

Doctrine and Defense.

Theological and ecclesiastical
contemporary history
Monthly Bulletin

Published
by the

German Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, et al.
St.

Edited by

College of Teachers of the Seminary of St. Louis

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."

Thirty-second volume

St. Louis, Mo.

Luth. Concordia Publishing House (M. C. Barthel, Agent).

1886.

Content.

January.

Since"

Preface	1
The latest Encyclical of the Pope	12
Literature	23
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history	25

February.

Foreword	33
On the doctrine of conversion	43
Luch a consequence of modern theology	54
Ecclesiastical contemporary	56

March.

Foreword	65
The Form of Old Testament Citations in the New Testament	77
Miscellaneous-	82
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history	85

April.

Recent Defence of the National Church against the Free Church	97
Ps. 19. and Rom. 10:18. ...	105
Miscellaneous	111
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history	118

May.

Recent Defence of the National Church against the Free Church	129
The doctrine of inspiration among Baptists	145
Ecclesiastical - Contemporary	150

June.

What does Scripture say of itself?	161
Against Mr. k. Dr. Philippi	169
Miscellaneous	178
Literature	183
Ecclesiastical - Contemporary	184

July and August.

Luther and the Concordia Formula	193
What does Scripture say of itself?	205
Two gratifying debates from German-German theological circles	215
Miscellaneous	225
Literature	231
Ecclesiastical - Contemporary	234

September.

What does Scripture say of itself?	249
How can we, the servants of the Church, have and keep a serene heart and a good conscience even in this time?	258
Miscellaneous	263
Ecclesiastical - Contemporary	267

October.

What does Scripture say of itself?	281
To Rom. 14, 5. 6	289
The Lutheran Church's doctrines of discernment are both clearly revealed in Scripture and exceedingly important	293
Miscellaneous	298
Literature	300
Ecclesiastical - Contemporary	301

November.

What does Scripture say of itself?	313
From the Minutes of the Rhenish Pastoral Conference of February 23 and 24, 1886	323
Miscellaneous	331
Literature	332
Ecclesiastical - Contemporary	333

December.

What does Scripture say of itself?	345
Are the 70 weeks in Dan. 9, 24-27. with the dawn of the New Testament fulfilled or does their finite fulfilment still lie in the future?	355
Literature	363
Ecclesiastical - Contemporary	363

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 32.

January 1886.

No. 1.

Preface.

In February 1884, Professors Dr. W. Volck and Dr. F. Mühlau gave two public lectures on the Bible in Dorpat in the auditorium of the university building before an invited assembly of the city's educated people. Volck dealt with the question: "To what extent can the Bible be said to be devoid of truth?" Mühlau: "Do we possess the original text of the Holy Scriptures?" The former made it his business to prove that the sacred Scriptures do, however, contain all kinds of errors in historical, geographical, natural-historical, and similar matters. It is reliable only in so far as it is the document of the history of the revelation of salvation. In order to show how a reader of the Bible, or rather an interpreter of the Bible (for the common layman who reads the Bible must of course rely here on the scientifically educated theologians), is nevertheless able to read the true out of the erroneous of sacred Scripture, he declared: "In order to be able to separate the area of the infallible from that where error is possible, and further - to be able to make the distinction between the essential and the unessential in the Bible, the interpreter must judge every detail of its content according to its relation to the salvation which is realized in the history it reports. He must see whether and in what connection it stands with the same." The final decision as to whether something in Scripture is true or false. The final decision, therefore, whether something in Holy Scripture is true or false, whether it contains something essential or merely incidental, something indifferent, whether it is in a certain sense the Word of God or merely a human opinion, rests with the interpreter of Scripture, and, of course, only with him who has understood how to abstract from Scripture a strictly closed whole of doctrine, and can now state exactly what belongs to it and what does not. The latter, Prof. Mühlau, simply answered his question in the negative, inasmuch as "none of the numerous doublets in the Old Testament, according to the words, are completely harmonious among themselves," and what the New Testa-

ment is concerned, "of the great quantity of manuscripts not two correspond completely with each other".

If Lutheran theologians had published such declarations in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in order to present the Scriptures as a book full of errors, all Lutheran faculties would undoubtedly have immediately protested loudly and solemnly against them. But what happened? Not one faculty of Lutheran name has raised even a faint protest against it. Rather, to our knowledge, they were all silent on the subject. As decidedly as they may disapprove of it as a great tactlessness that Volck and Mühlau have already stepped before the great lay public with the doctrine of the modern theological science of Scripture, just as decidedly do they recognize the aforementioned as true representatives of their, i.e., of the modern theology. Hence the silence. But while not even a single well-known theologian of the present day has raised his voice against the Dorpat lectures and renounced the fundamental heresy contained therein, individual modern-believing theologians, such as Prof. Dr. Luthardt in Leipzig and Prof. emer. Dr. Th. Harnack in Dorpat, the former in the advertisements of the respective writings, the latter in a little paper of his own, have expressly and unreservedly declared their support for the entire content of the Dorpat lectures. It was and is truly refreshing that an entire regional synod, that of the Livonian island of Oesel, through one of its members, Pastor N. v. Nolcken zu Prude auf Oesel, published a well-motivated "protest" in print, or, on the basis of a formal resolution, made it their own "as their confession". This protest concludes with the following words: "I, for my part, as a member of our national church and as an ordained servant of it, hereby lay down my **protest** against the fact that our confessional theological faculty at Dorpat, which is bound to the symbols and to the Bible, in two of its members (and without having testified on the part of the others) has evidently fallen away from the Bible and is teaching this apostasy to young theologians and spreading it in the congregation. So God help me, my soul shall have no fellowship in it! - Amen!" - God bless the dear man and the whole reverend synod confessing with him for this faithful testimony, remember them the same in the day of retribution, and let it avail many wavering souls to the renewal of their faith in the book of all books. -

1) Pastor v. Nolcken reports in the "Protest" which he edited, among other things: "The painful complaint has come to my ears from Dorpat: that many have been confused, saddened. One lady had spoken of the Bible with tears:

We do not place this announcement at the head of this year's preface to our theological monthly because it has only finally come to light through the events in Dorpat that the modern believers and modern Lutheran theologians have "fallen away from the Bible. Unfortunately, this is a fact that has long been known not only to all theologians, but also to those laymen who, as living members of the Church, are concerned about the harm done to Joseph in these last days. Already in the first issue of this magazine, thirty-one years ago, we had to seriously rebuke the fact that Prof. Dr. Kahnis (at that time, when he was far better off than at present, when he had not yet publicly completed his apostasy from all the foundations of the whole Christian religion, which did not happen until 1861, in his "Lutheran Dogmatics") had declared in his writing of 1854: "The Inner Course of German Protestantism": "Protestantism stands and falls with the principle of the sole authority of Scripture. But this principle is independent of the doctrine of inspiration of the old dogmatics. To take it up again as it was, can only be done with hardening against the truth." (!) After further "Lehre und Wehre," Jahrg. XVII (1871), pp. 72 ff., cf. Jahrg. XXI (1875), pp. 258 ff, By means of literal excerpts from the writings of the modern believers and modern confessional theologians, such as v. Hofmann, Kahnis, Luthardt, Kurtz, Dieckhoff, Grau, even Thomasius, Delitzsch, who had stated that they had all abandoned the divine inspiration of the whole of Holy Scripture, "Lehre und Wehre" registered the express public admission of the "Erlanger Zeitschrift" of 1873, p. 222.that "at least **no one in Germany** represents the old-church doctrine of inspiration any longer". Finally, "Lehre und Wehre," Jahrg. XXIV (1878), p. 316, and Jahrg. XXVII (1881), p. 218, also gave examples of how blasphemously - frivolously - only the little spirits, the faithful pupils of those academic teachers, now do not refrain from speaking of the Holy Scriptures. In the "Sächs. Church and School

I can't read them any more!' - Well - that will be demanded! - It was also strange to me to have received just this spring (1884) from Dorpat the report of the blessed death of a 'quiet one in the country', which admittedly took place before those lectures were given, but which contains a moment which I can only relate to events in the university town with which the lectures in question are closely connected. According to this account, the dying woman, awakening from a long agony, had cried out: 'Believe, believe, believe all that is written in the Scriptures! Every word is truth!' This is a holy protest from the circle of the "narrow" and 'bornirten' against the goings-on of academic bornirtness, which becomes incapable of faith and confession."

blatt" of August 15, 1878, such a Pythagorean writes: "Luthardt says somewhere: The formula according to which the position of Scripture is to be judged, we have not yet found. (!) The revered teacher of our Lutheran Church can only have been prompted to this confession by the consideration that the mechanical inspiration of words and letters is nothing, because the existing imperfections, inaccuracies, contradictions, and thus errors, cannot be denied. ... We must indeed regard the whole of Scripture" (i.e. Scripture as a whole synecdochically) "as God's Word, which presents to us the truth of salvation necessary for salvation, but not each individual word and each individual sentence." - In Luthardt's "Theol. Literaturblatt" of March 4, 1881, a reviewer, no doubt also a theologian *minorum gentium*, writes: "It is pure misunderstanding; as if the author wanted to represent the time which regarded the Bible as a book that came down directly from heaven and took the truth of its divine origin in such a one-sided way that it forgot that the prophets and apostles carried the treasure of divine wisdom in earthly vessels." (Just as if gold in earthen vessels became filthy dross!) "If in those days the choice of expressions was not even left to the writers, L. K. P. regards numbers as 'unconditional currency.' He should not forget, after all, that for the .apology and protection of the Bible,' as the infallible Word of God, it is a question of the preservation neither of a cultural-historical standpoint, nor of its scientifically correct chronological lists, but that we have in it the precipitation of the great revelatory facts of God to the world, that is, religious truths, and believe it for the sake of these facts, but not for the sake of its version in such or such a way." - Without doubt it is especially the immortalized Prof. v. Hofmann, from whose school most of the modern Lutheran-believing academic theologians have sprung, or to whom they all think they owe much for their theology, through whom the doctrine of the so-called "God-man" character of the Holy Scriptures has come to almost universal acceptance. The whole nature of his theological system demands a Bible of such a character, and while he virtually rejected taking his starting point in the construction of a theological system from Scripture, and wanted to be judged only from the whole of Scripture, he, on the other hand, knew how to speak to the church in such a way that, in his dissolution of all primary fundamental articles of our most holy Christian faith, he nevertheless appeared to many as the most orthodox among the orthodox and as the actual inventor of true theological science. It is very true that 1)5 Th. Kliefoth, in his criticism of v. Hofmann's so-called "proof of Scripture" on

The second consequence, which results from the non-distinction between the time of revelation and the time of the church, concerns the things which the history of revelation produces, that is, the truth of salvation, the revealed word of salvation, the holy Scriptures. If God makes the history of revelation with righteous men in the fellowship of ages, then these results, too, are naturally the joint products of God and these men, not given by God to men and merely accepted by men, but produced by God with these men in the form of historical development. This is the new doctrine of the "God-manhood" of revelation and of Scripture, which is now being proclaimed with a full mouth as the actual starting point of a new church age. With the utmost nobility one looks back on the theory of revelation and inspiration of the dogmatics of the seventeenth century as a formation which is not only a new, but also a new, and more important one. With extreme nobility one looks back to the revelation and inspiration theory of the dogmatics of the seventeenth century as to an education which could not hold its own against the advanced science; But, in truth, by dealing only with a few outgrowths of this theory, 1) one does not perceive that, with the new doctrine of the God-manhood of revelation and of the sacred Scriptures, which one supposedly brings into the field against that theory, not only that theory, but also what the Church has always held fast, and what that theory only wished to defend, The Church has always held, and which that theory only wished to defend; it has destroyed the belief in the inspiration of Holy Scripture itself, has placed Holy Scripture in the same line with every book now written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, has left it no other advantage than that of the earlier historical date, than that of the authority of the source for that time, and has thus passed over of its own accord to a treatment of Scripture which no longer differs essentially from the rationalistic one." (S. "Kirchliche Zeitschrift." Ed. by Dr. Th. Kliefoth and vr. O. Mejer. Sechster Jahrg. Schwerin. 1859. p. 636 f.) - It is not both this, therefore, which gives the appearance of those Dorpat professors its sad special significance, that they have denied the divine inspiration of the holy Scriptures, and have declared them to be a book in which one is to distinguish the erroneous from the infallible, the unessential from that which belongs to the history of salvation, and to do so; for this is the position which all modern-believing theologians of the present day take toward the Scriptures. The only thing that gives this appearance its sad significance is that this doctrine has been presented to the laity by men who have hitherto been regarded by the believing laity as the "truths" of salvation.

1) Does Dr. Kliefoth mean by this that the dogmatists taught an inspiration even of the Hebrew vowel signs, yes, some of the accents? - Luther, as is well known, teaches neither.

The question of inspiration, which has already been a burning question, has become the most burning question of our time. Thus then the question of inspiration, which was already a burning one, has become the most burning question of our time. Now it is truly necessary that every believing theologian, if he is to be blessed, should enter with the utmost earnestness into the struggle for the highest treasure of Christians, which God has given to mankind after the gift of His Son. Woe to him who is counted among the theologians, and yet does not wish to recognize that this is above all his calling, to preserve for the common Christian that on which faith, and thus the salvation and blessedness of the same, rests, the "foundation of the apostles and prophets, since JESUS CHRIST is the cornerstone"! Woe to him who wants to be counted among the theologians, and who, on the contrary, thinks that, as such, he must, above all things, contend that science shall retain its full freedom! For therein lies the deepest reason of the ever more complete apostasy of modern theology from revealed divine truth, and of the complete transformation of the Christian religion into a human science, that modern theology is no longer a *habitus practicus* ^{ἡ εὐσδοτος} (a supernatural science wrought by the Holy Spirit).

The first thing that we want to be (Luthardt) is not "the science of Christianity" (Kahnis), but "the scientific self-consciousness of the church" or "the ecclesiastical science of Christianity", which has nothing to do with religion, as "personal conduct", with the guidance to salvation and with piety.) But we say with Luther, "It is better that science should fall away than religion, if science will not serve, but trample on Christ. For if we would allow this, we would be guilty of trampling Christ under foot, and he will (if we will not) raise up others who will dare to do it, because Christ will remain in the regiment." (S. de Wette, Luther's Letters. IV, 545.)

Thus "Lehre und Wehre" will not only continue to bear witness to the doctrine of the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, as it has done from the beginning, but will also fight with ever greater seriousness against all falsifications of this cardinal doctrine of Christianity and warn our dear Christian people against those who fight against it, as the worst false prophets of our time, and to point out the terrible abyss to which they lead, into which thousands and thousands have already fallen, and in so doing, placed on the sandy and muddy ground, have lost faith, God's grace, soul and salvation.

Since a "preface" offers too little space to present the whole doctrine of the inspiration of the holy Scriptures, to substantiate it and to defend it against all objections, let this be our "doctrine and defence".

reserved for another occasion. It is only about this that we are permitted to speak out here, that now, incomprehensibly, we would almost like to say ridiculously, even **Luther** wants to be made the representative of the new theory of inspiration.

Thus, for example, Prof. Dr. Luthardt writes in his "Compendium of Dogmatics": "Luther connects with the strongest emphasis on Scripture as the Word of God at the same time a lively view of its human origin; 'without doubt the prophets studied in Moses, and the last prophets in the first, and wrote out their good thoughts, inspired by the Holy Spirit, in a book. But whether the same good faithful teachers and investigators of the Scriptures were sometimes also subjected to hay, straw, and stubble, and did not build only silver, gold, and precious stones, yet the foundation remains there, and the fire consumes the rest.* (Preface to Linken's Annotation on Moses.)" The same writes in his "Theol. Literaturblatt" of October 23 of last year: "In opposition to that external and essentially pietistic (!) view" (Von der göttlichen Eingebung der heiligen Schrift), "as it is, however, prevalent in lay and pastoral circles as the supposedly and only safe one, while it rather makes the authority of Scripture not safe, but uncertain (!), he" (Volck) "represents the truly ecclesiastical one in the sense of Luther." Kahnis writes: "In Luther's judgment on Scripture the strictly supernatural and the freely human views cross each other. "1) (Die Luth. Dogmatik. 1861. I, 665.) Dr. Grau, professor at Königsberg, writes: "With Hamann himself we reach out to Luther beyond rationalism and orthodox dogmatics. It is necessary, like Luther, to stand free and bound at the same time (!) to the sacred Scriptures." (Entwicklungsgeschichte des Neutestamentlichen Schrifthums. Gütersloh. 1871. I, 18.) Dr. H. Cremer, professor at Greifswald, writes of the time of the Reformation: "No one thought of disputing its" (the Holy Scriptures') "authority. Only the application was in dispute. This explains the fact that in the Reformers themselves, as in their contemporaries and in the period immediately following the Reformation, we find exactly the same conception of inspiration as before, without any further discussion of the relationship between the two factors that cooperated in the creation of the Scriptures, and without any limitation of the extent to which the Scriptures were inspired. Without limitation of the scope - for on the one hand the holy Scripture is for Luther a book in which inspiration is found.

1) The word "cross themselves" is evidently only the polite expression for the fact that Luther, as an inconsistent thinker, judged about inspiration sometimes in this way, sometimes in that way.

2) You see from this, the newer synergists consistently teach a synergism, not only for the production of faith, but also for the production of scripture.

On the other hand, he knows how to speak of hay, straw, and stubble, which the prophets had lost in their own good thoughts, of an insufficient proof of the apostle Paul Gal. 4:21 ff. ('too weak to sting'), etc." (Real Encyclopedia of Herzog, in second edition. Under "Inspiration," vol. VI, p. 753.)

Now those who here recall Luther's judgment on the Antilegomena, as he, for example, calls the Epistle of James "a right brazen epistle against them" (XIV, 105), the Epistle of James "a right brawling epistle against them" (the Epistles of Paul and Peter) (XIV, 105), and from this want to prove Luther's alleged free views on inspiration, we pass over here, since even the weakest mind can see without much thought how foolish it is, from a derogatory judgment of Luther's about a Scripture that he did not consider canonical, what free views he had about the inspiration of those Scriptures that he considered canonical, while the exact opposite is to be concluded from that judgment. Although the question also deserves to be discussed anew, with what right Luther distinguishes the protocanonical books of Holy Scripture from the deuterocanonical ones as he does, yet, as I have said, this question does not belong here, and, God willing, it will be discussed anew on another occasion in this our theological journal. Compare at will what has already been answered in the second volume of "Lehre und Wehre" pp. 204-216 to the question: "Is he to be declared a heretic or dangerous false teacher who does not hold and declare all the books found in the volume of the New Testament to be canonical?"

Among the reasons given for the opinion that Luther was the predecessor of the modern theologians in their view of the inspiration of sacred Scripture, only the two cited by Professors Luthardt and Cremer deserve consideration; first, that Luther, in his preface to Link's *Annotations on the Five Books of Moses* of 1543 (see Walch XIV, 170-174), writes: "The prophets are studied in Moses and the last prophets in the first ones. Walch XIV, 170-174): that "the prophets are studied in Moses, and the last prophets in the first; ... but whether the same good faithful teachers and investigators of the Scriptures sometimes also built with hay, straw, wood, and not vain silver, gold, and precious stones, yet the foundation remains there; the rest is consumed by fire"; secondly, that Luther "speaks of an insufficient proof of the Apostle Paul Gal. 4, 21. ff. ('too weak for the thrust')".

As to the first reason which both Luthardt and Cremer give, it would be an exceedingly striking one, if Luther meant what the gentlemen think they find in his words.

But they obviously did not compare Luther's words at all. For both do not reproduce them exactly and, for example, have Luther write the word "stubble" instead of "wood" (obviously substituted from 1 Cor. 3, 12), as well as the word "precious stones" (!) instead of "precious stones". It is therefore very probable that both have only copied Dr. Tholuck, who so inaccurately cites in the first edition of Herzog's Encyklopädie. Since our dear colleague, Professor Pieper, has already irrefutably demonstrated the invalidity of this reason for Luther's rationalistic view of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures in the November issue of the previous year, we no longer need to prove it; However, we are permitted to remind you that Luther and all orthodox theologians drew their conviction from the Scriptures themselves, first, that sometimes the prophets are mentioned who were only in the schools of the prophets and were only temporarily seized by the spirit of the prophets on certain special occasions (1 Sam. 10, 10-12.), but on the other hand, that the inspiration of the Old Testament prophets in a narrower sense was by no means, like that of the holy apostles, an inherent habit, but a gift given to them only at certain times and for certain purposes. Hence they, like other indirectly enlightened pious men, besides their ministry, were sometimes given hay, straw, and wood, along with "their good thoughts. Thus, for example, Luther writes: "The prophets had their order, or their ordinary offices, where they came together who learned from the prophets; not as if they all had the Spirit of God, but that they heard the prophets" and adhered to them." (On Zephan. 1, 1. VI, 3220.) He also writes: "Theologians have a common saying, that they say: Spiritus Sanctus non semper tangit corda prophetarum, that is, the Holy Spirit does not always stir the hearts of the prophets. The enlightenments of the prophets do not always last, forever and ever, without ceasing. Just as Esaias did not always have successive revelations of great things, but only at special times. The same is shown by the example of the prophet Elisha, when he says of the Sunamite woman 2 Kings 4:27: 'Let her alone, for her soul is troubled, and the LORD hath hid it from me, and hath not shewed it?' There he confesses that God does not always stir the hearts of the prophets. The Spirit also came when they played the harp or the psaltery, and sang some psalms and spiritual songs." (On Gen. 44. 18. II, 2417 f.)

1) Quenstedt therefore writes, referring to Luther's statement above: "The prophets, however, did not, as often as they wished and at all times, either conceal

With this, the last semblance of justification dissolves when the modern Lutheran theologians want to prove from Luther's preface to Link's Annotations on the Five Books of Moses that Luther teaches that also in the writings of the prophets of the Old Covenant "hay, straw and stubble and not only silver, gold and precious stones" are found. Not only is there not the slightest trace in that preface of Luther's speaking of the origin of the prophetic writings of the OT, but it is also as bright as day. It is also as bright as day and clear that Luther there speaks of the prophets outside of their prophetic office as "of good faithful teachers and searchers of the Scriptures," hence he had said immediately before of all right researchers and readers of the Scriptures in general: "Now such researching and reading cannot be done; one must be there with his pen, and record what is specially inspired to him under reading and study, that he may remember and retain it," and hereupon continues, "And in this manner, no doubt, the prophets studied in Moses, and the last prophets in the first, and wrote out their good thoughts, inspired by the Holy Ghost, in a book." On the one hand, it is true that Professors Luthardt and Cremer are to be excused in a certain respect, since they evidently did not read the passage in its context, but copied Tholuck in good faith; On the other hand, however, it is irresponsible for them to have relied in so important a matter on a man like Tholuck, who himself says of Christ "that what is necessary for interpretation, which is only to be learned by heart, can also only have been known and accessible to him (Christ) according to the educational level of his time and the educational means of his upbringing, his intercourse" (!!), from which Tholuck draws the conclusion: "If in the present speeches of the Redeemer there is also no

The prophetic spirit was not always with the prophets, since the prophetic gift was not in the form of a habitus (an inherent skill) but only in the form of an influence or radiance. For the prophetic spirit was not always with the prophets, since the prophetic gift was not given to the prophets in the manner of a habitus (an inherent skill), but only in the manner of an influence or an illumination and special illumination for acts determined by God. Hence a new revelation was always necessary when they wished to administer their office; nor did they always understand everything at one and the same time, and became undecided (*haerebant*) when the divine or inspiration was not at hand (*praesto*) to them." (*Antiquitates biblicae et ecclesiast.* Witteberg. 1699. p. 3.) Calov also judges not differently. He writes: "The preference of the apostles over the prophets appears partly from the gift of languages, with which the latter were not endowed; partly from the nature of the inspiration, because in the apostles the Holy Spirit dwelt continually and guided them into all truth, in the prophets only at a certain time; in the latter it was by virtue of an immanent habitus, in the latter it was bestowed after the manner of a temporary act, Num. 11, 25. 2 Kings 8:15-18.; partly from the object at which they laboured; because the prophets were sent forth to certain nations, or to certain persons, the apostles to all the world." (*Ad 1 Cor. 12, 28. Bibi, illustrat, ad 1. c.*)

meneutical formal error, it will not be possible to assert the impossibility from the outset, just as little as that of a grammatical linguistic error or a chronological error." (S. Tholuck, *The Old Testament in the New Testament*. Gotha 1861. p. 59 f.) - Is it already an irresponsible sin against the dear man of God Luther to ascribe to him, for lack of his own hindsight, an opinion by which, if one compared a hundred other sayings of his, he would stand there as the most confused head in the world, yes, an opinion, he would curse into the abyss of hell, it is a still more frightful sin against thousands, who have recognized Luther as the greatest witness of truth after the apostles and prophets, and who, against all truth, are made to err in their faith by Luther's authority).

As for Prof. Cremer's reference to the fact that Luther also speaks "of an insufficient proof of the apostle Paul Gal. 4, 21. ff. ('too weak for the engraving')", it almost seems as if the aforementioned had not compared the passage in question in its context either! From Cremer's words, every reader must conclude that Luther reproached Paul for having given an unsound proof. From the context, however, the exact opposite results. On the contrary, Luther praises Paul for having gloriously proved the doctrine of bondage under the law and freedom under the gospel, and then illustrating Gal. 4:21 ff. with a lovely allegory, even though an allegory in itself contains no proof. Luther writes to Gen. 18,

1) Incidentally, it is a great bad habit of many newer theologians, when they cite Luther's words, not to indicate exactly where they are to be found, so that one can look them up in their context. Unfortunately, this also happens in many cases with the words of Luther discussed above. The meaning of them is passed on from book to book like a fixed tradition, and it is therefore assumed that it is unnecessary to say where the words are found. Pastor v. Nolcken, too, seems to have experienced this, without, however, being misled in his faith. He therefore writes in the "Epilogue" to his protest: "Luther's well-known judgment about the 'straw-haired' James and many 'straw-haired' things in the prophets have been held up to me. Now, as far as Luther's judgment on James is concerned, it is essentially conditioned by his position on the latter as an antilegomenon, in relation to which he places himself all the more firmly on the homologumena. Where the judgment in question stands about some things in the prophets, I do not know, but it will probably (as also about James) only want to express a comparison. This much is certain for Luther, that even if he did not stand on James and other things, he did stand on all other things, and thus on the Scriptures themselves." (p. III.) To be sure, the suspicion of Luther, as a predecessor of modern theology, did him no harm by God's grace, but how many are there who, without opportunity to compare Luther's words in context, do not then fall into consternation and finally into wavering?

2-5: "As far as this text is concerned, we are indeed satisfied that the historical understanding does not argue against the Jews, but nevertheless, at the time of these changes it is also true that this, when it has first been seriously proved for a right reason, is then also acted upon with other pleasing words and examples, which seem somewhat weaker to the matter. For so does Paul Gal. 4, 22. ff., after he has masterfully proved the doctrine of faith, he afterwards brings in the allegory of Sarah and Hagar, which, though it is too weak for the sting, 1) for it departs from the historical understanding, yet it makes the transaction of faith finely light and adorns it." (Tom. I, 1731.) It is indeed incomprehensible how Cremer wants to read out of this a rebuke of Paul on the part of Luther, while Luther rather justifies Paul against the Jews with these words of his. Or is it against the perfection of a scripture, if in an exposition of it, which contains no proof at all, but is only to put the already proven thing in the light, is not useful for proving, but for putting the thing in the light? -

We reserve the right to prove in the next issue that Luther, far from sharing the modern concept of inspiration, strictly adhered to the concept of inspiration of the ancient church, and that in this he was the predecessor and model of all our recognized orthodox dogmatists.

(To be continued.)

The Pope's latest Encyclical.

The present holder of the antichristian See, Pope Leo XIII, issued a circular letter (*Immortale Dei*) under the 1st of November, 1885, in which he gives ex cathedra instruction to "all the peoples of the Catholic world concerning the Christian institution of States and the duties of individual citizens." It is noticeable that this circular

1) In the original Latin text it says: "*Addit postea de Sara et Hagar allegoriam, quae, etsi in acie minus valet (nam discedit ab historico sensu), tamen lumen addit causae et ornat eam.*" (Opp. exeget. lat. curavit Elsperger. Erlangae 1829. Tom. III, 189.) The words of the translator: "whether it (the allegory) is too weak for engraving," should therefore have read more exactly: "Whether it has less probative force in the controversy (with the Jews)." From which it is at the same time evident that it did not occur to Luther to deny that for Christians who have recognized Paul's authority as that of an inspired writer, and who therefore acknowledge that the doctrine presented by Paul by means of an allegorical interpretation of a story is just as conclusive as any other doctrine presented by him directly; according to the established hermeneutical principle: "*Sensus allegoricus non est argumentativus, nisi a Spiritu Sancto ipso traditus*, i.e., the allegorical sense is not conclusive, the allegorical sense is not argumentative unless it is taught by the Holy Spirit himself.

has not attracted more attention here in America. The secular press, which otherwise acts as the guardian of our state institutions, has either taken no notice of it at all or only a superficial one. In English ecclesiastical papers, which have come to our notice, we have so far found only in the "Churchman" of the Episcopalians a longer decisive discussion against this latest declaration of war by the Pope. For indeed - this Encyclical is an open declaration of war against all governments and especially against our state and ecclesiastical conditions. The pope inculcates: State and Church must not be separated; the State as State must profess, protect, and promote the Christian religion, and that the "right" Christian religion, the Papist religion. Cults contrary to this religion can be "borne" by the State only temporarily. The public instruction of the people should be in the hands of the "true" Church, the Papacy. Freedom of speech and of press, that is, freedom to speak and write against the Church of the Pabst, does not belong to the rights of a citizen and therefore should not be tolerated even by a rightly constituted State. Finally, the duty is imposed on all Catholics to work with all their strength, through active participation in civic and political life, so that the entire state is established according to the order of True Christianity, that is, the papacy. In other respects, too, the Encyclical is a genuinely papal work of art. It is a masterpiece in the art of lies and distortion. As in the Tridentinum the doctrine of Scripture is usually condemned in such a way that the true doctrine is combined with a manifest error and then the anathema is pronounced over the whole, so also in this Encyclical the pope combines and condemns revolution and reformation, apostasy from Christianity and apostasy from the papacy, etc., with one another. The Encyclical is a document full of deceit and malice; it is at once flattering and sinisterly threatening. It bristles with assurances that it only wants to help the truth to triumph in the world, and yet it is itself a great untruth from beginning to end and has the sole purpose of suppressing the truth.

In order to prove the foregoing, we now communicate the main ideas from the Encyclical, as it is printed in three numbers in the papist "Herald of Faith".

The pope begins: Although it is certain and history teaches that the welfare of public life is based on the beneficial influence of the "Church", nevertheless "very many have really believed that the order of public life is to be drawn from somewhere other than the teachings approved by the Church". These false views have spread namely "in recent times." "Therefore, it seems to us" - the Pope concludes his introduction - "most highly

It is important and appropriate to Our Apostolic Office to compare the new opinions concerning the state with Christian doctrine, trusting that in this way the causes of error and doubt will be removed by the illumination of truth (!), and thus everyone will easily be able to recognize those sublime rules of life which he is bound to observe and obey."

The pope now describes the form and shape of the rightly constituted state. He starts from the proposition that the sovereign power that the civil community needs comes from God, and he admits that "the right to rule is not in itself necessarily bound to any particular constitution of the state. However the state is constituted: "the holders of authority must always keep God, the supreme ruler of the world, before their eyes, and in the administration of the commonwealth take him as their model and guideline . . . Government, then, must be just, not imperious, but, as it were, paternal, because God's rule over men is most just and connected with paternal kindness; it must be conducted for the good of the nationals, because the superior is superior only in order that he may provide for the good of the country. And it must in no way happen that the power of the state serves the interests of one or a few, since it is instituted for the public good." To such a government obedience is inculcated in the subjects. This statement of the nature of temporal authority sounds at first very pious. It is certainly true that, as the temporal authorities are God's order, so they are to be, as it were, an image of God's justice in their administration of public law. It is to be God's servant for the punishment of evildoers and for the praise of the pious. But in his whole long Encyclical, the pope says not a word about the fact that a Christian must always be subject "to the authority that has power over him" (Rom. 13:1), that is, also to the authorities, who, like the Neronian authorities of old, do not always act justly in the administration of public law, but often show themselves tyrannical. Thus, already in this part of the Encyclical lies an indirect call to revolution. The pope expressly reserves the right to decide how public law must be constituted in a state, and which authorities are "just" and which are not. According to this, of course, the duty of obedience or disobedience is determined. In this Encyclical, the Pope expressly refers to the Consensus of the Roman Pontiffs. Thus he also wants to have recognized as truth what, for example, a Nicolaus I and a Gregory VII have stated. The former says: "The Roman See judges who belong to the godless princes and who do not." 1) And the latter: "Without the confirmation of the pope, no civil and no canonical law has any validity.

1) Citirt by Dr. Schick, Protest. Reply p. 259.

book validity. The pope alone has the right to use the imperial ornaments, he alone is owed the kissing of the feet by the secular princes, and he alone is entitled to the removal of emperors and kings from their dignity and to the release of subjects from the oaths they have taken." (Op. cit.) Leo XIII does not dare to use such plain language. But one must be unwilling to see it, if one does not recognize that this was the ulterior motive and ultimate meaning of his execution.

But the Pope becomes even more specific in describing what a true authority is. The rightly "constituted state" - he continues - "must now obviously correspond to the many and great duties that connect it with God, also through public religiosity. . . . "Just as no one" (that is, no individual person) "may neglect his duties towards God, and the highest of all duties is that of taking into one's heart and life, not any religion, but that religion which God prescribes, and which proves by sure and undoubted marks to be the true one: Just so also the states without crime cannot behave as if God were not there at all, or abandon the care of religion as a foreign and useless affair to them, or choose for themselves one of several forms of religion without distinction according to whim; rather, in regard to the worship of the Deity, they must by all means adopt that manner and rule which God has expressly ordained for his worship. Therefore, the name of God must be sacred among the rulers of the state, and they must consider it one of their most noble duties to turn their favor to religion, to protect it with benevolence, to make it secure with their prestige and the force of the laws, and not to introduce or adopt anything that might be detrimental to its prosperity. They also owe this to the citizens over whom they preside. For we men are all born and called to the attainment of a good above all goods, which is deposited for us in heaven, beyond the frailty and brevity of this earthly life, as our final end, towards which we are to direct all our endeavors. Since the complete happiness of mankind depends on this, the attainment of the aforementioned goal is not only important to the individual, but everything. Consequently, the State, which is by nature set up for the common good, must, in its care for the public welfare, take into account the interests of the citizens in such a way that, in regard to that highest and immutable good which they voluntarily strive for, it not only places no obstacle in their way, but rather offers them every possible encouragement. And it belongs especially to this that the State shall assist in the preservation and maintenance of religion, the practice of which unites man with God." The right state, then, in which one proves to be an obedient subject...

is that which publicly confesses and accepts the "true religion". If the latter does not happen, the state commits a "crime". It is "one of the most excellent duties" of the "rulers of the state" to promote the "true religion" and to secure it with laws.

But which religion is the true one, which every properly constituted state is bound to adopt in the manner indicated? The pope says: "It is easy to see this who examines the question with enlightened and sincere thought. It is the religion of the church which recognizes the pope as supreme lord. The Pope writes: "The Only Begotten Son of God founded on earth a society which is called the Church, and to which he has committed the continuation of the sublime divine office, which he received from the Father, to the end of time. 'As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you' (John 20:21.). 'Behold, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world' (Matth. 28, 20.). Therefore, as Jesus Christ came to earth that men might 'have life, and have it abundantly' (John 10:10), so also the Church has for her ultimate end the eternal life of souls. For the same reason it is so constituted by nature, that it should embrace the whole multitude of men, without being limited by any bounds of time or place: 'Preach the gospel to every creature' (Marc. 16:15.). To this great multitude of men God Himself ordained authorities, who should preside over their office by authority from above. Among them, according to his will, one should be the first and greatest and the most reliable teacher, and should be entrusted by him with the keys of the kingdom of heaven" - namely, the pope of Rome. "'Unto thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven' (Matt. 16:19.), 'Feed my lambs . . . feed my sheep' (John 21:16, 17.). 'I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not'" (! L. u. W.) "(Luc. 22, 32.)." Thus Leo XIII announced to all States that they must declare the Roman Church to be the State religion, and protect and promote it as the only legitimate religion, if they would not otherwise be guilty of a "crime." He condemns the view that church and state should be separate as a heretical one, referring to his predecessors in office. He writes: "On the separation of Church and State, Gregory XVI says: 'We can expect no better fruits for religion and the secular authorities from the efforts of those who want to separate the Church from the State and to break off the mutual harmony of the kingdom and the priesthood. In fact, it is certain that that harmony, which has always been beneficial and salutary for both sacred and state interests, is greatly feared by the very lovers of the most shameless freedom.' The State

Now, who is thus united in blessed "harmony" with the "true church," must not, of course, allow "the church" to be attacked in word and writing. This is what the pope intends when he writes: "The State, no less than individuals, is not permitted either to disregard religious duties altogether or to be indifferent to the various forms of religion; the unrestricted power to think, and to throw what is thought into the public, does not belong to the rights of citizens, and is by no means to be counted among the things worthy of favor and protection." There is, however, a dispensation with regard to the introduction of Pabstism as the state religion. But only a temporary one, and demanded by certain circumstances. Leo XIII admits: "If the Church declares it unlawful to attribute to the various forms of religious practice the same right as to the true religion, she does not therefore condemn those authorities of the State who, for the attainment of a great good or for the prevention of a great evil, patiently endure the existence of various cults in the State."

What the Pope says in general about the freedom and right of the Church to administer ecclesiastical affairs independently and unhindered by the State is correct. But the pope does not mean it in a Christian way, even if he once speaks in a Christian way. The ecclesiastical power which the pope wants to see preserved, he describes more closely as that which "the Roman popes" have always defended "with invincible stoutness against the enemies," which also "the princes themselves and the rulers of the republics recognized in word and deed." "by using treaties, negotiations, exchange of legations, and other commercial intercourse with the Church as a legitimate sovereign power," which finally was also "fortified by secular principality as an excellent defense of its freedom." So the pope is not concerned with a "spiritual power" as well as with secular power. It is also a pure mockery when the pope refers to Matt. 22:21, "Give to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's," and says that each of the two powers, the spiritual and the governmental, is "supreme in its own sphere. The area of "spiritual" power the pope soon describes thus: "Whatever in human things is somehow sacred, whatever belongs to the salvation of the soul and to the worship of God, whether it be so by its nature or merely because of the end to which it is referred, all this belongs to the power and judgment of the Church." Truly, an excellent definition of "spiritual power"! It is broad enough to make everything that is the emperor's subject to the pope's power. To this "ecclesiastical" power belongs, for example, also the temporal rule of the

The same applies to the right to depose emperors and kings and to absolve subjects from their oaths of allegiance, likewise "because of the purpose to which this is referred. With this specialization of the "ecclesiastical" power, we do not impute anything to the Encyclical. It itself has just presented the temporal rule of the pope as belonging to the ecclesiastical power, and for the conception of ecclesiastical power it has referred to the "Roman popes," thus also, for example, to Nicholas I and Gregory VII.

After Leo XIII has set forth "the Christian order of human society," he attempts to describe how well princes and peoples would stand with it. He also quotes Augustine. What Augustine says about the beneficial influence of Christianity, he quite unsparingly refers to the Papst sects. Here the Pope is seized by an elegiac mood. He remembers earlier times, namely the blessed time of the Middle Ages. "There was a time" - he writes - "when the states were governed according to the teachings of the Gospel, when Christian wisdom with its divine power had permeated the laws, the institutions, the customs of the peoples, and all the orders of the state, when the religion founded by JESUS Christ flourished everywhere in the position befitting its dignity, firmly established by the favor of princes and the protection of magistrates, when priesthood and kingship were happily united by concord and mutual service. Ordered in such a manner, the life of the states bore exceedingly glorious fruits" (as is seen in the disrupted state relations of the Middle Ages, L. u. W.), "whose memory still lives on and will live on in innumerable monuments, which the adversaries are not able to destroy or obscure by any art." ... "Certainly these goods would still have persisted if the concord of both powers had continued" (this "concord of both powers" has existed, for example, in Mexico and the South American republics - the lovely fruits are before our eyes! L. u. W.); "and still greater might justly have been expected, if the authority, the doctrine, and the counsels of the Church had been followed with greater fidelity and perseverance." But now came the Reformation, touching the "Christian religion" of the Pabbacy, and disturbing those lovely medieval conditions. Pabst writes: "But that pernicious and deplorable innovation, which was kindled in the sixteenth century, after first disrupting the Christian religion, soon penetrated in its natural progress into philosophy, and from philosophy into all the orders of civil society. From this source come those newer principles of unbridled liberty, which were invented and proclaimed in the mighty revolutions of the last century, as the principles and foundations of a new right, which had been unknown before, and which was not only founded by the Christian religion, but also by the Christian religion.

but also from the natural right in more than one piece." In this spirit the Encyclica now goes on for a while, describing the mischief which is said to have flowed from the Reformation. It is the old shameless papist lie: The Reformation is the real source of revolution and of all ruin in society and in the State. In view of the fact that it is precisely the papist countries which were and still are the real seat of revolution (compare Spain, Mexico, the South American republics), it takes all the papist shamelessness in the world to dare again and again to assert that the Reformation is the source of revolution. No teacher of the Church since the time of the Apostles has more powerfully and earnestly urged Christians to obedience to the secular authorities than Luther. And yet it is to the Reformation that the principle is to be traced: "Let all men, as they are in themselves alike in descent and nature, so let them also in fact be alike among themselves in practical life; let each man be so his own master that he is in no way subject to the authority of another; let no man have the right to command others."

In his evaluation and condemnation of the principles that are said to have sprung from the Reformation, the pope, in apparent contradiction with a previous statement, condemns the republican form of government. For, following the words just quoted, he writes: "Where society is governed by such doctrines, there is no other rule than the will of the people, which, as it alone has power over itself, so also alone makes laws for itself; it only chooses individuals to whom it entrusts itself, but in such a way that it does not confer upon them government both as a right and as a mandate, and indeed as a mandate to be exercised in its name."

It is precisely the essence of the republic that the people gives itself laws, and delegates the government to individual persons, who then exercise the government as a mandate in the name of the people. The "right" of the government is then also set at the same time. And Christians regard such a government as equally the monarchical as God's order. When the pope concludes from a government on behalf of the people: "The divine rule is hushed up as if God either were not there at all or did not care in any way for human society," this is a quite wrong conclusion. Godless men deny the divine order even in the monarchical form of government, "as if God either were not there at all, or yet cared in no way for human society." Christians, on the other hand, know that God's hand sets the authorities both by popular election and by hereditary succession to the throne. In the end, however, it comes out again that the pope does not accept any form of government, be it monarchical or republican.

and denies its divinely ordained character, which does not elevate Pabstry - with suppression of the "other cults" - to the status of state religion, hands over the public instruction of the people to Pabstry, subjects the press to censorship in the sense of Pabstry, stands up for the secular rule of Pabstry, in short: which does not live in perfect "harmony" with the Church, i.e., is not absolutely the instrument of Pabstry. Why, indeed, does the pope condemn the proposition that "the people should possess in themselves the source of all rights and all power"? Because it follows "that the State does not consider itself bound by any kind of duty to God, that it publicly professes no religion, nor is it required to inquire which of several alone is the true one, in order then to prefer one to the others and to favor it especially; rather, all kinds are to be given an equal right, provided only that the order of the State suffers no harm by them.

