recede quite into the shadow and background. For the best caretakers and nurses of the church of the New Testament, according to the spiritual nature of this church, can and should only be the individual congregations themselves, and the princes only in so far as they themselves are members of the congregation, and in so far as they have faith, love, wisdom, and external means for the promotion of the church and the spiritual life of the same.

So let us thank God that here in this country there is a fundamental divorce between Church and State and that the unfortunate civil marriage and coupling of the two has not taken place. *)

But after this brief digression, let us return to our real subject.

It is therefore an undeniable, factual, and as lovely as it is comforting truth that the pure Lutheran doctrine, especially the pure gospel of Christ and his merit, despite all kinds of resistance from without and opposition from within, has kindled true faith in the Lord Christ in the repentant hearers and has founded churches that are faithful to the confession. And it is no less true that a weaker or stronger congregational life, according to the age and condition of the individual congregations, really exists. And just as evident, as already mentioned above, are the fruits of this congregational life, as, for example, the works of faith and the labor of love in the founding and maintenance of our church teaching institutions, as well as the establishment and care of the parochial schools; likewise the hospices and orphanages which are springing up from time to time, and only recently the procurement of our synodal printing office.

*We do not wish to conceal the fact that the Papal Church, whose kingdom is of this world, has nothing else in mind here in this country than to make itself the sole ruler and, wherever possible, to remove the article of religious freedom from the Constitution.

But how now? Does the devil then act so indifferently, and let the Lord seek, gather, build, plant, and water him unhindered by his word and the faith of his servants? Then he would indeed have ceased to be Satan, that is, the adversary of God and man, and the special enemy of Christ, whose throne, as the Son of God, he once desired to occupy, and for this reason was cast out from the presence of God and cast into eternal darkness. With pressure and persecution by the unionist princes who hate the Lutheran confession, or by princes who yield to the urging of the unbelieving representatives of the people, as for example in Germany, he could not and cannot operate against us here in this country. Just as little has he been able to make serious efforts to tear apart our unity in spirit, or in pure Protestant or Lutheran doctrine, by stirring up romantic or fanatical heresies from without or within. Likewise, even in the years of the civil war, he did not succeed in having us preachers intertwine ourselves in the affairs of the secular regime against the Gospel or even bring politics into the pulpit, as the fanatical speechmakers almost all did and still do.

But there he begins in a different way. If all signs are not deceptive, he is now out to weaken the gratitude to God for his pure and honest word, especially in older congregations, and to strengthen the slothfulness, complacency, and weariness of the flesh with God's word, to strengthen the inclination to make oneself equal with the world, to stop the earnestness in Christian sanctification even through the abuse of Christian freedom, to blunt the moral judgment of political and social conditions based on God's Word, to make the customary depraved breeding of children, which knows nothing of the majesty of the fourth commandment, indigenous among us as well, and to immerse young and old in the most varied and slack addiction to pleasure.

For from where would come in many congregations the scanty attendance of the catechism lessons and the weekday evening services, the small contribution of spiritual recruits for the army of the Lord in the servants of his church from so many congregations, so that without the contingent from Germany we could not send the most needy number into the field? Where would the considerable number of our otherwise well gifted young men come from, who pay off their own war service with money, thereby supporting poor young men, in order to be trained from the war school of our educational institutions to become good warriors of Jesus Christ? Where, furthermore, does the large number of young men come from who lack neither gifts nor Christian knowledge, but who neither want to enter the service of the church themselves, nor support others in their preparation for it, but rather prefer to earn as much money as possible with as little and easy work as possible, in order to spend it again on as much selfish pleasure as possible?

admit? Where else does the slow progress of our present urgent and necessary synodal buildings come from, in which some congregations have not yet participated at all, others very weakly? Is it not strange that while individual municipalities are able to build large and costly churches, some of which cost more or about as much as all our present synodal buildings, these cannot be procured in the same time by more than 200 municipalities? Where would the meager support of our synodal treasury come from, whose most noble purpose is to pay the salaries of our synodal teachers, without whom our church cannot exist in the future? And is it not much nobler and more beautiful, much more Christian and more ecclesiastical, if the faith, which is constantly active through love, procures these means for the present need, than if, according to the custom of the country, agents are sent about, who, as it were, collect capital in the congregations, from the proceeds of which the teachers are then paid?

What do we pastors have to do in order to prevent, as far as possible, the spread of these evils in the already existing congregations? For what good would the outward growth and expansion of the church within our synod be if the spiritual life of the existing congregations were to decrease rather than increase?

First of all, according to Acts 20:28 and 1 Timothy 4:16, we must take care of ourselves, without which it would be difficult to take care of the doctrine and the armies commanded to us. To this care for ourselves belongs first of all that we are not infected by the creeping in or penetration of these evils, nor that we get into carnal zeal against them, so that in the former case our salt becomes stupid, in the latter bitter and corrosive. Rather, we are to keep our hearts in faith and love by the grace and word of God, farther from slackness and discouragement than from angry indignation or even bitterness. Secondly, we ministers of the word ought to humble ourselves and be guilty before God from the heart; for even if it were true that none of us, by conscious and persistent unfaithfulness in the action of the divine word, were guilty (publicly and especially) as a dumb dog, a blind watchman, and a loose disciple, that those abuses exist in our churches, yet we are all hardly free from many a weakness and indolence, yea, also from recklessness and wantonness; For hence it is that we do not feel the sins of our ecclesiastics, which are no longer hidden from us, as deeply and painfully in our hearts as should be right, and that heartfelt compassion does not so fill our souls that from it earnest and persevering intercession for them rises up to the Lord, and the fervent spirit is always present to penetrate powerfully into their hearts and consciences with the love of Christ and with God's Word, as the Apostle Paul in Acts 20:20 gives us such a noble and noble prayer. 20. has left us such a noble and glorious example of this.

But if, after this penitent humbling of ourselves, we also have in faith the constant forgiveness of sins out of the fullness of the merit of our Lord and Saviour, the question now is, What do we Lutheran pastors have to do, in order to prevent, as far as possible, those evils in our congregations? Perhaps it would not be out of place to begin by showing how this would not be accomplished.

In the first place, it is not by the introduction or completion of the old Lutheran ecclesiastical ceremonies. For as little as there is to be said against it, and as much as it can be praiseworthy and lovely, useful and edifying under certain circumstances, it would be a deception if we thought that a special spiritual revival and promotion of the congregations would result from it. Rather, it can happen by chance that in these and those people who are already ceremonially legalized, the delusion is strengthened that only now, through such introduction of the complete Lutheran liturgy and other customs and orders from the sixteenth century, have they become the true unbundled Lutherans, as was the case some decades ago with the so-called separated Lutherans in Prussia. And the present Churchbook in the General Council can also have similar successes, which alone will certainly not produce truly Lutheran congregations; For in general, there seems to be no lack of certain Lutheran Pharisees and Papists in the older Lutheran congregations, who think they find their righteousness before God in their outward affiliation with the Lutheran, as the orthodox visible church, in the participation in its ceremonies, and in general in their outward churchliness and worship, without righteous repentance toward God and true faith in Jesus and right evangelical sanctification living in their hearts.

On the other hand, the ills of the incipient satiableness, slackening, and secularization in our congregations are not essentially counteracted, nor is their true spiritual revival and strengthening achieved by the establishment of all kinds of associations, such as women's, young men's, and virgins' missionary, Bible, hospital, orphanage associations, etc., even if these all rest on the foundation of the church confession and are supported by it. This is not to deny that these and other associations have arisen from the spiritual life of individuals and from the life of the congregation as activities of faith through love; but it can hardly be denied that all such associations easily degenerate into a certain kind of business, and in any case it is not to be hoped that they will at first refresh and promote the life of the congregation.

Thirdly, the spread of these evils is not hindered and the spiritual growth of the congregations is not increased by the building of tasteful, sometimes rather costly churches and their interior decoration, however splendid; for in this outward church building participates

also the arrogance and vanity of quite a few members of the congregation, who know a lot about it and like to trumpet what a considerable contribution they have made to it. They like to rest on it for a good while, as on a soft pillow, and take it badly when they are disturbed in their rest and are encouraged to contribute to the continuation of a necessary synodal building; For the doctrine of the calling of a Christian man is hard for them, namely, that he has nothing else to do on earth than to confess his Lord Christ before friend and foe, to do good and to share in love in all kinds of ways for his sake, and yet to reap for word and work mostly only ingratitude, even hatred and malice, and thus to tolerate evil for doing good.

What, then, is to be done first of all by us servants of the word, in order to ward off those evils, as far as we are concerned, and to revive the weary life of the congregation?

First of all, we must, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, preach the divine word in public with proof of the Spirit and power, and for this purpose, before each sermon is written, we must implore the Lord with great earnestness that He, through the precious Holy Spirit, may give us the right thoughts and words in heart, mind, pen, and mouth in the interpretation and application of His word, which will thoroughly strike the heart and conscience of our church children. It is not enough that sermons which are merely appropriate to form and school should only one-sidedly engage the intellect and only formally promote the knowledge of the law and the gospel. Rather, every sermon should powerfully touch and move the whole person according to heart, mind, and will. It is not our fault that this does not happen in the individual hearers, nor is any special oratorical talent required, which neither Moses nor Paul possessed, at least according to his opponents in 2 Corinthians 10:10. In the same way, our fathers of the sixteenth century did not want to be brilliant pulpit orators; but because they lived in the divine word, and the same in them, their sermons had a powerful effect in producing and promoting knowledge, repentance, faith, and good works.

As for the right division of the word of truth, it would not be inconvenient to begin with a few words of understanding. There are indeed some preachers among us who think they are preaching in a truly Lutheran manner, when they either preach no law at all, but only the gospel, or else place the gospel very much in the background, partly because of the space and extent that the law occupies in their sermons, even where the text demands otherwise, and partly because of a lack of thoroughness in the interpretation and application of the law. This, however, is a regrettable misunderstanding, and nothing less than a common misconception.

The Saviour is only for sinners; "the healthy have no need of a physician, but the sick," says the Lord Himself. The Saviour is only for sinners; "the healthy have no need of a physician, but the sick," says the Lord himself. And therefore he also preached, Marc. 1:15, "Repent, and believe the gospel." Wherefore also he commandeth his apostles to preach repentance first, and afterward forgiveness of sins, in his name. Therefore St. Paul also says in Acts 20:21, that he testified of repentance toward God, and then of faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.

The first thing to do is to preach the law with great earnestness and penetrating sharpness as the holy, unchanging will of the majestic God, as the immovable, eternal rule for all our being, doing, and leaving, so that even the slightest inward deviation from this guideline, yes, even the inherited and inherited sinful corruption, will make us punishable and condemnable in God's judgment and bring upon us the eternal wrath of God in the abyss of hell. In the holy zeal for the honor of God, it is necessary to uncover the spiritual nature and character of the law, even in its will of law and its demand of the perfect holiness and righteousness created for us in Adam, as the letter that kills, and the office that preaches damnation, which reveals the wrath and curse of God over the children of unbelief, burning down even in the most hidden inward transgression to the lowest hell. Would to God that we understood and were better able to preach the law in every single commandment in such a way that we might smite with this hammer of God the hard hearts not only of gross and manifest sinners, but also of those who are proud of reason and virtue, of the self-righteous and sanctimonious, that in the face of God's holy majesty and his consuming fire against sinners, their loins would shake, their knees would tremble, their hair would stand on end, and they would feel no other way than to lead them down into the open jaws of hell and its eternal fire. We are not to go over with the divine law as with a duster over a dusted implement, or according to the saying, "Wash my fur, but do not make me wet." Let it also be from our mouths a two-edged sword, piercing sharply into the conscience and revealing to the sinner his carnal mind, his being sold under sin, his enmity against God and His holy abhorrence and eternal wrath and judgment against sinners. Or are the curses from the mouth of God in Deut. 27, apart from Christ, of no concern to us non-Jews? Does not our own conscience, by the law written in our hearts, testify against us, as transgressors and omitters of it, that, according to God's righteous judgment, disgrace, wrath, tribulation, and anguish, temporal and eternal punishment does and will befall us?

For this reason it is a harmful and pernicious, and in fact quite carnal evangelism, which does just the salutary effect of the righteous and saving gospel harm, to blunt the cutting sharpness of the law, and not to make it strong in every single commandment; for only where the conscience is frightened by the demands and the curse of the law, the troubled spirit, the crushed heart, can the gospel prove its consoling power. But from the disproportionate postponement and weakening of the teaching of the law follows irrefutably the unfortunate fact that there seem to be very few sin-careful, needy, eager for salvation, and grace-hungry hearts, as is also the case in our country. Hence also come the ecclesiastical hypocrites, who, without righteous repentance toward God, take carnal comfort in the gospel, and, if they continue thus, abuse it to their eternal ruin. Hence, no less, in individual cases of Christian knowledge, judgment, and action, the consciences are not thoroughly reported and sharpened in regard to the other table, the love of one's neighbor. Now and then in some congregations there are even older members who attend church diligently, and yet display a most scanty knowledge, for instance, of the spiritual nature of the seventh commandment, according to its depth and extent, in regard to acquiring, administering, and increasing money and goods, to giving and bestowing, buying and selling, lending and borrowing, business cooperation, and so forth. And yet it cannot be proved against them that they are manifest servants of mammon, and that through such service to sin they have in many instances blunted and suppressed even the natural knowledge of the seventh commandment implanted in the heathen.

But should we preachers be so completely innocent of such poor knowledge of the 7th and probably also of the other commandments, if we, as in sermons, so in the teaching of the catechism, do not treat the teaching of the law thoroughly enough, in order thereby to thoroughly inform and sharpen the consciences of our church children?

It is certain, then, that only those who are crushed, wounded, even spiritually killed, and condemned to damnation by the interpretation of the law, even from our own mouths, can be truly comforted, healed, made spiritually alive, and transferred to heaven by the forgiveness of sins through the preaching of the gospel, which kindles faith in Christ in the heart of the poor sinner.

But how shall we preach the gospel, that it may be done by the grace of God in as many penitent hearers of it as possible? Will this be achieved if we drive them, as it were, to the gospel by law, or by merely describing its nature and kind externally, or by preaching on this and that gospel word of Scripture above, or by breaking it down only according to its formal content for the formal understanding of the hearers, or by untimely or even unskillful faith in the divine

What is the meaning of the gospel, and what is the meaning of the fact of reconciliation and redemption, as if it were, at least in poor sinners, a contributory cause of the forgiveness of sins, as if this were a product of the two factors of the gospel and faith? No! by such preaching of the gospel that salutary fruit is not wrought. Rather, the divine fact of God's reconciliation, wrought by God's grace through Christ's merit, and the redemption of sinners from sin, death, and the devil, and the forgiveness of sins, life, and blessedness implied therein, must be testified to with the joyful opening of the mouth. Here, too, no special oratorical talent or abundance of godly thoughts or rhetorical flourish is required to preach the gospel with proof of the Spirit and power. This can also be done in simple, simple words; but the great divine, firm, certain fact in the incarnation of the Son of God, in his vicarious satisfaction both by his fulfilling the law and by his endurance of punishment, in his resurrection, ascension, sending of the Holy Spirit, in his intercession, and in the fact that he is the Son of God, is the most important thing. In his intercession and reign, and in his return to judgment, the Holy Spirit must everywhere, on the basis of Scripture, come powerfully, forcefully, and movingly to the fore. In particular, the redemption of sinners, perfectly accomplished through Christ, and the forgiveness of sins obtained in it, must be powerfully testified to in every truly evangelical sermon, even if no man believes. For it is this preaching alone that kindles true faith in Christ in the heart of the poor sinner, through which the Holy Spirit imputes to him the righteousness of Christ; and it shall not be because of this preaching that even the formerly grossest sinner, in spite of his conscience, however terrified, and his spirit, may not believe and obtain the comforting confidence in Christ and his merit, against the accusation of conscience, the law, and the devil, against the fear of death and the terrors of hell. It is not because of this sermon that he would not, through true faith in Christ, turn a sinner into a righteous man, a spiritually dead man into a spiritually alive man, a cursed man into a blessed man, a slave of the devil who had already been condemned to hell into a free and blessed child of God and his heir and co-heir with Christ.

But as this preaching of the Gospel necessarily presupposes the preaching of the Law as described above, it must in turn be followed by the preaching of the Law, but not exclusively, as in former times, to the unconverted for the recognition of sin and as a disciplinarian of Christ (for the Law is such for the believer only in so far as he still has the flesh about him), but as a rule and guide of good works before God and of new obedience; For otherwise he could easily fall into self-chosen works, devotion, and pretended worship by deceiving the finer, sham spiritual flesh, as the earlier hermits and the later monastic orders clearly demonstrate.

This sermon, then, exhorts and encourages, entices and stimulates those who have been born again and justified to put on Christ, of which it is said in Romans 13:14, namely, to follow Him as an example and pattern in the fulfillment of the law through the love of God and neighbor, and to prove faith by confessing His name, by good works, and by patience under the cross.

This preaching of daily renewal and sanctification or of the constant following of Christ in doing good and suffering evil - this preaching in constant connection with that of the gospel and justification - this is what, as it seems to me, is especially necessary for our church children now, in order to ward off, as far as possible, the beginning and increasing weariness, fullness and effeminacy. For this sermon, the epistles of the dear apostles and especially the final chapters of Paul contain a rich, inexhaustible treasure, just as the epistolary passages for the Sundays and feast days of our church year are mostly taken from them.

In this sermon, then, it is important to hold Christ up to the soul of the faithful, partly from Gospel history, partly from the letters of the apostles, both with reference to the Messianic prophecies in the OT, and to paint before the eyes how he has given his saints an example of doing good and tolerating evil, of following in his footsteps. We preachers, of course, his and his church's servants, are to keep him in mind above all others as our unattainable model example (which we are, however, to approach more and more) in seeking shepherd love and caring shepherd loyalty in fervent zeal for the house of God, in his joyful and courageous confession of the truth against the enemies, in his heartfelt compassion for sinners as a whole and individually, in his persistent supplications and intercessions, in his disputations with the Pharisees and scribes, among whom there were still some who could be healed, in his bearing patience against the disciples who were still so weak in knowledge and conduct, and so on. etc. And no less should those of us who do not take the preaching of the law carefully and thoroughly enough keep a sharp eye on the Lord Christ, even as the right interpreter of the spiritual nature and character of the divine law and its condemnatory power, and follow his example; for the devil is eager to make us drowsy and gradually to turn us into blind watchmen, dumb dogs, and saltless evangelists. It will be very helpful and salutary for us to keep our eye on the teacher of all teachers, as he reveals the spiritual meaning of the divine law in the Sermon on the Mount and sharpens its understanding, as he announces condemnation to the noncombatant of any lust of the eyes and of the flesh, as he pronounces the eightfold woe on the scribes and Pharisees who have remained hardened against his teaching, as he pronounces condemnation on Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum, as he pronounces condemnation on the scribes and Pharisees who have remained hardened against his teaching, as he pronounces condemnation on the scribes and Pharisees who have remained hardened against his teaching, and as he pronounces condemnation on the scribes and Pharisees who have remained hardened against his teaching.

how he prophesies to Jerusalem and its people the judgments of God; how he finally foretells clearly enough his own damning judgment against the children of unbelief on the day of the general judgment of the world.

But also to our parishioners - to the faithful for discipleship, to the hypocrites as a sharp preaching of the law - we are to paint our and their Saviour diligently before the eyes from God's word, as he has also left them an example in the manifold manifestations of self-denying love in bodily and spiritual benevolence and sharing, and in patience in all kinds of tribulation and cross, especially because of the confession of his word.

Then, in connection with this, it is important in this sermon to impress upon our people the high dignity and spiritual nobility of their Christian state and the glory of their general Christian profession of love and suffering, so that they may learn to be ashamed of speaking, acting, and suffering unfaithfully to this profession. Then it behooves us to contrast the desire for money and goods and for the treasures of this world, which are passing away, but which the flesh of true Christians also desires, with the desire of the believer to become rich in good works and the desire for the treasure that never diminishes in heaven; And as foolish and absurd as it is for a rich man in this world to exchange gold, silver, real pearls, and precious stones for brass, pewter, waxen beads, and cut glass, so much more foolish is it for a Christian to give for temporal, earthly, and perishable goods the eternal, heavenly, and imperishable.

In the same way, we preachers are to oppose and emphasize the high honor and dignity that the true Christian already has before God, because he is truly a citizen with the saints and a member of God's household, a king and priest before God, even God's child and heir, and even if he were lying like Lazarus at the door of the kingdom. Just as it would be highly wrong in human judgment if a king's son were to offer up his dignity in order to become an actor and king of the theater, so it would be even more wrong and sheer madness if a Christian man were to offer up his high dignity and honor before God in order to gain positions of honor, power, dignity, and prestige among and from men, contrary to faith and a good conscience.

Furthermore, we preachers are to contrast the desire for all kinds of pleasures and joys of this world, coarser and finer ones, which are contrary to the will of God, and of which even the Christian man, according to the old man, is not free, with the holy desire for and in God and his nature, will, honor, works, benefits and kingdom, and especially in his word, which reveals all this to us. How it is now already before men gray-

If it were abominable and detestable for a betrothed royal bride to cleave to loose boys and commit fornication with them, it would be even more abominable and detestable for a soul betrothed by baptism and faith to Christ, the eternal King, to break faith with its heavenly bridegroom and to court and whore with the world in one way or another.

It is therefore necessary here to exhort the faithful not to grow weary and tired in this following of Christ and in the pursuit of the heavenly treasure and in the constant battle against the devil, the world, and the flesh, and to always be found as the good fighters of Jesus Christ in the armor of God. It behooves the faithful to punish the unfruitful works of darkness in this battle, to confess the name of the Lord Christ, as the true light, courageously and cheerfully even against his enemies, to suffer joyfully for it and to take up their cross and in doing good as well as in tolerating evil, as faithful followers of Christ and as lights in the Lord, to walk worthily of the Gospel in the midst of the unrighteous and perverse generation, holding fast to the hope of eternal blessedness and glory in Christ Jesus.

The teachings and admonitions of the apostles concerning the Christian life of the faithful refer to all the commandments of God, and they go with them into all worldly orders and living conditions, so that every Christian in his particular earthly profession may demonstrate his common heavenly Christian profession, namely, show faith through love, which is the fulfillment of the law and the doer of all commandments. Accordingly we preachers ought also to do on the basis of Scripture, and to urge our church children, freed from the constraint and curse of the law by true faith in Christ, to walk in the law of the Lord. For example, it is urgently necessary at this time to thoroughly demonstrate to the older and younger Christians the godly walk according to the 4th commandment. For from where else does the so prevalent bad, careless, self-indulgent behavior of most of our children, young men and virgins in the home and school originate, than from the lack of consistent, careful, wise and strong, truly Christian child discipline in the home and from the increasing laxity of so many parents? In this case it would be very beneficial, wholesome and useful to occasionally preach a thorough, in-depth sermon on Christian child discipline on Sunday mornings, since in most congregations the catechism exam in the afternoon, where it takes place, is only sparsely attended, and least of all by those parents who are most in need of this instruction. Likewise, it would hardly be in the wrong place, in connection with this sermon, to do another one on the wholesome cooperation of home and school, parents and teachers, for the benefit and good of the children. No less do these and those moral evils and corruptions of our time, such as, for example, usury, life insurance, and others, call for a better understanding.

For this reason, the Holy Scriptures give us a thorough illumination and punishment for the swindling societies, and especially for the secret societies, which eat away at us like a cancer, since they are all contrary to the glory of God and the true love of our neighbor according to God's Word; and the Lord Christ will hardly take it amiss if we occasionally omit the Sunday pericope for this reason.

Let this be enough, or perhaps already too much said, as to how we pastors, especially in view of these incipient evils in our congregations, are to act in public preaching, law, gospel, and good works; and God grant that each one of us, for each sermon, may apply oratio et meditatio, prayer, and devout thoughtful contemplation of the present text with great earnestness, and as an ambassador in Christ's stead, through whom God admonishes, as a co-worker and helper of the Holy Spirit, pour out his whole heart into each individual sermon, pressing the whole strength of his soul into each one, so that it may be at the same time a result and living expression of our whole spiritual life in the orthodox interpretation and application of the relevant passage of Scripture. Then we will at least do what is in our power to ward off, as far as possible, the encroaching weariness, tiredness, and worldliness in our congregations, and to revive and elevate the life of the congregation.

On the other hand, however, it is of great need that thorough, special pastoral care is also available, which, as is well known, requires much love, wisdom, patience, flexibility, but just as much firmness, manly determination and energy of character; and here, too, it is necessary to implore the right word in the right place from the Lord for its proper application to individual cases through earnest petition and intercession. For even through longer experience in life and ministry and an already accumulated treasure of knowledge in this area, the matter is not settled; everything must be asked for anew; and even a younger pastor who seeks the help of the Lord in this way in a particular case will more often find what is right than an older one who relies on his already acquired knowledge and experience. -

But where should and can the special official pastoral care of the individual parishioners be primarily exercised? In my opinion, preferably at the time of confession. It is not to be denied, however, that it is also to be applied several times outside of this. There are sick people, lax church-goers and communion-goers, stupidly challenged people, unpeaceful married couples, and so on. Of course, the pastor must visit them and teach, punish, comfort and admonish them according to their needs. With the exception of such cases, however, he has the best opportunity, as a faithful and prudent steward, to give each of his household members his due, which he especially needs; for the state of Christian knowledge, the spirituality, and the spirituality of the individual are manifold and different.

The nature of the work, the worldly occupation, the natural aptitude, the living conditions, the level of education, and in connection with all this, the inclination, indeed the presence of these and those sins.

At such registration, for which some already come to their pastor and confessor with a collected mind and in the mood for self-examination, he has the desired occasion to deal with the individual in more detail in a fatherly and evangelical way with and according to God's word, according to their particular spiritual need, status and profession, also with regard to these and those prevailing harms, corruptions and sin diseases of our time, by which these or those of his confessors are more or less threatened, or already seized. There he has the most beautiful opportunity to show himself as an insightful spiritual physician who knows how to apply the appropriate remedy from the pharmacy of the Holy Scriptures, according to 2 Tim. 3, 16. 17. and Rom. 15, 4. which also helps infallibly when it is accepted and used with a penitent and believing heart. He can have the newly confirmed recite a passage from the Catechism, ask a few questions about the right understanding of it, and finally attach a short, urgent exhortation to it, especially sharpening the fourth commandment for them. There is no lack of occasion for him to deal in detail with the young men and virgins who have grown up, out of and according to God's word, to warn them fatherly against the worldly lusts that fight against the soul, to paint their Christian calling before their eyes, to prove to them from their own experience the vanity of the world and its lust, and to provoke them to discipleship with the examples of godly young men, such as Joseph, Samuel, Daniel. There they have the opportunity to minister especially to adult men and to give them, according to their inner conditions and outer circumstances, according to their particular profession and circumstances of life, according to the degree of their Christian knowledge and experience, the necessary and wholesome portion, be it teaching or admonition or punishment or consolation. They also have sufficient reason to impress upon the hearts and consciences of the housemothers, who sometimes announce themselves and their husbands, the dignity and importance of their maternal profession, and to exhort them with great and persevering earnestness to implore God, in true faith in Christ, for grace, wisdom, love, and strength for their right Christian child-rearing, and at the same time to pray for their children, that in the power of grace they may receive into a receptive and willing heart the wholesome teaching and discipline with and according to God's Word. Yes, indeed, the great importance of true Christian child discipline is to be held up to fathers and mothers with great emphasis, even in special pastoral care. And this is to be done in such a way that we pastors first convince the parents from God's Word in the knowledge of the intellect, and then convince them in the conscience of the truth thus recognized.

and finally win the heart for it. Of course, it cannot be denied that only truly Christian parents, who are themselves under the discipline of the Holy Spirit, are able to bring up their children in a truly Christian way. However, the investigation of this highly important matter is all the more urgent at the present time, since even within our Synod the lack of consistent Christian child-rearing and an excessive slackness on the part of parents is becoming more and more apparent - a slackness which, to be sure, is directly rooted in the sinful love against one's own flesh and blood in the children and is contrary to the will and word of God, but which is indirectly strengthened by the evil examples of slack child-rearing, which are present everywhere and are customary in the country, and which are corrupt in the flesh. And this, in turn, draws its nourishment in part from the local civil constitution, which encourages the carnal desires for freedom of the individuals, young and old, rather than limiting them in a salutary way, and accelerates its own downfall with the increasing corruption of morals and partisan instincts.

It is therefore very important that the special pastoral care, especially in the loving and wise use of the registration for confession, be and remain vigorously underway, and that we pastors give our parishioners the time they deserve; for it will be difficult, for example, in larger urban parishes, for only one day in the week before Communion Sunday to be sufficient for this, since many can only come in the evening and in the end the whole thing amounts to nothing more than a businesslike writing down of the names of the communicants. It is, however, of great necessity that the pastor, the longer the more, come into the right confessional relationship with each of his church children; and for this, of course, he must have and give the necessary time.

It is therefore necessary to show that and how we preachers are to act on God's Word both in public preaching and in special pastoral care, in order to ward off, as far as possible, the incipient satiableness, slackness, and secularization in our congregations, and to revive and refresh the declining congregational life by God's grace and blessing. For if, as God in His mercy would prevent, we were to become increasingly dull, lukewarm, and superficial in this twofold action of the divine Word, instead of becoming ever more fiery, thorough, and lively, we would not be blameless, despite all our adherence to the outward form of pure doctrine, if those evils were to increase and if not the number of truly faithful Lutherans, but only that of spiritually dead nominal Lutherans were to increase.

In conclusion, however, there are two more relevant points to be mentioned. The first is that we servants of the Lord and His Church should also make earnest and persevering intercession to the Lord, not only each one for the army of Christ as a whole, but also for the individuals whose spiritual need is known to him; for by this means also the love for these is preserved and increased, that we

do not tire of working on them. The other point is that in our conduct we give no one offense, whether through abuse of Christian freedom against love, especially for the weak, or through caring for the world and the belly, or through spiritual arrogance and lust for power, or through worldly and frivolous behavior in social circles, or by slack house-rule, or by disorder in the administration of our income, or by obstinacy and self-opinionatedness in indifferent matters, and by sensitiveness out of offended self-love, or by lack of active love and good works for the common good, and so on. etc., so that we do not preach to others and become reprehensible ourselves. Rather, it behooves us to live as much as possible what we teach, to present ourselves in every way, according to God's will and word, as an example of good works, to show ourselves as pious and faithful servants of Christ in all our official conduct, to preside well over our own houses, to bear the cross to the Lord Christ in self-denying love, and to walk blamelessly and unoffendingly on all sides.

It is true that we are living in a terrible time, in which not only the corruptions in doctrine and life are increasing, but also the mass apostasy from the Christian faith and God's Word is growing rapidly. And it seems as if the last general battle between Christ and Satan, the last day, is near.

Therefore it is all the more important that we Lutheran preachers in particular, the ministers of the pure Word and Sacrament, be found to be the good fighters of Jesus Christ, who, clothed in the divine armor, lie in battle against the devil and his angels and fight the good fight of faith, so that we may not only save our own souls, but also those who want to be saved. God grant this in mercy for Christ's sake, Amen.

"To the General Lutheran Conference."

Under this heading we find the following in the number of the "Kirchenblatt für die ev.-lutherischen Gemeinen in Preußen" (edited by J. Nagel, pastor in Breslau) of May 15 of this year:

The General Lutheran Conference, which, as is known, met for the first time two years ago in Hanover, but was cancelled last year, is to take place this year in Leipzig, immediately following the celebration of the Mission Festival there, scheduled for June 8. The members of our church are thus again confronted with the question of whether, or in what way, they may participate in this conference, if they consider their church and its confessional position toward the Union

do not want to deny. Even before the first conference, concerns had arisen on our side in this regard. The published original statutes were admittedly harmless according to their wording. But the interpretation which, as was asserted in the public papers, had been given to them on the part of the leading committee by admitting, even inviting, the Prussian Reformed Lutherans to full membership, caused the invited members of our High Church College to hold out the prospect of their participation in the Conference only in the event that this admission, which seemed to them to express the de facto recognition of the Uniate Regional Church of Prussia as an equally Lutheran church, would be rescinded. This did not happen; however, the closer conference, which met in Brunswick on April 7 of this year, acknowledged that the Prussian Regional Church, to which the Vereinslutherans belong, could not be counted among the Lutheran church regions of Germany, which was obviously intended to be, and indeed was, a concession to us. Since at the same time this admission was not only expressly and publicly declared permissible and upheld for the future, but also extended to the effect that a Prussian Vereinslutheran was even admitted to the further committee, the situation was rather worsened than improved for us, although the director of our Ober-Kirchen-Collegium was also invited to join that committee as a member.

All this has already been communicated in detail to the readers of the Kirchenblatt in the previous volume (pp. 174-182), whereby we refrained, however, from expressing any opinion of our own about the position we are now to take on that conference. In view of the proximity of the renewed meeting of the Conference, however, we feel obliged to make such a statement, and believe that we can best and most briefly fulfill this not exactly pleasant and convenient duty by printing the reply that we have received for this purpose, which the Director of our High Church College has already given to the Executive Committee of the Conference in response to the invitation extended to him on August 8 of this year, and which at least cannot be denied the acknowledgement that it makes a clear statement. If, however, in our best opinion, we can do no other than endorse it, then we must also hold that active and formal membership in this conference, so long as it also wants to admit the uninitiated with equal justification for the sake of their purely personal Lutheranism, is not to be recommended to any of us who do not want to involve themselves in the fatal contradiction of approving and participating abroad in what they fundamentally reject and actually avoid at home. Of course, we are not talking about passive participation as a mere listener, for instance, even though this will not be easy to establish and mark in such a way that it does not coincide with

The Lord knows how difficult it will be for us to contradict the next brethren in this way. - The Lord knows how difficult it will be for us to have to contradict the next brethren in this way. But 1 Timothy 5:22 leaves us no other choice, and the further development of the conference, which in this respect is not Lutheran in its design and composition, will make it evident that - in spite of all the theological stimulation and support which it will undoubtedly provide - instead of being a protective wall against the union, as was originally intended, it is more likely to become a bridge to it.

The aforementioned letter of reply thus reads from word to word: "Reverend Sirs and Brothers!

Your honored letter of June 10, C., in which you respond to the concerns expressed by me in conjunction with the church councillors Nagel and Besser on June 18, Pr., has only been able to make a pleasant impression on me and my colleagues as a testimony to your regret that we believed we had to stay away from the General Lutheran Conference until now, and to your efforts to eliminate the reasons for our refusal to participate. I also express my sincere thanks to you for the consideration and trust which, according to the resolutions of the Brunswick Assembly of April 7, c., have been bestowed upon me personally by my election to the wider committee.- However, to my great regret, I have not been able to find in your letter and in the resolutions passed in the narrower conference such a real removal of the earlier reservations against participation in the conference that this would also make it possible for me to accept the election.

It must be a source of satisfaction and joy to us to find in your letter the assurance that a view as if you did not regard the Lutheran Church in the older provinces of Prussia as an equal component of the Lutheran Church in Germany, but were ashamed of it because of its sectarian form or for other reasons, has always been far from your mind, and we now naturally drop this interpretation of the disconcerting fact of our initial non-consideration among the Lutheran church regions of Germany represented in the narrower Conference, which seemed to us the most obvious. But you yourself will feel that, if you do not also, as our previous letter wished, state the other positive reason for that non-consideration, this omission is not suitable to bring complete clarity and the thus desirable complete confidence into our relationship, and it is not our fault, and it is not our fault if we now-perhaps again erroneously-seek that reason in our perhaps different mutual position against the United Church, in which alone, after the new resolutions of the narrower Conference, something has changed simultaneously with the election of one of our own to the wider Committee. - In any case, there is something very precipitating about it.

It is a serious matter if the General Conference, after its brilliant beginning in 1868, is already suspended in the following year and then completely moved out of the country, where alone, as the place of its origin and the most burning danger - although in a more difficult situation, nevertheless also for the maintenance of the Lutheran Church within the new provinces of the Prussian State - it had its full significance and the greatest prospect of victory, even if in external defeat, You will not blame me, who, like several of you even now, am a very quiet and idle member of a similar committee set up in Leipzig in 1848 for a movement that in its time went far deeper in the circles of the regional church, but which has now also long since gone to rest, if I find no encouragement in those events to subsequently become a member of another committee, in which I would perhaps not be given much more occupation from the outset than to see how this new movement is inexorably coming to an end so much earlier.

But I could be mistaken in this, and the small prospect of taking up a position useful to the kingdom of God would at least not be a reason in my conscience for rejecting this choice. However, I must continue to find such a reason in that which, according to our previous letter, prevented us from holding out the prospect of our participation in the future, as long as this obstacle was not removed - in the position of equality which was assigned to the so-called Vereinslutherans of the Prussian Regional Church in the Conference. This obstacle was not only not really removed by the resolutions passed in Brunswick, but in a certain way was even strengthened.

It is true that the narrower conference there has now acknowledged that those "Lutheran brethren" in the Prussian Regional Church do not belong to a Lutheran church area, and has thus relieved us of the necessity, by joining the conference itself, of agreeing theoretically to an untrue proposition, by which we would at the same time have denied the right of our own ecclesiastical existence. However, it did not conclude from this acknowledgement, as our previous letter had suggested in order to remove our misgivings, that the so-called Vereinslutherans could not be members of the Conference, the purpose of which is to bring the members of the various Lutheran church regions of Germany closer together in order to cultivate their fellowship and to reach agreement on their common interests; On the contrary, it has decreed that this contradiction between the purpose of the Conference and the ecclesiastical position of these "Lutheran brothers" should not be an obstacle for the latter to become members not only of the General Conference, but even of the present wider Committee, a permanent authority which, according to the new resolutions, advises the executive committee in important matters.

and this decision was immediately followed by the election of a member of the Prussian Lutheran State Church as a member of the further committee. How you, dear Sirs, could have expected that this decision would remove our main concern, which consisted in the recognized, real and actual equality of the Vereinslutherans with the ecclesiastical Lutherans, is indeed inexplicable to me. By the same, the expressly conceded non-affiliation to a Lutheran church confession is not transformed into an affiliation. But if there is a contradiction between word and thing, the latter is always more powerful than the former, and thus the state of affairs remains as before. Also, the reason given, "because of their personal Lutheranism," when applied to an assembly that does not want to unite lovers and friends of the Lutheran Church, but has a distinctly ecclesiastical character in purpose and persons, is completely incomprehensible. In truth, however, according to these resolutions, the matter comes to pass in such a way that the Conference, which is to strive for a rapprochement and fellowship between members of the Lutheran church regions of Germany - mainly, after all, in order to counteract the threatening danger of a false, contradictory union into a so-called General German Lutheran Church - represents for this purpose itself a union fraught with contradiction between members of the Lutheran and a non-Lutheran church; that it is with the same justification of both in the Conference, in the Committee, and why not in the Committee as well? that for the right path and the goal to be striven for in the present ecclesiastical turmoil, it ascribes just as much full justification to the well-known program of the Vereinslutherans, which, in the worst case, above all wants to see the union of the state church maintained, even if with all kinds of concessions for the confession, as it does to the members of our church, who above all want to save the publica doctrina of the Lutheran church against the union; that, finally, for the interpretation of its last tendency, which is not directly expressed in the "Provisions," it exposes all members from the Lutheran church regions to the danger of the reproach of the saying: Noscitur ex socio, qui non cognoscitur ex se, and must therefore also fill them with the apprehension, which, however, must be especially painful to me after almost 40 years of struggle for pure Lutheran Church, of annoying many weak brethren. It is therefore not out of obstinacy or a careless underestimation of the importance of holding together in our Church, which is now so severely threatened, that I am still unable, for the sake of my conscience, to participate in such an ecclesiastical undertaking. But I also cannot believe that blessings can come from it for the Lutheran Church, and finally I use the word granted to me, honored gentlemen and brothers, to make a fraternal admonition: to examine the foundations of this conference once again according to the Word of God, and what this examination will mean for the Lutheran Church.

so that what was well-intentioned would not result in harm, which God the Lord graciously wants to ward off from His church.

In the fellowship of confession to Him, the Head of the Church, I remain

Your

Wroclaw, most devoted

August 8, 1869. (signed) E. Huschke.

To the Committee on Business of the General Lutheran Conference, for the attention of the etc."

Literary Intelligences.

Harleß, Dr. G. C. Adf. v., Staat und Kirche oder Irrthum und Wahrheit in den Vorstellungen von "christlichem" Staat und von "freier" Kirche. Leipzig, Duncker & Humblot (VII, 99 p. gr. 8.). n. 16 Sgr.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Pulpit Fellowship. Under this heading, the Lutheran Visitor of 22 June notes: "If it is suggested that other Lutheran preachers are unsafe spiritual leaders, we must be decidedly opposed. We are a Lutheran, and as to doctrine we prefer the Lutheran Church to any other. But if it comes to pass that being a Lutheran involves the necessity of denouncing as errorists, and their pastors as 'blind leaders of the blind,' so large and respectable a body of fellow-Christians as constitute the other evangelical Christians of this and other countries, we ask that it be remitted to us to be a Lutheran." The writer of these words, Rev. M. (Miller), seems to have been ignorant of the apostle's saying, "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump," or at least, when he wrote the citirte, to have forgotten it; quite apart from the fact that the difference between the doctrine of ours and that of the other so-called evangelical churches does not concern "a little leaven" at all. W.

Unitarians also want a confession of faith. The Lutheran Standard of June 15 reports: "The Unitarians, whose unbelief is considered respectable in New England, are moving among themselves the question of creeds, a part of them eagerly demanding a touchstone of discipleship and a flag around which they could rally. The friends of this movement are the so-called conservatives, while the opposing party wants no one to be asked on account of his faith." -C.

Dr. Philip Schaff recently became a professor in the Union Theological Seminary of the Presbyterians of New York.

From the proceedings of the Lutheran Ministry of Pennsylvania and adjoining states.

From the report of the same in the "Lutheran and Missionary" of June 23, we find the following: "Concerning Rev. J. N. Gross - a former member of the General Synod of Western Pennsylvania - the following was submitted for decision: The President of the Western Pennsylvania Synod has filed an official protest against the admission of the Rev. Gross, wherein he sets forth that Nev. Gross and his congregations ,are in regular communication with the Western Pennsylvania Synod, that although the same have properly petitioned for dismissal from this body, it has been withheld from them because of the geographical lines of demarcation established between the two Synods, and because the power to grant such dismissal is lacking; further, that the admission of the petitioner would encourage disorder and insubordination Your Committee regrets to say that honored members of the Western Pennsylvania Synod have found no boundary lines which would have prevented them from coming into congregations of our Synod to induce them to accept pastors who in doctrine and practice do not agree with this ministry, or have prevented the Western Pennsylvania Synod from officially declaring this ministry schismatic and unchristian, and our separation from General Synod and participation in the General Council organization tantamount to a breaking of all synodical contracts with members of General Synod; or to have prevented the Western Pennsylvania Synod from censuring the Rev. Gross for his sympathy with that body, as to spirit and customs. In view of these facts, your Committee propose the following: 1. Resolved, That this Ministry be willing and anxiously anxious to hold harmony with the Western Pennsylvania Synod, but only on condition of a full, unequivocal acknowledgment of the doctrines and customs peculiar to that body and peculiar to the Lutheran Church, and of a full, unequivocal acknowledgment of the doctrines and customs peculiar to that body.Lutheran Church, and an official retraction of the harsh, undeserved verdict of condemnation on the relation of this Ministry to the Confessions of our Church and to the General Council, passed against us by the Synod of Western Pennsylvania. Resolved, That this Ministry, out of fidelity to the truth, is constrained to use its influence for the protection of those who are censured and accused for their sympathy with the denomination which this body holds as that of the true faith of the Bible and of the Lutheran Church. Resolved, That in the present state of things, concerning the Western Pennsylvania Synod, we cannot consider the protest of this body against the admission of the Rev. J. R. Gross. - The same was unanimously received." -As a counterpart to this apparently Missourian procedure, formerly so severely contested, we read, of course, in the same report, that as "delegate to the Reformed Synod, Rev. Schmauck has been appointed, and as his substitute, Rev. J. R. Gross;" and a still more glaring one we find in the "Observer" of June 24. For while in the above report, on the occasion of the proceedings concerning Muhlenberg College, it is remarked, "The Erecutiv-Committee were instructed not to support any young man at any institution who belonged to a secret society of notoriously anti-Christian or un-Christian tendency," we read, on the other hand, in the "Observer" concerning this, as follows: "Rev. G. A. Hinterleitner introduced a series of resolutions proposing to exclude all secret societies from Muhlenberg College, declaring the same unfit and inconsistent with the principles of the Church, and withdrawing the support of the Synod from any student who belonged to such secret societies as would bar his entrance to the Seminary. After several improvements and substitutes had been proposed, and much time wasted in debating them, the resolutions were laid on the table by 46 votes to 34. " C.