Consequently, every question about religious matters is left entirely to the judgment of the individual. . . . From this, of course, arise the worst consequences: complete lack of rules for everyone with respect to the judgment of his conscience, the freest opinions about the worship of God and the omission of the same, an unlimited arbitrariness of thought and the publication of thought. Once such highly praised foundations of state life are laid, it is easy to understand into what unnatural position the church" (namely, the papist one) "is forced. For where the deeds agree with these doctrines, the Catholic Church is assigned the same place in the State with the societies alien to it, or a still smaller one. . . . The church, which by the command and commission of JESUS Christ is to teach all nations, is forbidden to concern itself with the public instruction of the people. In matters of mixed law, the rulers of the State proceed at their own pleasure, and proudly despise the most sacred laws of the Church in this respect. Therefore they subject to their jurisdiction the marriages of Christians, deciding even on the conjugal bond, on the unity and continuity of marriage. . . . In short, they deal with the Church in such a way that, denying the character of an essentially and legally perfect society, they place it on a par with the other communities which the State includes within itself. . . . The laws, the administration, the religionless education of the young, the deprivation and extirpation of religious orders, of the temporal power of the Roman Pontiff: all these aim at cutting the sinews of ecclesiastical institutions, and limiting the liberty of the Catholic Church, and destroying her other rights."

From this it is clear that the pope has all the governments that he has

as not coming from God. He assures us that there is no just reason "to accuse the Church of being narrow-minded and intransigent, or of being hostile to genuine and legitimate liberty. Of course not! One has only to get the definition of "liberty" from the pope. Then - one will find everything in order.

Finally, the Pope tells the Catholics how to arrange their "opinions" and their "actions" in these times. The instruction is clear and simple. He writes: "As far as opinions are concerned, it is necessary to hold firmly to everything that the Roman Pontiffs have commanded or will command, and to confess it openly if necessary. In particular, with respect to the so-called "liberties" of modern times, one must adhere to the judgment of the apostolic see and judge as it judges. One must be careful not to be deceived by their beautiful appearance, and well consider from what beginnings they have sprung" (namely, from the Reformation!). As far as "actions" are concerned, the Catholics are to seek to exert influence on the administration of individual cities as well as of entire states, "in order to introduce the wise teachings and the moral law of Christianity" (i.e., of the Papacy) "as the most salutary lifeblood into all the veins of the state system. In view of this glorious goal, the pope exhorts all Catholics to unity, especially "the men of the press": "If strife has existed, let it be voluntarily forgotten; what has been done carelessly and unlawfully, let the guilty make amends for by mutual love, and especially by general obedience to the apostolic see." This, in its essentials, is the Encyclica Immortale Dei of Leo XIII, "Given at Rome at St. Peter's, November 1, 1885."

As far as its meaning and content are concerned, it is not inferior to the bulls of the Gregories in the impudence of its demands and claims, just as Leo XIII refers to the consensus of all his predecessors; only in language and expression does it adapt itself to the conditions of the times. Whoever allows himself to be deceived by the new manner in which the old Pabst's song is sung, reveals a regrettable blindness. It is incomprehensible how the Luthardtsche Kirchenzeitung can write words like these: "Apart from this, as well as from the points emphasized above, which are to be decisively combated from the Protestant point of view, the clear, calm, and moderate presentation in the Encyclica, which is held in the tone of an academic lecture, is touching until the end." The Luthardtsche Kirchenzeitung, of course, agrees with a large part of the content of the Encyclical, especially with the main part that the state, as a state, has the duty,

to confess the true religion. If the most respected theologians are so completely blind, how can we be surprised when princes and politicians grope in the dark in the fight against Pabstism?

There is nothing in the whole Encyclical that could pleasantly "touch" us as Christians and as citizens; we have absolutely no interests in common with the pope and cannot fight shoulder to shoulder with the pope on any point. We freely advocate the entire liberty of the Church. We do not concede to any state authority, be it republican, monarchical, or absolute, the right to command us in the least in ecclesiastical matters. If princes and states have presumed and still presume to act according to the principle, *cujus est regio, ejus est religio*, we protest against this as against an ungodly encroachment on the rights and spiritual liberty of the church, and, by the grace of God, would rather give up our goods and lives than submit to the principle. But when the pope pleads for the "liberty of the church," he does not mean the spiritual liberty which Christ has bestowed on his church, but always and always the antichristian power which he usurps for himself as the alleged successor of Peter, and which also always encroaches upon the secular domain. If, therefore, the pope has succeeded and still succeeds in humiliating princes who, for their part, have been guilty of encroachments into a foreign territory, no Christian can rejoice over this as over a victory of truth. In this case only one devil cast out another. It was a great blindness when, in the German Reichstag, so-called Conservatives fought shoulder to shoulder with the Centrum in past years.

Nor can what the Pope says against unbridled freedom of speech and of the press be in any way sympathetically "touching." Admittedly, in the interest of the public good, we as citizens will insist that the impudent spirits who undermine the foundations of the state and social order and of civic morality in speech and writing be stopped in their tracks. But does the pope take offense at the freedom of speech and of the press in this sense? Not at all! On the contrary, he wants to have suppressed by the state that which impinges on the true church, that is, on the papacy. Whoever helps the pope to have freedom of speech and of press restricted in his (the pope's) sense, would soon learn, after the pope has succeeded in his plan, what the pope means. Incidentally, the secular authorities should exercise the right of censorship already with respect to the papal Encyclical. The secular authorities would not be guilty of encroaching on the spiritual realm if they all forbade the publication of the Encyclical. For the Encyclica evidently encroaches upon that which is the emperor's. It is, as we have seen, a declaration of war against all states which, as states, do not want to be at the pope's beck and call.

Finally, we also say that the church is a blessing for all human relationships and especially for the states. The good leaven of the church is to have a fine effect on all earthly conditions, even on those of public and state life. But not by constituting and governing the states "according to the gospel of Christ." This demand, apart from anything else, is utter nonsense. The Gospel of Christ must be thoroughly perverted, and papal commandments and ecclesiastical police regulations must be understood by it, if one thinks of wanting to govern the States "according to the Gospel of Christ. With the Gospel of Christ one can only govern Christians, not states. The Christian church benefits the state in such a way that all true Christians are first of all thoroughly faithful citizens for their own persons, and then also stand as models of civil virtue for others. For the sake of Christians, God makes the whole state community prosper, just as Christians lift up their hands in supplication to God for the country and the authorities. Thus the Christian church becomes the greatest blessing for the state. The situation is different, however, with regard to the papacy. Just as Pabbism is not Christianity but antichristianity, so it is not a blessing but a curse for human society and for the states, even in earthly relations. The proof of this is given by history on a grand scale. Where the papacy succeeded in "introducing its most wholesome lifeblood into all the veins of the state system," to use Leo XIII's expression, everything rotted and corrupted. The states have for the most part degenerated into "robber states. The papacy as an institution of Satan (cf. Luther: the papacy at Rome founded by the devil), where it comes to rule, deprives mankind not only of blessedness, but also of physical well-being. The secular superiors should therefore never give the pope even the little finger, but - if negotiations cannot be avoided - always touch him only with the fork. "Deus vos impleat odio papae!" - this also applies to politicians who mean well by their fatherland.

F. P.

Literature.

The first part of the book is an introduction to the history of the German language. A Guide to the Recognition of the Unnaturalness of Materialism and its Fundamental Consequences. In the form of a treatise, dedicated to the sincerely thinking unbeliever by Eugen Carl Fried. Ernst, evangelical pastor at Cottage Grove, Washington Co, Minn. Price 25 Cts.

As proof that man is not a highly developed animal, but was originally created as a man, the author gives the following points to consider: The idea of immortality inherent in man; the spiritual powers,

The following are some of the reasons for this: the ability to produce and the free will of man; the unprovability of a transition from the animal kingdom to mankind; the limits of instinct and of the species, which cannot be transcended by the animal; the fact that man is a permanent type; the peculiarity of man, which distinguishes him from the other creatures and consists in self-consciousness, self-determination and freedom of mind; his search for origin and purpose; his rational, immortal "soul of purpose" and his spiritual life; the preservation of his spiritual products; the direction of the animal's way of life, which is not to be decided by the animal itself, but which has been put into the species by the creator; the further development of the human spirit; strange events in the human sleeping life and in the dying; the striving of man for imperishable goals; The transmission of mental work from one generation to another, that is, the indefinite productivity of mental power; the complete absence of an example of the transition of one species of animal into another; the manifestation of the refined or neglected mental life in the outer person of individual men and whole peoples.

As consequences of the question under consideration are cited: the incapacity of science and the contradictions of naturalists in explaining creation; the fact that the truth of Christianity is based on life experience; the testimony of a personal God by the purposefulness of creation in whole and in particular, by the consciousness of God inherent in every man, by the religion springing from it, and the art springing from religion, and by "the venerable document, the Bible, in which mankind has the greatest treasure of science." Carnal service is the cause of the rejection of the Bible; destruction is the only effect of materialism, and destruction the final result of its dominion.

From these points it is obvious that there is much here that is useful for the encounter with materialists. However, it is highly improbable that they could bring a Darwinism to other thoughts. If a man has made it clear to his reason that one of the Chaldean primordial slime-bodies has, in the course of the millennia, formed itself entirely on its own account to choose for the present the bodily constitution of the easily bouncing flea, while another ancient contemporary of the same preferred now to be loaded as a camel: such a philosopher is irrefutably certain that a third corpuscle could very well occupy itself in the present time with bringing forth the "eruptions of a spiritual being of man" described by the author, independent of matter and far transcending it and its properties. To whom it seems possible that, although today two-by-two is four, after the lapse of certain millennia two-by-two will become five, it cannot seem impossible that two-by-two will also become seven, if only the necessary millennia are observed. With time everything makes itself, only sometimes much time is necessary. Nothing can help such people but the truthful preaching of the law and the gospel. A more childlike sitting at the feet of the apostles and prophets could also have saved the author from many an erroneous, nebulous assertion drawn purely from the imagination. In order to give at least one proof of this, the following piece of fantasy may be mentioned. Of the ancient Greeks, the author says: "A people of such profound spiritual sublimity and learning, once proverbial and still today imbibed ... possessed a deeply inherent longing for divine communion and, in the absence of knowledge of the all-true God, gave expression to it in the worship of many gods. The higher the intelligence, i.e. the spiritual aptitude of a people, the more this people will rise from lower to higher thinking and feeling, the more clearly will the consciousness of God and the idea of God springing from it reveal itself." We ask: Where did ever a people impute such silliness, meanness, even unnameable abominations to gods whom they worshipped, as the people of the Greeks did? Would to God that all who lead the cause of the church would fight in the armor of truth, which is presented in the confession of the orthodox church as proven in every battle. God grant that a more accurate acquaintance with the truths which the Church possesses may increase the usefulness of the gifts and zeal of the author of the above writing in further work.

R. L.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Religion and American Citizenship. As little as the latter is dependent on the former, the latter has its limit, namely, when the religion of an individual prevents him from fulfilling his duties to the state. We read the following in a local political newspaper: The new federal judge Powers in Utah has established the principle that one who believes in polygamy as a divine institution cannot become a citizen of the United States. Niels Hansen, a native of Denmark, came to him for naturalization. When questioned by the judge, Hansen stated that he would respect the Constitution and laws of the land, including those that prohibited polygamy. But he considered it not only permissible, but also right, according to divine commandment, for a man to have more than one wife. Therefore, if he were called to serve on a jury, he would not be able to find someone guilty of polygamy, even if the evidence were fully supplied. Upon this explanation the judge refused to admit him to citizenship. This decision, the correctness of which cannot well be disputed, is a severe blow to Mormonism. W.

The controversy over the doctrine of election by grace. After "Old and New" had ceased to appear regularly earlier, it also ceased its sporadic appearance at the end of last year. Its editor, who, as he expresses himself, is "practically considered out of office," has turned to a new enterprise with the New Year. He is publishing a new English paper "for the Adolescent Youth," "Lutheran Young Folks," thus carrying out "a favorite idea with which he has dealt for many years." The Ohio and Iowa Synods still continue to fight us in articles of contention. We have still read at least a part of them, but have not found it necessary to continue or renew the polemic on our part. The false doctrine on the part of our American opponents has long since solidified itself in a certain form and shape. It came to a head at last in the sentence, "Blessedness does not depend in a certain sense on God" (Schmidt), as against the Lutheran truth: blessedness depends in every sense and in every respect on God alone, as damnation depends in every respect on man alone. Ohio recently formulated the false doctrine thus: "It should be clear to all that if God decided the matter, no one would be lost" as opposed to the Lutheran truth: God, and God alone, "decides" "the matter" on the side of blessedness, while man, and man alone, by his evil will and at the instigation of the devil, "decides the matter" on the side of damnation. The Iowa polemic is characterized by its forced tone. The Fritschel brothers print, in addition to their own writings, the very stupidest stuff from Germany (e.g., from the Immanuel Synod), and in footnotes they declare their horror at Missouri's "Calvinistic doctrine of predestination. That this horror is not genuine, but affected, is so obvious that it is a real punishment to have to read Fritschel's manifestations. - How it came about that Prof. Schmidt is "practically speaking, out of office" is described by him: "In the summer, while the Church Council was in session here and everything was again only the tiresome continuation of the 'cunctatorial' procedure praised by Dr. W., I sent a declaration to the K. R. that I would not, for various enumerated reasons, work with the Church Council.

to continue my previous collaboration with false teachers. A thorough change was necessary. I should either be given leave for a certain period of time or, if that was not possible, my declaration should be regarded as resignation. This led to the second meeting in September, where the faculty had to discuss the doctrine for two days before the assembled Council. But again no result - only that the Council decided with 4 votes against one no and 3 abstaining from voting (although they "stand correctly" [i.e., Schmidtian, L. u. W.] "in the doctrine itself), that I should have brought my charge of false doctrine in the miss. "Redegjoerelse" not proven. Indirectly the miss. Indirectly, the false doctrine is approved, because the 4 had co-signed the document, so they were actually - defendants and judges at the same time. (? L. u. W.) So the matter now hangs again. There are now only 6 students here (? L. u. W.) against 43 5-6 years ago. Since the Norwegians, who are otherwise right in teaching, did not like the fact that I had stopped my work, I explained to my colleagues that I was willing to give lessons in certain subjects, but only with the understanding that I was no longer in a solidary (jointly responsible) relationship with them. I also made my offer known to the students, the majority of whom are Missourians, since ours have turned to Columbus and Aston; but both parts politely rejected it. Appeal to the Synod will now be the last step to take; but we can hardly expect much in that respect."

F. P.

Minnesota Synod. Since January 1, the "Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Messenger. Published by the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Minnesota. Edited temporarily by the College of Teachers of Dr. Martin Luther College at New Ulm." The "Synodal Messenger" is published twice a month at the rate of 50 cents a year. We cordially welcome this paper of the Sister Synod, the publication of which was made necessary by the establishment of the teaching college at New Ulm. F. P.

The Iowa Synod and the General Council. The "wait-and-see" attitude of the Iowa Synod seems to be gradually causing some members of the Council to become seriously disconcerted. Last year the Iowa Synod had discussed in public session its formal affiliation with the Council, but in the end, in spite of emphasizing doctrinal agreement, decided not to do so yet. This decision came up during the Council negotiations. A committee, representing the sentiment of a large part of the Council, recommended to the assembly the adoption of the following sentences, which we find in the Iowa Church Gazette: "1. We are glad to learn that it is the considered and mature conviction of the Iowa Synod that there are no confessional causes in the **General Council** to restrain them from full membership. (2) We regret that the Iowa Synod, while affirming the greatest consideration and declaring the closest agreement with this body in the fellowship of faith and confession, has yet found it necessary to refer to **alleged** un-Lutheran practice within the **General Council**, which is inconsistent with the official declarations of the Council, and to defend itself against it as if, in affirming its sympathy with us, it were responsible for the same (that un-Lutheran practice). (3) Inasmuch as the Synod of Iowa has been granted the privilege of the floor, on condition that it adopt the fundamental principles of the Council, the attention of the Synod is to be directed to § 10 of the Church Power, where it is said: "In the formation of a general body, the synods know one another, and act with one another merely as synods. In such a case the official report of the synod must be accepted."

4. We call attention also to the fact that no constitutional provision has been made for the continuance of the privilege of debate for representatives of any particular Synod which has not ratified our Constitution. (4) We also call attention to the fact that no constitutional provision has been made for the continuance of the privilege of debate for representatives of any particular Synod which does not ratify our Constitution (i.e. does not join the Oounoil), and that, after sufficient time has elapsed for acquaintance with the principles of the Council, that privilege may be withdrawn at any time. 5th We deeply regret the operation of Providence, which has kept the representative of the Iowa Synod from this Convention; and let all further action on this subject be postponed until our next meeting." On these motions of the Committee a prolonged debate ensued. While some spoke against the adoption of them, that is, against a public censure of the Iowa Synod, others were decidedly in favor. Dr. Schmucker, for instance, pointed out that one of the propositions "contained a sting," while Dr. Krotel remarked, "That's what I like in it. They are clear and concise (pointed). After 18 years of association with the Council, action should have been taken. The attitude of the Iowa Synod is a peculiar one. The Iowa Synod waits and presses, until at last it has been spoken of as the 'waiting Iowa Synod,' and its representative has been on committees, and has had great influence on committees, and has considerably influenced the Oounoil and its formation, and now it is heard that it has no further objections, and now it says what it does (? L. & W.); I rejoice in the motions of committees. I have respect enough for my own dignity, and for the dignity of this body, to desire that these motions should come into the record." Dr. Späth was also opposed to the adoption of the resolutions. "He hardly thought there was any necessity for these resolutions. He said he had been astonished how little knowledge that Synod had of the principles and character of the General Council." Dr. Krotel, on the other hand, wondered that the Iowa Synod should be ignorant of the character and position of the Council, especially "as the representative of the Iowa Synod had been here so often, and had so great an influence among us." Dr. Späth, however, again earnestly advised that no resolution should be passed to prevent the Iowa Synod from having a more distant relation to the Council. Finally, a substitute of Dr. Späth's was adopted: "That, as the representative of the Iowa Synod has been prevented by divine providence from coming to the meeting of the Council, the adoption of a resolution in this matter be postponed until next year." The Iowa "Church Gazette" makes the following remarks on this subject: "Such, then, were the negotiations. It is to be remembered, however, that the Council did not adopt the motions of the Committee; that it did not act at all just yet. But the thoughts of the hearts have been revealed; the negotiations have been cultivated, are read, and make their impression, and we members of the Iowa Synod will not be willing to button ourselves up against them; each will make his own glosses about it, one this, the other that. Clerk of this can only say for his own person, that after these proceedings have come to his knowledge, he wishes our Synod had years ago severed this kind of connection with the General Council, and confined itself to the cultivation of free communion of faith with the same. For the rest, he keeps his glosses to himself until the time of further speech and action shall come." Incidentally, we cannot understand why Iowa is still opposed to outright union with the Council. All things considered, the doctrinal position of the Iowa Synod is certainly no better than that of the Council. The Council is "offi-

cially" Lutheran, but so far has not been able to take the Lutheran confession seriously. On the other hand, we do not know that the Council as such has outright rejected a confessional truth, even though individual synods and individuals of the Council have continually made gross errors known. The Iowa Synod, on the other hand, takes a decidedly heretical position as a synod. For it has thoroughly identified itself with its spokesmen, and its spokesmen have for years clearly and decisively taught synergism, and in doing so have fought against and decisively rejected the doctrine of the Lutheran Confession. As the Council has preferably sinned by omission, so the Iowa Synod has sinned by doing evil. The Iowa Synod, according to its definite and official rejection of Lutheran doctrines, belongs more with the Ohio Synod, than with the Council. F. P.

II. Foreign countries.

Pressing of Conscience in the Bavarian Regional Church. In the Breslau "Kirchenblatt" of November 15 of this year, the following is reported, among other things: In the "Fränkische Zeitung" we read that at the recently held Bavarian General Synod a motion was made that no clergyman who, because of his conscience, does not want to serve the Lord's Supper to divorced persons who have remarried should be forced to do so. One would think that such a request is self-evident or rather incomprehensible, since the church government is not allowed to force such a thing, for divorced persons who have been divorced contrary to Scripture are not divorced before God and break the marriage with a new marriage, precisely because the old one is not dissolved according to Scripture. Since the former marriage is not validly separated before God, the new one is an adulterous relationship, and those who live in it may not be given the sacrament. This seems very self-evident. A faithful Bavarian Lutheran clergyman found himself in such a case, hence his application to the General Synod. The synod, however, rejected the request, since the sacrament may not be denied to those divorced in violation of the Scriptures after their marriage, if only they come repentant, in view of the Lord, who does not cast sinners away. The General Synod, therefore, understands a penitent coming to be one in which one says: I am sorry that I have entered into this relationship, which according to Scripture is an adulterous one; but now that I am in it, I will also remain in it. Thus the Scripture is broken. Even more dangerous was the following matter. The same petitioners (the Synod of Dittenheim, they are the friends of Löhe) had also requested that the Lutheran Bavarian soldiers garrisoned in the united Palatinate be served with the sacraments by a Lutheran military clergyman. This request is also very natural and the most just in the world. Our small Prussian Lutheran Church therefore regularly sends pastors into the imperial lands to bring the Lutheran sacrament to the Lutheran soldiers. What we can do, the large Bavarian Landeskirche should also be able to do, and, outwardly seen, it can do it. But it does not have the heart. Here it comes to the decision whether a Lutheran Church can remain independent in relation to the Union or not. How was this decisive question treated at the Bavarian General Synod? It was pointed out that this motion originated in the Loehse movement, that it had been brought forward again and again, but that it could not be fulfilled, since the Uniate Palatine General Synod did not want it, and the Bavarian Lutheran soldiers did not take offense at the Uniate Lord's Supper. Thus the request was rejected, and the newspaper concludes its report with the words: "We hope that the matter will be resolved."

will thus finally be buried." We must not hope for this, for it would mean the burial of the Bavarian Lutheran confessional loyalty on this point. We hope that now, more than ever, our friends from the Löhne movement will not remain silent, but will raise their voices and prove by deed that they are still alive. - So much for the church bulletin. Foolish hope! Unfortunately, the Löhneans have often brought about a "movement" for the better, but they have never gone to the extreme, even to the point of threatening to separate themselves from the national church if they were forced to act against their conscience. After all, they have always obeyed men, namely their national church, more than God, and have none the less continued to play the role of the "Society for Inner Mission in the Sense of the Lutheran Church" (!). W.

Luther's Writings in Germany. In the "Theol. Literaturblatt" of December 4 of last year we read: The publication of the "Unprinted Sermons of Dr. M. Luther" by the publishing house F. W. Grunow in Leipzig of the "Unprinted Sermons of Dr. M. Luther from the Years 1528 to 1546. Andr. Poach's handwritten collection. Published from the original for the first time by Lic. Dr. G. Buchwald", of which two half-volumes of the collection of 4 volumes have been published so far, has found so little acceptance that not yet 50 copies have been sold. The publisher therefore feels compelled to cease further printing and to withdraw the small number of copies sold, unless the announcement of the situation has the effect that the number of subscribers necessary for the completion of the work, approximately 300, is still found. - We are not at all surprised at this fiasco of the publishing house. The interest in Luther's writings in Germany is almost only a historical one, and even this only the men of science have; the ordinary pastor and even more the simple Lutheran, however, is content to feast on individual heroic sayings of Luther; to buy Luther's writings he considers a luxury he cannot afford. No one believes more than the Missourian Free Churchmen, for example, that they can learn the right pure doctrine from Luther. For instance, Luther's writings are still good for picking out something here and there with which one thinks to be able to prove that Luther is basically the antesignanus of those who pay homage to a freer direction in the faith. Would that things were better in America! But even here Luther's writings outside the Synodal Conference are a *noli me tangere*.

W.

Is the refusal of the altar community a ban? Dr. Munkel seems to want to answer this question in the affirmative in his "Neues Zeitblatt" of November 18 of last year. There he writes, among other things: "The Breslau Separation has so far only put the Hanoverian and a few smaller state churches under the ban. Missouri will put them all in the frying pan without distinction, as many regional churches in Germany call themselves Lutheran, Mecklenburg, Saxony, Bavaria, Wuerttemberg, etc.". This Missouri ban will not be very frightening. For Missouri is also under the spell of the Breslauers, and the Breslauers under the spell of the Missourians. Likewise the Free Church of the Immanuel Synod lies under the Breslau and Missourian ban, and vice versa, as far as we know. Thus one may go still further, and find that all the Free Churches or Separations are under the ban. The national churches of Germany, therefore, will not be dismayed to find that they share the same lot with Missouri and the rest." That the Herr Doctor should be so ignorant as to regard the denial of altar fellowship as identical with the ban seems to us in itself unthinkable; in addition to this, the Herr Doctor would in such a case also be testifying against himself, for without doubt he will not, for example, enter into altar fellowship with stiff Catholics, and yet will not regard the latter as lying under his ban, together and apart.

But for so long a time they will be suspended, until they have removed the hindrance of the altar community, namely, their church and faith community. Matth. 5,23. 24. What power of blindness lies in prejudices! W.

Unchanged Bibles, Dr. Münkler reports: The unfortunate situation has already become apparent that the unchanged New Testament is no longer available at all, because it is no longer printed anywhere, which is why, where it is requested, the new text with its 14 improvements must be sent. Even to print the unchanged text costs too much money. As far as can be judged, the friends of a Bible improvement are not numerous in the country, at least they are decreasing.

City of Brunswick. To the 10,000 souls counting St. Andrew's parish on November 27 of last year, despite a petition of 1500 persons for a faithful pastor (resp. Pastor Beste), "the most left-wing candidate, Pastor Dr. Hasenclever from Badenweiler, was elected with 23 votes against 7, the same man to whom, after the colloquium held with him on September 21, 1880, the Consistory at Brandenburg (not the Landesconsistorium at Hanover, as No. 47, Sp. 1130) was denied the qualification to hold an office at the Dorotheenstädtische Kirche in Berlin (cf. 1880, No. 43), because he had not yet reached a firm and certain conviction about 'decisive salvation facts and salvation truths of Christianity'. Beste, on the other hand, who served the congregation faithfully for seven years and whose election sermon was generally well received, is not even one of the other two candidates who must be presented according to the law, because it was feared that Hasenclever could not be confirmed at the highest level and one of the other two candidates proposed could be elected. There is much mourning in the congregation, and in part no small indignation." - This "indignation" is the end of the matter. The wolf is in the sheepfold. Those who do not want to separate themselves have no other choice than to acknowledge the wolf as their shepherd.

W.

From Brunswick the "Allg. Kz." of November 27 of last year is written: Since, according to the Lutheran view, the communion of sacraments is the communion of churches, and since the Prince did not belong to the unchurched military congregation in Hanover, but to the Lutheran Schlotz church congregation, he is to be considered a member of the Lutheran church. As expected, even before the election of Prince Albrecht, all decisive factors agreed that the matter should be viewed in this way. This is of great importance to us, because otherwise § 214 of our constitution would have to be applied, which reads: "If the Prince should profess a religion other than the Lutheran religion, then the restriction in the personal exercise of church power which then occurs shall be established without delay with the consent of the Estates.

The Luther Monuments in Berlin and Dresden. The ultramontane "Germania" reports with pleasure that the Luther Monument in Berlin is to take the place of the former gallows. That is one joy. The second joy consists in the fact that the Luther monument in Dresden is erected on the same place where the Chancellor Crell was beheaded in 1601 after ten years of imprisonment for smuggling in Calvinism. She relates his harsh treatment and pious death with much circumlocution, to prove that the Lutherans also bloodily persecuted the heretics. She forgets only one thing. While today's Protestants firmly reject such blood judgments, today's Catholics place a bloody heretic like Father Arbues among the saints. They would have liked to have had Luther on the gallows and on the scaffold long ago; now at least a small satisfaction happens to them. But they do not notice that Luther is not disgraced by the square, but that the

Luther brought honor to the first place, just as the cross on Golgotha did not desecrate Christ, but through Christ became a badge of honor in the whole world. Luther has always been an opponent of bloody heretical judgments.

(N. Ztbl.)

Bismarck and the Pope. On December 29 of this year, the following is written to the local newspapers from London: "The Chronicle publishes a dispatch from Berlin, from which it emerges that the last allocation of the Pope was not received favorably in Berlin. One is of the opinion that it is evident from the tone of the allocation that the claims of the Vatican have grown as a result of the consideration which has been shown to the Pope by the fact that he has been asked for an investigation in the Caroline question." - It is more than surprising that one is surprised that the Pope's rump has swelled enormously as a result of Bismarck's concession. But it is frightening that Bismarck should have made that concession. Of course, he did not do it out of sympathy for the Antichrist, but out of politics. But he should know from history that it was precisely the policy of the emperors that has always brought up the pope whom they hated. As it has always happened, Bismarck's policy in favor of the Pope will also prove disastrous for him in the highest degree, and the saying will also prove true in the case of the great chancellor: "*Quem Deus vult perdere, prius dementat*," i.e., whom God wants to corrupt, he first takes away his reason. The pope has been so impudent as now to send a medal to Bismarck also. As a true Antichrist, he gives him the Order of Christ! Bismarck certainly richly deserves to receive it from such a hand; whether he has accepted it, however, is not yet reported; but he who says A, must also say B. Having acknowledged the pope as arbitrator between prince and prince, he must now wear the pope's medal to his shame. Isa. 14, 10. (Cf. Luther's Commentary.)

W.

Denmark. Things are better, praise God, with regard to the mixed marriage that Prince Waldemar entered into. Thus the Allg. Kz. of December 4 of last year reports: "On the occasion of the marriage of the Danish Lutheran Prince Waldemar with the Roman Catholic Princess Marie of Orleans in the chapel of Eu Castle, much has been said about the concessions which the former has made to the Roman Catholic Church. As the ultramontane "Univers" now reports, the religious celebration did indeed take place in the chapel of the castle, but without blessing and without Mass. Msgr. d'Hulst, after his wedding speech, contented himself with letting the newlyweds pronounce their consent. After this ceremony, the prelate and the other clergy present withdrew, and they do not know what took place afterwards before the Lutheran pastor. The Archbishop of Rouen, in whose diocese the marriage took place, did not appear at the ceremony. Accordingly, the Roman Catholic clergy would have refused to give their blessing to the marriage of the French princess to the Danish king's son, and it would not have been the groom's family that made concessions, but that of the bride.

The Lutheran Church in the Russian Baltic Provinces. Under the 3rd of December of last year, the following is written to a German paper, among others: If there could still be any doubt that the Lutheran Church in Livonia, Estonia and Courland, until recently recognized by the State as the ruling national church, is at present exposed to persecution - the latest imperial decree must make it clear to everyone that at present it is only tolerated and exposed to humiliations. Even before Count Tolstoy took over the Ministry of the Interior, the Secretary of State Durnovo addressed the following circular to the governors: "In the circular of January 30, 1862, under No. 21, the following was written

that the Lord and Emperor has deemed it sufficient to make the construction of churches of other faiths dependent on the approval of the civil authorities and the Ministry of the Interior, and on January 6 of the aforementioned year he ordered that those provisions be removed from the relevant articles of the Collection of Imperial Laws which prescribe a prior exchange of correspondence with the legal eparchial authorities when an application is made for the construction of churches of other faiths. At the present time, in view of the changed circumstances, Her Majesty the Emperor, in response to my most submissive report of October 10, has had the highest authority to order that the above-mentioned most high command be rescinded and that Article 247 of the Building Code be reinstated in full force. Accordingly, before submitting plans for the construction of churches of other faiths to the Ministry, the government authorities must first ascertain through an inquiry with the eparchial authorities of the right faith whether there are any obstacles to the approval of the construction. I have the honour to inform Your Excellency of such a most high will as a guideline. State Secretary Durnowo." In other words, this document states: The building of a Lutheran church shall henceforth be dependent on the discretion of the Greek bishop. - In the "Allg. Kz." of November 27 of last year we read: "In the last few weeks 19 Protestant (i.e. Lutheran) clergymen in Livonia and Courland have been put on trial and are facing deportation to Siberia, merely because they have done their duty and warned their parishioners against the intrigues of Greek propaganda.

Necrology. On December 8 of last year, at the age of 70, Christoph Hoffmann died in Jerusalem, the head of the so-called German temple, this alleged preliminary institution for the establishment of the millennial kingdom, the center of which was to be Jerusalem with a new temple cult. In 1840 the deceased became a teacher at the theological seminary in Tübingen, in 1841 a teacher at the salon near Ludwigsburg, in 1848 a delegate to the German National Assembly, in 1853 the head of the missionary institute at St. Chrischona near Basel, in 1856 the leader of the temple congregation at the Kirschenhardthof; in 1860 he left the national church, emigrated to Palestine in 1868 with those he had gathered, and finally moved with them to Jerusalem in 1878. Unfortunately he was not only a grossly chiliastic zealot, but at last fell into rejection of all the fundamental articles of the Christian faith. Since 1878 he had been fighting the doctrines of the Trinity, of the divinity of Christ, of the Atonement, of Baptism and the Holy Communion, etc., partly in his "Warte" and partly in special writings. Communion, etc. His energetic proselytism finally made him a Jew himself. - On November 17 of last year, Heinrich Schmid, since 1848 professor of theology at Erlangen in Bavaria, died. He was born in Harburg near Nördlingen on July 31, 1811, and is best known for his "Dogmatik der ev.-luth. Kirche, dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt" (1843), also here in America. As to his own position in faith and theology, the same is sufficiently indicated in an article of the "Allgem. ev.-luth. Kz." of November 27, concerning him, with the note: "When Hofmann (of Erlangen) was severely challenged on account of his doctrine of reconciliation, it was Schmid who entered into the ideas of his friend and warmly defended this 'new way of teaching old truth (!)'" Already above it is said of Hofmann that he had "always held Schmid as the most faithful" and that "for both of them Lutheranism was not the dogma in the first place, but the direction of life." - On December 3 of last year, Heinrich W. J. Thiersch also died in Basel at the beginning of his 68th year, who, as is well known, astonished many in 1849 by his conversion to the Irvingians.

W.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 32.

February 1886.

No. 2.

Preface.

(Continued.)

Under other circumstances than the present, it would be downright insulting to its readers if our "Lehre und Wehre" first sought to prove that Luther also believed and taught the literal inspiration of all canonical writings of the Old and New Testaments. This is testified to by Luther's whole appearance and activity, which was open to the eyes of the whole world, up to his death and on every page of the works he left behind. On this doctrine he stood, as on an immovable rock, personally present at Augsburg before Cajetan, at Leipzig before Dr. Eck at Leipzig, before the Emperor and the Empire at Worms, before Zwingli and the Oberlanders at Marburg; from this doctrine he proceeded on the cathedra and in the pulpit; this doctrine shone before him, as well in his didactic as in his exegetical and polemical writings, against whomsoever the latter were directed, whether against the Papists, or against the enthusiasts, or against a rationalist, as Erasmus was, or against Jews and Turks. It is precisely in this doctrine that no earlier and later Luther can be distinguished. In this he has remained perfectly the same through all the periods of his life. Luther's word of 1517, with which he concluded his 95 theses against papal indulgences and gave the public signal for the great Reformation struggle, without knowing it himself: "Nor am I so unintelligent as to let the divine word take second place to the fables invented by human reason"; Luther's word of 1521, with which he made his first personal confession before the whole world: "I cannot do otherwise"; Luther's word of 1530, which, when his work was in the greatest danger, he sang out cheerfully and confidently to all Christendom: "The word they shall let stand"; Luther's word of 1546, with which he was praised by his Wittenbergers for

I will gladly suffer all kinds of words of reproach, but I will not turn away one finger from the mouth of one who says, "Hear this one! - These four words of Luther from the most diverse times are four torches which stand along the path of his life and will shine until the last day, testifying that Luther considered himself bound to every word of the Holy Scriptures as to the Word of the living God. As necessary as it is to first prove that Luther believed in a God, it seems to be just as necessary to first prove that Luther believed and taught the divine inspiration of the entire Holy Scriptures in the fullest sense of the word.

Unfortunately, however, this proof has become all too necessary. The modern theologians, who maintain that even in the writings of the prophets and apostles there are not a few errors, hay, straw, wood and stubble, which it is the task of the learned theologians to remove from the core of truth, maintain at the same time that Luther is their guarantor in this respect as well. May Luther, after all, write (Prof. Cremer is not afraid to cite this passage himself): "In one letter, yes, in a few tittle of Scripture, there is more and greater than in heaven and earth. Therefore we cannot suffer it to be moved, even in the very least." (Gr. Commentary on the Br. to the Galatians. VIII, 2661.) Luther may, after all, write: "Thus it is unto me, that every saying maketh the world too strait for me." (That these words of Christ: This is my body, still stand firm, from the year 1527. XX, 982.) Luther may after all write: "Here stands love, which you may mock or honor as you will; but faith or the Word you shall worship and hold most holy." (Letter to Capito, 1522. XIX, 669.) Luther may, after all, write: "This I confess, that if Dr. Carlstadt, or any one else, had reported to me five years ago, that there was nothing in the Sacrament but bread and wine, he would have done me a great service. I must have suffered such a hard challenge there, and wrestled and squirmed, that I would have liked to have been out, because I saw that I could have given the papacy the biggest puff with it. I have also had two who have written to me more skillfully than Dr. Carlstadt, and have not thus martyred the words according to their own conceit. But I am imprisoned, cannot get out; the text is too powerful there and will not let itself be torn from my mind with words." (Letter of warning to all Christians at Strasburg, 1524. XV, 2448. f.) Luther may at last write: "God's word is not to be joked with. If you cannot understand it, take your hat off to it." (Interpretation of a passage from the 23rd chapter of the Prophet Jeremiah, dated 1526. VI, 1396.) Far be it from us that such mighty testimonies of faith...

Luther's belief in the divinity of the whole of Holy Scripture should instill in the modern believing theologians a shyness to cover their apostasy from the Bible with Luther, as their predecessor's authority, and to mislead the believing Christians in their faith, they declare such sayings of Luther, as those quoted, to be heroic, hyperbolic, apophthegmata "crossed" (Kahnis) by counter-sanctimonious utterances, which therefore ought not to be pressed. Luther, however, had taken inspiration for granted, but "without expounding a theory of it" (Luthardt), and "without further discussion of the relation of the two factors co-operating in the origin of sacred Scripture" (the divine and the human) "and without limiting the extent to which inspiration is due to Scripture" (Cremer). The gentlemen, however, know very well that Luther already had his doctrine of inspiration; they also testify to it themselves. Therefore, of course, it was not necessary to oppose Pabstism with an elaborate, systematically arranged "theory" of inspiration. Already in the year 1519 Luther says exactly what he must concede to the Papists in this respect and what he accuses them of. In his well-known interpretation of the 22 first Psalms on the words: "They divide my garments among themselves, and cast lots for my vesture" (Ps. 22, 19.), with reference to John 19, 24: "Then they said among themselves: Let us not divide him, but let us cast lots for him, because he shall be", Luther writes as follows: **"They all confess that** which the Lord Christ saith, John 10:35, that 'the Scripture cannot be broken,' and that its authority, power, and prestige must be unchanged, and that it must not be contradicted, nor denied, nor denied. 1) This they confess and say continually and with one accord.

1) Therefore, in his preface to the Augsburg Confession, Melanchthon could, without fear of contradiction, describe that doctrine as the only right one, which was "based on divine holy Scripture", when he wrote there: "Therefore, and to E. K. M., we present and hand over to our pastors, preachers, and teachers, also our confession of faith, what it is based on divine Scripture. K. M. to most humble obedience we hand over and deliver to our pastors, preachers and teachers, also of our faith confession, what and in what manner they preach, teach, hold and teach in our lands etc. on the basis of divine holy scripture (*ex scripturis sanctis et puro verbo Dei*). Preach, teach, hold and teach." (Concordienbuch von Müller, p. 36, § 8.) In the struggle against those who actually denied the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, the most vehement papist zealots were therefore on Luther's side. To give but one proof of this, when Erasmus ascribed to the evangelist an error of memory in Matt. 27, Dr. Johann Eck wrote in a letter addressed to him in 1518: "By those words you seem to imply that the evangelists wrote as men are wont to do, and that they wrote this relying on their memory, that they neglected to look up the books, and that thus, for this cause, they made oversights. Listen, my Erasmus, do you think that a Christian will patiently accept that the evangelists have made mistakes in the Gospels? If the authority of the

But soon, if one wants to go on and conclude further, the soldiers make a loud mockery of the Scriptures with such freedom and impudence to gloss and distinguish, that is, to interpret and distinguish, that they ridicule, diminish, and even cancel the power, authority, and prestige of the whole Scriptures." (IV. 1763. Cf. pp. 1763-1769.)

It is true, however, that nowhere in his writings did Luther set forth a theory of the doctrine of inspiration, that is, nowhere did he treat this doctrine *ex professo* or develop it systematically. But as in the case of several other doctrines, so Luther already supplied the necessary building blocks for the development of the doctrine of inspiration, which the dogmatists of the seventeenth century then assembled into a harmonious whole. There is no essential moment in the doctrine of inspiration of our systematists which could not be substantiated by clear statements of Luther.

Let us be permitted, then, to bring in the evidence from Luther's writings for the following main moments of the doctrine of inspiration of our dogmatists.

I. All Scripture is the work of the Holy Spirit.

Concerning the words of David: "The Spirit of the Lord has spoken through me, and his words have come through my mouth" (2 Sam. 23:2), Luther writes: "Here David wants to become too strange and too high for me; God grant that I may attain to it a little; for here he begins to speak of the high holy Trinity of divine being. First, he calls the Holy Spirit, to whom he gives all that the prophets prophesy. And St. Peter, 2 Epist. 1, v. 21, refers to this and similar sayings: 'No prophecy has ever been produced by human will, but the holy men of God have spoken by inspiration of the Holy Spirit'. Therefore one sings in the article

What other part, then, will be without suspicion of error, as Augustine concludes with such a beautiful argument? Thou sayest, moreover, that they relied on their memory, as if they had written what they had read before, and what was stored up in their memory, they who were commanded not even to reflect on what they spoke before kings and princes, but who were to be guided by the Holy Spirit into all truth! And such testimonies, thou sayest, they borrowed not from books; as if, as we are wont to do, they had composed their writings out of divers books and authors, as is now the manner of making books! Far be it from us to suspect this of the disciples of the Holy Ghost and of our Saviour JEsu, of these pillars of our faith, who were not instructed in human wisdom! He accepted them as scientifically unlearned and ignorant, but made them the greatest scholars."

(Citirt von Quenstedt in his Theol. didactico-polem. I, c. 4. p. 2. g. 5. fol. m. 117.)

of faith 1) of the Holy Spirit thus: 'Who spake by the prophets.' So then one gives to the Holy Spirit all the holy Scriptures." (Interpretation of the Last Words of David, dated 1543. III, 2796. f.)

"Here also the text of Daniel (7:13, 14.) gives mightily the article of the Godhead in three Persons, and of the humanity of the Son; for there must be another Person who gives, and another who receives it. Namely, the Father giveth eternal power to the Son, and the Son hath it from the Father, and all this from eternity, or it would not be an eternal power; so the Holy Ghost is there, which speaketh it by Daniel. For such a highly secret thing could no man know, where the Holy Ghost revealed it not by the prophets: as it is oft said above, that the holy scriptures are spoken by the Holy Ghost." (Ibid. III, 2821.)

Concerning the words: "You shall not do anything to it that I command you, nor shall you do anything to it" (Deut. 4:2), Luther remarks: "Moses says here of the people, not of God: 'Thou shalt not add to it,' etc. For who doubts that God will add to it or subtract from it as the time requires? For whether he adds to it or subtracts from it, he remains true. . . So also all the prophets, if they taught any other thing than Moses, there God revealed it unto them, even as Mosiah, or, as Peter saith, 2 Epist. 1, v. 21: 'With the Holy Ghost they were breathed on to speak.'" (Exposition on the fifth book of Moses, of the year 1525. III, 2080.)

"And should the Psalter alone be precious and dear, because it promises so clearly of Christ's death and resurrection, and exemplifies his kingdom and the state and nature of all Christendom, that it might well be called a small Biblia, in which all that is found in the whole Biblia is most beautifully and briefly compiled, and made and prepared into a fine enchiridion or manual; that it seems to me that the Holy Spirit Himself would have taken the trouble to bring together a short Bible and book of examples of the whole of Christendom or of all the saints, so that whoever could not read the whole of the Biblia would still have almost the whole of the Summa written down here in a small booklet." (Preface to the Psalter, dated 1531. XIV, 23. f.)