The Evangelical Allianre, whose representatives intend to assemble in New York on Sept. 22 to Ortbr. 3 of this year, is also taken into account by the atheist Heinzen, who publishes the following in his "Pionier": "The 'Freethinkers' Congress' in Naples was intended to be an opposition to the cursing Council in Rome. If properly conducted, the opposition of these two extremes could have had a significant effect. That is now past, and cannot be made good. But another opportunity, in our opinion far more favorable for making propaganda for the radical ideas, presents itself in America. In the autumn a great council of all Protestant sects of the whole world is to be held in New York. This council, depending on its outcome, may become more dangerous to progress than the one in Rome, if its effectiveness is not paralyzed from the outset by a corresponding counter-effect. Such a counter-effect could emanate from a concilium of freethinkers of the whole world to be held simultaneously in New York. Even if the participation from Europe, because of the great distance, should be only slight, or should be limited to letter replies to the invitations to be issued, the Germans here alone, united with the American "Infidels," could already get an imposing force on its feet and set in motion a tremendous agitation against the clerical regiment. The radical women, Mrs. Rose in the lead, would also be drawn into the movement. The whole world would then learn what the much-maligned radicals actually wanted. At the same time, a far-reaching permanent union could be established. If our proposal meets with approval, we expect corresponding statements from suitable quarters and further proposals for public discussion. Perhaps these would best come from local assemblies and associations. In the case of a leading committee to be elected, the three associations which have also undertaken to put Dr. Büchner's lectures into effect, namely the Turnerbund, the Union of "Free Communities," and the "Association for the Propagation of Radical Principles," should be considered above all. Of course, we do not expect any support from the common press, because the proposal comes from us."

In Doctor Moldehnke in New York, according to his latest manifestations, a Grabau seems to have risen again, or rather, a Grabauchen seems to have emerged. The dear man seems to have slept during the time in which he fled from the Lutheran Church of America to the Uniate Prussian Church; otherwise he would hardly feel like trying again the miserable career of the Knight of Buffalo. If the Herr Doctor, having scarcely donned the armour of theological arguments, had laid the same aside in the "Lutheran Herald" of June 9. When the Doctor, after having hardly put on the armor of theological arguments, puts it down in the "Lutheran Herald" of June 9, and uses as a weapon a letter of Judas sent to him by an unnamed member of the Wisconsin Synod, he seems to imply that he has already reached the end of his theological wit; for he must indeed be at a great loss for weapons who seeks to save his cause by taking the letter of a malcontent member of the Synod - what Synod would not have such subjects in its bosom? -which scurrilously colludes with the opponents of his synod and reviles the same and its president behind his back, as his weapon. To see in advance what the end of a fight that is thus inaugurated must be, for that, at any rate, no gift of prophecy is needed. May such a fighter put himself on a high horse, so that he appears like Goliath "six cubits and a hand's breadth high", in the end of the Buffalo Goliath and other giants his end is already sufficiently prognosticated. W.

How Missouri Counts Lutherans. Under this heading we read in the Observer of June 24: "According to a reference from the number of Lutherans **in**

In the United States and in the world, The Lutheran criticizes the way in which, according to The Lutheran's revelations, the Missourians cut this figure with the sword of extreme symbolism: "More and more we become aware, by the declarations which Missouri makes of itself, that outside the Missouri Synod there is very little, if any Luther or Lutheran Church, as far as this country is concerned. And according to the manner in which a recent editorial of that paper instructed and interrogated Dr. Krauth concerning the great Lutheran Conference to be held at Leipzig, at which he and Prof. S. Fritschel are to be present on the part of the General Council, likewise according to the manner in which it speaks of Dr. Luthard, &c., we conclude that the question: how many Lutherans there are, must henceforth be answered thus: 51,500 in the Missouri Synod, and perhaps some few more here and there in America and Europe, who are at present acknowledged by Missouri, and known to it alone. That is, since there is great uncertainty about all outside the Missouri Synod, it is best and most advisable to place that there are just 51,500 known Lutherans in the world in this year of our Lord, 1870!!!' We publish this with pleasure," (would not, of course, have been necessary to affirm first) "and only wish not to have to add, that if only those are Lutherans who have been declared by the fundamental principles of the General Council to be really entitled to the name, the 'Lutheran' has little, little, if any, advantage over the 'Lutheran,' and that the generally accepted statistics must be abandoned until the question, What makes a true Lutheran? is authoritatively decided." - Surely the "Observer" does not get so excited about the "Fundamental Principles." He sees, after all, that they do not at all prevent Arians and Hegelians, like Kahnis and v. Hoffmann, or yet Semipelagians and Chiliastes, like Luthardt, from being counted as good Lutherans. -C.

The Happy Ambassador in Dayton, Ohio, recently reported of his sect, the United Brethren in Christ, that there had always been too much lack of true churchmanship in that "church" from the beginning. Father Otterbein did not want to be the founder of a new church community, and when it nevertheless took shape, there is already in its earliest history a kind of complaint that "the church lacked ecclesiastical sense" and that many thousands of members were lost to it. Some even seem to have sunk to apathy in this community, and this prevails "not only among the members, but too much among the preachers, and the proverb may also apply in this respect: As the shepherd, so the flock." It is lamented that there are even preachers in this community who neither read their church papers themselves, nor care for their circulation. Such preachers are only a hindrance in the church, and the sooner the same would leave the church, the better it would be for the church. Where one thinks and supposes that every ecclesiastical designation is right, there one stands out of the broad base on which many have already suffered shipwreck. (Ref. Kz.)

General Synod's broad-mindedness and its partial reason. In the Lutheran and Missionary of June 23, we find the following: "Doctor Wedekind of New York, who appeared at the recent General Presbyterian Assembly as a delegate of the General Synod, in his address asked the Presbyterians to support the General Synod with funds in order to be able to take active steps for the collection of the Germans: But of course: "The Mission Board of the General Synod reports that on June 1 there was only $594.46 left in the treasury, that up to the same date it owes the missionaries the sum of $1012.50, and that up to July 1 there will be a deficit of at least $2000 in the treasury. 14 requests for assistance had to be turned down during the last 12 months for lack of funds. C.

Ueber Vereiniguug der Lutheraner. A passage in the report of Dr. G. Diehl on the proceedings of the recent General Synod, held at Winchester, Va. gives rise to the following remarks in the "Lutheran and Missionary" of June 30: "We are very much in favor of a union of all Lutherans, North and South, Missouri and all. But so long as the existing differences in doctrine prevail, such a union is purely impossible. The effects of the recent violent hostility to the truth in some congregations and synods, are still too recent and too extensive to entitle us to hope for a fairly general and hearty acceptance of the pure doctrines of the Word in the near future. But what sacrifices of thanksgiving should rise in the day when those who have departed from the faith of the Lutheran Church, and yet still claim its venerable name, would return to the old ways, and in hearty unanimity with all who stand in the truth, agree to the apostle's spirit of delivering and confessing the doctrine and those alone which we have received from the HEART! But we are troubled by the remark in that report: 'The people do not care for those points on which our fighters are divided.' This is the remark of Dr. Diehl, a fine and learned man. But here, in spite of his fine skill, he is in error. It may be that the people, with whose feelings he is especially acquainted just now, take no interest in the heresies for which his fighters contend. But we know that the people, and, if you will, the fighters who accept the pure teachings of the divine word, are all of one mind, thousands as they are, that among them there are no such differences as people and fighters, and whether they could be divided into such classes, that the pure teaching of the word is nevertheless as dear to some as to others. The fact is, that the very doctrines most drawn into controversy have been so plainly presented, so warmly received, and with divine power have had such an invigorating effect on whole congregations, that the people care for them above all things, and, with or without disputants, intend to stand up for the truth themselves, which was once given to the saints. The truth is strong and will prevail. We hope not to be inferior to the sprightly Pastor and venerable Doctor in the earnest, fervent desire for a union of the whole Lutheran Church; but let it all be a union in the truth, then alone will it be a right and lasting one. This can be heard. -C.

Two counter-images, set up by the "Observer" in its number of June 24: "The first: The Report on the State of the Church from the Minutes of the General Synod of 1869. The second: First Annual Report of the Board for Inner Mission from June 1, 1869 to June 1, 1870. Both documents are the property of the Church, and it is certainly right that the Church should know whether the statements of the one are supported by those of the other. A few extracts from both, according to different Synods, may afford a comparative insight: Hartwick Synod ad 1. "The cause of religion has made encouraging progress in Hartwick during the past year. Many poor souls have been brought to the knowledge of the truth, new churches have been built and some old ones embellished. On the whole, the religious interest within the limits of this Synod is enjoying a prosperous condition.' ad 2. Contributions of the Hartwick Synod, (3,994 communicants), to Inner Mission K17. 19th Synod of New Jersey, ad. 1. ,Our congregations are all in a flourishing condition. A number of religious revivals have been reported. In the point of munificence our people are improving. Benevolent causes are finding better support from year to year. Some of our congregations have received a large increase of members. We find our situation hopeful.' ad 2. contributions of the synod of

New Jersey, (1,621 communicants), for Inner Mission: Not One Cent. - Northern Illinois Synod. ad 1. "There is spiritual life in our congregations. In all the fundamentals of religion we are one heart and soul. We hear nothing of strife, aä 2. Contributions for Inner Mission, (2,039 Communicants), H50. - Frankean Synod ad 1. .Practical religion was well encouraged. We had some glorious revivals to enjoy, ad 2. Contributions for Inner Mission, (1,782 Communicants): Not a cent. - Summa: Of nearly 10,000 communicants of such churches as have been reported to be 'in a flourishing condition,' the enormous sum of $67.19 was contributed in the course of one year to the important cause of the Inner Mission. Brethren, is this the .thriving condition,' let us pray that we may be delivered from it." -C.

"The true visible church of God on earth." If we Lutherans claim to be this, one tears one's clothes for the outrageous presumption of which we are thereby to be guilty. As we see from the "Reformirte Kirchenzeitung" of July 21, the Reformed Church addresses the same thing. Thus we read there, among other things: "In the confessions of the Reformers it is called the Reformed Church, because it wants to be so little a new church as a single church among many. It wants to be nothing more than the original apostolic and catholic church restored according to the Gospel.... For the same reason we do not inquire what the special calling of the Reformed Church is. She does not want to be a special church or 'special church', even though a large part of Christendom is separate from her. It has never made any other claim than to be just what the church is supposed to be according to God's will and was at the time of the apostles. All that belongs to it, that constitutes its profession. If she were to pick out individual things and leave the rest, she would indeed be a special church, that is, a sect."- Admittedly, we cannot grant the claim which the Reformed Church makes here; first she would have to leave behind her various dangerous fixed special doctrines, e. g. of the person of Christ, of the sacraments, of predestination; nevertheless, we rejoice in this language in our slack, indifferentistic time. An error which is held fast because it is thought to be truth, is not so dangerous as the unionistic despair of all truth, and the equal regard of truth and error. W.

A Conference of the Synod of North Carolina on Pulpit Fellowship. From the "Observer" of July 1. "The Eastern Conference of the Synod of North Carolina, at its last meeting, passed the following resolution: Resolved, That we as a conference disapprove of the exchange of pulpits, or pulpit fellowship, believing it to be injurious and pernicious to the interests of our church and the kingdom of Christ. - The Rev. C. H. Bernheim and J. D. Bowels were the only members of the doctrinal class present." -C.

Strange Resolution of Presbyterians" on the Baptism of Dissenters. In the same number of the "Observer" we read, "The Southern General Presbyterian Assembly, at their last meeting at Louisville, resolved that the baptism of Unitarians, Papists" (!) "and Campbellites was invalid." C.

II. Abroad.

Conversion of Roman. The Augsburger Zeitung reports from Leipzig that, in consequence of the recent events at the Council, Dr. Aug. Schenk, Professor of Botany in that city, has left the Roman Church and has become a member of the Lutheran Church.

has become. Another German paper says that in the city of Grätz there is concern about a mass withdrawal of the Catholics there from communion with Rome, in case the dogma of infallibility should be accepted by the Council. Booth.)

Kurhessen. The Braunschweiger Kirchenblatt of May writes: "In Kurhessen, the entire Lutheran clergy of Upper Hesse, with their Superintendent Kümmell at their head and with their congregations behind them, have declared themselves unconditionally against the competence of the presynod and against the validity of its decisions, and will remain firm in their Lutheran confession and the right of their old church constitution, come what may. 67 clergymen of the "reformed" Lower Hessian and the united Hanamian Church have spoken out with similar determination, and certainly not a few entire congregations and numerous members of the congregation also stand by them. In the meantime, the Prussian Ministry of Culture had already relented. But we cannot quite rejoice over this victory of ecclesiastical law and freedom. For without doubt only this way is given up, but not the goal. Rather, the walls of law and valiant manhood, from which we must for the time being retreat, will now be sought slowly to crumble: and it is far more difficult to prevent this than to beat off a storm. Thus the longer the decision is postponed, the more unfavorably it is likely to lie for the Church of God. May the Lord grant that the brave hearts of His fighters in Hesse may also prove themselves in patience, and withstand the long siege as successfully as they withstood the first storm!

Infallible Magisterium of the Bishops. Dr. Münkel comments on this as follows: "What is the use of the much vaunted infallible magisterium of the bishops, what is the use of their church assemblies, if the infallible pope alone can decide everything? The church assemblies are either a precious ecclesiastical luxury in doctrinal matters, or a humiliating school for the bishops, who are summoned together with their infallible magisterium, in order to be instructed by the pope and to have their possible errors remitted. The second and fourth chapters answer this: The infallibility is the same whether it is to be seen in the Roman Pontiff as the head of the church, or whether it is to be seen in the whole teaching church united with the head.' What a fine judgment! The pope without conciliar and bishops is as inerrant as the pope and conciliar taken together. The very simplest conclusion from this is this: pope and concil are infallible; further, pope + 0 (and zero, that is, without concil) are also infallible; therefore concil is equal to 0. This is mathematically proved. Now that the bishops have been made mere zeros, they are, on top of all this, treated like the bullfinches. They are told: 'Far from this power of the pope being opposed to the regular and immediate power of the episcopal jurisdiction, the latter is rather confirmed, strengthened, and defended by the supreme and general pastor.' This they must believe, though they do not see it, but rather see before their eyes that the pope consumes the fat of their office, and leaves them only sinews and bones. Without will they are given over to his power, and with submissive silence they must obey, just as if our Lord God himself were sitting on the chair of Peter and cursing everyone who did not acknowledge him as the supreme and universal judge of the world."

Decrease in the number of theological students and candidates. German newspapers report: "According to statistics, the number of theology students and candidates is in decline in most German states. At the old Prussian universities, the number of theologians from within the country has fallen by 20 percent in the last three years, from 891 to 714. Because some old Prussians have transferred to foreign universities, the number of theologians has fallen by 20 percent.

The students who study at the other universities do not show any significant improvement. If one includes New Prussia, the situation is not significantly different. The number of eligible candidates has decreased even more, as some of them go on to study other subjects after graduation. If in 1865 the number of candidates eligible for election was still 335, in 1868 it had fallen from 225. In New Prussia, in Hanover and Holstein, the lack of candidates is perceptible enough, and in Central Germany the situation is said to be no better. Of the universities, Leipzig at present exerts the greatest theological attraction. It has 209 foreigners, next to it Tübingen 139, Erlangen 84 and Berlin 38, i.e. Berlin, the university in Prussia most attended by non-Prussians, no more than the liberal Jena and Heidelberg. One goes where one either comes somewhat nearer to Lutheran theology, or yet expects a real Biblical theology." (Evangelist.)

The Allgemeine Zeitung is informed from Rome **about a new paper by Dupanloup:** The International Commission of Minority Bishops had felt the need that the highly important question of the moral unanimousness necessary for dogmatic decrees be illuminated in a separate writing, and Dupanloup undertook this task. He had a pamphlet on this printed at Naples, and submitted it to the Fathers of the Council. In it he shows, first of all, by the history of all the Councils considered ecumenical, that the provision of moral unanimity was never violated, and, as at the Council of Trent in particular, was acknowledged and upheld by the Pontiff himself. Hereupon he hears the judgments of the greatest theologians of all times, among them Vincent of Lerins and Augustine, and of Popes Leo I, Vigilius, and Gregory the Great, all of whom agree that moral unanimity is the indispensable condition for a decree of faith. The further elaboration by Dupanloup is as follows: In questions of discipline and canonical laws, a numerical majority suffices, since determinations in these areas could also be changed again, but for a dogma, the moral unanimity of the council and the churches to whose faith they bear witness is required; otherwise Catholicism would be destroyed. But papal infallibility was opposed by great theologians and theological schools of former times, and at the present time at the Vatican Council by a number of bishops representing great churches and great Catholic nations. A council is only infallible if the bishops of the entire church testify to the murmur that has been inherited since the origin of the church. The majority must therefore convert the minority to its views by means of free discussion, or must itself pause in its action. If it wished to suppress them by the brute force of numbers, this would be unconciliar and unheard of in church history. Not mere probability, but undoubted certainty was required in the discussion of a dogma, but this firm conviction of the truth of papal infallibility did not exist in a significant number of outstanding members of the Council. But if one nevertheless wanted to define it, such an undertaking would indicate that one considered oneself the judge and lord, not the depositary and witness of the faith. Only a minority that would deny a dogma that has always been the faith of the church would be in the wrong; but not one that would reject the dogmatization of a doctrine that has never been considered a tenet of faith. Even the pope, by his authority, could not give the decision of a mere numerical majority the dignity of a dogma, for he proclaimed decisions of faith only sacro approbante concilio, but without moral unanimity the council had not approved. With these remarks, the Bishop of Orleans turns preferably against the "Civilta", which, as is well known, takes the opposite stand-

point tried to make, and he raises the question: Are we at a Conciliar or not? If the former is the case, then the conciliar rules must be observed, otherwise one lets a large assembly of bishops merely play the role of a show. Dupanloup goes on to point out the storms and incalculable evils which would result from the definition of papal infallibility for church and papacy. And he concludes at last in the following manner: "If ever moral unanimity was necessary for a dogmatic decision, this is the case with a council like the Vatican one, where one pays 276 Italian bishops, of whom 132 belong to the Papal States; then 43 cardinals, of whom 23 are not bishops or do not occupy an episcopal see; then 120 archbishops or bishops in partibus; finally 51 aebts or generals of orders, while the bishops of all the Catholic countries of Europe, with the exception of Italy, amount to 265, so that the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and diocesan bishops of the whole world are already in the minority against the Italian diocesan bishops alone. At a council composed in such a way, the simple majority can never decide, all the less so when the personal intervention of the pope is still felt at the same council, when so many considerable obstacles to freedom are imposed on the bishops, when the question (about the infallibility) of the pope has been ruthlessly and violently brought to consultation only by a recent sovereign act, by a kind of coup d'état; when there is already anxiety in the consciences, and sensational writings, signs of deep concern among the faithful, are circulated; finally, when the bishops themselves let slip from their pressed hearts an outcry, which the whole press repeats. In such a state of things it is impossible to put an end to everything by a majority vote. But if it should happen, all mischief is to be feared. And I am not alone; there are a hundred bishops who say: "We would feel an intolerable burden on our conscience. And our fears would be that the ecumenical character of this Council would be called into doubt, that a rich material would be offered to the enemies of religion to attack the Holy See and the Council, and that in general the Council would be without authority in the eyes of the Christian people, as if it had not been a true, a free Council. And in such eventful times as the present are, no greater mischief could well be conceived!"

From Livonia comes the news that one of the most outstanding theologians and university teachers, Professor Dr. Moritz Engelhardt in Dorpat, has been denounced because of a recent sermon and has been cited to St. Petersburg to answer to a secret committee of inquiry. The news is causing a great stir, and many fear that the absence of the Emperor will be exploited by the enemies of the Germans both to condemn this excellent patriot and to take new steps of violence against the Baltic provinces in general. (Ref. Kirchenztg.)

From Rome. The "Unita Cattolica" in a long article speaks to the conscience of the bishops who are against the proclamation of infallibility. It proposes to them: . Every bishop should ask himself before God: Is it out of love for the Church that I fight the definition of the infallibility of the pope? Is there nothing worldly in the decision I have made? (2) Let the bishop advise himself what he would advise another who would ask his opinion and make his own vote dependent thereon. 3rd The bishop thinks to himself that he will die immediately after the vote. 4th He votes in such a way that he may give an account of his vote before the terrible judgment seat of God. Will he answer God that he

did not vote for infallibility out of consideration for public opinion? Or out of devotion to Counts Beust and Daru? Will he say that he believed more the articles of Doellinger, the books of Janus, than St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Francis de Sales?" This article of the official paper of the Curia has caused quite a stir here, and the bold insinuations of which it is replete, as well as the impudence with which a simple priest thus speaks to bishops, have excited no small indignation among the bishops of the minority. But Don Margotto feels himself under the aegis of papal protection. He treats the opposition bishops as villains, while his French college loves to portray them as imbeciles.- Incidentally, his admonition has not been entirely in vain. For papal infallibility is decreed by a rather significant majority.

Dampers for the Ritualists. After these in England have so long flirted with Catholicism and seduced so many into the Catholic Church, for some time now the flirting with the Greek Church of the East has become fashionable to the point of ridiculousness and distastefulness. If a Greek dignitary is seen among them in his beautiful coat of many colours, they are beside themselves, as if the glory of Christ had been revealed to them. Their souls long for ecclesiastical pomp and ceremonies; and if the Privy Council should now decide against them in a pending suit, especially against the transubstantiation of bread in Holy Communion, or against the true presence of the body, and thus nullify their preaching of the Mass; they will either form a "free Catholic Church," or approach the "venerable Church of Constantinople for a new apostolate." There is no more talk of the Roman Church. What has she done so gauz out of the air? It was the Roman Council that did it. Pusey, the head of the Ritualists, has reported to Rome that they, the Ritualists, must henceforth send the Roman Church the letter of refusal, because the Conciliar wants to declare the pope infallible. Now the declaration is in full work, and there comes to the Ritualists the feeling that it is unworthy of an Englishman to lick the dust of his imperious incursions from the pope's feet.

(Münkel's Neues Zeitblatt.)

Dr. Münkel writes in his Neues Zeitblatt of June 17: "Even if the Pope is preparing to ascend the chair of the Antichrist on the necks of the bishops, one must only lie on one's knees before him and worship him with the pack of the historically political papers. - So it seems that even Dr. Münkel is finally beginning to see the light, and that the latest events in Rome have made it clear that the Pope is the Antichrist after all.

Communism. In May the second congress of the social-democratic workers' party met in Stuttgart. It was declared to be a social necessity to transform all arable land into common social property. For the time being, the beginning is to be made only with state domains, church estates, etc.; although, however, many landowners will not object much to the latter transformation per se, this should nevertheless dampen their sympathy for this measure, that it should only form the beginning, after the implementation of which one intends to go to the arable land of private owners.

Death. Dr. Eduard Vehse, who, as is well known, belonged to the Saxon Lutheran Emigration Society in 1838, but soon returned from America to Germany, suffered shipwreck in the faith, but by God's grace came to faith again, died in Neustrießen near Dresden on June 18.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 16. September 1870. No. 9.

(Sent in by Pastor Franz Schmitt.)

To answer the question: whether the entering into marriage of a widower with fine deceased wife sister is divinely forbidden or not?

Preliminary remark. Concerning this question, which has not only moved within the German church since the time when the old Lutheran-positive spirit, which completely submitted to the principle of Scripture, began to give way, but which has also formed a point of contention between the High Church and most Dissenters in England for some time, so much ambiguity seems to have arisen, because, on the side that negates this question, it has usually been overlooked that, in deciding a controversy over a human law, the legislator himself, as the infallible authority, is to be exclusively consulted and heard, how much more so in deciding this question of controversy concerning the divine law. Then also in recent times, both in Germany and here, **) attempts have been made to discuss such questions, which touch social life with

1) Incidentally, in the better times of the Lutheran Church, controversies over such marriage laws were usually not concerned with the question, in dogmatics and ethics, whether a marriage in the degrees forbidden by Lev. 18 was permitted or not, but in casuistry with how such unions, once concluded, were to be regarded, whether they were to be tolerated or dissolved under all circumstances; a proof that the former question was usually answered in the negative on both sides.

2)) The merit of having imported these principles here, that authority over God's Word goes, because God has instituted the authorities, so that what is called the authorities thereby becomes divine order (a confusion of the causa principalis, God, with the causa ministerialis, authority, and the ministerial cause with the effect)-principles which brought such nameless mischief upon the German churches to the delight of the devil and had to serve as a fig leaf for the introduction of the Union-this merit, like so many others (!), is certainly due to Prof. G. Fritschel.

The Apology, in its complete ignorance of the divine law, even with denial of it, to answer simply by referring to the relevant laws of the secular authorities, and not only declares this to be sufficient for civil respectability, but also, horribly, even with abuse of Art. XVI. of the Apology, that in "outward bodily things" the Christian alone can keep a good conscience who abides by the law of the land and the laws of the state, whereby the exception is expressly deleted that this only goes so far as God in his revealed word says nothing else. In the latter case, Christ's sheep hear only Christ's, that is, the voice of God's word, whether it be a question of rights which the civil authorities also grant to Christians as citizens of the state, or of duties which they impose on their subjects.

I. If the contracting of such a marriage is to be divinely forbidden to all men, such a prohibition must be found clearly and unmistakably in the Scriptures of the Old or New Testament, and, in the case of Old Testament passages, must prove to be a part of moral law and natural law.

Note 1: Nothing can be laid upon the conscience as divinely forbidden that is not clearly and distinctly found in God's Word to be forbidden by God, whether by means of a general or a special prohibition, for that would be adding to God's Word. But what is found in Scripture to be a prohibition of the moral and natural law, no man can dispense with, for that would be to add to it.

Note 2: If we are dealing with Old Testament laws, more especially with Mosaic laws, then, before we determine the validity of such a law, even for the time and persons of the New Covenant, we must first examine, on the basis of a completely objective study of Scripture, whether the same really belongs to the natural law and moral law that is valid for all times and for all men, or whether it forms a part of the either political or ritual laws of God that were intended especially for the Jews, namely the people of the Old Covenant.

and let him take credit for it; we, for our part, in spite of Fritschel's grimness and contemptuous pity, want to stand firm with the divine "αυτός εφα"; faithfully accept everything that God himself teaches us and "repeat it in all innocence and simplicity of heart; should also Fritschel, on his walks, which he makes with such mighty ringing (that probably the hollow sounds of the earth on which he marches are not heard) after the fields of history, jurisprudence, national economy "Behufs "genauerer Untersuchung," ob wahr ist, was Gottes Wort sagt, "ein viel anderes Resultat" vorschwindeln uns. Cf. "Theol. Monatshefte. 1870. March, April, especially pp. 80. 81. 101.

II. Since the above question is not decided in the New Testament with such clarity that consciences can be resolved or bound, we must look back to the Old Testament to answer the question; there we find the various prohibitions of marriage between certain degrees of relationship, especially Leviticus 18 and 20. 18. and 20. as at the seat of the doctrine thereof. First, therefore, we must examine whether these marriage laws belong to the Old Testament state and ceremonial law, which was intended especially for the Israelites, or whether they belong to the generally binding content of moral law and natural law. We affirm the latter, and base ourselves on the following grounds:

because of the censure and punishment even of the Gentiles for the violation of these prohibitions, even before the express promulgation of them, Levit. 18, 3. 24. 25.;

because of the words in the introduction to the prohibitions, verse 5: "he shall live thereby."

because the holy prophets themselves list The prophets themselves list parts of these marriage prohibitions, which form an integral whole, under sins against the moral law, Ezk. 22, 10. 11. Amos 2, 7;

from the use which both John the Baptist, Marc. 6, 18, and St. Paul, 1 Cor. 5, 1, make of parts of these prohibitions for the purpose of evangelical church discipline;

from St. Paul's special reference, in punishing the incest 1 Cor. 5:1, to the fact that this law, so far as it relates to marriage with the stepmother, belongs to the natural law;

From the specifically mentioned terrifying threats and curses, which God puts on the circumvention of all these prohibitions expressly for the Jews, Lev. 20, 9-20. Deut. 23, 2. 7. 8. 9. 23. we conclude compellingly on the affiliation of these prohibitions to the moral law and natural law. If we put them to the touchstone of all moral law, the commandment of love (Rom. 13, 9.), we get the same result.

Note 1: The specifically Jewish ceremonial and civil laws did not require the Gentiles to obey, and therefore did not punish the non-Jews in case of transgression. However, God Himself, in enacting these prohibitions, presented the Gentiles to the Jews as a warning example and clearly stated that the Canaanites were to be punished, even exterminated, for the violation of the law that had occurred before its explicit promulgation, Lev. 18:3, 24, 25.

The fact that God, before the express promulgation of the law.

The fact that God punishes the transgression shows that it belongs to the natural law which is valid for all times; just as God, by punishing the transgression also of the Gentiles, tells us Himself that He counts this marriage law among the morals which are valid for all men, as He also extends it forbiddenly to the Colons dwelling among Israel, verse 26.

Note 2: The whole marriage law, Lev. 18, and especially the general prohibition, v. 6, are introduced by God with the following words: "For every man that doeth them shall live by them," v. 5. According to the nature of the divine law, these abstract words can only refer to a moral law; the analogy of Scripture also forces this assumption upon us; when Christ says: "But if thou wilt enter into life, do the commandments," Matth. 19:17, "Do this, and thou shalt live," Luc. 10:28; and St. Paul writes, "The man that doeth the law shall live," Gal. 3:12, no Christian will deny that such promises, apart from the impossibility of man's keeping them, refer to the Decalogue alone. But if the perfect keeping of the marriage laws of Lev. 18 has the same promises, it is clear that they also belong to the content of the Decalogue, that is the moral law.

Note 3: The whole marriage law, Lev. 18, is presented to us by God five times as a whole, all of whose parts are organically connected with it: Verse 24: "in this none," "in this alone"; v. 26: "This abomination none"; v. 27: "All such abominations"; v. 29: "These abominations." It follows from this, that the position before God, which individual parts of this general law now occupy, is also to be assigned to the whole of this law, and to every other part organically connected with it. *) Thus, when the prophets list individual points of the law as parts of the moral law, as Ezek. 22:10, 11, Amos 2:7, they at the same time state that the whole law and every other part is moral. Among other grave sins against the moral law, Ezek. 22, 10. 11. punishes the following abominations, which are contrary to Lev. 18: "They blaspheme the shame of the fathers" (against v. 7.) "and torment the women in their sickness" (against v. 19.) "and make friends among themselves.) "and do abominations among themselves friend with friend's wife" (against vv. 6. 16.); "they defile their own cord with all courage" (against v. 15.); "they distress their own sisters, their father's daughters" (against v. 9.). And Amos 2:7: "Son and father sleep with a damsel" (against vv. 7, 8, 15, 17), "that they might profane my holy name," i.e., transgress the moral law.

*This, of course, does not eliminate a difference of degree. For example, it is clear that the transgression of the laws of the first degree is a much greater abomination than the sin against the prohibitions of the other degree. But all the prohibitions contained in Leviticus 18 belong to the same covenant; they are included in moral law and natural law.

John the Baptist used this law - also at the time of the freedom of the New Testament *) - for the purpose of church discipline, since he punishes Herod Marc. 6, 18. thus: "It is not right that you have your brother's wife", thus not only because of adultery in general, but specifically because of the forbidden marriage with his "brother's wife". In the same way, St. Paul, in 1 Corinthians 5:1, declares him banned who had his "father's wife" according to Leviticus 18:8; but what is to be used by the law for the exercise of church discipline must also necessarily be moral. In short, the "holy men of God" of the Old and New Testaments, "impelled by the Holy Spirit," have expressly written v. 7. Spirit," expressly repeated v. 7, v. 8, v. 15, v. 16, v. 17, v. 19, and implicitly v. 6. The general prohibition, which includes all these cases, is declared to be moral law; but where the general rule and six organic parts of a law, which God's Word itself declares to be an integrating whole, are declared to be moral law by Scripture, then, as the whole law, so also each individual organic part of it must necessarily belong to the moral law.

Note 5: The incestuous man in question, 1 Cor. 5:1, no doubt referred to it in a good antinomian way, that the law of Moses, which forbids marriage with the stepmother, was abolished in the New Testament; to which the apostle points out that this is not so, but that it is such fornication, "of which even the heathen know not to speak," i.e., they are appalled, because such "fornication" is already against the natural law written in the conscience of respectable heathens (which also some heathens, both old and new (especially English civil-ethics), expressly affirm). i.e., are terrified of it, because such "fornication" is already contrary to the natural law written in the consciences of respectable Gentiles (which also some Gentiles and old as well as new (especially the English) civil marriage laws expressly confirm). If, however, according to the apostle's authentic explanation, one part of the Law of Leviticus 18 belongs to natural law, so do the other parts of it that have the same meaning, such as the law in general.

Note 6: The Jews were also punished for violating Israelite ceremonial laws. Nowhere, however, does one find such terrible curses placed on non-moral laws in the case of transgression as on sins against the marriage prohibitions in question. Of the whole law, and of every part of it, it is said, "They that do not keep it shall be put to death," Lev. 20:9, 10, 11, 15; "They have committed a shame and an abomination," vv. 12, 13; "They shall be burned with fire," v. 14; "They shall be put to death," v. 16.; "this is an incest," v. 17.; "they shall be cut off from among their people," v. 17. 18.; "their blood be upon them," v. 9. 11. 12. 13. 16.; "they shall bear their sin and iniquity," v. 19. 20.; "die without children," v. 20.; - that there be no vice among you," v. 14., and by

*Matth. 11, 13: For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John.

The transgression "is a **vice",** v. 14, "is a shameful deed", v. 21, and so on. A child born of such incest was not to be admitted to the congregation of the Lord, i. e. to the public Israelite worship, until the tenth generation, Deut. 23:2, and he was to be publicly cursed and excommunicated who, v. 8, 23, 9, 7. 8, 23, 9, 7, Deut. 27, 20-23. But what God punished the Jews for must truly be directly against the moral law and natural law, cannot only be Jewish-political, even less specifically Mosaic ritual law.

Since the reasons that are to be given for such natural law Lev. 18, already according to reason, consist in the fact that in marriages contrary to Lev. 18,7-10. the sixth and fourth commandments *) come into consideration, in marriages which run contrary to the degrees forbidden in the collateral lines of blood friendship and affinity, the sixth commandment **) might easily be violated; Such marriages also violate the sum of the second table, the seeking of the general best of human society, which is based on the sociable union of men; so it is evident from this that even these prohibitions of marriage are covered by the general commandment of love toward one's neighbor, and thus already lie wrapped up in the holy ten commandments, i. e. belong to the moral law and to the moral law of the world. i.e. they belong to the moral law and are valid for all men at all times [according to Rom. 13, 9. †)].

III. The prohibition here in question, not to take the wife's sister in marriage, we now meet under the Marriage Law, Lev. 18, which belongs to the Law of Nature as well as the Law of Morals, first in the general rule given in verse 6, which, literally translated, ††) reads: "Man, man, to all the flesh of his flesh, shall not approach," etc., i. e., "No one shall approach his nearest blood friend," etc., ‡) viz.

*) namely, the violation of parental etc. Respect.

**) namely, in consideration of the more intimate intercourse which such relatives usually have, which might much more easily be abused against the sixth commandment by the idea of a future marriage.

†) "For that which is said, Thou shalt not, etc., is written in this commandment. And if there be any commandment more, it is written in this commandment, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

(††: XXXX XXX XXXXX XXXXX XX XXXXX XXXXXXXX

‡) Cf. Dav. Chytraeus, in Levit. &c. cap. XVIII, pag. 293: ,,Vir, vir (id est omnis vir, seu quicunque sit) ad omnem relictionem (seu propinquitatem) seu consanguinitatem, id est propinquam seu cognatum (ponitur enim abstractum pro concreto) carnis suae non appropinquabit ad revelandum nuditatem seu pudenda ejus, id est nemo ad ullam cognatam carnis suae seu consanguineam accedat, ut concumbat cum ea. Ego Dominus, qui prohibeo etc., vindex ero." Gerhard, loc. de conjug. in the place cited below, translates, "Vir vir ad omnem carnem carnis suae," etc.

To take her in marriage, or to have carnal intercourse with her out of wedlock. Since a woman's sister is her husband's closest blood friend, flesh, it is undeniable that this general prohibition already divinely forbids her to marry her sister. If this is done, then, according to the introduction and epilogue of Lev. 18, the name of the Lord is profaned.

Note 1. Since God wishes the order to be kept that the procreation of the human race should take place through marriage, but marriage is when two, who before **were** two, that is, two flesh, **become one** flesh through conjugal intercourse, so that they are now no longer two, but one flesh, *) therefore God has forbidden marriage between those who were flesh and flesh flesh (that is, not two flesh) already before, so that they can no longer become one flesh; Further, true polygamy, because **two** shall become one flesh; then cohabitation apart from matrimony, because two shall become one body and flesh, **) apart from the order of marriage willed by God; further, onanism, because the heat may only be derived through marriage and not be satisfied contrary to nature, wherefore also all other unnatural abominations are so earnestly forbidden.

Note 2. The words: "XXXX XXX", †) Flesh,

*) Matth. 19, 5. 6.: ,,ζαϊ εσονται *ol δυο εις σάρχα μίαν. "Ωστε ουχέτι είσϊ δύο, άλλά σάρξ μία"* Literally so also Marc. 10, 8. after the fundamental passage.

Gen. 2:24; "And they shall be One flesh (One XXX)."

**1 Cor. 6:16: "Know ye not that he that cleaveth unto whoredoms is one body with her: for they shall be, saith He, two in one flesh."

†) Joh. Gerhard, loc. de conjug. P. I. s. I. § 258: ,XXX descendit a radice XXX reliquus, residuus fuit, 1 Sam. 16,11. Ezek. 9, 8.; ideo Arias Montanus vertit ad reliquias, alii ad relictionem carnis suae. Sed quando XXX pro .reliquiis ac residuo usurpatur, tunc sub X est - vel -, Es. 10, 20. e. 14, 22. Hic vero sub χ in ultima syllaba est -- (Zere), quomodo punctatum significat car-, nem Ps. 73, 26. Prov. 11, 17. De verbo igitur ad verbum reddendum fuerit, nemo ad carnem carnis suae accedat, id est ad propinquam carnis siiae, ad car nem carni ejus propinquitate generis et sanguinis ejus proxime adhaerentem, inde Targum ubique reddidit XXX propinquum, ut abstractum pro concreto, scilicet caro pro propinquitas secundum carnem, pro femina secundum carnem propinqua, sive consanguinea poni intelligatur. LXX reddiderunt προς *οίχεία σαρχος,* vel ut alii Codices legunt οίχείαν ad domesticam carnis suae. XXX variis modis in Scripturis accipitur, proprie autem significat carnem, juxta quam acceptionem XXX XXX propinquus carnis, erit propinquus sive cognatus secundum carnem consanguineus. Sic Gen. 37, 27. fratres Josephi de hoc fratre suo dicunt: frater noster est, XXXXX, et caro nostra. Gen. 29, 14. Laban ad Jacobum, sororis suae filium, dicit: Os meum es, 'XXXX et caro mea. Atque hac ratione generalis illa prohibitionis regula pertineret duntaxat ad consanguineos. Propinquitas carnis meae, inquit Hemmin-.

V. 6, point to the other members of the same flesh, namely those who are also of the same flesh of his flesh. Husband and wife are one flesh according to Gen. 2, 24. Matth. 19, 5. 6. Marc. 10, 8. so that one has to think of the other as his own body, his own flesh. Both spouses also have others who are of the same flesh, in the ascending line, those from whose flesh each spouse is begotten and born, the parents of both spouses, Rom. 9:5; then, in the descending line, those who are begotten and born from the flesh of the spouses, the children, Rom. 9:5. 9:5; and finally, in the descending line, those who are begotten and born of one flesh with the husband and wife,-brothers and sisters, Gen. 37:27. Accordingly, the children begotten with the wife are the husband's flesh, and their parents and brothers and sisters are his flesh. In short, since the wife is the flesh of the husband because of the marriage union, and the wife's sister is one flesh with the wife because she is begotten and born of one flesh with the wife, the wife's sister is flesh with the husband, and thus in a relationship of kinship, that is, of affinity, which, according to Lev. 18:6, forbids the husband to marry her, quod erat demonstrandum.

gins, de conj., pag. 84., est, quae me sine intervallo attingit,, idque vel superne, ut pater et mater, vel inferne, ut filius et filia, vel ad latera, ut fratres ac sorores. Sed quia postea in speciali certorum graduum prohibitione non solum a nuptiis consanguineorum, sed etiam affinium abstinere jubemur, ideo rectius generaliter accipitur pro quavis carnis propinqua, sive per consanguinitatem, sive per affinitatem proxime aliquem attingente, quomodo usurpari videtur Jud. 9, 2., ubi Abimelech ad fratres matris suae et ad omnem cognationem familiae patris matrisque suae dicit: Os vestrum sum, XXXXXX et caro vestra. Ne vero

quis excipiat, non ad affines, sed tantum ad consanguineos Abimelechum locutum esse, ideo adducimus locum alium, qui nullam patitur ενστασιν, de filia enim privigni et filia privignae, quae nonnisi affinitate me attingit, dicitur Lev. 18" 17.: 'XXXXX caro tua sunt. Quoniam igitur maritus cum uxore fit una caro, ideo etiam consanguinei uxoris, qui scilicet secundum carnem eidem sunt propinqui et mariti affines redduntur, ejus caro vocantur."

In short, if it should be objected that the first two degrees of blood-friendship are included under "flesh" in v. 6, but not any degree of affinity, such an objection would have to be rejected, because both according to the literal sense of the word in "flesh" the nearest relatives of the wife of the husband are included, and in vv. 14. 15. 16. just such degrees of affinity are exemplified as forbidden in the general rule.

It should be noted here, by the way, that it is not a matter of inventing and refuting fabricated objections, as it might almost seem, but which would be as desperate a business as it would be thankless, but of presenting such objections as have really been made at various times by the most diverse parties.

Note 3: How generally and unbendingly this general prohibition, v. 6, which thus includes the marriage of sisters in question, is decreed by God, is evident first of all from the address, i. e., everyone, whoever it may be, under whatever circumstances, at whatever time. ‡) In this address lies an immense energy of the prohibition, which is still increased by the fact that God twice prefixes to the general prohibition, together with the exemplifications, the words, "For I am the Lord your God," the same formula with which the Decalogue is introduced (vv. 2. 4.), and also during the text.), and also during the text itself and at the end of the whole chapter (v. 21. 30.) uses the same serious words: "For I am the Lord your God," who has given this law; whoever transgresses it "profanes the name of his God," like a thief, murderer, and so on.

IV. If there were no other prohibition in the canon concerning the case in question, it would still be divinely forbidden for every man to lead his wife's sister in marriage in the strictest and most categorical way, as only another sin is. In fact, in the face of such a prohibition, all other evidence can only take a subsidiary position. In the examples appended to the general prohibition, in which God does not norm but illustrates the prohibition in v. 6, the parallel degree to marriage with a wife's sister is further exemplified as a forbidden degree, namely, marriage with a brother's wife, v. 16, a special prohibition, which is then repeated in a stricter form in Lev. 20, 21. is repeated in an intensified form, and is expressly declared by John the Baptist to be valid also for the time of the New Testament, on whose proclamation John held so vigorously that he would rather give up life than the punishment of sin against this prohibition. Since it is stated in v. 6 that God reckons according to the degrees of kinship of the flesh, it is evident that the forbidden marriage to a brother's wife is also forbidden by God in the same way as marriage to a sister's wife.

Note 1: That in vv. 7-16 only examples are set up to illuminate the general rule, and not a complete

‡) Joh. Gerhard a. a. O.: "XXXbis repetitum recte redditur: omnis vir, sive quilibet, substantivum enim, in singulari numero continuo repetitum, distributionem et consequenter universalitatem notat. (Buxdorflus in thesaur. lib. 2. pag. 16.) LXX reddiderunt *ἀνθρωπος ἀνθρωπος,* qua generali quorumvis hominum circumscriptione tollitur omnis personarum in hac prohibitione re-' spectus. Quilibet ad propinquam etc., id est, nullus homo, cujuscunque sit sortis, vel conditionis etc."

and exclusive analysis of the same is intended, it is evident from the fact that some still more severe degrees of the general rule are not forbidden to be exemplified in v. 6, namely: grandmother and grandson, father and daughter, mother-in-law and daughter's husband, etc., all cases which certainly lie wrapped up in v. 6, and which even respectable heathens must declare to be quite shameful.

That the wife's sister is the flesh of the husband's flesh has already been clearly discussed in III, 2. The brother, however, being begotten and born of one flesh with the husband, is one flesh with the husband; the brother's wife, having become the brother's flesh through conjugal intermarriage, is thus the husband's flesh. The woman's sister and the brother's wife, then, are both in a parallel degree of sisterhood with the husband; they are both his flesh. It is clear from the exemplified prohibition of marriage to the brother's wife that the parallel degree with the wife's sister is also implicitly divinely forbidden, quod erat demonstrandum.

Note 3: If it should be objected that these two relationships of affinity stand in the same degree, but under different conditions, for in marriage with the brother's wife the related seed is mixed in a feminine vessel, which does not take place in marriage with the wife's sister, two things would have to be answered to this; for in the first place God does not at all state the mixing of the related seed in a feminine vessel as a condition of the prohibition, but says: If this purely human, accidental distinction were to form the basis of the prohibitions, there would no longer be any doubt that a man could also marry mother and daughter after each other, because then, in such a marriage, the related seed would not be mixed in a feminine vessel, a consequence which evidently shows the untenability of the above distinction. Then it is to be replied that through conjugal cohabitation a consubstantiation takes place in the man just as in the female part, which is why the ancient Greeks called such (honorable or dishonorable) intercourse of a man with a woman not only a joining together, a deed, but consubstantiation ,

*) cfr. Erasmus Schmid, ,,Versio Novi Testamenti nova" etc., ad 1 Cor. 6, 16. p. 1058: *,,α -Εν σωμά ίσπ)* Hinc Graecis, etiam Etruris, consuetudo viri cum femina, sive honesta, sive inhonesta, non tantum συνβσία vocatur a συνεινα^ quod una sint: sed συνβσιααμός, quasi Consubstantiatio, quod unam inter se *otxriav* faciant coeuntes. Neque vero hoc tantum modo quodam loquendi sic dicitur, sed revera in oculis Dei, licet modo nobis incognito et impervestigabili, tam conjuges, quam qui inter se scortantur, corporis communionem habent, imo unum corpus sunt, una caro, una ουσία sunt. Matth. 19, 5- Mare. 10, 8. Eph. 5, 31. et hoc loco ex Gen. 2, 24."

The first part of the body, the second part of the body, the third part of the body, the third part of the body, the third part of the body, the third part of the body, the third part of the body, the third part of the body, the third part of the body, the third part of the body, the third part of the body, the third part of the body, the third part of the body, the third part of the body, the third part of the body, the third part of the body.

Note 4: The same is true of the objection that in v. 16 the reason for the prohibition of sisterly marriage, which is omitted in the case of the wife, is given: "For she is thy brother's shame. To this it is to be said, The sole principal reason always remains that given in v. 6. "She is the flesh of thy flesh." It is also a purely arbitrary human distinction to object that the wife's sister has not yet suffered exposure of her shame through kindred flesh, as the brother's wife has, for that happens precisely through the marriage to be entered into. Where there is a statement of ground, such as: "for she is thy brother's shame," God always refers back to the basis laid down in v. 6: she is thy flesh, thy flesh's flesh. So also in v. 11, for example, no specific reason is given; the true reason is already evident from v. 6; and in vv. 12, 13, 14, the main reason appears in direct words: "for she is the flesh of thy flesh"; cf. v. 17: "for it is her flesh.

Note 5: That the conclusion from the prohibition of marriage with the brother's wife to the prohibition of marriage with the wife's sister is correct is further corroborated by the fact that in v. 14. **) the marriage with the father's brother's wife is expressly forbidden as a forbidden one, whereby we must necessarily infer from the prohibition of the more remote degree the prohibition of the nearer degree, and that in affinity; but that the wife of the father's brother is just one degree more remote in affinity than the wife's sister, needs no further proof.

1) Eph. 5, 28. *Εαυτών σώματα* (cf. III, 2. VI.). As man and woman are One natural Body, so believers are members of One Body, One Flesh, One Bone of the Mystical Body of Christ, B. 30. From this comparison it is evident that there is a special emphasis on the very word *Εαυτών σώματα,* and that "One Body" forms the tertium comparationis. -

2)) To be sure, the relationship between me and this aunt of mine on my father's side is that of flesh to flesh. This v. 14 teaches us, then, that where the parental respect (aunt-nephew) is added to the degree of kinship, even if in a relationship created by affinity, v. 6 is to be extended by one more degree. Since, however, the prohibition of the third degree of affinity, if parental respect is taken into consideration, presupposes the absolute prohibition of the second degree of affinity (in which I stand with my wife's sister), then the above note 5. (IV.), in connection with the direct proof supplied for the intended purpose, certainly cannot be denied demonstrative force, as well as for how exactly and consistently this calculation of degrees is carried out according to the general rule.

Note 6: Finally, it should be noted that the entire marriage law, Lev. 18, refers to the man and not to the woman; therefore, if the law is to be applied to the woman, it is to be reckoned according to the parallel degrees that are forbidden to the man. That the law itself applies not only to the man, but also to the woman, is evident from Lev. 20, since in v. 11 the terrible punishments for transgressing these prohibitions of marriage in degrees of relationship are expressly extended to both parts, man and woman, chap. 20, 11. 12. 17. 19. 20. and also 21. - Ch. 20, 12. 19. 20. 21. it is further expressly remarked that both parts, "they," "have committed a shame," "shall bear their sin, their iniquity." In addition, chap. 18, 7. expressly indicates that the binding force of the rule given to the man forbidden is reciprocal for both sexes.

V. Among the more distant crimes of immorality listed from Lev. 18, 16, we find at the top the prohibition of simultaneous (real) bigamy, in the first verse that with mother and daughter, with grandmother and granddaughter; in v. 17, on the other hand, real bigamy appears forbidden with two sisters at the same time. Now, although our subject deals only with successive, not simultaneous, bigamy, it is necessary, in order to cut off false consequences, to consider this 17th verse. In it it is forbidden that a man should marry his wife's sister during the latter's lifetime and in opposition to her, that is, that he should have a double marriage with two sisters. Now who may say, The majus is forbidden, ergo the minus permitted; because it is forbidden to take the sister in double marriage during the wife's lifetime: therefore I may marry her after the wife's death; thus v. 6 is to be restricted by v. 18! For no man has the right to limit or enlarge, to add to or subtract from, the understanding of a clear, distinct passage, and, in addition, of a sedes, by glossing it. He who, as above mentioned, concludes, and would attempt to limit the general prohibition in v. 6. by not the tert, *) but a gloss to the tert in v. 18. would not only add (to v. 18.) to the clear word of God, but also (from v. 6.) from it, he would in all seriousness be opposed by the Reformation "Textus semper manebit, pereat glossa iners" (originating in Ps. 119, 89. Deut. 4, 2. 12, 32. Rom. 12, 7. etc.).

Note 1: If one wanted to restrict v. 6 by the 18th verse, which deals with a completely different matter, then one would have to

*) :XXXX XXXX XXXXX
literally: "Thou shalt not take a woman to be her sister's concubine," etc. (Fürbringer in "Lehre und Wehre", I, p. 322.)

Inevitably blame God, the Lawgiver, for the inconsistency, that with special force and exclusiveness He should have forbidden in v. 16. the same degree as in the seat of the prohibition v. 6. which He afterwards, on another occasion, permitted.

Note 2: Whoever wants to limit the 6th verse in this way obviously acts according to the wrong principle: From what is written I must conclude what is not written. If, for instance, it is written in one place, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," (Marc. 16:16) and Rom. 1:16, that the gospel "is the power of God to save," neither of these two passages restricts the other; both are to be added together: baptism and gospel-both save. - It is further written, "If then (in the last days) any man shall say unto you: Who would thereby restrict the general warning to beware of false prophets to the very last days? Where would one arrive in the application of this principle? Certainly outside the marks of Scripture, even of the ratio communis!

But the rightful exploitation of this principle would also lead to many arbitrary chains, even to carnal licentiousness. To cite only Lev. 18, I might also conclude thus: V. 6. is to be limited by the words in v. 18. "contrary to her" to the effect that a double marriage with two sisters is permitted if it is not contrary to the first wife and she approves of it; likewise: V. 6. is to be limited by the little word "together" in v. 16. to the effect that after the death of the first wife I may take her daughter or granddaughter in marriage, and so on. But a principle that permits such inconsistent, compelling conclusions must necessarily be wrong, and its application, especially to exegesis, must be wholly inadmissible.

Without four interpolations in God's clear Word, it is impossible to read out of v. 18 the approval of successive bigamy with two sisters. For if the gloss, "but after the death of the wife you may enter into marriage with the sister," were already happily inserted in v. 18, nothing more would be accomplished than that now Scripture would evidently dispute with Scripture, if the sedes in v. 6 were not also given a corresponding amendment, and v. 6 a corresponding amendment. 6. received a corresponding amendment, and v. 16. and ch. 20, 21. It would thus be quite necessary to add in one place, as well as to take away from three other places, to restrict the general norm by v. 18. which, according to Deut. 4, 2. 12, 32. is strictly forbidden by God.

Note 5: The scopus of the 18th chapter is absolutely a prohibition; there is no mention of consent or permission to marry. Therefore, anyone who would read a permission into v. 18 would be acting contrary to the divine intention in Lev. 18.

Note 6: If one wanted to find reasons why this simultaneous bigamy with two sisters is specifically forbidden in v. 18, the following could be adduced:

1) Because otherwise someone could want to cover himself with the holiness of the patriarch Jacob by entering into such a double marriage, who at the same time had Leah and Rachel for marriage, Gen. 29;

2) because the Jews very often repudiated their wives for the sake of very little things, and for the sake of their hardness of heart the bill of divorcement was divinely and politically permitted also apart from the case of adultery; thus the case lay much nearer than with us, that a Jew during the lifetime of the first (repudiated) wife, - contrary to her, - took home the sister of the same;

3) because God Himself, Deut. 5, 25, has instituted the so-called levirate marriage in connection with the salvation decree, so that no one would take this ceremonial commandment, given for a specific case, for a general moral law.

VI. Since, as has already been proved, man and woman become one flesh by marriage, and not only morally and either active or passive, but physically, factually, and both active and passive (Eph. 5, 28. τα *Εαυτών σώματα^*), but God Lev. 18, 6. has energetically forbidden anyone to unite in marriage with the kindred flesh of his flesh, then no one can take in marriage her who was one flesh with her, and still is after her death, with whom he became one flesh by conjugal intermixture, and still is after her death. That is, applied to the present question: Even after the death of the first wife, this first wife remains sister flesh to the surviving husband of the deceased; therefore, even after the death of the first wife, the same cannot enter into marriage with the sister of the same.

Note 1: It is certain that according to Rom. 7, 2. 1 Cor. 7, 39. the vinculum conjugale between the deceased and the surviving part ceases; but not so the factual, physical relationship created by the former marriage.*) From the dissolution of the vinculum, therefore, to conclude the cessation of all real relationship between the widower and the relatives of his departed wife is not possible. The former sister-in-law now by no means steps out of all relationship of kinship.

*) If the relationship, and not only the marriage bond, had been dissolved by death, St. Paul could not have punished the incestuous man of Corinth for having taken his father's wife in marriage, since through the death of the father she would have become a stranger to the son of the stool.

*) Thus the husband, on account of actual intermingling of blood, is and remains One Flesh with the deceased wife, **) just as the sister of the latter, because produced and born with her of One Fresh, remains One Flesh with the deceased, thus the husband's flesh of the deceased. For already through illegitimate sexual intercourse such a physical change is effected that two become one body, one flesh, 1 Cor. 6, 16.

If, contrary to the natural physical and indefinite existence, one were to propose such a cessation of all former relations to the survivors with the death of a person who is one flesh with another, the most inconsistent, even most perverse postulates would necessarily result from this, e. g., that after the death of the mother, one could also marry the latter's sister, his aunt; that with the death of the father, not only filial obedience to him, but all sonship, would cease.That, after the death of the mother, a man might marry the latter's sister, his aunt; that, with the death of the father, not only filial obedience to him, but sonship in general, and every kinship of the son effected thereby, had reached its finality; that, according to the fourth commandment, the parents of the deceased wife were no longer required to pay any special filial homage, and so on. Such absurdities, which arise as quite compelling consequences from the established principle, by which a factual, moral, not only but also physical, bodily relation is to be abolished, show how false the principle itself is; just as by the same the necessary, but the whole world upside down, conclusion is given, that no human relationship exists between the different generations of one and the same tribe.

VII. Since, however, by the arrangement of such marriages on the part of many modern civil marriage orders and the prolonged abeyance of this divine order also in the German national churches, as well as by the

*) Eph. 5/ 28.: "*0ΰτως όφείλβσιν ol ανδρες άγαπαν τάς έαυτων γυναίχας ώς τά ίαυτώ'ν σώματα,*^ Rg{. IV, 3.

He was a man, and he was a man, and he was a man, and he was a man, and he was a man, and he was a man, and he was a man, and he was a man. He was a man, and he was a man.

If, as a result of the criticism and spirit of "the newly awakened times" (††) and because of some older voices from the church that are contrary to the Word of God, a great lack of clarity is often found in our congregations with regard to this divine prohibition, this divine order is to be restored with zeal through instruction from the Word of God in public preaching and in private conversations: However, those who claim not to be able to recognize this part of the moral law are not immediately to be treated as sinners against knowledge and conscience. The ecclesiastic must indeed reject such a couple from the marriage ceremony, but can and must tacitly tolerate such a marriage, once it has come about by civil means or through another medium, since a church discipline procedure is only admissible against those who have been proven to sin wickedly, ‡) but the marriage itself is not such a marriage, which would have to be dissolved immediately as incest in the first degree, ‡‡) but is to be regarded as one that, though not rite, nevertheless exists at a rate.

*Thus, for example, in No. 14 of Luthard's "Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung" (Leipzig, April 8, 1870, Supp. Sp. 275), on the occasion of the criticism of a writing by H. W. J. Thiersch, entitled: "The Prohibition of Marriage": "The Tertullian spirit of Thkersch shows itself also in the treatment of this specifically social-ethical subject. He seeks here to prove the continuing validity of the Mosaic prohibitions of marriage, and indeed according to their strictest interpretation, according to which even marriage with the sister of the deceased wife is forbidden, as is the case in England, but has been contested for years, for internal and external reasons." Indeed, an easy way to occasionally polemicize against a moral prohibition set forth from God's Word! A simple-minded Bible Christian does not know about social-ethical issues *against* God's Word. All ethics, whether it touches the individual or the social life, has its source in Scripture, and must in no case be contrary to Scripture or seek to abrogate the latter. - Therefore, the conclusion of the aforementioned critique in relation to the judgment cited above is all the more surprising: "If Thiersch goes too far in this, standing under English influence, his writing is nevertheless a serious reminder of the laxity of the present and places the specific question under higher and more general consideration, etc." Such higher quite specific consideration could do the critic of the "Kirchenzeitung" no harm either.

1) How little inconsistent such a practice is, every one who has acquired the principles of evangelical church discipline will at once see, if he draws a parallel between such a case and others, as, for instance, sins which occur in pawnbroking, etc., and are often not recognized for a long time, even by a great part of Christians, as transgressions of the divine law, because of weakness.

1s) Just as God Himself placed Jacob's double marriage under His divine tolerance, because He saw that Jacob did not sin wickedly; and because He also instituted the Levirate marriage.

But for this reason it would be absolutely inadvisable for a minister to solemnize such a marriage, since he cannot and must not consciously participate in another's sin, much less confirm such a sinful undertaking with the Lord's blessing; to which must be added that it is doubly damnable sin for the minister to do anything only with a doubting heart, Rom. 14:23; and how much more if he were to do something out of supposed considerations of expediency and favor, which is contrary to his knowledge and conscience, enlightened by God's Word.

Materials on Pastoral Theology,

communicated by C. F. W. W.

(Continued.)

Note 4.

If a case of church discipline is even somewhat unclear, or if the preacher cannot bring the otherwise willing congregation, which never consciously opposes the Word of God, to a unanimous decision about a case that is quite clear to him, then conscientiousness and prudence demand that other, perhaps neighboring or otherwise experienced church ministers be called in to evaluate the case. The answers to questions in such cases, which are found in the collections of theological concerns in which our church is so rich - I recall only the Wittenberg Consilium and the Thesaurus consiliorum by Dedekennus - show how it was the custom in our church in its best times to turn to well-known experienced theologians, city ministries, and theological colleges for advice in all difficult church discipline cases before proceeding to banishment. It is true that we Lutherans must strictly adhere to the declaration of our church: "Because the bishops have taken such jurisdiction (the ban) to themselves as tyrants and have shamefully abused it, and because there are other good reasons for not obeying them, it is right that this stolen jurisdiction should be taken from them again and delivered to the pastors to whom it belongs by Christ's command, and that it should be used in a proper way" ("legitimate", with the involvement of the congregation), "for the betterment of the people and for the increase of the glory of God." (Schmalkald. Art. appendix 2. fol. 158.) But by the preacher and congregation seeking counsel in every case of some difficulty, yea, by seeking in every case the co-operation of brethren outside the local congregation, they do not relinquish the right to which they are entitled, but only exercise the conscientiousness with which every case is to be treated in which a former member of the congregation is to be deprived of the rights of the brotherhood.

It happens not infrequently that when the congregation gathers together to

to execute the last admonition to his person under church discipline, who has not appeared and later excuses himself with the fact that he did not know that he should appear. The citation for the final admonition should therefore always be made in writing, handed to the person concerned by a person designated for this purpose, and a statement demanded from the person thus cited as to whether he wishes to appear or not, so that the congregation, when it assembles, can act. If the citified person declares that he does not want to appear, he is not to be excommunicated, since the last admonition according to Matth. 18, 17 cannot be given to him, and he has already excluded himself from the congregation, but he is then to be publicly declared from the pulpit as a person who has excluded himself from the congregation and the brotherhood, and is now to be treated the same as those who are outside. 1 John 2:19; but in this public declaration, the expression should only be used, that the person concerned had put himself under ban, when the cause of the church discipline imposed upon him was a manifest mortal sin. Of persons who put themselves under ban, Luther says: "We must not put our usurers, drunkards, taciturns, whoremongers, blasphemers, and scoffers under ban; they put themselves under ban, and are ready for it up to their ears; they despise the word of God, come to no church, hear no sermons, go not to the sacrament. Well then, if they do not want to be Christians, let them be pagans. .. Then the priest shall not absolve them, neither shall he administer the sacraments to them, nor shall they come or stand at any baptism, nor at any honest wedding, nor at any funeral; they shall thus keep themselves like the heathen among us, which they also do gladly. And when they want to die, no priest, no chaplain shall come to them; and when they have died, no disciple, no chaplain shall come to them; because they want to be heathens, we also want to keep them as heathens." (Tischreden. XXII, 974. f.) Luther further wrote to the council of the city of Nuremberg in 1532: "Therefore let it remain that one does not give the holy sacrament to those who lie and remain in public vices. And although the world is now so rough and wild that it does not hurry to the sacraments and churches, this may not be considered a punishment; if someone excommunicates himself in this way, let it go. But nevertheless the preachers are to punish with all seriousness in sermons such pagan being and life with narration of divine prophecy." (Erlanger A. Bd. LIV, p. 317. f.) - If even he who had declared his intention to appear does not appear, he is therefore by no means to be regarded as excluding himself and to be declared so, not even on the basis of the rumor that he really did not want to come, but before further steps the reason for his non-appearance is to be investigated and proceeded with according to the findings. (To be continued.)

Miscellany.

On the Natural History of Majorities. Under this title Dr. Münkel writes, among other things, as follows: Since the vote is the main means of knowing the will of God, and the majorities also stand in God's place in the church until he has them eaten by other majorities; it is necessary to study the disposition of this new prophet in order to appreciate his sayings. . In 1802, when a vote was to be taken to make Napoleon I Consul for life, General Lannes made the following address to a regiment: "Soldiers, it is a question of appointing General Bonaparte the first Consul for life. Opinions are free, I do not wish to influence anyone. Only I call your attention in advance to the fact that I will have the first who does not vote in his favor shot like a dog-faced man before the whole regiment, Long live liberty!"

"The Significance of Doctrinal Unity for the Lutheran Church in the Present." This was the subject of the lecture given by Prof. Dr. C. E. Luthardt at the 2nd General Lutheran Conference at Leipzig, June 9, this year. This lecture contains much that is excellent. Instead of a summary, we prefer to share the following aphorisms with our readers: "Experience has shown that every external agreement is a mother of discord if it is not based on agreement in faith and doctrine. For this is the bond and the limit of the unity of the churches. And so, in harmony with the instruction of the Lord and the teaching of the apostles and their disciples, in contrast to the error of Rome, which places unity above all in the constitution, our fathers in the days of the Reformation made that word of great faith the principle of the evangelical church: Satis est ad veram unitatem ecclesiae consentire de doctrina evangelii et sacramentorum: 'it is enough for the true unity of the Christian churches that there be preached with one accord according to pure understanding the gospel, and the sacraments administered according to the divine word'. This is enough, for the Lord has set his church on the word and faith, and so it has its unity in the one doctrine which bears true witness to the word and faith. This is enough, but it is also what is indispensably necessary. For as the Word and faith are necessary to the existence of the church, so the doctrine is necessary to its existence; and as its unity rests on the One Word and the One Baptism and the One Faith, so it rests no less on the One Doctrine. But it is not unity in arbitrary doctrine that our Fathers demand for the unity of the Church, but consensus in the true doctrine of the Gospel and the scriptural administration of the sacraments. For as the doctrine of the Church is nothing but the Word of God set in motion by her, and the unfolding of the Word of God, so the unity of the Church is nothing but the unity of the Church.

Just as it is not any word and any faith that makes the church a church and the people members of the church, but the word that Jesus Christ gave and endowed the church with, and the faith that appropriates this word; so it is also not any doctrine that the church must lead if it is to remain what it is, but only the doctrine that has the word of Christ and true faith as its content. Thus it is necessary, as enough, for the true unity of the Christian churches, that the gospel be preached with one accord, according to pure understanding, and the sacraments administered according to the divine word. But there are differences which are the antithesis of unity, arising from the obscurations and corruptions of saving truth, which come from the strange circles of thought of the natural spiritual life. From such corruption of truth it is not the mere thought-work of the head that protects, but above all the moral obedience of the heart to the word of truth. The differences of faith and confession between the churches are not merely natural, but moral. As long as Rome rejects and outlaws the teaching of the gospel, there is no peace between us and Rome. But even from those who are so much closer to us, from the sons of the Swiss Reformation, we are separated by differences of doctrine. There is so much that unites us with them, and what would we rather have than that we might be entirely one with them? But so long as the doctrine which we and they profess is not one, we cannot be united with them in One Church. We can extend to them the Christian brotherly hand when we come before God's throne in spirit, and can stand together with them in many a good work on earth; but the hand of ecclesiastical fellowship we must refuse, so long as we are not one in doctrine. For doctrine divides the churches, because it alone unites them ecclesiastically. For our church did not become one by the Protestant princes uniting and entering into a covenant with one another; not by the congregations separated from Rome adopting common orders of worship or church constitution, but by the experience of faith that Luther made and the knowledge of faith that he gained being repeated and echoed in so many hearts, and so the hearts and minds united in this one faith and knowledge, and so the expression that the common faith gained in the Augustana became the confession of all. It was not the legal recognition of this confession as the legal basis of the Protestant churches in the empire that established the church of the Augsburg Confession and its unity. It was not the legal recognition of this confession as the legal basis of the Protestant churches in the empire that established the Church of the Augsburg Confession and its unity, but rather that legal recognition only acknowledged what had already been established through common conviction. It is not legislation that is the foundation of our church, the bond of its unity, but rather the confession and

its doctrine. When our fathers call the church both the community of believers and the community of the called, they say by both that doctrine is the bond of the church. For it is the teaching word that works faith and calls sinners to Christ. . It is the fellowship of doctrine that makes the Lutheran Church of the 16th century and that of the 19th the One Lutheran Church. To give up that communion is to give up the communion of the Lutheran Church. When we sing and pray the songs and prayers of our fathers, it is the faith of our hearts that makes those the words of our mouths as well. And when we read the learned works of our classical theologians, it is here that we feel the home of our spirit. It is true that in our wandering years of the 18th and 19th centuries we have learned and collected many things, and brought home many a good and right thing; our way of thinking has often become a different one; our spirit wears a different scientific garment in which it is accustomed to move. But the house of our fathers is still the old home in which we are comfortable and in which we welcome the spirits of the past. For the individual, of course, the main thing is the salvation of his soul and the faith that makes him blessed. And we know that faith has very different stages, from the simplicity of a child to the full knowledge of a mature man in Christ. But the church is the preacher of faith and the teacher of the nations. She must therefore be sure and certain of her doctrine, and must possess more knowledge than the individual needs. What she has received from God in the way of knowledge of the blessed truth, and what she has become certain of on the basis of Holy Scripture, is an asset that God has entrusted to her, of which she is the guardian and steward, but not its owner, so that she can do with it as she pleases. Certainly, it depends above all on the one fundamental truth of the forgiveness of sins by grace for Christ's sake, on this articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae. No one has stated this more decisively than Luther and the confession of our church. But it would be folly to think that we possess this truth when we detach it from all other truths which are decided in it or which are demanded by it, so that it cannot exist at all without them. . According to Lutheran principles, the confession is recognized only where it is acknowledged as the determining norm and power of all ecclesiastical action. This, however, naturally excludes the possibility that different doctrines which do not agree with each other can have equal rights in the same church. For the Church is a community of faith and doctrine, and not a cluster of differences of faith, in which one has the right to teach one way and another another. .. But what is the consequence of this principle of doctrinal difference? In the nature of things no other than that the churches first go astray, and then become indifferent to all doctrine, because they come out of such a perverse and unrealistic doctrine.

The last result is then inevitably that the principle of doctrinal difference develops into the principle of unrestricted doctrinal freedom. And the final result is then inevitably that the principle of doctrinal difference develops into the principle of unrestricted doctrinal freedom, and thus this union prepares the way for the direction of the so-called Protestant Association. Protestant Association. . Even if the Union does not recognize the Protestant Association, the Protestant Association recognizes the Union. ... As the pope by majority vote makes new dogmas, so these Protestants by majority vote abolish old dogmas. . . The Church is a community of the professing, and not a school of seekers, or a playground of disputers, or a heap of deniers. If the Church no longer has what it takes to answer questions, but only to ask them, no longer has the courage to humble the questioners, because it no longer has the certainty of possessing the truth and of being the teacher of the nations - what does it want at all? Then it may abdicate in favor of philosophy, for instance, and give way to the rule of the schools. But that is then the end of Christianity, at least of the Christianity of the apostles of Jesus Christ. The nationalization of the Church has been begun, but the secularization will be ended, just as the Union was begun and the Protestant Association ended. Rome having declared the State to be a province of the Church, it is not the proper Protestant answer to declare the Church to be a province of the State. This perversion of the truth our Confession has expressly directed in its certain keeping apart of the two regions. Admittedly in vain. Satan pergit esse Satan, Luther was already angry. And about the territorialism and caesareopapism a great serious row of witnesses of the noblest sons of our church complains. In our days, however, it seems to want to fulfill its measure and to empty our church of its cup to the full. Therefore, if both the sovereign church government and the rule of doctrine in the church come into conflict with each other, we must, if we want to remain faithful to our confession, let the latter go, just as in the days of the Reformation the government of the bishops had to be let go for the sake of the confession. Let it not be forgotten that the justification in principle of the sovereign church government is not in itself without difficulties, but that these difficulties have increased considerably since the conditions of the state have become so entirely different from those of former times, since the territories have become confessionally mixed and the rights of citizenship have become independent of religious confession, and since also the princes - we do not wish to conceal this either - have in many cases taken a personally different attitude toward the doctrine of the church than was the case in the beginning. But we are told that this is what they are endeavoring to do now as never before. For the setting up of synods everywhere has no other purpose than that the church may become independent. Is this really the case? Indeed, allent-

Half of them are now made synodal constitutions. This is seen as the most essential progress in the ecclesiastical field and the real universal remedy for the church in our days. And no church will escape this fate that has not yet been affected by it. It is a fact into which we must find ourselves. One promises oneself a beautiful future of religious and ecclesiastical life from it. Whether the success will correspond to these hopes? We shall probably live to see. I do not say this as if I were a principled opponent of synods. They have been recognized in our Church from the beginning. In the 17th and 18th centuries, pious and enlightened teachers and members of our Church demanded synods in order to make the Church more independent in the face of Caesareopapism. And I know from experience that, if they are properly constituted, they can be salutary, even a blessing for the Church and a protection against attacks from outside. In America, as we know, our church is synodal, and our brethren are well within this constitution. I am far from rejecting synods in principle; rather, where they exist and where we can enter into them with a good ecclesiastical conscience, they demand our loyalty and devoted labor. Nor does it occur to me to demand or even to desire mere synods of the clergy. Those older friends of the synods demanded for the synods, apart from the teaching class, God-fearing and understanding men from all classes. And no one among us will fail to applaud this. But if our ancients demanded or approved synods, and if we should desire or acknowledge them, it is self-evident that they are not just any synods, but synods of the churches, and that they are therefore one and united with them in the confession of doctrine. For without this bond of communion with the church, they are no representation of the church at all, and therefore without internal authority, however formally they may seem to be authorized. This is the highest and foremost demand we must make of all the synods of our church, that their election and composition, their deliberations and decisions, be based on the confession of our church as the dominant and authoritative norm. . The congregational principle is proclaimed. This is the starting point. But in speaking of the congregation, one misuses a noble biblical and ecclesiastical word for the purpose of unbiblical thoughts and intentions. It is not the congregation of believers that is meant, nor is it the congregation of the professing or called ones who are gathered around the One Confession and its doctrine. This is what the Scriptures say, and this is what our fathers say. Those prophets of the future mean it quite differently. To them the congregation is the totality of the bourgeoisly unpolluted, so far as it outwardly bears the name Christian or Protestant - they may stand by the confession of the church as they please, and if since their confirmation they have perhaps scarcely ever again seen a divine service and have no longer cast a glance into the Scriptures, and have no longer understood the doctrine of the church, then they will be called to the church.

ridiculous - nevertheless, because they outwardly bear the name Christian and Protestant, they are the church and the subject of church power. Indeed, the less they have hitherto been concerned about the affairs of the church, the more apt they are, as a rule, to speak and act in its name. We know, however, from the A. Testament, that word which has become famous: 'Ye make it too much; for the whole church is holy everywhere, and the Lord is among them/ But this was the word of Korah, as they are called, and the judgment of God was passed upon them. But those go on in the same sense and spirit, as if it had not been done and written down for a lesson and warning for later times. They refer to the spiritual priesthood of all Christians. But truly the apostle Peter did not mean his word about the general priesthood of the faithful in such a way that it could be changed into the ecclesiastical democracy of all five or twenty-one year olds. . If the confession and its doctrine are the united bond of the church and the determining power of all ecclesiastical action, then it is self-evident that only by this is a synod justified, and only by this are its acts and resolutions valid, that everything is subordinated to the doctrine of the church and is determined by it. For only then is the synod a synod of the church, and its decisions decisions of the church. But if it is detached from the ecclesiastical creed and its doctrine, or if it is in contradiction to them, every synod is objectively unjustified, for it is no longer a synod of the church in question. For it is not the synod that makes the church and is sovereign over the church, but the church and its doctrine is sovereign over the synod. Where Lutheran doctrine ceases, the Lutheran church ceases. Thus, any synod has stepped out of the context of the Lutheran Church, which has stepped out of the context of its doctrine, and has thus lost the right to represent and command those who are willing to remain with their church. . . In Rhenish Bavaria the original Christian dogmas of the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, His atoning death, etc., were rejected at the synod per majora, unconcerned about the opposition of the faithful minority and the protest from the bosom of the congregations. The way to this was paved by the Union. Here, too, it was only to abolish the separating effect of the doctrines of difference, but otherwise to maintain the confessions and their doctrine - so it was declared from the highest authority as late as 1837. But the principle carried out its consequences. Progress does not tolerate standing still. The Synod is called to represent the spirit of progress. Thus, one has progressed to the point of being cleared away with the Christian faith itself. No sooner is the draft of the synodal order ready in Weimar than the representatives of rationalism are already stirring and demanding not merely toleration but recognition for their direction. And what does a synod based not on confession but on free power want to do in the face of such a demand?

What can be opposed to this? It is also quite consistent: if all, without distinction of direction, have equal rights to elect and be elected, their directions must also have equal rights. But if it is the election which confers full authority on every synodical member, just because he is such a member, it follows that the synod itself does not take its authority from elsewhere, but carries the fullness of it within itself. It is sovereign. Thus also in regard to doctrine. As well as state chambers of estates can change the constitution and laws of a country, synods can just as well change the confession and doctrine or prescribe the limits of their validity. This is the prevailing opinion of synodal sovereignty. And in more recent times an attempt has been made to justify juridically this proposition of the legislative right of synods with respect to doctrine. Since church doctrine, it is said, owes its validity in the church to legal recognition and establishment, another legal establishment can also change this validity of church doctrine. The church makes the church doctrine, not the church doctrine makes the church. So the churches, i.e. the synods, have power and right to change the doctrine. But these are propositions as contrary to history as they are dogmatically incorrect. The authority of a doctrine in the church does not rest on a legal establishment, but the legal recognition only expresses the fact which has already taken place. From Luther's recognition of the truth an evangelical church with quite definite evangelical doctrine was formed. It was not only at Augsburg that the Protestants made their doctrine, so that they could change it again; but they only testified to the doctrine which they had already led before: ecclesiae nostrae docent - it says in the Augsburg Confession. This common doctrine which they led and then testified to, and on the basis of which they were then recognized, was the common bond of their unity. He who did not share this doctrine did not belong to them, and he who left it left their fellowship, and he who now leaves it now leaves the fellowship of the Lutheran Church. That deduction fails to recognize that doctrine is an essential element of the church itself, and is sunk into the very roots of it. In place of the teaching and professing church, it puts a mere Schleiermacherian 'community of piety,' of which it would be conceivable that it would remain the same in the same mood and direction of piety, even if it changed the circle of its ideas and doctrines. This view of the church, which makes it a human community instead of seeing in it a foundation of God, to which a certain faith, confession, and doctrine are endowed from the outset-this is the last ground of these theories, the church-dissolving power in the way of thinking of those circles. . We must demand of all synods of Lutheran churches that they submit themselves and their resolutions to the authority of Lutheran doctrine, and that from the agreement of the synods of the Lutheran churches, the Lutheran doctrine be applied.

The Church must be able to recover its justification by means of this alone. It is not sufficient to meet this demand that individual synodal orders declare, and thus believe that they have done the most in this matter, that the confession is not an object of negotiation or legislation. For it is too little to treat the confession merely as a noli me tangere or as a sacred relic to be placed in the corner, since it is to be the all-dominating and determining power and norm of synodal activity. . The time of the popular pedagogy of the Church seems to be coming to an end. Many beautiful and good things are coming to an end with it, many a beautiful and noble custom, many a lovely poetry of our popular life, much support for the weak and wavering, many means of influencing public conditions, many blessings - the blessings of a thousand years of work by the Church on our people. Let us be careful to hold what we can, for the sake of this blessing; it is our duty to defend every foot of land. But let us not deceive ourselves: a new time is coming in which the Church will be detached from the external and legal orders of public life. Step by step it is already being pushed out of them. What would I rather do than be wrong! But I fear that I am not mistaken. With whatever feelings we look forward to this future - this is certain: the more the outer walls and supports of the Church sink, the more it must turn in on itself and seek in its own being the support and unity of which it needs. This, however, is her faith as it expresses itself in confessional doctrine. Let us then, venerable brethren, unanimously raise our voices and, as we mean it, summarize and declare in common expression and say: (1) Unity in confessional doctrine is, according to the unquestionable principles of the Lutheran Church, the bond of ecclesiastical unity and therefore an inalienable demand of our Church. (2) For this reason we reject both the error which justifies the diversity of doctrine and the other which declares the freedom of unconfessed doctrine in the church. (3) For the same reason we must expect and demand of the sovereign church government that it consider itself bound in its measures to the confessional doctrine of the church and to the cooperation of the ecclesiastical organs committed to it, and must call the opposite a disregard for the church and an abuse of power. (4) No less can we recognize synods and their decisions as ecclesiastically justified only when they are based on the confessional doctrine of the church, and therefore cannot grant them any right to change this doctrine, to which they are bound by law and conscience. (5) Therefore, we earnestly request that all holders of church authority in our church, for the sake of conscience, maintain the Lutheran church in the unity and validity of the confessional doctrine, and let all their own actions in the church be determined by it. 6. to

But to all our brethren whose churches are in danger of being deprived of unity in Lutheran doctrine, we address the fraternal encouragement and exhortation to persevere unwaveringly in the validity of Lutheran doctrine, that in it the bond may be preserved which binds the individual Lutheran churches, each within itself and all among themselves."

Literary Intelligences.

A Textbook of the English Language. - Although it is not our custom to review other than theological books in our periodicals, we would like to make an exception this time. This is because the study of English is a very important matter, not only for our preachers and teachers, but for all our fellow believers in this country. We therefore recommend an excellent book that has just appeared: C. H. R. Lange's Lehrbuch der englischen Sprache. In order to inform the readers more precisely about the structure of this book, we are including a circular from the publisher, whose statements we also refer to as an expression of our conviction:

Textbook of the English Language for German Schools in America. By C. H. N. Lange. 8vo. XIII. & 283 pp, b. a $1.00.

The art of teaching English has not been raised to such a height by any of the many existing textbooks and methods that progress in this direction would be impossible. In the above work, a new and earnest attempt is offered to the teachers of English to make the teaching more effective and profitable than can be done by the textbooks hitherto known. In order to be able to learn the English language in an easy, appealing, quick and yet thorough manner, a combination of the most effective means (rich and complete word formation exercises and classical exercise sentences with only words already learned, indication of the pronunciation for each word, strictly methodical progress, even distribution of the subject matter in lessons, etc.) has been used, as has not yet been done in any textbook of the English language. The peculiar and at the same time very simple arrangement of the book results in advantages such as the following:

1. Consistent practice in understanding heard speech, as well as in reading, speaking and writing English;
2. Correct and accurate pronunciation of each word contained therein, and skill in the accentuation of words of similar formation;
3. Quick and easy acquisition of a vocabulary of about ten thousand words and the ability to increase it easily by familiar, appropriate derivation;

4. Training in good, genuine English, in the written and colloquial language, and in the pleasing, thoughtful, and apt expression of the masters of the language;

5. Such an easy course of teaching and gradual progress that even the untrained teacher can achieve rich success in his work for each lesson;

6. Promotion of the knowledge also of German with regard to vocabulary and expression.

It would not be easy to find a more suitable work for self-instruction, and even those who are more experienced will find the use of the book a rewarding way to perfect the knowledge and skills they have already acquired.

Pedagogues who have had the opportunity to inspect the work have, without exception, spoken only favorably of it.

The undersigned publishing house has taken care to publish this work, which is certainly desirable and welcome to many teachers, in a beautiful and practical layout. We supply the work bound at $1.00, per dozen at 25 per cent.

Siemon Bros. Co.

Agendas of the General Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Ohio et al. St. Columbus, O. 1870th, and:

Selection of forms for the use of evangelical Lutheran ministers. Columbus, O. 1870..

Especially the latter will no doubt be desired by many of us. For it is not uncommon for preachers of our Synod to be asked to baptize, marry, or bury a dead person in English. The price of the English part alone is only 30 cents, and in leather binding with gilt edges K1.00 (postage included). It may be obtained through Mr. J. A. Schulze, Columbus, O.-

There is one thing we would have liked to have added to both agendas (the English and the German): the vow of obedience on the part of the bride. It is precisely because in these last sorrowful times of ours the ungodly are so opposed to this important vow, which is so clearly demanded by God's holy Word.

Light and shadow from the history of the old covenant.

I. Samuel the Prophet. By Justus Ruperti, Lutheran pastor at the Kreuzkirche in Bremerhaven.

This is the title of 9 reflections on the life of Samuel, partly taken from Bible lessons. The headings of each are: 1. time and people; 2. the house of the Levites in Ramah; 3. the prayer of a broken heart; 4. Samuel - God hears; 5. the song of praise.

Annae; 6. the boy Samuel and the bad boys; 7. the night in the sanctuary; 8. God's chastisements; 9. Mizpah and Eben Ezer.

These 9 speeches contain a wealth of healthy, spiritual thoughts, in a flourishing, pictorial, yet pithy language, and give many salutary applications of that story to the life of the individual Christian. Admittedly, they presuppose a class of readers who are on a higher level of education in order to be always fully understood. A passage p. 52 from the words: Nothing is so natural to man as praying, etc., might well require an explanatory note to bring it into full harmony with the Lutheran doctrine of free will.

B.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The Illinois - Synod and the Church-Council. Recently, at its annual meeting, the Illinois - Synod, which is now still a part of the Council, but which has also entered into an agreement with Missouri, resolved to submit the known four points with all earnestness for decision to the Council at its next meeting, in order to obtain a clear and distinct answer about them, because the very Pittsburg resolutions on these points are obscure, and really meaningless. The Illinois Synod makes its retention of the Council dependent on the answer to be expected at Lancaster. - The "Lutheran" now publishes, by request, the proceedings of said Synod, but finds itself obliged to accompany them with an editorial article, written in a very irritable, rude, and totally improper tone. In the very first lines it is pointed out in a throwaway manner that the Jllinois Synod consists only of Germans, and that its members are surrounded by members of the Missouri Synod, which is also totally German; further, to illuminate the weight which this past of the Illinois Synod has, it is then pointed out how tiny it is, that "in Philadelphia alone there are many thousand times more Lutherans" than in the complaining Jllinoiserin. Then an attempt is made to show how the "General Council" has completely satisfied all just expectations of a pronouncement on the "four points," and has nothing more to do with them now. In short, the Illinois Synod, and all those who are not satisfied with the Pittsburg resolutions on the "four points," are treated in an arrogant tone, and in a very schoolmasterly manner, by the Lutheran. The "Lutheran Magazine" also finds this conduct repugnant. It says of it, "Much as we deplore the position of some of our highly esteemed friends in the West against the General Assembly of the Church, we deplore the tone of the editorial in the "Lutheran" of July 14, in regard to the resolutions of the Illinois Synod on communion and pulpit fellowship. For what the brethren in Illinois desire, we and many other brethren in Pennsylvania desire, namely, a free, open, thorough discussion and fraternal deliberation on the four points..... As a friend of the General Assembly of the Church, we feel impelled to take this stand on the matter. Of course, we are heartily sorry to have to differ in this from our esteemed colleague in Philadelphia, but we cannot

otherwise; we are also comforted and strengthened by the conviction that a majority of the members of the General Assembly of the Church in the East agree with us." - It may, indeed, be that a majority of the Council disapprove of the position of the "Lutheran," but this does not alter the fact that the gentlemen in Philadelphia, or rather those involved in the "Lutheran," seek to dominate the Council, in which they are only too often brilliantly successful. (Luth. K. Z.)

What more can you ask for? - Victoria University in Coburg, Canada, is a Methodist institution. It is affiliated with two Catholic colleges, one of medicine and one of law. At the last opening, Roman Catholic professors announced the names of their students on the same tribune, while a graduate of the college delivered a eulogy on Luther, which was accompanied by loud applause from the Catholic professors. The Methodist president then distributed diplomas to both Catholics and Protestants.

(Wiscons. Municipal Gazette)

The evangelical Alliance meeting, which was to be held in New York this fall, has been postponed because of the war raging in Europe.

Very liberal. In the Arch-Iankee State of Massachusetts the following has occurred: The Chinese, who were lately imported there as cobblers' boys, and on account of whom so much spectacle is now made, went one Sunday also to the Congregationalist church at North Adams. The Holy Communion was distributed, and the elements, bread and wine, were carried by the deacons to the people in their pews, as is the custom among the Calvinist sects. When the bearer of the bread came to the chairs where the heathen Chinese were sitting, he also handed them the bread without further ado. Some were ready to take it, but were prevented from doing so by one of their comrades, who noticed the impropriety of it, and at any rate had more sense than the Congregationalist priest and his deacons. With the wine the experiment was not tried. (Luth. K. Z.)