"They cannot prove from the Scriptures that Peter is called the Pope. But this we can prove, that the rock is Christ, and the faith, as Paul saith. This interpretation is right. For of this we are sure, that it is not devised of men, but drawn out of the word of God. Now those things which are written and preached in the prophets (says Peter) were not invented by men.

1) See the Nicene Symbolum in Müller's Concordia Book, p. 30. § 7.

but the holy, pious people have spoken it from the Holy Spirit". (Excerpt from the other Epistle of St. Peter, 1524. IX, 858. f.)

To the words: "In the book it is written of me; thy will, my God, I do gladly" (Ps. 40:8, 9), Luther adds: "The Spirit speaks as if he knew of no book (though the world is full of them), but only of this book, the holy Scriptures. ... This is the book of the Holy Spirit, in which one must seek and find Christ." (Interpretation of many beautiful sayings of holy Scripture, which Luther wrote in the Bibles of some. IX, 1364. 1365.)

"Since Moses is the fountain from which all the holy prophets and apostles have drawn the divine wisdom and art of salvation, how to be saved, through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, we cannot do our work better or more rightly than to lead the disciples or hearers to the same fountain and to show them, according to our ability, the origin and seed of divine wisdom, which the Holy Spirit has so scattered through Moses that neither reason nor the power of human understanding (except God has given us the power to do so) will be able to give them the knowledge of how to be saved, as much as God has given us, to show the origin and seed of divine wisdom, which the Holy Spirit has scattered and sown through Moses in such a way that no reason nor power of human understanding (apart from the Holy Spirit's assistance) can recognize or understand it." (Preface to the Interpretation of the 90th Psalm, dated 1534. V, 1081.)

"Doctrines of men we blame not because men have said them, but because they are lies and blasphemies Against the Scriptures, which, though written also by men, yet are not of or from men, but from God." (Of men - doctrine to be shunned, from the year 1522. XIX, 739.)

"So the Holy Spirit also shows us here (Gen. 12:11, 12) a domestic lesson, when he tells us that Abraham spoke so kindly to his Sarah. For first he asked her, and then he told her how beautiful she was." (Interpretation of the First Book of Moses, from the year 1536-1545. 1, 1197.) ^)

I. However, in a certain sense also v. Hofmann, after Schleiermacher the second father of modern scientific theology, teaches that the whole sacred Scripture is a work of the Holy Spirit. He writes, for example: "As the Spirit of God has been active in the history exemplified by Christ, so, therefore, in a salvation-historical manner, He has also brought forth a corresponding memorial of the same in Scripture. ... That the Old Testament Scriptures are inspired is only remembered by our doctrine (the twelfth of the first lesson) in such a way that it is said of them that they, like the exemplary history of which they are a memorial, are the work of the Spirit of God. For we have shown elsewhere that everything that serves to perpetuate sacred history is done by virtue of an effect of the spirit that is at work in it, and that for this purpose the spirit indwells man in such a way as is necessary for the purpose of such an effect, in a determinative way, with respect to his natural life. The Scriptures of the New Testament testify that we are to understand the bringing forth and the making of the

II. Between a prophet in the proper sense and a worldly wise and indirectly enlightened pure teacher there is a specific difference.

The wise pagan Plato praises highly the verse and saying of the pagan poet Homeri, in which he calls Minos (who gave those of Crete their rights and laws) and calls him "a listener to the idol of Jupiter". But this name we give more cheaply to the holy prophets

For just as it is said of miraculous healings or other works of power serving the commonwealth of God that they are wrought by the Spirit of God, so we read of the prophets of the Old Covenant that they prophesied by the same Spirit; as God works those exercises of power, so also did he speak through the prophets. But as little difference is made between the operation of God, by which the acts of sacred history, and that by which the words of prophecy are produced: so little between that by which God's word is spoken, and that by which it is written.... Neither is there any distinction made between the parts of the sacred Scriptures, that some of them are produced more or differently than others, by divine agency. . . So the whole of Scripture is the one word of God to his church. As a whole it is, and nothing is to be distinguished in it that is not valid for it, and nothing is to be considered as valid for it that is found apart from it. But not only on the writers, but also on those who compiled the individual parts of Scripture, whether into books or into the whole, the Spirit of God, as it was in the Old Testament church, exerted its effect, aiming at the production of the unified whole of Scripture". (Schriftbeweis. 1, 670. ff.) According to this, v. Hofmann seems to agree perfectly with Luther in the doctrine of the inspiration of the sacred Scriptures, and even to go beyond him in regard to the compilation. And yet, everything that says so has nothing but the empty appearance of it! Whoever is acquainted with v. Hofmann's whole theological system sees this at first sight; Dr. Kliefoth, therefore, makes the following well-founded remarks on those and similar controversies: "This sounds to me quite powerful and full, and as if v. H. had appropriated the whole theory of inspiration of the seventeenth century just in its crassest execution; but only if one takes v. H.'s expressions according to the sense which the church associates with them. But if we think back to what we know as v. H.'s doctrine of the working of the Spirit of God, here everything melts away under our hands. For we know, first of all, that, according to the author, the Spirit of God is by no means confined to those who serve in the history of salvation, but is present in the natural life of all men; indeed, that it has a determining influence on all and every phenomenon of the physical world, and that therefore not only everything that serves to perpetuate sacred history, but in general everything that belongs to the natural and historical development of the world, is brought forth by the action of the Spirit and the spirits. If, therefore, v. H. attributes the origin of Scripture to God's spirit, which has a determining influence on the natural life of man, nothing is said, in H.'s sense, that would attribute any higher origin, any higher dignity to Scripture. To the natural life of the writers and compilers of the Iliad, the Spirit of God was just as determinative as to the writers and compilers of the sacred Scriptures for their purpose. Therefore, it is only deceptive when v. H. says that the spirit of God

and with truth. For they do not bring forth what they have devised and well-believed, but what they have heard from God Himself, and He who created all things has shown and instructed them either by dreams or by visions, the same they reveal and present to us, Num. 12:6.... So they are true hearers of God. For the eternal Almighty God, the Spirit of God rules their hearts and tongues." (Other interpretation of the prophet Joel, from the year 1545. VI, 2169. f.)

He said that the Spirit did not work differently in the creation of Scripture than in the healings of the sick and other miracles in the history of salvation. He should have gone further and said, according to his doctrine, that not only what is unordinary, but also what is common, is due to the action of the Spirit and the spirits: Effect of the Spirit is not merely where the Scriptures become, but also where healings and miracles take place, yea, even where the *Ilias* becomes, and even where the *Wmd* blows; the difference is only this, that the same Spirit of God here accomplishes a wind-bride, there healings, there Hellenic Scriptural monument, and here again a Scriptural monument of salvation history. Secondly, however, we know and hear again that this effect of the Spirit of God was only on the natural life of the people involved in the writing of the holy Scriptures. Then, however, it was limited only to writing and composing, to this outward formality, as v. H. also mentions only writing and composing where he describes the relevant activity of the spirit according to the above. On the other hand, the activity of God's Spirit in the writing of the Scriptures did not extend to the production of the content, for this would naturally have required an effect not only on the life of nature, but also on the personal life of the people used in the process, on their thinking and willing; as, then, also V. H. does not express with a single word that the Spirit of God gave the content to the authors of the Scriptures. Therefore, all that John says about the inspiration of the Scriptures is reduced to the fact that the Spirit of God did the same thing in the creation of the Scriptures that He must do in everything that men are to bring about by means of natural life. There is no question of an inspiration of the contents of the sacred Scriptures by the Spirit of God; and after weighing all of v. H.'s remarks, we have still not learned more from the Scriptures than that the New Testament is to him a humanly credible and rather rich monument of Christian primeval history, and that the Old Testament is to him a monument of the history exemplified by *JEsum*, and indeed, according to the testimony of *JEsu*, a corresponding such monument." (Kirchl. Zeitschrift. Edited by Dr. Th. Kliefoth and Dr. O. Mejer. (Kirchl Zeitschrift, published by Dr. Th. Kliefoth and Dr. O. Mejer, VI. Jahrg., Schwerin, 1859, p. 650 f.) Even v. H.'s disciples do not reveal more about what they want to be understood by inspiration. They are not so naïve as to refer to "Bible verses"; they construe their "inspiration" from the necessity that the Christian church needs a written record of its origin, and from the nature of Scripture, which corresponds to this need. Dr. Luthardt, for example, writes flatly: "The self-witness of Scripture" (concerning the nature of its origin) "is not based both on individual passages, but rather in the nature of Scripture itself, the corresponding recognition of which is the task of Scripture scholarship. (Compend. 4th ed. p. 253.) Modern theologians consider such *dicta probantia* as 2 Tim. 3, 16. 2 Petr. 1, 21. 2 Sam. 23, 2. even to be mentioned in their exposition of the doctrine of inspiration; they leave that to the dogmatists of the old school, who had no idea of historical view. Every doctrine must be the result of "scriptural science."

"A prophet is called he who has his understanding from God without means, to whom the Holy Spirit puts the word in his mouth. For He is the source, and they have no other Master but God, 1 Cor. 14:1. 2. No man can make a prophet by human preaching and teaching, 2 Pet. 1:21. and though it be God's word, and I preach the word of God most purely, yet I make no prophet; a wise and understanding man can I make. As Matt. 23. chap. v. 34. are called 'wise men,' who drew doctrine from the prophets, for God speaketh by men, and not without means; but 'prophets' they are not, who have doctrine from God without all means. So it is said here, 'Aaron shall be thy prophet'; even as I, God, also make prophets without any means, when I speak with them; so thou art God, and Aaron is the prophet, for he shall learn of thee without means, as thou hast learned of me." (Ausl. über etliche Kapitel des 2. B. Mosis, gepredigt zu Wittenberg, vom J. 1524-1526. III, 1172.)

Concerning David's words: "The Spirit of the Lord has spoken through me, and his words have been spoken through my tongue" (2 Sam. 23:2), Luther remarks: "What a glorious arrogant pride is this: whoever may boast that the Spirit of the Lord speaks through him and that his tongue speaks the word of the Holy Spirit! Of course, he must be very sure of what he is saying. This will not be David, Jesse's son, born in sin, but he who has been raised up as a prophet by God's promise. Should not he make sweet psalms who has such a master, who teaches him and speaks through him? Hear now, he that hath ears to hear! My words are not my words, but he that heareth me heareth God; he that despiseth me despiseth God," Luc. 10:16; for I perceive that many of my seed shall not hear my words, to their great hurt. We, nor any man, who is not a prophet, may make such a boast. This we may do, if we also be holy and have the Holy Ghost, that we may boast ourselves catechumens and disciples of the prophets, as those who repeat and preach the things which we have heard and learned of the prophets and apostles, and are sure that the prophets have taught them. These are called in the Old Testament 'the children of the prophets,' who put nothing of their own nor new, as the prophets do, but teach that which they have from the prophets." (Ex. of David's last words 2 Sam. 23:1-7. III., 2797. f.)

III. There is nothing in the scriptures in vain.

"Where thou findest in the Scriptures that God speaketh of God as if he were two persons, thereupon thou mayest boldly reason that there are three persons signified in the Godhead. As, here in this place saith the LORD, that the LORD will build David an house (1 Chron. 18, 10. ff.).

Item, Gen. 19:24: 'The LORD caused fire and brimstone, etc., to rain from the LORD.' For the Holy Ghost is no fool nor drunkard, that should speak a tittle, much less a word, in vain." (Exl. of David's last words 2 Sam. 23:1-7. Ill. 2804. f.)

After a spiritual interpretation of the words: "And now she was a widow of four and fourscore years" (Luc. 2, 37.), Luther remarks: "Let this be said enough this time, so that it may be seen how not a word in Scripture is written in vain, and how the dear old fathers, with their faith, have set before us examples, but with their works have always illustrated that in which we are to believe, namely, Christ and His Gospel; so that nothing is read of them in vain, but all their things strengthen and improve our faith. (Church Postil on the Gospel on Sunday, after Christmas Day, 1521. XI, 373.)

"If therefore" (Jews and Turks) "they insist on the Scripture that there is one God, we again insist that the Scripture indicates just as strongly that in the one God "there are many" (a majority). To us our Scripture is as much as theirs; for no letter in Scripture is in vain." (The Three Symbols, from J. 1538. X, 1229.)

IV. The holy scripture is free from error.

"I have said that it is not asked how the saints lived and wrote, but how the Scriptures indicate that we should live. The question is not of that which has happened, but of how it should happen. The saints have erred in their writing and sinned in their lives; Scripture cannot err." (Scripture of the Abuse of the Mass, of the J. 1522. XIX, 1309.)

"In order that I may also have answered those who blame me, I reject all the holy teachers of the churches. I do not reject them, but since everyone knows that they have sometimes erred as men, I will not give them further credence, except they give me evidence of their understanding from the Scriptures, which have not yet erred. And this is what St. Paul tells me in 1 Thess. 5:21, when he says: "Test and prove all doctrine beforehand; whichever is good, keep it. In the same way St. Augustine wrote to St. Jerome: 'I have learned to do honor only to the books which are called the holy Scriptures, that I firmly believe; none of their writers have ever erred; but all others I read in such a way that I do not believe what they say to be true, unless they prove it to me by the holy Scriptures or by public reason.'" (Reason and Cause of all Articles, so by the Roman Bull unlawfully condemned, of the Year 1520. XV, 1758. To the latter saying of Augustine Luther repeatedly confesses, also in his writing "Of the Concillii and Churches," of the Year 1539. XVI, 2635. f.)

With reference to Muhammad's own alleged confession that what is to be read of him in the Koran contains in part error, Luther writes: "No one will ever persuade me (beware, not even a sensible man) that a man (if he is otherwise a man who is in his right mind) should be able to believe with earnestness a book or scripture of which he would be certain that one part (let alone three parts) was a lie; in addition, he would not have to know which of them was true or not true in different ways, and thus would have to buy it in a sack." (Faithful Warning against Mahomet's or Turk's Abominable Doctrine and Faith, etc., of the year 1542. XX, 2830. f.)

(Conclusion follows.)

(From the "Mecklenburgische Kirchen- und Zeitblatt".)

On the doctrine of conversion.

The dispute between Pastor Brauer and the author of the articles signed † deals with another highly important point in the present controversy over the election of grace, indeed with the actual main question in this controversy, namely, the question: Is the conversion and blessedness of man ultimately based on man's own free decision, even if only made possible by grace, or is it based solely on God's grace and the effect of grace? In the doctrine of conversion lies the main difference between us "Missourians" and our opponents, and this is becoming more and more evident. More precisely, it is a question of when man's participation begins, whether already before conversion in the narrower sense (regeneration), in consequence and in virtue of the freeing of the will effected by preparatory grace, so that man is enabled by this effect of grace to decide for salvation for himself, Or does man's co-operation begin only after the consummation of regeneration (the effect and bestowal of faith), while before his regeneration man can by no means contribute anything at all to his conversion, but can rather only behave reluctantly towards grace until grace in conversion overcomes his reluctance and creates faith in him, in which case man behaves in a purely suffering manner. The former our opponents assert, the latter we "Missourians" teach.

Our opponents find in the different use of the partial *arbitrium liberatum* placed before rebirth the explanation for the fact that of those who hear the word of God, some are converted, but others are not. They place the cause of conversion partly in the conduct of man; we, on the contrary, place it in God's grace and grace alone.

We find the cause of the non-conversion of those who are lost in man alone, namely, in the persistent resistance to grace on the part of those concerned. And to rhyme this with reason we are certainly not able, but neither are we commanded. (F. C. Sol. Deci. Art. II. § 53). This the status coniroversiae.

Let us now see how the author of the article in question attempts to defend his position and to refute Brauer's counter-evidence. He divides his defense into 4 sections. We follow him in this.

1. The opponent imputes to Brauer as if he wanted to make God the subject of faith. We do not know where Br. would have done this. But this Br. denies, and every Lutheran must deny it on the basis of Scripture and the Confession, that faith is a "behavior made possible by divine action. It may well be called a human behavior wrought by God, for Scripture calls it God's work that we believe. But if faith be defined as "a conduct made possible by divine effect," it is made only partly a work of God, and partly a work of man, which is contrary to Scripture. For when Scripture calls faith "God's work," it evidently says not only that God "enables us to believe," "makes it possible for us to believe," but rather that God works and creates faith itself in us. This does not at all mean that it is God who believes in us. The subject of faith is always man, not God. Faith is a behavior of man. This is undisputed on both sides. But it is a question of the *causa efficiens* which effects this behavior in man, and this *causa efficiens*, according to Scripture and the Confession, is God alone, not partly God and partly man. Otherwise, how could faith be called in Scripture a gift and work of God? Joh. 6, 29. Col. 2, 12. Phil. 1, 29. Hebr. 12, 2.

And how else (if our Lord opponent were right) could the F. C. Sol. Deci. Art. II, § 25, say: "As then the holy Scriptures do not attribute conversion, faith in Christ, regeneration, renewal, and all that belongs to the real beginning and consummation of the same, to the human powers of the natural free will, neither in whole, nor in half, nor in some, to the least or least part, but in **solidum**, that is, wholly, to the divine efficacy and Holy Spirit alone, as also the Apologia says."

The Strasbourg theological faculty (Dannhauer, Dorscheus, and others) wrote against the same error, which was defended by Laternmann at the time.

thum et al: "Deusne non praestat a sua parte, ut velimus? *ut credamus?* Praestatne tantum, *ut possimus* velle, ut *possimus* nos convertere, *ut possimus* credere?" (Calov. System. Tom. X, 50 sqq. quoted in "Lehre und Wehre," 1881, July issue, pp. 300 f.)

2. Our opponent here refers to some of Chemnitz's sayings in support of his doctrine of an at least partial *arbitrium liberatum* before rebirth. But the two passages cited do not at all prove what they are supposed to prove. On the contrary, they prove the exact opposite. Chemnitz does not speak in the place cited (Exam. Conc. Trid. pag. 134) of *conversio stricte dicta*, of conversion in the narrower or proper sense, which is nothing other than regeneration, the effect and bestowal of faith; *) rather, in that passage he speaks of *conversio late dicta*, which, as Quenstedt Syst. III, 489 says, *non tantum aliquam translationem ex peccati statu in statum fidei, sed etiam justificationem ac renovationem, nec non hujus continuationem ambitu suo* comprises (in Schmid, Dogmatik, p. 390). That conversion in the broader sense is meant in that passage of Chemnitz, appears most unambiguously from the context, as well as from the fact that the term conversion is more closely defined and explained by the words: "*sanatio et renovatio*." But that conversion in the broader sense, or *renovatio*, is a process, and does not happen in a moment, but has its *initia et certos progressus*, no "Missourian" has ever denied. Chemnitz also does not say in another place (Loc. i, pag. 184) that before the effect of faith in man the struggle of the flesh with the spirit begins, which cannot take place without the movement of our will, but he says: *quando gratia praeveniens,² id est, prima initia fidei* et conversionis homini dantur, statim incipit *lucta carnis et Spiritus*, etc.

1) Quenstedt, theol. didact.-polem. III., 508, makes the following important remark about the difference of "conversion" in the wider and in the narrower sense, and the conduct of man in it: "*Sive conversio late sumatur, prout includat etiam actus praeparatorios, et sic ad quemvis actum vel gradum homo se mere passive habet; sive stricte, pro ipsa translatione ex statu irae in statum gratiae, quae in momento fit per ipsam fidei salvificae donationem, utique et hic solus Deus agit, homine, ut subjecto patiente, huic actioni divinae substrato* (in Schmid, Dogmatik, pag. 395).

2) One must not be misled by the expression *gratia praeveniens* to understand this passage of the preparatory effects of grace before regeneration. Schmid already remarks l. c. p. 394 snb 16, that in distinguishing *gratia* into "*praeveniens*," "*operans*," and "*cooperans*," the "definitions are not always the same." Ch. calls the regenerating, faith-creating grace here a *gratia praeveniens* because in the work of conversion it is not man but God who "lays the first stone," as Luther says, since it is not man who seeks God, but God who seeks man, and even the first, faintest spark of longing is not always the same.

The gift of the beginnings of faith and conversion is nothing else than the rebirth. According to the clear teaching of the Holy Scriptures and our Lutheran confession, the new birth happens through the effect of faith in man: 1 John 5:1, Evangelical John 1:12, Galatians 3:26, Apologians 3:26. Art. III, § 171: *Haec fides sola . . . regenerat*, cf. *ibid.* § 194. But that after regeneration or conversion in the narrower sense, the human will cooperates, "moved and supported by the Holy Spirit," as Ch. I. c. expresses it, is again not denied. On the other hand, neither Scripture, nor our Confession, nor even our old orthodox dogmatists, know anything of a gradual freeing of the will before regeneration, of an intermediate state in which the unregenerate man is enabled by grace to cooperate in his conversion. The Lord Opposer is not able to produce a single passage from Scripture or from the confessions of our church in support of this doctrine.

Scripture and confession say of all unregenerate men without distinction that they do not understand God's word, but consider the gospel to be foolishness, are dead in sins, are under God's wrath, even are God's enemies, and always resist his word and will, and cannot do otherwise than resist: 1 Cor. 2, 14. Rom. 8, 7. Eph. 2, 1. 3. 5. F. C. Sol. DecII. II.

§ 9. 10. 17. 18. 85, and a. a. St. And the F. C. very definitely gives as the point where this state ceases, where the reluctance is broken, and the will of man is changed and renewed, conversion (in the strict sense) or regeneration: Epit. II. § 17. 18. sol. Deci. II. § 5. 21. 59. 60. 90 (at the end). Now where is there any room here for that arbitrarily assumed intermediate state?

The opposing view is further excluded by the clear confessional statements that "before the conversion of man there are only two real causes *) to be found, namely the Holy Spirit and the Word.

God works in him through his grace (cf. F. C. Sol. Deci. II. § 14). That this is the sense of that expression is indicated by Ch. himself, *loc. cit.* when he further says there: *quae ergo de gratia praeveniente, praeaparante et operante traduntur, habent hunc sensum, quod non nostrae partes priores sint in conversione: sed quod Deus per verbum et afflatum divinum nos praeveniat, movens et impellens voluntatem.*

1) Hutter (*loci comm.* 284) says: *Si ... de prima (conversione - quae est impiorum sive infidelium et nunquam renatorum) fit quaestio, certe neque plures neque pauciores conversionis causae constitui possunt et debent, quam duae: ita ut qui hoc loco ternarium ponunt, et voluntatem hominis urgent, a synergistico errore haud sint alieni.* Nor may it be argued against this that Chemnitz (*de libero arb.* c. 7) says: "*Et recte dicitur: Tres esse causas bonae actionis 1) verbum Dei, 2) Spiritum sanctum, 3) vo-*

God, as the instrument of the Holy Spirit, by which he works conversion" (F. C. Epit. II. § 19), that before conversion man has no *modus agendi* to work something good and salutary in divine things (F. C. Sol. Decl. II. § 61 et seq.), that man (unborn again) has only a *capacitas passiva*, not *activa*, for his conversion (I. c. § 22), that man is **purely passive in conversione** (§ 89), that conversion is wrought in man *tanquam in subjecto patiente* (ibid.), and that the unborn man's understanding and

Will is nothing else than "alone *subjectum convertendum*" (§ 90).

And how can one keep up this view of the arbitrary lib. that was already partly made before the rebirth, compared to the clear teaching of scripture and confession, that conversion or rebirth is nothing else than a revival from spiritual death, a spiritual new creation?) Eph. 2, 5. 6. 10. 4, 24. Col. 3, 10. 2 Cor. 4, 6. Ezek. 36, 26. ff. F. C. Sol. Decl. II, 87, while, according to the opinion of our opponents, man is supposed to be spiritual, alive, and active even before he is born again.

Further, the F. C. says, in plain and clear words, that man, before and in conversion, can by no means contribute to his conversion, but that he is "converted, believed, born again, and renewed without all his doing" (I. c. § 5. 7. 59), and ascribes "conversion, faith in Christ, regeneration, and renewal, and all that belongs to the real beginning and consummation of the same," "*in solidum*, that is, wholly and entirely, to the divine operation and the Holy Spirit alone" (I. c. §25). But if it be objected that the F. C. in §7 and a. St. excludes and rejects only a co-operation of man to his conversion by his own natural powers, but not a co-operation by the use of co-consecrated powers of grace, it is to be replied that even this latter is evidently excluded by passages such as §5 and 59, etc., since according to this man is spiritually dead up to the moment of regeneration, and is God's enemy who resists him and his will. It is to be remembered, moreover, that the F. C. neither knows nor says anything of a communication of powers of grace to man before his regeneration, but that, according to the F. C., this communication takes place only in conversion, i. e., in regeneration: I. c. § 65. § 65. And whence then should

luntatem humanam." For Ch. does not here say that the will of man belongs to the causes of conversion, but rather that it is to be reckoned among the causes of a good action. But a *bona actio* can proceed only from the born-again man, whose cooperation is not denied.

1) Quenstedt says I. c. III, 498 (in Schmid, p. 400 f.): *Hominis conversio est solius gratiae divinae operantis actio et perficitur per eandem infinitam potentiam, per quam Deus ex nihilo aliquid creat et ex mortuis resuscitat....*

How can the unregenerate man take away the power to use and apply these powers of grace, since he is spiritually dead? In short, in the theory advocated by our opponent, we cannot get beyond the contradiction that before regeneration there should be an intermediate state in which man, though not yet born again, and therefore still spiritually dead, should at the same time already be spiritually alive and active for his salvation. This is an untenable contradiction, which is not compatible either with the logic so exalted by our opponent, or with the Scriptures and the Confession. One cannot be dead and alive at the same time, be under God's wrath and under God's grace at the same time. Quenstedt (l. c. 497, in Schmid p. 395 sub 16 a. E.) already gives this as a reason why conversion in the proper and narrower sense must be thought of as occurring in One Moment, namely, when he says that the *gratia operans et perficiens* 3) works "*ipsum fidei actum et in Christum fiduciam*," and now continues.... "*quem fidei actum immediate sequitur ipsa e statu irae in statum gratiae translatio, quae est ultimus conversionis actus fitque in instanti seu momento, cum fieri non possit, ut homo simul sit in statu irae et gratiae, sub morte et vita.*" Scripture and confession know only one twofold state of man in this life (after the fall), namely, the status iras, where man is in spiritual death under God's wrath, and the status gratiae, where man is born again, made alive, and renewed by the grace of God.

The point where the status irae ends and the status gratiae begins is the moment of regeneration, the *donatio fidei*, whereby justification and at the same time the awakening from spiritual death, the *ζωοποίησις*, takes place: Eph. 2, 1. 3. 5. Col. 2, 13. F. C. Epit. II, 1. Sol. Decl. II, 21. 59. 60. (a. E.) 90. But neither Scripture nor Confession know of any middle state between these two states, where man, before he is born again, can follow the train of grace, assent to the divine will, and will good himself, though only by power of grace.

The Danzig Ministry wrote in 1646 against Latermann's thesis: "If men will by grace, they can be converted", among other things the following: "Just as I do not say: Lazarus, who was made alive, if he wills by Christ's power, can be made alive by the same, since he is already alive, so I also do not say: If a man wills by grace, he can be converted; since he is already converted who so wills by grace, Rom. 7, 22. Phil. 2, 13. . . . Since those who are to be converted are purely suffering, it is inconsistent to ascribe to a purely suffering subject an act such as converting; which is the same as saying: The dead man comes to life, the clay...

wants him to be formed, Lazarus awakens... . . We dislike this sentence as an inconsistent and Pelagian one, namely, that the consent of the will is required for the beginnings of believers, since the will of man is dead before the first conversion has taken place. . . . We say more correctly with Dr. Gesner (on the Concordia formula p. 103): 'If the heart of man agreed, it would indeed be converted before it was converted.'" *) By the way, Brauer has already proved in detail that even this most subtle and hidden form of synergism, as Latermann advocated it in his time, and as it is now extolled and defended by almost all modern theologians as orthodox church doctrine, was rejected as heresy by our old orthodox dogmatists, and our common opponent has not been able to refute this proof.

Ad 3, our opponent wants to make human logic the standard of the correctness or incorrectness of a dogmatic doctrine. He does not consider that in doing so he is basically making rationalism his program, which he surely does not want. Nor does he consider - as Brauer has already pointed out to him - what results this would lead to, namely, that we would then finally no longer retain a single tenet of faith. What logical consequences, for example, result for our reason from the proposition that Christ's body is received orally by the communicants in Holy Communion! Shall we then, for the sake of logical consequences, maintain that Christ's body is bitten with the teeth, chewed, etc.? Or, because those consequences are contrary to the truth, may we doubt the correctness of the supersentence?

Our church has by no means always held that "not only the truths attested in Scripture," but also "the logical consequences of them are to be accepted as right. On the contrary, our church says in its confessional writings that our reason is blind and incapable in spiritual things (F. C. Sol. Decl. II, 9),

1) "Homines si per gratiam volunt, per eandem possunt converti." - Sicut non dico: Lazarus vivificatus, si per potentiam Christi velit, per eandem potest vivificari, cum jam vivus sit; sic nec dico: "Homo si velit per gratiam, potest converti", cum jam ille conversus sit, qui sic vult per gratiam Rom. 7, 22. et Phil. 2, 13. ... Cum homines convertendi pure passive se habeant, absonum est, pure passivo subjecto adscribere actionem, qualis est se convertere. Quod perinde est, ac si dicas: Mortuus se vivificat, lutum vult se fingi, Lazarus se excitat. . . Displicet haec propositio ceu absona et pelagiana, nempe ad initia fidelium requiri consensum voluntatis, cum ante conversionem primam peractam voluntas hominis sit mortua. Nos rectius cum Dr. D. Gesnero p. 103. F. C., „si", inquit, assentiretur cor hominis, conversum utique esset, antequam converteretur. (Calov. Syst. Tom. X. p. 68 sqq. "Lehre und Wehre" 1881. July issue. p. 301 f.)

that, therefore, in regard to the word of God, one must **not** take notice of their pleas, "however sweet they seem to reason" (F. C. 1. c. VII, 45), but must take his mind captive to the obedience of Christ in all the articles of faith (F. C. 1. c. VIII, 96), shut the eyes of reason, and believe simple-mindedly (ibid.).

Our opponent overlooks the difference between human and divine logic. For the latter, i.e. in itself, one truth of faith cannot, of course, contradict another. But for our human, limited logic, there can be an (apparent) contradiction between two revealed truths of faith. And for the sake of this apparent contradiction we are not yet justified in abandoning or even altering one of these truths of faith. - With respect to the doctrine of election by grace, the F. C. expressly recognizes an indissoluble mystery in this doctrine for our reason and logic, when it speaks of that which we "cannot make sense of" in this doctrine, which is therefore an apparent contradiction for our human logic (Sol. Decl. Art. II. § 53). The F. C. does not shrink from teaching, notwithstanding the contradiction with Scripture which lies here for our reason and logic, that the cause of our salvation, and therefore also of our election, lies in God alone, in his mercy in Christ; but that, on the other hand, the cause of our damnation lies just as exclusively in us alone, namely, in our persistent resistance (1. c. 8 60 ff. § 87 f.). But why God overcomes the reluctance of some and not of others, why he converts some, though they are in the same guilt as the others, whom he leaves to their destruction, the F. C. leaves as a mystery insoluble to our reason and not revealed to us in God's word (1. c. § 57). It does not dissolve this mystery; it does not say, "that some are chosen before others, and are converted, has its reason in the conduct of the same, in their having used the opportunity given them by preparatory grace not to resist"-no, it simply leaves the mystery here and acknowledges it. And so do our orthodox old dogmatists, even the later ones, in spite of their "intuitu Läsä." Martin Chemnitz, for example, writes: "How is it, then, that God does not give Judas such faith in his heart that he could have believed that he could be helped through Christ? Then we must return with our questions and say Rom. 11: 'O what depth of riches, both of wisdom and knowledge of God, how utterly incomprehensible are his judgments, and unsearchable his ways!'"* We cannot and ought not to search this out, and delve too far into such thoughts." (Passion

sermons Th. IV. P. 17. cited in "Doctrine and Defense." 1883. March ed. P. 94 f.) The same says (Loc. I, 155): Paulus non dicit, Deum esse causam scelerum, quae a vasis irae perpetrantur, sed totum genus humanum dicit unam et eandem esse massam aptatam ad interitum: *ex illa vero massa Deum gratuita misericordia quosdam assumere et convertere*, quosdam vero justo Dei iudicio relinqui in illa corruptione. Nec lutum potest dicere figulo, quid me sic fecisti? Justa enim et debita est poena, et in vasis irae ostenditur, quid omnes meriti simus, qui gratuita misericordia formamur ad salutem (in Frank a. a. O. p. 259 f.). Further, the Strasbourg Concordia Formula (in Löscher Hist. mot. II, 288) states: *Quod autem haec gratia sive hoc donum fidei non omnibus a Deo datur*, cum omnes ad se vocet et quidem pro sua infinita bonitate serio vocet, venite ad nuptias, omnia parata sunt, *arcanum est, soli Deo notum, nulla ratione humana pervestigabile mysterium tremendum et adorandum, sicut scriptum est: o altitudo divitiarum sapientiae et scientiae Dei* etc. (in Frank I. c. p. 263). Thus, further, the authors of the Apology of the Formula of Concord, Chemnitz, Selnecker, and Tim. Kirchner, write together: "But when it is asked, why God the Lord does not convert all men (which **he certainly could do**) by his Holy Spirit, and make them believers, etc., we are to speak with the apostle: How incomprehensible are his judgments, and how unsearchable his ways! Do they (the Calvinists) press upon us and say: Because you confess the election of the elect, you must also confess the other, namely, that in God Himself there is a cause of reprobation from eternity, etc.; we say that we are by no means anxious to make God the cause of reprobation (which is actually not in God, but in sin), and really to ascribe to Himself the cause of the damnation of the ungodly, but we want to remain with the saying of the prophet Hosea Cap. 13, where God says: Israel, you have brought disaster upon yourself; your salvation is with me alone.' Now, as we have heard from Luther, will we inquire of the dear God, inasmuch as He is hidden and has not revealed Himself," etc. (Apologia. 1584. f. 206 f., quoted in "Lehre und Wehre" I. c. p. 95 f.)

Quenstedt writes (l. c. P. III. C. 2. s. 2. q. 4. fol. 59): *Quod dicitur, causam, quod quidam credunt, non esse in hominibus, sed in Deo, fidem pro beneplacito suo iis largiente, id verbo est consentaneum*. Eph. 2, 8. Phil. 2, 13.

In Joh. Musaeus (Colleg. controvers, p. 390) it is said, "Primum enim, **causam discretionis**, cur alii convertantur, alii non convertantur, unice penes hominem esse, dicere nostrates non solent; sed uno ore dicunt omnes, *causam, cur convertantur, quicunque convertuntur, non*

esse penes homines, sed unice penes Deum; causam autem, cur non convertantur, qui in impietate perseverant, non penes Deum, sed unice penes hominem esse." ("Doctrine and Defence," l. c. p. 303.)

In his *Concordia Concors*, Leonhardt Hutter lists the following error of Melancthon as one of the reasons for not accepting Melancthon's *Corpus Doctrinae*: "He does not place election solely in God's will and mercy, but partly in man's will, for he expressly says: In man there is and must be some cause why some are chosen to salvation, but others are rejected and condemned'. ('In homine esse oportere causam aliquam, cur alii ad salutem eligantur, alii abjiciantur et damnentur.')

Likewise Hutter, in his *Explicatio libri Conce.* p. 200 s., among the sayings of Melancthon, which "are evidently synergistic," also adduces the following: "Necesse est in nobis aliquam discriminis causam, cur Saul abjiciatur, David recipiatur, hoc est, necesse est, esse aliquam actionem dissimilem in his duobus." Thus, as may be seen, not only is no ground of merit found by our orthodox dogmatists, but not even the explanatory ground for the election and conversion of some before others, in the conduct of the persons concerned.

Does our Herr. Opponent now perhaps accuse Chemnitz, Selnecker, Kirchner, Quenstedt, Musaeus, and Hutter of Calvinistic predestinarianism? Truly, this accusation would first of all hit the apostle Paul, for he knows nothing of a grace of election and conversion that is somehow conditioned by human behavior, he only knows an unconditional, unlimited, free grace: Rom. 9, 15. 16. God says to Moses, "To whom I am gracious, I am gracious, and on whom I have mercy, I have mercy. Now therefore it is not in any man's willing or running, but in God's mercy. And v. 18: He will therefore have mercy on whom he will. Cf. Gal. 3:18, Eph. 1:5, Phil. 2:13. In all these passages, the reason why God chooses and converts those whom he chooses and converts is given as the "free grace" of God alone, the "good pleasure of his will." How could we still speak of the gospel of God's free grace in Christ if the same were dependent on our conduct? Augustine, in the 2nd book of original sin, Cap. 24, very beautifully and finely, *Gratia non est gratia ullo modo, si non gratis datur omni modo*. Through the opposing doctrine the law is mixed into the gospel and thus the pure gospel of grace is altered, even abolished, in its innermost core and essence.

Ad 4. If our opponent appeals for his doctrine of predestination to the "praevisa fide" of the ancient dogmatists, Brauer has already proved in No. 9 d. Bl. proved that this doctrine of our ancient dogmatists is

The doctrine of election conditioned by foreseen faith is something quite different from the doctrine of the newer ones, according to which the behavior of non-resistance, which is admittedly made possible by grace, is supposed to be the reason and condition of election. Joh. Gerhard writes *Loci theol. tom II. de elect. § 175*: „Non dicimus ex. prae visione fidei esse praedestinationem, sed intuitum fidei *ingredi* electionis decretum; inter quas propositiones magna est differentia, prior causam meritoriam vel προ- *xαραρχιχήν* exprimit, posterior saltem, *ordinem* denotat." The same adduces in an entirely approving manner the following passage from Augustine's book *de praedest. sanet. 17*: „Elegisse Deum fideles, sed ut sint, non quia jam erant; non credere homines, ut eligantur, sed potius eligi, ut credant⁴⁴ ; cap. 19: „Non quia credidimus, sed ut credamus, eligit nos, ne priores eum elegisse dicamur etc. Sed haec et similia opposita sunt semipelagianis sive reliquiis pelagianorum. . . . Illis igitur **merito** sese opposuit Augustinus et, **fidem esse electionis Causam, negavit; quin** etiam, quod in expositione quarundam propositionum ep. ad Rom. scripserat: '*Deum elegisse fidem in praescientia, ut, quem sibi crediturum esse sciverit, illum elegerit*' **illud retractat** 1st *Retract.* c. 23 et *de praed. sanet. C. 3.*" (Joh. Gerh. l. c. § 166.) The same writes: l. c. § 188: "Proinde electionem hominum ad vitam *Deo in solidum* Scriptura transscribit, *a nullo enim alio principio pendet hoc summum divinae gratiae opus, quam a Deo et aeterno ejus decreto, quod in Christo fundatum* et certo mediorum τάξει est ordinatum." Quenstedt says of the causes of predestination: "*Causa movens* alia interna est, alia externa; interna est gratia Dei *mere gratuita*, excludens omne omnino operum humanorum meritum sive omne id, quod nomine operis vel actionis, *sive per gratiam, sive* ex viribus naturae factae, venit. Elegit enim nos Deus non secundum opera, sed *ex mera sua gratia. Etiam fides ipsa huc non pertinet, si spectatur tanquam conditio, magis vel minus digna, sive per se, sive ex aestimio per voluntatem Dei fidei superaddito, quod nihil horum decretum electionis ingrediatur, tanquam causa movens aut impellens Deum ad tale decretum faciendum; sed id purae putae gratiae Dei est adseri- bendum. Probatur haec propositio ex Rom. 9, 16. 16.: Miserebor, cujus misereor. Non volentis, neque currentis, sed miserentis Dei est.*" (l. c. P. III. c. 2. s. 1. th. 10. fol. 25. cf. "Doctrine and Defense." 1881. July ed. S. 302.)

From the passages cited it is evident how far our old dogmatists are from making man's conduct, which is made possible by the gratia praeveniens (his non-resistance or whatever one may call it), "the basis of the final salvation," since

they do not even regard the foreseen faith as the *causa movens vel impellens* for the conclusion of election.

and rightly so. When the old dogmatists say that God has chosen *intuitu fidei*, this means nothing else than that God has chosen us in Christ and to faith in Christ: God has chosen us in Christ and for faith in Christ, inasmuch as those who are chosen attain salvation only through faith in Christ. The *intuitu fidei* cannot have any other meaning, if faith, according to Scripture, is regarded merely as a gift of God. But then nothing at all is gained by it for the explanation of the mystery which lies in the election of grace. Moreover, as this expression can very easily be misunderstood and used as a cloak of synergism, as experience teaches, it is safest to avoid it altogether, especially as neither Scripture nor the F. C. use it. Cf. Frank, l. c. S. 167.

Finally, we cannot suppress the remark that it would have been more appropriate if the unknown opponent had refuted Mr. Pastor Brauer's detailed evidence in a factual and thorough manner, instead of indulging in personally hurtful remarks against him. How unjust and unworthy is such polemic, especially in regard to the sacred object it concerns! And how futile, indeed, how it actually hinders the purpose of reaching mutual understanding and agreement in the disputed questions!

Walter-Qualitz.

Also a consequence of modern theology.

The fact that the Pope has conferred a medal on the German Chancellor and that the latter has also accepted it has astonished the world and dismayed many Christians who know the papacy and want to do good for the German Empire. One involuntarily asks: How was this event possible? It is easy to understand that the Pope was able to give the order. An English ecclesiastical paper very correctly remarks: "The Pope is ready to decorate anyone, even such an arch-heretic as Prince Bismarck, if he can thereby gain something for his purposes." But how could the German Chancellor accept a medal from the hand of the Pope? If one says, "The acceptance was only a matter of politeness," or, "The German Chancellor wished in this way to cripple the Centrum in its agitation against him (the Reich Chancellor) as the enemy of the Catholic subjects, the question returns, How could the Chancellor be courteous to the Pabst in this way, or use this opportunity to take the wind out of his opponents' sails? The explanation can only be found if one realizes how, precisely in the ecclesiastical

The theology that is the order of the day in Germany has taken away the fear and horror of the Papacy. The theology, which is the order of the day in Germany, has deliberately taken away from the Christian people of Germany the shyness and the horror of Papacy. All the notable theologians of Germany, the "orthodox Lutherans" at the head, deride the sentence of the Reformation, the sentence of Luther and of the Lutheran Confession, that the Pope is the right Antichrist, as a "Missourian quirk"! We remember very well that some years ago the Lutheran *Luthard* literary journal took offense at the fact that a German writer had called the papist doctrine of justification (in which the antichristian nature of the papacy is so well expressed) a doctrine of the devil. Modern church history, too, has been busy clouding the judgment about the papacy. Just read, for example, what Kurtz writes about Pope Gregory VII in his "Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte für Studierende. Here, where the abomination of antichristianity stares at the Christian eye in its most horrible form, the "Lutheran" historian still knows how to discover quite significant bright sides. Kurtz himself presents Gregory's "basic ideas" thus: "In the unity of the papal theocracy, which for its part has only God and His law above it, all states of Christian name should be connected with each other as members of one body. The princes receive their consecration and divine sanction through the spiritual power; they are 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 the temporal authorities, can also withdraw it again where it is abused. With it, then, the obligation of subjects to obedience ceases of itself." In this "fundamental thought" of Gregory's, according to Kurtz, "the unevangelical brusqueness" (!) "should not be misjudged", "but it must" - these are Kurtz's own words - "on the other hand also be recognized as the necessary (!) opposition to the raw arbitrariness and the despotic encroachments of the secular power in that time of ferment for the establishment of equilibrium.... The Church, if it were 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." (6th ed. p. 303.) The papacy, something necessary for the preservation of the Church, the papacy-if not a wholly unadulterated, yet at least a blessing to the Church and to the world-this is the fundamental idea of the

Kurtz's criticism. From this basic idea, "Conservative" politicians and "Conservative" theologians have also in the recent past in Germany fought shoulder to shoulder with the Pabst against the German Reich Chancellor. As late as last year the "Lutheran" editor of the Kreuzblatt, "Pastor a. D." Grote, did the Lutheran name the dishonor of delivering a eulogy to Gregory VII, in the words: "The salvation of the Church was dearer to him than to any other, and even if he failed in his means, the glory is to be left to him undiminished, that he meant it faithfully and honestly with the task set him, and according to the measure of his insight and the whole circumstances of the time did what he could to fulfill it." *) Finally, Prof. Luthardt, in his "Allg. ev.-luth. Kztg." of December 4 of last year, also praised the Pope's latest Encyclical, which gives expression to all the demands and presumptions of the Antichrist, "for its clear, calm, and moderate presentation." Luthardt "subscribes" to one part of the Encyclical; to the other he opposes only a harmless "Protestant point of view." Thus the theologians judge the Pabstacy. Thus they, who should sharpen the conscience of Christians, blunt the Christian judgment and the Christian conscience toward Pabstry. Through the fault of the theologians it has come to this, that one regards Pabstry as a more or less legitimate type of the Christian religion. Thus it becomes clear how the German Chancellor could win over himself to accept a medal from the Pabst! The sin of the Chancellor is at the same time the sin of the whole Protestant people, and especially the sin of the theologians. If God should withdraw his hand from Germany, which he has hitherto so visibly exalted among the nations, because of this public flirtation with the Antichrist, he is at the same time punishing the sin of the whole Christian people and especially of its teachers, who have so misappropriated the heritage of the Reformation, to which belongs also the recognition of the Antichrist, in spite of all warnings.