II. Abroad.

The General Lutheran Conference held its second meeting in Leipzig during the week of Pentecost. Southern Germany was extremely poorly represented. From Leipzig one counted about 180 names, of which 143 were students of theology, and about 25 persons of secular status. Of the separated Lutherans there is one name on the list. The opening sermon was preached by Bishop Dr. Koopmann of Kiel. The proceedings of the Conference were held in the University Church. The chairman, President Dr. v. Harleß opened them. Consistorialrath Professor Dr. Luthardt then gave a lecture on the significance of doctrinal unity for the Lutheran Church of the present. We have reported the most important parts of it above. On the second day of the conference, Superintendent Polstorff from Güstrow in Mecklenburg reported on the principal position of the Lutheran Church in relation to the introduction of civil marriage by the state. The second item on the agenda, the Sunday question in its social significance, was dealt with by Ober-Consistorialrath Dr. Uhlhorn, without further discussion. (Münkel's N. Z.-Blatt.)

The Bible in English Schools. A great meeting at St. James Hall, under the presidency of Earl Shaftesbury, declared it a national disgrace,

that the Bible should be excluded from school instruction. Also, the proposals of the Education League, which amounted to a thoroughly pagan education, did not at all conform to the will of the majority of the people, especially of the working classes. The most important men of the parliament, clerics as well as laymen, were sanctified at the demonstration. (Ev. K. Chronicle.)

Another addition to the news about the Frledrich-Werder District Synod in Berlin. On the occasion of the motion submitted by this synod to the Consistory, General Superintendent Dr. Hoffmann, the most influential member of the Prussian Oberkirchenrath, let himself be heard, according to the Lutheran newspaper "K. Ztg: The authorities would not allow themselves to be misled into imprudent measures by either one or several district synods. A consistory stands on a higher standpoint than the district synods; it has to consider the whole of the church. The authority does not deny that the Protestant association has many questionable aspects; but this association does not lack inner justification. - The dear reader may well ponder what higher standpoint the Unirte Consistorium and the Unirte Generasuperintendent Dr. Hoffmann stand on. The District Synod and Pastor Knack speak thus: Since the Protestant Association says that he is a good Christian who believes in the deity of Christ, as well as he who rejects the deity of Christ, the Protestant Association is one to which a preacher of the Prussian State Church may not belong. This, then, is the lower point of view. The higher point of view is that of Dr. Hoffmann, who says: "The Protestant Association, which declares deniers of the deity of Christ and confessors of the deity of Christ to be equally good Christians, has an inner justification, and it would be imprudent if the ecclesiastical authorities were to forbid Prussian preachers to become members of the Protestant Association. - The apostle John says in his second epistle, v. 7: For many deceivers are come into the world, which confess not Jesus Christ, that he is come in the flesh. And v. 9: Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath no God; and v. 10, 11: If any man come to you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not at home, neither salute him. - Hereby the holy apostle John certainly forbids even the Prussian preachers to fellowship with the Protestant Association, which, after all, also recognizes such people as deny that the Son of God and Himself eternal God came into the flesh, i.e. became man. But according to the speech of Dr. Hoffmann, the holy apostle John also has only the lower point of view. The higher standpoint, which the Consistory should take, is: that a Prussian preacher cannot be forbidden, if he not only does not take the Protestant Association into his house, but enters into its house himself, i. e. becomes a member of it, even if he greets the Protestant Association in a friendly manner, i. e. says: You stand right, you stand on the level of the times, and have a great inner justification. (Wisc. Gemeindebl.)

From Hamburg. The new draft constitution for the Protestant-Lutheran Church of Hamburg, prepared by a deputation of 21 members, is ready. According to the name, a Lutheran church is still recognized, but in the other provisions, not only the Lutheran, but also the Christian has been eradicated as far as possible; it is a constitution on the broadest Protestant-association basis; it does not require a specific confession from the members, the will to belong to the congregation is sufficient. The qualification for a church office depends only on the fact that one is 25 years old and promises faithful, lawful conduct in office.

(Ev. K. Chronicle.)

From Bavaria. The magistrate of Munich has decided to reject all burdens arising from Catholic processions. Such cult practices belong in the church, not on the street. (Ev. K. Chronicle.)

A Unionist Synod. At the Palatinate General Synod, Dean Saul described the course of the 1848 Diocesan Synod in Neustadt: about 500 people attended, some of them in shirt sleeves; they not only smoked and drank beer, but also committed other gross mischief. The shouts rang out: Shut up, you mucker! Before the audience was admitted, they shouted in front of the meeting hall: "If the priests don't let us in, they'll all be hanged," and so on. One sees how splendidly education and enlightenment go hand in hand. (Ev. K. Chronicle.)

Austria and the Pope. In response to an inquiry, the Pope decided that an Austrian cleric could take the oath to the state constitution only with the reservation that divine and ecclesiastical laws be observed. At Linz the Bishop appointed a teacher of religion at the High School, who refused to take the oath without this clause. The governor did not want to permit this, and asked the bishop for another teacher: but the latter declared that he could not provide one, for a clergyman was not allowed to take the unconditional oath. The governor now turned to the Minister of Culture and received the order: either to suspend the religious instruction altogether, or to transfer it to a religious teacher already sworn in at another school. - The Austrian government has decided that whoever does not want to take the oath to the state laws without reservation and caveat is not to be admitted to a school office. (Ev. K. Chronicle.)

Jesuitism in Switzerland. The diocesan institutes of the diocese of Basel met in Solothurn on April 2. Against one vote (that of the Canton of Zug) it was decided to abolish the seminary for priests in Solothurn, because there morals are taught according to the notorious textbook of the Jesuit Gury. Furthermore, it was decided to convene a special conference in order to agree on the attitude towards the decisions of the ecumenical council. (Ev. K. Chronicle.)

Papal coins. The French Minister of Finance has decreed that the papal coins shall not be accepted for full at the French tills. They are so badly minted that France has already lost 2 to 3 million francs on them. A peculiar way of taxing countries! A petition to the Senate proposes to pay the French Clerus with this coin; but even he will accept it at most as St. Peter's penny for full. (Ev. K. Chronicle.)

The Papal Declaration of Infallibility finds imitators. Rabbi Hillel in Omsk, a scholar much revered by the orthodox Jews, who claims to be a descendant of Maimonides, wants to declare himself infallible and has already received many approving letters. (Ev. K. Chronicle.)

Correction.

In our August number, it should read:
Page230Line 10 from bottom: loose whitewash instead of: loose disciple.
Page 230 line 8 from bottom: Hardness instead of: Hurtfulness.
Page 236 line 23 from top: Pattern **and** model instead of: Pattern-Model.
Page 238 line 14 from bottom: slack instead of: bad.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume. October 1870. No. 10.

(Sent by Pastor A. Wagner in Ratibor in Silesia.)

How do the teachers of the Lutheran Church in the 19th century judge the Antichrist; demonstrated to Prof. Kurtz in Dorpat.

Just as the trouble caused by the evil enemy has always been a blessing to the church, so the trouble caused today by the Roman Council will not remain without some important fruits for the Lutheran church, if we use it correctly. In any case, in view of the apostasy that has now been revealed even more clearly, every righteous Lutheran Christian should feel called upon to examine seriously whether he has still held fast with the Lutheran Church to the sentence of its confession that the Pope is the Antichrist. Yes, the Council has already really brought about this success, at least among individuals, and I may assure you with heartfelt thanks that Brunn's excellent paper, "Is the Pope the Antichrist?"It was spoken from my soul, and it has opened the eyes of many other faithful Christians all the more, the less they were able to find a round and clear answer to this very question in most of the writings of our Lutheran theologians of today; indeed, one may well say, along with many other sayings of our fathers, one is positively ashamed of this sentence, which has been included in our confessional writings, and it is as if the prohibition against preaching about the Antichrist, which Pope Leo X. issued as late as 1516, were briefly forgotten. issued as late as 1516, was issued again shortly before this present revelation of the Antichrist and, above all, found validity and recognition within our present Lutheran theology. Oh, how many thanks we therefore owe to Pastor Brunn and the American brethren for giving a clear sound by their trumpet in "Lehre und Wehre" (Doctrine and Order) concerning this highly important question, as a result of which a man of war nevertheless gets the desire to arm himself for this battle! How very necessary it has been

The Lutheran Christians should be reminded of the relevant passages from the Schmalkaldic Articles. Articles, as Part II, Article 4: "This piece shows tremendously that the pope is the true end-Christ or anti-Christ, who has set himself above and against Christ and exalted himself, because he does not want to let the Christians be blessed without his authority.

But, as I said, no matter how unequivocally the confession of our church may speak about this, such appeals will not be of much avail to both present theologians of our church, who look for the Antichrist somewhere else than in Rome, or at least find the Antichristian essence still much too weakly pronounced there; for, if this article were to be acknowledged, many a more recent book, considered to be well Lutheran, would still require such a reworking that it would, of course, no longer resemble itself and would thus lose its main appeal to an important circle of readers. Thus, it offers a peculiar charm in many of our most read church-historical works of today, that in them, with the same intimacy with which one presents the development of the work of the Reformation and the struggle of the Lutheran Church in the following centuries, luck is wished beforehand for the construction of the entire antichristian edifice, the foundations of which the Reformation alone was called upon to overthrow; one finds in the development of the papacy not something absolutely necessary, but something relatively indispensable, highly necessary and salutary for that time! How else can one explain this strong self-contradiction than by the fact that the devotion with which such historians present the victory of truth in the Reformation to the reader cannot come from an unfeigned love of truth, but rather from your natural admiration of everything that appears in the splendor of majesty and sublimity - and this character has been attached to the work of the Reformation from the beginning. But when falsehood, although it has sworn death to truth, succeeds at times, through the favor of circumstances, in emerging also in the splendor of majesty and sublimity, the unshakable in the pursuit of its goal, the splendor of this spectacle so captivates the senses of these historians that, instead of clearly revealing the difference between truth and falsehood, they draw a confusingly similar picture of both. This is the impression that the "Leitfaden der christlichen Kirchengeschichte von Joh. Heinr. Kurtz" (Guide to Christian Church History by Joh. Heinr. Kurtz), which probably appeared in 1846 and was really completed in its artistic form, made on me from the beginning. Who would fail to recognize that this book bears witness to an intimate love for Christ and His Church, and who would therefore not rejoice that it has now replaced many other inane textbooks in the hands of most students of theology at the better German universities? But if only there were not at the same time such idolatrous admiration of all that is done under the name of Christ with the appearance of piety, greatness of character, and

The fullness of the spirit is revealed in it! Certainly, his description of the development of the Lutheran Church from the Reformation until today must awaken love, because it comes from unmistakable love for the Lutheran Church, and in spite of the succinctness of the summary, it will not be easy to forget something that deserves to be mentioned for the glory of the Lutheran Church. But how disappointed one feels when, in the account of the development of antichristianity, one rightly expects the tone of holy disgust and instead hears throughout the same language of adoring and devoted love! A picture of Gregory VII. as well as of Innocent III., ideals of piety in the inhabitants of Clugny and in a Franciscus of Assist, is sketched out for the reader with such an artistic hand that even the last unpleasant stains, which even Roman eulogists are not able to remove from them, at least for our eyes, disappear completely unrecognizable. Is this of any use, especially to young minds and future combatants in the Lutheran camp? For it is not as an idle spectator that a future co-worker in the work of Christ should look at the hostile and the friendly army camps, in order to let his mouth burst out in admiration at the sight of all that shines, but for this reason the young theologians should practice church history, in order to learn the art of war of Joshua, that one should immediately ask in conscience of any appearance that may occur to one: "Do you belong to us or to our enemies?" Joshua 5:13; but I fear that by such representations one learns to ask with how much or little propriety each one knows how to use his sword, rather than for whose cause he fights; and, if only in the opposite camp one finds spiritual sovereignty, consistency in striving for the chosen goal, and at the same time many appearances of Christian piety, then those who are nourished by such food will not have much hesitation in going over from the highly praised Lutheran camp to the hostile one! To prove, however, that such complaints about the idolatrous veneration which Kurtz pays to the chief adversary of the Church of Christ, the papacy, are not raised without reason, it may be permitted to subject his presentation of the papacy to an examination, beginning with the appearance of Hildebrand.

That the indisputable spiritual gifts and willpower emerging in Hildebrand or Gregory VII. which emerge in Hildebrand or Gregory VII, the indisputable intellectual gifts and will power as well as the enthusiastic devotion to his cause have not only caused Kurtz but also every other observer a silent or loud astonishment, is quite natural; but the sober reader will be astonished when now in this man all at once no trace of mean imperiousness or vain ambition is supposed to be left, but all his steps are supposed to have sprung from the purest intentions; yes, when our fathers show the man of sin, which is revealed in the whole papacy, in Gregory's person quite openly.

one will look at himself a little questioningly when one hears Kurtz assure that "in all this he was able to preserve the consciousness of the poor sinner who seeks and finds salvation only in the mercy of Christ. But not only does he want to protect Gregory's person against a hasty judgment, but he also dares to prove the good right of the cause he advocates to the extent that, after all, the salvation of the Church can be seen nowhere else than in the execution of his plans. This, however, is the most outrageous thing to us. If someone believes that Gregory did and said what he did ignorantly in unbelief and that therefore repentance was still possible for him on his deathbed - for it is certain that he did not do it as long as he was in office - we want to leave him with this opinion, although Kurtz would first have to prove the authority for his confident assurance; but against this we may well protest with all seriousness, if Gregor's and his comrades' charges are to be declared a relative, if not an absolute necessity; but so he writes of Gregor and his comrades-in-arms: "They were right, respectively. The Church, if it were otherwise to fulfill its world-historical mission of educating the peoples who had now come to the forefront of history, if it were not instead to perish itself under the brutality of the times, must necessarily concentrate and secure itself in a power such as Gregory's papacy was."

But we hear Kurtz comment in context on the cause championed by Gregory:

"In the monastery of Clugny in Burgundy, which since its foundation had exercised an immeasurably beneficial influence on the whole Occident, a propaganda had been formed by the most serious and capable men of their time, who were deeply concerned about the plight of the Church, and who recognized in the elevation of the papacy from its disgrace and impotence the only radical remedy. Here, around the year 1048, when Bruno, Bishop of Toul, was promoted to Pope by imperial election, we find a monk named Hildebrand, son of a blacksmith in Saona. An intimate friend of the noble Pope Gregory VI, he had already strongly supported him in Rome, and after the abdication of the same had withdrawn to Clugny."

To this we reply: That a more serious spirit prevailed in the monastery of Clugny than in the other monasteries, which were then very secular, is generally asserted. The only question is whether this kind of seriousness was sufficient or even in any way suitable to remedy the peculiar basic damage to Christianity. But in what does this actual ruin and basic damage consist, against which all the faithful children of the church cry out day and night and fight with all seriousness? Is it not that the word of God is not taught purely and correctly, and that we do not live by it as holy children of God? Has perhaps) that "pro-

paganda of the most serious men of their time" fought against this damage to the death, and did the "immeasurably beneficial influence", which is said to have emanated from it on the whole Occident since the foundation of the monastery in 910, consist in this serious fight against all false doctrine, in order to then also be able to fight successfully against false life? Unfortunately, we find the exact opposite assured by all reports of the historians; so little did one fight in Clugny against tearing down errors, that rather a whole number of errors already in the making came to full birth there and from there, under the high name of their Clugniac patrons, only reached general recognition in Christendom. As this may be said of all those heresies which were introduced by former disciples of Clugny, when they had ascended the papal throne, as: Transubstantiation, introduction of the priestly celibacy, supreme supremacy of the pope over temporal power and all kings, and the like; so this is most indisputably true of the feast of all souls, because this was not brought to light by disciples of Clugny in Rome or elsewhere, but quite actually first saw the light of this world between the walls of this monastery itself. Now, as is well known, this feast actually has the purpose of elevating the false doctrine of Purgatory and of God's reconciliation through human works, which has been generally believed since Gregory I, to an inviolable church doctrine. This even Kurtz cannot pass over entirely with silence: "To the feast of all saints came from Clugny since 998 also the feast of all souls, on November 2, for the salvation of souls from purgatory through the intercession of the faithful." Of course, in the erection of such a new bulwark of darkness in the Church, it did not go off, as always, without ghostly apparitions. A monk of Clugny, on his return from a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, came to a hermit in Sicily, who told him how the poor souls near the volcano had to go through their purgatorial torment, but how he had heard the devils complain bitterly that many of these souls, given to them by right, were taken away from them sooner than was right, through the prayers and alms of the faithful; and the monks of Clugny were most to blame for this, praying day and night for the deliverance of the souls from purgatory. The monk immediately reported this to his abbot in Clugny, the famous Odilo, whereupon he decreed that in all his monasteries, on the day after the feast of all the saints, the memory of all the souls resting in Christ should be solemnly celebrated by prayer, the sacrifice of the Mass, and almsgiving. This was already a sample of the blessing that the Clugniacens Congregation brought to the whole Occident, and which one of the popes later elevated to an irrevocable order by a church law. If, therefore, there were no objection to Kurtz's description of the blamelessness of their conduct, then

we must say, "God preserve us from such propaganda; for he that teacheth otherwise than the word of God teacheth, profanes the name of God among us." But we confidently maintain that in Clugnp and the "propaganda of the most earnest men," as Kurtz calls it, which proceeded from there, people also lived differently from what the Word of God teaches; or is that not called "living differently from what the Word of God teaches," if that which I punish in others as sin and sacrilege, if it is committed by me with the intention of helping up the church with it, is, on top of that, to be called an important service which I show to my God? "But he that teacheth and liveth otherwise than the word of God teacheth, profanes the name of God among us; from this, dear Lord God, keep us!" Let us hear how very different was the judgment of these serious men concerning the abomination of simony, when it was committed by the emperor and other princes, or when it was committed by themselves! It is evident that the worldly nature, which at that time had corrupted the whole Church, came to light quite glaringly in simony, the shameful buying and selling of ecclesiastical offices for money; against this abomination, as it was practiced without shyness by the Emperor and all princes at that time, the propaganda of Clugny ruthlessly took the field; especially when Gregory VII had ascended the throne. One of his first acts, especially when Gregory VII. had ascended the throne, was to declare all priests deposed and their priestly functions invalid who had received their office through simony; his legates went through the countries and ruthlessly carried out the Pope's commandment; five imperial councils guilty of simony were soon deposed at the Synod of Rome, and Henry IV. had to submit. When he later practiced simony more than before, this was one of the main charges against him, for which he had to make a pilgrimage to Rome for responsibility and apology. Who would not have to bear witness to the friars of Clugny that holy zeal for God's glory drove them to such a serious struggle? But a perhaps careless remark of Kurtz's may be to blame if we are not yet so completely convinced of this, and rather Rom. 2:27 comes to our mind: "Now teachest thou others, and teachest not thyself? Thou sayest not to steal, and thou stealest?" or, what is the same, thou dreadest the iniquity of simony, and thou practisest simony! Kurtz has just told us that "Hildebrand, before he himself became pope, as a trusted friend of the noble pope Gregory VI, had already strongly supported him in Rome." If he was his intimate friend, he must also have known how this "noble pope" came to the papal chair, a matter that may, of course, be told only to intimate friends; Kurtz, however, tells us himself: "Pope Benedict IX sold the papacy to Gregory VI, who, in order to save the chair of Peter from ruin, took upon himself the ignominy of simony." So against what were these people zealous when they cursed simony, against the abomination itself, or against the demolition it brought to papal honor? I mean, in the former case

Hildebrand did not need to wait until Henry IV with his curses against this abomination, but should have already shown his friendship to his friend Gregory VI, to warn him, whom he saw sinning to death, in all seriousness! Paul himself shows this friendship to Peter at Antioch, Gal. 2:14: "But when I saw that they walked not aright according to the truth of the gospel, I said to Peter openly before all, If thou, being a Jew, livest heathenish, and not Jewish, why dost thou compel the Gentiles to live Jewish?" and v. 18: "But if I build again that which I have broken, I make myself a transgressor." But is it to add nothing to their excuse that Gregory VI bought the papal chair for money merely with the good intention "to save the chair of Peter from destruction" and because "these men recognized in the elevation of the papacy from ignominy and impotence the only radical remedy for the misery of the church"? But just this, that they think to do God a service by it, makes the simony of Gregory VI and his approving friends a worse abomination than all the simony of Henry IV and other secular princes ever was! According to Kurtz's account, this sin, perpetrated by the noble Gregory, was even the most extreme sacrifice of self-denial that a disciple of Christ can make for the love of his Lord, that he, for the sake of saving the honor of his Lord, loads upon his person the ignominy of simony! One must ask: Did these strange doctors of the church not know a supreme physician and shepherd of his church, to whom they could cry out and cry out with the few remaining saints, even in the extreme distress and disgrace of the church, that he would cut off all hypocrisy and the tongue that speaks proudly, instead of inventing all kinds of pretended "radical remedies" at their discretion? (Ps. 12.) Who again saith, Because the miserable are cast down, and the poor groan, I must be up; I will make a help, that they may teach with confidence? This only radical remedy against all harm in the church these people did not consider to be anything, and, because in their opinion there was no God in heaven who wanted to take care of the distress of his church on earth, these prophets, whom the Lord had not sent after all, went their way as the only remaining saviors of the church, and that with the privilege of being allowed to transgress even the clearest commandments of God as often as this could help their purpose! But the most distressing thing is that, after God has long since pronounced His strict judgment on their work, they still find some faithful guardians in the bosom of the Lutheran Church, at least in the nineteenth century!

The same principle, that no means which could serve to raise the papacy from its impotence should cause these men any compunction, we see further almost at every new step in their course. For when Gregory VI. had, through disfavor of circumstances

and now some time later Bruno, Bishop of Toul, had been promoted to Pope by imperial election, he wished to have the mighty monk Hildebrandt at his side and therefore travelled via Clugny. Hildebrandt followed him, but only on condition that Bruno, who had been elected merely by imperial decree, should lay aside his papal regalia and go in pilgrim's garb to Rome, there to be legitimately elected anew." Thus, according to Hildebrandt's ideas, the emperor had no right to elect a pope, but for the time being the clergy at Rome, and later, in consequence of his order, the College of Cardinals. But why did Hildebrand, one naturally asks, not rather advise Bruno, who according to this view had not yet been elected, not to go to Rome at all, where he had no business to be, but rather to remain quietly at home until those to whom the election was due would of their own accord come to the idea of electing him? So these despisers of every election of the pope by the emperor as an illegitimate one did not quite dislike their illegitimate election after all! The small gain, namely, the appearance that they had been legitimately elected, and the hope of being elected again by the legitimate electors as a result, they thought it good to take with them until they no longer needed it, and they could trample on the imperial election without prejudice to their own interest!

These samples, we hope, will suffice to justify our doubt of the immeasurably beneficent influence of Clugny; but what else is told of the moral earnestness of this monastery, reminds us of 2 Cor. 11:13: "For such false apostles and deceitful workmen pretend themselves to be Christ's apostles; neither is it any wonder; for he himself, Satan, pretends himself to be an angel of light."

But let us hear further how Hildebrand strove for his goal:

"Bruno (now Leo IX) employed him as a deacon in Rome, and from then on Hildebrand was the soul of the Roman Curia until his own accession to the throne, and with his high spirit, despite all obstacles, raised the papacy and the Church from deep disruption to unprecedented power and glory. Systematically, from the beginning of his activity, he proceeded, ever more boldly and irresistibly, towards a total reformation of the Church. Suppression of simony, freedom of the church from the arbitrariness and power of the state, ruthless severity against the immorality of the clergy, introduction of the colibate as the most powerful means of emancipating the clergy from the world and the state, appointment of the ecclesiastical offices by the most capable and worthy men, and especially the transfer of the election of the pope to the Collegium of Cardinals under Nicolaus II, were the well-deserved levers of this reformation."

So we hear that a man with his high spirit can lift up the church to unprecedented power and glory, and thus at any rate

The Church is still able to bring a good bit of weather than even the apostles were able to, at a time when the Church still held on to its crown, the pure doctrine! For even then, according to Kurtz's judgment, such glory and power must not have been seen in her as this Hildebrand knew how to bestow upon her! Whoever should be disconcerted by this, will surely understand Kurtz's words in such a way that Hildebrand at the same time understood how to raise both of the schoolchildren, the papacy as well as the church, so high, while the apostles spent their efforts only on the one, the church. So the papacy and the church, both at the same time! and indeed the papacy first, because it probably cared more about it, and only if the church wants to put up with this alliance with the papacy, then it should also get its share of the never-seen glory and power! It is only a pity that she must give thanks for this offer; for where the papacy is lifted up, the church is trampled underfoot, and where the church is freed, the papacy's fall has come; the two are now against each other to the end of the world! Therefore, Hildebrand will have used his efforts in vain, insofar as they concern the elevation of the church!

But if we then hear the list of the "well-appreciated levers of this reformation," we soon get the impression that this must be a different kind of reformation, if not a complete deformation, which had to look for such levers in order to be able to set itself in motion, whereas it is the characteristic of all true reformation that it is set in motion without hands, solely by the eternal Word of God. But "well worthy" that is: cleverly devised, they may have been, after all, to give the appearance of a reformation to this overthrow or apostasy from the eternal foundations of the church. The first lever, the suppression of simony, would have been quite honorable, if it had been more than a name in the hands of these people who themselves practiced simony; the second, indulgent severity against the immorality of the clergy, must have failed its service at that time; At least we read that with its help the immorality of the clergy could neither then nor later be eradicated from the Roman Church; the Roman Catholic clergy still remained immoral and became so by the third lever, the introduction of the celibacy, in tenfold measure stronger than before: the fourth lever, on the other hand, finding out the most skilful instruments of their intentions, has undoubtedly been applied with the best success of all.

Let us hear Kurtz's account further: "Hildebrand had finally strengthened the papacy enough to be able to express the seal of completion to his work with his own name and ascended the chair of Peter as Gregory VII (1073-1085). If he had been even so honest as to express his name to this work, the damage would not have been so emphatic; but unfortunately the name of God had always to be

to give the shameful game a divine consecration; but at least Kurtz calls it his (Gregory's) work this time, not God's work!

"At a synod at Rome, in 1074, he renewed the old strict laws of celibacy, and declared all priests who lived in matrimony deposed, and their spiritual functions void." Consider what an outrage to break up thousands of marriages, while the Lord said, "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." The admiring Kurtz does not seem to have thought of 1 Tim. 4, 2. 3.; at the most he helps himself with a remark, such as: "With all ruthlessness and severity in what he had recognized as true, wholesome, and necessary, he also not infrequently proved a humanity and free-mindedness above his time."

With vivid colors Kurtz sketches for us the basic idea of Gregory's life, the establishment of a universal theocracy, the visible head of which would be the Pope as the representative of Christ on earth, who as such would be above all power on earth. In this theocracy, which for its part had only God and His law above it, all states of Christian name were to be united to one another as members of one body. The princes are indeed by God's grace, but not directly, but indirectly; between them and God stands the Church as the middle authority. The pope is their arbiter and supreme liege lord; they must submit to his decisions without fail. The kingdom relates to the papacy as the moon to the sun; from it it receives its light and its warmth. The church, which confers its divine authority on temporal power, can also withdraw it again where it is abused. With it, then, the obligation of the subjects to obedience ceases of its own accord." After such a lively description of the ideal with which Gregory's mind was filled, one may hope to hear Kurtz's own judgment, at least in a few words. This he expresses, at first only apologetically: "the unevangelical abruptness of this system should not be misjudged," but afterwards in such brilliant vindication of the Gregorian system that one must only lament how shamefully this righteous servant of Christ, Gregory VII, has hitherto been almost universally misjudged in the Lutheran Church. "Gregory," he continues, "and with him the most capable men of his time, saw in the execution of this system the only means of salvation of the age. And they were right, respectively. The Church, if it were otherwise to fulfill its world-historical mission of educating the peoples who had now come to the forefront of history, if it were not instead to perish itself under the crudeness of the times, must necessarily concentrate and secure itself in a power like Gregory's papacy." But then Kurtz did not need to apply the mitigating expression: "they were right, respectively"! No, if it says so

If the church had to concentrate in Gregory's papacy, then they were absolutely right. For we know of no other world-historical mission of the Church to educate the nations than that which the Lord gave in Matthew 28: "Go ye into all the world, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." But among these nations are no doubt included those who had now come to the forefront of history. If it was impossible to carry out Christ's mission among these peoples in any other way than through the Gregorian papacy, and yet Christ insisted on the world-historical mission of the Church to these peoples as well, then there is truly no need to excuse Gregory, but in establishing the papacy he acted entirely according to Christ's will. Thus, after all, the Antichrist must be Christ's most faithful servant!

Once again Kurtz briefly summarizes the ideas cherished in Clugny in the following outline: "Clugny's political ideal was to present all nationalities of Europe as integrating, equal members of a great Christian confederation of states, whose uniform representative should be the papacy. Few emperors were self-denying and insightful enough to respond to these salutary ideas; rather, they strove to establish an absolute world dominion after Charlemagne's processes." So what were the salutary ideas for which the emperors lacked, to Kurtz's great regret, in part self-denial and in part insight? Not only the establishment of a great Christian confederation of states, but above all its unified representation by the papacy; for this representation was the sole aim of the whole confederation of states, so that, as Kurtz himself reports, the popes sought to prevent every other Christian union of the peoples that did not gather around this representative, but rather sought to prevent it by instigating war and rebellion, which our poor Germany in particular experienced as hardly any other country. That the emperors, too, often enough lacked self-denial and insight is certainly true; however, that they were not able to fully understand the salutary nature of this political ideal of the popes and their faithful assistants in the monastery at Clugny, that will probably be the least reproach that can be made against them.

If one can already be so enthusiastic about the founder of the great universal theocracy, how should one not have to do it to an even greater extent for the most brilliant holder of it, Innocent III! Kurtz does not lack this, either:

"Innocent III, the greatest pope Rome has ever seen, ascended the chair of Peter and brought the papacy to the highest conceivable height of power and splendor. In strength of mind and will he was not inferior to Gregory; in learning, perspicacity, and agility he surpassed him,

and his piety, his moral earnestness, his enthusiasm and devotion for the Church were at least as pure, strong and lively, and even more profound and intimate than those of Gregory. This really means a lot after all the good things Kurtz has already told us about Gregory, for it almost seemed as if this saint could no longer be surpassed by a second! As proof, however, of this pure piety and moral earnestness of Innocent, which make such a powerful impression on Kurtz, read in Schröckh's christl. Kirchengeschichte, Theil 26, pag. 268, the papal opinion as to which of the three German emperors already elected, whether Otto IV, Philip of Swabia, or his ward Frederick II, was to be recognized, whereby the three questions are considered in a political way, 1. what is permissible, 2. what is decent, and 3. above all, what is useful to the papal see - the latter also always gives the deciding factor -, and from which oaths taken - for in each case at least two of them had to be broken - the pope could most easily release himself and the peoples. Then, of course, one will find complete justification for what Kurtz has said above about the astonishing "agility" that one should not at all assume in these often so scrupulously conscientious men, namely, when it is a matter of disregarding this and that conscientious objection of the gravest importance. Indeed, Kurtz himself cannot fail to provide splendid proof of this by telling us how the army of the French crusaders under Count Balduin of Flanders preferred to found a Latin empire in Constantinople and lay it at the feet of the Pope. The impression which this act of violence made on the Pope's moral earnestness is described by Kurtz: "The Pope's sense of justice was outraged, he even threatened the robbers of a Christian throne with banishment; nevertheless (so deep went the indignation of his sense of justice!) he submitted to what had happened, and from Rome occupied the patriarchal see at Constantinople." Is it meant to be a mockery when Kurtz goes on to describe Innocent's efficacy, "Papal omnipotence in all lands received a foil in papal omnipresence through his legates"? But with his above admiration of papal piety, it had been no joke to him!

In describing the effectiveness of Innocent III, he naturally also mentions the two new orders which Innocent himself helped to establish, despite the fact that he had forbidden the foundation of new monastic orders at the Fourth Lateran Council, because his keen eye could already sense their great importance for the further development of the Church in their inconspicuous beginnings, namely the Franciscan and Dominican orders. Innocenzo's personal position towards Franciscus of Assisi, who "was mocked by the people as a madman, soon venerated as a saint, preaching repentance throughout the West and the East", is described by him in the following short words: "Innocenzo, who had been

How could he have rejected such a useful tool, which, properly used, was able to impart a wonderful halo to his own work! After Kurtz has sketched for us a picture of the world-denial and self-denial of "this heavenly stranger on the selfish earth," for which he can well wish himself more luck than for the clumsy praises of his admirers in the Roman Church, he continues, not in order to give us an account of his fellow religious, but, as at least every simple reader must believe, in order to express his own conviction:

"The indulgence in the compassion of the earthly suffering of Christ imprinted wound marks on the body of the Saviour, and, laid bare on the floor of the Portiuncula church, he died under the blessed pain of these wound marks in 1226. Gregory IX canonized him as early as 1228. Countless miracles are reported of him by his contemporaries, and even the most severe critics will not be able to avoid the impression that in the life of this most miraculous of all saints there is much that cannot be denied which goes beyond the common course of nature. In the 14th century, the General Chapter of the Franciscans at Assist authorized the book 'Liber conformatum', which proves 40 similarities between Christ and St. Francis. In the time of the Reformation, it was published with a preface by Luther under the title: Der Barfüßermönche Eulenspiegel und Alkorar." Of course, we do not want to deny that many miraculous things have been seen in this faithful helper of the papacy, and that they may really have been accomplished by him, just as, in general, a Lutheran Christian will never be a friend of that criticism which denies everything "that goes beyond the common course of nature"; but we must be surprised that a teacher of Lutheran theology does not even remotely remember, in view of such stories, that 2 Thess. 2, 9. 10. is said of Antichrist, that "his future shall be according to the working of Satan, with all manner of lying powers and signs and wonders;" and Paul's warning, Col. 2, 18.: "Let no man shift his aim, who walketh after his own choice in humility and spirituality of angels, having never seen any; and is puffed up without cause in his carnal mind, and continueth not in the head, out of which the whole body by joints and joints receiveth hand, and is contained one to another, and so increaseth unto godly stature." If the story of the alleged wounds on Francis' body was not really a mere invention of his contemporaries and the popes, nothing proves more that he did not hold to Christ, the Head, and was not in union with Him through the right joints and fugues, than this mirage seen in him and by him. A Lutheran Christian knows nothing and wants to know nothing about another way of bearing the wounds.

We do not bear the marks of our Lord Christ on our bodies, but those that come from the burden of the cross or even persecution for the testimony of Christ, as St. Paul boasts of himself, Gal. 6:17: "Henceforth no man troubleth me, but I bear the marks of my Lord Jesus in my body"; but all other bearing remains to be felt for the time "when our vile body shall be like unto his glorified body" Phil. 3:21.

For a correct understanding of these wonderful reports, the account from the mouth of a writer who, although not based on Lutheran principles, is generally recognized as a historically faithful reporter, Schröckh, (Theil 27, pag. 441.), may be cited here:

Bonaventure has described a not insignificant number of the miracles wrought by Franciscus; his numerous resurrections of the dead, deliverances from danger of death, shipwreck, imprisonment, dangerous diseases, and the like; likewise his frequent restorations of the faces of the blind, also the miraculous punishments of those who would not (!!) venerate him. It takes a lot of patience, indeed, to copy all these extraordinary heavenly pardons, which are said to have happened to an enthusiastic head whose main intention was to fill the world with pious beggars, to his fellow members of the order. However, we still have to hear about the most wonderful privilege that a man might dare to expect from the Saviour of the world: Franciscus received his wound marks from him! In 1224 he had gone to Mount Alverna to fast for forty days in honor of the archangel Michael; at the same time he asked God to make his will known to him, so that he might be guided entirely by it. Suddenly the thought came to him that God would reveal it to him through the first passage on which his eyes would fall when he opened the book of the Gospels. So he had his companions open the Gospels, and three times passages of the Passion of Christ fell into his eyes. From this the saint concluded that as he had imitated Christ's life in all his actions, he should also become like him in his suffering. On the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross, then, as he was praying more fervently and was completely imbued with the pain of the Crucified, Christ came flying towards him in the form of a seraph and pressed his wounds on his hands and feet and on his side, not without great pain and loud cries from the saint. Nails of flesh were seen on his hands and feet ever since, though open wounds always remained, from which much blood sometimes flowed; and walking became particularly difficult for him ever since. The circumstances of this story were told by the saint himself and by the brother Leo, who was present at the incident and who had to bandage his wounds more than once. Many others of his friars, including St. Clare, saw them, and Pope Alexander IV himself was an eyewitness. After the death of the saint

she was venerated and kissed by many of the inhabitants of Assisi. Franciscus could not have risen higher in his eyes and in the eyes of the people; he suffered with Christ and for his sake; he became a Christ living anew among men; the sight of this must have made an astonishing impression in an age such as his; and the doubts of a so-called pious fraud had long since been set aside. From the time when Franciscus was said to have received the honor of the marks of Christ's wounds, he lived, according to the report of the writers of that order, two years more in a sickly languishing condition; there was scarcely a limb in his body which did not give him pain, and he had to be carried from one place to another. At last, perceiving the approach of his death, he had himself taken to the church of Portiuncula, where he had founded his order. Here he prostrated himself naked on the bare ground, in order to die in a state of complete poverty. He had a robe, a cord, and a hood solemnly presented to him once more, but then he thanked Christ that he could go to him free of all things and without a garment of his own, just as he himself had hung naked on the cross. Hence he also commanded his brethren to let him lie for some time after his death quite uncovered. In his last moments he recommended to them above all things poverty, humility, and strict adherence to all the tenets of the faith of the Roman Church, and died on October 4, 1226. In order that this important example of how a man, by virtue of his holiness, could not only be like Christ, but could even precede him, might become known to the whole world, so as to teach them higher concepts of human holiness than they had hitherto, this whole miracle story was put on paper by the Franciscan Bartholomew de Pisis in 1385, and presented in a large folio volume under the title: "Liber conformitatum, the complete resemblance of Francis to Christ which emerges from it, for astonishing adoration. 40 similarities between the two are described here, e.g. the preaching and models of both in the Old Testament, their teachings and miracles, their prophecies, their elevation above the angels, and the like. But it did not remain so; Franciscus is more than once preferred to Christ. Thus the author says that it was unthinkable that Christ should have preserved his body incorruptible in the grave until the third day; but even greater is the miracle that Franciscus should have preserved his wounds for two years without decay, and the like. One can justly call this book the most complete nonsense of superstition, about which one cannot easily think of anything more inconsistent and annoying. It is therefore not to be wondered at that in the first period of the Reformation it was sought out and bitterly enough reproached to the Roman church. Erasmus Alber gave in 1531, with a preface by Luther, an excerpt from it

which he called "Der Barfüßer Mönche Eulenspiegel und Alkoran" (The Barefoot Monk Eulenspiegel and Alcoran); in 1556 Conrad Badius published another French excerpt of the same in Geneva with biting remarks under the title: "l'Alcoran des Cordeliers". In consequence of this, in the Roman Church itself, that offensive work has been gradually viewed with different eyes than in the beginning, where it seems to have met with great acclaim; prudent writers of the same have regarded it with displeasure and contempt; one has even taken the liberty of placing it in the Roman list of forbidden books. It is not, however, the miracles reported in it, but the clumsy form of the narrative that they reject; for those are still preached by the Roman Church on the feast of the St. Francis Wounds, which Benedict XII has already decreed.

So far Schröckh, whose sober report on the true facts of the matter I have cited here in somewhat more detail to show the difference between his account and the exuberance of a Kurtz; To the latter, in view of his spirit's absorption in Franciscus's holy splendor, this Reformation writing, which is not merely a mockery of the form of the Liber conformitatum, but of Franciscus's entire false halo, should actually appear to be a strong ungodliness; but it is not evident from his words whether he regards the Reformation writing in this sense, or also finds it beautiful as an expression of the Reformation spirit. My intention, however, was to show by these samples from Kurtz's Guide to Church History how complete ignorance of the difference between the Church of Christ and antichristianity prevails even in the most used of our recent textbooks.

Materials on Pastoral Theology,

communicated by C. F. W. W.

(Continued.)

Note 5.

The decision made in a lawful congregational meeting that a person is to be excommunicated should always be put into effect as a definitive congregational decision only after it has been confirmed in the next meeting, among other things so that no one is excluded from the fellowship of all through the fault of those just assembled, contrary to the knowledge or will of the absent members. If the latter is done, a flagrant injustice is committed against these members of the congregation, who are deprived of the opportunity to vote for or against the ban; and since, according to the word of God, the power of banishment or exclusion from the congregation is a power of the whole congregation, it is a power of the whole congregation.

(Matth. 18, 17. 1 Cor. 5, 2. 4. 13.), then a ban that is carried out by a majority with the exclusion of the minority and is not decided unanimously, even without the tacit consent of all members, is unlawful and unholy. Johanu Gerhard therefore writes: "The great banishment may only take place with the knowledge and confirmation of the whole congregation. 1 Cor. 5, 4. 2 Cor. 2, 6. The most important actions in the church must not be taken without the consent of the whole church body, and, as Pope Leo writes: "What concerns all must be done with the consent of all/ But what can be more important and what concerns the body of the church more than the cutting off of a member from the body? And if the whole congregation is to abstain from confidential intercourse with the banished person, it is absolutely necessary that the banishment be done in the assembly of the whole multitude, and with the tacit confirmation of the same." (Loc. th. de minister, eccl. § 286.) Calov remarks on the passage 1 Cor. 5, 5.: "The Abostel calls himself absent in body, but present in spirit, and the congregation assembled in the name of JESUS CHRIST at the same time with his spirit; where Grotius, without any reason, understands not all Christians, but the best, for which then to assemble, and which to regard as the best, would have been uncertain.... But the congregation does not thereby send prayers to God alone, but also passes a judicial sentence valid in heaven." (Bibl. illustrat. ad l. c.) On this, that according to God's word the ban may be executed by the preacher alone, but must be decided by the whole congregation, comp. above § 40. Note. 2.

Note 6.

F. Balduin writes about the nature of the final announcement of banishment from the pulpit: "The superintendent or pastor declares from the pulpit that this person has been admonished several times about a notorious offense (which is to be named) and still persists in it. Since this did not happen without great annoyance to the congregation and without the most obvious danger of divine wrath, it was decided in the public meeting of those who had been deputized in this matter" (that is here in the congregational meeting), "that such a person be expelled from the fellowship of the church as a rotten member, be rejected from the use of Holy Communion, from paternity, from weddings, and from all intercourse with respectable people, until he recognizes his offense and repents seriously. The congregation is therefore admonished to completely abstain from such a person as a rotten member, not to allow him to associate with anyone, but to consider him a cut-off member.... At the same time, the wretched man should be prayed for with compassion, so that God may save him.

to the knowledge of his sin, and work an earnest repentance in him, that his spirit may be saved." (Tractatus de casib. conscient. p. 1129. f.)

In the Saxon General Articles, under No. XI. the following form of banishment is found: "Dearly beloved in Christ, this (vel this) N." (here the whole name of the one to be excommunicated is to be mentioned) "has been arrested in the vice of blasphemy (vel drunkenness, vel alterius generis) for a long time, and although manifold admonitions and punishments, (both) by God's word (and secular authorities) have been tried on him (vel her): yet all this has not wanted to move him (vel her) to right Christian correction. So that a whole flock is not corrupted by a mangy sheep, and the evil and annoying example of a common Christian assembly is harmful and detrimental; so that God's wrath and punishment are also prevented: "the members of the church" (here it should read, "the assembled congregation") "have to punish this (or these) N. until his (or her) public death. until his (or her) public, demonstrable correction, from the Christian church and excluded him (or her) from the use of the Holy Communion of our dear Lord JEsu Christ as unworthy, that he (or she) also not be used in infant baptism and not be admitted to any Christian assembly (outside the preaching of God's Word). May the almighty, merciful God make known to him (or her) his (or her) sin, create right new ones in him (or her), and awaken him (or her) to the amendment of life." (His Serene Highness - Lord Augustus - Order. 1580. fol. 311. f.)

Note 7.

Balduin writes about the behavior of the members of the congregation towards a banished person: "As far as the contact of the banished person with other pious people is concerned, the prohibition of this may not extend further than (general) Christian love permits. Therefore one must refrain from intimate intercourse with those who are banned, so that it does not appear as if one despises church discipline or makes oneself partaker of other people's sins. 5, 9. 2 Thess. 3, 15; however, we are not to give up benevolence toward them, but to bear compassion for their misery, to admonish them, and (according to circumstances) to comfort them and pray for their conversion, and therefore to show ourselves eager for their blessedness in everything. Nor does the ban cancel civil intercourse, contracts, and commerce with the banished person; just as in the papacy the oath of allegiance and the obedience of children is dissolved when the authorities or the father has been banished; but because the ban only affects the criminal, but not his friends and relatives, therefore the subjects owe obedience to the authorities, the children to the parents, the wife to the husband, even when he is in the ban.

And may use their service as often as necessity requires. For the ban does not effect a separation of those whom God and nature have joined together, but only a separation from a particular church in ecclesiastical matters, until true repentance takes place." (L. c.. p. 1130. f.) In Luther's Table Talks, therefore, it is said, "I fear, on our part, that our parish rulers will be too bold, and reach into bodily things, after goods, as the pope did; if he excommunicated one, and put him under ban, and he did not turn back to it, he would say, Hey, we must forbid him also the market, etc., that he may not buy or sell. This is the devil's way of going too far." (XXII, 975.) A clear principle is laid down by Hartmann. He writes: "A double relationship can be understood here; one is a necessary one, as between spouses, parents, and others who are bound to each other and obligated to each other according to the rights of nature and by other means; the other is a non-necessary and possible one, which is not employed both out of necessity and for the sake of confidentiality, pleasure, and benefit, in order to testify to a friendly relationship. The former, which is necessary, is not annulled and forbidden by the ban.... The other not necessary and possible intercourse, where there is no such bond, is to be fled, lest the ban be fastened by defiance; so Paul forbids Rom. 16, 17. 1 Cor. 5, 11. 2 Thess. 3, 14. and John 2 Ep. v. 10. to greet." (Pastoral, ev. p. 872. f.) Concerning greetings, it goes without saying that this does not mean the greeting which may be required by the laws of politeness, but the fraternal one, expressing familiarity. As little, by the way, as civil intercourse with banished persons is wrong in itself, so, according to Hartmann, a conscientious Christian will also show caution in this and, for example, will not easily choose a banished person as his business partner.

To the question, "What has the pastor to do during the time of the existing ban?" Brochmand answers, "He will visit the banished one frequently, and urgently exhort him to earnest repentance, in order to snatch him out of the devil's jaws." (System, th. II, f. 1028. s.) This counsel, however, seems to be based more on country-church circumstances, for when it is said in 2 Thess. 3:15, "Yet hold him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother," this is probably not to be referred to the time during the ban, but before the same.

Note 8.

Finally, it should be noted that no proceedings of the congregation should be recorded more precisely than those that concern church discipline cases. The congregation should always be able to prove from its minutes the correctness of its procedure in every ban case that occurs, since without this proof other congregations are not in a position to be able or to have to respect the ban in all cases. (To be continued.)

Miscellany.

Gymnasium or Real Education? Various petitions have been received by the House of Prussian Representatives, the purpose of which is to give secondary school pupils the opportunity to study at universities as fully entitled citizens. Apart from special branches of science and exceptions, up to now no one could be enrolled as an academic citizen without a Gymnasium certificate of maturity. The petitioners therefore aim at nothing less than that the Realschulen should be placed on an equal footing with the Gymnasien in this respect. The Minister of Education, Mr. v. Mühler, who is concerned with the education law, has obtained expert opinions from all universities in Prussia, since the academic teachers need to know best whether the education provided by the secondary schools is sufficient for their tasks and whether their students can attend the academic lectures with benefit. The reports are published in an official imprint. A great deal is at stake here; for it is a question of carrying out a revolution which has been in preparation for more than a hundred years. To see this, consider the difference between grammar schools and secondary schools. The core of grammar school education is the ancient languages, Greek, Latin, and their classical literature. The core of the Realschule are things, knowledge, natural sciences, newer languages, history, mathematics, etc. The Gymnasium is intended primarily to train the mind and its powers, to form thought, language, and taste, and to give a general human education, without preparing for any particular subject. Mathematics, natural history, history, etc. are of course also taught, but have only a serving position. The Realschule has no such means of education in its subjects, not even in the newer languages, mathematics and the beginnings of Latin. Their education goes directly to the immediate needs of life, and is an education for usefulness. The grammar schools owe their reputation and flourishing to the Reformation, and have always been regarded as the planting places of the church and the state. The Realschulen are of modern origin, and for a good while have been treated as the womb-children of the spirit of the age. They now appear with the pretension of being equal before the hand. It is of more than ordinary interest to know what the universities think of them. On the average, their verdict has been negative, very decidedly negative. The opinion of the Berlin University is the most incisive and thorough. None of the four faculties of the university found the education of the secondary schools to be sufficient for academic training. The summarizing verdict of the academic senate makes the excuse that the Realschule students would make up for their lack of human Gymnasium education "by making somewhat greater progress in the natural sciences and mathematics," and produces

This is like saying that two half-ripe apples are as good to eat as one fully ripe one. The fact that the directors of the secondary schools have refused to admit former secondary school students as teachers at secondary schools, although they can pursue their education at universities without hindrance, shows how little secondary school education can replace secondary school education. The Senate and the University see a great danger in putting the Realschulen on an equal footing with the Gymnasien. Since time is directed towards the material and the immediately useful, the truly intellectual education, together with the grammar schools, would fall into decay and a new barbarism would break in, which would likewise force the universities to descend from their heights in order to sacrifice the crown of science on the altar of utility, acquisition and enjoyment. France, he said, had been making cautionary attempts in this direction since 1852, from which the educational status of the students had suffered severely. If it had been reversed again, he said, it would be very difficult for him to come to terms with it again. "The question is whether the Prussian state should give up the previous basis of its intellectual superiority, in order perhaps to make good an administrative blunder of some municipal communes (the petitioners)." In the same way, several universities are taking up grammar school education seriously, above all Bonn. Remarkable is what the medical faculty of Halle gives to consider. It would regret it if swarms of secondary school students were to flow towards it and the grammar schools were to be depopulated. The current decline in Gymnasium education alone suggests how much has been lost with the decline. "Not only the oldest of our faculty, who know 40 to 50 years of cultural history from their own experiences, but even the much younger among us cannot help noticing that with the increasing decline of classical studies at the Gymnasiums, a certain intellectual immaturity is appearing in the younger student world. It is striking how little the students of the present time have mastered their mother tongue, and how often what they write in the German language makes a schoolboy impression stylistically and logically." In other words, the very immaturity of which the Realschule students are generally accused. However, the neo-Barbarian heresy, let it not be overlooked, has also made not to be despised, even threatening conquests among professors on the heights of science. Already the Frenchman Fontenelle said one and a half hundred years ago, if only the sweat-soaked study of the ancients and their language could educate the mind, where then did the ancients themselves, the exemplary ones, get their education? Could we not begin just as well with ourselves, and come just as far? This is the keynote of several faculty opinions. They consider the time and effort spent on the ancients to be a waste of time, since natural sciences, newer languages, and mathematics not only confer the same intellectual formation, but also require a sum-

They want to put up with grammar school education only if more mathematics and natural sciences are taught. They only want to put up with grammar school education if more mathematics and natural sciences are taught, i.e. if the chair of the grammar schools is moved. How much the spirit of the times has penetrated is shown by the remark of the philosophical faculty at Kiel that it would be salutary if the Realschulen could compete for the prize as equals with the Gymnasien; then the latter would be compelled to improve their curriculum. This freedom of trade, however, the faculty does not seem to see, would undoubtedly bring down the grammar schools completely, the fruits of which are neither so palpable nor so easy to pluck. Only One Faculty, in all the Universities without exception, has refused to admit real students. That is the theological faculty. It could stand so little in doubt that it sometimes only opposed the modern demand with an arid "no" on the grounds that the theologian needs Hebrew, Greek and Latin for his preliminary education. Here, too, the Berlin theological faculty goes deeper, showing that not only would theological studies sink, but also that the university would be transformed into a kind of polytechnic school, which would inevitably have a corrupting effect on the entire state of science and drag theological studies down with it. What gives support to classical education should be its inner value, the experience that this means of education cannot be replaced in any other way. However, material usefulness will call this into question as long as the intellectual successes of this education are not brought strikingly and materially before its eyes, which is actually only possible when a whole generation has completed its studies without it. On the way to this we are taking strong steps. Gymnasium education has had to slacken a great deal in its demands. What has held back the more rapid decline is partly that our present education is branched out with history and antiquity, and cannot do without the old languages, but still more that the church is indissolubly interwoven with antiquity. The church cannot do without the old languages and the knowledge of antiquity, since not only its sacred documents come from antiquity and are written in Greek and Hebrew, but also the language of the church, or at least the theological language, has been Latin until recent times.

(Dr. Münkel's N. Zeitbl.)

Union in Osnabrück. Recently a pamphlet was published which set itself the task of proving that Osnabrück is by no means purely Lutheran, but has been afflicted with the Union since the old days. The intention was to open a wide door for the Union to enter Hanover. The proof, however, was very miserable. It was precisely the pamphlet that, through the data it contained, put the historical Lutheran character of that city beyond all doubt. This can be seen from the following excerpt,

which Dr. Münkel reports in his Neue Zeitblatt of July 15. It is as follows: The magistrate of the city of Osnabrück wrote in 1844 to the theological faculty at Göttigen literally as follows: "The preachers' order of the city of Osnabrück of 1688, which must be signed by all new preachers, contains among other things the following obligation for the preachers: First, to lead pure and healthy doctrine in their parish churches, according to the corpore doctrinae of the old unchanged Augsburg Confession, as presented to the Roman Imperial Majesty Charles V. at the Imperial Diet at Augsburg in 1530. at the Imperial Diet in Augsburg in 1530, to which we and our congregations confess ourselves, in the sense in which it was established in the Apology that followed, and likewise in the Concordia Formula of 1536, as well as in the Schmalkaldic Articles and in Luther's Large and Small Catechism, then also in the Concordia Book, or Christian repeated unanimous confession of the secular electors and cities." This is the whole sum of the Lutheran confessions, including the Concordia Book, which is hostile to the Union, only increased by the Wittenberg Concordia Formula, which was agreed upon between Luther and Bucer in 1536, and is so well Lutheran that the Reformed Swiss did not want to know anything about it. Now, however, follows an addendum to the above obligation, which reads: "Should one or another of our preachers complain about accepting, keeping, and subscribing to such articles, he shall declare himself well rounded, and in such a case be released from his ministry with good will. If one or another of our preachers should promise to accept and keep these articles, and yet forget them and act against them, he shall immediately be deprived of his ministry. The Magistrate adds that the city, which has its own Consistory according to the contents of the constitutional charter of October 31, 1814, shall proceed according to this preaching order." The theological faculty at Göttingen, in view of such a resounding and undoubted fact, cannot fail to confess in its report: "Accordingly, the stricter Lutheran confession is still valid in the Lutheran Church of the city of Osnabrück at the present time, as it has also been expressed, among other things, in the dispute with and in opposition to the Reformed Church in the Bergische Concordienformel of 1580. Does anyone know how to express more clearly that Osnabrück is strictly Lutheran and rejects union with the Reformed? - Lutherans, like the Iowans, with their known position on the Lutheran symbols, may at any rate congratulate themselves on not being in union with the Lutheran Osnabruck ministry, for in such a case every Iowan "would be hereby dispensed of his ministry with good will," nay, "would soon have abjured his ministry. " W.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Antichrist. The "Katholische Kirchenzeitung" of September 8, after declaring 2 Thess. 2 to be a prophecy of the Antichrist, continues: "Apparently the prelude to this was in the French Revolution at the end of the last century, where a harlot was placed in the temple at Paris and publicly worshipped as the goddess of liberty. And might not perhaps in Rome, which to all human appearance now stands defenseless, the man of sin really first appear? Only, of course, the man whom the devil has chosen as his incarnation to terrorize the Christian world for a time does not yet seem to exist. Garibaldi, Mazzini, and all the other revolters and antichrists are far too worn out and worn down. The Antichrist must be a universal genius and a world conqueror who will gather all antichristian spirits among philosophers, theologians, physicians, naturalists, chemists, jurists, statesmen, builders, artists, journalists, military men, merchants, money-grabbers, etc., etc., to his black and red banner and, after forcibly abolishing Catholic worship and destroying all churches, will for a few years establish a horrible rule in the world. - This much is certain, at the end of time, when the apostasy from the Christian faith will be a general one, then a high and extraordinarily gifted personality will appear in some country and gather around him all the anti-Christian elements, in order, where possible, to exterminate the Church of Christ from the face of the earth. -Luther once said that he had married a nun in spite of the old legend that the Antichrist would one day be begotten by a monk and a nun. - Of the Antichrist, however, St. Paul writes further in the same letter to the Romans. Paul writes of the Antichrist in the same letter to the Thessalonians, that his coming will take place according to the influence of Satan with all kinds of power, signs and false miracles, with seduction to wickedness for those who are lost because they have not accepted the love of the truth in order to become blessed. - And then the Lord Jesus will kill that wicked one (the Antichrist) with the breath of His mouth, and bring him to nothing with the brightness of His coming (2 Thessalonians 2:8-11)." This is Roman Iowa antichristosophy.

Antichrist. The "American Lutheran" of Sept. 3 makes fun of Dr. Siess because he has tried to prove in his "Prophetic Times" that Napoleon III. is the prophesied Antichrist, will soon establish the Antichristian empire and raise himself to the absolute monarch of the whole world. The former consoles Dr. Siess by saying that it is not he, but the Prussians, who are to blame for the fact that nothing seems to come of his (Dr. Siess') prophecy. W.

The Aug. 11 LUTHERAN AND MISSIONARY contains a submission, in which a "German pastor" complains that the German pastors have so far done far too little to bring students to the seminary in Philadelphia. The sender remarks: "We do not expect much from the establishment of an exclusively German seminary, except that it would soon follow Missouri and make a man's blessedness dependent on his position in the four (or, including usury, five) points. There are, however, some, indeed, a great number of brethren who, in great humility and longing, demand a certificate of orthodoxy from the headquarters at St. Louis, but there are also many, even among us German pastors, who do not want to surrender their consciences and honest convictions to the mere "human feet" of Missouri. But German exclusiveness drags there, and therefore we regard it as an enemy of the Lutheran Church. As far as our personal-

Insulanus' is right." - We can only thank this "German pastor" for the compliment he pays us Missourians in the foregoing, in that he ascribes to us such a genuinely German character that the establishment of a purely German seminary would inevitably draw the German pastors into the waters of Missouri. It is based on a misunderstanding, when the "German Pastor" insinuates that blessedness depends on these four points. We have never and nowhere asserted this, but have only made the Lutheran character of a church dependent upon it. As for the so-called fifth point, which concerns the doctrine of usury, we have never and nowhere equated it with the four points. To be sure, we do not regard Luther's doctrine of usury, as the Iowans, as notorious falsifiers of history, say, as a medieval, but as a Scriptural doctrine, which, as is well known, all Christendom, without exception, held until Luther; but we have never believed, nor taught, that the right doctrine of usury belonged to the articles of the Christian faith." It is true that Luther's doctrine of usury can only be compared to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and the like. But it is and remains only a piece of teaching belonging to the interpretation of the seventh commandment. It may be that many would rather accept any speculative doctrine, even an entirely new one, than this purely practical doctrine, which so deeply intervenes in life, yes, in the pouch; nevertheless, misrecognition of this doctrine does not deprive a church of its Lutheran character, as long as the organic principle of all doctrine, the holy Scriptures, remains untouched. The same is true of chiliasm, for example, which in any case deprives a church of its Lutheran character. W.

"Evangelical." In a necrology of the because, unirt Professor A. Irion, the "Messenger of Peace" of the Protestant Synod of the West, Sept. 15, says of the aforementioned: "His direction was a thoroughly evangelical one, equally distant from everything confessional, as from everything modern Protestant." Must have been a strange "thoroughly evangelical direction" which was "equally distant from everything confessional" as from everything rationalistic. The judgment seems even more strange, since the gentlemen "Protestants" in the West usually take it very badly when one denies that they have a confession. The people are just practical: depending on the circumstances they are confessional, depending on the circumstances the opposite. W.

The "theologische Monatshefte", edited by Pastor Brobst, became more and more an organ of the Romanizing Lutherans. In the June issue there is again an article with the heading: "The Doctrine of the Holy Office of Preaching", in which it says, among other things: "According to this, the church government with the office of the keys is not given, neither to the authorities, nor to the congregations, does not rest in the first place in the congregations, so that the local congregation is to be the judge. But this ecclesiastical power is all given and commanded to the bishops by divine right in the Gospel.... The command of Christ to bind or banish him who has been revealed as impenitent, because he has not heard the admonition of the congregation, he has given to His ministry alone. .. Accordingly, therefore, the whole church or congregation of Christ, not every local congregation, has the supreme and final judgment, in its representation by concilia and synods." Finally, the essay itself gives, among other things, the following as summarium: "The church regiment is given to the ministry alone, or to those in the holy preaching office, and is to be exercised and driven by them alone, continuously, with preaching, sacrament, and office of the keys or jurisdiction, and that according to divine right and command.... The ecclesiastical courts, on the other hand, are assembled from all three estates in the church from time to time in concilia and synods. They may also, according to human order, as consistories or ecclesiastical colleges, etc., in the interim, be the supreme court of the

Conciliar and Synodal Representations." - It is certain, indeed, that such essays seduce no one; they are too confusive for that; but this much at least is evident from the wording, they wish to assert the Romanistic error: but such essays do not belong in an Evangelical Lutheran journal. W.

Convention of an Association against Secret Societies. "As a consequence," we read in the 'Lutheran Standard' of September 15, "of the an

D. P. Rathburn, steps have been taken to call a State Convention of the State of New York for the purpose of forming a State Association against secret societies as an auxiliary to the National Association which has come into existence against those societies. " C.

St. Paul's College at Springfield, Ill. The Lutheran Standard of September 15 reports: "The college, which was erected years ago for the General Synod at Springfield, III. but proved a miscarriage under the former management, has passed into the hands of the Pennsylvania Synod and was reopened on the 5th of this month under the name of St. Paul's College. Special diligence is to be given to the instruction in German, and to the study of the Scriptures and Catechism. " C.

Laudable resolution of the Synod of Virginias. The Lutheran Standard

At the meeting of the Synod of Virginia held last month, the following resolution was passed, which is a new proof of the desire generally felt in our church for a strictly Lutheran literature in the English language: 'The want of a general circulation of a more extended ecclesiastical literature is more and more painfully felt throughout our Church of the South. In order to remedy this state of affairs, be it resolved that we, as a Synod, with such other Synods as wish to cooperate with us, which cooperation we earnestly desire, form an organization under the name of: Translation and Publication Society, the purpose of which shall be to promote the

rich treasures of our literature, which are now closed to most of us because of ignorance of the German language, into the hands of our preachers and laymen in English translation. The same is incumbent upon: 1. the election of a President, a Secretary, and a Treasurer, who shall attend to the ordinary business of such officers. 2. the appointment of a Publication Committee, which shall have the duty of selecting and having translated books suitable for circulation. 3. the appointment of a Business Committee, whose duty it shall be to administer the funds of the Society, and to contract with any reputable bookseller for the publication of all such books as may be placed in their hands for this purpose. 4. to open subscriptions of not less than $1 for the purpose of establishing a fund for immediate operation, which shall be paid into the treasurer as soon as $1000 shall have been subscribed. These subscriptions to be redeemed by the Society with its first publications, at the store price/ " C.

Report from Austria of frequent conversions 'to Judaism. Thus we read in the same issue of The Lutheran Standard: "A communication from Vienna reports that since the publication of the laws for religious freedom in Austria, a movement has arisen among the population of that city which, to say the least, is of a peculiar nature. In the course of less than 2 years, 680 persons of both sexes have renounced Christianity and adopted the Jewish faith. And these conversions are still on the increase. " C.

The Lutherans in the Baltic Provinces are to be granted toleration. The "Lutheran Standard" of 15 September also reports on this: "At the

At the urgent request of Mr. de Pressense, the excellent French evangelical preacher, the Zaar of Russia has promised that the Protestants in the Baltic provinces, who have been forced to renounce their faith and join the Greek Church, shall have full liberty to return to their faith." God grant that this may be confirmed, and that it may be actually carried out. - C.

II. Abroad.

Paris. How pernicious the present war threatens to become for the cause of the Lutheran Church in Paris and all of France is already expressed in the August number of the "Schifflein Christi," the organ of the German Lutherans in France. Under the heading: "The German Mission in Paris" we read the following: "We sincerely and urgently ask our friends, in the present urgent need which has come upon the church work among the Germans in Paris as a result of the war, not to completely forget ours. All the existing churches and schools and other institutions here are maintained from one month to the next by the gifts of Christian charity which the love of the brethren in faith offers. Thus not only the prosperous further development of this cause of the Kingdom of God, but its very existence is called into question as soon as the gifts from Germany flow more sparsely or dry up altogether. We are well aware that charity will be called upon even more than usual as a result of the coming war, and that aid for the wounded, etc., is more important than anything else for the regions that will be the scene of the battle, but the same is true here: Do the one and do not leave the other. We therefore urge the friends of our work not to let a work of peace, which has been unfolding for decades in the blessing of the Lord, fail because of the din of war, on which many a drop of sweat of sour work has stuck, which the prayers and gifts of love of many thousands have carried so far. Our fears in this respect are only too well founded. Already in the last few months not so much has come in as is absolutely necessary to cover current expenses, so that debts have already had to be incurred for this purpose. Therefore, we stand with trepidation at the threshold of the next months; and if we did not know that it is God's work that we are doing, the God who directs the hearts of men like streams of water, to whom both silver and gold belong, - if we did not look up to the mountains from which help comes to us in firm faith in his helping hand, - then our arms could sink powerlessly and our humanly weak heart could despair. - A standstill or cessation of our work would be all the more saddening at the present moment, since in the last year our ever-expanding activity has sprouted two new shoots, namely in Havre and in St. Etienne. In the former city, a German community existed until the year 1848, which, however, succumbed to the revolutionary year with its various shocks. However, the resumption of the work there was a duty on the conscience of the committee, since our fellow believers in Havre were spiritually orphaned. So last year an unsought opportunity was seized to restart the work. Under God's blessing everything prospered as desired. Soon a small number of eager and eager souls had gathered around the preaching of the divine word. The schools already number more than 80 children. A benefactor also advanced us the funds necessary for the construction of a school building under very favorable conditions, which we would accept with the greatest gratitude, since despite several changes and extraordinarily high rents, each time the school board found the building insufficient and threatened to close the school. The new school is now in the process of being built, but the continuation of the whole thing is seriously threatened by the outbreak of the war. - In

In St. Etienne, where 3,000 Germans live, the committee, together with Pastor Meyer of Lyon, has also started schools and preaching, which at the same time is the **first** step towards establishing the long-desired traveling preacher post in the south. - In the remaining, old parishes of Billette, Batignolles, St. Marcel, Redemption, Vaugirard, everything goes on as usual. Only several changes in personnel are to be noted. Pastors Mast, Müller and Berg have left our midst. The former is working in Havre, Pastor Müller has accepted a position in Moringen near Göttingen (Hanover), and Pastor Berg in Ulm (Würtemberg). In all three we have lost much after years of blessed work; however, the former is still in the service of our mission through his work in Havre. Their positions have since been filled again by Messrs. Frisius from Tofsens (Oldenburg), Herzog from Stuttgart, Schäfer from Friedberg (Hesse). - This, in a few words, is the present situation of our German mission. May the merciful God encourage the heart and mind of all those who have already been our co-workers through prayer and gifts to continue the work quite zealously and give us new ones to add to the old."

Alsace. We read the following in the August number of the "Schifflein Christi": "Pastor Kühn from Paris, the excellent French defender of Lutheranism, has published an excellent article in the Temoignage (number 28), in view of the movement brought about by the question of parish elections, which has caused a great stir, and has found as much admiration as censure and contradiction. In our whole organization,' he says at the end, 'from the congregation to the upper consistory, not a single thing is in its true place; and if one attempts to improve anything in this great machine, one soon becomes aware of a basic defect which stands in the way of any serious improvement. This basic damage, we declare aloud, is the unfaithfulness to the confession of the church.... Truly, I know not what can be gained by an outward agitation, which takes the place of the inward, spiritual agitation, which we are always to effect. The most we can do is to organize the disorder. What pains us most in all this is that, with the exception of the tirelessly struggling group of confessional Lutherans in Alsace, we are the only ones who make the elementary basic demands indispensable to church life. O Alsatian brethren, *) You could have had a beneficial influence on the development of our Church in these difficult times! And now you have to let it be done, and can, with all the respect you enjoy, with all the excellent men you count among you, still do nothing but look on impotently at the victory of liberalism and lament over a misery whose greatness you recognize just as well as we do. Where does this come from? Let me tell you, and bear with my complaint even if it should seem unjust to you! What I reproach you with - and God knows, I do it with a humbled heart - is that you have become unfaithful to the spirit of the Lutheran Church. Alsace, which by its favorable position between France and Germany should be our light, our spiritual mother, has allowed itself to be driven out of its natural position. The faithful there, who should be our teachers, humbly repeat the meager lessons of our fashionable theology, a theology consisting of rhetoric and sentimental rapture. There is the sore spot. The people, too, are moving away from an orthodoxy which has only shadows and mists to offer; and the higher society, which disgusts a manly Christianity, has surrendered with all its soul to a tepid, worldly pietism, which delights in superficial tawdriness, and is only opposed to the Lutheran

*) Addressed to the Alsatian Pietists, Unionists and mediation theologians. Red.

Church is enraged. O brethren, you who lament over your impotence, and who in the depths of your hearts have still preserved a spark of love for your Church so despised, resist with us that dangerous current and become again what you should always have remained: the most beautiful flower of the Lutheran Church in France! Then you will again become a blessing to all, and the future is yours.'"

Germany. On August 1 of this year, a Lutheran preacher in western Germany wrote to us: "When the great war, at the beginning of which we are now standing, will have been fought out and Prussia will have won, I foresee only in such a favorable case that, under the natural dizziness, 'German unity' will become even greater and firmer, and then the time of the German national church under the aegis of the Hohenzollern house will break in mightily as a dwelling of all false-believing spirits. Our after-Lutherans will already know how to build bridges as good pioneers, and the Lutheran Church will then be at an end. Oh, if I could only salva conscientia away from this misery, I would soon be over there." On July 21, a Prussian Lutheran pastor wrote us the following, among other things: "I may assure you that since that time I have taken even greater pleasure in 'Lehre und Wehre,' in which I have found complete comrades-in-arms in several Dresden friends, bookseller H. Naumann and Mr. Gnauck. I tell you without any exaggeration that in this journal of yours I find exactly what I have been looking for in vain here and there, the clear sound of the trumpet, not only in regard to a single point of contention, but for the entire struggle of our church. With regard to the struggle against the Union, praise be to God, such excellent things have been done by my Prussian brethren that I desire nothing beyond that. But from my studies on, I have looked in vain for the correct evaluation of the whole of recent theology; indeed, I have longed to hear such voices and to find such signposts as I found in your journal, among others in the excellent essay: 'Antitheses on: What is Theology?' in the June 1869 issue; of this essay in particular, every word has spoken to me from the soul. Although I am convinced that most of my Prussian brethren agree with it on the main points, we still lack a journal of this kind, in which the whole field of present theological literature is set before the eyes of those who do not have much time for more detailed study, in a practical way, with the proper salt of the divine Word. For this I am heartily grateful to you; and not less for the beautiful information taken from the works of the Reformation fathers; for unfortunately these treasure houses have remained all too unknown to us, like a locked and buried treasure; and I must confess, to my shame, that I still know practically nothing of the vast majority of them; Apart from some excellent writings of Luther, which I have read over and over again, the Harmonia Evangeliorum of Chemnitz, and the excellent Examen Concilii Tridentini, which I have been studying for a year with true joy of soul, I know the excellent works of the Reformation mostly only by name. I must now confess that the connection with you is very valuable to me."

Landeskirchenthum. From northern Germany we receive a letter dated August 25: "You also know how things stand in the German regional churches. All Prussian garrison churches are unchurched, including the Hanoverian and Holstein ones. The Hanoverian field preachers are now obliged during the war to give communion to every unirt. The Mecklenburg soldiers are sent to Prussian garrisons, and there are numerous Prussian officers and officials in Mecklenburg. Kliefoth instructed his pastors: 'When Prussians come to you, you ask them what they are. If they say: we are reformed, you instruct them to go to Bützow (there is a reformed church there).

If they say: we are unchurched, answer: we are not; if they say: we are Lutheran, do you let them take the sacrament? Now this is by no means an ecclesiastical decree - God forbid, one is too Lutheran for that - but it is simply a factual condition, which is in some way occasionally exploited as a mousetrap. So far it is certainly with the German regional churches that one can say: whoever is in, may see how he gets through and for how long with a good conscience; whoever is out, better stay out. You have scarcely any idea of the Babylonian confusion which prevails everywhere, and of its constant increase. Alongside it then goes growing bitterness; it is a veritable bellum omnium contra omnes. I recently visited my old university friends in Saxony. They let Luthardt sing them sweet-sounding lullabies. The Erlangeners are rid of the general conference, but they have their Hosmann Science or the Neudettelsau Deaconissenthum. More numerous separations are not to be expected in Germany."

From the history of the General Lutheran Conference in Leipzig. The Neue Mecklenburgische Kirchenblatt of August 1 reported that Metropolitan Vilmar of Measurements had said, among other things: "We need a person for ourselves, and this person God has given us, on this person our church rests;" Harleß therefore considered it necessary to rectify this "misleading designation of a person (Luther?) as the cornerstone of the church;" certainly with good reason. Hereupon Prof. Kahnis, who had become an Arian, had pronounced, among other things, the following: "All roads lead to unity; let us therefore be a united people of brethren." We read nothing of a protest against this at this Lutheran conference; of course, where a Kahnis is granted membership, one must naturally believe that all roads lead to unity. The reporter in the Mecklenburgische Kirchenblatt further remarks: "Professor Luthardt's lecture does not contain much that is new for the regular reader of the general Lutheran church newspaper, if one does not want to call it new that Professor Luthardt presented himself as a representative of pure doctrine, although in his dogmatics (compare also his writings on free will and on the last things) he breaks off the points of the main points of church doctrine. He certainly urges us to be patient, but why should we be so intolerant of the Union when we allow no small dissonance in our own house? The wrong notes disturb every melody, and hinder a harmonious standing together against the common enemy." Would that the gentlemen of the "Lutheran" and the "Observer" would pay attention to these remarks of a German who has nothing in common with us Missourians. These gentlemen have again and again scoffed at the fact that we Missourians, on the occasion of an appraisal of the composition of the Leipzig Conference itself, have refused to allow a Luthardt to be considered a faithful Lutheran. They see this as a sign that Missouri's exclusivist fanaticism has reached its boiling point. The reported judgment, which is completely consistent with Missouri's, should convince the gentlemen of the "Lutheran" and the "Observer" that our judgment cannot be eliminated as easily as they think, as a peculiarly Missouri judgment. It is sad indeed, if a Luthardt is already regarded as the non plus ultra of an orthodox Lutheran, and the denial of it as absurd fanaticism. One is accustomed to this from an "Observer," but how can one explain that even a "Lutheran" speaks in such a way? - The reporter in the Mecklenburger Blatt further reports: "Professor Hölemann wished (in the special conference, in which the Lutheran God's Box was discussed) that especially the Lutherans threatened by the Union be considered; he mentioned by name the Seminary of Pastor Brunn in Steeden (Nassau). When thereupon Pastor Karsten (from Reinshagen) declared that the

When the Mecklenburg caste of God had taken issue with Brunn on account of his ecclesiastical position, it was emphasized from various quarters that support of the Steeden Seminary did not imply approval of Brunn's "principle" (in any case, Brunn's position on the corrupt Lutheran state churches is mainly meant here) "; America was the land of the future, also of the future of the Lutheran Church, and therefore we had to take special care of our brethren, of our flesh and blood." **W.**

Wonderful and sad conditions in Mecklenburg. The following is written by Pastor S. in the N. Mecklenb. Kirchenblatt of July 18: "In No. 12 of this paper, Brother B. states that the main argument for communion of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches seems to be the Canon: For the worthy enjoyment of the Sacrament no more and no less is required than repentance and faith on the part of the communicant'; and further on he concludes from this that an inevitable consequence of this premise is also the admission of Roman to the Lutheran altar. Thus Brother B. seems to take it for granted that hitherto all those had to be rejected from the Lord's Supper who professed the Catholic doctrine of the real transformation of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. This, however, seems to me to have gone too far. I have many parishioners whom I am convinced pay homage to that Catholic view, since to them the Lutheran words: "in, with, and under" remain difficult for them to understand; are all of these to be rejected from the Lord's Supper because they are too attached to the letter (?), when they otherwise bring with them all the conditions for the worthy enjoyment of the Sacrament? I would like to see the question further discussed on this side also, since the number of those who pay homage to the Catholic view, with the exclusion of the doctrine of the drawing of the chalice, (?) is greater than one might think." - It almost seems incredible what is here reported; but do really "many" of the scribe's parishioners believe Roman of the Holy Supper, why then does not the same teach them better? It may almost be looked as if the Lord Pastor himself were not tactful, otherwise how could he say that those who believe transubstantiation are "too attached to the letter"? Does Christ then say, "The bread is my body"? Then, of course, the letter would speak for a transubstantiation that had taken place. But Christ only says, giving the bread, "This is my body," that is, what I give with, in, and under the bread. This "with, in, and under" is now to "remain difficult to understand" for the "church members" in Mecklenburg! Strange! Should it really be difficult to understand, even to the most simple-minded, if I hand him a stone bottle with the words, "This is wine," what I want to say with it? Should not even the most simple-minded person immediately get the idea that I am handing him wine with the bottle, that there must be wine in the bottle, that there will be wine here under the shape of the bottle? Or will he think, when I hand him the bottle, that I want to make him believe that the bottle has been turned into wine? There is no doubt that if members of a Lutheran congregation pay homage to the "Catholic view," it must be due to their preacher, who either is not clear himself, or does not instruct his congregation members clearly. W.

Bavaria and the New Dogma. In a Royal Bavarian Ministerial Letter of August 9, it is announced that the publication of the decisions of the Vatican Council in the newspapers is against the constitution of the country, according to which the approval of His Majesty the King is reserved for the promulgation and execution of such decisions, and that decisions of the Council are subject to the Placetum regium. The ministerial letter concludes: "Accordingly, the most reverend lords archbishops and bishops must be reminded again that the

Proclamation and execution of the so far issued decisions of the Council and also the simple printing of the same in the Oberhirtliche Verordnungsblätter as the official organs of the ecclesiastical authorities may not take place without prior fulfilment of the prerequisites therefore demanded by the state constitution". - It has also, as the "Augsb. Abdztg.", the Ministry of Culture had eleven questions submitted to the theological faculties in Munich and Würzburg, "concerning the influence of papal infallibility on the behavior between church and state, with special consideration of the Bavarian constitution", for "prompt answer". According to the "Abdztg.", the continuation of the Bavarian Concordat will undoubtedly depend on the results of these expert opinions.

A Protest against the Conciliar and the Infallibility. The following protest circulated among the Catholic professors of the University of Munich, and of the 54 Catholic professors no less than 44 signed this declaration: "In consideration of the obvious facts: that the bishops summoned to the so-called Vatican Council of 1869-1870 were kept in the dark about the main subjects of the future deliberations and thus the necessary preparation was made impossible; that - apart from the composition of the assembly, which was subject to considerable misgivings - any real and completely free debate in the sessions was prevented by the octroyed rules of procedure; that many members of the Council were in unconditional dependence on Roman propaganda, and that, moreover, both the Pope and his authorities in Rome exerted a sensitive moral and physical pressure on the bishops; finally, that - which is our main complaint - precisely the most important decisions were not taken with the moral unanimity absolutely necessary for the definition of a dogma, the undersigned consider themselves bound in conscience to declare frankly, that they are unable to recognize the Vatican Assembly as a free ecumenical council and cannot attach any validity to its resolutions, and in particular that they reject the proposition of the personal infallibility of the Pope as a new doctrine not founded in Holy Scripture and openly contradictory both to the tradition of ecclesiastical antiquity and to Church history. Munich, end of July 1870."

State interference in church matters. Thus a Catholic church newspaper writes: "The delusion of certain Nassau newspapers and individual liberal Catholics that they could gradually exert the desired influence on the institutions of the Catholic Church by refusing to pay church taxes was only of short duration. For on June 22, the Minister of Culture, v. Mühler, in accordance with the procedure existing in the other provinces of the Monarchy, ordered that in the future the budgets of the municipalities which must levy church taxes be submitted to the Land Councils, and after they have checked their correctness, the taxes be collected from the defaulters by executive order."

Saxony. A local political newspaper reports from Germany: "The Corpus Christi procession in the Catholic Court Church in Dresden has given the national press cause for energetic complaint, since not only Protestant military was again commanded to this ceremony, but Protestant officers also had to carry the canopy over the priest.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 16. November 1870. No. 11.

Theological concern about a marriage case.

The teachers' college of the Lutheran seminary at St. Louis has been requested to raise a concern and to inform the readers of this magazine for their benefit and piety about the following marriage case.

A man who does not yet belong to a Lutheran congregation reports to such a congregation for Holy Communion. During the usual exploration, it turns out that he is living here in marriage with a person, while his former wife is still in Germany, but is suffering from temporary insanity. After she had suffered from it for seven years, the doctors declared her incurable, as a result of which the local preacher advised the man to divorce his wife for the sake of the children's education and to marry elsewhere. The civil authorities now carried out the requested divorce without further ado, granting permission for a second marriage. The preacher of the place then copulated the divorced man with the person with whom he currently lives. A number of children have already sprung from this union. The children from the first marriage are also with the father. Two questions now arise: 1. How is the man's present union with the person he married after his divorce from his wife to be judged according to God's Word? and 2. What is to be demanded of him so that he can have a good conscience before God and man in this regard as well, and be admitted to absolution, communion and church membership?

I. According to God's clear words, only he can divorce his spouse without sin whose spouse has first broken the marriage, whether this be by fornication or by the spouse's maliciously, that is,

has left his wife with the intention of breaking the marriage bond forever and cannot be persuaded to return to marital fidelity. The Lord speaks clearly and plainly: "It is also said, 'Whoever divorces his wife shall give her a bill of divorcement. But I say unto you: Whosoever shall put away his wife (except it be for adultery), let her commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry a woman that is put away, let her commit adultery." (Matt. 5:31, 32.) Further we read, "Then said they: Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorcement, and to divorce her? He said to them: Moses permitted you to divorce your wives because of the hardness of your hearts; but from the beginning it was not so. But I say unto you: Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery. And whosoever shall put away her that is put away, committeth adultery." (Matth. 19, 7-9. cf. Mark. 10, 2-12. Luk. 16, 18. Rom. 7, 2. 3.) Finally the holy apostle writes: "But I do not command the married, but the Lord, that the woman should not separate from the man. But if the unbeliever divorces, let him divorce. There is no brother or sister caught in such cases n." (1 Cor. 7:10, 15.)

Two things are irrefutable according to these divine testimonies: First, that it is absolutely not lawful according to God's will to divorce one's spouse unless the latter has already dissolved the marriage, whether by fornication or by malicious desertion; and secondly, that it is not only contrary to God's commandment, but the sin of adultery, if he who has divorced himself for other reasons "marries another," far from the union of one so divorced being a marriage, of which God says: "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." (Matt. 19:6.) For Christ saith not, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another," sinneth; but, "He committeth adultery:" neither doth Paul write of the woman, "Wherefore, if she be with another man, because the man liveth," she is called a sinner; but, "she is called an adulteress." (Rom. 7:3.) And when Christ adds: "Whosoever shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery," it follows irrefutably from this, that the spouse of him who has divorced himself without the conditions laid down by God Himself, is still his spouse before God, and remains so, The adultery committed by the contrary divorce is therefore continued by the new alleged marriage, which involves the sin of polygamy, in which only the first spouse is and remains the real spouse.

It is true that there has been much dispute about whether there are not other grounds for lawful divorce that do not violate the conscience, the raging and blustering of the spouse up to danger to life, expulsion from the country, or free marriage.

willing flight after crime committed, disgusting, incurable, contagious diseases, as syphilis, leprosy, etc., impotence occurring, insanity; alone the exclusive particles of which Christ makes use: παρεχτός (be it

(For), εί *μη* (except) Matth. 5, 32. 19, 9. put an end to all these disputations. According to this decision of the Most High, no man, neither state nor church, in short, no creature in heaven and on earth can do anything to or from it.

Our Church, therefore, has always held to the exclusiveness of the conditions of legitimate divorce stated in God's Word, and has therefore declared all the above and similar causes to be void in the forum of conscience.

As far as the life-threatening raging of a husband is concerned, the following decision of the Wittenberg Consistory can be found in the Dedekennus: "The case of B. B., who in the village of G. took a widow in marriage, whom he so battered with beatings and evil tractings in a standing marriage that she was weakened in body and mind, and who, for her sake and especially for the sake of the divorce, desires to be reported, we, the decreed doctors of the Churf, Sachs. Consistorii of Wittenberg, that since no improvement is to be expected in the man, it is by no means advisable for women to continue to stand in such danger to body and health; therefore, since they both desire divorce, you may separate them from each other at table and in bed, but that neither may dare to marry the other while the other is alive. 1 Cor. 7, 10. 11." (Thesaur. cousil. Vol. III. 446.)

Concerning expulsion and flight, Gerhard writes: "We say, since there are only two causes of divorce, adultery and malicious desertion, that therefore a woman cannot marry another man on account of the flight or deportation of her husband as a result of a crime committed by him, unless it is evident that the man who has become a fugitive has become involved with other women's persons or has entirely abandoned the marital disposition. For no human authority is permitted to add other causes to those which are expressly mentioned by Christ and St. Paul, for the sake of the exclusive mode of speaking so emphatically used by the Saviour." (Loc. de conjug. § 691.) Luther here appeals to the example of Cain's wife. He writes: "Therefore the woman had to follow Cain out of necessity; for because man and woman are one body, they did not want to separate Adam from each other, and the woman also had to bear a part of the man's curse and punishment." (I, 577. Cf. X, 954.)

Concerning contagious diseases, Luther wrote: "How then, if a man have a sick spouse, which is of no use to him for conjugal duty, may he not take another? But serve God in the sick person, and wait for him; think that God will serve you in the sick person.

He hath sent sanctuary into thine house, that thou mayest gain heaven. Blessed and blessed art thou, if thou knowest such a gift and grace, and thus serve thy spouse for God's sake. But if thou sayest, Yea, I cannot keep myself, thou shalt deny it. If thou wilt serve thy sick husband in earnest, and know that God hath sent thee, and give thanks unto him, let him take care of thee: surely he will give thee grace, that thou mayest not bear more than thou canst. He is far too faithful to deprive thee of thy spouse thus with sickness, and not also to take against it the will of the flesh, when thou otherwise faithfully ministerest unto thy sick." (X, 726. f.) Brentius writes: "Leprosy is a serious displeasure to a spouse, and since leprosy is separated from the attendance of men, one might think that leprosy would be a civil death, and that therefore the healthy spouse would be done away with by the leper; but since not the divine word... But since it is not the divine word that divorces marriage on account of leprosy, it is not fitting for any man to recognize a divorce on account of leprosy, for our Lord Christ permits freedom to divorce not on account of sickness, not on account of unwillingness, not on account of leprosy, but on account of adultery; and all Christians should leave it at that, and give themselves captive to the word of Christ." (Dedekennus, Vol. III, lib. 1, fol. 629.) Even betrothals, therefore, our orthodox fathers do not allow to be broken up for the sake of such causes, much less consummated marriages. Dedekennus communicates the following decision of the Wittenberg Consistory: "In response to your question and marriage matter sent to us, concerning your blood friend and another bridegroom who is familiar to her, in which you have asked to report what is right, we etc. inform you by law: Have your blood friend Margarethe L. and Hans N. publicly committed suicide? have publicly engaged to be married by virtue of your report, then they cannot, on account of the abominable illness of the French, which is said to have broken out most violently on Hans N. in a standing engagement and to have been made known to your friend, either conceal or break such public engagement, and your friend cannot, with a good conscience, be admitted to any other marriage if her confidant is alive." (Op. cit. fol. 308.)

Finally, as far as madness is concerned, the following insight is found in the Dedekennus: "When you sent us a question in which it is reported that Martin N., your foster daughter Dorotheen's husband and landlord, fell into an insanity several years soon after his wedding, which, by God's help, later led to an apparent recovery in the third year, but then again in the case of the said Martin N.. Martin N. in such a way that he is now imprisoned longer than in the sixth year because of such dangerous physical stupidity and insanity, as a poor senseless, miserable and raging person, separated from all human society.