F. P.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

"Old and New" Herr Exprofessor Schmidt's. For a long time now we have not been able to bring ourselves to read "Altes und Neues" or Ohio's Blätter, and thus to enjoy the old synergistic cabbage, newly warmed up and served up in every new number. In this we have followed our father Luther, who, among other things, made the following declaration: "Among all books, so the enemies

1) Cf. "Lehre und Wehre" 1885, p. 186 ff.

of truth have written against me, I have not read any but Erasmi's Diatribe; yet I have also read it so that I have often thought to throw it under the bench. For all that have hitherto written against me have given me argument enough in one or two leaves; the others I have sacrificed to Pilato." (XXII, 1630.) Just now we read in Luthardt's "Theol. Literaturblatt" of December 24 last the following exhortation of Mr. Schmidt in his parting words on the announcement of the suspension of his "Old and New" "The error of the Missouri Synod is evidently inwardly overcome. The St. Louisans have long preferred to keep as quiet as possible about their Reformation? discovery; the Wisconsinans care very little about such trifles at all, and have thrown the new doctrine of election by grace into the rumpus chamber; the Norwegians, as far as the doctrine is concerned, are all the more inwardly broken and shattered. ... Never will Missouri think of again touting its supposedly reformational doctrine of election by grace. And a false doctrine, which is put under a bushel *ex professo* by its friends, is not so harmful in the end." The "Literaturblatt" adds: "Since the sheet has thus fulfilled its task and achieved its purpose through its rich and grateful historical contributions, it has now ceased to appear." That the "Literaturblatt" should judge thus does not surprise us, since it is the manner of German "theological science" to form its judgment on Missouri, as the papists form their judgment on Luther from Cochläus, from such writings as Mr. Schmidt's and the notoriously mendacious Iowaer. That is what is now valid in Germany for the "objective" presentation of history. But that Mr. Schmidt should lay down his arms with suchrodomontades as the above, we are even less surprised. When blowhards begin their "great retirade," it is just then that they are wont to sing their songs of victory all the louder. He knows quite well that he has made a disgraceful fiasco, that he has not only lost the battle, but that through his zeal he has even lost his office and has now become completely bankrupt in every respect. He also knows very well that we Missourians, as far as our doctrine of election by grace is concerned, still stand today as we did before the outbreak of the controversy, but that we have no desire, first of all, to quarrel any longer with our opponents about what has long since been proved and long since disproved, nor to hold up to our congregations a doctrine which belongs not to milk but to strong meat, as the highly experienced Luther writes in his golden preface to the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Pauli to the Romans: "Without suffering, the cross, and mortal distress, one cannot act out one's misfortune without harm and secret anger against God. Therefore Adam must first be dead before he suffers this thing and drinks the strong wine. Therefore take care that you do not drink wine while you are still a baby. Every doctrine has its measure, time, and age." (XIV, 126.) 1) This doctrine, of course, could not be entirely concealed, since it is revealed in God's Word for our salvation, partly for our despair in ourselves, partly for our comfort in severe trials. Therefore we continue to recite it to the souls entrusted to us, both privately and publicly, according to need. The reason why we treated this doctrine in detail in 1877 et seq. was that it belonged to a whole series of doctrines which were intended to show that our Church gives all glory to God alone in all its doctrines and also proves that it is the visible true orthodox Church of God on earth. The Lord

1) This judgment of Luther shows at the same time that the doctrine of election by grace of our opponents is not the mysterious biblical Lutheran doctrine, but one that has been adjusted by blind reason for the spiritually blind.

Exprofessor, however, has acquired an indisputable merit by his immediate lashing out after the publication of our proceedings of 1879, namely, by the fact that those who were not of us have departed from us under his covering shield, and that in this way our ecclesiastical community has been purged of the highly dangerous synergistic-Pelagian elements which have crept in'. Not only have we been strengthened in our doctrine in the controversy he has stirred up, but we have also learned in it, as has always been the case in all doctrinal controversy, to speak of the truth under attack more and more distinctly and with more confidence. But if the Madison professor thinks that he has positively done something to save the truth, this reminds one of the fable of the mosquito, who thought that by jumping down from a stuck hay wagon he had caused its subsequent movement. In short, with the "attainment of his purpose," of which the "Literaturblatt" fables for his consolation, and with the "inner overcoming" of our doctrine, of which he himself fantasizes, it is, praise God, nothing. W.

Papism and Citizenship. The Episcopal "Churchman" writes: "The principle enunciated by Justice Powers" (namely, that a Mormon could not become a citizen of the United States) "suggests a further application. Since the Syllabus of Pius IX, (why not longer? L. & W.) it has been quite clear that no Roman Catholic can render full allegiance to the government of the United States. ... This consideration has become still more important since the publication of the last Encyclical, in which Roman Catholics are directed to take an active part in politics as such (namely, as Catholics) for the express purpose of extending the influence and power of the Papal See. If, for example, the Emperor of Germany wished to reserve for himself a certain, definite claim to the obedience of all Germans immigrating here, the recognition of this claim on the part of the German seeking naturalization would certainly be rightly regarded as a reason for not granting the latter citizenship. If a foreign-born Roman Catholic recognizes a similar claim on the part of the Bishop of Rome, this should be regarded as a sufficient reason for denying him citizenship. This must eventually come to pass with us, if our country is to preserve its liberty. The conflict between Rome and national independence is inevitable. Long before, France found it necessary to defend itself against papal attacks in the well-known 'Gallican liberties.' England, long before the Reformation, recognized the necessity of securing her national existence and declared in the Magna Charta that papal interference in the relations of subjects and the internal administration of her affairs would not be tolerated. Our country has even more reason to take a similar stand. Not only because the decree of infallibility and the doctrines of the Syllabus have evidently made it impossible for any faithful Catholic to give full allegiance to the State, but also because citizenship in a country like ours involves the exercise of a sovereign power over the history of the people - a power which, under the direction of clerics pledged to obey in all things a foreign and irresponsible ruler - can be used just now in a terrible way to control our political and governmental affairs. The recent Encyclical of Leo XIII only confirms what Gladstone long before maintained, that the Papal See, by claiming to be the supreme authority for life and doctrine, arrogates to itself the right to exercise the ultimate control of the Church.

control over the political and social duties of all its adherents. Hence the time is surely coming when the old controversy between Rome and national independence must come up in this country, and the decision of Justice Powers is therefore of the greatest importance, because it indicates the point at which the question must first come to a decision. Surely no stranger should obtain citizenship, and thus be invested with the right of voting in this free country, who is unable to discharge the duties and obligations of a free citizen, because he considers himself bound in conscience to obey a foreign unaccountable power." So far the "Churchman." We agree with the result of the execution.' Only, with respect to the main point, the "Churchman" misgrasps in the evidence. The claim of the Papal See to be "the highest authority for life and doctrine" - blasphemous as it is, and marking the "Papal See" as the most antichristian - would nevertheless not come into conflict with the rights of the State, if the "Papal authority" wished to be recognized merely in the spiritual sphere, and not at the same time to encroach upon the secular sphere, into that which is the Emperor's. The latter, however, is done by the "Papal See" in the spiritual sphere. But the latter is done by the papal see, and therefore, however, perfect obedience to the pope cannot be united with the duty of a subject in a secular realm. F. P.

What is Ritualism? - Judge Lubke in St. Louis recently delivered his decision in the Barr inheritance case, in a lengthy document which, however, is probably of special interest only to members of the Episcopal Church. The Rev. D. Eglinton Barr, formerly pastor of St. James Episcopal Church in Elleadsville, had bequeathed his not inconsiderable estate to various charities and religious foundations and had settled his daughter with a bequest of \$5.00. The latter then contested the validity of the bequest. The latter then disputed the validity of the will and the representatives of the charitable institutions, realizing the injustice done to the daughter, renounced their share of the inheritance without further ado. The executor, however, retained a sum of \$5,000, which the testator had bequeathed to students of theology preparing for the ministry of the Episcopal Church, and who were not adherents of ritualism, in order that the court might decide to whom the bequest should go under the limitation of the will. Judge Lubke heard a number of preachers to ascertain what was to be understood by ritualism, and it appeared that on this subject the learned gentlemen themselves were not agreed, and that there was no provision in the church by which ritualism could be accurately explained. It was asserted, indeed, that the Rev. Barr understood by Ritualism that movement in the Episcopal Church which amounted to the reintroduction of ancient ceremonim which had fallen into disuse; but all such explanations were not sufficiently definite to select, on the basis of them, those students of theology for whom the bequest was intended. The judge therefore ruled that the deceased's designation of this bequest could not be carried out, and that it should therefore go to the heiress at law. The executor was directed to deposit, out of the sum of \$6,090.86 still in his hands, with John or Wm. Barr \$530 for a plaque and to pay the balance to Mary A. Barr, presently married Gross. (A. d. W.) - So it goes when a church grants so-called "different directions" right of existence in its midst. Had this not been the case here, the church representatives would soon have agreed on a definition of ritualism. W.

II. foreign countries.

Wording of the Pope's letter to Bismarck. In its unofficial section, the "Reichs-Anzeiger" reports the Latin wording of the papal letter to the Reich Chancellor, which was presented to the Prince at the same time as the Order of Christ. The translation reads as follows: "Leo P. P. sends greetings to the excellent man, Prince Otto v. Bismarck, the great Chancellor of the German Empire. After a happy agreement has been reached concerning the Caroline Islands on the terms proposed by Us, We have taken care that the sublime Emperor of Germany be informed of Our great joy at the success. But we also wish to inform you, most powerful Prince, of this joyful mood of ours, to which you, following your own judgment and your own intuition, gave rise that this dispute was proposed to us for arbitration. Yes, we gladly confess, in accordance with the truth, that if we have succeeded in overcoming the many difficulties in this task, it is largely due to the willingness and zeal with which you have supported our efforts from beginning to end. Thus we testify to you our gratitude for the fact that it is essentially through your counsel that we have been given the highly desirable opportunity of exercising such a truly noble office in the service of peace, a task which, though not new in the history of the Apostolic See, has not been desired for a long time, although there is scarcely anything that corresponds so well to the nature and essence of the Roman Pontificate. You have freely followed your judgment, and by judging the question more according to its true nature than according to the opinion of others or according to custom, you have not hesitated in the least to trust in Our impartiality, in which the open or tacit approval of all those who judge unadulteratedly has evidently been at your side, but with special joy that of the Catholics throughout the world, who must certainly have been pleased with the honor done to their father and shepherd. Your wisdom of state has done most to give the German empire that mighty greatness which all recognize and acknowledge; but that empire - which is synonymous - is thereby equipped for the long term with power and forces. It has by no means escaped your wisdom, however, what great power for the integrity of public order and the state rests with that power which is exercised by us, especially when, after the removal of every obstacle, freedom of action is given to it. May it therefore be granted to anticipate the future in thought and to draw hope for the rest from what has happened. In the meantime, so that you yourself may have a memorial from Us of both Our deed and Our wish, We appoint you by this letter a Knight of the Order of the Service of Christ (*equitem ordinis militiae Christi*), the dignity of which We ourselves cause to be presented to you at the same time as this letter. In conclusion, We sincerely wish you all the best. Given at Rome near St. Peter's on December 31, 1885, Our Pontificate un 8th year. Handwritten: Leo P. P. XIII." - Under January 18 it was written from London: "The publication of Bismarck's letter to the Pope, in which he expresses his thanks for the Order of Christ recently conferred upon him, has caused a great sensation. In the letter the Pope is addressed as 'Sire'. The letter begins with the assurance that the Pope's letter and the award of the Order have greatly pleased Kaiser Wilhelm and Bismarck. It goes on to say that the Pope's words that the Papal See intended to practice the works of peace had first given Bismarck the idea of appealing to the Pope as a mediator in the Caroline question, and that in agreement with the Pope's words, Bismarck had decided to take up the matter.

with his unaltered confidence in the impartiality and exalted views of the Pope, he had chosen him as arbitrator in this dispute. Germany and Spain had no reason to be dissatisfied with the terms of the decision, and the result of the mediation would be lasting. He, Bismarck, would not miss any opportunity in the future to prove to the Pope his most lively gratitude, deepest affection and highest respect. The letter is signed: 'Your very devoted servant, Bismarck'."

Hanoverian Free Church. The following is reported in the "Allg. Kz." of December 24 of last year: "For the Lutheran Free Church of Hermannsburg in Hanover, whose organ has so far been the "Kirchl. Volksblatt aus Niedersachsen: Unter dem Kreuze," published by L. Grote, retired pastor in Basel, Pastor E. Bingmann in Celle will publish a "Kirchl. Anzeiger" from New Year's Day on. The paper is to appear semi-monthly at the half-yearly price of 1 Mk. The sample number contains, among other things, an overview of the number of members of the Lutheran Free Church in Hanover according to the report of the Pentecost Synod of the year. According to this, the total number of souls is 5800. 3000 of these are in the congregation of Hermannsburg alone. This congregation also has its own church with two pastors (the second position is not occupied at present), in addition to five outlying congregations with vicars and partly churches, partly emergency churches. After Hermannsburg come the parishes of Nettelkamp with 741, Scharnebeck with 646, Wriedel with 364, Verden with 338, Groß-Oesingen with 256, Bleckmer with 219, Rabber with 160 souls. For all these there are ten pastors and four vicars, 14 newly built churches, several noth churches and prayer halls, seven parsonages and two schools of their own." Pastor Grote must be considered by the people of Hermannsburg to be their rightful representative. He writes in relation to the above news in his "Kreuzblatt" of January 3: "Since the 'Kreuzblatt' has been at the service of the Hanoverian Free Church from the beginning, it was naturally a surprise to me when I saw from the newspaper that a new Free Church paper had suddenly appeared next to it, of whose founding I had no knowledge, of whose sample number I had not even received a copy, let alone that any consultation with me had taken place."

W.

A calendar reform concerning the celebration of Easter. A local political newspaper contains, among other things, the following: "In Germany, a calendar reform is being advocated in all seriousness, namely, the fixing of Easter on a certain day. As is well known, Luther already spoke out very forcefully in favor of this reform. We learn the following from a German newspaper: In the year 1886 we are especially aware of an oppressive grievance, the mobility of the Easter feast. This time it falls on April 25. Since Easter, our greatest and oldest Christian festival, rightly dominates not only our ecclesiastical but also our civic life, since all our schools (elementary and high schools) are oriented toward Easter, a delay of the summer half-year by 4 weeks must cause general disturbance. Especially the friends of ecclesiastical customs must wish that there be no gap between this and the general cultural life. Even if the Easter celebration seldom falls on April 25 as the outermost date, does it not remain as a great inconvenience that the celebration can fluctuate back and forth within a period of 35 days? Is not a stability of Easter extremely desirable, even if we do not make Easter the beginning of the year, as was the case in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and for which a beginning has again been made in the present accounting year beginning with April 1? Would there not be an extraordinary clarity and simplicity of the ecclesiastical festive season if the

Would the feast of the resurrection be celebrated regularly on the first Sunday after the spring equinox, i.e. after March 21? The determination of the Easter feast is based on a calculation, whose factors in the resolution hardly still find recognition. The Conciliar of Nicaea (325) assumed as a basis that the spring equinox always fell on March 21. Now, however, we are to wait for the next full moon, as the Jews did in calculating their Passover, and then Easter is to be celebrated only on the next Sunday after the full moon, the latter in order that our Christian Easter celebration may not coincide with the Jewish Passover celebration. But why this detour? Why should we, who have solar years, wait with the Jews, who have had lunar years, until the full moon, and after that, to avoid them, again on the Sunday following? The astronomer Arago says: 'The innumerable complications in the ecclesiastical feast reckoning are due to the fact that one did not want to adhere exclusively to the solar year. However, the Church would have had the right, in the reform of 1582, to take away the flexibility of the Easter feast and to fix it invariably, for example, on the first Sunday in April.'" - That Luther was in favor of fixing the time of Easter is true. Compare his writing "Von den Conciliis und Kirchen". X VI, 2676-2683. He certainly did not agitate for this.

W.

Old Testament and Christianity. The German Imperial Court has recently given the curious decision that an insult to any passage of the Old Testament is not yet an insult to Christianity, and emphasized that "the Old Testament is indeed a religious source of Christianity, but not identical with it. Christianity, then, may not be insulted, but the religious source of it may!

W.

"National Church Matters." Under this heading the "Kreuzblatt" of December 27 of last year reports the following: The Schlesische Zeitung reports on an incident from the last Protestant General Synod in Berlin, which the anti-Semitic "Reichsbote" and other papers of this color have probably not concealed without reason. Pastor von Bodelschwingh had proposed that those Protestant spouses who promised to raise their children in the Catholic Church should be denied ecclesiastical honors at the funeral. After some members of the synod had raised concerns and proposed amendments, the proposer also changed his view and took a position that was pretty much the opposite of what the proposal represented. Pastor von Bodelschwingh declared that he agreed with all the proposed amendments. He wanted to withhold ecclesiastical honors at the funeral only in the most extreme cases of coercion, and only if clergymen of another confession declared themselves ready for the funeral. According to this it seems that the applicant wants to exercise leniency even in "compulsory cases" if no other clergyman can be found who is willing to show the deceased the denied ecclesiastical honors. For without ecclesiastical honors it does not work, even with the most unchurched. Thus Pastor von Bodelfchwingh had as good as given up his motion. We are not surprised at this; for consistency and firmness are not everyone's cup of tea, and one can be taught better and change one's standpoint for another. What is incomprehensible to us, however, are the following words which the reporter puts into the mouth of Pastor von Bodelschwingh: "Incidentally, he is of the opinion that if a rabbi refused a Jew ecclesiastical honors at the funeral and the surviving relatives turned to him, he would be obliged to guarantee ecclesiastical honors without further ado.

is ready*." (Lively bravo!) Astonished one asks oneself: How is this statement compatible with the standpoint of a Protestant preacher? And how did the applicant get from the Catholics to the Jews? Had he been accused of confessional narrow-mindedness, and did he seek to protect himself against this by an eclatant confession of his liberalism? It seems that in the course of the debate Pastor von Bodelschwingh converted to the view that the ecclesiastical honors of a Protestant preacher must be conferred on anyone who has been deprived of them by a Catholic priest or Jewish rabbi. This means, of course, to carry "tolerance" to extremes. But what did Stöcker say to this union practice of his Jew-friendly colleague? The "Rheinische Lutherische Wochenblatt" remarks: "It will seem strange if the next time the pious, possibly even Lutheran, Pastor von Bodelschwingh will precede the coffin of a Jew, whom his own rabbi did not like to bury, with the ringing of bells, and then intones at the grave (certainly also in the Jewish churchyard?): 'Christ, he is my life,' and thus waits for his office. How can one speak in such a manner who knows himself to be bound as a servant and representative of a church that is conscious of itself!"

German Judgment on American Theologians. In an advertisement of the new edition of *Loci th.* J. Gerhard's in the "Theol. Literaturblatt" of December 24 of last year, we read: "The material principle of dogmatics lies in Scripture and church doctrine, its formal principle in the scientific method originating elsewhere. Therefore, an undertaking, such as that of some American theologians, to simply repeat the old dogmatics, is based on a misunderstanding not only of recent scientific development, but also of the special character of theology; J. Gerhard in particular would object to such an undertaking." - After the gentlemen of German theology have in recent years made it a reproach to "some American theologians" that the same depart from the dogmatists in a doctrine, they should cheaply stay at home now with their old reproach of repristination. W.

Summary proof that the Pabst Church is the only one that can save, and that all others are not true churches. The "Pilger a. S." of December 27 of last year writes: The anti-German attitude of a large part of the Roman clergy in northern Bohemia has already resulted in isolated conversions to Old Catholicism. The clergy have had misgivings about this; they now fear even further apostasy from the Roman Church. The Bishop of Leitmeritz has therefore issued a pastoral letter in which he exhorts to fidelity. It states: "Religious associations may have ordained priests, but they still do not belong to the Church of Christ, and still less are they the Church which is the only Saviour, if they have renounced the Roman See; they will never be able to prove, to point out only one thing, that the Sacrament of Penance is lawfully and, except in the most urgent cases, validly administered among them; for this Sacrament may and can be administered only by that priest who is authorized to do so by his bishop who is in communion with the Roman Pontiff. Therefore the enemies of the Church offer you no substitute when they advise you to go over to one of the older non-Catholic religious communities which separated from the mother Church in the sixteenth century. There, too, because there is no pope and no bishops and priests, you will find no true church; there you will seek in vain infallibility in doctrine, in vain the holy mass, in vain the true sacraments of confirmation, altar, penance, last rites, and consecration, in vain the veneration and intercession of the saints, in vain so many aids to the sanctification of your own soul."

Switzerland and the books used in its public schools. The "Allg. Kz." of December 24 of last year writes: "The government of the Canton of Bern has rejected in a very definite manner the request of ten ultramontane Jurassic Grand Councils, which demanded the withdrawal of the new French reading book: '*Le trésor de l'écolier*', from the classroom or the deletion of the passage dealing with the Council of Constance and the Reformation. In the letter of reply of the director of education Gobat it says literally: 'I can only reply to you that in a country where the reformed faith prevails, the concealment of the event which has exerted the greatest influence on the civilization of mankind would be a folly'."

The Society of the Deniers of God was severely affected some time ago by the apostasy of its principal founder and chief fighter, M. Jogand, or as he called himself Leo Taxil, who covered the walls of Paris with blasphemous and filthy images, and was a terror to many Christians. When he took leave of his comrades, a wild uproar arose, and he was violently insulted. When he attempted to speak, some one interrupted him, exclaiming: Thou hast no faith! No, replied Taxil, I am afraid I have not, and that is what makes me unhappy, but I bear a desire to preserve it. In the explanation of his resignation, Taxil says: "This is not only a direction and prelude to repentance, but with me it is repentance itself, a sincere and complete repentance. The repugnance which the injustice of my associates has aroused in me has been followed by the shame of my forgiveness. If I weep today, it is not out of anger because I see myself deceived, but I weep for the trouble I have caused. I regret it from the bottom of my heart, and my endeavor will be to repair the harm "done."" His conscience has awakened, and with it his faith in God, which is inseparable from him, and which must now fight its way through the old doubts. This is the story of many a God-denier and free spirit.

(N. Ztbl.)

Russia. The "Allg. Kz." of December 24 of last year reports: "Not long ago, petitions from the Russian Baltic provinces by the Baltic knighthoods and a Latvian peasant community concerning proven damage to the Lutheran Church in Livonia, especially through the reintroduction of the requirement for mixed marriages that the children of these marriages be raised in the Greek confession, were submitted to the Emperor by the Petitions Commission in St. Petersburg. On December 9, the President of the Commission received it back with the Emperor's remark: to leave the petitions submitted to the Petitions Commission without any consideration and to inform the petitioners that such a petition should not have been submitted at all." - The "Livl.Gouv.-Ztg." publishes the following official notice: "The Lord and Emperor has on July 26, a. c. The Lord and Emperor, on the 26th of July a. c., has the highest command to issue immediate orders for the strict observance of the law in force concerning the reversals prescribed in Art. 67 of the Swod of Laws Vol. X in the case of mixed marriages in the Baltic governorates. - Article 67 reads: "If the bride or bridegroom belongs to the Orthodox confession, it is required in this case everywhere, except in Finland: that the person of another confession who enters into marriage with a person of the Orthodox confession sign a reversal that the children born of this marriage be baptized and educated according to the doctrines of the Orthodox (that is, Greek) confession" (Church Gazette of Warsaw).

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 32.

March 1886.

No. 3.

Preface.

(Conclusion.)

"In order that I may also have answered those who blame me, I reject all the holy teachers of the churches. I do not reject them, but since everyone knows that they have sometimes erred as men, I will not give them further credence, unless they give me evidence of their understanding from the Scriptures, which have never erred. And this is what St. Paul calls me in 1 Thess. 5:21, when he says: 'Examine and prove all doctrine beforehand; whichever is good, keep it.' In the same way St. Augustine wrote to St. Jerome: 'I have learned to do honor only to the books which are called the Holy Scriptures, that I firmly believe that none of their writers has ever erred.'" (Reason and Cause of all the Articles condemned by the Roman Bull, of the year 1520. XV, 1758.)

V. Scripture is nowhere in contradiction with itself.

"This deceived the good man Oekolampad, that Scripture, being contrary to each other, must of course be reconciled, and take one part of a mind that suffers itself with the other; because it is certain that Scripture may not be at variance with itself. But he did not perceive and consider that he was the man to admit and prove such disagreement of Scripture; but he accepted it, and pretended it, as if it were certain, and already proved. There he falls and fails. But if they would consider beforehand, and see how they would speak nothing but the word of God, as St. Peter teacheth, and leave their own saying and setting at home, they would not do so much mischief. The word 'Scripture is not contrary to one another' would not have deceived Oekolampad, for it is founded in God's Word that God does not lie, nor His Word not lie." (That these words, This is my body, still stand fast, from the year 1527. XX, 994. f.)

"I charge thee, however, that the Scriptures are contrary to one another, ascribing righteousness in one place to faith, and in another to works. For it is impossible' that the Scriptures should be contrary to themselves; without only that the unwise, rude, and hardened hypocrites should think so." (Detailed Explanation of the Epistle to the Galatians, dated 1535. VIII, 2140.)

"I myself am heartily displeased with myself, and hate myself, because I know that all that the Scripture saith of Christ is true, beside which there can be nothing greater, nothing more important, nothing more agreeable, nothing more joyful, and which ought to make me drunk with the highest joy; because I see that the holy Scripture agrees in all things, so that there cannot be the least doubt about the truth and certainty of so important a thing, etc." (Short Exl. on the Pophet Jesaia, of the year 1532. VI. 268.)

"So there are many sayings in Scripture which are contrary to each other according to the letter, but where the causes are indicated, all is right." (Of the Conciliis and Churches, of the year 1539. XVI, 2668.)

"We have established the articles of our faith sufficiently in the Scriptures, so stop and do not let yourself twist them with glosses and interpret them according to reason, how it rhymes or not, etc., but if someone wants to smear something else on you from reason and your thoughts, then say: Here I have the dry Word of God and my faith, and I will stay with it, But if any other thing be smeared upon thee out of thy reason and thoughts, say, Here have I the dry word of God, and my faith; there will I abide, and think no further, nor ask, nor hear, nor reason, how this or that rhymeth, nor hear thee, though thou bring forth some other text or saying than is contrary to it, drawn out of thine own head, and smeared thine own slobber thereon; for it will not be contrary to itself, nor to some article of faith, though it be contrary in thine own mind, and rhyme not." (Sermon on Christian Armor and Weapons, of the year 1532. IX, 452.)

VI. To every letter and tittle of Scripture there is infinite attachment, and the whole church is bound to every one of them.

"In one letter, even in a few tittle of writing, there is more and greater than in heaven and earth. Darwin we cannot suffer it to be moved even in the very least. (Detailed Explanation of the Ep. to the Galatians, of the year 1535. VIII, 2661.)

"Far be it, far be it, that there should be one letter in Paul, which the whole general church should not follow and keep." 1) (Of the Babylonian Prison of the Church, 1520. XIX, 22.)

1) Absit, absit, ut ullus apex in toto Paulo sit, quem non debeat imitari et servare tota universalis ecclesia. (Opp. lat. varii argumenti etc. Fran- cofurti ad M. 1868. Vol. V, 27.)

VII. The simplicity of Scripture, even the description of trivial things in it, is due to God the Holy Spirit Himself.

(I) "Faithfully beseech and warn every devout Christian not to be offended at the simple speech and history which he often encounters, but do not doubt how badly it may always be regarded as the vain words, works, judgments, and history of the high divine majesty and wisdom. For this is the Scripture that makes fools of all the wise and prudent, and is open only to the small and foolish, as Christ says, Matt. 11:25. Therefore let thy pride and feelings depart, and think of this Scripture as of the most high and noble sanctuary, as of the most abundant treasure, which may never be fully filled, that thou mayest find the divine wisdom, which God here so foolishly and ill presents as to subdue all pride. Here you will find the swaddling clothes and the manger, where Christ lies, to which the angel also directs the shepherds Luk. 2, 11. Bad and insignificant are the swaddling clothes, but precious is the treasure, Christ, who lies within." (Preface to the Old Testament, 1523. XIV, 3.)

"Gen. 24:22: When the camels had all drunk, he took a golden clasp weighing half a shekel, and two bracelets on their hands weighing ten shekels of gold? What is told here seems to reason as if it were a very carnal and worldly thing; and I myself wonder why Moses speaks so much of such small things, when he has spoken so briefly of many higher things. There is no doubt, however, that the Holy Spirit intended this to be written for our instruction. For in the holy scriptures nothing is held against us that is of little account, or that is vain; but all things that are written are written for our learning, Romans 15:4: for God is to be known in all things. . . Therefore let us hear the bridal song for an example to the youth, that they may learn of marriages, and at the same time keep husband and wife honest; which things are all despised among the heathen, as is seen in the writings of the poets, both Greek and Latin. For they look only to the flesh, and so revile and dishonor God the Creator. To the same we are to hold the text of the holy Scriptures for noses. . . The Holy Spirit beautifully adorns the bride here, as if he had nothing else to do and teach." (Interpretation of Genesis 1, dated 1536. ff. I, 2563. f. 1568.)

"Gen. 44:1, 2: 'And Joseph commanded his steward, saying, Fill the men's sacks with meat, as much as they may carry, and

Put every man's money in his sack. And put my silver cup in the top of the young man's sack, with the money for the grain. He did as Joseph had told him.' Now I have often admonished, and it should always be held against people and imagined, that the Holy Spirit lets so great patriarchs write such jocular and small things, when he would choose brave, important, and great holy things; just as he sometimes includes some of them and puts them among the histories of the holy fathers. An unintelligent carnal reader, thinking that these things are of no value at all, is easily annoyed by them, and is astonished that such things are read in the church and congregation of God, and that the Holy Spirit can thus spend time and labor in telling such small, trivial things. For why does he not rather reproach us with great strange miracles, of the fasting of the monks, of Stoic and Spartan hardness and unkindness of men, who were as hard as iron; just as the Carthusians want to be taken for such hard men; as if in these ridiculous and trivial things there could be special great doctrine? Likewise they also dispute whether this play, which Joseph did with his brethren, could have pleased God, and of his own inspiration, or of what spirit he might have done it. To this I answer therefore, That Joseph did this thing, and was therefore described by the Holy Ghost, that we might learn therefrom how to live rightly before God, etc." (A. a. O. 11,2386-88.)

VIII. Even where Scripture tells of sexual things offensive to natural feeling, the Holy Spirit himself is the Rapporteur.

In reference to the story of Judah's incest with Tamar, Luther writes: "It is a marvelous diligence of the Holy Spirit to describe this shameful, lewd history. . . . Why did the purest mouth of the Holy Spirit descend to such low, despised things, which are also somewhat lewd and obscene, and in addition are condemnable, as if such things should be of some use, so that the church and congregation of God might be taught by them? What hath the church to do with it? To this I answer, as before, that all these things are thus told for Christ's sake, who is described in all the holy Scriptures as being our brother, our blood-friend, and our kinsman, and so forth. . And so the Holy Ghost descendeth with his most pure mouth, and speaketh of abominable sin and abominable incest." (A. a. O. 11,1759.1761.)

On the narrative of the birth of Perez and Serah Gen. 38,

27-30. Luther writes: "I have said before that we must almost make our own preface and euphemism before every chapter; for we are so tender that we do not suffer to speak, nor to hear of human birth, and yet we have done besides that which is abominable to say. It is true that this is a very rough chapter, but it is written in the Holy Scriptures, and the Holy Spirit, who has a purer mouth and pen than we, wrote it, so that I do not know how to make it more beautiful than this. If any man have purer mouth and ears than he, let it stand: if he be not afraid nor ashamed to write, let us not be ashamed to read and to hear. Would to God we had kept discipline and shame where we ought, and shunned fornication where we ought! so we have turned it to appearance. Where it was necessary to speak of it, we kept silent, but we did much worse, and again. The Holy Ghost knoweth well what he hath done, even so speaketh he of his creature as it goeth. . . . Now this history Moses described brightly and roughly, therefore open your eyes, and think that it has happened to us for the teaching of the Holy Spirit, etc." (Sermons on the 1st Book of Moses, from the year 1527. III, 342. ff.)

IX. Even the lack of right order that seems to be found here and there in Scripture has its reason in God's of the

Holy Spirit wisdom.

"To the first question (Matth. 24, 3.) he answers, when Jerusalem shall be destroyed, saying: 'When ye shall see the abomination of desolation,' and saith, that for the elect's sake the days shall be shortened.... But the words are somewhat obscure, and Matthew and Mark include the tribulation for the end of the world, and also that Jerusalem should be destroyed, and at times they also indicate the destruction of the world, that he thus mixes and blends the two together; and it is the way of the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures that he speaks thus. For when Adam was made, and Evam was yet to be made, the scripture saith: God took a rib and made a woman of it. Then he uses the word "build," when he might have said, "He created, or made a woman of it. Then he uses the word "building," as carpenters build a house, and the Holy Spirit flies out of the same history with the word and indicates something special, that with the word "building" not only Eve is described as Adam's bride, but also that at the same time the Christian church is indicated, which is also God's dwelling place and temple, which God has built and is still building until the end of the world; for this is the spiritual Eve, who was taken from the side of Christ. For when the side is opened, it is taken out of his flesh and body.

Blood taken. Adam's rib was with flesh and blood; so we, the Christian church, are also built up from the side of the right Adam, Christ. This is what the word meant in the beginning of the world. So the Holy Spirit often says, pointing out from the history, that just as Eve was the true woman, made from the rib of man, so let the bride of the Lord Christ be the true Eve, the Christian church, which was also taken from Christ, just as Eve was born and built from Adam's flesh, for this is what it meant. So here Matthew also uses several words that refer to the last calamity of the world, which was caused by the destruction of Jerusalem. For the same will be the tribulation of the churches, saying, "Except the days be shortened, no man shall be saved. This is what Matthew does. Now we will divide it from one to another in his time." (Sermons on etzliche chapters of the Evangelist Matthäi, from the year 1537-1540. Erlanger Vol. XLV. S. 119. f.)

"But what is the matter, that Moses casteth the laws so disorderly among themselves? Why does he not put the secular laws in one heap, and the spiritual laws in one heap, and faith and love in one heap? And sometimes he repeats a law so often, and repeats the same words so often, that it is displeasing to read and to hear? Answer: Moses writes as he ought, so that his book is a picture and an example of the government and the life. For so it is, when it is in progress, that now this work must be done, now that. And no man can so regulate his life (if it be otherwise divine) as to practice this day a spiritual law, and the next a temporal law; but God regulates all the laws one to another, as the stars of heaven and the flowers of the field, that man must be ready every hour for every thing, and do that which first cometh before his hand. So Moses' book is also mixed together. But the fact that he is so busy and often repeats the same thing is also an indication of the nature of his office. For he who governs a law-abiding people must always stop, always go on his way, and deal with the people as with asses. For no law is made with pleasure and love; it is all forced and compelled. Because Moses is a teacher of the law, he must show by his activity how the laws are forced works, and make the people weary, until by such activity they recognize their sickness and unwillingness to obey God's law and seek grace." (Preface to the Old Testament, 1523. XIV" 8. f.)

"Before we begin the text (Habac. 1.), I must pave the way and make a common entrance, which is not only necessary and useful to understand this" (Prophet Habacuc), "but almost all the Prophets. For this has hitherto made much astray in the prophets, that,

When they speak of the Jewish kingdom, they stop short and talk about Christ, and it seems to anyone who does not know their ways that they have a strange way of speaking, as they do not keep order, but throw the hundredth into the thousandth, so that they cannot be grasped, nor can they be made to fit in. Now it is a very unpleasant thing to read a book that keeps no order, because one cannot bring one thing to another, and hang it on one another, so that it may be well arranged one after another; as is fitting, then, when one wants to speak rightly and well. So the Holy Spirit is to blame for not being able to speak well, but as a drunkard or a fool speaks, so he mixes them together and utters wild and strange words and sayings. But it is our fault that we have not understood the language, nor known the manner of the prophets. For it cannot be otherwise; the Holy Spirit is wise, and makes the prophets wise also. But a wise man must be able to speak well; this is never lacking; but he that heareth not well, or knoweth not the language well enough, it may seem good to him that he speaketh evil, because he heareth or heareth scarcely half the words." (Excerpt from the Prophet Habacuc, 1526. VI, 3093. f.)

X. Even that which the Holy Scriptures say of natural history, God the Holy Spirit Himself says.

"I have often said that whoever wants to study the Scriptures should always see to it that he sticks to the simple words as much as he can, and should never deviate from them unless some article of faith compels him to understand them differently than the words say. For we must be sure that no more simple words have come down to earth than those spoken by God. Therefore, when Moses writes that in six days God created the heavens and the earth, and all that is in them, let it remain that there were six days, and let no gloss be found on how six days were one day. But if thou canst not understand how there were six days, give glory to the Holy Spirit, that He is more learned than thou. For thou shalt deal so with the scriptures, that thou shalt think as God himself speaketh. But because it is God who speaks, it is not for you to steer his word where you will, unless necessity compels you to understand a text differently from what the words say; namely, if faith does not suffer such understanding as the words give." (Homilies on the 1st Book of Moses, of the year 1527. III, 23.)

"Hilarius and Augustine, as the two greatest lights of the Church, are of this opinion, that the world was created suddenly and at once, not successively through six days. ... As far as St. Augustine's opinion is concerned, we hold that Moses actually spoke, not allegorically or figuratively, namely, that the world was created with all creatures within the six

Days, as the words read, was created. But since we cannot reach nor understand the cause with our wit and reason, let us remain disciples, and let the Holy Spirit have his mastery". (Ausl. des 1. B. Mosis, vom J. 1536. ff. I, 3. 4.)

XI. The chronological data of the holy scriptures are also of divine origin.

"We do not have much to complain about Eusebius, who was truly (as Jerome writes) a wonderful and extremely industrious man. We complain about all the other historians, and they themselves complain among themselves that they lack a certain accounting of the years. That is why I have let them go in this work and have wanted to bring about this account primarily from the holy Scriptures. For we can and should truly rely on it with constant faith.... I hold to the holy Scriptures alone, therefore I must also reject the Philonem (which I am very reluctant to do), since it sets too much in the weeks of eighteen years. ... This cause has induced me not to despise the Historicos altogether, but to prefer the sacred Scriptures to them. I use them so that I am not urged to contradict the Scriptures. For I believe that in the Scriptures God speaks who is true, but in other histories that very fine men apply their best diligence and fidelity (but as men), or even least that their copyists could have erred." (Chronicles, from the year 1541 and 1545. XIV, 1112. 1116. 1117.)

Before Luther would have wanted to attribute a chronological error to one of the holy scribes, he preferred to assume that a chronological indication of them, which was incompatible with other established data, must have come into the biblical text through copyists. He writes: "The time of the judges from the death of Moses to Samuel is 357 years, including Joshua, as you see for yourself. And the calculation does not fail, because in 1. B. of the Kings C. 6. from the Exodus to the temple of Solomon are counted 480 years. Therefore it is a public error in the histories of the apostles Cap. 13, (20.), provided by the scribes, and the Latin Versio is twice wrong, because it sets 450 years before the judges for the distribution of the land, thus forcing the Lyram to run back to the years of Isaac. But the Greek text is falsified by the scribe's error, which could easily have happened, that he wrote 450 for 350, namely τετραχοσίσις for τριαχοσόος."

(Op. cit. p. 1178. f.) 1)

1) Beza agrees with Luther in this, and justifies the opinion of the same in his "Novum Testamentum et Th. Bezae annotationes," 1598. col. 512.

XII. The interpretation of the Old Testament that Christ and the apostles give is the authentic interpretation of the Holy Spirit Himself.

"Jerome reports, among other things, in addition to this (90th) Psalm, that in Psalms it is a constant custom that ten successive Psalms are allotted to the author whose name is printed in the preceding Psalms. He may have taken this from the Rabbinical tradition. But I do not doubt that this one psalm is to be attributed to Mosi and not the following ones, which have no title. For the Epistle to the Eberians C. 4, 7. speaks publicly of the 8th verse of the 95th Psalm: 'This day, when ye shall hear his voice,' etc., that God hath spoken these things by David; wherefore we must take it that Jerome hath herein followed the poems of the Jews." (Excerpt of the 90th Psalm, from 1534. V, 1086.)

"That the 'rock' (Ex. 17. 6.) in the wilderness signifies Christ, is not said by reason, but by Paul, 1 Cor. 10, 4. So that no one else interprets the figure, but the Holy Spirit Himself, who set the figure and did the fulfillment, that word and work, figure and fulfillment, and both declaration, may be of God Himself, not of men, that our faith may be founded on divine, not human works and words. . . . That this saying (Ps. 110, 4.) is said of Christ, I hold, you will not deny, as St. Paul Ebr. 5, 2. and many more, and the Lord Christ himself Matth. 22, 44. indicate it of himself." (From the Papacy at Rome, against the highly famous Romanist at Leipzig, from the year 1520. XVIII, 1127. 1229.) 1)

1) Brenz, in his interpretation of the 2nd Psalm, writes: "If we have apostolic testimonies, which are the ground of the church, that this Psalm is to be understood of Christ, the Son of God, then even no angel, much less a godless rabbi, who teaches otherwise, may be heard." (Opp. Tom. III. fol. 181.) The same: "If Paul interprets this (18th) Psalm of Christ, no other, even that of an angel, is to be acknowledged" (Ib.) On the other hand Calvin writes: "While the Prophet deals with the excellency of men (in the 8th Ps.), this ("trahit,") the Apostle draws Ebr. 2, 6-9. on the humiliation of Christ.... What the apostle afterwards sets forth of a short condemnation is not exegetical, but he bends it to his purpose (*ad suum institutum deflectit*), which was said by David in another sense. Thus he puts Ephes. 4, 8. the passage Ps. 68. both exegetically, but rather accommodates the same by means of a pious bowing down ('pia deflectione') to Christ's person." (Ad Ps. 8. Vid. Opp. Tom. III, 24.) The modern theologians go, alas! much, much further. Tholuck has spoken most radically on the subject in hand, thus: "The Messiah of the prophets, and his kingdom prophesied by them, is not the JEsus of the New Testament, nor the Church founded by him; but it is to him who recognizes in the institutions of Old Testament religion the preformation of the higher stage of Christendom." (The Prophets and their Prophecies. p. 149.)