We are pleased to inform you that it would be permitted and granted to a married householder to be thus lonely for her honor and conscience, burdensome, dangerous and disadvantageous to proceed to other daily marriages, in view of the fact that, according to the opinion and report of physicians and other experts, she could not hope for an improvement of such furious insolence, and could live out and conclude her life in honor and with a good conscience in other honest relationships. Accordingly, we, the dean, the senior and the other doctors of the theological faculty, in addition to the commissioners of the Electoral Consistory here, give you instruction and answer that the said Dorotheen N. in the shape of this miserable case, it is difficult to advise her otherwise than that she obediently bear and overcome this cross imposed upon her in patience and in supplication to God; For to let her come to another marriage publicly, can by no means happen by virtue of divine and all other rights described and customary in this case, and the causes and concerns you have raised, her honor and conscience danger, also that you assume that she would hope in vain for improvement, are far too little and ineffective for a promise and refund of such another marriage. But what she is to do in such danger and trouble, she may have Christian instruction and comfort at any time from her pastor and pastoral counselor. Such we have you, whom we are willing to serve kindly, do not want to behave to desired instruction. Date Wittenberg 13 Feb. Anno 1566." (A. a. O. 297.) The famous Lutheran ecclesiastical lawyer Joachim von Beust (d. 1597) judges likewise. He writes: "The same is to be said of the insanity that follows after a marriage has been entered into, because even this may not dissolve the consummated marriage, whether it be a perpetual one or not. For husband and wife are so joined that they must endure joys and sorrows together. Though thy wife be mad, yet is she still thy flesh. For even now the divine law preaches to thee: No man ever hated his own flesh." (Dedekennus op. cit. fol. 530.)

These decisions may seem hard; as indeed Christ's decision in this matter seemed so hard even to the disciples, that they thereupon exclaimed, "If the matter of a man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry" (Matt. 19:10.).); but wretched is the man who, because this decision seems too hard to him, will not submit to it, either acting against it himself or dispensing with it, while we men, from this so great a woe often connected with marriage, ought rather to recognize with penitence and humility the curse which has followed our fall from the foot, and thereby let ourselves be moved to take the so decisive step of a marriage with fervent petition for God's guidance.

Now, as far as the case presented is concerned, some people might think that circumstances existed in the same case which, after all, put the case in a

The fact that the divorce was not an adultery, and the new union a continued commission of this dreadful sin, would make it appear in a different light. But this is by no means the case.

1. First, one could object that this case may well be analogous to a case of desertion, in which also, without fornication necessarily having to be proven on the part of the other party, another marriage is permitted. But there can be no question here of a case such as that of malignant abandonment, since the person on whom God has imposed the terrible penalty of insanity has not thereby caused a rupture of marriage, which is absolutely part of the essence of a desertion that dissolves the marriage and gives the right to another marriage. Rather, the insane woman remained faithful to her husband; therefore, before God, she is still the wife of the healthy part, and the divine judgment still applies to the healthy part: "The woman is not powerful in her body, but the man is; and the man is not powerful in his body, but the woman is. (1 Cor. 7:4.) Yes, the greater the distress into which the woman has fallen through madness, the more powerfully does the word press upon the conscience of man: "So also let men love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. For no man hateth his own flesh at any time, but cherisheth it, and cherisheth it, even as the Lord cherisheth the church." (Ephes. 5:28, 29.) As little, therefore, as a man may or can leave himself in trouble, so little his wife. Therefore, in the Lutheran agendas, the question is put to the man who is to be married: "Will you have your present wife, love her, honor her, nourish her, and preside over her, and will you not forsake her all the days of your life? But how will a husband answer for it, if he, contrary to this sacred promise given before God, leaves his husband in adversity? When therefore God had once declared to the Jews by the prophet Malachi, that he would know nothing of their worship, it is said further, "Thus say ye, Wherefore this? Because the LORD hath testified between thee and the wife of thy youth," (the heavenly witness at thy marriage), "whom thou despisest, seeing she is thy companion, and the wife of thy covenant. So did not the one, and yet he was of a great spirit. But what did the some man do? He sought the seed of God. Therefore beware of your spirit, and let no man despise the wife of his youth." (Mal. 2, 13-15.)

2. Perhaps another will object that our present case does not belong under the above divine rules because the man in question has obtained a lawful divorce from his lawful authority. But this does not change the case at all. It is true that the temporal authorities, who are only appointed for the things of this world, can and must permit and leave unpunished some things which, according to the word of God, no one is permitted to do.

and what God's will has threatened with temporal and eternal punishment; but the authorities, by this permission of theirs and by the impunity they assure, can never again make right what is unjust according to God's word. God's word also says concerning the authorities, "God must be obeyed rather than men." (Acts 5:29.) Now if it is sinful to do what the authorities command when God has forbidden it, how much more sinful will it be to do what God has forbidden when the authorities only permit it? It is true that the man in question, in divorcing his wife, has not acted contrary to the law of his state, but he has acted contrary to the law of God, the King of kings and Lord of lords. Before the state he is divorced from his first wife and is the lawful spouse of the person with whom he now lives, but before God all this has not the least validity. The authorities of the world cannot release him from any of God's commandments.

Already Ambrose, referring to a constitution of the Emperor Theodosius, according to which divorce was permitted even in cases not allowed by God, writes: "You put away your wife as if you had a right to do so, and as if it were done without sin, and you think that this is permitted to you because human law does not forbid it: you who follow men, fear God; hear the law of the Lord, which even those who give the laws obey: What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." (Lib. 8, c. 16. Luc.) The Church Order of Lower Saxony, in which these words are cited, adds, "Is therefore dangerous, to take from the political forum alone, without express light divine Scripture causes, which in the forum of conscience shall apply in divorces." (Dedek. loc. cit. fol. 468.) When once a preacher was assured of the prince's consent in a marriage case, Luther wrote (1524), "If he be otherwise uncertain, he cannot be secure by the prince's consent, whose office it is not to decide anything in this matter, and since it is for the priests to answer from God's word, out of whose mouth one is to seek the law, as Malachi says." (Epistles, ed. by de Wette. II, 459.) Brentius, therefore, recognizes a divorce, though performed according to secular law, but contrary to God's law, as not an effectual divorce, and the alleged marriage entered into thereafter, not a marriage, but concubinage. After mentioning that Moses and the imperial laws recognize more spurious grounds for divorce than God's word, he continues, "Now how do Moses and the secular law rhyme with the divine word? The divine word says: one should not divorce for any reason outside of adultery; but Moses and the imperial law say: one should divorce for other reasons. But this is easily compared. The divine word teaches what is right, but the two magistrates, Moses and the emperor, allow one wrong and evil to prevent a greater wrong and evil.

And this is the reason: the divine word alone rules the pious Christians, but the secular magistrate often has Jews, Christians, pagans, Turks, and all kinds of trash in his regiment. Therefore, if he is unable to raise up a Christian life in his subjects (as he would like), he is content to maintain a peaceful life among them. For Moses, who was ordained of God to be a lawgiver and a temporal magistrate of the Jews, was gifted with the Holy Spirit, and also received word from the Lord our God that he had faithfully served in the house of God, and yet, in order to prevent greater misery, sin, and evil, he tolerated and permitted a public, but nevertheless proper, adultery, by allowing a man to divorce his wife in matters of anger and to take another: From this it may well be understood that a godly authority does not do unreasonably when it tolerates (though against its will) a peaceful and orderly wrong, so that a worse one may be prevented; But it behooves an ecclesiastic who preaches God's word, and a pastor who is to govern the church according to God's word, to act strictly according to the instruction of the divine word; under their rule, that is, to consider no one in the Christian church who lives in an ungodly state as a Christian, and to administer the sacraments as a Christian. Unfortunately, they must suffer that there are many unbelievers, but in the number of Christians they must not accept and recognize any unbelievers; just as a secular authority must suffer much discord in other countries, but in their own country they must not tolerate any discord. If there is a stiff-necked subject who does not want to get along with his wife in any way, and yet there is no adultery, but only envy and hatred, which often occurs between husbands and wives without adultery, that it is to be feared that, if they were forced together, they would forgive each other with poison, strangle each other, or cause some other misfortune: A temporal authority would be excused if, after the example of Moses, it granted a proper concubinage to a stiff-necked man who did not want to keep himself chaste in any way, so that secret adultery with other wives and disorderly fornication, now with this one and now with that one, would be prevented; but to take another wife cannot be permitted. For such a one is not accepted by the church, much less blessed. Thus also the door of the penitent life would be closed to the obstinate; for if he wished to amend himself, he would have to leave the last wife and cleave to the first, and so he could not well leave the last for the sake of marriage. *) It is difficult that a Christian authority should

*) One sees from this, Brentius' opinion is, that even the secular authorities should not regard the perverse divorce for a real divorce and the following union not for a lawful marriage and treat it as such, but as a concubinage which is judged by the state.

But it must be remembered that not only Christians, but also unbelievers, have authority, and that the hardness of men's hearts is too great. Thus I consider that Moses also bore a great grudge against adultery and fornication, as a man of high and low estate might otherwise be found to have done; and he also, according to the order of his law, in the 5th book, Cap. 24. and has been none the less beloved of God as a faithful and diligent magistrate: But it behooves a pastor not to hold such stiff-necked people in any way to be Christians, and to approve of their ungodly state, if they step from their spouse and have an abode, but, according to the doctrine of Paul, to charge them not to divorce their wives, or, if they do not wish to have an abode, to remain without marriage between them, or else to go idle unchastity, or to be reconciled to their spouse." (Dedek. op. cit. fol. 465. f.) To the question, "Cannot the authorities ascertain other causes of divorce?" Friedlieb answers, "No; for the sake of the particles which exclude all other causes. One objects: What the authorities ordain has its origin from God. Answer: something else is the jus fori (the law of human judgment), something else the jus poli (the law of heaven); the one cannot, the other may be changed according to circumstances." (Opus novum, fol. 597.)

3. Perhaps a third person will object that one must consider that in the case presented, the man who had been divorced against God's word had been legally married by a church minister. But as the state, so also the church cannot dispense with God's word and commandment, rather this belongs to the character of the Antichrist; and since the ecclesiastical copulation does not make the marriage, but only confirms it, does not belong to the essence, but only to the Christian nature of an already otherwise valid marriage, so the obtaining of it changes nothing in the nature of the marriage entered into. **) Therefore, when a young man once had himself married without the consent of his parents, and had already become a father as a result of the union entered into, the theological faculty of Rostock declared in an objection demanded about this that the marriage allegedly entered into was not a valid marriage because of the lack of parental consent, and added to this: "Such a statement and conclusion cannot annul or invalidate the copula carnalis et sacerdotalis objected to it. For as far as the copulam carnalem is concerned, we hold that concubitus non faciat nuptias, especially because this fellow was brought to it by wicked fraud, who was not a freeman.

**Dannhauer rightly writes: "Marriage is a union arising from a just consent, 1 Cor. 7, 36, 37; if the same exists, it is already a marriage, Deut. 22, 23. ff. Gen. 19, 14. Matt. 1, 20. though, in order that it may be a Christian marriage, ecclesiastical blessing is to be expected before the copula." (Hodosoph. p. 70.)

for the sake of N. Just as the copula carnalis (if it is done properly) is the use of the marriage state, so also the priestly blessing is only an external means ordered by the church, which does not belong to the essence and nature of marriage in itself, but is held in high esteem so that everyone with whom they deal may know that these two copulated persons are true spouses who have entered into the state of holy matrimony according to God's order and will; and also that the state of the young spouses may be diligently commended to God in prayer, and that they may be reminded of their office. If, then, a marriage is not right or perfect in itself, the copula sacerdotalis cannot improve it or make it a right marriage." (Ibid. Appendix Volum. III., lol. 36.) It is, however, a fact, that our theologians, when a betrothal, unlawful for want of parental consent, and connected with the copula camalis, had received ecclesiastical sanction by the consecration of a preacher, have usually expressed their misgivings in favor of the existence of the union thus consummated, but this has not been done, because they were of the opinion that through the ecclesiastical marriage the otherwise unholy act attained validity,*) but, as the Leipzig theological faculty says, so that one would not "expose this holy action ludibrio (to ridicule) and give offense to many, who would then be caused to think little of the benedictione sacerdotali." (A. a. O. fol. 37.) But this cannot be decisive in our case, since it is not only a question here of subsequently granting, by virtue of a person, a right not due to him and assumed by him, in order to avert greater harm, but at the same time of the right of a third party. Incidentally, the astute and zealous theologian J. Fecht, among others, is not satisfied with the decision that has become customary even in those cases where the right of a third party is not violated. He writes: "Others, both theologians and jurists, decide contrary, and maintain that neither the copula carnalis, nor the benedictio sacerdotalis, inasmuch as the former was not done without great sin, the latter was not either extorted or yet obtained without a grave offence, makes a thing in itself illicit, as a marriage contracted without the consent of the parents is, a lawful one; Since this whole act violates the divine law, is performed solely at the instigation of the devil, gives the children an opportunity to force the consent of the parents against their will, opens the door to manifest crimes, violates public respectability, and commits the highest injustice against good and pious parents. However, several circumstances may arise in such cases,

*It is known that all Lutheran theological faculties have continued to insist that all marriages of persons in forbidden degrees of relationship, even those blessed by the church, be declared null and void, and that those in such marriages be condemned to the church.

which may induce the consistories to advise the parents that they give consent (afterwards), but not without the principal cause of compelling the same from them." (Instruct, pastoral, p. 183.)

II. As for the second question, it is clear from the foregoing that the deplorable man in question can only have a good conscience before God and man and be admitted to absolution, communion, and church membership if he not only repentantly recognizes that he has divorced his unhappy wife and entered into another marriage as a grave sin against God's clear word and commandment, but also dissolves the bond tied against God and returns to marital fidelity to his first wife. As certain as it is that he is not divorced from his first wife before God, and therefore the second is not his lawful wife before God, so irrefutable is that consequence. What applies in regard to theft: Non remittitur peccatum, nisi restituitur ablatum, i.e. without restitution no forgiveness, applies also here. As Herod could not obtain God's grace, because he would not separate from his brother Philip's wife, whom he had freed, although John the Baptist cried out to him in the name of the Lord, "It is not right that thou shouldest have thy brother's wife" (Mark 6:17, 18); as that incestuous man, who took his stepmother to wife, could not have been absolved had he not separated from her (1 Cor. 5:1 ff. 2 Cor. 2:6 ff.); as Paltiel could not have been absolved had he not separated from her.); as Paltiel could not have had forgiveness of sins, if he had not given back to David Michal, Saul's daughter, who had been stolen from David and given to him, though he did it with bitter tears (1 Sam. 18, 27. 25, 44. 2 Sam. 3, 13-16.) So also that man, of whom we are speaking here, cannot take comfort in the grace of God, unless he dissolves the present ungodly relationship and fulfills the duties of a faithful husband toward the wife who was first married to him.

1. Perhaps one appeals to the fact that the certainly deplorable man has sinned in ignorance, shamefully seduced by his own unfaithful pastor, that therefore in any case a milder assessment of this case is necessary than in other cases of knowing, willful transgression of the divine commandment. But as true as this is, that the preacher who advised the man to divorce, and who himself blessed his second marriage, is more guilty of sin than the man he misled, as the chief priests who delivered Christ to Pilate were more guilty of sin than this heathen (John 19:11); as true as it is, that the preacher who advised the man to divorce, and who himself blessed his second marriage, is more guilty of sin than the man he misled, as the chief priests who delivered Christ to Pilate were more guilty of sin than this heathen (John 19:11).) It is true that it would not be in accordance with Christian love to condemn the man who claims our deepest sympathy, but a sin committed in ignorance remains a sin, and whoever persists in it after he has known it from God's word, it becomes a damnable sin.

In all analogous cases, therefore, the same judgment has always been passed in our church by its orthodox teachers. Thus Luther writes: "If a man believed, and were eloquent of this with a mighty appearance and sign, and his confidant died, and after that she came again, and found another with him? Answer: He shall take the first again, and let the other go. How? if she will not return to him, and will not have him? Well, then, let the authorities know this and force her to you; if she does not want to, then let yourself be acquitted and confirmed with the other, because there is no lack of you; you have wanted to have her again and have sinned through great error, not willingly, that she owes you forgiveness, and she does not want to, then it is just as much as if she now ran away from you and left you wantonly. (Of Matrimonial Cases of J. 1530 X, 931. f.) Similarly writes Dr. Mentzer writes: "If a man is absent from his wife for a whole decade or longer because of just necessity, and in the meantime the wife, because she has heard from credible people that her husband has died, marries another man and has children with him, she is bound to take up her first husband again when he returns, because absence, even if protracted, does not dissolve the marriage if there is no evil intention. It cannot, however, be said of the woman that she committed adultery, because she believed on probability that her husband had died, which Unsinful Ignorance may excuse her until then." (De Conjug. p. 232.) The same judgment is rendered by Dannhauer. He writes: "Adultery is nothing else than a knowing and willing dissolution of the conjugal bond.... I do not say in vain, and without cause, a knowing dissolution, for what is done out of ignorance is not really and for- maliter (in its essence) adultery. It may happen that a woman is reported that her husband, who has gone to war and stayed away for many years, is dead; she meanwhile marries another; the first and right husband comes back unawares, so the other must give way, but no adultery has actually been committed." (Catechism Milk II, 261.) Already Bishop Leo writes of the case of the first dead husbands returning to their wives, who had been married elsewhere: "If wives are so taken up with love for their other husbands that they prefer to remain with them rather than to return to their lawful communion, they are justly to be punished, so that they are deprived of ecclesiastical communion, because they have made a pardonable thing to stain themselves with a crime, proving that according to their evil desire they have taken pleasure in that which a due pardon could still have made good." (Epist. I, 77. ad Nicetam, cit. by Gerhard 1. 6.)

According to this, even ignorance through no fault of one fact does not change anything, much less ignorance through fault of the will of God, as it is revealed in his word.

2. Perhaps, however, one might think that since, according to God's Word, love is the highest law and, as Luther says, the empress of all commandments, therefore, for the sake of the love fulfilled by it, the outward breaking of the commandment of the Sabbath, of the Shewrods, etc., was a fulfillment of it, it would also be right, out of consideration for the sad consequences of a dissolution of the second union for husband, wife, and children, to let love prevail and not demand separation. But since we are dealing here with the right of a third party, to whom the husband first owes the duty of love, a continuance of the husband in his supposed marriage would not be a fulfillment, but a shameful transgression of the law of love, yes, of the meanest justice and fidelity.

3. Others may argue that the lesser evil is preferable to the greater, but that the rupture of the present happy family ties is a greater evil than the denial of marital fidelity to a madwoman. But the greatest evil is sin; it, not outward necessity, is the ruin of men. Of two sinful evils, the lesser, indeed, in cases of collision, the lesser (but then only apparent) sin should be chosen, e. g. obedience to parents and authorities, if this comes into collision with obedience to God, should be abandoned, but never can an apparently minor sin be committed for the sake of great need. Therefore, when in 1560 the Consistory of Meissen was asked to consider the fact that a man had married a divorced adulteress, the Consistory declared this marriage unlawful, asserting the principle: "Majus malum et majus scandalum est anteferendum calamitati unius aut duorum," that is, the greater sin and the greater annoyance is to be considered more than the affliction of one or two persons. (Dedek. Ill., 542.) But if it should be pointed out that some marriages, when once consummated, are tolerated, although it was sinful to enter into them, it must be remembered that this is a union which not only ought not to be contracted, but which, so long as the other innocent party lives, is not a marriage, but a material concubinage, nay, adultery, and becomes formal adultery, if it is continued even after a better knowledge of God's word has been obtained.

4. Perhaps some might also point out that according to Deut. 24,4. Jer. 3, 1. the one who had dismissed his wife by a bill of divorce was not allowed to take her as his wife again, that therefore a man who had divorced against God and entered into another marriage was not allowed to take his first legal wife again. But the law of the bill of divorcement is so completely an Old Testament political one that from this

It is absolutely impossible to infer what is right before the forum of conscience, especially since Christ, in clear words, opposes the moral law to this political law with its consequences in the question of what is right before God.

5. Finally, however, one will perhaps say: But what would happen if these strict principles were now to be enforced everywhere? Would this not result in a revolution that would shake and disrupt our entire social relations? - But though this be true, yet, first, the condition of this dreaded result is unfortunately not to be expected; and, secondly, when we have God's clear word before us, it behooves us Christians only to obey it, and to leave the consequences to Him who has given us His word. And consider this: when was the perverting of the divine order in regard to marriage greater and more general among any people than among the Jews in the time of Christ? But did this prevent Christ from presenting the original order to this people, and even from declaring all those to be adulterers who, on the basis of the permission given by the state law through Moses himself, had either divorced themselves against the original order of God, or had freed persons thus divorced? No. There is no doubt, then, that the greatness and generality of a moral corruption that has penetrated cannot make God's word ineffective and invalid, but can rather be attacked by God's word alone, and must therefore also be attacked by God's word. The more the practice of divorce and the copulation of divorced persons, which is in accordance with the word of God, is now in a bad way, the greater is the responsibility of the orthodox preacher, if he too, by his ungodly lax practice, wants to help not to control the terrible destruction that has penetrated, but to strengthen the present adulterous generation in its ungodliness.

St Louis, Mo., Oct. 12, 1870.

C. F. W. Walther. E.A. Brauer.
E. Preuß.
A. Crämer.

Dispositions of the evangelical texts of the church year. *)

First Sunday of Advent. Matth. 21, 1-9.

Introduction: While there is a general joyful movement at the beginning of the bourgeois New Year, few, on the other hand, take care of the

*At the request of some readers of this magazine we are beginning with this issue a cycle of sermon dispositions, of which from now on, God willing, every issue will contain some.

The beginning of a new ecclesiastical year; most people hardly know anything about it, neither when it begins, nor what its significance is. While the civil year is determined by the earthly sun of the world, the ecclesiastical year is determined by the heavenly sun of grace. The latter, without the ecclesiastical year, is only vanity, but the latter, with its Sundays and feast days, makes time a seed of a blessed eternity. The most important thing is that the ecclesiastical year reminds us that our time is a time of grace, that Christ has brought the gracious year of the Lord and that he wants to keep his entry of grace into the world anew.

Theme: Christ's solemn entry into Jerusalem, a picture of His spiritual entry into the world; for in it we see:

1. why Christ could and would make such an entrance, namely, because he would
   a. the omniscient, omnipresent, omnipotent, even looking into hearts and guiding them,
   b. is the Saviour of the world;
2. with whom Christ would make his entrance, namely
   a. With the daughter of Zion, that is, with his faithful ones, and therefore also
   b. With all who shall become so, even with the greatest sinners, as the inhabitants of Jerusalem were;
3. whereby Christ would bring about this entry,
   a. by the joyful message of the gospel, as the means and
   b. through his servants, as the intermediaries;
4. What those who want to enjoy it have to do, namely: a. Let themselves be called out of the world and sin, b. Accept Christ in faith as their king of grace, c. Live in praise and honor of Christ.

Third Sunday of Advent. Matth. 11, 2-10.

Introduction. Not only do the wretched, blinded Jews still not believe that Jesus is the Messiah prophesied by the prophets, but they are still waiting for another; even many who bear the name of Christians are now like the Jews in that they also do not consider Jesus to be the Messiah, but only a teacher of truth and a model of virtue, only that these do not, like the Jews, wait for another. Now JEsus Himself has solemnly declared Himself in judgment to be the promised Christ; if He were not so, therefore, He could not be a teacher of truth and a model of virtue. It is therefore most important that we firmly establish our faith that Jesus was indeed the one who was to come. Joh. 21, 31.

336 On the meeting of the General Synod of Ohio.

Theme: That in JEsu the promised Messiah has already appeared; this proves

1. the circumstances under which he was to appear:
a. of the time,
b. of the place,
c. of parentage;
2. the works he was to perform:
a. Healings of the sick (their quantity, variety, type),
b. Death awakenings;
3. the doctrine he was to preach:
a. the nature of which it was made,
b. the people to whom he preached the same, and
c. the reception which it received;
4. The forerunner who was to precede him:
a. his life and
b. his teaching.

(Translated from the "**Lutheran Standard**".)

Ueber die Bersammluug der Allgemeinen Synode von Ohio.

The General Lutheran Synod of Ohio, etc., assembled at Dayton, O., Wednesday, the 5th of October, and continued until the 12th. This meeting was expected to be one of the most important in the history of the Synod, and its outcome was looked forward to partly with hope, partly with apprehension. The generally felt burning desire for united efforts to build up our Zion, and the lack of agreement with the General Council, raised doubts as to what should and could be done, in addition to what had already been done, to further the cause of truth, especially since the position hitherto taken in the question of the ministry was not such as to show complete unity with other Synods, which, like ours, are unable to go together with the Council. That all were eager to do what seemed to them best for the welfare of our Zion need not be mentioned; but it was to be expected that there might be a difference of opinion as to the way in which the interests of the Church should be promoted. The apprehensions, however, that this might lead to difficulties were put to shame, and by God's blessing a degree of unanimity was attained which confirmed the boldest expectations. The meeting was probably the most numerous ever held by the Ohio Synod, and certainly one of the most interesting and important. After the synod had met by re-electing its former officers, the proto-

After the meeting had been organized with the exception of the colliring secretary, who was replaced by Pastor Belser, the work that seemed to be the first and most important to all hearts and minds was immediately taken up and pursued with great earnestness. This was the discussion of the theses on the office of preaching. For years the Synod had been working to come to a unity of understanding on this subject, and it was almost the desire of all to come to a conclusion at this meeting. Three important theses had already been decided upon two years ago, and now four others were discussed. The main obstacle that stood in the way of an immediate decision was the doubt that some had as to whether the general priesthood of all Christians really included in itself the powers and rights of the ministry, and whether, consequently, the parish office arose from that priesthood. Some thought that if it were admitted that the vocation of a congregation made a man a called pastor, disorder and confusion would be the result. It seemed doubtful to them that the keys should be given directly and originally to the Christian people, and notwithstanding the clear statement of the contrary, the idea repeatedly arose that the holders of the office had something essential to do in conferring the office on others, so that the profession alone did not confer it. These points were discussed in detail with patience and astonishing fraternal friendliness, and it was not until Tuesday that a final decision was reached, since the intended purpose was conviction, and not a drive, since a large majority was ready to vote on the first day. Finally, the theses were adopted with a unanimity that exceeded the boldest expectations, in the following form. We print them in their entirety, including the three that were already adopted two years ago.

1. There is a universal priesthood in the Christian Church, which consists in the fact that the entire Christian people have the right and the duty to proclaim the virtues of Him who called them from darkness to His marvelous light.

2. But there is also a divinely appointed public ministry in the church, usually called the pastorate, to preach the gospel publicly, to administer the sacraments, as well as to administer Christian discipline and order in the congregation.

3. There is a difference between the evangelical pastorate and the general priesthood. For the priestly profession of all Christians must not be confounded with the ministerial profession of the congregation, or the public office of preaching. But this difference is not that the public preaching office has a different word, baptism, absolution, and the Lord's Supper, than is given to the whole church; but that it administers such word, baptism, absolution, and the Lord's Supper publicly in the church. Whereas all believing Christians, according to their priestly profession, have the right and the duty to

have a duty to handle God's word outside of the public profession and also be able to baptize and absolve in case of need.

4. The church, that is, all Christians, have the keys originally and directly from Christ, and are holders of the spiritual priesthood; but it does not follow from this that a Christian is also a pastor.

5. The ministry is not a human arrangement, but a divine foundation, even though the direction of it is a work of the spiritual priesthood.

6. The call to the pastoral office comes from God, but not directly, as was formerly the case with prophets and apostles, but indirectly, through men, i.e. through the Christian congregation.

7. Ordination in the narrower sense is not a divine commandment, but has been the practice of the Church since apostolic times; it is not unconditional, but is ecclesiastically necessary; it is not the bestowal of official gifts, but is a blessed confirmation of the profession made by the Church (which should, of course, take place according to the existing ecclesiastical order), and in the orderly state of the Church it should be performed only by those already in the teaching and pastoral office.

Thus a subject which had occupied the serious attention of the Synod for a number of years was happily brought to a decision within its limits. All who heard the thorough discussion of the theses testify that they were never present at a meeting where the proceedings were conducted more in the spirit of Christian love. If one remembers that more than a hundred pastors were present, together with many deputies, and that the interest in the subject matter was always lively, then the good order and atmosphere that prevailed at the Synod must be highly praiseworthy. After so many sessions had been devoted to the discussion of doctrine, the business proceeded with the greatest possible haste. Among these were some of special importance to the church, which we therefore wish to note, since it will probably be some time before the synodal report is ready for distribution. The points of union between our Synod and that of Missouri, which were adopted two years ago, were not ratified by the latter Synod because of a misunderstanding concerning our adoption of the first point, which that body regarded as merely conditional. A resolution has now been passed removing all misunderstanding, and two delegates have been appointed to the next meeting of the Missouri Synod. A committee of five pastors was also appointed to correspond with other synods occupying the same position with ours, or to hold conferences with similar committees appointed by the same, for the purpose of devising a plan for co-operation in the work of the church. Should such a plan be agreed upon, an extra session of Synod shall be convened.

to consider it and to take the necessary steps to carry it out. In view of this step, the Committee for our Institutions in Columbus advised that nothing should be changed in the present organization, however much this might be necessary in the opinion of many brethren, but that such changes should rather be postponed until the Conference Committee had solved its task. In the meantime, it was decided to pursue the work of education with greater zeal, trusting that the Lord would continue to bless our institutions as He has done up to now. As soon as our German hymnal was published, many brethren wished that an edition in a smaller format could be produced. Since this was recognized as a general need, the Committee received the order to publish an edition in a smaller print and format as quickly as possible. Those who have been anxiously waiting for this will be pleased to hear that such an edition will appear as soon as the necessary arrangements have been made. The establishment of an orphanage under the supervision and direction of the Synod was brought up and the matter favorably received. Several offers of suitable sites had already been made, which was taken as a sign that the work should be undertaken. It was believed that such an institution would be well supported, without detracting from the support of the Synod's already existing institutions, which are, however, in such need of funds to fulfill their task sufficiently. A committee was appointed to take the preliminary steps necessary to carry out such a work, to receive offers of places, to prepare plans, and to report to the next meeting of the Synod, where final decisions on the matter will be made. The subject of discussion at the next regular meeting, which is to be held at Bucyrus, O., is the Antichrist, on which Pastor Belser is to draw up theses and publish them in our papers two months before the meeting. The Synod, which held its sessions in the beautiful spacious church of the congregation of the Rev. Groth, and was very hospitably entertained by the dear people, was one which, both as to loveliness and importance, will be remembered all one's life. God bless her work! - C.

Miscellany.

Dr. Münkel on the Antichrist. After Dr. Münkel has communicated the well-known sayings of Gregory the Great about the Antichrist in his Neues Zeitblatt of Sept. 9, he himself adds: "One can see that the opinion of the Reformers that the Pope is the Antichrist was already held before the time of Gregory the Great.

1200 years is pronounced by one of the noblest Roman bishops, though we do not believe that the Man of Sin has already appeared in the flesh in Pio IX himself." - What might the good man have in mind by the "man of sin" still expected of him? Luther rightly understood by it not a man who lives for his person in all sin, but who makes sin. He wrote: "Therefore the Lord Christ gave the keys of his churches, and not to the pope, to make laws and sin according to his pleasure, and to abuse the power of the keys. For therefore he also had two keys in his coat of arms, that he, being a robber and a wicked man, might put a terror and a fear into the whole world, and thereby he also became the Antichrist; and therefore also St. Palus makes him a man of sin, not indeed for his person, but that he is a causer and a founder of all sins in the world, and makes men to be damned for them. For when men hear him," (in his new laws,) "and follow him, they do sin, when there is no sin. Therefore he also is called the child of perdition." (Erlanger Vol. XLIV, 102.) Therefore, though some popes, like the present one, may have led a hypocritically respectable life in their satanic arrogance, yet the pope is and remains the man of sin, whose future St. Paul prophesied. In another place, therefore, Luther writes: "We do not punish and condemn the pope on account of his own sins and errors, which are in his person. For these, though we should punish them, we hold them to his credit and forgive him; just as we desire that our sins also be held to our credit and forgiven. Therefore we have nothing to do with the priest on account of his own sins and vices, but we fight him on account of doctrine and God's word, namely, that the priest, together with his own, contends and sifts over his own sin against the grace and glory of God, against Christ himself, of whom the Father says, Matt. 17:5, "Him you shall hear. We are not concerned with the error of his person and sinful life, but with much greater and higher things, for which we contend and fight, namely, on account of the Son of God, who died for our sins and was raised for our righteousness, Rom. 4:25, of whom he was preached, and who is to be preached and heard even to the end of the world. If the pope wants to forbid such things, and reproaches us with the violence of the churches," we say: Satan, get thee out of my sight: for we will bear thy sin against thee, but blasphemy, and thy denial of Christ, we will not bear against thee, neither will we consent to it for ever. For Christ is greater than the church which thou reproachest us with; yea, because thy church persecutes the word of God, it is not God's, but the sorrowful devil's school." (Walch's Exh. Tom. V,

615. f. cf. Erlangens. Part. lat. XVIII, 223. s.) It is astonishing that even men who are otherwise so sharp-sighted can allow themselves to be blinded by the appearance of a Pharisaically respectable life, to believe that in such Pharisees the man of sin could not possibly be represented. But it is still more astonishing that such a man of sin should still be awaited, one who wallows in every conceivable sin. There have already been enough such unfaithful men in and outside Rome, so that we need not wait for the future of still greater unfaithful men in order that Paul's prophecy may be fulfilled. W.

Literary ads.

I. So just published by Schulze L Gaßmann in Columbus, Ohio:

ESSAY ON THE MINISTERIAL OFFICE : an exposition of the scriptural doctrine as taught in the Ev. Lutheran Church. By Rev- M. Loy, M. A., Professor in theEv. Lutheran Theological Seminary at Columbus, Ohio.

This writing contains substantially a reprint of several articles by the said author which appeared in the "Evangelical Quarterly Review" in the years 1861, 1864, and 1865. It was a happy thought to reprint them in book form. Works published in a Quarterly Review come into the hands of a comparatively small circle of readers, and, however important and thorough they may be, are as a rule soon buried and forgotten. However small the loss to the reading world of most of the attempts at writing contained in the theological journals, the contributions to which the venerable author has given the more modest title of an "attempt" belong to a completely different genre. They are of lasting value and belong to the gems of the new English Lutheran literature. Not only do they acquaint the English-speaking Lutherans of this country with a question which has been one of the most burning in the German Lutheran Church on this side and on the other side of the ocean during the last quarter of a century, the question of the sacred office of preaching; but while the struggle over this important question among the German Lutherans has hitherto left the English-speaking Lutherans almost untouched, with this "Essay" they at once receive the right answer from the "pure,

The book contains a clear, transparent, well-organized, thorough, and calm presentation of our church's doctrine on the disputed point, proven with clear writing and abundantly furnished with testimonies from the public church confessions and the private writings of our orthodox fathers. This excellent book should not only be in the hands of every English-speaking Lutheran to whom the divine truth-

The book is not only a serious matter for the German Lutheran, but also for every German Lutheran who is even somewhat familiar with the English language. It is true that so much has recently been written in German about the subject matter of the book that it would seem superfluous to a German speaker to follow the negotiations about it in English as well; but not only must it be a joy for a Lutheran, who is a Lutheran at heart, to hear the truths that have become so dear to him and the glorious testimonies of our blessed teachers, who have long since been removed from battle, spoken out in English as well; Not only must it be a matter of the greatest interest to him to observe the now inevitable struggle in a church of another language so close to us; but he may also expect to be strengthened in his faith and encouraged in right knowledge by the knowledge of this English writing. - The work is divided into three parts, the first of which deals with the nature of the office of preaching, the second with the profession, and the third with ordination to the same. In order to acquaint our readers with the richness of its contents, we share here the preceding overview of the same in extenso. It is as follows: PART I. The Nature of the Ministry. Chapter I. The Ministerial Work. Salvation ordinarily dependent upon Means of Grace. Administration of these the necessary Work of the Ministry. Chapter II. The Ministerial Workmen. All Christians called to engage in the Work. All Believers are Priests. All Believers have the Keys. Proof from Biblical Precepts and Examples. Errors involved in the denial of Common Rights. Chapter III. The Ministerial Calling. Existence of a Special Ministerial Calling. This Special Ministry a Public Office. The Functions performed in the Name of the Church. The Office instituted for the sake of Order. The Activity in the Name of All is by Divine Appointment. The Public Office distinct from the Universal Priesthood. The Office not a Superior Order, but simply a Ministry. PART II. The Call to the Ministry. Chapter I. The Necessity of the Call. Direct Scripture Proof of such Necessity. Indirect Proof. Proof from the Confessions. Chapter II. The Call given through the Congregation. Not given immediately. Call given mediately through Congregation. Church has the Priesthood. Church has the Keys. Divine Commands imply this. Ministers are Ministers of the Church. Involved in the Practice of the Apostles. Refutation of Conflicting Theories. That Call given through Civil Authorities. That Call given through Ministry. Chapter III. The Call Limited in Place. Proof of Limitation in Place. From the Nature of the Office. From direct Testimony of Scripture. Testimonies of Lutheran Writers. Chapter IV. The Call not Limited in Time. Proof that no Limitation in Time. Scriptures fix no Limits. Reason forbids Limitation. Call not incapable of being revoked. But Pastoral

Relation cannot be arbitrarily severed. No human Authority can prescribe Limits. PART III. Ordination to the Ministry. Chapter I. Ordination not Essential to the Ministry. Ordination not a Sacrament. Word of God does not teach its Necessity. No Divine Command for it. No Proof from Apostolic Authority, No Evidence in the Gifts bestowed. Doctrine of Necessity inconsistent with the Scriptures. Symbols of the Church in Conflict with its Necessity. Best Writers of the Church deny its Necessity. Attempts to invalidate Testimony vain. Chapter II. Ordination a Confirmation of the Call. This the Doctrine of the Scriptures. This the Doctrine of the Symbols. This the Doctrine of the best Lutheran Authors. Chapter III. Ordination a Useful Rite. Utility of Ordination. Church teaches its Utility. The work contains 247 p. in 8vo and costs bound the single copy (postage included) $1.00, the dozen (without postage) K9.00, to be obtained through No. J. A. Schulze, Columbus, Ohio. Sacrifice, then, every one who is able, a dollar for this valuable book; it is well worth the sacrifice. W.

II. Steffann, Past. E., The Bible is God's Word. Lectures. 2nd ed. Berlin 1870, Rother (57 p. gr. 8). 4 Thlr.

This booklet, whose 1st edition was sold out in a few weeks, deserves further careful attention. For in a skillful use of historical, linguistic, geographical and especially scientific knowledge, the verse, fresh and lively discusses the reasons for and against and leads in detail with convincing clarity the proof that the objections against God's word have their reason only in ignorance and in the lack of thinking and therefore they are also found most among the semi-educated, whose educational apparatus is the encyclopedia, the pamphlet literature and the newspaper press, but that finally the most decisive reason for unbelief lies in Joh. 3:20. - The little book, to which in the new edition, besides various additions, a particularly interesting chapter, "The Language of the Stones," has been added for the confirmation of the Biblical account by the ancient Babylonian and Egyptian inscriptions, which have only recently been deciphered, will be welcomed with joy by the friends of the Holy Scriptures, and the doubters will find in it an excellent hint for the solution of their doubts. No less, however, does it challenge the indifferent and the opposed to come to terms with the clear, perceptive, and convincingly presented reasons.

(Allg. Luth. Kz.)

III. A paper was published in Cleveland this year with the following title:

"The justification of the Christian faith: a pamphlet of controversy against Dr. Meier, the Rabbi of Cleveland, by Wilhelm Purpus, Prot. pastor at the congregation "Zum Schifflein Christi" in Cleveland, Ohio.",

to which we take the liberty of drawing the attention of our readers. It contains such excellent apologetic material against the cursory objections of mindless opponents, who allow themselves to think that they stand at the height of contemporary education and are marveled at by an ignorant public, that it is really worthwhile to study it. We hope to be able to give a more detailed account of this valuable work from a competent pen in the next issue. Therefore, this is only preliminary. The book (106 pages in large octavo) can be obtained from the author for 50 Cts. W.

Aphorisms.

When a Luciferian had been refuted by an orthodox, and the latter also admitted this, he at the same time declared, according to Jerome: "Non solum te vicisse existimes, vicimus uterque nostrum; palmam refers tu mei, ego erroris," i.e. Do not think that you alone have triumphed, each of us has triumphed; you are victorious over me, I over error.

"It is written in the book of Nehemiah, Cap. 4. when they rebuilt Jerusalem, that they built with one hand, but with the other hand they had a sword, because of the enemies that hindered the building. This is how St. Paul interprets Titus 1:9: that a bishop, pastor or preacher should be mighty in the holy Scriptures to teach and admonish, and also to defend the gainsayers. That the word of God may be used in two ways, as bread and as a sword, to feed and to fight, in time of peace and in time of war; and so with one hand to build up, to improve, to teach, to feed Christianity, and with the other to resist the devil, the heretics, and the world. For where there is no resistance, the devil has soon spoiled the pasture, to which he is even an enemy." (Luther, XII, 136.)

All godly teachers and preachers appear in the Christian church with fear and trembling when they are to teach and preach; at first they are fainthearted, but when they have begun their ministry, they become confident and undaunted. On the other hand, the false teachers and the false enthusiasts are bold and courageous at first; but when danger, persecution, and the meeting approach, they are despondent and give up their courage. (Here. Weller about 2 Mos. 4, 10.)

One can find scribes who can interpret the Scriptures grammatically and give the content correctly; but it is not enough; it serves well for the young theologians; but to point out and indicate what doctrine and consolation is to be taken and drawn from each saying, and sometimes to include beautiful, wonderful thoughts in the interpretation, that is art, and to interpret the sayings of Scripture with right thoughts, that not everyone can do. In this Lutherus is a master and far surpasses other teachers and scribes. (Here. Weller, Tom. I, p. 281.)

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The "DOISLUXN L.XV MissioNHix", As often as we have allowed ourselves to draw conclusions from the declarations of this paper, which, as is well known, appears within the densral voundl, as to the position which the latter body takes, we have always been told that that paper is not an organ of the OouneU. Finally, however, an ecclesiastical body has taken up the paper and made it the exponent of its convictions. The "Synod of North Carolina", which met on August 25 of this year, has, as the "luUü. Visitor" of September 28, adopted the paper as its "official organ." **W.**

Strange Classification of the Lutherans in America. Thus writes the "DutU. Visitor" of September 28: "The great evil of the present time is this, that there are three parties in the Lutheran Church - one set has the letter, but not the spirit; another has the spirit, but cares little for the letter; the third party has both the letter and the spirit. This third party makes up the true Lutheran Church. To this we belong... The party first mentioned would bring the church back to the intolerant age of the originators of the Concordia formula." We say that this classificir is a strange one, ^for, first, it is strange that one of the parties should have the spirit without the letter, and, secondly, it is strange to us that the editor of the "Visitor" should want both letter and spirit, and yet brand the age of the writers of our glorious Final Confession, which was written for the love of Concordia, and by which Concordia was also really established in our Church, as the age of intolerance. From what historical sources might Dr. Rüde have studied the history of the Concordia formula?

W.

In the "Pilgrim," published by Rev. J. J. Kündig, Neading, Pa., October **1,** a contributor in an article signed "Also a German pastor," once spoke in favor of our Synod. Since we always have to read so much against us, it is not to be blamed on us if we see to it that a fraternal word that has been put in for us also comes to the knowledge of all our Synod comrades. In the "Lutheran and Missionary" an essay was published with the signature: "A German Pastor". The article in the "Pilger" is directed against this essay. Finally it says: "Finally the "German pastor" has made a lunge against the Lutheran Synod of Missouri. It seems to have become fashionable in the 'Lutheran and Missionary' to attack Missouri. Certain people are suffering from flatulence. The 'Lutheran and Missionary' must be suffering a great deal from the malady; for it always brings so much wind now. It's all that bad Missouri's fault. - Didn't want to go to General Council. More than that, has taken strong hold of the four punts. And now it's taking the General Council one synod at a time. That is hard, very hard, and it is no wonder that the 'Lutheran and Missionary' blows so much. Then a 'German Pastor' comes along and wants to blow a little too. Oh, it's wind, nothing but wind. Just listen: Missouri makes a man's blessedness dependent on the position he takes on the four points! That is not true! The German pastor should take his catechism and learn the 8th commandment diligently, because he has transgressed it. Hear further: There are many, yes, quite a few brethren, who humbly and eagerly desire a testimony about their

Orthodoxy wailing from headquarters in St. Louis.' Wind, too, nothing but wind. But it is true that there are many, indeed quite a number of brethren, who look with favor upon the earnestness and constancy of the Missouri Synod, and are not afraid to say: Would to God it were so with us also. Finally, the German pastor* also spoke of the "little feet of man" of the Missouri Synod, but did not say what he meant by this. Probably, however, the four Puncte, over which the General Council has so beautifully passed. That is true, the German pastor* learned handsomely. 'Mere human feet' and that settles the matter. Dixi. What God's word says about it is the same to him, he does not inquire into it, he just calls it 'mere human feet.' - Sapienti sat!

Pennsylvania Synod. The 123rd annual meeting of this Synod was held this year during Trinity week at Pottsville. From Thursday, the 9th, to Saturday, the 11th of June, a Special Session was held, to continue the discussion of the Theses on the Sacred Preaching Office, begun last year. On Thursday evening the same was introduced by a sermon, the subject of which was the question, "What does the Evangelical-Lutheran Church teach according to the word of God concerning the holy office of preaching?" As the sermon was preached in German, very few of the English-speaking pastors, perhaps three or four, had turned out. Of the officials of the Synod, only the German secretary was present. On Friday morning the discussion of the theses was taken up. The author of the same was not himself present, and so the proceedings themselves proceeded slowly. The matter was not clear, nor could the slightest trace of unity in doctrine be discovered. Only a few pastors (perhaps six in all) took part in the debate, and among these not two agreed. One of these, in his confession of the preaching ministry, went decidedly with Missouri, while another held just as decidedly with Buffalo (old style). The others held with no one, they had their views, of course their own. In this manner it was begun and concluded. What doctrine is now taught in the Synod of Pennsylvania of the sacred office of preaching? Yes, guess what! Is it any wonder that under such sad conditions a Prof. Fritschel, with his heresy of "open questions," finds readers for his articles? - On Sunday morning the Synod celebrated Holy Communion, in which it was certainly very noticeable that the former German secretary, (Rev. Schmauk) used the Unirt formula in the distribution. Rev. Brobst spoke a great word calmly, when he announced in the Magazine, "For fifty years the Mother Synod has not been so united in doctrine, usages, and languages as now." (No. 25.) The above may serve as an example. - No doctrinal questions were discussed in the Synodal sessions. They proceeded, as the proceedings testify, in an old-fashioned manner. And yet not entirely. On page 24 of the German proceedings we read: "A resolution was adopted instructing the Erecutiv-Committee not to support any student from our Benefice Fund who is a member of secret anti-Christian societies. For among the beneficiaries of the Synod there are also Freemasons, 'Odd Fellows,' and after this resolution one would think that these would be put out of business. But this is by no means the case, for the Executive Committee is still in doubt whether these associations may be counted among the anti-Christian societies, and therefore takes the precaution of proceeding against the students of theology who belong to them. The resolution is to be applied only to the students belonging to secret college societies. - On the 36th page there is also the report of the delegates to the General Council. The report is very tame and does not mention the negotiations that have taken place.

The four points were not discussed at all. In general, the Synod of Pennsylvania seems to have a great fear of this, otherwise it would certainly have been worth the trouble to discuss this matter, which alone has hindered the prosperity of the General Council and kept it in a constant state of ferment. - That Doctor Moldehnke was also present is not apparent from the proceedings. However, he was there and unfortunately did not behave in the best way, which made a bad impression. However, in an article in the Lutheran Herald, the Doctor subsequently tried to erase this impression by lavish praise.- The negotiations in the synodal meetings are mostly conducted in the English language. The German pastors themselves speak a great deal of English, not out of love, but out of necessity, because it is clear to every open eye that one does not pay much attention to a word spoken in German. A few more years and one will no longer hear a German sound in the Synod of Pennsylvania.

(Submitted.)

North Carolina Synod. According to the Lutheran magazine, the "Lutheran Visitor" contains the following report on the proceedings of this body: "The doctrinal basis of the Synod, which now deals with everything that even the strictest Lutheran can desire, works like a charm (!). The interest shown by preachers and congregations for the doctrine of the Lutheran Church and for the welfare of the Church is commendable and gratifying. All that is needed is the instruction of our people in the doctrine of the church. Several 'revivals' are reported, but with the exception of three congregations, they have done very little to make the congregations concerned more generous or more punctual in the payment of parish salaries. It is precisely those pastors in whose congregations such revivals have taken place who complain the most about greed for money and love of injustice. Would it not be good if our people were taught that when God converts a man, He awakens in his heart an aversion and hatred of all sin and a noble generosity, according to Matt. 3:10 and 6:24? It is gratifying to hear that some of our pastors regularly instruct their entire congregations on Sunday afternoons in the catechism and confession of our church.

Even in the General Synod of Alleghany there was at least one vote for doctrinal discipline. In the Lutheran and Missionary of September 29, a report of the recent meeting of said Synod states: "At the last meeting at Sommerset, the following resolution was introduced by the Rev. J. A. McAten: "That the Rev. C. L. Ehrenfeld, who was commissioned by Synod to deliver the ordination address, be regarded as an authority, and Synod be held responsible for his remarks in that address delivered September 11, 1870, and that in said address he delivered doctrines contrary both to the clear Word of God and to the Augsburg Confession, as this Synod holds them. Confession, as this Synod understands it, in that he asserted that God's Word is not a sufficient and the only rule of faith and life, and taught of the divine Word and the activity and work of the Holy Spirit and the church contrary to the Augsburg Confession. Let it be resolved that we, as a Synod, not only disapprove of the doctrines set forth in the said discourse, but utterly condemn and reject the same as most dangerous.' It is enough to know that the above resolution was not adopted." Much as this was unfortunately to be expected from a (General Synod, it is nevertheless gratifying that at least ONE voice in the same has resolutely risen against false doctrine. -C.

Even the stones must cry out. This is what we thought and this is what the Christian reader will think with us when reading the following testimony Against Secret Societies from a paper of the General Synod, which formerly included in its wide love also these undeniable works of darkness. The "American Lutheran" of October 1 writes: "Think of a society that has come into being to spread a fragmentary view of virtue, composed of atheists, deists, spiritualists, moralists, Mormons, and finally also, and not in the least number, of Christians, that is, of persons of every possible kind of character, from the pure and pious Christian woman down to the shameless blasphemer and disgusting libertine! And who would not know that some of the existing" (secret) "societies are such an amalgamation of all sorts of opposites. It may be a praiseworthy work which they undertake to do, and most probably a sorry sort of jDing, called a constitution, according to which the thing is to be carried out. No doubt such arrangements also serve some purpose. Samson put his foxes and fires together very well to burn the Philistines. But it is not probable that turning one tail to another, and putting one fire between two tails, improved the foxes' habits very much. Put the virtuous and the vicious together, and let them be indiscriminately chained together by the bond of a common brotherhood; what good will come of it? There are together in one and the same society such as reverently cling to Christianity as their only hope for time and eternity, and such as blaspheme it as a distortion and a fraud; such as would sacrifice their lives for the promotion of truth and the protection of purity of morals, and such as acknowledge no attachment to right, no object but gratification, no law but lust: what fruits can be expected? What do we see? There is a youthful disciple of Christ. He has just made a public profession of his faith, and pledged eternal allegiance to the principles and practice of our holy religion. Then he comes together with some who also bear the name of Christians, and, enticed by their example, and enticed by the prospect of being able to do good, and by the promise of a spiritual fellowship, he makes the promise and goes under the direction of a religious order. What was the consequence of this? The familiar gatherings of the 'Church had to give way to the exercises in the Lodge. The sum of his obligations exceeds the amount he contributed to the support of the Gospel. He can no longer keep a religious paper, but he reads the organ of the Order. To his journeymen he says little or nothing about their becoming followers of Christ, but very anxious that they should be 'initiated' into the Order. The Church may be blasphemed with impunity, but if only one word is spoken against the Society, how enthusiastically he defends it! Indeed, in sympathy and practice he has exchanged the Church for Society. To the same degree that he has become interested in and attached to the latter, he has become cold, if not bitter, toward the former. And in not a few cases the shameless declaration has been made that of the two, society is the more desirable, the one that does the most good. Oh how dangerous and not infrequently poisoning is social influence! How deceptive the pretext of association for philanthropic and reforming purposes! Of how many who pretend to such things it may be said that, instead of saving others, they themselves perish. What wisdom it is to sacrifice purity to the ground-satiety of defilement! How good it would be if some of our zealots for the societies could be brought to study the divine purpose that lies in the apostle's word: "Go, be ye"!

from them and separate yourselves? A young man said of certain members of a fraternity to which he belonged: 'You should not think that I would recognize them anywhere in the common societies of life.' And yet he consorted with them in the Lodge week after week as with brothers and sisters." So now even a General Synodical paper writes of secret societies. - C.

II. Abroad.

Union Tolerance. The districts of Hersfeld and Orb, ceded by Bavaria to Prussia in 1866, with a population of 8,000 Lutherans in 7 parishes, have been transferred to the united Consistory at Hanau without further ado. Prussia has not yet dared to do this in Hanover; it can be seen from the above example that this was not done out of conscientiousness. It is hoped that a smaller territory can be easily dealt with without dangerous agitation; with regard to larger territories, one waits for the appropriate time.

Reformed Judgment on the Alleged Blessing of the Union. At the end of 1869 the question was raised whether it would not be more expedient to divide the Unirte Kreissynode Elberfeld. The .reformed? The Reformed Presbytery of Elberfeld gave a motivated opinion in favor of confessional divorce, from which we cite the following pertinent reasons: the Union has not made the Protestant Church more powerful: neither in relation to Rome, which has since grown in rights and power in the Prussian state, nor in relation to unbelief, which since then has also become more and more bold and consolidated; - since dissent has been abolished, and the Consensus of Formulation mocks, all objective doctrinal norms are lacking;- the Protestant Church has since become more resistant and weaker, e. g. it has almost completely taken the school from itself. It has not become more united through the Union, for instead of two currents with orderly development and peaceful coexistence, there are now at least three (apart from the many "schismatic" branches, which do not absorb the most ignoble forces), which live in strife and discord with one another (Evang. ref. Kz. x. 155.).

Weimar. The state parliament has decreed the equality of all cults; as a result, the state treasury also takes over half of the salaries of the state rabbinate, and the Jewish clergy are considered state servants. (Ev. Church-Chr.)

The nineteenth general German teachers' assembly met in Vienna in the first days of June. Schulrath Dittes rejected any communion of pedagogy with church and theology; until this was achieved, religious instruction was to be banned from the school altogether. With this he won the full applause of the assembly, which shouted the same at him in a most tumultuous manner, so that even the rapporteur of the Protestant. Kz. declared that one had to believe that in places one was not among German teachers, but among wild Croats and Pandurs. In the same way, the assembly gave its derogatory vote to those who dared to raise an objection against Dittes. - This is the freedom of conviction of which our time is so fond. Whoever does not join in the radical horn is shouted down and rumored down. How right the great Niebuhr was when he prophesied even then that barbarism would soon break in! These are the teachers to whom we must entrust our children! (N. Ev. Kz. Nr. 26. Prot. Kz. Nr. 26.)

Ritualism in England. The fact that even the spiritual exercises of Ignatius Loyola, as well as litanies of angels and saints, have now appeared for members of the English Church is proof of the Romanizing direction of the ritualists.

(Evangelical Church Chronicle.)

Russia. After obtaining the opinion of the Synod, the Emperor issued a ukase permitting Greek Orthodox clergy to perform official acts on members of churches that are united with Rome. The purpose of the ukase is propaganda; anyone who claims this permission is thereby considered a member of the Orthodox Church and, according to state law, cannot leave it again. Especially in the military, where unchurched clergy are not employed, this procedure yields numerous converts. (Evang. Church Chronicle.)

Liefland. The Paris section of the Protestant Alliance has taken advantage of the presence of the Emperor Alexander of Russia in Germany to present to him, by a deputation consisting of Rev. Monod, Edmond de Prefsense, Pros, de St. Hilaire, and Boissier, to present a petition in favor of the Esthians and Latvians of Liechtenstein who had been fraudulently lured over to the Greek Church. The Emperor received the deputation very graciously on June 23 at Berg Castle near Stuttgart and replied that he personally would not put any obstacle in the way of the people if they wanted to return to the Lutheran Church; however, there was an imperial law which forbade such a return and which he could not change. (Evan. Church Chronicle.)

Pabst. A Roman nobleman is said to have said: The former Popes declared themselves Vicars of Christ on earth; Pius makes the Lord Christ His Vicar in heaven. - On the PaSquino was the following epigram:

> God becomes man on earth to save mankind, The Pope makes himself God to chain them again.

In an inscription to be read on a triumphal arch on the occasion of the illumination on April 20 (the festive anniversary of the Pope's return from Gaeta), the Pope lets himself be called the cornerstone of the church (pietra angolare della chiesa). The measure of exaltation fills more and more. (Ev. K.-Chronik.)

The Breaking of Bread in Holy Communion. We read the following in Dr. Münkel's N. Zeitblatt: "At the communion celebration of the Pomeranian presynod in Stettin, the Lutheran formula of giving bread was used, which is not prescribed, but only permitted with higher permission. In addition, it was prescribed that the bread be broken, which was done by breaking apart baked wafers before or during the celebration. Since this was seen all the more as a victory for the Lutherans, since the friends of the Union had also complied with it, the magistrate of Stettin turned to the king with a complaint, because of interference with the Union. In the king's reply, the Ober-Kirchenrath answered on June 30 of this year. He rebukes in the king's dispatch that the celebration is exploited in the party's interest. Apart from that, the celebration itself offered no cause for reproach. The donation formula was granted by law and used for the sake of peace. "Moreover, at the celebration itself, the decisive characteristic of the rite of union existing in the Castle Church, the breaking of bread, remained untouched by this formula and was also practiced.""

Pusey has declared that the ritualists in England would have to send the Roman Church the brush of rejection in consequence of the declaration of insalubrity. On the other hand, their desire for union with the Oriental Church is increasing. If the Privy Council should decide against the true presence of the body in the Lord's Supper in a trial that is now pending, they want either to form a "free Catholic Church" or to approach the venerable Church of Constantinople for a new apostolate. (N.Zeitbl. p. 176.)

Spirit of the Parisian Press. After the catastrophe of Sedan became known, a Parisian paper wrote the following, which a local paper, as it says, communicates in a literal translation: "The defeat of France , it would go to heaven.

cry out like a monstrous flaw in the universal logic of things , like a prostitution of fate! Sad, miserable triumph! Who knows-Prussia herself ought to lament it, she ought to feel an impulse to spit out (sic!) again what she has devoured, tormented by remorse for the murder she has committed, overcome by disgust at her self-abuse! Awakened from its bloody drunkenness, it will curse itself for having created so much night; for what can it put in the place of the radiant light extinguished under the upturned pimple-hood? O, if France were to succumb! If the impossible were to happen, if this bloody alley-boy prank of Providence were to be fulfilled! The horrified human race will accuse eternal justice and sink back into the realm of doubt and denial; but France, in purple, will rise once more before the blinded deity and, like the defeated Caesar, breathe out her last sigh in a terrible curse, and with her smoking bowels strike heaven in the face!

Open Question Theory. In the assessment of a paper from Hanover, the Luthardtsche Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kz. of September 9 states: "In this we agree with the author of the first brochure that a commitment to the symbols with Quatenus is not sufficient. Therefore, however, the Ministry of Culture was completely in the right when in 1855 it expressly forbade this kind of obligation, which had crept into the city of Osnabrück. The attempted proof against it, that now some of the symbols must be issued after all, has turned out as miserable as possible. The author gives the following three reasons for this: 1. The symbols teach that private absolution must remain, and that it has fallen after all; but this is only the agreement of a use that has been declared wholesome, and for which the right still exists. 2. art. XXIV of the Augb. Confession asserts that it is unjustly said of the Protestants "that they should have taken the mass," and yet Luther calls it a "dragon's tail" already in the Schmalkaldic Articles. That article of the Augsburg Confession alone does not mean the Roman sacrifice of the Mass, which is rather rejected by him with all its abuses, and the name Mass or Officium missae is also still used in the Calenberg and Lüneburg Church Order for the sacrament of the altar. 3. (3) We speak everywhere of a Lutheran church; but the symbols do not know of such a church, for they know only of one church, and Luther and the symbols declare themselves against the name "Lutheran. The author himself admits, however, that the symbols know in a certain sense of a majority of churches; they only say (cf. Apology, Art. XII.) that the adversaries first used the name Lutheran in disparagement, and Luther, though he declares himself against the name Lutheran in one respect, afterwards used it himself (cf. "Sämmtliche Werke," XI V, 348; XXIX, 77; XXXI, 358.).

Communion. At a pastoral conference held in Hermannsburg on June 21, the following resolution was unanimously adopted: "In preaching, in confirmation classes, and in pastoral care, we want to uphold the principle that confessional fellowship, communion, and church fellowship coincide, and by proceeding according to this principle, we will not consent to the so-called guest admission of members of churches of other faiths to the Lord's Supper of our church.

Ludwig Grate, formerly pastor of Hary, Bönnien and Störy in Hanover, but from this triple pastorate especially because of a sermon held on the Reformation Feast of the year 1866 (cf. "Two contested sermons from the year 1866, held on the Feast of St. John and the Reformation Feast" [1868]) by rescript of the royal Pruss.

He had recently been sentenced to one year's imprisonment in contumaciam because of various insults to the majesty which he had committed in the "German People's Gazette from Lower Saxony for the Defence of Law and Truth" published by him since April 24 of this year. He had evaded this sentence by fleeing; after the announcement of the amnesty he had returned to Hanover, but immediately disappeared again. A few days ago he is said to have been seized and arrested in the region of Kreiensen in peasant clothing. (Ev.-Luth. Kz.)

War Sermons of Repentance. The faithful preachers in Germany are now doing just as they did in our new fatherland, when they preach repentance to the people in the midst of a war crowned with victory and declare the war to be a judgment of God. Dr. Münkel writes in his Neues Zeitblatte that the Berlin Staatsbürgerzeitung wrote about this, among other things, as follows: "It is truly hair-raising that such teachings can be preached from Prussian pulpits, even more so at this moment! and if there were not a man at the head of the entire church system of our state who belonged to the same pietistic school of thought from which that monstrosity of unpatriotic spirit sprang, we would expect a strict investigation, as a result of which all the clergymen who had been guilty of treason against the fatherland, such as that mentioned, would be brought before a court martial!" The plaintiffs also immediately pass sentence as judges, and do not seem to have bad breath to deliver the executioners thereafter, all in one person, for they conclude: "Never and never must it be tolerated that stupidity or hypocrisy should put a damper on the enthusiasm for a just war, such as we now have to wage. Better to put a **bullet to the head of the** stupid or hypocritical who attempt such a thing**!"** The Brunswick Church Gazette makes the remark on this subject, "You can see where it is going, and what we have to expect from these friends of liberty and opponents of capital punishment."

America, a Place of Refuge for the Lutherans. We read the following in the Neuendettelsauer Kirchliche Mittheilungen (No. 9 of this year): "Through German emigration the German Church is now coming to America, and the task of the German Lutheran Mission is to raise it up there and to nurture it with all diligence. Nowhere does the Lutheran Church have such fertile soil as in free North America. Here it can and does build itself without external hindrance. Many who fear that the Lutheran Church could possibly cease to exist as a national church in Germany and continue to exist only as a private religion or in a kind of brotherhood (separated congregations), see North America as a kind of refuge for the Lutheran Church, since there it is allowed to exist freely as a church, while in its homeland it would be half or completely outlawed. However this may turn out, (God forbid the worst!) this much is certain, the spread and planting of the Lutheran Church in America, the loving care of it, is as much a Christian as a genuinely German and patriotic work, and deserves the fullest consideration and participation of all well-meaning members of the Lutheran Church."

Enlightenment. The Berlin court newspaper of June of this year contains the following appearances: A woman is asked in court about her religion. Answer: Prussian. To the same question a gentleman of better rank replies: Yes. - "That is no answer. What religion?" Christian. - "That will not do. What confession?" The man does not know what to say; and only on being further asked, "Protestant, perhaps?" - he says, "Yes, Protestant.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 16. December 1870. No. 12.

(Sent in by Pastor Zucker.)

Explanation of the list and 22nd from the theological axioms of justification.

The 21st.

Faith justifies not by its existence or by its nature, but by its object and by its relation.

The 22nd.

Faith is taken either absolutely for a believing heart, or relatively for the confident apprehension of Christ himself; in the former way (i.e., as an inherent quality in us) it is not reckoned righteousness.

It is God, the Triune, who justifies us by grace for Christ's sake, not by merit of works. We can do nothing to justify ourselves; even our truly good works are no merit before God. God in Christ through the Holy Spirit does all things. Some one might reply, "Well, if God must and does all things, and I can do nothing in addition, then I need not trouble myself at all about righteousness and salvation; God will certainly make me righteous and blessed. No, God does it according to a certain order of salvation, not directly, but indirectly. Word and faith are the means. Word and Sacrament is the giving hand from God's side. Word, promise demands faith. Faith, therefore, is the receiving hand on our part. Therefore, if we want to be justified and saved, we must keep to Word and Sacrament; we must believe. For this reason also it is said that faith justifies us, that is, we are justified by faith as the one means or hand that takes hold of salvation. The same is said by our two axioms; but they also tell us in what way faith does not justify. The two axioms may be divided into three parts:

I. Faith does not justify by its existence, not by itself, not as such a good condition of the heart.
II. God does not justify us according to the character of our faith, but
III. Faith justifies by its object and by its relation.

I.

In reality or in concreto, true Christian faith cannot be separated from Christ and his righteousness, for he would not have Christian faith whose faith did not take hold of Christ's righteousness. But a distinction must be made between faith in itself and its object, which is Christ's righteousness. And this distinction must be kept in doctrine, that justification by grace alone, without any merit on man's part, may stand firm, and that no man may rely on his faith as such in itself, and think that because he has such a good, such a believing heart, therefore God will and must justify and save him. Such a one thinks he has true faith, but has not it. -

What then actually makes us righteous before God, or by what actually do we become righteous? Does God's grace actually justify us through Christ's righteousness, or does our faith as such a good condition of our heart? If we were to answer this question by saying that our faith as such actually does it, then Christ's righteousness would be quite superfluous, the whole gospel would be unnecessary, we would have enough of the law, we would then be justified by the fulfillment of the law; for faith, taken absolutely, apart from Christ's righteousness; believing, trusting in God, relying on him, that our heart should be so constituted, that belongs, after all, to the content of the law. But we could only say that we are justified by faith in itself, inasmuch as this part of God's will was really fulfilled, if there were a partially perfect fulfillment of the law, a partially perfect righteousness. But God is not content with a partially perfect fulfillment of the law and righteousness; indeed, there is no such thing. I cannot fulfill one part of the law perfectly without the others. If you want to bring your own righteousness before God according to the law, then it is either one piece perfect and all-that would be a perfect righteousness according to the law-or one piece imperfect and all-that would be an imperfect righteousness, or no righteousness at all before God; for "if any man keep the whole law, and sin in one, he is wholly guilty of it," says the Scripture of Jacob. 2, 10. We must have a perfect righteousness-

We have either a perfect righteousness of our own, or a perfect righteousness of another, acquired from a person who was able to acquire it. There remain therefore but two things: either we are justified by our own perfect righteousness alone, or by a foreign righteousness, by Christ's righteousness alone. -

Therefore we cannot really answer the above question in this way: we are justified in part by Christ's righteousness and in part by our faith, which is such a good condition of our hearts; for this would mean being justified by two righteousnesses, Christ's righteousness and our own. Then Paul would not be right when he writes Romans 3:28: "That a man may be justified without works of the law." But how? one replies: the apostle himself then continues: "by faith alone". Answer: here the apostle does not understand faith, taken absolutely, as a work of the law; immediately before he had excluded all works of the law; but here by faith is to be understood first of all the object of faith, faith, so far as it takes hold of Christ's righteousness. Hence it may well be said, in accordance with Scripture, that faith justifies us, or that we are justified by faith, but in the right sense only when it is so understood, in which sense, for instance, it may also be said that the poor man is made rich by his hand, inasmuch as the same has received a great treasure from a rich man. -

Faith is the hand that grasps the righteousness of Christ. The similitude of the hand makes it quite clear that faith does not justify by itself. If a man could be thought to have faith, however good it might be, and a believing heart, and there were nothing to take hold of the hand of faith, and no righteousness were acquired by the merit of a stranger, would we have righteousness by believing? What good would a hand, however good and healthy, be to a hungry man if there were nothing to eat? Or we might put the case: the righteousness acquired would be offered in the Word, but the hand of faith would take hold of something else? What is the use of a man who is very hungry, if instead of bread he takes a stone in his hand? -

Now faith must of course be there to lay hold on the righteousness of Christ; but it does not justify by itself, as little as the poor man is enriched by his own hand. From this follows the second point: God does not justify us according to the nature of our faith. Since this point is so closely connected with the third: faith justifies by its object and by its relation, these two points are not to be strictly separated even in their treatment.

II. and III.

Faith justifies not by its nature, but by its object, which is the Mediator Jesus Christ with his merit, or Christ's righteousness. It is by this relation alone, that faith appropriates to itself the merit of the Saviour, that faith justifies. God has promised us what was from eternity his gracious purpose, to make us righteous and saved in Christ Jesus through his righteousness. He has promised that whoever believes will receive righteousness and salvation, which the Holy Spirit will work in him who does not willfully resist, so that he may be righteous and blessed. So God's unspeakable love to us poor sinners, his free grace, and the merit of Jesus Christ, is what makes us righteous and blessed; but faith only in so far, only in the sense that it enters into such a relation to the grace of God, to the righteousness of Christ, that it seizes it, appropriates it. He that believeth thus hath it, because God hath promised it. -

If, then, according to God's promise, it is his grace and his Son's merit alone that justifies us, and if it is not faith in itself, but only through its relationship, then righteousness and happiness cannot depend on the nature of faith, whether it be small or great, weak or strong. He also is made rich who with a weak, trembling hand has accepted the gift of a large sum of money from the hand of a kind, rich man.

This is true faith, which takes hold of Christ; even weak faith takes hold of Christ, otherwise it could not be called faith at all; therefore it is true faith. Therefore the Scripture says, without any degree of qualification, he that believeth is justified; he that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth hath eternal life. If faith, however weak, only tremblingly appropriates God's grace and Christ's merit to itself, such a weak believer is therefore perfectly righteous and blessed. Even he, therefore, who is still challenged with doubts, but has only the faintest sincere desire to believe that JEsus would be a Saviour even to him poor sinner, that Christ's righteousness would also blot out his sins, he holds the treasure with trembling hand, but he has it nevertheless. He who does not like to doubt, but wants to believe, believes. To want to believe is also to believe, for the Holy Spirit works such willing: "God works both willing and doing." Only he who likes to doubt (such a one does not really doubt at the bottom of the heart; only perhaps in words does he still express doubt, but at the bottom of the heart sits naked unbelief) only he who likes to doubt lets the treasure fall, or rather, he will, pushes it away from him. How would one comfort a man who is stricken with doubt, and kindle the smouldering dim light of faith to brightness, if faith justified by its very nature? One would much-

We must not extinguish the smoldering fire by this erroneous conception and representation of justifying faith. No, God's Word does not make the imputation of Christ's righteousness and salvation, thank God, dependent on the nature of our faith. God's Word tells us generally, "He that believeth shall be saved;" "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life;" "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy house." -

And what doctrines would follow from this, if it were taught that justification depends on the nature of our faith? Either this doctrine, that every one who desires to be saved, and is saved, must at least immediately before his death have attained to a certain degree of faith; or the doctrine, that not all attain to that certain degree by the time of death, and what then, if they die? Either we must then say that they are damned who have not attained so far, or we must, with the Papists, interpose a middle state between blessedness and damnation, where all who have not yet attained so far here, may still attain so far in faith there, that they may even enter heaven. In all these cases the doctrine of justification would not be a consoling, but a terrible sermon; the sermon of faith could not be an evangelical, but would be a legal one. Who would, who could say, that he had brought it to the highest degree of faith? who then could be sure of his blessedness? But praise God! the holy Scriptures teach us something more consoling: they say, "he that believeth," they determine no degree, "he that believeth," whether strong or weak, "shall be saved." Only he who does not believe at all will be damned. Of a middle state, then, the sacred Scriptures know nothing either. -

Even according to the concept of justification in the Scriptures, it is quite inadmissible to teach that faith justifies by its very nature. Justification takes place perfectly in the moment, for it is the judgment of God, when he justifies the poor believing sinner, free from the guilt of his sin and the penalty of it, and he is not moved to it from without by the good nature of faith, but only by the merit of his dear Son. But if it depended on the character of faith, then one would have to say that God does not fully justify him who believes only weakly; then Pastor Löhe would be right when he says of that publican and Pharisee in the temple, in connection with the words, "This man went down justified into his house before him," that with the former it would not yet have been so far that he was fully justified. For it is the same in a temporal court, that when an offender is said to be justified, to be acquitted, it cannot be understood that he is half acquitted, and half remains in prison. However, in a secular court it may still have a meaning, inasmuch as a wrongdoer who is accused of several crimes may be acquitted of one crime.

He is not found guilty of this. But this can never take place in the court of God; for there, according to the Scriptures, it is said, "If any man keep the whole law, and sin in one, he is wholly guilty." From this it follows that to whom God does not forgive one sin, he forgives none; and again, to whom God has forgiven one sin, he has forgiven all, and is therefore entirely justified.

It has already been remarked here and there what the external motive of our justification is; we must also go into this in more detail. Is this motive our faith? If it were, it would depend on the nature of it; then God would justify us only when the measure of faith was full. But no, it is not for the sake of our faith as an actual motive that God justifies us, but only for the merit of Jesus Christ, for the sake of his righteousness. To the believer, no matter in what degree believer, the righteousness of Christ is imputed; for Paul writes, "to him that believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith," that is, the object of faith, Christ, Christ's righteousness, "is reckoned for righteousness," as if it were his own. God justifies him who by faith appropriates Christ's righteousness to himself, which, of course, man cannot do himself, but the Holy Spirit must do. God justifies him whose sins are all covered with the mantle of Christ's righteousness, so that God's eye no longer sees them; he is free from sin and punishment in God's sight and judgment. But the righteousness of Christ cannot be divided. It is imputed to a man either wholly or not at all. If it is fully imputed to a man, he must also be perfectly justified at once, whether he be weak or strong in faith. If justification depended on the nature of our faith, we should suppose that only a part of Christ's righteousness would be imputed to a weak believer; if he believed more strongly, more would be imputed to him; and only when he had attained a certain degree of faith would it be fully imputed to him. But no! As the skirt of Christ, which he wore on earth, was woven through and through, and was not divided under the cross, but the lot was cast upon it; whomsoever the lot met with, he had it wholly: so also the skirt of Christ's righteousness, which he wrought for us especially on the trunk of the cross, by his suffering and dying for the shame and nakedness of our sin, is woven through and through. It cannot be divided; it is put on every believer completely and covers all his sins so that God the Father no longer sees any sin in him; they are all covered. Yes, this mantle of Christ's righteousness is so perfect, so great and wide, that if I had committed more and greater and more grievous sins than I have really committed, yea, if I had the sins of the whole world upon me, and I only reach out with the

If, by the power of the Holy Spirit, I put on this robe with the weakest faith, it covers me so completely with all my sins that God no longer sees any sin in me and will not punish me. To whom therefore this robe of Christ's righteousness is clothed by faith, an infinitely better fate has fallen than to him under the cross, to whom the bodily robe of Christ fell by fate: to him indeed the fate has fallen in a lovely way, a beautiful inheritance has become his. - So long then as we stand in faith, whether it be weak or strong, so long are we clothed with this robe; the sins of weakness remain covered; so long may we say: Christ's blood and righteousness, this is my adornment and garment of honor, with which I will stand before God when I enter heaven. Only he who sins against his conscience, whereby he loses his faith again, tears this robe from himself again, casts it from him, and now stands before God again in all his shame and nakedness of sin. But as soon as he believes again, it is also put on him again in its entirety. -

Now for some closing remarks.

How important and absolutely necessary it is that the doctrine of justification, this fundamental doctrine of the whole Christian doctrinal edifice, be kept firm and pure according to the holy Scriptures, as well as the doctrine of faith! Some erroneous paths in doctrine, which one takes if he does not have the sound doctrine in these articles, have been pointed out shortly. It has also been particularly pointed out what mistakes might then be made in the practice of pastoral care, e. g. in regard to one who is challenged with doubts. How and when, then, could a sinner who had fallen on hard times and was then deeply grieved be powerfully comforted with the Gospel? When could one have the courage and joy to pronounce full absolution to one or more sinners, to tell them that all their sins were forgiven, if our justification was according to the nature, measure, or degree of our faith? If we had preached the law to a sinner in all its severity, if he had recognized his sin and expressed remorse and sorrow for it, we would still have to fear and think that he did not yet have the full measure of faith to be able to preach to him the whole gospel and full absolution. Indeed, the whole general preaching of the gospel ought in the end to be nothing but an exhortation, an urging, and a driving, that one should only work, struggle, and fight to bring it to the highest measure of faith, and thereby to justification. But what would be the result of this way of preaching? This: poor men would, above their laboring, struggling, and struggling, lose more and more the certainty of faith and the joy of it. Then salvation in Christ, as the prophet Zechariah prophesied, would not be the free open well, which is there for all freely and openly, and which has therefore already been dug by God, from which they can only draw water.

of life. It would not be a free open well if we first had to dig it with our faith, and if only he could drink this water of life whose faith is such that he is able to penetrate far enough into the depths of this water. Faith, after all, is not the instrument "that we should first dig for this water, but it is the vessel with which we draw water from this full well; for one can draw water from a full well not only with a bucket, but also with a spoon, or even with a potsherd; But the great difference is that he who draws from the well with a spoon, or even with a potsherd, has just as much as he who draws with a bucket, because it is not physical but spiritual water. It cannot, therefore, be a pure, right evangelical preacher and pastor who teaches falsely of 'justification,' and, in connection with this, of 'the law of God. Justification and, in connection with it, faith. -

It is therefore impossible to express, and God cannot be praised and glorified enough for all eternity, what a delicious and comforting treasure the treasure of pure doctrine, especially the doctrine of justification, is. Heaven is open, salvation has appeared, righteousness has been purchased for all sinners, so that they can stand before God and enter heaven; whoever wants to become righteous and blessed, whoever believes, is righteous and blessed. We can do nothing, and need do nothing for our justification and salvation; but if we are righteous and blessed, then as such we will give thanks to God for it with mouth and hand, with word and deed. Therefore, recognizing our sin and guilt, conscious of our utter powerlessness, let us humbly confess: "I can bring nothing before God but thee, my highest good"; but we can joyfully and confidently and with defiant courage and full of blessed certainty further confess: "JESUS, I must succeed through thy rosy blood. The highest righteousness is acquired for me, since you died on the trunk of the cross. The garments of salvation I have obtained, wherein my faith endures for ever." Amen.

Materials on Pastoral Theology,

communicated by C. F. W. W.

(Continued.)

§ 43.

If a person who has been banned asks the preacher for absolution and readmission to the congregation, the preacher must inform the latter of this request. If the congregation then unanimously declares itself satisfied and reconciled with the person by the repentant confession and demonstration of the person who has returned, then the preacher is to give the

The church is to carry out the decided re-admission by public announcement of the happened return and reconciliation, resp. by absolution, in the public church service meeting and communication of the banned person. 2 Cor. 2, 6-11.

Note 1.

That all this once happened in the apostolic churches is proved by Martin Chemnitz from 2 Cor. 2, 6-11, as follows: "When one noticed from the deed itself that such banished persons were divinely grieved, recognized the greatness of sin, were afraid of God's wrath, and earnestly asked for forgiveness and reconciliation with God and the church, so that they might be received back into the fellowship of the church.Then the church, seeing that it had achieved the purpose sought by the discipline, applied such mildness that he who was already divinely sorrowful would not be plunged either into despair, or into hardening, or into hardening, by too great severity, that he might not, as Paul says, sink into too great sorrow, or be prevailed upon by Satan, 2 Cor. 2:7.... Because therefore the Corinthian church had used the severity of discipline against that incestuous man, because his heart was sure and unrepentant, and saw that by the action of the Holy Spirit that which was sought by discipline had been wrought in him, that he knew the greatness of his sin, was grieved by the knowledge and feeling of God's wrath, and with fervent faith humbly and earnestly sought God's mercy, and asked that he might be absolved from sin by the ministry of the word: Therefore the church thought that this fallen man was to be taken up again, that forgiveness was to be announced to him from the gospel, and that absolution from sins was to be imparted to him through the keys of the kingdom of heaven. But because the crime committed was exceedingly great, and they had previously been sharply reproved by the apostle for too lightly proceeding against that fallen man, they reported the matter to the apostle, and asked him what was to be done in such a case. And since the case was as we have stated, Paul approved the Corinthians' counsel and judgment, and answered: It is enough that he is thus punished by many,' that is, by the whole church: therefore, as ye before, when he was sure and impenitent, accused him, punished him, and bound him by the retention of sins, so now also, when he is brought to a change of heart, ye ought the more in the contrary to comfort him, and to give or forgive him sin, lest he sink into too great sorrow. And after this he adds another reason: Lest we be overawed by Satan, for we are not unaware of what he has in mind.' And to confirm the judgment of the Corinthians, Paul adds these words: 'Whosoever ye forgive, I also forgive him;' and, his example concerning the reception of the fallen

he adds: For I also, if I forgive anything of any, forgive it for your sakes, in Christ's stead; for he hath promised, Matt. 18: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them: what therefore ye shall loose on earth, that shall be loosed also in heaven. Paul therefore exhorts that, as that incestuous man was before banished by the public judgment of the church, and delivered up to Satan, that is, declared by the common voice of the church to be not a member of Christ, but of Satan, so now again they confirmed the resumption and reconciliation of him by the public authority of the church, and their common voice. For this is the meaning of Paul's words: 'Wherefore I exhort you that ye 'prove' and confirm the love/ with which ye ought to embrace the penitent, 'in him' by your public vote.' For the Greek word χυρουν means something like through

The same is true of the other passages of the Pauline text, which I will discuss here in some detail. That this is the meaning of this Pauline passage is clearly shown by the circumstances, the context, and the history itself, which I have therefore wanted to treat here in somewhat greater detail. For it is, as is usually said, the actual seat of the doctrine of church discipline, namely, of excommunication, of public penance, and of public absolution and readmission of the fallen, as it was constituted in the time of the apostles, with what intention, for what reason, for what purpose, and with what leniency it was instituted, observed, and used. And the Concilium of Trent should have been anxious that such apostolic discipline, which would be useful and wholesome to the Church, and absolutely necessary in these times, should be restored." (Examen Concil. Trident. Loe de indulgentiis, p. m. 75.-78.)

Note 2.

The Saxon General Articles contain the following concerning readmission: "Since the excommunicated person would do a Christian trial and lead a demure, obedient life from the time of the imposed church punishment until the next visitation and ask for mercy, the special superintendent together with the pastor of the place, also the magistrate and the court shall report in writing to our deputies in the Consistory; Then our consistorials shall again publicly release the excommunicated person (but again with prior knowledge and consent) from the church punishment and give the order to the pastor of the same place to absolve the excommunicated person again publicly in the church without danger in the following manner or as is ordered at any time after the trial and correction, and on the next Sunday after receipt of the

The command of the churches to reconcile. Namely: "Beloved in Christ, since until now this N. has for some time been separated from the holy Christian church as a useless member because of his mistreatment, has been excluded from the reverend sacrament of Holy Communion, and also from other church meetings; and since then, by God's grace, he has kept himself obediently, patiently, and Christianly in this punishment, and has also promised, by God's grace, to lead an unruly, Christian life for the time being. of his church punishment on this occasion is half discharged, and is again admitted to the Christian reception of the reverend sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as well as other Christian church meetings. And hereupon you shall all be admonished to pray diligently that the almighty, merciful God may graciously forgive this man and all of us our sins through Jesus Christ and grant us the Holy Spirit, so that we may lead a Christian, chaste life until our death, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen/ Thereupon the priest shall pronounce public confession to the excommunicate, who kneels before the congregation, and immediately also absolution, and conclude the Actum ecclesiae with the usual chant." (K. O. des Churf. August, fol. 312. f.) Although the process of admission is presented here according to the circumstances of a state church, the preacher within a congregation independent of the state will easily recognize how this mutatis mutandis also applies to his circumstances.

Note 3.

Other "church punishments," as they were customary in the 4th century, are not to be interpreted to the penitent. In the Lutheran state churches, even in better times, certain punishments were imposed on the penitent, but this was done with the clear consciousness that this was not an act of the church itself. In the church ordinances confirmed by the Lutheran princes, they themselves distinguished exactly what was really church ordinance and what was purely secular sovereign law. In Churfürst August's Church Order of 1580, therefore, it is said, among other things: "When the authorities.... would show mercy to an offender, and at the same time, for the sake of great offence, it is necessary that it should not pass without public punishment, nor without righteous repentance and recognition of his sin, should such an angry person be admitted to the communion of the reverend sacraments, and the authorities therefore impose on him, as an abomination and example, an external punishment, that he must stand before the church door with a white staff, or the like, several Sundays in succession: Shall this not be considered a church punishment?

The Apologia of the Augsburg Confession evidently testifies to this. The Apologia of the Augsburg Confession evidently testifies to this; so that the ecclesiastics have nothing to do, and for this reason it should not be done in the church, where people are not punished physically, but God's Word is preached and the reverend sacraments are administered. For the power of the ministers of the church does not extend further, for as they are commanded to keep the impenitent from their sins, so they are also in turn bound to absolve every penitent sinner, who recognizes his sins, upon his confession." (p. 307.) Cf. supra, § 41, note 5.

Note 4.

How to proceed with banished persons who suddenly find themselves in mortal danger and call the pastor to them, see above ß 18, note 5. at the end. - On the burial of those who have died under the ban, see above § 37, note 2.

(To be continued.)

Two German theologians on the transformation of the national churches into free churches.

"The Erlangen journal writes: "Two writings have appeared in close succession, which in the main deal with the same subject, the relationship between the state and the church, but which diverge widely in their results. Harleß (Staat und Kirche oder Irrthum und Wahrheit in den Vorstellungen von "'christlichem'" State and of ""free"" Church. Leipzig 1870) warns against the desire for a free church, Harnack (Die freie lutherische Volkskirche. Erlangen 1870) does not consider the continuance of the Landeskirchenthum with the sovereign church power to be possible, and thinks that the church must prepare itself for another mode of existence, but this is no other than that of the free church. Harleß represents, one may express it this way, the conservative principle. Harleß warns the church that it should not, in its longing for freedom from the often burdensome ties of the state, partake of them, that the state should become free and rid of the thorn of conscience, which for it lies precisely in the orderly and state-recognized relations with the church. The church would thereby take the de-Christianization of the state upon its conscience and its responsibility; the de-Christianization would consist in the corruption of the organism of the state and of the concept of the state through the establishment of an after-concept of the state, according to which it would be contrary to the nature of this order of life, which originated with God, to place itself in an orderly relationship to the Christian church that has grown up in the bosom of a people. If the people tore itself apart in its state organism in an insane self-interest

If the flesh is the connecting thread with Christianity and the church, then at least those who want to be Christian and churchly have to keep their hands clean. For it is not their business to promote the dulling of the people's conscience and the apostasy of the last days. Finally, Harleß addresses a serious word to those who call themselves Christians and enthuse about the ideal of a ""free"" Church in the sense that they must and may lend a hand to realize this ideal. He asks them what drives them to do this? Is it the desire to be rid of the creed that the state imposes on the church? He asks them whether they consider the present church to be a butterfly that only needs to burst its chrysalis state in order to soar on free and strong wings? His eyes see otherwise. He sees few who are only able to tolerate so-called freedom, let alone to make proper use of its goods and to hold down its dangers with strong courage and arms. According to him, our time has much more strength and skill for smashing and destroying, even in the religious and ecclesiastical sphere, than for building up and creating anew." According to this, Harleß seems to be guided more by the concern for the de-Christianization of the state than by the concern for the preservation of the church from secularization in the striving for a church free of the state. Would to God that the blessed Rudelbach were still alive! He who, in the bonds of the State, sighed so fervently for the freedom of the Church from them and who, for that very reason, was driven from Saxony by his conscience, would now, when the State is evidently opening the door to the Church, speak differently than Harleß. In the Erlangen Journal, it continues: "When Harleß discusses quite abstractly the relationship between state and church and shows in what sense the state can and should be a Christian one, Harnack immediately focuses on the concrete conditions, the present state and national church system, and asserts of this that its last hour is rapidly approaching and that the church, for its part, must work toward a complete break with that which constitutes the specific and characteristic character of this church form according to its present state. For this very thing stands in such decided contradiction to its nature and vocation, and so surely holds out the prospect of its complete ruin, that no choice is left to it. First of all, Harnack describes the incorporation of the church into the state organism as specifically unchurchlike in the present state church system, through which it has become a state institution and sees itself virtually in contradiction with the unchangeable principles of its existence and its constitution. Thus its independence and its unity are threatened to the highest degree. As a second characteristic feature of the existing state and regional ecclesiastical system, in which its unchurchliness becomes apparent, Harnack mentions the traditional and even now still in thesi or in praxi maintained view of territorialism, according to which the sovereign ecclesiastical power is simply regarded as a "state institution.