"First, it is to be known that all things which the apostles taught and wrote, they drew from the Old Testament; for in the same all things are proclaimed which were to take place and be preached in Christ in the future, as St. Paul says Rom. i, 2: "God promised the gospel of his Son Christ through the prophets in the holy Scriptures. Therefore all their preaching is based on the Old Testament, and there is not a word in the New Testament that does not look behind it into the Old Testament, where it was preached before. So we have seen in the epistle" (Ebr. 1. for the third day of Christ) "how the deity of Christ is proved by the apostle out of the sayings of the Old Testament. For the New Testament is no more than a revelation of the Old. For the Old Testament is a letter of Christ's testament, which he opened after his death, and gave to be read and preached everywhere through the gospel, as Revelation 5:5 is signified by the Lamb of God, who alone opened the book with the seven seals, which no one else could open, in heaven, on earth, or under the earth.'" (Sermon on the Gospel on the Third Day of Christ, 1528. XI, 214. f.)

"I will be to him a father, and he will be to me a son,' they have also made this saying dull, as if they were teachers only to weaken the Scriptures, and say that this saying has two senses: one is to be understood of Solomon, as a figure of Christ, the other of Christ. But if this be admitted, that the Scripture doth not insist on a simple sense, it argues no more. Let the Jews maintain that it is said of Solomon, as we confess, but the apostle lies in the sand with a good appearance, and smokes nothing. Therefore it is to be firmly held that he alone is said of Christ." (Sermon on the Epistle on the Third Day of Christ, 1522. XII, 228.)

"We leave the Jews' talk and stick to St. Paul's understanding, who not without reason (Gal. 3, 16.) so diligently presses on the little word 'seed,' and thereby shows that the holy Scriptures Gen. 12, 3. and 22, 18. speak of one seed, not of many, and freely says that such seed is Christ, and does this out of a right apostolic spirit and understanding. Now whether the Jews do not like such an interpretation of the apostle, we Christians are not at all mistaken. St. Paul's interpretation has more force with us than all the rabbis' glosses." (Ex. of Br. to Gal., dated 1535. VIII, 2220.)

"Because therefore David's words in this place (2 Sam. 23:17.) give such understanding" (of Christ's God-manhood) "gladly after all manner of ibra-.

In the New Testament, where it rhymes and resembles the New, we Christians should neither seek nor respect any other understanding in it, but consider it the only right understanding, and all other interpretations as human idiocy. The New Testament cannot be lacking, nor the Old Testament, where it rhymes and is similar to the New. (Excerpt of the last words of David, from the year 1543. III, 1814.)

"Münster begets in one place a Jewish rabbi, who says: Sine supra et infra non potest intelligi Scriptura sancta, that is, the sacred Scripture cannot be understood without the highest and lowest points. And the same is true of the Ebraeans. But they do not indicate who was the one who taught or ordered that these words should be read according to the points; nor do they give any certain arguments or proofs as to why the points should be added in this way. At the time of Hieronymi, as can be seen, dots were not yet used, but the whole Bible was read without dots. ... Therefore I do not ask much about the Jewish rabbis Supra and Infra. It would be best to read the Scriptures according to the Infra; and the New Testament gives us the right inward understanding of the same, not the highest or lowest." (Ausl. des 1. B. Mosis, vom J. 1545. II, 2703. f.)

XIII. Even where one cannot understand the Scriptures, he must still regard and treat them with holy timidity and confess his ignorance.

"For this reason we should not allow the sayings (of the Old Testament) about Christ to be torn asunder, of whom Jacob began to say that he would be the Lord of the Gentiles, and that the nations of the whole world would hear him and obey him. We are bound to keep the same intention of speaking of Christ, and not to make up strange figures (as Hysteron Proteron, etc.) and to draw them here. But where we lack understanding, let us leave the mastery to the Holy Spirit, only that we do not allow the text to be thus torn and confused. For I will rather confess that I understand it not." (Exl. of the 1st Book of Moses, of the year 1545. II, 2912. f.)

We repeat here in conclusion Luther's saying, "There is no joking with God's Word. If you cannot understand it, take your hat off to it." (Excerpt of a piece from the 23rd chapter of Proph. Jeremiah, of the year 1526. VI, 1396.) -

Thus we have herewith presented Luther's doctrine of inspiration in his own words from the most diverse times of his life and work. With this, one should now compare, among other things, Luthardt's and Cremer's judgment. The former professes to write that the

Volck, who accuses the Holy Scriptures of many errors, thus represents "the truly ecclesiastical view in the sense of **Luther**!" The latter asserts with the former that Luther believes so little in the inspiration of Holy Scripture that he rather knows to say "of hay, straw, and stubble, which the prophets have run under with their own good thoughts," and indeed both want this to be understood of the prophets, whose writings make up a major part of Holy Scripture!

As little as it is to the credit of these learned theologians, who even want to be Lutheran, that they herewith reveal how little they are at home in Luther's writings and how little reliable at the same time their historical data are even in such important questions, this is still by no means the most frightening thing. For if - and we are reluctant to write it down - Luther had really considered the Bible to be a book afflicted with all kinds of errors, from which only scholars could extract the divine core of truth, then only Luther would have been taken away from the Bible Christians. The most frightening thing here is that the modern believers and modern Lutheran theologians (as it seems almost without exception!) declare it to be a fact, now no longer to be disputed, that the Scriptures, besides the "own good thoughts" of their authors, also contain "hay, straw, and stubble" which "the fire consumes". Thus the Bible Christians are not deprived of a man whom they had hitherto considered a faithful witness of the truth; thus the Bible Christians are deprived of their Bible itself, their lamp and light on their way to eternity, their rod and staff in the dark valley of tribulation, in short, of God's Word, and thus of their comfort in the anguish of sin, their hope in the night of their hour of death!

In his Great Confession of the Lord's Supper, Luther writes of Zwingli's alloecosis: "Beware, I say, of the alloecosis; it is the devil's larvae, for it finally brings about such a Christ that I would not gladly be a Christian, namely, that Christ henceforth be no more, nor do with his suffering and life, than another bad saint. For if I believe that human nature alone has suffered for me, then Christ is a bad savior to me, and he himself needs a savior. Summa, it is unspeakable what the devil seeks with the alloecosi." (Cited in the Formula of Concord, Art. VIII. p. 682, § 40.) We must say the same of the so-called "God-humanity of Scripture," as it is now understood and taught by modern believing theology: Beware, beware, I say, of this "God-manliness of Scripture"; it is the devil's larva, for it ultimately directs such a Bible, according to which I would not willingly be a Bible Christian, namely, that the Bible henceforth is no more than another good book, which I must read with constant earnest examination, lest I fall into error. For if I

that the Bible also contains errors, it is no longer a touchstone for me, but needs one itself. Summa, it is unspeakable what the devil seeks with the "God-humanity of Scripture.

We know well what our waiting for this our seemingly intemperate declaration. It will be despised and laughed at as a sign of a zealot's lack of understanding, if not worse. But woe to us, if here, where it is not even merely a question of this or that doctrine of faith in Scripture, but where it is said, "They overthrow the ground" (Ps. II, 3.), "Pure off, pure off, even to their ground" (Ps. 137, 7.), if we, though we do not belong to the learned, but wish to be Christians, should be silent to it! Then the stones would have to cry out. - Have mercy on His poor Christendom in this last afflicted and perilous time. W.

The form of Old Testament citations in the New Testament.

In the holy Scriptures of the New Testament we find many quotations from the Old Testament. When the evangelists and apostles tell "the stories" that "passed among them" (Luc. 1, 1.), or when they present the doctrine of salvation, they insert "as it is written", "as the Scripture says", etc., into their speech. In this way they prove the fulfillment in the New Testament of the events prophesied in the Old Testament, or they adduce the testimony of the Old Testament in support of their doctrine. In this connection, however, we meet with the phenomenon, which is striking at first sight, that the words which are expressly cited as words of the Old Testament by means of "as it is written," "as the Scripture says," not infrequently deviate significantly in form from the Old Testament Scriptural word. Luther writes, "So one often sees how the evangelists introduce the prophets somewhat changed." 1) In the Epistle to the Romans, according to our count, there are 47 citations from the Old Testament, but only 24 of these can be considered literal citations. The formal deviations from the wording of the Old Testament text are of various kinds. In some cases the Old Testament text is expanded (Is. 61, 1. Luc. 4, 18.), in many cases it is condensed (Is. 8, 22. 9, 1. Matth. 4, 15.), in many cases sentences are rearranged (Hos. 2, 23. Rom. 9, 25.), very often several passages are merged into one (Jer. 32, 6. ff. Zech. 11, 12. 13. Matth. 27, 9.).

1) E. A. 10,16.

That the actual meaning of the Old Testament scriptural words is always preserved in this way of citation is a priori certain to all those who believe that the evangelists and apostles spoke and wrote through the Holy Spirit. It can also be shown a posteriori in the light of the New Testament that the intended meaning of the Old Testament scriptural passage is no other than that which the quotation expresses in the New Testament. Luther writes: "(It) is to be known that the evangelists are not concerned that they should not attract all the words of the prophets; it was enough for them that they should lead the same opinion and indicate the fulfillment." And after the above-mentioned words: "Thus it is often seen how the evangelists introduce the prophets somewhat changed," Luther continues: "But it is all done without interruption of understanding and opinion."

However, the question still remains as to the actual reason for the often so conspicuous and thoroughgoing formal deviation from the wording of the Old Testament. If, for example, a preacher introduces passages of Scripture with an explicit: "Thus writes St. Paul," "Thus writes St. John," etc., we expect him to adhere to the wording of the passage. We would justly think it unseemly if he made it a rule to disregard the wording in regard to the form of the citation, as is evidently done by the evangelists and apostles in regard to the Old Testament Scriptural word.

People have tried to explain this in many different ways. For example, it has been suggested that the form of the Old Testament passages found in the New Testament was the original form. If we now have a different wording in the Old Testament passages in question, it is because we no longer have the original text of the Old Testament, but only - at least in the passages in question - a very corrupted text...) This would certainly explain the difference in wording. But this explanation is entirely inadmissible. Apart from anything else, the history of the text of the Old Testament knows nothing of such a corruption of it. Others have tried to find the cause of the discrepancy in a lapse of memory on the part of the sacred writers. The latter would have wanted to cite the Old Testament exactly and would have meant to cite it, but in doing so they would have been mistaken. In recent times, too, the "inaccurate citations" of the evangelists and apostles have been cited as proof against the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. Dr. Kahnis asked whether one really had worthy thoughts of the Holy Spirit, if "all the inaccurate quotations" of the New Testament were attributed to it.

1) Thus Ludovicus Capellus II. Cf. Pfeiffer, *Critica sacra*. Leipzig. 1712. p. 105 ff.

- 1) The Englishman Row writes: "The manner in which the Old Testament is cited in the New gives the death blow to all theories of a mechanical (!) and literal inspiration."
2)

But apart from the fact that the assumption of "oversights" on the part of the apostles directly contradicts the statements of the latter that the Holy Spirit speaks through them (cf. 1 Cor. 2, 13.), the theory which attributes the deviations from the Old Testament text to "oversights" or "errors of memory" in the citing must also appear untenable to purely human observation, as will be further explained below.

There is only one explanation for this often so free switching with the wording of the Old Testament scriptures in the New Testament. The explanation is given in scriptures like 1 Petr. 1, 10-12, where it is explicitly stated that the same Holy Spirit who was in the prophets of the Old Testament and spoke through them, now also testified in the New Testament through the evangelists and apostles. To this testimony belonged of course also the introduction and interpretation of the Old Testament scriptures. Thus in the quotations from the Old Testament the Holy Spirit, as it were, cites Himself. And he has power and free disposal over his words; in quoting, he makes, as it were, a "new text" out of the Old Testament scriptural word, as Luther expresses it, thereby interpreting the Old Testament text at the same time. The evangelists and apostles, driven by the Holy Spirit, therefore do not cite as well as they do a "grasp" into the Scriptures. Here belongs what Luther says of the apostles' Pentecost sermon: "How powerfully they reach into the Scriptures, as if they had studied them a hundred thousand years and had learned them best. I could not make such a certain grasp of the Scriptures, even though I am a doctor of the Holy Scriptures. ... Thus God proves by the greatest foolishness and foolishness of the wretched, weak beggars the greatest wisdom that has come on earth, that no one can imitate them, neither Annas nor Caiphas, nor any man on earth." 3) Flacius writes: "It is to be noted that the Old Testament is usually cited by the sacred writers of the New Testament in such a way that they have looked at the meaning, and have added more the fulfillment of the prophecy than the words of the prophecy themselves. But this will not seem strange or audacious to any one who is convinced of what the matter itself enforces, namely, that the same Spirit spoke through the mouth of the evangelists who had opened the mouth of the prophets.

- 1) In extenso citirt von Dr. Walther, Baieri Comp. Vol. I. p. 102.
- 2) Citirt by Dr. R. Watts, The Rule of Faith. London 1885. p. 233.
- 3) E. A. 5,183.

Second, that the office of the prophets was to foretell things to come, but that of the evangelists it was to tell what had happened. Since, therefore, the Spirit of God does not write out the prophecies of those in the New Testament, but interprets them, we must not demand that he list the individual words. Pfeifer remarks: "That the passages of the Old Testament have not always been cited in the New according to the wording (αυτολεξει), does not come from a corruption of the text now before us, but from the fact that by inspiration of the Holy Spirit an explanation of the actual meaning of the passage is given." 2) The same (*Critica sacra*. p. 109 f.): "In the New Testament the sayings of the Old Testament are not always cited according to the words, but often according to the sense, and that freely, sometimes from the Hebrew text, sometimes from the Septuagint, sometimes from both. What need of many words, if no contradiction is found here? The Holy Spirit has revealed the Old Testament and reserved the right to explain it in the New Testament. Where this has been done by the Septuagint, its translation has been retained; where this has not been done, it is cited according to the basic text. Repeatedly the Holy Spirit has bound himself neither to that translation nor to the words of the basic text, but has expressed the meaning in new words. Whatever be the case, the same Holy Spirit, the best interpreter of his own words, has spoken in both places."

Dr. Watts also writes very well in the above-mentioned work, p. 236 ff.: "The New Testament writers often change the wording of the passages which they quote from the Old Testament in order to give an authentic interpretation of them. This deviation from the wording is expected precisely under the circumstances in which the New Testament writers found themselves. They were the chosen and inspired interpreters of the revelation of the Old Testament, commissioned by Him whose Spirit impelled the prophets of the old covenant to speak and write. If they were in such a relationship to the Old Testament testimony of the mystery of redemption, then it would have been strange if, in referring to it, they had found it so clear that it needed no interpretation, and had therefore reproduced the old text literally in every case. True, they might have reproduced the sacred text as it stood, and then added their own explanatory remarks. But in this, as elsewhere, for those who wish to prescribe rules for men who acted under the special guidance of the Holy Spirit, the apostolic admonition is in place: "Who has known the mind of the Lord?"

- 1) *Clavis* Sc. s. Part. II. p. 103. (Ed. Franks, and Leipzig 1729.)
- 2) *Thesaurus* hermeneuticus. 1704. S. 59.

Or who has been his counselor?" (Rom. 11:34.) . . . Inspired by the free spirit. . they reveal the freedom with which the Holy Spirit, who was in them, freed them, and they quote from the Septuagint where it differs from the Hebrew, and from the Hebrew where it differs from the Septuagint, and often quote a passage in a form in which it is found neither in the Hebrew basic text nor in the Greek translation. By driving the New Testament writers to deal with the Old Testament in this way, the Holy Spirit, who is the actual author of both Old Testament and New Testament revelation, is only asserting his own sovereign right. In this he acts according to the law of authorial right, which no one questions in the case of non-inspired writers. No one holds an author bound to stick to the exact wording of the first pronunciation when repeating an earlier statement. Granting such liberty to a man, and regarding it almost as the natural right (birthright) of human authorship, it is as dishonorable as it is unreasonable to attempt to abridge the liberty of the Spirit of God."

The form of the Old Testament quotations in the New Testament does not, therefore, when properly considered, give "the death blow" to the theory of "literal inspiration," but is, on the contrary, a powerful proof of it. Let us suppose that the evangelists and apostles were not inspired, but, like other writers, left to their own human consideration. Would not their citations have been quite different? Would they not have carefully avoided all the impulses which human contemplation finds in their way of quoting, and have quoted more literally? If we say that the apostles were just not aware of the right context and the right wording of the quoted passages, the objection is quite invalid. Assuming that both context and wording were lost to them, there was a very simple means of remedying the defect. If the context and wording of a passage to be cited are not present to us, we look it up. The evangelists and apostles would have done the same; they had the Old Testament at hand. They would have looked up the passages to be cited, looked up the context, and written out the passages exactly according to the wording. Or could anyone reasonably suppose that the apostles would not have taken the trouble to help their defective memory by looking up the passages, on the supposition that their readers would not notice the inaccuracy in the citation, if such had happened to them? St. Paul, for instance, regarded his readers as those "who know the law" (Rom. 7:1). We think that human reason, too, if it wants to be reasonable, must refrain from noticing the deviations of the New Testament quotations from the wording of the Old Testament.

The Holy Spirit speaks through the apostles and sets them free with their own word. There is only one explanation: the Holy Spirit speaks through the apostles, and switches them freely with his own word. And just as the apparent contradictions found in Scripture are proof that Scripture is not the work of calculating men, so especially the way in which the evangelists and apostles cite the Old Testament is a powerful proof that they did not speak and write out of themselves, out of their purely human reasoning, but out of the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. F. P.

Miscellany.

From the History of the Lutheran Church in the Baltic Provinces. In the "Allg. Kz." of November 27 of last year we read: The first storms roared over the land under Ivan grosny (John the Terrible 1533-84), but broke through the heroic courage of the German Knights of the Order and the old Hanseatic cities. About the same time, under the Polish rule of Stephan Bathori (1582), a Roman Catholic bishopric was imposed on the Livonians, the newly founded Jesuit College was granted the Lutheran Jacobi Church in Riga, and the Protestant nobility was driven from their homes and courts (cf. "Historical Pictures of the Lutheran Church of Livonia", Leipzig 1869). Conditions improved when, after a twenty-year struggle, the Swedes under Gustavus Adolphus came into possession of the country in 1621. Under his reign, the University of Dorpat was founded in 1632, shortly before his heroic death; under his successor, Charles XI, a church order, an agenda, and a hymnal were published in a truly evangelical spirit, and the Bible was translated into Baltic and Estonian. There is only one thing to complain about, and that is that the Swedish language was favoured too much, and thereby the German Lutheran Church suffered a serious injustice.

It may sound strange, but it is a historically authenticated fact that the Lutheran Church in the Baltic provinces only gained its full freedom and independence under Peter the Great. The chivalrous bravery of the Baltic nobility and the citizens of the Hanseatic cities had instilled such respect in the otherwise so violent Czar that he issued a letter of grace to the knighthood and the cities at the Capitulation in 1710, the tenth article of which reads literally: "No compulsion of conscience shall be introduced in the ceded lands, but rather the Protestant religion, also church and school system, and what is dependent on it, shall continue on the footing as it was under the last Swedish government.

However, in such a way that the Greek religion could and might be practiced freely and without hindrance in the same. In the capitulation of Reval, it was added that no Greek church or chapel could be built within the city walls, and that only German-Lutheran men could become citizens. At the same time, this letter of grace, which was solemnly confirmed at the peace congress in Nystadt on August 23, 1721, also designates the capitulation as binding for the imperial successors.

The first rupture in the privileges of the Church fully entitled in the Baltic provinces was accomplished in 1794, when the Lutheran Provincial Consistory, out of cowardice, did not protest when the Russian governorship, in the name of Catherine II, who was born in Germany (Stettin) and had been brought up as a Protestant, issued a decree according to which, to mention only one point, "in the case of incitement to conversion from the Orthodox to another Christian creed, the guilty party is sentenced to deprivation of his professional rights, to banishment to Tobolsk or Tomsk, or to imprisonment for one to two years".

After this "Non plus ultra" of Russian discipline, under Paul I (1796 -1801), who was a warm friend of the Germans, as well as during the reign of the mild, almost evangelically-minded Alexander I, a time of peace for our Church again occurred, which was not interrupted until his death (1825). Even in the first years of the reign of Emperor Nicolaus I (1825-55), the Greek-Russian propaganda could not yet begin its work. All the ministers were German men, among them the noble Prince Liewen, who was even Minister of Culture. It was only under his successor in office, Uvarov (1833-49), that propaganda began its business anew. At first it walked softly and tried to Russify the grammar schools and the University of Dorpat, this pearl of the North; later, however, no means were spared to drive the good Protestant Latvians and Esthans into the nets of the Greek Orthodox Church. The agitation reached its climax in the years 1845 and 1846: within these two years it is estimated that the number of apostates and deceived persons amounted to one-eighth of the entire national population of Livonia. That the Emperor Nicolaus put no end to these goings-on is explained by the fact that his motto was: "One Law, One Faith, One Language for the whole Empire." Thus it remained until his death on March 2, 1855. With the accession of Alexander II to power, a new star of hope shone for the sorely afflicted country. On his birthday, he had sent out a letter to the Lutheran clergy of Livonia through the General-Superintendent Dr. Walter in Riga, in which it said, among other things: "He really loved the Livonians and believed in them.

to their love, will therefore decide for themselves in case of violation of their most sacred interests, and secure to our Church a just sentence." To this end the Emperor soon after sent his wing adjutant, Count Bobrinski, to Livonia, in order to bring about, as far as possible, a return movement. What impression the personal perceptions made on the noble Count we see from the report which he sent to Petersburg: "Sire!" are the words, "Both as a member of the orthodox Church and as a Russian, it has grievously distressed me to have to see with my own eyes the degradation of Russian orthodoxy as the result of a clearly exposed 'official fraud.' Not only the sincere speeches of the unhappy families, who turn to Your Majesty with humble but fiery pleas to grant them their right to choose their religion according to the conviction of their conscience, have made this saddening impression on me, but above all the consciousness that such compulsion of conscience is inseparably connected with Russia's honor and orthodoxy." This energetic report struck home. The deceived and apostate were granted permission to return to the faith of their fathers, and thousands made use of it, and after the painful experiences they had made, became only the more faithful members of our church.

We present our readers with a **sample of recent church history** from the 9th edition of Kurtz's *Kirchengeschichte* (1885). Dr. Kurtz wants to describe here also the latest history of the American Lutheran Church and gives as source besides R. Hoffmann's "Die Missourisynode in Nordamerika. Gütersloh. 1881" the Fritschel's writing "Die Lehre der Missourisynode von der Prädestination". From these sources the church historian has drawn the following: "But even in the . . . Synodal Conference, too, a seed of dogmatic discord had sprouted rampantly in the seventies (!). A large number of the Synod members in question, with Dr. Walther at their head, had developed a peculiar doctrine of predestination, which they elevated to the status of the only true Lutheran confession. God, they taught, had chosen a number of men from eternity for salvation and had decided that these should and must be saved. Salvation in Christ is indeed offered to all, but only in the case of the elect does God see to it 1) that they also take hold of it securely and do not lose it again, and that not *intuitu fidei*, but only according to his pure good pleasure. It is true that even an elect person can seem to fall temporarily from grace, 1) (!) but he cannot die without first knowing himself to be again in full possession of it. As early as 1872 Prof. Fritschel lodged a protest against this view as essentially Calvinistic. But also within

1) Highlighted by us.

of the Missouri (!) Pastoral Conference (!) rose in opposition. Prof. Asperheim (at the seminary of the Norwegian Synod at Madison in Wisconsin), who first spoke out against it (1878), was forced to resign from his office and to leave the Synod (by whom? L. u. W.). The controversy, however, did not become really heated until the two (!) extremely strongly attended (by about 500 pastors) conferences in Chicago in 1880, where Prof. Stelhorn of Fort Wayne, and three months later in Milwaukee in 1881, where Prof. Schmidt of Madison vigorously opposed it." (In the latter case, the Milwaukee colloquium is probably meant.) "Walther closed the conference with the words, 'You want war, you shall have war.'" As a result (!) the whole Ohio, as well as a large part of the (Norwegian) (!) Wisconsin Synod (!) revoked church fellowship with Missouri." If anyone had taken pains to squeeze quite a lot of historical nonsense into a few sentences, he could not do his thing any better than Dr. Kurtz has succeeded. And yet Dr. Kurtz is in earnest, at any rate. But this is because he indulges in the manner of "objective" historiography toward Missouri, that he, first, obtains his information about the latter from the Iowans, the bitterest enemies of the Missouri Synod, and, secondly, does not take the trouble to even somewhat comprehend what is presented to him from that side. For it is impossible that the synodal relations and the historical data can be so incorrectly stated in the Iowa Scriptures, while the misrepresentation of the doctrine of the Synodal Conference on the election of grace can, however, be taken from the writing of Fritschel, who, in notorious dishonesty, passes off his nonsensical conclusions for the doctrine of the Synodal Conference, Dr. Kurtz's procedure, however, is not at all excusable. How easily he could inform himself of our doctrine, if he wished to describe it, by procuring the documents in which it is officially stated, that is, as a confession on the part of the Synod. F. P.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The local Unirten and the "Lutherans" in the Prussian Union. The Unirte "Theologische Zeitschrift", organ of the "Evangelical Synod of North America", is **quite** dissatisfied with the latter, whom it calls the "Confessionelles". According to the report of this journal, Dr. Meinhold, a leader of the "Confessionelles," spoke of the events at the last Prussian General Synod thus: "We" (namely, the Lutherans within the Union) "have been reproached that we did not call ourselves 'Lutheran Fraction' or 'Fraction of Lutherans'.

But this is simply impossible, because the great majority of the friends of the "Positive Union" are also Lutherans according to their position of faith, as well as according to their doctrine and their confession (even if they do not call themselves so), and only have views about the meaning and significance of the Union that differ from ours. The idea, which was brought to us by one of our own before the Synod, that we should demand that the General Synod declare that the Lutheran Church rightly exists within the Prussian Union, could not be accepted by us. The fact is correct, as proved most irrefutably by Wangemann in his *Una sancta* (! L. u. W.), that both in fact and in law, despite the Union, the Lutheran Church continues to exist within the Protestant Church of Prussia. However, to state this explicitly would have been rejected by both the Lutheran Oberkirchenrath and the General Synod; the motion would have been settled by the order of the day, i.e. we would have suffered a defeat. And this had to be avoided, and rightly so. It is obvious to anyone with open eyes that throughout Northern Germany the Lutheran confession is gaining the upper hand. The Reformed congregations will be gradually sucked out by the Lutheran current, precisely because of the Union, a fact which is also expressed and deplored by many Reformers. For this reason I had to hold back a motion I intended to make, namely, that the appointment of Reformed candidates to Lutheran congregations and vice versa be declared no longer permissible. For it was held against me by friends who are knowledgeable in the matter, that thereby the Reformed congregations would be placed in the greatest embarrassment, since they, in the absence of Reformed candidates, would take Lutheran ones as their pastors without any reluctance." On this the united "Theologische Zeitschrift" remarks: "The Lutheran church politicians within the Prussian church have seldom spoken out with such openness. As long as one feared from the Union a fusion of the Lutheran with the Reformed essence, so long one took the legal stand against the Union, in order to resist any intrusion of a non-Lutheran orthodox truth. Now that one believes that one can use the ecclesiastical-regimental union to make Reformed congregations Lutheran, it is quite welcome. What spiritual justification do these Lutherans still have for a Union whose ecclesiastical and spiritual dissolution they are working on, instead of helping to fulfill it into a united, truly Lutheran Church? The only strange thing is the ingenuousness with which it is said that this faction is concerned above all things not to suffer defeat, i.e., not to go backward on the way to attaining the desired position of power. They act as if the prophet of his time had said: 'Strive for power,' while it is true: 'Strive for right.' - The *Unirte Zeitschrift* can reassure itself. Those "confessionalists" in the Prussian Landeskirche will not do the Union such great harm.

F. P.

Baptist judgment on German theological works. The first quarterly of the Baptist Quarterly Review, in an advertisement of Raebiger's Encyclopedia (English edition by Clark, Edinburgh, 1885), says: "A more serious defect is the rationalistic tone which runs through the discussion of the Scriptures and their doctrines. The author may not be reckoned among the rationalists in his own country, but certainly he has enough of their spirit in him to be an insufficient guide to those who reverently and sincerely, without a *reservatio mentalis*, regard the Scriptures as a revelation of God's will to men, and their doctrines as an infallible standard of faith.

and life." Zöckler's "Handbook of Theological Sciences" is generally favorably reviewed there. Only the reviewer thinks that it does not quite reach the point of view of "American orthodoxy. By "American orthodoxy" he does not, of course, mean Lutheran orthodoxy, but what the local sects call "orthodoxy. The term is somewhat vague, and it is hardly ever actually defined. If, however, one were to ask an "American orthodox" what he counts as "orthodoxy," he would immediately name four: the deity of Christ, substitutionary satisfaction through Christ's suffering and death, the eternity of the punishments of hell, and the inspiration of the holy Scriptures. Of course, it is chiefly on the last point that the Baptist Recensent declares Zöckler's Manual not quite "orthodox." F. P.

"The Aristocratic Tendency in American Churchmanship." In a local political paper, under this heading, we find the following remarkable article: A Mr. Oscar Fay Adams, who acknowledges himself to be a supporter of the Episcopal Church, in an article in the last number of the "American Review," makes out the following order of precedence for the localities of Western New York, where he makes his home: First among the Protestant churches of the United States comes the Episcopal Church. Then come the Unitarians, the Rationalists translated into English. First comes the Presbyterian, to which many descendants of Scottish immigrants adhere. Almost in the same rank with the Presbyterians are the Congregationalists and the English Lutherans. But Mr. Adams suggests that in some churches of the latter denomination a remnant of the German tradition has been preserved, and that such churches are closer to the religious needs of the great masses. It is a fact that almost all Lutheran churches in the United States, where English is now preached, were originally founded by German immigrants, or are daughter churches of such. To lower in the social ladder, at last, come the Methodists, Universalists, and Baptists. It should be noted that Mr. Adams is writing for the East, specifically for the western part of New York State. Here in the Mississippi Valley the order of precedence may not be the same everywhere. But a hierarchy exists here too.... Even within the various denominations, however, there is still a difference in rank. If there are two Baptist, two Methodist churches in a place, one is attended by the "better class," the other by the common people. But the great mass of working men, unable to rent a pew for themselves, their wives, and their children, are more and more weaning themselves from church attendance. They are not liked to be seen in the fashionable churches. They cannot dress their wives and daughters in velvet and silk, put feathered hats on them, or adorn them with jewels. If people in plain clothes wanted to attend a fashionable church, which is used by the wives of the rich to show off their dresses and jewels, it would soon cease to be fashionable, and this would be shown in a very unpleasant way by a decrease in the income for pew rents. One does not exactly turn the poor out of doors, but one makes it clear enough to them that the space they occupy is not paid for. Why do they not go to the so-called "mission churches," which the rich maintain in the districts of the poor, and in which no pew rents need be paid, since the rich pay all the expenses? Admittedly, they must make do there with sermons which do not seem good enough to the rich, and to receive religion, as it were, as charity in such churches, the American is generally too proud. "We may say what we please," complains Mr. Adams, "the Protestant church has no place for the poor man. The rich churches

set him back in a grievous manner, until he exchanges them for less sashionable ones, or ceases to attend church altogether, since even churches which do not belong to the sashionable ones are not too polite towards the poor man, who should be satisfied with the cold food which is given in the 'Mission Church'. It would be too unpleasant if, in our cushioned church seats, we should once find a man with work-soiled hands and in torn vestments beside us! He would not be in his place there. These comfortable seats are for well-fed and well-dressed Christians who have listened to the gospel with pleasure all their lives, and are not hungry for the bread of life. Away with you, to the mission church where you belong! There you may find a tenth-class preacher whom you understand better, and on Sunday afternoon we may be so gracious as to come ourselves and examine you as to what you know of the carpenter's son who had not where to lay his head, and whether you know also the distance between Jericho and Jerusalem." Mr. Adams reproaches his fellow Protestants for the fact that the Roman Catholic Church tolerates no such distinction between rich and poor, distinguished and lowly, in the churches, and concludes by saying, "Woe to the faith that cares not for the poor and the weak for whom Christ died! Woe to the faith that preaches to the rich the gospel of being better and to the poor that of humble submission! Woe to the faith that gives to him who has, and takes from him who has not even the little that he has! Woe to American Protestantism because of its pride, its hardness of heart, its 'civilized paganism,' which wears the mask of Christianity and always crucifies anew the Lord whom it pretends to worship!"

II. Abroad.

The modern faithful theology. - We read the following important reminders in the Breslau "Kirchen-Blatt" of January 15: "But there are grave dangers threatening the mission at its roots in the homeland. When missionaries have to write to Germany that the now more and more emerging type of German theology is beginning to pull the rug from under their feet, in that the German scientific theologians are beginning more and more to abandon the complete credibility of Holy Scripture and its divine inspiration, while the missionaries have no weapon against the heathen and Muhammedans (who are not always unaware of the doubts of the German theologians) other than the truth of the Scriptures, then there are dangers which should not be hushed up. In the last century the Lutheran mission in India flourished. But in the mother country, Germany, the professors of theology and the pastors fell into the unbelief of Rattionalism, and missionary zeal died. And the Lutheran missionary field in India fell, shamefully enough, mostly into the hands of the reformed English, who were not as unbelieving as the German Lutherans. God had mercy on Germany, and after the horrors of the French Revolution and Napoleonic rule, and after the salvation of the wars of liberation, gave new impulses of faith. The Lutheran Church was saved from the rationalistic union and the Lutheran mission was also renewed. The evil spirit of rationalism was also cast out in wider circles; since then it has wandered arid places and found no rest. Now it has arrived again with seven other evil spirits, and under the proud firm of scientificity covets admittance into the believing circles of Germany. He knocks at the universities and churches, finds many things well adorned and ready to receive him.

and takes one lectern after another, one pulpit after another. What will it be, if this continue? It will be worse in Germany than it ever was. After the Leipzig mission festival there was a pastoral conference. There our Sup. Nagel gave an interesting lecture on Bugenhagen, which is in print. This was followed by several other speeches, and when, after Bugenhagen's effectiveness at the university, attention was drawn to the dangers that now threaten from the cathedrals, that one dares to sear the Old Testament again, to deny the books of Moses to this man of God, to deny chapters 40-66 of the prophet Isaiah to this prophet (although the New Testament always testifies to the opposite) and to speak of a second Isaiah, false Isaiah, or the 'great unknown' - as Professor Riehm in Halle expresses it - and that in general the teaching of Christ and the apostles about the meaning of the Old Testament is no longer to apply throughout - loud applause rang out from a large part of the pastors present, who well felt the danger. Nevertheless, it advances daily, lest it should find a church asleep. Even in Germany, the enemy will not find everything as unresisting as in the last century, but the reaction should already be much stronger now, while it is growing weaker. But against the rock of the living God even this temptation will shatter."

Hermannsburg Free Church. The separated congregation in Hermannsburg has for the second time called Pastor Meinel, who belongs to the Immanuel Synod in Hamburg, to be their first pastor. Pastor Meinel, who declined the call the first time, is said to have accepted it now.

The Hessians in the Hermannsburg Separation, Dr. Munkel writes in his "N. Zeitbl." of January 14: "From Hesse some clergymen, Gerhold, Bingmann, have moved into the Hermannsburg Separation, who represent Vilmar's ideas of church, office and hierarchy. The other separated pastors, although not Hessians, are more or less affiliated with them and form a synod with them, which is why they are all united under the name Hessians. In Hermannsburg they meet with aversion, which is why they had to hold their last synod in Celle and not in the mother congregation. In their own congregations the memory of Harms lives on too much, and they are too well Hermannsburgian for the Hessian Jdem to take deeper root, especially since they are Bohemian villages to the simple layman's understanding. Th. Harms may be dead, but a Harms is still alive whose reputation is on the rise. The Hessians have recognized the necessity of calling the press to their aid. Since the beginning of this year they have been publishing a newspaper, the "Kirchlicher Anzeiger" (Church Gazette), which, for the sake of its existence, must be calculated for the separated people. We owe it information about the number and number of souls in the congregations. The total number of souls in all the congregations is given as 5800, which seems to us to be a little high. The error will lie in the fact that for Hermannsburg itself about 3000 souls are estimated, of which probably 800 must be deducted. In addition, the "Anzeiger" counts 5 outer communities, mostly far away from Hermannsburg. For all these 14 vicars and 10 pastors are appointed. Not listed are the parishes of Hanover and Dalinghausen, although both are of good Hermannsburg origin and were formerly in Hermannsburg. However, the Hanoverian congregation has broken away, and although very small, has been divided into two congregations, one in Breslau and one in Missouri, which deny each other communion. The congregation in Dalinghausen, in the Osnabrück district of Wittlage, also belongs to the Missourian congregation. There is no prospect of growth, although at least the Missourians are served by a capable clergyman. The town is sufficiently supplied spiritually, so that the existing needs can be satisfied.

nen. It may be added that there are one or two ladies in Hanover who let themselves be served by the Hessians. Accordingly, all four main Lutheran segregations are represented in Hanover, the Breslau, the Missourian, the Hessian, and the Immanuelite, the first two of which are closed off from each other and from the other two. How the Hessians and Immanuelites will relate to each other still needs to be clarified, although their doctrinal concepts relate to each other like water and fire.

Hesse - Darmstadt. The deceased Princess Elisabeth of Hesse, née Princess of Prussia, bequeathed in her will 20,000 Thaler to the Diaconissmhaus Elisabethstift in Darmstadt "under the condition that it always remains an institution connected with the Lutheran Church". The heirs are to be obliged "to have the noted capital amount paid out to the Diaconissenhaus for their own administration".

The separated Niederhessen, writes Dr. Münkler in his "Neues Zeitblatt" of January 7, who made a lot of noise several years ago, have almost disappeared for us. The "Lutheran God's Box" tries once again to refresh their memory in order to awaken sympathy for them, the completely neglected. For in fact their situation is, if not a pitiable one, at least a very distressed one. Right at the beginning, a rift went through them. Some of them gathered around Metropolitan Vilmar, the brother of the well-known professor, and wanted to retain their Lutheranism with the four reformed points of improvement along with the reformed name. Vilmar died some time ago. The others under Metropolitan Hoffmann threw away all reformed additions and, as they said, placed themselves as Lutherans on the Lutheran confessions by forming the "Hornberg Convent". The Hoffmannians at present number seven clergymen, an eighth having died, and a ninth having passed into the Hermannsburg Separation. Hoffmann is 82 years old, and lives with a 79-year-old and a third pastor in Homberg, the main seat of the separation. But if one considers that the total number of souls in the separated congregations is 500, divided among seven pastors, one will understand that Schmalhans is the kitchen master. It makes a gloomy impression when one follows this course of events. The Hoffmannians are faithful disciples of Professor Vilmar, who, in the years of his power, worked toward a renewal of the Church, and, by his firmness, his great gifts, and his profound eloquence, gathered a numerous following, especially among the clergy of both Hessians. The "hitherto misunderstood article of the Church" was now to be experienced, a kind of hierarchical constitution with an episcopal head was to be envisaged, and the extraordinary gift and grace of the spiritual office was to be set in motion for the revival of the Church. This sounded tempting to the clergy, but the congregations were lacking; for, as the above shows, the Vilmarians did not have the congregations behind them. The congregations did not understand Vilmar's theologically ecclesiastical ideas; they were too high for them and too remote from their spiritual needs for them to make sacrifices for them and leave the national church. Such is the "experience" gained by the Article of the Church. The establishment of a pisthum for 500 souls will probably not be thought of, and they will be content with having produced a kind of hierarchy in miniature, a makeshift in the emergency hut. Perhaps they hope for better times, which are hardly in sight for them. In communion with the Separates of Hesse-Darmstadt, who are their flesh and blood and likewise in a difficult situation, they have established ties with the Breslau Synod, because they also want a hierarchical

core. However, despite some differences, a unification has not yet succeeded.

Hanoverian Regional Church. The "Allg. Kz." of Feb. 12 reports the following: "By order of the Minister of Spiritual Affairs, a church collection has been announced for the Reformed congregation in Osnabrück not only in the Reformed congregations of Hanover, but also in all Lutheran congregations for the Sunday of Invocavit. The Lutheran Landesconsistorium of Hanover, in its announcement of January 22 of this year, evidently felt that this collection, as is in fact the case, would cause consternation among the Hanoverian clergy of the Lutheran confession. Therefore, it says in the added explanations: "If the members of the Reformed sister church have already often helped us Lutherans in their part to build churches by means of collections collected from them, as was the case recently with the new churches in Hanover, the duty of Christian love requires that we also help them again. - If the Lutherans allow themselves to be supported by Reformed Christians for their ecclesiastical needs, justice certainly demands that they repay like with like; but both are nothing but a sign of an ecclesiastical indifference that is displeasing to God.

W.

Catholicism cultivated in Wuerttemberg for the sake of peace. - Dr. Münkler writes in his "Neues Zeitblatt" of January 28: According to Beyschlag's deutsch-ev. Blättern, the vaunted church peace in Wuerttemberg has its precarious reverse side. "As is well known, the reigning sickly and childless king is so amenable to ultramontane influences that the opinion has repeatedly arisen in the country that he has converted to Catholicism. It is credibly asserted that when, after the Infallibility Council, Bishop Hefele made an appearance to maintain his opposition to it, it was the Protestant government of Württemberg that urged him to submit in order to preserve the peace of the country. The Tübingen Stift trained prospective Protestant clergymen. The previous King Wilhelm set up a Catholic foundation at its side with half as many pupils as the Protestant one according to the ratio of the number of Catholic souls. Now, however, for a number of years, it has regularly taken in more pupils than the Protestant one, without keeping the individual more scarce. Quite a few of the pupils later enter the civil service and prepare themselves for it in the convent, so they would have to pay for their education, just like the Protestants, but they are treated very liberally. There is therefore the prospect that the Jesuit-run convent will supply the country with Catholic chief bailiffs, cameral administrators, perhaps even ministers at state expense. This prospect is the more alarming, because after the demise of the present king, and of his next childless successor, who, however, is engaged, the government will fall to a Catholic line. - If we keep this together with what Zahn writes about the confessional peace in Württemberg, we see that the Catholic Church stands quite well by it, and grasps quite peacefully where opportunity finds itself. The same experience has been made with the sects, which were first received as dear brethren, and when they likewise seized, they were resisted in vain."

The so-called Protestantism in its powerlessness against Catholicism. - Johannes Janssen, the Catholic historian of German history from 1400 on, has attained an astonishing reputation among Catholics. Formerly they were somewhat meek when the time before the Reformation was spoken of; it was admitted that much in the Church should have been different if it wished to absolve itself from the guilt of the Reformation, and that the Reformation, too, had come upon the Church like an air-clearing thunderstorm. That is several centuries

long been the prevailing view. But how that has changed! Janssen turns this upside down and proves that the time before the Reformation was a golden age of the Church, and that with the Reformation came the apostasy and decay of the Church and the people. How should not the hearts of Catholics leap at such a wonderful new discovery! This gives them courage and confidence, and one can almost grasp it with one's hands how they are marching forward in attack, believing that the world nevertheless belongs to them, and that Protestantism, as a defeated army, is in the process of complete dissolution. - Joh. Janssen celebrated his twenty-fifth anniversary as a priest last year, and retired into silence to avoid the crowd of well-wishers. Nevertheless, about 400 letters reached him, and what is especially striking to us, among them were 50 letters from Protestant well-wishers, which Catholic papers report with satisfaction. How many may be of the same mind without having sent letters! - Since Luther's celebration, a flood of writings against Janssen has appeared. We would like to know whether they or the Luther celebration have made a deeper impression on our people. On the other hand, we perceive enough how the flirting with the Catholic Church is increasing in all kinds of forms, consciously and unconsciously, along with their admiration. It is also admitted that in former times many things were exaggerated in favor of the Reformation, and that many good things were passed over on the opposite side. Thus, one is partly in the process of regression, and where is the man who will revive the Protestants who have become slack?

(N. Zeitbl. of 21 Jan.)

"All is yours." (1 Cor. 3:21.) In the Breslauer Kirchenblatt of January 1, the editor, Fr. Greve, after criticizing Fr. Willkomm's speech at the introduction of Fr. Hübener in Hanover, writes, among other things, the following: "A Missourian, asked by us where in Scripture it is said that the individual congregation originally has the office of preaching, and that it is entrusted to the pastor to be called, cites the saying: 'All is yours.' Everything, that is, including the office of preaching! Is it right, then, to use the Scriptures in this way?" - With this mere question the dear man makes it all too easy for himself. It may be that it is unthinkable to a man from Breslau that the "all" should include the office of preaching. But what gives him the right to follow his thinking and exclude the preaching ministry from the "all"? Can he prove this from the context of the text, or from a parallel, or from the analogy of faith? He cannot; rather, the reverse is evidently the case. The whole Scripture makes the church the mistress of the house, and the preacher its steward. Or can he invoke the confession against it? He cannot do that either. The Confession rather derives from that saying that "the church is more than the ministers" (*ecclesiam esse supra ministros*), and that "neither Peter nor other ministers of the word may ascribe to them any authority or supremacy over the churches" (p. 330. § 11.), and adds in the following: "Above this it must ever be confessed that the keys do not belong and are given to one man alone, but to the whole church, as then this can be sufficiently proved with light and certain causes. For as **the** promise of the gospel belongs certainly and without means to the whole church, so the keys belong without means (*principaliter et immediate*) to the whole church, since the keys are nothing else than the ministry by which such promise is communicated to everyone who desires it." (P. 333. 8 24.) How could the original possession of the office be more distinctly ascribed to every church, yea, to every member of the church? Or can Mr. P. Greve, for instance, call out the ancient orthodox teachers of our Church for his opinion, that in the "all" is not included the office of the ministers of the Church? He can't. At any rate, he knows himself that for the

On the contrary, a great deal of testimony from the writings of our dogmatists can be held against him. - After an exhortation to a gentle answer, which we gladly accept, he continues: "For what a Hessian clergyman said in the Hamburg Conference of last year, that he had not yet read anything Missourian in which the old man did not reveal himself through immoderate scolding and exaggerated vehemence, is unfortunately only too often confirmed. To this we must reply that the "Hessian clergyman" must hardly have read much Missourian. In the first place, our peaceful literature is, by the grace of God, considerably greater than our polemical literature; and, in the second place, as far as our polemics are concerned, we may well take comfort from all the former godly polemicists, who have not been able to prevent their polemics, which have been forced from them by conscience, and which are at times indeed sharp, from being branded by judges of the heart as "intemperate scolding and exaggerated vehemence" coming from the "old man". But when Mr. P. Greve concludes, "It is difficult to negotiate with the Missourians," we would put the question to him: Has he ever tried to negotiate with the Missourians? Hardly! For then he would have learned that it is not difficult at all. We only have to recall the negotiations of our fellow-Converts in Germany with the blessed Th. Harms, and the many negotiations of opponents with us so-called Missourians here in America, which, with few exceptions, have passed off most peaceably and have concluded with peace treaties. If, of course, as is known to have happened, we are made to accept, as a condition of entering into negotiations with us, a prior full recognition with communion, then, we confess, with us, who detest all external union in the face of internal differences of faith as a hypocritical abomination before God, it is not only "difficult" but purely impossible to negotiate. By the way, we may finally make the following remark: as much as Breslau's cooperation with apostate regional churches and their modern Lutheran theologians, e.g. in the matter of missions, weakens our confidence in Breslau, the faithful testimony which Father Greve bears against the apostasy of modern theology in the Breslau organ commands our sincere respect.

W.

In recent times the **introduction of cremation has been advocated** by accusing churchyards of being the cause of numerous diseases. It is therefore very gratifying that Dr. msd. Rud. Müller in Dresden in the paper: "Do the churchyards damage the health of the living?" (Dresden 1885, Knecht [32 p. 8] 50 Pf.) proves anew the groundlessness of the assertions about the danger of churchyards. One searches in vain in the series of writings on the burning of corpses for evidence of specific cases of individual diseases or epidemics caused by churchyards. The poisoning of wells by churchyards is also not found, with the exception of individual cases where all hygienic regulations had been ignored. The number of medical and chemically educated authorities is very large, who share the opinion of Dr. Holland, the burial inspector for England and Wales, that the use of burial can be maintained without danger to the present or any future generation.

(General Kz.)

Jesuits. The Prince of Monaco has banned the Jesuits from his little country.

There is a strange stir **among the Jews in the** Carpathian countries. In Galicia, Lodomiria, Rumania, and the neighboring parts of Hungary, the Jewish population is so numerous that in many places it forms the majority of the population, and that towns of 5-10,000 inhabitants are inhabited exclusively by Jews. Now

the Hebrew translation of the New Testament by Professor Delitzsch in Leipzig, completed in 1877, of which about 40,000 (?) copies were sold in those regions, has caused a Jewish-Christian movement there. Those who possess the book guard it like a treasure; some have even learned it by heart. The Central Committee for the Mission to the Jews in Leipzig must always send new shipments of Hebrew testaments to the Carpathian countries. Wealthy Jews themselves bring their children to Leipzig for education. Circles of Christian Israelites have formed in the cities, groups of twenty and thirty, who come together to talk about Christ and to enjoy singing Christian songs translated into Hebrew. Many have already been expelled from the synagogue, but the conversions are increasing steadily, and recently they have been encouraged by the fact that an alliance which has come together there to preserve and strengthen the Jewish nationality has decided to include the Jews who believe in Christ among the people of Israel. (Berl. kirchl. Anz.)

Vivisection is the cutting and dissecting of living animals or individual limbs, eyes, etc., with a sharp knife, in order to make observations and experiments to learn about the life, habits, and activities of the animals. This is a cruelty which has outraged many and driven them to fight against it. The vivisectors, however, tenaciously maintain that their procedure is necessary for the sake of science, and they cover themselves with the good cause. They themselves will not be able to deny that their procedure is a cruelty, and they must already have become very jaded through practice if the animal's twitching and misery do not go to their hearts. Among people who call themselves educated or humane, the torturing of animals is everywhere considered crude and immoral; we need not even refer to the Bible, which in more than one place calls for mercy toward cattle. Now if cruelty to animals is in itself abominable and reprehensible, why should it cease to be so from the moment that vivisection takes possession of it? One replies: It is done for the sake of science and purpose. What, then, is immoral in itself becomes moral and permissible as soon as science is served by it and a higher end is kept in view. Then one ought to stop chiding Jesuit morality, which must be used at every opportunity. One does just the same, only with the difference that one does for the sake of science what the Jesuits do for the sake of the rule of their church. Science, which has long since outstripped everything, has now come to the highest place, and may do as it pleases, if it only profits by it. Science would now have to decide whether another ordinary man, who has not risen to the height of science, may steal, swear falsely, and murder for the sake of benefit. Or may one permit himself to commit cruelty only against animals? But we have heard it said that the cruel treatment of animals indicates crudeness of temper, and is a sign that such crude men will vent their cruelty also on men as soon as they are in their way. As we believe, in such matters not science but conscience is the highest judge, to whose judgment science must simply submit. ("N. Ztbl.")

Russia. The Knighthood of Courland addressed the following address to Emperor Alexander: "Your Imperial Majesty, Most Gracious Lord! When Kurland in 1795 voluntarily joined the Russian Empire, the Empress Catherine II, of glorious memory, issued a manifesto on April 15, 1795, in which she graciously promised: 'At the same time We declare on Our Imperial Word that' not only the free exercise of religion, which you inherited from your ancestors, but also the free exercise of religion, which you have inherited from your ancestors, is guaranteed.

The Church of Kurland has not only the rights and privileges of the people of Kurland, but also the rights and privileges and the rightful property of each of them. On the basis of this Most High promise, Courland enjoyed for many years complete equality of rights between the various Christian churches. No law hindered the freedom of religious confession and full confessional peace and mutual respect of the Christian confessions prevailed in the country. The emanation of the Penal Code of 1845 changed the state of things in a shattering manner. In favor of the rule of the Orthodox Church, freedom was replaced by compulsion of conscience, and the Lutheran Church, to which the overwhelming majority of the Christian population of Courland professed and still professes today, was reduced to a tolerated one. Parents, some of whom belong to the Orthodox Church, are threatened with punishment under these laws if they have their children baptized and educated in a confession other than the Orthodox. Those who, following their individual religious convictions and their deepest spiritual needs, turn from the Orthodox denomination to the Lutheran one, shall be punished with severe criminal penalties, and the Lutheran clergy, who perform official acts on such persons, shall be punished with imprisonment, dismissal from office, and exclusion from the clergy. The faithful inhabitants of Courland sighed and suffered under the pressure of these harsh laws until they were finally able to breathe a sigh of relief when His Majesty, the Emperor Alexander II, who rests in God, eliminated a particularly palpable state of emergency by the gracious Supreme Decree of March 19, 1865, while at the same time initiating a mild and lenient application of those laws. If these laws are now to be applied, an epoch of distress of conscience, persecution of the faith, and the most severe suffering for the expression of religious conviction will take hold. The inhabitants of Kurland look to the future with anxious concern. In this distress and anxiety, the knighthood of Courland knows no other way out than to turn to the fatherly heart of their ancestral lord and emperor. They dare to take these steps in the consciousness of their unshakable loyalty and devotion. The Kurland knighthood represented at the Diet therefore most humbly lays at the feet of their Emperor and Lord the imploring request: Her Imperial Majesty will deign to free the people of the Governorate of Courland from the distress of conscience by amending the laws in question." The Czar refused to accept the address, and the signatories were informed that the present system of Russification was to be continued and that the historical rights of Kurland would have to take second place to the "necessities of state" of Russia.

Russia once again. Thus we read in the "Allgemeine Kz." of January 15: "In the Baltic provinces the religious persecution is assuming an extent that one would not have thought possible. The fact that the building of Lutheran churches has been made dependent on the opinion of the Greek Orthodox church authorities of the country, i.e., on the Bishop of Riga, seems even less dangerous than the right granted to the Orthodox confraternities, as is said, to compulsorily expropriate any land and buildings which they believe they can use for their purposes. As far as we know, nothing definite has become known to the public about this, but there is hardly any doubt about the fact itself. That the whole external organism of the Lutheran Church is thus given over to the principle of destruction is obvious. The brotherhoods need only appropriate the Lutheran church buildings, and the matter is done, since new churches may not be erected without the permission of the bishop. Who, by the way, would dare to do so, since the brotherhoods would also be allowed to "expropriate" the completed building! The situation is no better with the schools. The Pope, with the help of the confraternity, can also erect them in every

The Lutheran pastor has already been deprived of school supervision anyway, or this is in the near future. Otherwise, what would be the point of placing the Lutheran elementary schools and seminaries of the country under the Ministry of Public Enlightenment? Until now, these institutions have been under the name of the Minister of the Interior, who has never taken care of them, since they were kept in good condition by the Baltic knighthoods. If change is now brought about in this respect, and the Minister of Popular Enlightenment is placed at the head of the school system, this only makes sense on condition that a fundamentally new system is introduced, i.e., that the schools are withdrawn from the influence of the estates and the clergy and subjected to that of the empire and the Greek Orthodox Church; thus: Russification and "conversion". But this requires two things: a choir of at least 2000 schoolmasters and several hundred popes as school overseers. The one can be stamped out of the earth as little as the other; even if they were brought here with the exposure of other parts of the empire, nothing would be achieved, because the immense mass of the peasants does not understand Russian, while the Russian teachers and popes, for their part, know neither Latvian nor Estonian. It is therefore impossible to think of any positive success in the near future. On the negative side, however, much can be done in a very short time, that is, the present school organism can be destroyed, and this will probably happen. The landowners, who maintain the schools to no small extent at their own expense, although they have not been obliged to do so since the enactment of the Landgemeindeordnung of 1866, will naturally have no desire to do anything for Greek Orthodox schools with Russian as the language of instruction; but since no funds are likely to be made available by the Reich, the end can hardly be other than that most of the schools will be closed. Enough, a relapse of the people into barbarism is to be foreseen.

Guatemala. President Barillos issued a decree on January 6 stating that while the government is willing to encourage immigration for the advancement of art, science and industry, it must also combat the immigration of people whose presence is a constant danger and an obstacle to progress and freedom. The decree breaks down to Roman Catholic priests of foreign nationality who oppose the government and cause dissension among the populace. An order has been issued to expel such priests.

Necrological. On February 7 died at Breslau, almost 85 years old, the Geh. Justizrath Dr. G. Ph. Ed. Huschke, Director of the Oberkirchenkollegium of the Lutheran Church in Prussia, born June 26, 1801 at Mündm, 1821 in Göttingen Privatdocent in the subject of Roman law and legal history, 1824 full professor of law in Rostock, since 1827 in the same capacity at Breslau. In 1841 he became director of the Oberkirchenkollegium of the Lutheran Church in Prussia, which was recognized by the state in 1845. In 1852 he received the theological doctorate from the University of Erlangen. - On January 15, Pastor emer. died at Bonn at the age of 84. Dr. th. Emil Wilh. Krummacher, formerly reform. Pastor at Langmberg, known among other things for his writing: "The Dogma of the Election of Grace together with the Interpretation of the 9th, 10th and 11th Chapters of Paul's Letter to the Romans" (1856.).

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 32.

April 1886.

No. 4.

Recent defense of the Landeskirchentum against Free Churches.

We have just received the following writing:

National church and free church. Response to ? . O. Willkomm's "open missive to the 41 ministers of the Ephoria Zwickau" of 4,16. Dr. **Georg Buchwald**, deacon in Zwickau. Zwickau. Published by Gebr. Thost (R. Bräuninger). 1886 (18 pages in small print).

This little pamphlet has the following meaning. At the beginning of this year, under the title "A Word to our Congregations", a leaflet was published, signed by 41 so-called clergymen of the Ephory of Zwickau in Saxony, which contained a warning against the Methodist, Baptist and Irvingian sectarians who had broken into the regional church congregations in that area. Since in the immediate vicinity of Zwickau, in Nieder-Planitz, there is also the most important congregation of the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church, which had left the Saxon State Church, the warning word of those 41 clergymen included, in addition to the sectarians mentioned, the separated Lutherans as equally guilty parties.¹⁾ The latter caused P. O. Willkomm in Nieder-Planitz to write a letter to the Lutheran Church in Nieder-Planitz. Willkomm in Nieder-Planitz to address an "open missive" to the signers of the pamphlet in the organ of the Lutheran Free Church of Saxony, and to have the same sent out in pamphlet form; and it is this "open missive" against which the above-mentioned pamphlet "Landeskirche und Freikirche" is directed. In it, the author himself says that the "open missive" seemed to him at first "not in need of a reply," but that since the missive had gone out of print so quickly and soon appeared in a second edition, "finally the necessity of a reply" had arisen.

1) See: "Lutheran" of February 15, p. 29.

When the above pamphlet, "Landeskirche und Freikirche," came into our hands and we saw Lic. Buchwald named on the title as the author, we opened it in the hope that in it, at any rate, a completely different light would shine than in the beyond measure deplorable "Wort an unsere Gemeinden. Since the aforementioned had brought to light several Luther manuscripts found by him in the Zwickau City Library and had put them into print, we expected from him at least more Lutheran understanding and Lutheran judgment on the questions in question than had hitherto been revealed in the publications of the Regional Churches. But how bitterly we were deceived when we read Buchwald's pamphlet! There is nothing to be discovered in it of the assertion of Lutheran principles. Words from Luther's writings are, however, adduced here and there, but mostly in a sense subordinate to them. The most important, decisive reasons, which are found in Willkomm's "Epistle," are not addressed, and what is considered in it is almost regularly not faithfully presented.

To prove these accusations, we are permitted to extract... ..to extract the following from the writings.

Already on the first page Lic. Buchwald writes: "When Fr. Willkomm says in the place just cited that his desire for 'clarity in doctrine remained unsatisfied in the study of the theology prevailing in German universities,' when he thus speaks of the 1) theology prevailing in German universities, he nevertheless seems to assume that the One is 1) theology, that there is therefore unity 2) of doctrine also with us." A strange conclusion! Can not then a theology prevail whose characteristic is precisely that it considers unity of doctrine to be a mere phantom? And this is really the case with regard to the theology now "ruling" in Germany. Or can the licentiate name even two leading theologians of the present day who are united in doctrine? Or - supposing (but not admitting) that there were really unity in "doctrine" - is abstract unity already something praiseworthy? Even unity in false doctrine?

B. continues on p. 4: "We would also like to ask about the logic of what was said on p. 9: 'To leave, to separate oneself, is something originally German'. Is this meant to justify religious separatism? Must we pay homage to an error because our ancestors had it? Shall we not rather rejoice that in our time the spirit of separation has at last been defeated in the political field? Shall it now be put to the test on the

- 1) Underlined by Buchwald himself.
- 2) Underlined by us.

...religiously?" To this we have two things to remark. Willkomm only wants to prove that "to leave, to separate oneself, is something primordially German." We, too, therefore, would like to ask "according to the logic" of the objection: "Is religious separatism to be justified thereby?" Does not the Herr Doctor philosophiae thereby commit a manifest *mutatio elenchi*? But this should least of all happen to a man who has just attacked the logic of his opponent. By the way, Father Willkomm immediately adds: "Or would the Reformation have come about without separation?" Hereby Willkomm shows, after having declared that separating, which the 41 clergy had declared to be something American and German, to be something, on the contrary, originally German, which separating alone he regards not only as originally German, but also as originally Christian. In this respect, too, B.'s objection is an inexcusable *mutatio elenchi*. Yes, when B. begins the following new section with the words: "On the same page, P. Willkomm asks: 'Or would the Reformation have come about without separation?'" it does indeed look as if the reader should not notice that these words of W. are directly attached to the preceding, in order to prove what kind of separations alone he approves of among the original German ones. But, be it commanded to God, the heart's annunciator.

To the words of W. just mentioned: "Or would the Reformation have come about without separation?" B. makes the following remark in the following section: "With this he puts the separation of the Free Church from the national church on the same level as Luther's Reformation. - Where is the logic here again? Or does one put those things which one compares with each other or reckons to one and the same genus, thereby also on One level?!"

The Licentiate adds: "What Luther drove out of the Roman Church was something quite different from what the Free Church brought into being. Or has this the forehead 1) to assert that at our time in our Protestant Church things are as Luther complains of the Catholic Church of his time 2) and whereby he justifies his leaving the Roman Church (E. A. Zweite Aufl. Bd. 10, 57.): 'Greater error, sin, and lies have not reigned on earth, from the beginning, than in these hundred years. There the gospel is publicly condemned at Costnitz. - It is not possible that greater lies, abominable error, terrible blindness, hardened blasphemy, should ever come to reign more than they have hitherto in Christendom.'" We only remark on this, that we find this whole apostrophe, beginning with the *echauffier*-

1) Underlined by us.

2) The latter two sentences underlined by B. himself.

or does this (the Free Church) have to assert the forehead," etc., for a rhetorical trick used only for the purpose of alarming the uninformed; for B. knows as well as we do that it does not occur to us to equate the Saxon Regional Church with the Pabst Church of 1522.

Dr. B. thus continues, p. 4: "There is only one right reason conceivable for separation from the church: only this, that the church itself has ceased to be the body of our one Head JEsu Christ, and consequently can neither preserve its adherents as members of the Head, nor educate new members to the same." (Underlined by B. himself.) If the Doctor means to say by this, that a man can justly separate himself from a church only when the same no longer has so much of the beatific truth, that in it he can come to faith, remain in faith, and be saved, then no Reformed man may separate himself from the Reformed, no Methodist from the Methodist, no Baptist from the Baptist church, &c., nay, even no Roman from the Roman. For in each of these communities a man may come to faith and be saved. A more unionistic syncretistic principle has hardly ever been enunciated. This principle, however, seems to have been conceived for the sole purpose of preventing anyone from separating from the national church, for if the members of the national church were really serious about this principle, they would have to consider it unconscionable if a member of the Lutheran Free Church, a Methodist, a Baptist, or even a Roman were to separate from his church and want to join the national church, unless, in good papal fashion, they alone considered their national church to be the body of Christ and the mother of all believers. That, by the way, Luther did not pay homage to that grossly syncretistic principle, the gentlemen of the national church, at least Mr. Vr. B. himself, will not deny. For Luther writes, among other things, thus: "We must confess, however, that the enthusiasts have the Scriptures and God's Word in other articles, and whoever hears and believes it from them will be blessed, even though they are unholy heretics and blasphemers of Christ" (Letter on Rebaptism, 1528. Walch XVII, 2675.); and yet, as is well known, Luther, a year later, in Marburg, renounced church fellowship with the Zwinglians and separated himself from them.

B. writes p. 4. f. further: "How the great apostle Paul condemns the sectarianism that was already stirring up in his time in Corinth is clearly written in 1 Cor. 1, 10-13. The separation of the 'Lutheran' Free Church is a violation of this commandment of the apostle. Free Church is a transgression of this commandment of the Apostle, which, in spite of different, subjective versions of Christian doctrine, means to keep us together as members of Christ; it is also a great injustice against Luther, whom we truly know just as well and hold in the same high esteem.

respect, but not idolize, as those." - What an exegesis and what an application! Paul chastises in the Corinthians their divisions on account of attachment to persons and their gifts, and the Lord Licentiate applies this to divisions on account of doctrine, namely, false doctrine! Or, for instance, did Paul, Apollos, and Cephas lead different doctrines? Or does the Saxon Free Church differ from the Saxon Regional Church only in "different, subjective versions of Christian doctrine," while both agree in the doctrine itself?

In our pamphlet, p. 5, we read further: "(Separation) is also a great injustice against D. Luther, whom we truly know just as well and esteem just as highly, but do not idolize, as they do." - In what the injustice consists, which the separation is to commit against Luther, it has unfortunately not pleased the author to reveal. Since, as he says, he "truly knows Luther as well" as the Free Churchmen, he doubtless also knows the almost innumerable declarations contained in his writings, in which he denies brotherly fellowship to all who contradict God's clear words in any article of the faith. Far from the Free Church doing Luther an injustice by separating from the Saxon Regional Church, it is only following in his footsteps. It is true that the Saxon Regional Church, by means of a formula put on screws, still officially professes the symbols of the Lutheran Church, but what doctrines resound in its cathedrals and pulpits? what doctrines are expounded and defended in the writings of its ecclesiastical writers? and does it not have its Sulze, Graue, etc., who unmolestedly blaspheme Christ in the face of their church guards? If, therefore, the Saxon formula of doctrinal obligation were a hundred times better than it is, it would be, far from being a testimony to its Lutheran character, only a the truer testimony to its apostasy. She indeed revealed what she wanted to be held for, but at the same time that she was not this. - By the way, if the licentiate accuses us of idolizing Luther, that is simply not true. We do not believe in Luther, we do not believe a word he says in divine matters, because he says it; but we believe him when and where he proves his doctrine clearly and distinctly from God's Word. Is this idolatry? When Lic. B. refers to the well-known passage in which Luther warns us to call ourselves after him, as his master, but also warns us, where his doctrine is concerned, to "throw Luther down," and finally writes: "But you must say, 'Luther is a knave or a saint, I have no interest in him; his doctrine, however, is not his, but Christ's'" - neither the first nor the other warning applies to the Lutheran Free Church, but the national church to the latter.

When the Lord Author writes in the following p. 5. f. of P. Willkomm, that the same gives Luther's translation of the Bible an "absolute un-

This is only a tendentious reversal of the latter's words. The latter had written: "When you" (those 41 clergymen) "write: 'We still have our dear Bible in Luther's pithy, pithy translation,' then I admire your boldness, since it cannot be hidden from you that precisely the Saxon church regiment is most eagerly pursuing the introduction of the revised Bible. How long, then, will you have this fame?" - Since, by the way, the conviction that Luther's translation of the Bible should be retained for the sake of many causes not to be discussed here is nothing specifically Free Church, we will not go into this point here either.

From pages 6 to 11, the author deals with the accusation of lack of doctrinal discipline, which Father Willkomm raised against the Saxon regional church. The first thing that the licentiate remarks against this is as follows: "First of all, Father Willkomm accuses our church of a lack of unity in doctrine. To this we must reply that never and nowhere, not even in the Free Church, has such unity existed, and for internal reasons cannot exist in the contending Church, which has not yet attained to the triumph of perfection, 1) 'until we all come to one faith and one knowledge of the Son of God' (Eph. 4:13.)." This honest admission that the Saxon regional church lacks "unity in doctrine" will not be pleasant to some regional church members, but we accept it with great thanks. This already proves everything that Father Willkomm wanted to prove. For an ecclesiastical community which itself professes not to be united in doctrine, and even declares such unity to be impossible, is not a church into which a right-believing Christian can enter or in which he can remain with a good conscience, but a united one. It is true that Lic. B. again touches 1 Cor. 1, 10. ff. to prove his theory, but with great injustice, for Paul, Apollos, and Cephas were, as already remarked, united in doctrine. B., too, wants "all to remain on the one foundation which is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. 3:11), and all to confess: (1 Cor. 3:11), and all confess, 'Jesus Christ, yesterday and today, and the same for ever' (Ebr. 13:8)"; but a teacher of the church remains on this ground, as such, only when he adheres to the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith. To abandon the fundamentum doctrinale, while desiring to hold fast the fundamentum personale, is a mere fancy, or an empty pretence.

B. continues on p. 7: "A doctrinal unity, as Father Willkomm demands it, i.e. a conception of the Christian truth of salvation, in which all agree together in the smallest and least without any individual coloring, under the condition that all are united.

1) Underlined by us.

Elevation of all, even the most insignificant differences, 1) is therefore not possible on the ground of holy Scripture." We remark on this: Here only one of two things is possible: either the writer wants to say that Father Willkomm really demands what the words seem to say, or that the words are to be taken differently from what they sound. We must not assume the former, since that would involve a deliberate untruth, for Fr. Willkomm did not explain this in his "Open Epistle." The latter must therefore be assumed at any rate. Therefore, B. himself adds: "Fr. Willkomm also seems to realize this. For he wants 'doctrinal discipline on the basis of the Lutheran confession,' 2) i.e., on the basis of the symbolic books including the Formula of Concord." This, then, is what Lic. B. censures! He has no objection to the church servants being committed to the symbolical books, especially when it is done as it is in the Saxon Regional Church, but to practice doctrinal discipline on the basis of the same is an abomination to him. "For," says he, "what would be the consequences? Above all, a complete undermining of theological science. . . Impossible would be the ever new drawing from the inexhaustible bosom of divine revelation." That this is really the case is then demonstrated by the barrenness of the American Free Church, which evidently lacks "independent biblical research". As proof of this, reference is made to a letter of the blessed Pastor Röbbelen, reported in Father Köstering's History of the Emigration of Saxon Lutherans, p. 180 ff., in which he is said to have simply declared that he could not consider the book, the Revelation of St. John, to be canonical, "because Luther, who had understood more of it than he, did not consider it to be canonical either. According to this, we must assume that the licentiate has not read the letter himself, but has drawn his explanation of it, as he usually does, from derived sources; for it is not true that Röbbelen has made this statement. To be sure, he admits that Luther's judgment on the canonicity of the Apocalypse, this chosen tool, already makes him "inclined" to follow him, but hereupon he not only gives the reasons that moved Luther to his judgment and him, Röbbelen, to agree with it, but at the same time testifies that he cannot follow Luther not only with respect to other Antilegomena, but also in the fact that in earlier years he had counted the Apocalypse among the Apocrypha, while he (Röbbelen) only did not consider it canonical, i.e., such a biblical book. i.e. for such a biblical book which God has given us "as a guideline of doctrine". May this serve as a warning to the licentiate not to condemn us on the basis of quotations from others, or even from our opponents, which unfortunately continues to happen in a disgraceful manner.

1) Underlined by B.

2) Underlined by us.

especially in Germany. We readily admit, by the way, that we have done nothing for what is called theological science in Germany, that is, that we have not discovered any new doctrine as a result of our study of the Scriptures, and that we have not remodeled any doctrine of our church; but if in any community of many there is independent research in the Scriptures day and night, then it is ours. Whoever has followed our whole development with its struggles in this sectarian country of ours, and has read our publications, will readily admit to us that this is no vain glory. But we must deplore the fact that our opponents in the national churches seldom take their proofs and counter-proofs from Scripture to defend and refute us.

We must declare it to be a miserable slander, as harsh as it may sound, when B. writes, p. 8 f.: "The Bible is generally held in too low esteem in the Free Church in comparison with the valuation of the symbols. In fact, it is regarded only as a collection of proofs for the 'one pure doctrine', as it is laid down in the symbolic books and the old dogmatists (especially Baier 1)). The Bible, which ought to be the **source of** doctrine, is thus made the **witness of** it, and vice versa: the symbols and orthodox dogmatics, the **witness** the **source of** doctrine." 2) Thus only a fanatic can write, who has not yet a conscience sharpened for truthfulness. Only a skeptic can write thus, who thinks it an impossibility to have become divinely certain, by God's Word alone, that the doctrine of our confession is the doctrine of the Word of God. Only a man can write in this way who asks only whether his judgment will be applauded as a mighty trump by his party comrades, without asking whether he can also answer for it before the God of truth and justice.

(Conclusion follows.)

1) Thus written by B. himself. We must confess that we are very tempted to conclude from this spelling of the name of the old dogmatist Baier that the licentiate knows him only from hearsay. This may be, however, as it may be; but it is true that we have based our dogmatic lectures on Baier's Compendium, but that he is nothing less than a special dogmatic authority to us, that we have chosen his Compendium as our textbook for quite different reasons from others, that we always read it with a critical eye, and that in this way, too, we seek to sharpen the theological judgment of our students; in short, that the theological essence and life which the Herr Doktor is so kind as to ascribe to us is nothing but a picture of his only too creative imagination.

2) Thus underlined by B. himself.

Ps. 19. and Rom. 10, 18.

Rom. 10, 14. ff. the apostle explains the thought that the Jews cannot excuse their unbelief of the gospel by not having heard it. The apostle asks v. 18, "Have they not heard it?" 1) And answers in the words of the 19th Psalm, "For the sound thereof hath gone out into all the earth, and the words thereof into all the world." 2) The apostle's argument is this: If the sound of the gospel has gone out into all lands, it has certainly reached Israel.

From the introduction of the words of the 19th Psalm every unbiased reader gets the impression that the apostle understood them from the preaching of the gospel and citire in this sense. Nevertheless, the newer exegetes unanimously maintain that Ps. 19, 5, as well as the first part of the 19th Psalm, originally dealt with the revelation of nature, and that the apostle - so most of them continue - did not cite Rom. 10, 18, both Ps. 19,5, but rather clothed his own sentence of the general preaching of the gospel in those words of the 19th Psalm.

This is quite improbable from the outset. The apostle introduces Ps. 19, 5. word by word, and the next thought is that he citire these words in their proper and original sense. It is not possible to refer to Rom. 10, 6-8. "But righteousness by faith speaketh thus, Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (which is nothing else, but to bring Christ down.) Or, Who will go down into the deep? (which is nothing else, but to bring Christ from the dead.) But what saith it? The word is near thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart." Here, however, the apostle lets the personified righteousness of faith characterize itself with words, which are partly taken from the passage Deut. 30, 12-14, without an actual citation.) But this peculiar use of the passage is also interpreted by the apostle himself here

1) *μη οὐκ ηκούσαν ;*

2) *Μενοῦνγε εἰς -πάσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλ,θεν ὁ φῶς λόγος αὐτῶν καὶ εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ ρήματα αὐτῶν.* Luther's: "though" - in truth.

3) Only Stier is known to us as a partial exception. He also concedes a "good right" to the "allegorists." He writes: Even the allegorists, among whom Luther himself is here, retain their good right, who interpret the first part of the Psalm figuratively from what the second then actually expresses - which can be seen clearly enough especially in the mediating transition from the sun to the law of the Lord. (70 Selected Psalms, Vol. I, p. 2.)

4) So also Luther (Exeg. opp. lat. in Deuteronom. XIII, 328.). Very well and at length also Philippi on Rom. 10, 6-8. in s. Commentar.

in that he expressly introduces "righteousness by faith" as speaking, and always interposes between the borrowed words his own commentary: "this is nothing else than bringing Christ down," "this is nothing else than bringing Christ from the dead." - Nor can it be pleaded, further, that the Apostle uses the words of the 19th Psalm without a citir formula *χα\$ώς γέγραπται, ως ή γραφή λέγει*, etc.

I would like to introduce. 1) The citir formula is also missing in v. 13: "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. And yet the apostle Joel 3:5 is evidently quoted here as a proof of what has just been said: "There is no difference here between Jew and Greek; for there is One Lord, rich above all them that call upon him."

No, the opinion that the apostle Rom. 10, 18. does not actually cite Ps. 19, 5. but only dresses his own proof in words borrowed from there, has everything against it. And no one would have come to this forced conclusion, if it had not been considered a foregone conclusion that Psalm 19, in its first part, does not deal with the revelation of God's glory in the kingdom of grace, but with God's revelation in the kingdom of nature. This is so self-evident to most commentators in our day that they do not even consider it necessary to enter into a discussion of the question in the explanation of Rom. 10, 18. Meyer writes on Rom. 10, 18.: "(Taken) from Ps. 19, 5. where the all-spreading natural revelation of God is spoken of." Philippi remarks: "Cf. on this passage, which originally deals with the natural revelation, Hengstenberg, Comment. über d. Psalm. Vol. I, p. 440 ff."

It would be worth the effort to take a close look at Ps. 19, if it does not "originally" deal with the proclamation of the gospel and not "with the revelation of nature", so that one would be overtaken by the more than forced opinion that the apostle citire Rom. 10, 18. not at all Ps. 19, 5. For what Philippi brings from Hengstenberg in order to explain the use of the words of the 19th Psalm in the passage in question is thoroughly characterized as a makeshift. Philippi quotes from Hengstenberg, loc. cit.

1) Thus Chr. A. Crusius: Nulla utitur formula, quae *allegationem* textus tanquam idem dicentis indicet. (Hypomnemata II, 442.) So now Siele. against Bv^Iφβ: Nostrae explicationi *minime officit*, quod Paulus sacram ab se vocem citari expressis verbis non dixit (vid. not. ad v. 13.). But to verse 13. Fritzsche writes: Firmat apostolus v. 12. . . . voce sacra Joelis 3, 5., quam *ut nobilem neminique ignotam* ita affert, ut V. T. locum ab se citari observare supersedeat, ut 9, 7. 10,18. Male igitur ex eo, quod Paulus non scripsit *ή γαρ γραφή λέγει' πας κτέ...*, auteum *sua cogitata Joelis.verbis enuntiasse (Flatt.)*, aut allata Joelis verba in proverbium abiisse a multis celebratum (*de Wette*) concludas. (Pauli ad Rom. epistola cet. Tom. II, 404.)

The manifestation of God in nature is a real prediction of the generality of the proclamation of the gospel. If it is not accidental, if it is rooted in the divine essence, then it must come from the same divine essence. The revelation of God in nature is a pledge to all his creatures, to whom it is given as such, that they too must one day be made partakers of the higher and more glorious revelation. It was a guarantee to the Gentiles that the temporal limitation of salvation to Israel was not a contradiction, but a means of limitation." In this form it is rather philosophy of religion than theology. Next, too much would be proved by this. If, according to Scripture, "the generality of the revelation of God in nature" is really related to the "generality of the preaching of the gospel," and if the latter is therefore a kind of type of the former, then the apostle, Rom. 10:18, would not have clothed his proof merely in the words of Ps. 19:5. or had not merely interwoven this passage into his own speech, as Philippians expresses it, but then Ps. 19:5 would have been truly cited, just as the evangelist John, Cap. 19:36, truly cited the words first spoken of the Jewish Passover lamb, "Ye shall not break his bones" (Ex. 12:46), as being fulfilled in Christ, because the Passover lamb was a type of Christ. of Christ.

But Psalm 19, even in its first part, originally dealt only with the revelation of God in the kingdom of grace, or with the preaching of the word of God.

The interpreters of the 19th Psalm can be divided into three groups. Those who are furthest to the left assume that the Psalm consists of two unrelated parts (vv. 1-7 and 8-15), which were pushed together by a later poet or "the collector". Ewald, for example, said: "(There) is also no transition at all from the first piece to the second, neither in the thoughts nor in the words; all inner fellowship and relationship is lacking, and the distance between vv. 7 and 8 is not merely abrupt and hard, but without all bridge and possible connection. . . . Hence only the supposition remains that a later poet tacked this conclusion on to that old piece, in order to make the revelation in nature and in Scripture equal to each other." 1) A second group of interpreters, some of whom do not want to engage in the critical arts that the foregoing assumption requires, recognizes the unity in the 19th Psalm, even if the first part deals only with the revelation of God in nature, the second with the glory of the Word of God. For it is to be described how the one God gloriously reveals himself both in nature and in his word. Thus all recent believing and unbelieving interpreters (as far as the latter do not belong to the

1) In the Commentary on Ps. 19. So also de Wette.

The first class assumes that the whole Psalm, and especially the first part, is about the revelation of God in the realm of grace. 1) A third class, finally, assumes that the whole Psalm, and especially the first part, deals with the revelation of God in the kingdom of grace, and that in the first part in figurative speech borrowed from the kingdom of nature, in the second part in actual speech. Thus the old Lutheran exegetes, Luther first; Luther, Bugenhagen, Brenz, Gesner, Calov, and A. Luther in 1530: "This psalm is about how the gospel is to be revealed and spread throughout the whole world. And the teachers of old have interpreted it in various ways, one in this way and another in another. Now this is the substance of it, that the gospel should be manifestly manifested in every part of heaven, and day, and night, and speech, and earth, and the ends of the world; that the gospel should reach as far as the heavens and the earth, and should not be preached in a corner, secretly, but, as Paul saith, Col. 1, to the whole creature; and Christ, Go and preach the gospel to all creatures, that it may fill the whole compass of the earth." 2)

And this interpretation proves to be the only correct one when considering the text. We will leave aside that St. Paul really quotes Ps. 19, 5 in Rom. 10, 18 - as we have proven - and therefore interprets this passage authentically from the preaching of the gospel. We only want to point out that the words of the Psalm itself, apart from the quotation of Rom. 10, 18, do not allow for any other interpretation. V. 2: "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament proclaims the work of His hands" could, however, still be understood of the revelation of God in the realm of nature. Here we might declare with Hengstenberg, "The heavens and the best are personified, and the proclamation of the glory of the Creator is attached to them, which the pious contemplation beholds in them," or with Delitzsch, "How glorious God is, and what his hands have made, i. e. what he has brought forth with his mastery, to which all things are possible, this the heavens tell, this the best also plainly says." But now this interpretation does not get beyond this verse either; in the following verse the way is already barred to it. It goes on to say: IXXX-XXXX XXXXX XXX XXXX XXX XX,,

Literally translated: "Day to day the speech flows and night to night the message is shared", Luther well translated: "One day tells another and one night makes it known to another". The expressions used here in v. 3. cannot be referred to the manifestation of the glory of God, which has shone forth uninterruptedly from nature since creation, but presuppose that the object of the proclamation is a historical event, a fact of which the day and the night are the same.

1) Hengstenberg, Moll, Delitzsch, etc. So also recently in "The Old Testament Student," March '85.

2) E. A. 38, 188.

The "other" or "following day" does not know anything in itself, in relation to which it only receives information from the preceding day. But in regard to the glory of God, which shines forth from Creation, each day is informed from itself and is its own independent proclaimer. There is no need for one day to send word and tidings to another. As the signs of the glory of God are immanent in every day and every night, so also the proclamation of the glory of God is immanent in every day and every night. Therefore nothing remains but to refer the "word" and "tidings" in this verse to the Word of God, to the Gospel, whose ceaseless proclamation continues through the lines, which one day communicates to another, one time and generation to another. The "glory of God" (XX-XXXX) in the preceding verse is therefore the glory of God, which shines forth from the gospel of God's grace, and "the work of his hands" (XXX XXXXX) is his doing in relation to the redemption and blessedness of men. This is enforced by the words of v. 3. One has only to consider the viable explanations of v. 3. to see at once that they do not do justice to the text. Hengstenberg, for example, remarks on v. 3: "The naked thought is that the heavens with their celestial bodies bear unceasing witness to God's glory, in that the sun always shines by day, the moon and the stars by night. This thought the singer thus expresses, that he makes every day and every night sub-heralds of God's glory, who communicate to their successors what they have heard from heaven and the best in their field." The first and second clauses are in perfect contradiction with each other. "Every day and every night" do not need "to communicate to their successors" at all "what they have heard in their sphere," since "the successors" are already informed without the communication, in that every day has for itself "the sun" and every night for itself "the moon and the stars." Delitzsch, too, at first only remarks on v. 3: "In an unbroken chain of tradition the word of this praising sermon is propagated," without considering that in the case of the testimony of nature, where every day is its own witness, there can be no question of a "tradition" at all. But Delitzsch gives the thought another twist. He writes: "The poet does not say that the tale of the day, when it wants to fade away at its passing, is taken up by the night and the tale of the latter by the day, but (since the tale of the day has as its content the works of God visible during the day and that of the night the works of God visible at night) that each dawning day "continues" the speech of the one that has perished and each dawning night the tale of the one that has vanished.

1) There is with one

1) Highlighted by us.

The idea is that one day gives up the business of proclamation to the other day. But that is not what it says. Rather, it says that one day gives speech to another, and one night to another; only this can be signified by the words XXX XXXX XXXX XX and XXX XXXX XXXXX XXXX, which Delitzsch himself translates: "Day gives speech to the day, and night gives speech to the night." 1) To give someone news and to give the business of proclamation to someone are two quite different terms. But as certainly as it is said, "One day giveth speech to another, and one night giveth tidings to another," so certainly we cannot here speak of natural revelation, but only of the preaching of the gospel. V. 4. and 5. then still say that the voice of the heavens is heard in all tongues and spreads over the whole earth. The general preaching of the gospel is described, as it were, in three dimensions; it extends v. 3. through all ages, v. 4. through all languages, v. 5. through all lands. By the way, v. 5: "Throughout the whole earth the sound thereof went forth, and unto the ends of the earth the words thereof" is from the beginning unfavorable to the relation to the natural revelation. The idea is that the sound went out from one point over the whole earth. This fits the preaching of the gospel, the revelation of glory in the kingdom of grace, but not the natural revelation, which is spread over the whole earth from the beginning.

But we break off here. The purpose of this article was not to give an interpretation of the 19th Psalm, but only to prove by some clear words of the Psalm that the first part of it also deals with the revelation of the glory of God in words and that the apostle Paul Rom. 10, 18. actually and in the original sense eitere the 19th Psalm. Calov is right when he says: "The thing signified by those figurative expressions (of the first part of the 19th Psalm) is the general preaching of the apostles?) which the apostle proves from the Psalm." That this is not recognized in more recent times is due to the fact that Ps. 19. has not yet been looked at closely. F. P.

1) Biblical Commentary on the Psalms. Leipzig 1867. p. 179.

2) Luther adds, "and of all those who execute the apostolic office, that is, the office of the word," quotquot funguntur apostolico munere, id est, officio verbi. Exeg. opp. lat. vol. xvi, 137.

Miscellany.