The church is regarded as an outflow or essential annex of princely power in general and as such, its justification is derived directly from the sovereignty of the land, and its mode of exercise is justified by it and shaped accordingly. The sovereign sumpiscopate contradicts the confession insofar as it mixes secular and ecclesiastical power, places the government of the church under a sovereign power that is contrary to its nature, bureaucratizes it, and, like the rights of the ecclesiastical office, also approaches those of the congregations too closely. For the unchurchlike nature of this ecclesiastical system is also characterized by the fact that it has paralyzed the rights of the congregations, reducing them almost to mere passive objects for the activities of the ecclesiastical office and the sovereign ecclesiastical government, and not drawing them to an orderly participation in the affairs of the church. In so doing, however, it has also placed itself in contradiction with the principle of the general priesthood. Harnack finds that the unchurchlike, which under certain circumstances might be tolerated, has now become an unchurchlike thing that can no longer be tolerated without denying the faith, since it has elevated itself to the highest ruling principle in the church, disregarding the faith and conscience of the church as well as its law and confession, and has abused its power to make the church a kingdom of this world and to degrade it to a handmaiden of dynastic or national-political endeavors, and in general to the demands of the spirit of the age. So openly, says Harnack, has the unnaturalness of the whole relationship come to light that prolonged passive behavior on their part threatens to become a betrayal of their own existence. In particular, he reminds us that the State has broken off the alliance with her and thrown down the gauntlet along the entire boundary line where her interests and its own directly touch. " "For all the social questions which move our time to the bottom, - those about the school, marriage, the family, the oath, the care of the poor, the celebration of Sundays, the church property - even the others about infant baptism and the theological faculties, which are already at the open door, they lie on this boundary. And the way in which this struggle is being waged by the chambermajorities, which the spirit of the age has for itself, and is everywhere advancing in closed battle array against the church; by the conduct of princes and governments, who know no better how to appease the national, political, social movement than by concessions which they make to it in the ecclesiastical sphere - it tells us, whether we want to hear it or not, that the existing State or Landeskirchenthum, with that by which it is specifically characterized, its interconnection with the State and its plenipotency of the sovereign sumpiscopate, is in the process of dissolution."" It is true that Harnack admits that under certain conditions the continued existence of the Landeskirchenthum is conceivable, but after he has listed these, he himself declares that such a proposal comes too late, and that

is also not sufficient. Therefore, the Lutheran Church can expect nothing but its downfall from the transition in which the German regional churches currently find themselves, regardless of whether the half- or completely confession-free union, the Prussian union or the union of the Protestants, first asserts the field. The free, independent, organized people's church is, according to Harnack, the next goal which our church must definitely consider and strive for in its organization, in which a distinction between the communion congregation and the baptismal congregation is to be brought to bear. Harnack believes that this idea can already be found in Luther's work, namely, that Luther, who was burdened by the conventional practice of the Lord's Supper and the responsibility for the multitude of unworthy partakers, carried around the year 1523 the idea of an orderly gathering and assembly, not only of true believers, but of those "who earnestly want to be Christians and confess the gospel with hand and mouth. Harnack finally describes his "communion congregation" by name in the following sentences:

1) Only members of the Communion Church are entitled to active participation in the affairs of the congregation and the church.

2) Hence the distinction between the congregation of the baptized and the congregation of the members of the Lord's Supper within the church body.

3) The right to Holy Communion, however, can only be granted to those who are spiritually mature, i.e. only to those who personally and consciously stand in the faith, and who make this known by freely professing the ecclesiastical confession as their own, and by declaring their willingness to shape their lives according to faith and confession, to submit to the church order, and to place their powers and gifts at the service of the church in a professional manner.

4) The right of the Lord's Supper includes all other and congregational rights , in...

8) Hence, finally, a definite act of confirmation, though not fixed according to age, as a confirmation and obligation of the baptized to the communion church, -at the same time for the safeguarding of the sacrament and the church, and an evangelical pastoral discipline procedure for the salvation of those in whom the same has become necessary, and for the protection of the church against the dishonesty and hypocrisy that has become evident.

At any rate, these proposals of Harnack's for the new formation of a new people's church out of the ruins of the old national churches, meager as they are, are among the best that have yet been made. W.

The usury question.

In the July issue of this periodical we asked Prof. G. Fritschel to interpret Scripture from Scripture instead of his historical wanderings to save usury, that is, to prove from Scripture itself that what the prophets say about usury in their interpretation of the law is a temporary positive law, such as the commandment to keep the Sabbath. What then does the professor do? In order to evade our certainly reasonable request, he presents it in Brobst's Monatshefte (in the August issue of this year) as if we demanded that he submit to us "a register of all the individual statutes belonging to the ceremonial law," including the usury expressly mentioned in the New Testament. Something of the sort, of course, did not occur to us. The professor also seems to have suspected that this would be answered; he therefore at the same time makes an attempt to prove briefly that the Old Testament prohibition of usury must be abolished in the New Testament, since it does not have the characteristics of a moral commandment, which, according to God's Word, is united only in New Testament economy. But if our opponent, in this summary proof, pleads that "conscience" must decide here, but that the consciences of many Christians feel nothing of the sinfulness of usury, we must again remind him of the following: 1. that, by the generalization of a sin, the conscience itself is often the cause of the sin. (2) That even many heathen, who had not the written law, have been convinced in their consciences of the sinfulness of usury, and have therefore condemned it, not only for its consequences, but also for its nature; and, finally, (3) That in the New Testament, usury is not a sin, but a sin. 3. that in the New Testament the prohibition of usury is not only not expressly abolished, as, for example, the Sabbath commandment is, but that in it even the spiritual sense of all the Old Testament provisions of the law concerning lending is most clearly revealed, and in it usury, which after all takes place chiefly in lending, is condemned, which is by no means remedied by our Lord's opponent's declaring Christ to be a popular speaker, whose words ought not to be taken so exactly. It was the latter, in particular, that we had in mind when we called out to the professor: Hic Rhodus, hic salta!*) Professor Fritschel boldly asserts,

*) Chemnitz, too, emphasizes those points in his detailed treatment of the usury question. He writes, among other things: "One objects: Paul advised Philemon to set his slave free; likewise he writes in 1 Cor. 7:21: If thou canst be set free, thou needest it much better. And yet it is not declared that he sins who keeps his servants in slavery. But he that lendeth for nought doeth better,

his proof from Scripture stands "unshaken to this day; not even an attempt to refute it has been made"; but rather the words of Scripture opposed to him, "Lend, that ye hope nothing for it - love thy neighbour as thyself," stand unshaken to this day. If the Christian business man wants interests, let him not seek to obtain them by lending, for nothing is to be hoped for in return, and let him make such a contract in which there is equality, for he is to love his neighbor as himself. - Incidentally, we are not inclined, according to the unmistakable wishes of our opponent, to follow him every step of the way in this matter; we consider that there are more important differences between us and him, which we do not wish to be pushed into the background over the usury question. In part, the usury question has already been discussed enough, so that it already shines brightly in the eyes of anyone who wants to recognize the truth; in part, our entire Synod is just about to bring that question to a conclusion, at least among themselves, on another occasion. We already thank God for the

But he that lendeth on usury sinneth not. Answer: If we show just such testimonies of Scripture to usury as to slavery, the argument would have to be accepted. But to argue from a passage, which deals only with something similar, against a statement about which Scripture is clear, is not a foundation on which conscience can or may rest. Usury is admitted in the Old Testament, namely, civilly, but condemned theologically, in conscience before God. But in the New Testament this distinction is taught still more brightly and clearly by the Son of God Himself. For since in the Old Testament there are especially two indulgences which were perverted by the Pharisees, namely, that of divorce and usury, Christ opposes both indulgences with the eternal rule of righteousness in God Matt. 5:32 and 42, 19:8, and Luk. 6:34, 35.... The teachers of the law had given this interpretation: Because Moses, in the laws of lending and usury, makes a distinction between neighbors or brethren and strangers, therefore the will of God is satisfied if one helps out only his friends by the loving service of lending, but it is no sin to suck others by usury. But Christ, who was sent, not to be a political legislator, but to instruct the conscience before God by the revelation of his eternal and unchangeable will, says that before the forum of conscience that distinction between the neighbor and the stranger, which takes place in civil society, does not apply, but there applies: "Give to every one that asketh thee," whether he be thy friend or foe. And of that general lending, whether it be to poor or rich, friend or foe, he says: "That ye hope for nothing in return. Therefore, as the law of divorce is politically abolished, so the same must be the case with the statutes concerning usury. But it is admirable, since avarice in this depraved nature devises various excuses, that usury has been vehemently condemned even by the more understanding heathen, both philosophers and legislators. And this is the clearest testimony that the same contends not only against the Scriptures, but also against the law of nature itself, which Paul says is the truth of God written in the hearts of men." (Loc. theolog. II, fol. 160 sq.)

great blessing of our testimony, to have first conquered so much that it is now beginning to be understood almost universally, even on the part of Iowa, that usury against the poor is sin. Whoever realizes this is well on the way to realizing that all usury is a sin, and such a person, if he is conscientious, cannot possibly identify himself with the existing usury societies, which, above all, draw their so-called interests from the misery of the people, even of the blood-poor church. If one is serious about no longer profiteering from the poor, what does it matter? then the lifeline of usury is cut. It is easy for anyone to see that if usury were an honest trade, it could be practiced just as much with the poor as with the rich. W.

Litterary ads.

The Justification of the Christian Faith. A pamphlet against Rabbi Dr. Meier in Cleveland, by Wilhelm Purpus, Prot. pastor at the congregation "Zum Schifflein Christi" in Cleveland, Ohio, Cleveland 1870.

This writing is a testimony of Christian faith against the modern despisers of it, executed with astuteness and erudition. The superficiality and unreasonableness of their objections from the standpoint of the allegedly scientific enlightenment is revealed in it in a deeply penetrating manner by means of numerous examples. At the same time, it presents the attacked doctrines of the Christian faith in such a compilation of reasons and their necessary consequences to the examining reason that the latter, if it wants to be an impartial judge, must declare the Christian faith to be completely justified. It forms an armory for those who wish to attack this kind of adversary in their own camp, to wrest their arms from them, and turn them against them. For each of the subjects treated, fruitful thoughts are found in it, which, capable of further development and manifold application, may furnish rich material to convince the opponent of the folly of his contradiction and of the glory and truth of the contents of the Christian faith. Even apart from apologetic purposes, this writing offers many edifying thoughts that promote Christian knowledge, strengthen faith and godliness, and can bring rich spiritual blessings to the believing reader. Both as an indication of the diversity of the contents of this thankful gift of the author, as well as for the orientation of the reader in the little work printed without a table of contents, may follow here a brief overview of the subjects treated therein with indication of the pagina.

First, in the first section, which deals with faith and knowledge, the assertion that faith is unnecessary, since man can attain unlimited knowledge, is refuted by authorities, such as Humboldt's, as well as by general experience, which shows the first causes and reasons of things to be unknowable, p. 4, 5; likewise, that man's knowledge is divine, by the opposition between our thinking and things, which is an immediate fact of our consciousness. (6) There follow remarks on the contradictions in his own assertions and those of famous naturalists; on the mischief that is done with "facts" which are mere hypotheses, or prove to later investigators to be deceptions; on the various explanations of established facts and the researches driven to and fro by the winds of opinion. (7) That knowledge asserts itself with certainty and unites the whole world, refutes the disagreement on the most important questions; the displacement of even subtle concepts by crude newly formed ones in empirical knowledge; the contradiction of systems in philosophy. (8) There follow references to the impossibility of proving the eternity of matter; to the contradiction of the idea of a daily increasing eternity; to the impossibility of explaining the origin of man and his first nature by known laws of nature, or of assuming an eternity of the human race. (9) From the point of view of the adversary himself, the assertion that faith is an arbitrary product of man must appear absurd. (10) Why should faith be excluded in the religious sphere, since it is necessary for the knowledge of history, the administration of justice, and the whole science of experience, in the general human sphere? (11) (12) Since the finite intelligence can never gain an adequate conception of the infinite by its own reflection, there is nothing to prevent it from accepting a revelation that offers secrets. History shows that belief in this revelation has not held thought captive; nor is this revelation at the same time fact; Christianity proves itself in history; the testimonies of Christ are credible; his character could not have been invented by Jews, the allusion to the customs and principles of the Greeks, Romans, and Jews could not have happened only in the second century; Christianity cannot be a myth for internal and external reasons. Only half knowledge leads away from faith; what the opponent pretends to know is disputed and unproved, and how little knowledge secures heaven on earth is shown by self-confessions like those of Schiller and Goethe. 15.

The author now took from the assumption that atoms in an isolated state are inconceivable a proof of a necessary being that is distinct from the world; and from the movement in nature a proof that this being is pure spirit. (16) The profound purposefulness in inorganic nature, in the solar and fixed star system, in the inclination of the

The law of nature, since it is the prerequisite for the existence of the elements, since they are determined according to it, must be set by a spiritual, conscious force that is different from nature and its determination. The law of nature, since it is the prerequisite for the existence of the elements, since they are determined according to it, must be set by a spiritual, conscious force that is different from nature and its determination. And nature, as an ordered whole, is founded in the thoughts of a spiritual primordial being, which is self-conscious and absolute. (17-20) To assume that chance is the cause of purposeful events is a mere excuse for headlessness. (21) The untenable nature of the generatio originaria is pointed out, as well as the thunderous explanations of the origin of organisms, and the impossibility of explaining them by chemical affinity. 22-23 Against the Darwinian hypothesis, scientific reasons are asserted; also, the question remains, "Where did the first organisms come from? The moral law cannot be the product of our will, or of our reason, or of nature; nor can responsibility have arisen through habituation and education, but only through a supreme lawgiver who is an ethical being. This absolute Being can only be One, never fully comprehensible to finite beings, the absolute ideal of the world and humanity, the supreme intelligence by which the atoms are embraced and pervaded, thus omnipresent, immutable, eternal, immanent in the world as much as transcendent above it. For this divine being, self-consciousness is no barrier, since he carries the totality of all phenomena in himself as a knowing and eternal content set by himself. The new cultural-historical and ethnological researches prove that monotheism, not fetishism and Shavanism, was the original religion; in the worship of natural objects, these are only the bearers of the divine elemental force. (28) The consciousness of God could have had its first origin only in the influence of God, not in the fear of tremendous natural phenomena, or in sensory perceptions that formed themselves into false knowledge. 29.

Materialism is a lack of philosophical education and consists of a conglomeration of contradictions and absurdities. 30. 31. Pantheism makes the absolute conditional; nor can a multiplicity be the bearer of the one world-soul; nor can the individual in nature have emerged with necessity from the one cause. Furthermore, the identity of God and the world is contradicted by the experience of impressions that do not proceed from our self-consciousness; and if human thought is God's thought, how can the false consciousness arise that it is a human one? 32-35.

In the face of the futile attempts to solve the riddle of the world, the biblical account of creation is historically grounded, a postulate of rational thought that is not overturned by the logical laws of thought,

While the doctrine of emanation contradicts them. The assertion of an eternal creation of the world carries its own refutation, while the free love of God as the reason for the creation of the world, creation as the speaking of God, and the systematic progress of this creation correspond perfectly to the essence of divine creation. (39) It is a presumption of philosophical reason for natural science to take the place of theology. In Burmeister's cosmology, the first origin of the earth's mass and the first impulse of motion are an insoluble mystery. 42. (42) Besides, the scientific cosmogony does not contradict the biblical history of creation; its purpose is that of religious instruction, which must hold fast to the ordinary use of language, in order not to obstruct its real aim. 43-44 The term day in the biblical account is to be understood as a longer, limited period. (45) (46) The scientific theory of the formation of the earth does not refute the biblical account. 47-48. The dogma of the descent of the human race from One Pair is scientifically justified. 49. neither geology, 50-52, nor the chronology of other peoples require us to depart from the biblical chronology. 54. the first man must have begun to exist as an adult. (55) The idea of man's original savagery is inconsistent with history and reason. 56. 57. Man's freedom is asserted against pantheistic necessity, 58-63; the possibility of the Fall is attempted to be explained by the existence of a love of God and self, 62; the Scriptural doctrine of the Devil, 63-65, and of sin is defended. 66-74.

The following are proofs of revealed religion from history and from its nature as the education of mankind, 75-80; of Christianity in particular, 81-84; of Muhammadanism and Judaism, 85-86; of its divine origin, its intrinsic value and truth, 87-90; and of miracles, 90-95.

The conclusion is formed by a series of explanations on anthropomorphisms and modes of expression in the sacred Scriptures, 96th; on the punitive justice of God, 97th 98th; the dispersion of Noah's descendants over America and Australia, 99th; the omnipresence of God, 100th; his revelation as Jehovah, 101st; his speaking to Moses, 102nd; on blessedness by faith, 103rd; on eternal blessedness, 104th, and immortality. 104-106.

For the sake of the truth, which this book is intended to serve, it must be noted that the astute author has failed to realize that some of his assertions are neither philosophically nor theologically tenable. The proof of the existence of God, p. 16, for example, is based on the concept of the mutual conditionality of atoms with respect to their being, which has rightly been proved to be absurd and impossible. Now, instead of accepting this conception, which is held by a few isolated

The first thing he did was to give up the unfortunate metaphysical speculation that had been presented in his head, or to hold on to the contradictory opposite as truth according to the principle of the excluded third, but he retained it and supplemented it with the concept of God; whereby, on the one hand, the mutual conditionality, that is, the reason for the proof itself, is destroyed, and, on the other hand, a pantheism is produced according to which things can only be regarded as illusory substances, consequently as modi of the divine substance. Likewise, the subsequent proof that God is pure spirit lacks a sound philosophical or theological ground. Against the assertion, Matter is not able to do anything, a material cause is therefore a complete contradiction, p. 17. compare, e. g., Quenstedt, de Prov. Sect. I, Thes. XV. not. 1st: De concursu causae primae cum secundis observandum, quod Deus non solum vim agendi det causis secundis et eam conservet, sed quod immediate influat in actionem et effectum creaturae, ita ut idem effectus non a solo Deo, nec a sola creatura, nec partim a Deo, partim a creatura, sed una eademque efficientia totali simul a Deo et creatura producatur, a Deo videl. ut causa universali et prima, a creatura, ut particulari et secunda.

Nothing forces us to look at the days of creation as aeons. It is only by revelation that we can know at all how much time God used to create, and no unbiased person will say that Moses did not mean to speak of ordinary days in Genesis 1. Then we are by no means justified in making the glorious days of creation into days of destruction. The geological ages are really only a framework of the division of fossilized organic formations into various rock formations, and their succession is not determined solely by the actual superposition of the layers. The newest geology does not want to know anything about sudden and extended changes, by which certain periods would be separated from each other, so that they could be understood as definite limited, separate days or ages. Molluscs of the primary period could therefore live at one place, and ichthyosaurs of the secondary period at another place, at the same time, and their demise could only occur after the creation had been completed.

It is to be regretted very much that due to the throughout recorded opposition against a single unworthy opponent the form of the representation has suffered considerably and the superficiality has been destroyed. R. L.

The Schoolmaster and his Son. By Rev. K. H. Caspari. Translated from the third edition of the original German. Philadelphia: Luth. Board of Publication. No. 42 North Ninth Street. 1870.

This is the well-known excellent folk writing by the blessed Caspari in a good English translation and most tasteful, yes, brilliant design. It belongs to a larger cycle of such, from the

luth. Publications - Committee at Philadelphia, translated from the German, which bears the name "The Father-Land Series". While we have to declare the youth tales by Franz Hoffmann with their Pelagian piety published at the same time in this publishing house an unfortunate choice, we can only gratefully acknowledge the choice of the above beautiful booklet as a lucky grip. W.

(Translated from the "Lutheran Standard".)

How the General Council defines its position.

The General Council, which closed its sessions on Lancafter last week, provided a response to certain questions posed by the Minnesota Synod. The purpose of the questions was to elicit, where possible, certain debate on mixed communion and pulpit sharing with non-Lutheran pastors. Since these items are two of the obstacles to a number of synods in their union with the Council, the answer to those questions will be of greater interest to the church at large than anything else that was discussed at the recent meeting of that body. We have taken pains to obtain an accurate transcript of the answer. The same is as follows: The inquiries of the delegates of the Minnesota Synod, as presented to the General Assembly of the Church at Chicago for official answer, have finally been referred to the Committee in the following formulation:

"As the Declaration of the General Assembly of the Church has been interpreted in various ways within its own circle in regard to the four known points, but as unanimity on such important questions must be deemed necessary for common cooperation, the Lutheran Minnesota Synod takes the liberty of inquiring whether the proper interpretation of the Declaration in question is the following, viz.

1) that heretics and those who err in fundamental doctrines cannot be admitted to our altars as communion guests, nor to our pulpits as teachers of our churches?

2 Since the so-called doctrines of distinction, in which the doctrinal opposition between the Lutheran Church and other denominations is expressed, are fundamental, does the General Assembly of the Church (in No. III, 1. and IV, 1. and 2. of its Declaration of last year) understand by those who err in fundamental doctrines those who, with regard to these doctrines of distinction, do not agree with the pure doctrine of the Word of God, as it is known and taught in our Church?"

These questions were asked on the basis of the instruction given by the Minnesota Synod to its delegate, "in the General Church Constitution," and the following questions were asked.

The Church is called upon to work towards making its position on the Confession ever clearer and more unequivocal.

Two things, then, are involved: I. the position of the General Assembly on the Confession, and II. the meaning of certain declarations made at Pittsburg in 1868.

1 .. With regard to the first point, the Committee declares that it cannot reasonably be questioned whether the General Church Assembly unreservedly and officially adheres to the entire faith of the Evangelical Lutheran Church as it is confessed in the unaltered Augsburg Confession and further defined and defended in the other recognized symbols of our Church. The General Assembly of the Church has, up to this hour, acknowledged the confessions as explicitly and sincerely as they ever have or ever can be.

2 .) What is set forth as doctrine in the recognized confessions of our Church, whether in positive or negative form, is regarded and confessed by the General Assembly of the Church as fundamental to the whole completeness of our Christian faith.

3 .) In harmony with the confessions and theologians of our Church, however, the General Assembly of the Church makes a distinction between such doctrines as are fundamental to the continuance of Christianity, i. e. "essential to the true knowledge of Christ and faith in Him," without which one cannot hope to be saved; and between such doctrines as are fundamental to the entire completeness of our Christian faith, i.e., to the complete and irreproachable (*absolute*) perfection of Christian doctrine, without which, if one does not wish to judge uncharitably, it may nevertheless be possible to attain to blessedness.

11 . 1) As regards the second point, the Committee answers the first question in the affirmative.

12) With regard to the second question, what is meant by the term "fundamental errorists", the Committee submits the following:

a. The General Assembly of the Church, however, holds the doctrines of distinction of the Evangelical Lutheran Church to be fundamental to the extent that those who err in them err in fundamental doctrines. But by the expression "fundamental errorists" the Pittsburgh declarations do not understand those who have fallen a victim without their will, but those who have deliberately, maliciously, and persistently fallen away from the Christian faith, as a whole or in part, especially as it is contained in the confessions of the General Church, and that in its purest form as it now exists on earth, - namely, the Evangelical Lutheran Church, who therefore overthrow the ground known therein, assert such heresies in defiance of the admonitions of the church,

and spread them out and thereby seduce the souls from the way of life.

d. Thus only a very narrow circle remains open, in which there can be a difference of opinion on these points, since they have already been largely decided by the Pittsburgh Declarations. And how then in this narrow circle the above principles and distinctions are to be applied to the preservation of the purity of our pulpits and altars, that the General Church Assembly leaves to the conscientious judgment of our faithful pastors and congregations in each individual case, by whom alone the individual cases can be decided."

At the risk of arousing anew the suspicion among our contemporaries in Philadelphia that we do not sincerely desire the welfare of the Council, and are inclined to censure it at all hazards, we must say that we find no great pleasure in this result. If the answer of the Minnesota Synod proves sufficient, that is its own affair, and the Council may wish itself lucky to be rid of a burden. Certainly, however, the answer will not serve to draw into the Council those Synods which, though they have accepted the fundamental principles of the faith, have hitherto remained aloof from it. We will not dwell on the shifting of the question, which is openly revealed in the first paragraph of the answer. As we understand it, the Minnesota Synod had not expressed any doubt as to the sufficiency of the declaration of adherence given in the fundamental principles of the faith. These say it strongly enough that the confessions of the Church are also the confessions of the Council. But the question referred to the weight of this confession in relation to the practice of the Council. The confession of the mouth may be overturned by the confession of that. It was in regard to the latter that the Minnesota Synod desired that the relations of the Council should be more clear and unmistakable. Therefore, the Council's appeal to its literal statements, namely, that they are clear and unambiguous, is of no consequence at all. It is to avoid the point in question, and the Minnesota Synod has no reason to take kindly the censure which is included for it in the first paragraph of the report. What moves us in this matter, however, is the interpretation of the Pittsburgh statements on mixed communion and pulpit exchange. The Council declared two years ago that heretics and those who err in fundamental doctrines are to be excluded from the Lord's Supper. That is very good, as far as it goes. But in our circumstances it was also very natural that those who wished to carry out the confession of their mouths conscientiously in their confession of deeds should wish to know whom the Council meant by 'heretics and those who err in fundamental doctrines,' and this was the purpose of the Minnesota question.

gen. What then is the answer? It is that those who err in the doctrines of distinction of the Lutheran church do indeed err in fundamental doctrines, but that the Pittsburgh statements were not meant to apply to all such, but only to those who 'willfully, maliciously, and obstinately' depart from the Christian faith as set forth in our confessions. In other words, the position of the Council is that those who willfully, maliciously, and obstinately reject the fundamental doctrines of Christianity should not be allowed to communicate at our altars and preach in our pulpits, and that in the 'narrow circle' not included in this declaration, the judgment of the individual faithful preacher must decide what he is to do. The Council people cannot reasonably find it strange that those who wanted something definite in the matter, something that might give reason to hope that the Lutherans would still all unite into one in the Council, should think about these things and wonder about them. The Council was, as it appears to us, in a delusion, if it thought that by this answer the cases left undecided would be confined to a very narrow circle. Would the Council approve of giving the Lord's Supper to a person who willingly, wickedly, and obstinately departed from the Christian faith on a point which, though clearly revealed in Scripture, was not considered fundamental? Would it be acceptable to pass it on to one who throws out fundamental articles, but who does not do so willingly, wickedly, and obstinately, because he is simply ignorant or misled by crafty deceivers? We may be pardoned if, with our sincere intention of finding in the Lancaster statements, wherever possible, something more definite and decisive than in the Pittsburgh declarations, we can find in them only a step backwards. Formerly it was at least possible to understand by a 'man erring in fundamental doctrines' one who erred in 'fundamental doctrine', whether willingly or not, and thus to understand the Council as rejecting such people from its altars; now no room is left for just this interpretation. We get a little more clarity, but what is clear now is apparently not the intention to put the Lutheran Confession into practice. Or does the report really say, for instance, that a Methodist, or a Presbyterian, or even an Anabaptist, or a Romanist, who is thought not to be wickedly, willfully, and obstinately erring, should be excluded from the Lord's Supper? If this, in what words? - It has been reported to us, that in the meetings of the Council, sentiments and convictions have been expressed, which contain far more than is stated in the report, and which place this body in a much more favorable light. We would also like to believe that there are people in it who would gladly say something more definite, something that the Lutherans,

who are not on the Council were more satisfied. Perhaps also that the general practice of the Council is in advance of these declarations. But we cannot think it right to base our opinion of the whole body on the pronouncements of individuals rather than on its official utterances. The Council is not responsible for what this or that member has said, but for what it has itself declared. But the officially given explanation is the above. Nor can we conceal the conviction that if the body had wished to say more than is said, it has men enough who could have said it exactly as they meant it. If the Council meant that those who, while they come forward to the Lord's Supper, are still in error, should be instructed until they either give up their error and confess the truth, or until they have become manifest as wickedly and wilfully erring, and that they should be received only when that first end is accomplished, leaving extraordinary cases to the conscience of the pastor; it could have said so, and according to charity we are bound to believe that it would have said so. The lodge might have done so in a few words. As it now stands, those who, notwithstanding the repeated defence of the lax practice in the 'Lutheran,' which is conducted by men who pretty much go their own way in the Council, still cherished the hope that the relation of the Council to the Confessions should become more and more clear and unmistakable, are doomed to find themselves deceived in their hope. -

We would not have anything to add to the above, since it so completely expresses our own conviction, and therefore content ourselves with communicating it to our readers in translation. -C.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The theses on the Antichrist, which Pastor Körner submitted to the discussions of this year's Synod of the Eastern District, can be found in English translation in the "American Lutheran" of October 15, with the remark of the

The author states that he has only found his conviction strengthened by this. It almost seems as if there is more clarity and agreement on this point in the General Synod than in the General Council. This is indeed saddening. But that is just one of the bitter fruits of chiliasm, that it does not allow us to recognize the true Antichrist to the great detriment of souls, but only allows us to expect a dreamed one. W.

The local free schools. The reformed American scholar Dr. J. W. Nevin has spoken a good word about the local free school system, which the "Allentowner Friedensbote" has quoted and the "Christlicher Botschafter" has also adopted. The verdict is as follows: "The system of our free schools is often heard praised as the right nerve of all our institutions, the guarantee of our political freedom, the

crown of our civilization, the very special glory of our century. It is not too bold to say that it rests head and tail, not on a faithful recognition of the supernatural claims with which Christianity presents itself, but precisely on the factual rejection and denial of them. The matter is by no means improved by the fact that this school system does not formally contradict the idea of revealed religion. The whole difficulty lies in the fact that, while Christianity claims to be the highest authority for man and his spirit, our school system denies it the exercise of that authority, and this precisely in an area of the highest importance for our lives. If an education is to be truly Christian, it must be fully serious about the realities of a higher life according to their peculiar character; it must subordinate all merely temporal, natural ends to the demands of God and of an eternal world from the clear standpoint of Christian teaching. Our system ignores positive Christianity and pretends to be able to educate youth without its help, as if it were at all possible to prepare it completely for the duties and tasks of life, while its mind is directed only to the things of this visible world, while man's highest destiny is forgotten, namely, that he may become partaker of the powers of a future world."

Schooling in the United States. The Bureau of Education in Washington, through Dr. Edwin Leigh, has published statistics of the adult inhabitants of the United States who are unable to read and write. It covers the period from 1850 to 1860. In 1850 there were no less than 1,053,420 adults (over 20 years of age) (not including slaves) who could not read and write. Of these there were . 962,898 whites and 90,522 free colored persons. Of the total number 858,306 were natives of the country and 195, 114 were immigrants. In 1860 the number of illiterate adults was one-fifth more than in 1850, namely, 1,218, 111 (not counting slaves) of whom 1, 126,375 were whites and 91,736 free colored. Natives of the country were 871,418, immigrants 346,873 among them. The increase was thus greatest among the latter (the Jrrlanders, Scandinavians, Bohemians, less among the Germans). It is to be feared that the Census of 1870 will bring the total number of illiterate adults to 3 million, which would be nearly one-fifth of all adults at all. Under such circumstances, American newspaper writers might be a little more economical in glorifying the "most enlightened nation." The more so because among 20 Americans who can write at all, there is hardly one, on the average, who can write his native language perfectly orthographically. (Wahrhtsfr.)

Baptismal Doctrine in the Reformed Church. Thus the "Evangelist" of November 16 writes: "The old mother synod of our church held its annual meeting in Mechanicsburg, Pa. at the end of October, from the proceedings and resolutions of which we learn the following of general importance: Concerning emergency baptism by laymen, whether valid or not, this Synod has been in dispute for some years, but has still been unable to come to any conclusion. Some think that baptism is so essential to salvation that they believe that children must be baptized in any case, and if there is no preacher at hand, someone else must do it. The preachers of the old reformed way, who do not consider baptism to be essentially necessary for salvation and therefore do not know emergency baptism, are opposed to this. On the other hand, many preachers have such a high opinion of the office of preaching that they cannot recognize as valid a sacrament that is not administered by a preacher. The Synod could therefore not quite agree on this question and decided,

that the preacher himself should judge the validity of such baptisms according to his conviction. In doubtful cases, he should hypothetically baptize again such children who had been baptized by the midwife or the parents. This is a scholastic expression that is not easy to explain. It means something like this, that the preacher should baptize the child again and thereby say: If thou art not yet baptized, I baptize thee now, etc." We would scarcely have believed that the German Reformed Church was still in all these errors, namely, that it still regarded baptism as an official admission into the church, which therefore could be validly performed only by an official of the society, and now even that, like the papists, conditional baptism was practiced. (Dgl. Luther XXI, 1195. s.) W.

From the sect of the "Weinbrenners" the "Christian Messenger" of November 16 reports, among other things, the following: The German "Aeltesterschaft" of the "Gemeine Gottes" (Weinbrenner) had its annual meeting at Hebler Bethel, Schuylkill Co., Pa. on October 15. Among other things, it was decided, in regard to departing members, that we earnestly advise the brethren and sisters, when they leave their place of residence and remove elsewhere, that they demand a letter of indulgence from the church where they last resided, and give it in the church where they remove; and if there is no "church of God" where they remove, that they then give their letters of indulgence to the church in the next place where one exists. Instead of joining other churches without further ado, such members are to proselytize in their new home in the interest of their church, establish preaching places, and invite their preachers to visit them. The preachers were obliged to visit such members. - The divorce question was also discussed and declared and decided upon: "Since it is demanded by several brethren that in the future the preachers of this Aeltesterschaft should not copulate any separated person, whose former husband or wife is alive, for the sake of conscience from such as deem it Schxist-widxig; and we do not wish to rule over such brethren's consciences; and as we do not wish to deprive the preachers of their liberty of conscience; therefore resolved, that we advise the preachers, for the sake of such brethren's consciences, and for the sake of peace, not to put such persons into matrimony in the future." Regarding the preachers, the Untexrichtscommittee reported: "The new preaching brethren are also advised to read diligently in the Holy Scriptures and other and useful books, so that they have no lack of doctrine and knowledge in the Scriptures, and other necessary sciences, when they go forth to preach. When the cops and heart are full, it is never needful to make excuses, to clean out the throat by coughing at almost every sentence, as if one had a severe vex cold, and to fill in every few minutes "My dear hearers," and other needless interjection in the fabric of the sermon or exhortation." Char Friday is to be observed as an annual fast day, etc. The above quotations are taken verbatim from the "Christlicher Kundschafter", the German organ of this brotherhood.

II. Abroad.

The Vatican Council has now, according to a message of the "Köln. Volkszeitung" from Rome, the Vatican Council has been adjourned by a papal bull of October 7, after most of the members of the Council had already been suspended in July until the beginning of November. It is nothing new under the sun. As in 1552 the Tridentine Conciliar was hounded out of existence by Prince Moritz, so in 1870 the Vatican Conciliar was hounded out of existence by King Victor Emmanuel. W.

The conversions of Catholics to Judaism still continue in Vienna and are becoming more and more frequent.

Infallibilitats - Declaration. We cannot fail to inform our readers retrospectively how things went during the Pope's solemn proclamation on July 18 of this year that he was infallible. We learn the following from the Berlin "Sonntagsgast" with the "Freimund": "Several thousand people were gathered in St. Peter's Church on July 18, mostly priests, monks, and pupils of the ecclesiastical institutions. The wing doors of the Conciliar Hall, which, as is well known, occupies the entire right transept of St. Peter's, were open; apart from the diplomats, military officers and distinguished Romans, to whom the audience boxes of the hall itself were reserved, only those standing nearest the door were able to see anything of the celebration. The Pope, dressed in a red coat richly embroidered with gold and a golden pointed cap, sat motionless on the throne in the center like a brightly painted statue; in the large semicircle, amphitheatrically arranged, were the bishops and cardinals. After the solemn opening, the public vote began, with roll-call and the monotonous placet repeated a hundred times. But for all that, even the most faithful of the faithful could not help feeling trepidation. Instead of the triumphant jubilation that had filled so many of the earlier sessions, there was anxious silence, inquiries for news from outside, obvious tension and weariness at the spectacle without spectators, in which they now had to participate once again and whose whole splendor and glory might already be wiped from history tomorrow. It was a gloomy day. In the morning the sky was already overcast with grey, and the further the meeting progressed, the darker and more sinister it became in the wide halls. A heavy thunderstorm came up, and in the midst of the placets which assigned infallibility to the brocaded aged man, it flashed and thundered with unearthly violence for nearly two hours without ceasing. It grew darker and darker in the assembly hall, the votes were counted, the minutes were recorded, and when the Secretaries of the Council presented the new dogma to the Pope for proclamation, when he rose with difficulty from his chair, supported by his servants, to read the words of the dogma, it had become so dark at noon that a candle had to be brought in, by the light of which Pius IX read out the new truth: Faithfully adhering to the tradition handed down from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of our Divine Savior, the elevation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of the Christian peoples, with the approval of the Holy Council, we teach and establish the new truth. We teach and establish this as a divinely revealed dogma (doctrine): That the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks ex cathedra, that is, when in the exercise of his office as pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he pronounces a sentence of faith and morals to be observed by the whole Church, by virtue of divine assistance, that he is endowed with that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer wished his Church to be endowed in determining a doctrine in matters of faith or morals, and that therefore such determinations of the Roman Pontiff are, by their very nature, unalterable. But if any one should take the liberty of contradicting this determination of ours, which God may avert, let him be accursed. Of the salutation which the Pabst still made, nothing could be understood. A Tedeum followed, and the great day was ended. There will not have been many in Sct. Peter who could escape the feeling that it was the last great day of old Papal Rome. And as if Heaven had set itself to-day to give the proper scenery to this spectacle, it performed its task of

until the last moment. Just as the assembled were about to leave the church, another violent downpour came, and now all, clergy and people, pushed in wild confusion through the vestibule into the covered passage that leads from the Scala Regia to the arcades of St. Peter's Square. All clamoured for the carriages, which could only proceed one at a time; it was as if all the shattered remnants of papal glory were trying to save themselves from the onrushing: flood of sin. The cardinals in their splendid high red robes, the bishops in violet silk, the senators of Rome in old Spanish costume with velvet and lace, the Swiss Guard in their Landsknecht costume - all in full dissolution calling for umbrellas and skirts or cut off from their chariots in the throng - the spectacle could not be ended more characteristically than with this final scene."

Secular Power of the Papacy. After the Pope had lost his temporal power, he protested against it in a letter to the members of the College of Cardinals dated September 29 of this year.We, though unworthy and without merit" (very modestly), "exercising on earth the power of the Vicar of Christ Our Lord and the shepherd of the whole Church" (universalis sacerdos, as Gregory the Great already called the forerunner of the Antichrist), truly feel that we lack the freedom which is absolutely necessary for us to govern this Church of God and to assert its rights." One sees that it is time for the Roman pontiff maximus to proclaim the necessity of his temporal power as a new dogma, which every Christian must believe if he loses his salvation.

W.

Position of the Reformed in Germany on the Union. The local Reformed church newspaper reports the following: The Conference of Reformed Preachers, Church Elders, and Candidates of the Province of Hanover met at Lingen on July 12, and deliberated on the question "how the Reformed of Hanover are to take their stand on the Union." Pastor Iken from Ringstedt preached on Ephes. 4, 7-16, on the unanimous laying on of hands in the building of the Kingdom of God as a beginning waved and blessed by the Lord. Pastor Sanders from Westerhusen, as speaker, was decidedly in favor of joining the Prussian Union, as long as it consisted of a common church government and communion. According to Zwingli's example, one should cultivate what is common. But one must have guarantees that the doctrine, along with the simple order of worship (without the agendas), would remain untouched. On the other hand, the Correferent advised against joining the Union. It would bring legal uncertainty and an artificial order of worship and would strengthen separatism. These views were supported by various speakers. In particular, Dreesmann from Stapelmoor reproached the Prussian Union for not having a confession and reminded of the flourishing of the Reformed Church in Holland, Scotland and America. Cathedral preacher A. Zahn from Halle also warned strongly against the Union, which he called the way to the downfall of the Reformed Church. Again, General-Superintendent Bartels of Aurich was more on the opposite side. He found the ecclesiastical situation untenable in the long run. Union, he said, was a question of time. A letter from Pastor Hesse from Emden, who was absent due to illness, was read out, declaring the union with the historic Prussian Union, or more precisely, with Rhineland-Westphalia, to be a necessity. Only the doctrine of the Heidelberg and Emden Catechism, the exclusion of the Confirmation compulsion, and the simple order of worship would have to be preserved. Superintendent Smend from Leeden in Westphalia defended the Union as something God wanted, admitted some deficiencies, but appealed to its ability to develop. - The conference proceeded without a definite result.

Protest. In the Augsburg "Allgemeine Ztg." (1870, No. 263, Enclosure) the following protest against the Vatican Concil is found: "Protestor contra conciliabuli Vaticani de papae potestate et infallibili tate decretum sicuti contra Pii IX. dogmata impia protestatus sum. Cui decreto vel dogmatibus qui assensum praestant aut ignave simulant, ii apostatae a Christi fide et ecclesia sunt, Christo hominem substituentes. Th. Braun, ecclesiae Passaviensis presbyter Ortenburgi." The writings in which Thom. Braun set down his former protest are: "Kath. Antwort auf die päbstliche Bulle über die Empfängniß Mariä" (1856) and "Der Fall des Pabstthums und die unbefleckte Empfängniß Mariä" (2nd ed., 1863).

Flight of the Jesuits. After the fall of the Emperor and the declaration of the Republic, the Jesuits prepare to leave France. More than two hundred have arrived in Geneva. Others will follow. They know what is in store for them, for the Republic has never been kind to them. Archbishop Darboy of Paris knows better than that. A close friend of the Emperor, he declared the war on Napoleon's part a just one. Now that the Emperor has fallen, he seeks the friendship of the Republic and has prayers said in his churches: Domine, salvam fac rempublicam (Lord, grant salvation to the Republic!)

(Dr. Münkel's N. Ztbl.)

In Vienna Luther's writing "To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation" has recently been published and the words "The Pope has thus found a little bell, that he may lie in his own person, deceive and ape and fool everyone. O noble princes and lords, how long will you leave your land and people open and free to such ravening wolves?"

(Ref. Kz.)

Hesse. By order of the Ministry of Culture, an investigation has been ordered against several Lutheran pastors, because they were accused of

not having preached patriotically enough; one names the Councilor Sup. Kümmel and Pastor Kolbe in Marburg, and Pastor Vilmar in Wellinghausen. (The latter has been suspended.) There seems to be a certain scale, therefore, as to how patriotic the sermons in the annexed provinces must be; we would like to know their degrees. At any rate, an offence against the earthly majesty is much more punishable than a denial of the heavenly majesty of the Lord Jesus. Just as in his time at Byzantium; Chrysostom experienced it.

(Ev. K.-Chronik.)

In the English branch of the Evangelical Alliance a dogmatic disagreement has occurred. The Alliance recognizes the doctrine of the eternal damnation of the wicked in its 9 propositions. One member now put forward the doctrine that from time to time mitigations of the punishment of the damned occur. The stricter members demanded that he be expelled, but the committee declared that he was only teaching a mitigation, not a complete pardon; this was in harmony with the statute. 8 members declared their resignation after this decision.

(Ev. K.-Chronik.)

Russia. According to official reports, the Lutheran Church in Russia in 1868 had 1149 churches and prayer houses, 497 ordained ministers, 29 candidates in 2 consistorial districts.

(Ev. K.-Chronik.)

Litterary ad.

We are pleased to inform our readers that the bookseller G. Schlawitz in Berlin has lowered the price of the following four books. He sells namely

Luther's commentary on the Epistle
to the Galatians now at 20 Sgr.

Prussian and **Baier's**
Compendium theologiae
positivae, C. Dieteriei
Institutiones catechet.,
Melanchthon's Loci
theologis

at 15 p. r. each.

P.