The First Week of November in Rome, Otherwise and Now. Under this heading, the papist "Herald of Faith" published in St. Louis has the following wistful reflection written from Rome: For Papal Rome, the first of November marks the beginning of the fiscal year. The month of October has always been devoted by the Romans to resting after the summer heat, and even now, on every Sunday and Thursday of this month, one can see thousands of Romans from the working class going out in wagons and on foot to the rural places of amusement to celebrate their "Ottobrata". Under the papal government, on Thursdays in October, the administrative officials were also off duty, and the congregations and other ecclesiastical authorities still have holidays throughout the month, as do the courts and schools. Even the regular papal audiences are cancelled in this month. - Since the majority of cardinals and prelates were absent from Rome during this time, there were no major functions for the sacred collegium, so-called papal and cardinal chapels. The first of these after the holidays took place on October 31, namely the Pre-Vespers for All Saints, which took place in the Sistine Chapel in the presence of the Pope, the Cardinals and all the Colleges of the Prelature. On the high feast day the same personalities come together again at 10 o'clock in the morning to attend the Pontifical Office celebrated by a Cardinal-Bishop, during which an alumnus of the German College delivers a sermon in Latin. The pope and the cardinals, together with the members of the prelature, also participated in the death vigils in the afternoon, as well as in the solemn funeral mass on All Souls' Day, which the Cardinal Grand Penitentiary had to celebrate.

More brilliant than these functions, however, was the feast of St. Charles Borromeo two days later. The feast of St. Charles Borromeo, whose heart is kept in the great church dedicated to him in the Corso, was celebrated two days later. All Rome was on its feet to watch the ascension of the Pope, who always attended the Pontifical Office in the said church with the Sacred College and his entire court. Such a great spectacle as this Ascension was not to be seen in any other capital of the world (not even at Christ's entry into Jerusalem! L. u. W.) and also in Rome itself only four times a year. At the head of the procession rode on a white mule a prelate in a purple robe, carrying the papal cross. Then followed on foot the servants of the court, all in large Gallic costume, as well as the bodyguard, who marched on both sides as an escort.

Then, surrounded by officers and higher court charges, the pope's chariot appeared, all gilded and with mirrored windows all around. The six horses, whose harnesses were covered with red velvet and richly studded with gold, were led in hand by servants dressed in red carmine damask. On the main seat of the carriage the pope sat alone, always blessing to the right and left the crowd kneeling along the streets (! L. u. W.); opposite him two cardinals. Behind the papal carriage followed several four-horse court carriages with the highest court chargés, and a detachment of mounted national guardsmen closed the brilliant procession.

At the church door the Pope was received by the Holy College and the Prelates. Collegium and the prelates. He ascended the portable throne (*Sedia gestatoria*) and, thus elevated above the heads of those present in the church, made his entrance into the house of God. At the altar of the Most Holy Sacrament he descended to the ground and remained for some time in adoration (! L. u. W.), after which he ascended the throne to the left of the high altar and here attended the divine service. After the service he returned to his palace in the same manner.

On the following day, classes were resumed in all educational institutions, and the courts as well as all other dicasteries resumed their activities. Thus the new business year in papal Rome was ushered in by magnificent ecclesiastical festivities.

Today it is quite different. On All Saints' Day and All Souls' Day, the Sistine Chapel no longer resounds with pious song, and the feast of St. Charles Borromeo is no longer distinguished by the consecration of the Pope and the Cardinals. The feast of St. Charles Borromeo is no longer distinguished by the congregation of the Pope and the Cardinals. (Why not? Does the Pope not want to participate, if perhaps it cannot be done in the former pompous way? If, instead of riding on his great idol chariot, he went on foot on the occasion, it would be just as seemly for the "Vicar of Christ." But the pope wants to play the "poor prisoner." L. and W.) Instead, Rome sees the followers of Radicalism celebrating the memory of those who helped to wrest from the pope his temporal rule. Just in these days, commemorations are being held for the bandits who, under Garibaldi's leadership, pillaged the papal territory in 1867, and for the monsters who, at the same time, murdered the Pope's defenders in the streets of Rome. Whoever saw the beautiful festivities of the first week of November in Rome twenty years ago, and whoever is now a forced witness of the revolutionary orgies, will be doubly saddened; for on All Souls' Day he cannot even make a distant visit to the graveyard, because the godless rabble is spreading there too (this is a generation, after all, that has mostly grown up under papal care! L. and W.).

Comparison of the union of the Godhead and humanity in Christ with the purification of the fire with the iron in a red-hot iron, and of the body with the soul in a man. This most appropriate comparison is found, as is well known, in the eighth article of the *Solida Declaratio* of the Formula of Concord concerning the person of Christ. This was immediately reproached to our church in the Neustadt "*Admonitio ebristiana de libro concordiae*" of 1581 as something that proved the opposite of what the Lutherans wanted to prove or make clear with it. To this the authors of the "*Apologia of the Christian Book of Concord*" of 1583, Chemnitz, Kirchner, and Selnecker, answer in this Apology, among others, as follows:

"Afterwards they fence the parable of the fiery iron, which the Concordia book from Origene, Basilio, Cyrillo, Augustino, Damasceno, etc., mentions for the explanation of the right doctrine of the communication of the Majesty. And let the reader diligently note that they are especially hostile to this similitude of the ancient churches, because this doctrine of this mystery, as revealed in Scripture, is rightly and simply explained by this similitude and can best be understood from it. For this reason they also apply all their art to how they may take, destroy, and pervert this parable of the church. But let us look at their sophistical art a little. They say that fire imparts to iron certain properties that do not destroy its nature, such as warmth and brightness, but not that it becomes as subtle, thin, and light as fire, and that it passes over itself as fire is wont to do in its way. For where this happens, the iron no longer remains iron, but loses its nature. Thus the divine nature of Christ imparts to its assumed human nature the great created gifts of which it is capable, but it does not impart to it its divine power and majesty, for if that were to happen, it would be destroyed. To this the Book of Concord and our proper answer is that we, praise be to God, know well that such a likeness does not correspond in all respects with this high mystery. For iron is a subject of appearance and heat; human nature in Christ is by no means a subject into which the divine majesty is poured out. As such is proved in the praefatione of the Book of Concord. As Justin Martyr himself confesses in the likeness of the soul and the human body. We must admit, then, that if the doctrine of the communication of the majesty and power of God were not strongly grounded in many clear sayings of sacred Scripture, it would be impossible to build it on this and other parables, for such would be far too weak and few. But because we have the glorious sayings of Matt. 11, 28, John 3, 5, 6, Phil. 2, 1 John 1, in which this doctrine is irrefutably founded,

have also given the consent of the whole old orthodox church in this similitude of the fiery iron and others like it, we cannot nor shall we allow ourselves to be deprived of this doctrine and also of this similitude, by which it is so finely explained, for we would deny God's word and truth itself. And now there is no dispute about this, as far as the speech in *primo genere* is concerned, nor about the created gifts, of which alone they want to interpret and understand this likeness; but the main dispute is about this: Whether it is sufficient to apply it only to the *habitualia* and *creata dona*, which are given to human nature in Christ in such a way that it has them in and for itself as created gifts and attributes, and whether orthodox antiquity also explains this similitude of the fiery iron in this way and not otherwise. But it is found that the opposite explanation does far too little in this matter, and even wants to follow from it something else than orthodox antiquity has concluded and taught from it. . . In sum, orthodox antiquity deals with these three pieces in this parable of the fiery iron. The first is this: As the two distinct natures, of fire and iron, are united together, without any change or extinction of their essence and essential qualities, so also the two natures in Christ are inseparably united together in one person, without any change or extinction or extinction of their essence and essential qualities. The other is, That as iron by reason of the union imparts to fire its essential properties to shine and burn without some mixture and transformation of them, so the divine nature of the Son of God imparts to its assumed human nature by reason of and according to the nature of its personal union with its essential properties, that they may shine, work, and be powerful in the same, and with the same through the same, and yet let this be done without some mixture and transformation of the natures or essential properties themselves. . . The third is, That though fire imparts its property to iron, yet iron does not impart its blackness and coldness to fire; so also in the personal union of the two natures in Christ, the divine imparts its properties to the human good, but the human nature imparts nothing to the divine. . . . The Book of Concord goes to these three pieces and no further. From this it appears sufficiently that this similitude of the fiery iron is by no means to be drawn, as our counterpart does, solely on the created gifts imparted. But that fire does not impart to iron its *raritatem*, *levitatem* et *motionem sursum*, i.e., that it becomes as subtle, thin, and light as fire, and that it passes over itself as fire is wont to do in its own way, whether or not the other gifts are imparted to it.

(This) takes nothing at all away from this matter, and does not annul the right doctrine of the impartation of divine majesty and power, of which we have express testimonies in Scripture. Nor does it follow from this that the assumed human nature of Christ has only *Accidentia* or *Qualitates*, i.e., created, finite, imparted to it. It is enough that Scripture testifies, and affirms this similitude of the fiery iron, that, as the essential qualities of fire can be communicated without the destruction of iron, so also the essential quality of the Son of God, of which we have express testimony in Scripture, can be communicated without the destruction and annihilation of human nature. For in this respect orthodox antiquity used and applied the similitude. Now, just as fire imparts to iron the qualities of shining, burning, and working realiter, truly, and in fact, and therefore does not immediately impart to it its *raritatem*, *levitatem*, *motionem sursum*, and thus transforms it entirely into its own essence, so it proves to be the same thing: Thus it is shown here that the Son of God can and is able to impart to his assumed human nature all power, strength, and authority to make alive, to have everything under his hands, to cooperate and govern everything; And so, by virtue of the personal union, and likewise of being seated at the right hand of God, it must not follow from the beginning, as our adversary pretends, that he should also communicate to it his eternity, infinity, item, that it should become God, as he is in his eternal nature, and what is more like that, or even change it into his spiritual, eternal, infinite nature, that it should become the Godhead itself, and entirely lose its nature, essence, and essential qualities. Summa: if fire can impart its essential qualities to iron in part, and not transform it immediately into its substance itself, how much more can the Son of God impart to his assumed human nature the essential qualities that he wills (from which will we proceed from and according to his word, and go no further)? and must not therefore immediately make them his divine essence itself. . . . So we also do not teach that omnipotent power is of substance to human nature or is essentially imparted to it, that human nature is now essentially omnipotent or has omnipotent power; but, as reported, this is the teaching of the Christian Book of Concord: That the omnipotent power is **imparted to the** assumed human nature in the person, or by reason of and after the manner of the Personal Union, that it is elevated to the communion and custom of the same, and that the divine omnipotent majesty shines, works, and is powerful in, with, and through the assumed human nature, as fire shines in, with, and through iron.

He is united, shining, shining, and burning. Summa, when we speak of the impartation of majesty, we do not mean an essential impartation, or a natural outpouring and separation of the divine attributes or created omnipotence into the assumed human nature, as one pours water from one vessel into another, but the personal impartation, or the impartation that follows from and in the manner of the personal union as a consequence. In the same way, they reflect more the same thing about the soul and the human body than they do for us, for the essential qualities are and remain distinct. This we also teach, hold, and say, that the essential qualities of the body and of the rational soul are and remain distinct, and are not blended together. But that the rational soul therefore does not truly communicate its potentia, as they say, to the body, that is, that it should perform its action "in, with, and through the same organ" as long as it dwells in the body, is a palpable falsehood. For the soul sees through the eyes, hears through the ears, speaks through the tongue, grasps with the hands, etc., and as far as the mind is concerned, it needs the head, the brain, and the senses. Just as the eyes see, the ears hear, etc., so too. For this reason, and because the soul with its potentia is personally united with the body, there is no transformation of the soul into the body, or of the body into the soul, or any comparison of the properties of the body and the soul, through this communication, which is physical and natural. Now if this happen in this natural union body and soul without some mixture and exequation, how much more may and can this happen in the assumed human nature, which the Son of God inseparably put on and assumed?" (Apology of the Christian Concord. Heidelberg edition of 1593. fol. 55. a. -57. b.)

It will perhaps interest some readers to learn something of the library of Dr. Knaake, the editor of the critical edition of Luther's works (so-called Kaiser edition), which he has collected specifically for this purpose. The collection of Luther's writings, which he possessed until now, Dr. Knaake has sold to the Prussian government, but without the duplicates, of which there may be about 600, while the latter comprises about 2100 pieces. Not yet sold, however, is his entire collection of prints from the century of the Reformation, which, without the duplicates, consists of about 3300 pieces, and thus, with the duplicates of the Luther collection, amounts to nearly 4000. The usufruct of the Luther writings, which the Prussian government has purchased, however, remains with Dr. Knaake until he delivers them or until he dies; but in return for the fact that he has renounced his free disposal, he receives the interest.

of the purchase capital, which passes fully into his hands according to the number of delivered pieces; therefore, each individual print is also noted with a certain price. Since at that time, during the negotiations about the support of the critical Luther edition on the part of the Emperor and the government, the securing of this Luther library for the state was a condition, so Dr. Knaake, in order not to endanger his plan, set the sales sum a quarter less than the value of it was subsequently estimated. He now intends to proceed similarly with his remaining collection, which contains many rarities, indeed unica. In particular, for the sake of his Luther edition, he had for many years searched for writings by friends and opponents of the Reformer. Of Eberlin's "15 Bundesgenossen", for example, which were written in a popular style and were deeply influential, he owns all the old editions, for which, of course, he paid 15 Thaler for each of them in his time. Accordingly one can estimate this collection at 10,000 dollars. How rare some of the prints in it are, is evident, for example, from the fact that Professor Kolde in Erlangen, in his *Analecta Lutherana*, declares that he has never seen the *Revocationes Jacobi Praepositi*, the well-known friend of Luther, while he bibliographically cites a reprint, while the original print is in this collection. Professor Kawerau (the present collaborator in the publication of the critical Kaiser edition) had only found something of a writing by Johann Agricola in a counterpart, otherwise not even bibliographically, although as a describer of Agricola's life he did much research in the great libraries of Germany into the writings of that man of sad memory; it too is in this collection. These are only a few examples of the book treasures that this library contains, and it would really be a shame if this library of the Reformation and Luther were to be sold off at auction.

H. Bayer.

A Sample of Papist Idolatry. A tract comes into our hands with the title: "A beautiful prayer, which contains a twelve-hour recommendation, in which a Catholic Christian can ask for a blessed end and to be provided with the holy sacraments. The tract is printed at Znojmo without indication of the year of printing, apparently at the end of the last or beginning of this century. The "beautiful prayer" reads thus:

The first hour: I command myself body and soul! Jesus, Mary and Joseph!

The other hour: I commend myself body and soul to the holy guardian angel.

The third hour: I commend myself body and soul to the Most Holy Trinity.

The fourth hour: I commend myself body and soul to the four evangelists.

The fifth hour: I commit myself body and soul into the holy blood-flowing five wounds of Jesus Christ.

The sixth hour: I commend myself body and soul to St. Francis Xavier.

The seventh hour: I commend myself body and soul to the seven sorrows of Mary, Mother of God.

The eighth hour: I commend myself body and soul to St. Anthony of Padua.

The ninth hour: I commend myself body and soul to the nine choirs of angels.

The tenth hour: I commend myself body and soul to the ten thousand martyrs.

The eleventh hour I commend myself body and soul to the eleven thousand holy virgins.

The twelfth hour: I commend myself body and soul to the holy twelve apostles.

Our Father. Hail Mary.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

A "theological desideratum." The "Lutheran Observer" of the General Synod dealt in several numbers with a "Handbook of Lutheran Theology" to be published here in America (in English). One writer, who signed himself "Fraterculus," expressed himself thus: "We have long felt the need for such a compendium, and have heard others speak of it. We may well consider it a foregone conclusion that a system of sound Evangelical Lutheran theology, of moderate scope, would remedy a really existing deficiency, both to enlighten and fortify our own people with respect to the faith of their church, and to remove from others the many prejudices which they harbor against us." Concerning the nature of the desired handbook, the same writer comments in more detail: "Such a compendium should reproduce the Lutheran spirit of the year 1530, the spirit of the Pentecostal period of the Reformation, where the Gospel was preached and known in a fullness and purity as never before since the time of the apostles. The book was to combine firmness in doctrine and living personal faith. It was to contain pure doctrine as the life-blood of the church, but it was to make living Christianity the goal of doctrine. But no system of Lutheran theology can count on success which ignores the great dogmatic systems of the **seventeenth** century. These systems can only pretend to be despised by those who do not know their nature, their content, and the service they rendered to the Protestant (?) faith at the time of the struggle. But these systems do not fit the 19th century either in form or in spirit. They are learned, cold, colossal,

polemical, scholastic - they offer the highest attainments of the intellect in the field of theology. Whoever would combine their exegesis, their erudition, their logic, their analysis, their dogmatic tact with the spirit of the Augustana, the Catechisms and the Apology, would supply a system of theology which has not yet had its equal in the world. To such a system goes the waiting, the desire, the prayer of the Church. (!) Such a system will no doubt be the final theology (the Final Theology). But such a system can only be constructed by someone who, taking his way backwards, works his way through the great dogmatists of the seventeenth century until he stands before the still greater men, Luther and Melanchthon (!), and absorbs their spirit.... Such a book would remedy a decided deficiency not only in the Lutheran Church, but in all churches. We think such a work possible; but it would be the result of long, patient study of the theology of the church, the confessions of the church, and the Scriptures, combined with the examination of every doctrine by the enlightened and sanctified Christian consciousness (!) of the author." We refrain from criticizing the individual in this rhetorical argument. The same is also hardly calculated to be taken at its word in detail. What is Melanchthon's spirit as distinguished from Luther's spirit? What is the spirit of 1530, the spirit of the Augustana, the Apology, and the Catechisms? Whoever could so extrahir this "spirit" that the extract would be agreeable to all general synodists would be a thousandfold artist. Dr. Butler, in reference to the "theological desideratum," writes to the editor of the "Observer," "Let me urge your own very appropriate words, and say that this manual, 'which represents Lutherthum in its original purity, consistency, and catholicity,' ought to be 'cleared of all excesses, unfortunate representations,... rationalistic speculations, and all Roman terms and expressions.' 1) They say very truly that 'certain expressions, idioms, and natural illustrations, which were used by Luther himself in certain periods of his theological development and under the influence of the controversy, and which are cited in the symbolic books, have been so misunderstood and so perverted in respect to their proper and intended meaning, that the Lutheran Church is continually misrepresented and its good reputation before the Christian public is damaged.... which harms the cause of Protestantism itself, which owes its origin and character to Luther and the Lutheran Church'. I thank you most sincerely for this apt, courageous and manly editorial remark. I am glad that you have printed the same." To further his "theological desideratum," "Fraterculus" should request Dr. Butler and the editor of the "Observer" to once extract the "spirit" from the Augustana, the Apology, and the Catechisms, with leave, omission of all "excesses," etc.

F. P.

"American Lutheranism." The Washington Correspondent of the "Lutheran Observer" gives a description of "American Lutherhood." He writes in one of his weekly letters, "Would it not be well if a sample number of the 'Observer' were sent to every German pastor in the United States? Very many of them do not know what American Lutherhood is-so many of the German papers misrepresent the General Synod altogether. I heard lately of a good, noble, sincere, and earnest German pastor who went to the Moody meetings, and whose soul was seized by what he saw and heard there just as you and I would be seized. There are none more sincere

1) Highlighted by Dr. Butler himself.

people than our pious Germans. They need the 'Observer'¹ as an antidote to the exclusive confessionalism which is served up to them weekly in 'more ecclesiastical' papers in their mother tongue. And, truly, the best measure in regard to this whole question is the speedy Anglicization of these masses, whose children we" (the General Synodists?) "are losing, as every careful city pastor knows, because the German language and the German manner is the unbreakable rule of the mother church. The children do not want to be bound by the same, nor should they be. One great mission of the 'Observer'¹ is to open the blind eyes and convert our Teutonic people from the fetters of their language and customs to the light and freedom of this Bible-loving, Sabbath-keeping, water-drinking, church-going, God-fearing country." This is truly an apt characterization of "American Lutheranism" as espoused by Dr. Butler. Leaving out all figures of speech, the three articles of "American Lutherhood" are: 1) water-drinking, 2) the "Christian Sabbath," 3) the "spirit" of the Augsburg Confession. F. P.

The doctrinal controversy in the Norwegian Synod. The "Gemeinde-Blatt" of April 1 reports: At the request of a recent preachers' conference of the Minnesota District of the Norwegian Synod, Pastors Homme and Frich have taken steps to bring about a doctrinal colloquy between representatives of the two principal parties at present in conflict in the Norwegian Synod. The two pastors mentioned publish the following proposals under the 5th of March: 1) A colloquium will be opened either in the middle of April or at the latest immediately after Easter of this year in La Crosse or in another convenient place. 2) If a satisfactory result is not reached at the first meeting, the Colloquium will be continued at subsequent meetings. 3) The Colloquium shall be held by at least three and not more than four of the following pairs: Prof. F. A. Schmidt and Rev. V. Koren; Rev. P. A. Rasmussen and Prof. L. Larsen; Rev. L. M. Björn and Rev. O. P. Vangsnäs; Rev. N. Ellestad and Rev. C. K. Preus. Substitutes: Prof. Th. Mohn and Rev. H. Halvorsen; Rev. L. M. Dahl and Rev. N. Amlund; Rev. M. O. Böckman and Rev. O. Juul; Rev. K. Thorstensen and Rev. O. E. Solseth. For the sake of equality, these are listed pair by pair, so that if a pair or someone in a pair should be unable to attend, or later feel compelled to step down, the next pair will step in in the order in which they are named here. We have named so many to be sure that the Colloquium will take place under all circumstances. One or two pairs of substitutes should at least be present at each meeting, to be able to step in if someone from the Colloquium should fall away. 4) The members of the Church Council attend the Colloquium as witnesses (not as judges). 5) The Secretaries of the District Synods (or their substitutes) are present to record the necessary report of the proceedings. If any of the said Colloquists (or substitutes) should find themselves unable to attend the Colloquium, notice thereof should be sent to the undersigned J. B. Frich (La Crosse, Wis.) before the 20th of this month. Those not answering will be considered as consenting. - Nothing has been announced as to the further progress of this movement at the time we write this.

In the Norwegian Synod it is evident that the Schmidtian spokesmen are always bringing up the old papist objections to Lutheran truths. Now, for example, in a pastoral conference, the following statement is made: "In this passage (Matth. 25, 34. ff.) the Saviour gives the conduct of men as the reason for their being placed in eternal life!" - According to what was said after the Ver-

As it is publicly reported at the meeting in Red Wing, Minn. and can otherwise be read in the Norwegian publications, it is evident that Prof. Schmidt is no longer the leader of the Norwegian Schmidians, but must content himself with a subordinate role. He himself, like the rest of the anti-Missourians, seems to be led wherever Pastor Muus may wish to go. W.

Council's Philadelphia Seminary. The "Luth. Kirchenblatt" of Reading-Philadelphia of March 6 writes: With the German language- things are quite weak in the Philadelphia Seminary. A year ago a number of students objected with great reluctance to the fact that a student in German had held the morning service in the chapel of the seminary. They demanded of the professors that they be allowed to hold the service separately. The anti-German spirit that was displayed in that story made an evil impression on many German pastors. In the seminary bulletin "Indicator" the same sentiment is now (February number) made known. In former times it was different. German students bought the English **Church Book** and learned to sing and pray along with it, and the English did not rebel against the German service. But we have advanced rapidly in the last 10 years and the desire for a good English seminary is justified. Then also the above question comes to rest.

Doctrine of Baptism in the Canada Synod. The "Kirchen-Blatt" of the Canada-Synod prints the following from Kurtz' ("Christian Religious Doctrine") about baptism: "Baptism is 'the bath of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Spirit' (Tit. 3, 5.), which for this life" (!) "is bound to the water of baptism (Joh. 3, 5.).... It is now the task of this life of testing and education to bring the new creature in us, born of God by baptism, to perfect manhood in Christ (Eph. 4, 13.), that it may reign over the old man, sanctifying and purifying him more and more, until he is changed into it and arisen" (!) "(Eph. 4, 22. Col. 3, 9.)." (In the passages alluded to it rather says that the old man is to be "put off" and "stripped.") "Nor is it sufficient to blessedness to be baptized, i.e. born again, for every birth which does not come to growth and formation by suitable nourishment, care, and education, atrophies and dies at last.... The Lord says Marc. 16, 16.... 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned,'-he may be baptized or not. God's wise and salvific order has bound the participation in the goods of salvation prepared by Christ's life, suffering, death, resurrection, and sitting at the right hand of God to baptism, and in this life there is by all means no other means and no other way of attaining to it than baptism alone." (!) "So without baptism we cannot be saved, but without faith even baptism is of no use, serving rather to increase natural damnableness. But faith, which must be added to baptism, is twofold, an antecedent, as a condition of the right reception of baptism, and a subsequent, as an effect of the rightly received baptism. Not knowledge, but only knowledge of salvation, not full faith that proves itself in a Christian life, but only consent, desire, and longing, is the condition of baptism. This can be awakened in the natural man also before the actual impartation of the goods of salvation" (!), "and must be awakened if they are to be received with right, full blessing; - that can only be gained in consequence of and as the effect of the rightly received and rightly used goods of salvation (in enlightenment, justification, and sanctification, comp. No. 395). The preceding faith is the fruitful soil for the seed of baptism; the succeeding (or beatific)" (!) "faith is the fruit-

which grows out of this seed. - The Christian Church has unanimously, by virtue of the Spirit who guides her into all truth, introduced infant baptism; she has steadfastly and victoriously asserted its necessity against sectarians and separatists, and will never be able to let go of it. The reasons against infant baptism are based on ignorance or misunderstanding. That the baptismal formula (Matth. 28, 19.) testifies against it, can only be asserted by ignorance (cf. the correct translation of the passage). That the apostles did not baptize infants is yet to be proved, and if it were proved, it would not prove anything against the present ecclesiastical practice, for the church is called, under the guidance of the Spirit, who leads it into all truth, to further form the apostolic doctrine and practice, and to lead it toward its highest and most complete development." (!) "More significant seem the objections from the nature of baptism itself. It is said that the child cannot be baptized because it cannot yet have knowledge and faith, for which the necessary consent of the person to be baptized is lacking. - To be sure, salvation, and therefore also baptism, cannot be forced upon anyone. But the child is as little violated by the impartation of baptism as by the impartation of human knowledge and education, which are given to him without his will and consent, and often against it. For the will of the parents is, without further ado, also the will of the infant. - And so, to a certain extent, their faith (at least in so far as faith is the condition of baptism, namely, consent, desire, and longing) is also the faith of the child who has not yet developed into a self-confident independent personality." (!) "As the bodily life of the child before birth is one with the bodily life of the mother, and becomes independent only through birth, so the spiritual life of the child after birth is still one with the spiritual life of the parents so long as its own spiritual life has not yet matured into free independence and has not yet developed into clear and full self-consciousness." (!) - The foregoing is a new proof that an almost incredible ignorance in regard to Lutheran doctrine prevails within the Canada Synod.

F. P.

Caplan of the Adjusted States Senate has recently become Dr. Butler, pastor of the "Memorial Lutheran Church" at Washington. Dr. Butler has previously been Caplan of the House of Representatives. The "Lutheran Observer" says: "A more fitting choice could not have been made for this place of honor and trust, and we congratulate our friend on the occasion of this renewed recognition of his high character and dignity as a minister of Christ in the nation's capital." A "recognition" on the part of a collection of poor but earnest Christians would, to be sure, weigh more heavily than that emanating from the Senate of the United States.

F. P.

Temperen; - Matter. Prof. Delitzsch's pamphlet on the Bible and wine has also become known among English-speaking Americans. The "Congregationalist" quotes from the pamphlet a passage in which Delitzsch says that the wine used at the Jewish Passover was "fermented wine," and admonishes the American representatives of the temperance movement not to twist the Scriptures to suit their opinion. But the "Congregationalist" adds, "We shall no doubt see that the inevitable Dr. Samson and others of like ignorance and audacity, if not the National Temperance Society itself, continue to pervert Scripture and history, and persist in asserting that the Passover wine was unfermented."

F. P.

Atheists and judicial oaths. The Presbyterian reports: The Legislature of the State of Connecticut rejected without debate the proposition that the testimony of atheists and unbelievers should have the same validity in court as the testimony of others.

II. foreign countries.

The so-called Chemnitz Conference met this year on March 2. On this occasion Pastor Dr. Siedel from Tharandt gave a lecture on communion, in which he complained, among other things, that the confessional consciousness of the congregation members of the regional church had often "completely disappeared" and that in regard to the admission to Holy Communion there was "often a prevailing practice of union". The following theses were adopted, most of them unanimously: A. Principle (i.e. fundamental). 1. communion in the Lord's Supper presupposes church communion; consequently only members of the Lutheran church can be admitted to the Lutheran Lord's Supper. (2) The Lutheran Church is only there where the Lutheran confession rightly exists and the Lutheran doctrine is *publica doctrina* (i.e., according to the Church Order, solely and exclusively rightly existing doctrine). (3) Since neither of these things is the case in the unchurched church, its members are not to be admitted to the Lord's Supper in the Lutheran church unless they renounce the unchurched church. (4) This requires both love toward the erring brethren and faithfulness toward the Lutheran Church in our country and in other countries. B. Practice. (5) This principle is difficult to carry out in large congregations, and where there is no custom of making confession. But even there many things can be done, if the pastor learns that there are unrighteous people in his congregation. (6) There is no general template for this communion practice, but each individual case must be dealt with pastorally. (7) In each case it is to be ascertained whether the Unrighteous in question belong to the Reformed Church (in which case they are simply to be directed to it), or whether they are so-called 'Lutherans in the Union' (in which case they are to be instructed and, if they can be instructed, admitted; if not - not). 8) A 'right of hospitality' for non-Lutherans at the Lutheran altar can neither be justified by the Holy Scriptures, nor by our confessions, nor by the past practice of the Lutheran Church. (9) In Lutheran border parishes that touch a Lutheran national church, a distinction is to be made between those unbelievers who stay only temporarily in the Lutheran congregation (these can comfortably seek Holy Communion in their home congregation) and those unbelievers who settle in the Lutheran congregation (these should be dealt with according to Thesis 7). (10) Everywhere in the Lutheran congregations this highly important subject is to be given careful consideration in confirmation classes and in preaching. (11) If the principle is acknowledged and handled to the best of our knowledge and ability, individual oversights in the matter do not impair the Lutheran character of the congregation." After the "Pilgrim" of March 15, from which we have taken this, has described the negotiations on this, he writes: "It should also be mentioned that a simple layman expressed his great joy over the confessional position of the Conference. Now he could tell the Missourians that one does not want to deviate even one step from the right Lutheranism in the Saxon regional church." To be sure, these theses contain much that is good; but, first of all, it is to be feared that the acceptance of the theses will probably be the end of the matter, and that the "prevailing practice of union" will continue to be the prevailing practice, which fear is justified by the success so far of similar, well-founded resolutions. On the other hand, the theses also leave a loophole here and there for those who practice unionism. Thirdly, there is a lack of theses that condemn the admission of those who are named Lutherans, but who are obviously neither orthodox nor orthodox believers; for this practice of the Lord's Supper is more abominable than the giving of the Lord's Supper to presumptively believing reformers and unbelievers. W.

The Immanuel Synod in Germany. After the "Hannoversche Pastoral-Correspondenz" of March 13 has reported how the editorial staff of Immanuel seeks to justify the ordination of the missionary director E. Harms, which is contrary to all church order, it continues: "Immanuel also seeks to come to an understanding with the Lutherans of the regional church. It seemed as if by his ordination Harms had been admitted to the doctrinal status of the Immanuel Synod, as if Immanuel had thereby placed himself decidedly on the side of the Hanoverian Free Church, which stands in opposition to the Landeskirche, and the serious question was addressed to the Hanoverian God's Caste whether it would further be able to support Immanuel. The repeated declaration that the Immanuelites would by no means reject Hanoverian Lutherans from their altar on the ground that they belonged to the Lutheran State Church should be quite sufficient. And we believe that if the Synod is not willing to let itself be pushed further on any side, it cannot be resented, and the God's box can be reassured. God forbid that, after Breslau has hastily broken the bond, we should also be separated from Immanuel, which champions correct Lutheran principles like no other free church." The Immanuel Synod has the distinguishing characteristic before other Free Churches that it maintains church fellowship with the Landeskirchen. This makes it popular with the regional churches, which seems to be of great value to it. But with this happy freedom from the disgrace that other Free Churches in Germany must bear, it takes upon itself the disgrace of being a schismatic community that has separated itself without a reason of conscience.

Hermannsburg. Dr. Münkelt writes in his *Neue Zeitblatt* of February 25: "Pastor Meine! was present in Hermannsburg on Tuesday, February 9, in order to arrange matters for the congregation, and held a meeting of the congregation representatives for this purpose. What was decided, we must learn from the congregational meeting of the following day, which Meine! did not attend. There were two parts: first, the congregation of Hermannsburg resigned from the previous synodal association of the Hermannsburg Separation, because Meine! had only accepted the call to Hermannsburg under this condition, since he could not and did not want to have any church fellowship with the Hessian (Vilmar's) party. For the rest, the Lüneburg church order, which had been in force until then, was to be amended according to the needs and conditions of the separation, because it was originally calculated for state churches, and is not applicable everywhere in free churches. The first piece now seems to have led to excited negotiations with the local pastor, Konrad Drewes. It was demanded of him that he give up his Vilmarian views and let E. Harms should temporarily allow the Immanuelite to help out in the office. This he would not do. Since we are not in a position to give an exact account of the course of events, we can only note that Drewes was violently attacked, and that an otherwise honorable, but under certain circumstances outgoing, churchwarden threw a few words at his head, which resulted in Drewes leaving before the congregation had voted and resigning his pastorate. We regret this occurrence and cannot condone the proceedings. Drewes is a mild-mannered man under Hessian influence, and even Meine! is said to have been not averse to making the now admittedly futile attempt at cooperation with him. Drewes, in his rapid steps, must have assumed that Hessians and Immanuelites cannot put their hands to the plow together. Thus it came about that a second separation was formed within the separation, for the Hessian party did its best to save for itself what could be saved. In Hermannsburg there is a large number of people who have moved here from outside, a colony of foreigners, some of whom belong to the higher classes and most of whom are women.

The Hessians have found much favor with them. From the majority of them a new congregation has been formed, which, with the addition of a few small people, numbers 50 to 60 people, for whom Drewes holds services in a prepared prayer hall. The actual congregation of Hermannsburg has remained with Meinel and Egmont Harms, so that now three services are held on Sundays in the town, one national church service and two separate services. The bitterness of the two separate parties against each other is said to be very great, and, as is natural, has also been communicated to the youth. After Drewes had closed his confirmation class, a confirmand is said to have said: Today we really annoyed Drewes. It is thought that this rift will continue in the other congregations under Hessian leadership, since they are innately Hermannsburgian in Harms' sense, and Egmont Harms is generally held in high esteem in Hermannsburg. The latter, however, is an opponent of the Hessians. The future, they say there, belongs to the Free Church, but certainly not to a Free Church which produces rift upon rift in internal struggles, and goes to pieces. But the main mistake was made by Th. Harms himself, who had still taken too much country-church leaven with him, and therefore remained impartial to the Lüneburg church order. He employed clergymen indiscriminately, if they were only decidedly Christians, and did not consider that the separation must above all hold to sameness of faith and confession, if fights are not to develop which would become dangerous to the existence of the Free Church. For that is what the separatist fierceness urges.

Hermannsburg. In the "Ev.-luth. Freikirche" of March 15, which comes to us just before the end of the present issue, we read the following to supplement the previous reports: Pastor Meinel has finally refused the appointment to Hermannsburg. We learn nothing more about the reasons that moved him to do so. Incidentally, the Hermannsburg congregation does not seem to be willing to make the unclear and vague ecclesiastical position of the Immanuel Synod vis-à-vis the national church, as expressed in particular in its communion practice, their own, while the Immanuelites, as already communicated, have firmly declared that they are determined not to give it up under any condition. So we can only wish Hermannsburg luck with this turn of events. It is true that at present the poor, orphaned community is in real need. But the times of need have always been the most salutary for the Church of God. - Pastor Paulsen reports about the Hermannsburg split in his "Kropper kirchlicher Anzeiger" of March 5 as follows: "In Hermannsburg a sad split has occurred in the free congregation. The majority of the congregation has left the former congregation and has founded a new congregation. A part of the congregation has remained faithful to Pastor Drewes. Those who caused this split have a heavy responsibility before God and man; we will report on this in detail later. Unfortunately, this incident has again proven what becomes of congregations when the spiritual office is delivered to them." - In taking the side of the "Hessians" and their doctrine in these words, Paulsen himself must admit that this whole business is not a mere division per se, but actually a division for the sake of doctrine. And this is what matters first and chiefly. According as one takes a stand on the doctrine about which the controversy revolves, according as one will judge of the division and its causes, its right or wrong. What else may have been sinned against on this or that side, or on both sides (and where is a man who does not sin), that is another question. Leaving the latter aside, we ask: On which side is

in this case the right and on which side the wrong doctrine? As is well known, the synod of the Hanover Free Church, and with it Pastor Drewes, leads the false doctrine of church government, that a Christian congregation does not have the right to elect or appoint a pastor, but rather that it is up to a higher "church government" to "set" one for it. For years the be. Pastor Th. Harms had resolutely defended the Lutheran doctrine of the right of the congregation against papal pretensions and, foreseeing the turmoil that would occur after his death, had instructed and warned his congregation about this matter. Soon after his death the "church regiment" of the Hanover Free Church wanted to "send" a pastor to the Hermannsburg congregation, true to the Vilmarian principle: "Shepherds can only be appointed by shepherds." The Hermannsburg congregation forbade such. For a long time, perhaps too long, they tolerated the pastor who adhered to false doctrine. At last it had to come to a divorce. And this divorce - however much sin may be attached to it - is according to the word of God. For it is written, "Now I exhort you, brethren, that ye take heed to them which cause divisions and vexations, beside the doctrine which ye have learned, and depart from them" (Rom. 16:17). From this it is clear who "caused the division" and on which side the "heavy responsibility before God and man" lies. Those, namely, who stubbornly hold the false doctrine, have caused "division and trouble," in this case none other than Pastor Drewes with his followers. For Drewes - and this is the main thing in this whole business - did not want to give up his and his comrades' false doctrine. The congregation had not only the right but also the duty to demand this according to God's Word. God's Word, and God's Word alone, is to have dominion in a Christian congregation. And the congregations and all true Christians are to watch that this is done. The Roman Church and all the Romanizing "Lutherans" of today want to deny this to Christians and Christian congregations. For these, they think, could not and do not judge about doctrine, as such, for example, is written in Vilmar's writings in bare, dry words. We have not said too much when we say that these Romans treat the church members like stupid sheep.

Hanoverian Regional Church. After a Hanoverian correspondent of the Allg. Kz. of February 19 reported how much better things had become in the Hanoverian Landeskirche in the last twenty years, in spite of the Protestants who belong to the ministry of the same, the Correspondenz concludes with the following words: "The Lord has given us room in the land! Of course, how long will it last? Will we not soon face worse enemies than before? Frequently one hears from informed quarters the complaint that our candidates and our theologians studying in Göttingen are professing liberal theology in ever greater numbers; that even among garden assemblies of candidates, such as they meet in our seminaries, only a few faithful to the confession are to be found!" - This not only opens up a frightening prospect for the Hanoverian Regional Church, but also shows how sad things already are for it at the present time. What kind of a church is this that lets its future ministers be prepared for the holy office by enemies of Christ and blasphemers? And what is to be thought of the preachers of such a church, who claim to be faithful Lutherans in it, and make no noise in spite of such conditions? W.

Brunswick. Here a rationalist by the name of Hasenclever, who had been rejected by an uninformed consistory, was appointed pastor of the St. Andrew's parish by the Brunswick church regiment, without prior examination or

Colloquium, solely on the basis of the signature of the usual teaching commitment formula. In relation to this, the following is written in the Allg. Kz. of February 19 from Brunswick: "Of course we are well aware of the difficulties that confront every more serious church regime - and by God's grace we have such a regime - in the faithful fulfillment of its duties in our days, and we know how to appreciate them: but we must hold that it is always and especially in such critical times the most advisable and right thing to follow the path that has been indicated, the consequences of which we do not have to answer for. But we must hold that, especially in such critical times, it is always the most advisable and right thing to take the path that has been pointed out, for the consequences of which we are not responsible, unperturbed by calculation and consideration of all kinds of possible consequences that no one can yet know for certain in advance. But the way pointed out was in this case the more easily recognized and the more unobjectionably trodden, because another church regiment had already preceded on the same." - At the end the writer himself says: "The friends are discouraged, the opponents encouraged," but he finally adds: "We hope and wish that the settlement of this case will remain an exception, and that in the repeated case the way of church order will be taken all the more firmly and surely, so that here too it may be said: *Exceptio firmat regulam*." We must remark on this: first of all, it is ungodly to make an exception in such a case, and secondly, it is quite a vain hope that a supposedly "more seriously directed ecclesiastical regiment," which "exceptionally" puts a wolf in charge of a congregation, will leave it at this one exception. Old Jakob Heilbrunner answered the question whether a Lutheran superintendent could, by order of his superiors, introduce Calvinist pastors into the ministry of a congregation as follows: "Such a one would not entrust the sheep to shepherds, but to hirelings and wolves; indeed, he is worse than a hireling who flees when a wolf breaks into the sheepfold by letting the wolf in himself. Therefore, a superintendent must suffer death rather than knowingly grant admission to such a church servant." (*Opus Novum* qq. practico-theol. Francof. 1676. col. 483.) W.

The following important decisions of the German Reich Court in matrimonial matters were reported by the Allgemeine Kz. of February 19: A husband who repeatedly expresses to his wife, who has left him, his willingness to continue the marriage and invites her to return, but who in fact drives the returning wife morally out of his house again, as it were, by his inconsiderate, unwilling conduct, cannot, if the wife then leaves him for the duration, base on this his action for divorce on the ground of malicious desertion. (IV Civil Senate, judgment of June 25, 1885.) A prison sentence imposed on a spouse does not constitute grounds for divorce in Rhenish law, even if, in addition to the same sentence, a partial or permanent loss of civil rights is also imposed. (II Civil Senate, judgment of Oct. 6, 1885.)

Memorial Day. On February 28, 1686 Abraham Calov, General Superintendent and Professor in Wittenberg (born April 16, 1612) died. J. G. Neumann, who was his college teacher at Wittenberg for five years, wrote about him: "I have known the grey, highly deserving head for five years and often listened to him with amazement. The whole city still knows to speak of his unadulterated piety, how he, according to his habit, encouraged himself early in the morning at 3 o'clock, fell down on his feet before God and performed his prayer for over an hour. He was not possessed with avarice, and let no poor man of will go without help. He sought no honor in starting innovations in our religion, but this was his concern, that the precious supplement, which Luther had replaced for us from the Holy Scriptures, would be preserved unaltered and intact for later posterity." (Allg. Kz. of Feb. 26.)

"The Best of All Worlds." Under this title Dr. R. Löber, who calls himself "Evangelical Court Preacher" at Dresden, has written a book of 130 p. large 8. In a review of it in the "Theol. Literaturblatt" of March 5, it says, among other things: "Admittedly, when the author, e. g. or that even heaven can offer the angels 'nothing more magnificent' than the spectacle of Christians struggling through, then these are exaggerations, which in the reference to grace-filled cross-bearers, who 'would not like to be freed from their affliction at all', because then they would have God's mercy. Because then they no longer fear to feel God's mercy, they increase to an inhuman untruth.

The Liberal Teachers in Baden. The liberal and radical teachers of Baden have published a "Memorandum", based on the executive committee of the "General Baden Association of Elementary School Teachers", in which they have expressed themselves "in an exaggeratedly arrogant and challenging manner about the present local school supervision by the mayors and municipal councils, as well as the desire for the elimination of all local school supervision". This aroused bad blood in the liberal papers. In former times the teachers used to make such a fuss about the school supervision of the clergy. But it seems that the municipal councils, mayors, etc. are even more uncomfortable for them. They now do not want any school supervisors on the spot, a demand that is admittedly not new. (N. Ztbl.)

Liberal Jews. Dr. Münkel writes in his "N. Ztbl." of March 4: "Some time ago, in the association of respected and influential Jews in Dresden, the Dresden city councillor and advocate Dr. Lehmann gave a lecture on the "Jews once and now," in which he demanded that the Hebrew language and several religious forms be abandoned in the church service. The most remarkable thing, however, was that the Sabbath should be transferred to Sunday, the Jewish feasts to the Christian ones, and circumcision should be abolished. Sabbath and circumcision are the two fundamental demands of Judaism; whoever abandons them is no longer a Jew; according to the law of Moses he is to be cut off from his people. As many as live up to the demands, they must dissolve into our people. The lecture met with great applause in the assembly of the association, and the Talmud Jews will not lack to dislike it.

Denmark. The Bishop of Aalborg in Jutland has been authorized by Royal Resolution to absolve the members of the former Grundtvigian "elective parish" on the island of Mors and in the county of Thy. The Bishop of Aalborg in Jutland has been authorized by Royal Resolution to release the members of the former Grundtvigian "elective congregation" on the Island of Mors and in the County of Thy from the obligation to receive absolution before receiving Holy Communion, upon well-founded application, provided that the clergyman in question agrees to this; however, it remains the case that all Communion guests must hear a confessional before receiving the Sacrament, which concludes with a general promise of forgiveness of sins. The other bishops have also been granted a similar right of dispensation in possible cases. - It is difficult to disentangle what is to be understood by that "well-founded" request. W.

France. The French Senate is still dealing with primary education. During these negotiations, it was announced, among other things, that in a textbook published with the approval of the Paris city council, Lafontaine's verse: *pourvu que Dieu lui prete la vie* (the little fish will grow up if God lets him live), was changed to: *pourvu qu'on lui laisse la vie* (if "one" lets him live)!

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 32.

May 1886.

No. 5.

Recent defense of the Landeskirchentum against Free Churches.

(Conclusion.)

On p. 9, Lic. Dr. Buchwald continues as follows: "But do the Free Churchmen really have one doctrine on the basis of the Lutheran Confessions? 1) Yes, they say." Every reader will expect that the writer will now continue: "But this is by no means so! Even the Free Churches lack 'one doctrine.'" But far from it! Rather, the Lic. continues: "But let us see how they achieve such unity*)" According to this, he seems to concede unity of doctrine to the Free Churchmen after all, and that, as we shall soon see, on the basis of the Lutheran confessions, and to find only the way in which the same is attained reprehensible. By the interrogative form: "Have (they) then really?" he seems, therefore, quite unusually, to want to introduce not a negation, but an affirmation! By what immediately follows, however, the doctor seems to want to make the matter uncertain again. For before the writer criticizes the way of the Free Churchmen to establish and preserve unity, he says: "First of all, the Free Churchmen themselves must admit that there is enough strife among them." And this is quite rightly proved by the long doctrinal controversy in which the Missouri Synod has been involved with the Synod of Buffalo. But this controversy only proves that disagreement in doctrine can take place even between Free Churches. But who has ever denied this? To deny this would be simply ridiculous. Or who has ever asserted that a church, as soon as it becomes a free church, is thus at once also united among itself in doctrine? It is, after all, an equally undeniable fact that some free churches lack doctrinal unity not much less than the national churches.

1) Underlined by us.

In a bottom note of p. 9, B. casually remarks that we have called "the Reformed the unbelievers of Zwingli" and used to call the "opponent of the Free Church in general a 'pestilence, poisonous plant, Satan's deception and the like'". We must declare both untrue until B. proves that we or anyone in our fellowship has spoken or written in such a silly and unchristian manner. It is true, however, that the Reformed, when they reject doctrines which are found sunny and clear in God's Word, prove themselves unbelievers in this piece. (Mark 9:24.) But this does not deny to every Reformed man the saving faith, since at times, as has been said, even believing Christians show themselves unbelieving in certain points.-. If, furthermore, B., in the same note on the ground, calls it "somewhat strong" that we speak in a festive sermon of the "spirit of a religio-mennonical union," "which now blows through all Christendom like a pestilential air, and stifles and kills all love of pure truth at birth"-we cannot retract a word of it. Or is not the spirit of a religious union now really the prevailing one, and does the principle of this union, that a unification in truth is not necessary, indeed not possible at all, not kill the zeal for truth more than the most passionate defense of error, in which one thinks one must contend for truth? Experience teaches that a sincere fanatic, like Saul, is more likely finally to fall to the truth when he is convicted, than an indifferentist, like Pilate, who looks upon him for a fanatic who professes to have found the truth, and to whom he cries out with a scornful smile, "What is truth?"

On p. 10 B. writes further: "But how does the Free Church preserve its doctrinal unity in spite of such disputes? It proceeds thus: if a disputed question arises, it is dealt with and finally answered at the next synodal assembly." - Quite right! But how on earth is a synod to proceed when false doctrine arises in its midst, if this procedure is wrong? Shall it not "deal with" the false doctrine that has come to light at its next meeting? Or should it at least not "finally answer" the disputed question, but leave the matter undecided? What did, according to Act. 15, the first Christians at Antioch, when a "controversial question" arose among them, and such great dissension arose over it that even Paul was not able to restore unity? - They brought the question before the apostles and elders at Jerusalem. And what did they do? They set up a synod, "examined", that is, dealt with the question of dispute that had come to light with the whole of the church and finally decided it on the basis of the writings of the prophets, and in conjunction with the whole church they also finally put the final synodal decision in writing and handed it over to the deputies of the Antiochian churches.

Church. But what else do we free churchmen do? - B., however, probably to help his bottomless criticism, immediately adds: "The decision of the Synod is considered the pure teaching of the Word of God, just like a decree of a general council recognized by the Catholic Church or the 'ex cathedra' pronouncement of the infallible pope. Here, as there, he who refuses to accept the decree is excommunicated." On this we must explain the following: If we were not allowed to suppose that this representation was only the product of a vivid imagination, we could declare it to be nothing but an infamous simulation. But it is well known that there are people in whom the creative imagination is so strong that they, at least in the end, even believe in the reality of the creatures of it, especially when the wish that it be so is the father of the thought. What Mr. Licentiate says here about our Free Church is simply untrue. The principle which is valid and carried out in our Free Church is: The authentic judge in matters of faith and life is the triune God; the voice of this judge is the divine writings of the apostles and prophets; the church, however, in whatever form it may judge, is here only a servant, whose judgment has no power or validity flowing from any authority of its own; it is only a sub-judge, and that *iudex probans*, whose final judgment unites the consciences only so far as this sub-judge irrefutably clearly proves the same as God's final judgment from the holy Scriptures. The final judgment is not authoritative as well as logical. The church, therefore, in her so-called decrees with the apostles, elders, and brethren at Jerusalem, must first be able to say, "It pleaseth the Holy Ghost," before she may say, "And us" (Acts 15:28). If she cannot prefix the latter in her decrees, her "And us," namely, her decision, is null and void. In our Free Church every member is instructed not to submit to the decision of any pastor, congregation, presbytery, ministry, synodal presbyter, or synod in matters of conscience, unless the same prove that God has already so decided in his Word. Even as to the power of the church in matters of means, our Free Church heartily agrees with what Johann Gerhard, among others, writes: "The true church does not command means to be done or to be omitted for the sake of her commandment, but only for the sake of order and decency, that order may be kept and vexation avoided; so long, therefore, as this is not violated, she leaves the *gens* free, and neither makes them scruple, nor imposes a necessity upon them." *) In short, our Free Church does not make use of the Prin-

1) "Vera ecclesia res adiaphoras non jubet facere vel omittere propter

suum mandatum, sed tantum propter *τάξω καὶ ἐνσχέμισσιν* conservandam,

We believe, teach and confess that the only rule and guideline by which all teachings and teachers are to be judged and evaluated are the prophetic and apostolic scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as it is written: Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path,' Ps. 119:105. And St. Paul: 'If an angel come down from heaven, and preach otherwise, let him be accursed,' Gal. 1:8." (The Symbol. Bücher der ev.-luth. Kirche, herausg. von Müller. Epitome of the Concordienf. P. 517.) It is true that Dr. Buchwald wishes to justify the hideous picture which he has painted of our Free Church, from the proceedings of our Synod in the years 1856 and 1857*) with a chiliast, but the caricature which he draws, by picking out this and that tendentiously from it, is not worthy of consideration. Whoever wants to find out about our procedure should read the relevant synodal reports for himself and not rely on our opponents in the old fatherland.

After B. has sketched his distorted picture, he writes p. 11. "Now we only ask: is it in truth A doctrine that exists there, when one forcibly gets rid of those who teach otherwise?" To this we reply as follows. First, we cannot comprehend the logic that when one really forcibly gets rid of those who believe and teach differently, "in truth One Doctrine" does not exist. Secondly, it is not true that in our Free Church we forcibly get rid of those who believe and teach differently. Of course, we cannot speak of physical violence. B. therefore evidently ascribes to us a moral violence. But with what does he want to prove this? During a period of 1½ years, our synod, first the respective district synod and then the general synod, in public assembly as well as privately through committees appointed by it, refuted the error of the person in error from the relevant passages of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, until he could no longer raise anything against it. Even by the authority of the confessions, to which he was nevertheless bound, we did not seek to bind his conscience. For we know well that when a man has gone astray from a truth confessed by the church, his conscience cannot and ought not to be caught by the ecclesiastical confession, but must go back to God's word, to which alone conscience, as the voice of God, can and must submit. So then we ask: Is this practice a "forcible disowning of those who teach otherwise?"

ut ordo observetur et scandalum vitetur, quae, quamdiu non violantur, conscientias liberas relinquit, nec iis vel scrupulum injicit, vel necessitatem imponit." (Confess, cathol. L. II. art. 3. c. 7. fol. m. 627.)

1) B. moves the proceedings to 1875 and 1877.

single"? It will not be claimed by B. himself. The contentious apologist of the national churches has evidently here once more transformed into a historical account the conception which he has abstracted from his derived sources of our Free Church. It is in this sphere that he belongs when, as we have seen above, he asserts that "he who refuses to accept the (Synodal) decision is excommunicated"; for if B. takes excommunication in the common sense of banishment, this too is quite untrue. Our Synod has never ascribed to itself the power of excommunication, but has left the same, as well as the power of deposition, to the parishes to which it belongs. If, however, our apologist understands excommunication to mean exclusion from the synod, it is certainly true that our synod excludes from the synodal fellowship those who are taken in by fundamental errors and are not at all wise, because in this case it can no longer work together with them in the work of the Lord. But this has nothing to do with the ban, into which only stiff-necked unchristians can and should be put. With this abolition of church fellowship, however, we are in complete agreement with our dear Evangelical Lutheran Church, which testifies in the Formula of Concord: "We also believe, teach, and confess that no church shall condemn the other, that one has less or more external ceremonies, not commanded by God, than the other, when otherwise in doctrine and all the articles thereof, as well as in the use of the holy sacraments, unity is held with one another." (A. a. O. p. 553. § 7.) If the national church, as whose apologist B. has appeared, rejects this principle, it is high time that it should throw off the name "Lutheran." -

Now, p. 11. of our pamphlet goes on to say, "The theology of the Free Church is merely 'backward theology,' 1) and this is its error; by this it will fall." The former we wholeheartedly accept; but the latter we deny; we rather regard the same, instead of being its error, as its merit, and, instead of being an omen of its decline, as the only guarantee of its continuance. The theology of our Free Church goes daily backward to Moses, the prophets, and the apostles, it is true; but it is in this backwardness that it seeks its forward. Our theology is not a new one, but the old one, whose leaves, however, never wither, for it is planted on the right water-trees; it is therefore also not, as B. fantasizes, a dead "scholasticism" which deals with idle questions, but a theology which deals with pure questions of life, and which therefore also, by God's grace, has already been able to answer many a question.

1) Underlined by us.

has brought forth fruit. We do not want a new theology any more than we want a new church and religion. Nor do we rest idly on the old truth as a dead, inherited capital, but work diligently to make it new to us and ever more living in us, to penetrate it ever more deeply, to experience it ever more powerfully, and to utilize it ever more fully for the edification of the church on the foundation that has been laid, which is Jesus Christ. Modern theology, to be sure, calls its forward progress a further development; but this is pure deception. For it does not really develop the truth that is already there, by taking it up again, but it takes it away. The result of this "further development" of modern-believing theology has hitherto been that it has in part entirely done away with a great number of old truths, in part made them waver, but has not brought to light a new alleged truth which a Christian can accept and die upon with assurance and joy of faith. We are not ashamed, therefore, to confess what Luther once confessed to the papists: "We invent nothing new, but hold and abide by the old word of God, as the old church had it. . . For they find nothing with us but only the old of the old church." (Against Hans Wurst, of the J. 1541. XVII, 1659.)

But let us go further.1) Father Willkomm had written in his "open missive": "Secondly, we want Holy Communion to be administered in the Lutheran Church only to those who, as far as can be seen by conscientious examination, possess a sufficient knowledge of pure doctrine and profess the same, and who are also determined to lead a Christian way of life with God's help - in a word, we want communion discipline according to the old practice of the Lutheran Church. Now what does the Herr Doctor philosophiae answer to this? First, on p. 12, he again makes use of the popular fallacia ignorati elenchi and compositionis. Instead of dealing solely with the necessity of the so-called report of confession and the exploration connected with it, of which P. W. alone had spoken, he speaks against "confession-".

1) Yesterday we received, to our delight, a 36-page booklet in large octavo with the following title: "The Good Law of the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church, its Doctrinal Position and Ecclesiastical Practice, Against the Unjust Accusations of Die. Dr. Buchwald defended by O. Willkomm, P. Zwickau, printed and published by Johannes Herrmann. In commission with Heinrich J. Naumann in Dresden. 1886." This little paper makes our whole article superfluous, but since Die. Dr. Buchwald has attacked not only our confessors and comrades in arms in Germany, but expressly at the same time our local Free Church, it should be neither unseemly nor useless if we take part in the defense of our common cause with a few words. We say, with few words, because we can be all the shorter in the following, the more victoriously Father Willkomm has already repulsed the attacks on us contained in Buchwald's pamphlet.

and the "questioning of the confessor about individual sins" and their "narration"; of all of which W. had not said a word. To properly represent the adversary is the first requisite of honest polemics. He who, in the manner of our Iowa men, first imputes allegations to his opponent and then takes up arms against his figure, and is satisfied if readers who are incapable of judgment allow themselves to be misled by it, or if party comrades turn a blind eye to it, and celebrate him as the victor, is not with God, and is neither in the service of truth, nor in the service of love and justice.

B. continues on p. 12 f.: "If, by the way, Father Willkomm considers his 'discipline of the Lord's Supper' to be 'Lutheran', he must be in error. We refer him only to Köstlin, *Luthers Theologie*. Vol. II, p. 529, where also the passages are precisely given. There Luther's teaching is stated by the man who among our contemporaries certainly knows it best: It is enough that one confesses himself guilty of being a sinner and recounts the individual sins for which he is in special need of consolation. Of such as already know rightly what sin is, as of pastors, of a Melancthon, etc., the enumeration of sins is not to be required. - What Luther said as early as 1518 applies: 'It must be enough for the priest that I ask for confession and absolution without his having to be certain of my repentance and my faith...) - even that before Communion.'" - To this we first remark the following: It is quite wrong that our pamphleteer, instead of letting Luther himself speak about how he teaches on this point, lets another, namely Köstlin, lecture. B. assures us, to be sure, that in Köstlin's work the proofs are exactly given; but what good is that to him who does not have the work? Now we do not want to assert that Köstlin did not really substantiate his exposition of Luther's teaching on the present question with passages from Luther's writings; but how little one can as a rule rely on it when the present German theologians cite Luther, is shown, among other things, by their citations in proof that Luther had a very lax doctrine of inspiration). In any case, a Lutheran in our Free Church demands that he not be expected to rely on men in such highly important matters, whether his name is Köstlin or Buchwald. Secondly, we remark on B.'s quotation from K.: It is also wrong that B. has omitted the words with which the quoted passage begins and which form the key to what follows, namely to the sentence underlined by B. himself! namely, the words: "But never ever shall the

1) Underlined by B. himself.

2) Cf. p. 7. ff. of the present volume of "Lehre und Wehre".

old torture with the enumeration of all individual sins re-enter. It is enough," etc. Thus, Köstlin does not want to prove with the following what B. wants to prove with it, namely, that Luther declares an exploration in the evangelical manner to be an unnecessary thing, but that he did not want to see the "old torture with the enumeration of all individual sins" reintroduced. How wrongly, therefore, B. understood Luther's words, emphasized by him, "it must be enough for the priest," which, to be sure, are a true gospel in B.'s mind for uncertainly liable administrators of Holy Communion in the national churches, - this becomes even clearer when Luther's words, wisely, are considered in their context. They occur in his "Sermon on the Sacrament of Penance" of 1518. (Erl. Ausg. Vol. 20. p. 179. ff.) The words immediately preceding the quoted ones, however, read as follows: "Twelfth, there are some who have taught us that one should and must be uncertain of absolution, whether we have been received into grace and our sins forgiven, because we do not know whether repentance is sufficient or whether enough has been done for the sin; because of ignorance even the priest may not impose penance worthy of the same. - Beware of these "seductive" unchristian chatters. The priest must be uncertain of your repentance and faith; there is nothing in it. It is enough for him that you confess and desire absolution; he shall give it to you, and owes it to you." (A. a. O. p. 185. f.) Every one sees that this passage is first of all directed against those papists who teach that absolution is a true absolution only when the one coming to confession has sufficient contrition for the sin; But neither the confessor nor the penitent can be sure of this, and the latter therefore cannot know whether the penances which he imposes in order to obtain forgiveness of sin are "worthy of the same degree," or whether the guilt is really preponderant; therefore one should and must always be uncertain whether one is really absolved. In contrast to this atrocious error, Luther now says that the validity and force of absolution is based neither on this certainty of the confessor nor on that of the penitent. Therefore, if, as far as the priest is concerned, he is still uncertain (as it is not at all possible for him to be otherwise than uncertain, since he cannot see into the heart), it must be enough for him if the confessant desires only this twofold thing: first, that the priest hear his confession as of a poor, unworthy, lost, and condemned sinner, and secondly, that he hereupon pronounce forgiveness of all his sins in Christ's stead. According to this, it is clear that, as far as the salvation and relative necessity of confession and exploration is concerned, there is nothing at all in that passage of Luther's, neither anything for it nor anything there.

against, is stated. At any rate, there is not a drop of consolation in this for the dissolute practice prevailing in the national churches. For the task of exploration is not to inquire into the secret sins of the confessor, to test the perfection of his repentance, or even to impose penances upon him, but to test him as to whether he wants to go to Holy Communion only out of habit or for the sake of the people, without knowledge of his sins and without a faithful desire for forgiveness, and, if so, to help him to obtain what he lacks, and to receive Holy Communion worthily, not for his own condemnation.

Nor does the fact that Luther does not want to know of any compulsion to confess, but leaves confession "to the need", give the least comfort to a preacher who shuns the effort of exploration. For in rejecting the compulsion to confess, Luther does not mean to approve of a man's despising confession and running to the delicate Lord's Supper as to a common meal; on the contrary, Luther is above all against the compulsion to confess, so that people do not, as, for example, in the papacy at Easter, partake of the Holy Supper in judgment out of mere compulsion without recognition of their sin and without hunger and thirst for grace. Therefore, Köstlin also quotes the following passage, among others, from Luther's writing "On Confession, Whether the Pope Has the Power to Command," from 1521, as the last of his words against the compulsion to confess, cited by B.: "Behold, so you do, nonsensical, raging Pope, even with your sects, you worst enemies of God. Secret confession is an open treasure of grace, in which God keeps and offers his mercy and forgiveness of all sin, and is a blessed, rich promise of God, which no one compels nor forces, but entices and calls everyone. So thou plumpest along with thine iniquity, and compelest all the world to such goods, and knowest and seest that they are not yet desirous of them, neither takest they, nor keepest they. What do you do here but think God is a fool who spills his goods for the sake of your compulsion? you bring him many heaps to give to, and there is no one who desires his. O what an abuse of the noble and precious goods thou dost, thou wretched priest, that I may say that there is no more sinful and damning day in the year than Easter Day; and if the whole year were a carnival, and there were dancing and drinking every day, there would not be so many and so great sins as there are now in the most holy time of fasting, and before that in the weeks of martyrdom and Easter feasts. . . For all who are unwilling to confess and go to the sacrament, and do not desire from the heart, it would be better for them to fall into grave public sin." (Erl. A. 27, 354.) Did our apologist of his national church, when he quoted Köstlin, not himself read this passage faithfully cited by the latter?!

Otherwise we must fear that he understood neither Köstlin nor Luther correctly.

Incidentally, the licentiate himself seems to have felt that his interpretation of Luther's words is diametrically opposed to almost innumerable statements by him on the subject in question. In a note on the ground, he writes: "That Luther, under other circumstances, also expressed himself differently about private confession, we know quite well. But this proves precisely that his changing private opinion 1) cannot be made the norm of a church." This evasion, however, which reviles Luther as a wind vane, is barred to the Lord, for from what has been communicated it is plain to see how even Luther's many most decided demands, that a conscientious pastor should admit to Holy Communion only those who have been previously explored (with the exception, of course, of those who have long since been explored for all time, such as Master Philip and others), are in harmony with what is said in the Bible. A.), are in fullest harmony with what Köstlin lets Luthern say in accordance with the truth, both as regards exploration and the obligation to confess. We are permitted to present only the following two passages from Luther's writings.

Thus Luther wrote in his revised "Instruction of the Visitators to the Parish Priests" of 1528: "The papal confession is not commanded, namely, to tell all sins; which is also impossible, as in the 19th Ps. (v. 13.) it is written: 'Who can know how often he feilet? Forgive me the hidden files.' But people should be admonished to confess for many reasons, especially those cases in which they need counsel and which grieve them the most. Neither shall any man go to the holy sacrament, unless he be specially questioned by his pastor, whether he be sent to go to the holy sacrament. For St. Paul says in 1 Cor. 11, (v. 27.) that those are guilty of the body and blood of Christ who take it unworthily. Nu dishonour the sacrament not only they that take it unworthily, but also they that with diligence give it to unworthy. For the common wretch runs to the sacrament for the sake of custom, and knows not why the sacrament should be used. He therefore that knoweth not these things ought not to be admitted to the sacrament." (Erl. A. vol. 23, 40.) Cf. also the magnificent passage in Luther's "Formula missae et communionis pro ecclesia Wittenbergensi," 1523. S. Lutheri opp. lat. varii argumenti. Francof. ad M. 1873. vol. VII, 12-14. German in Walch X, 2764-2766.)

If we now add the following passage from Luther's "Warning to those at Frankfurt am Main" from 1533, we must

1) Underlined by B.

We may well ask the tender ears of German readers to forgive it beforehand; but it is too characteristic, so we cannot well suppress it here. After Luther has praised our freedom from papist auricular confession and exhorted us to right evangelical confession, he continues: "It is true that where preachers offer vain bread and wine for the sacrament, it does not matter much to whom they offer it or what those who receive it are able and believe. There one sow eats with another, and they are cheaply overtaken with such trouble; for they want to have desolate mad saints, and also think not to educate Christians, but want to make it so that for three years everything is disturbed, neither God, nor Christ, nor sacrament, nor Christians remain any more. But because we intend to educate Christians and to leave them behind us, and to administer the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament, we do not want to and cannot give such a sacrament to anyone, so that he may first be interrogated as to what he has learned from the catechism and whether he wants to refrain from sins that he has committed against it. For we do not want to make of Christ's church a stable of swine, and let every one run unheard to the sacrament, as swine to the trough. Such churches we charge to the enthusiasts." (Erl. A. Vol. 26, 307. Walch XVII, 2449. f.)

B. continues, p. 13: "Luther's practice is also in harmony with this, as he describes it in the 'Kurze Vermahnung zu der Beicht' (Symbol. BB., edited by Müller, p. 843, 32.): 'When I exhort to confession, I do nothing else than that I exhort everyone to be a Christian.) If I bring thee thither, I have well brought thee to confession, etc.'" What this is supposed to prove in favor of the notoriously dissolute practice of the Lord's Supper in the national church is difficult to fast. But a the clearer proof lies in those words of Luther in favor of our free church practice; for the words of Luther, spoken on the occasion of the personal registration, the 25th Art. of the Augsb. Conf. and the 15th of the Apology of the same 2) has the very purpose of testing the people whether they come as Christians to the table of the Lord, and, if this is not yet the case, to make them such Christians. But this is lacking in the national church, with few exceptions; whether because the preachers believe that all their people are already

1) Underlined by B.

2) "Confession has not been dispensed with by the preachers of this part. For this custom is held among us, not to administer the sacrament to those who are not first interrogated and absolved, *non-nisi antea exploratis et absolutis.*" (P. 53. § 1.) "*Apud nos utuntur coena Domini multi singulis Dominicis, sed prius instituti, explorati et absoluti.* But with us the people of the

(p. 212, § 40) Cf. p. 248, § 1, § 259, § 49. "The Lord's Prayer, the Lord's Prayer, the faith, and the ten commandments, which are first interrogated on Sundays, whether they know or understand anything. (P. 212. § 40.) Cf. p. 248. § 1. 259. § 49.

Whether they are good Christians, or out of fear of man and laziness, let the gentlemen themselves say. Therefore, may Mr. Deacon B. take to heart what Luther writes shortly before the words he cites: "But if you despise it and go so proudly unconfessed, we conclude the verdict that you are not a Christian and should not enjoy the sacrament (*nec te ad usum sacramenti admittemus*).\" (A. a. O. p. 843. § 29.)

On p. 13 of the pamphlet we read further: "But that we withhold a notoriously impenitent sinner from the Lord's Supper is also done at the risk that, "if not legal action, then endless writing in the newspapers and an interpellation in the Diet would be the consequence. This sounds almost as if this were really done in the national church, while notoriously this is not even the case. Therefore, as a precaution against being taken at his word, B. immediately adds: "That we are perhaps (!) somewhat more far-sighted 1) in this than the Free Church" (should mean: have a broader conscience), "has its good reason in that we, mindful of Matt. 7:3: 'Why do you see the mote in your brother's eye and are not aware of the beam in your own eye?' do not feel called to be judges of our neighbors. But here we also stand fully on the "faith ground* of the symbolical books. "God is the Judge*", says the Apology (M. 185. § 6-8.), who commanded the Apostles, not to judge, but to execute grace, to absolve those who desire it, and they also absolve and absolve from sins which do not occur to us." - What an exegesis of the Bible and what an interpretation of the Church's confession! With what on earth does the Lic. intend to prove that the official judgment of a preacher on manifest sins is splinter judging? Indeed, a splendid way to be completely relieved of the fatal office of punishment! Has not our pamphleteer read what Luther writes in his church postilion on Matt. 7:3? Has he not read: "Those who have the office of judging and condemning do not do wrong when they do it. ... Therefore it does not rhyme at all that one wants to stretch this text as if the Lord should speak of those who have the command to punish injustice, as there are preachers," etc. (Erl. Bd. 13, 81.) Just as fundamentally wrong is also the reference to that symbolic passage (p. 185, § 5-8.). Does he not know that it is directed against the doctrine of the papists, that the confessors must recount all sins with all circumstances, so that the priest, whom God has here appointed judge, may prescribe the satisfactions necessary for the expiation of the sins, according to the quantity, magnitude, and gravity of the same? The

1) Underlined by B. himself.

The doctor could have seen this from the context in which his quotation stands, if he had paid attention to it. For the whole passage in question begins with the following words: "But of the telling of sins 1) we have said above in our confession that we hold that it is not commanded by God. For the fact that they say that a judge must first hear the things and infirmities before he pronounces sentence, so that the sins must first be told, etc., does not matter. For absolution is badly the command to absolve, and is not a new judgment to inquire into sin. For God is the judge," etc. (See above!) Nothing, therefore, can be more foolish than to try to bring this passage against the pastoral exploration that precedes admission to Holy Communion, since in this the pastor neither demands a recounting of sins nor inquires into secret sins himself, nor decides in any judicial way to what degree of performance the granting and power of absolution is to be tied, according to the findings. Exploration, in regard to the person explored, is nothing but a service of love, which a pastor does for his confessor, so that the latter may be able to comply with the apostle's admonition: "Try yourselves whether you are in the faith, examine yourselves. Or do you not know yourselves that Jesus Christ is in you? Unless ye be unfit." 2 Cor. 13, 5. But in regard to the explorer it is a duty of love, without the fulfillment of which he makes himself liable to the dreadful sin of the unworthy communion of the souls entrusted to him. (1 Tim. 5, 22.)

B. finally concludes the present section on p. 13 f. with the following words: "But the question is well permitted: Does a deception of the pastor never occur in the Free Church, or does he feel able to look into the hearts? 2) When are we at all 'worthy' to enjoy the Lord's Supper? Is not he who in his innermost heart considers himself 'unworthy' much, much more worthy than many who in Pharisaic pride profess to be rightly prepared, to be 'worthy'? Luther is also right here when he says ('Kurze Vermahnung zu der Beicht' in the Symb. BB. edited by Müller, p. 842, § 21.): 'He who also goes to his work, how purely he has done his confession, he only remains of it.'" We remark on this: Both what is written here at the beginning with blocked writing, and what is written hereafter with ordinary writing, proves that the author makes silly enemies for himself, in order to then gloriously overcome them under the applause of his readers who are incapable of judgment or belong to his party. A preacher of the free

- 1) These words are underlined in Müller's Book of Concord itself.
- 2) Underlined by B. himself.

The Holy Catholic Church knows quite well that even with the greatest faithfulness in exploring, he cannot prevent some of his explorers from enjoying Holy Communion in an unworthy manner; but he wants to prevent that at least, as Luther writes (see above p. 138), his "indolence" is not to blame. Which is well to be noted! Finally, however, as regards those who hypocritically think themselves worthy guests, the very purpose of right exploration is not to promote this, but, if possible, to prevent it by God's word and grace. To want to prevent this by letting people run about uninstructed, untested, and unwarned, - that "we leave to", to speak with Luther, "the enthusiasts"! (See above, p. 139.)

In the place of a Corollary, B. p. 14, at the end of the second main section of his Apology of the Church's Condition, he poses the following question in blocked script: "Can I therefore not be sure of the forgiveness of my sins in the Lord's Supper, because an unworthy person also enjoys the Lord's Supper? Must I, because unworthy enjoyment can and does occur, turn my back on my church, which has received me and brought me up to this day?" One sees from this that the Herr Doctor philosophiae sticks to his once popular tactic: he changes the status controversiae. For he knows quite well that no truly Lutheran Free Churchman answers his question in the affirmative, and yet he poses as if, as a faithful guardian of his Zion, he must take the Free Churchmen into his protection the negation of his question. Probably he knew no other way to save his glorious national church; and that, after all, was the "good purpose" of his little writing! -

In the last section B. now defends on pp. 14-16 the fusion of church and state accomplished in his national church. Here we encounter a piece of theological darkness that we otherwise find only in Richard Ruthe and the Prussian Union theologians. There is no room here to show his theory of the relationship of the church to the state in all its nakedness. Nor is it necessary. First of all, Father Willkomm has expressly declared that if the demand for doctrinal and communion discipline had been met in the national church, which is interwoven with the state, no separation would have taken place on account of the constitution, although they, the Free Church members, would prefer the Free Church constitution. The question whether it would be better and more in keeping with the word of God and our ecclesiastical confession for church and state to be separated from one another as far as the government of both is concerned, is also, on the other hand, not of such a nature that one said yes only over there and no only over there, in that all preachers of the national church who are even somewhat distressed about Joseph's damage sigh about the yoke of the state. April expressly says that, although Buchwald's writing "in the

1) answer", "one could perhaps not agree with individual passages in Scripture, e.g. on the relationship between the state and the church". Finally, we have already dealt with the question referred to in detail on other occasions, partly in our publications and partly at our synodal assemblies, so that we may refer our readers to them. We would like to briefly address only two points.

First, B. writes on p. 16: "To make such a constitutional question a condition for the attainment of 'salvation 2) is quite un-Protestant." Evidently B. means to say that this is done by the Free Churchmen. What shall we say to this? We are silent on it; for if we spoke, we would have to offend. And yet even the editor of the "Sächsisches Kirchen- und Schulblatt" (Saxon Church and School Gazette) confesses to it! God forgive him this great sin.

On the other hand, B. writes there: "No one has ever been separated from his headship, Jesus Christ, by the union of state and church, 3) and this would be and remain the only conceivable reason for separation. - How? by the union of church and state no one has ever been deprived of soul and salvation? - We say rather: uncounted thousands! (We are not speaking here, of course, of that union in abstracto, but in concreto.) Who has appointed the educators of false prophets in the universities? Who has given wolves to shepherd the churches? Who has given up the seminaries of school teachers to the disciples of the Rouffeaues, Dinters, Diesterwegs, &c.? Who has given over the planting gardens of the church, the Christian parochial schools, to hollow, conceited, rationalistic schoolmasters? Who has taken the old good agendas, hymnals, and catechisms from the preachers and congregations by brute force, and forced upon them in their place the most wretched works, bristling with the poison of false doctrine? Who, above all, has hindered doctrinal and vital discipline in the church? Who has persecuted the pure teachers and appointed false prophets in their place? Who has destroyed entire Lutheran regional churches and transformed them into unionist, irreligious, and unbelieving communities through expulsions, fines, imprisonment, and corporal punishment? Have not these been your regional bishops and their creatures, the royal, ducal, princely consistories and superintendents? Who therefore may count the souls which

1) Buchwald's opus is certainly quick-witted, but it is a pity that it always misses the mark, hits only an enemy of its own making, and leaves its own opponent unharmed, or turns against God's word and the confession itself.

2) Underlined by B. himself.

3) Underlined by us.

have fallen victim to the constitution of the state, or, as one prefers to speak euphemistically, of the regional church, and have been torn to hell by it? Who has imposed upon you, you faithful Saxons, your ungodly unbelieving fellow-officials and schoolmasters, over whom you sigh, with iron constraint? Is it not your royal consistory? And for this constitution do you stand?! -

Now just one more thing! At the end, B. quotes some passages from our jubilee sermon of 1872 and from our synodal speech of 1878, in which we seriously complain that "a sad decline can be felt among some formerly zealous members, especially of our older congregations". From this, B., in an almost unbelievable blindness, concludes, among other things: "It is not beautiful fruits that doctrinal discipline, communion discipline and separation from state and church have borne," and the editor of the "Sächs. Kirchen- und Schulblatt" (Pastor Schenkel in Cainsdorf) agrees with him! Yes, B. remarks: "Is it with worse or better? It remains to be seen!" To be sure, we do not retract any of the complaints we have raised, and we recognize from the bottom of our hearts that we have great cause to humble ourselves to the dust before God because of this; but when the gentlemen mentioned leave it undecided because of this whether things are worse or better in their regional church congregations, then this reveals a truly astonishing insight into their conditions, or rather damages and infirmities. It is only good that B. should respond to the charge of Fr. Willkomm's charge that their national church is a Babel. When even an old Saxon preacher who emigrated in 1838 for the sake of religion, who stayed in Germany again for a longer time in the years 1850 and 1860 and made his observations there, who also knows the German theological and folk literature quite well, also took care of the religious, moral and ecclesiastical conditions in Germany out of a love for the fatherland that had not yet been extinguished, moral and ecclesiastical conditions, we would otherwise draw a picture of the Babels beyond, which would drive away the gentlemen's desire to tickle themselves over our infirmities, which we have punished not according to a police but a spiritual standard.

Summa: Hrn. Buchwald's writing is indeed a splendid lullaby and sleeping powder for the consciences that have awakened over there, which he has prepared as guardians of his Zion, but as an apologia of his national church it is so well-designed that everyone immediately sees that he, as easily as he may be able to read old manuscripts and as learned as he may otherwise be (both of which we are not inclined to belittle along with the merits belonging to him), has here entered a field in which he is obviously a stranger. Finally, we must say: Whoever wants to learn about the plight of the Saxon state church should read his defense of it. W.

The doctrine of inspiration among Baptists.

The Baptist Quarterly Review brings seven shorter articles by seven "representative Baptists" on the doctrine of inspiration, and the editor remarks that the views expressed in those articles indicate the state of the Baptist community in the doctrine of inspiration. Those articles are prompted by a publication of a certain Professor Fox in a former number of the "Baptist Quarterly Review." Fox is on the extreme left, speaking lightly of the sacred Scriptures, and scoffing at "The plenary inspiration of the Bible." If the remark of the editor of the "Review" that those seven articles reflect the view of the Baptist communion is correct, three-sevenths of Baptists hold the sacred Scriptures to be the word of God, while three-sevenths deny it, and one-seventh hold the Scriptures to be an infallible record of God's revelation to man.

We do not give the point of view of the three writers who do not consider the Scriptures to be the Word of God. They generally walk in the ways of the newer German theology. They say that no actual definition of inspiration can be given, that degrees of inspiration are to be assumed, that Scripture is not to be regarded as consisting "of infallible and inerrant documents which are absolute truth or express absolute truth," but as an account of truth, as "revealed truth in the process of communication" through human media, that the Bible, though it might be called God's Word, must necessarily have its weak places because of the frail human instruments through which revelation passed, but that Scripture "as a whole" offered the means of weeding out what was erroneous. Three of the writers, on the other hand, defend with great earnestness and in part happily the truth that the Scriptures are in the proper sense God's Word. We have included some of their statements here, on the assumption that it will interest our readers to learn something of how individual Baptists are trying to defend themselves against the unbelief that is overwhelmingly taking hold among them. In the following, we will compile the main points from the three articles, and therefore also omit the introduction by speech marks.

Professor Norman Fox's article has, says one writer, excited many readers. It is a fundamental article of our faith, that the sacred Scriptures are the supreme authority in matters of religion. But if there be no infallible inspiration of Scripture, if the sacred writers err in the conception and exposition of truth

If the teachings of Scripture have to be corrected by conscience or common sense, then the old foundations have given way and the final standard of decision is lost. Then the Bible is no longer the highest authority, but human reason. The long struggle between the rationalists and the believers is then over, and the rationalists have won the victory.

The New Testament acknowledges the infallible inspiration of the Old Testament. There is no passage in the New Testament from which to squeeze out a proof of Mr. Fox's conceit that the Bible "is not God's word, but contains only God's word." The Saviour refers to the Old Testament as containing "God's commandments," and he severely rebukes the scribes for substituting "commandments of men" for the Word of God. So complete and absolute is the Old Testament God's Word that not one iota or tittle (the Greek term is much more significant than the English translation) can fall from it. All questions are irrevocably settled by the words, "It is written." The authority of the Saviour directly and unmistakably advocates the infallible inspiration of the Old Testament. The choice of the patriarchs and prophets as the mediums through which God speaks involves neither an indeterminacy nor an imperfection of the message. It remains always and only the Word of God. The testimony of the apostles is equally definite. They refer to the Old Testament as an absolute authority. What they cite from the Old Testament, they cite as spoken by holy men who were impelled by the Holy Spirit. There is no doubt about the Old Testament in the New Testament. The New Testament endorses in spirit and letter the holiness of the Old: "Ye shall not do any thing that I command you, neither shall ye do any thing of it" (Deut. 4:2).

As for the New Testament, the Lord promised the apostles the Holy Spirit, who would guide them into all truth, and commanded them to remain at Jerusalem until they had received the new light and the new power. The promise was fulfilled at Pentecost, and from that time on they were entirely new people. They were no longer groping in the dark as if they were first seeking the truth. There was no vagueness about their doctrine. St. Paul, who was not included in the promise given to the apostles, testifies himself that he received his knowledge through direct revelation from heaven and that he did not speak the truth he was told in words of his own choosing, but in words given by the Holy Spirit (Gal. 1, 12; 1 Cor. 2, 13), and he praised the Thessalonians that they did not consider his sermon to be the word of men, but (as it truly was) the word of the Holy Spirit.

was) as God's word. The authority of the apostolic teaching was absolute. They were secured against error in teaching by the promise that the Holy Spirit would guide them into all truth. And they believed this promise. When they were absent from the churches which they had formed, they wrote letters to them, according to which the churches were to keep themselves in doctrine and life. They suppressed all divisions and heresies with authoritative force. There was no doubt in their minds that not every apostolic word and every apostolic act was under the control of the Holy Spirit. Likewise, there was no doubt in the minds of the churches that apostolic authority should not be decisive. Resistance to apostolic authority was considered rebellion against God. The book of Acts gives decisive testimony that both the apostles and the churches believed infallible inspiration. Apparent exceptions, as in the case where Paul punished Peter for ambiguous behavior, fall into the area of moral infirmities, from which inspired men were not exempt, neither in the old nor in the new covenant.

As for Paul opposing Peter to his face at Antioch, there was no disagreement over doctrine or principle. Peter had already, at the meeting at Jerusalem, publicly and formally assented to all that Paul brought to bear. But in the practice of his intercourse with the converted Gentiles he was not altogether firm and consistent. And this circumstance presents no other and greater difficulty than the generally acknowledged fact that the inspired men were not sinless. No one asserts that they were without sin, and they themselves give this to be understood again and again. It is therefore as unseemly to introduce such incidents against the perfect inspiration of our apostolic writings, as it would be unseemly to conclude: Elijah did not act and speak in God's name on Mount Carmel (1 Kings 18.), because he afterwards became weak in life (1 Kings 19.); or, Jonah's message to Nineveh had not full divine authority, because he became fugitive from the direction of it, and afterwards sulked. Balaam was a wicked man, but a good prophet. - The divisiveness between Paul and Barnabas was not over a question of doctrine, duty, or church government. It was over whether it was expedient to take Marcus with them on a second missionary journey, when he had left them on the first.

Mr. Fox claims that the apostles never intended their writings to be the norm of faith for centuries to come. He says: "If the apostles had possessed telephones to communicate with the distant churches, we would not have a New Testament now.

have. They wrote only for their contemporaries. They wrote to remove local difficulties in local communities. Therefore, he says, it is unhistorical and wrong to suppose that their writings were intended for future times. Huxley's argument against the miracles of the Gospels, borrowed from the immutable order of nature, does not more completely ignore God the World-Governor than this argument of Mr. Fox. First, are human plans and actions the only factors in events? Did Balaam intend to bless Israel when he sacrificed on the altars of Moab? Did Caiaphas intend to prophesy that Christ would die for the people? It was not the apostles who laid the plans to set down in the New Testament the standard for later times. It was the Lord of heaven and earth, whose thoughts dominate the ages, who made the Jewish people the treasury of truth in the ancient world, who foretold the future of the Messiah through a long succession of prophets, though they did not understand the full meaning of their message, and who now also used the apostles as his instruments to build up a spiritual kingdom and to hand down the laws of that kingdom for centuries to come. It is of little importance to know whether the apostles were consciously writing for other generations than their own. But neither must we hastily conclude that the apostles did not have a clear understanding that their writings were to transmit God's revelation to the ages to come. They knew the special significance of the apostolic office; they knew that the full and final revelation of God's grace in Christ was entrusted to them, that through them it might be made known to all the children of men in all ages to come. And think what a kind of book that would have to be, answering in advance every question of every man of every future century! By faithful use of the Bible as it is, every man, every community, and every age can obtain adequate instruction.

It is also said that we do not necessarily need the infallible authority of the apostolic writings. We can, they say, distinguish between divine truth and human error "by examining whether an act or saying agrees with the teachings of the other apostles or with the teachings of a particular apostle on other occasions; we can also examine whether a saying is in harmony with the teachings of the Old Testament prophets, and with the still older revelation of God found in the human conscience and common sense. In other words, in order to know what is divine truth, we must know what men believe it to be. What in Scripture does not agree with human conscience and common sense, we throw overboard. However, let no one rely on his own conscience, but on the common human conscience.

I do not trust in the (Christian) conscience. This looks like a swamp that always gives way under our feet and has no bottom.

One seems to want to reply here that there is no infallibility in the copying and transmission of the original text. Thus we would be in the mire again, even if it were admitted that the original apostolic writings were the infallible word of God. Now, the difference is precisely that which exists between a ground of mud, where there is nothing but mud, and a ground of solid rock, where there is nothing but rock, but where a little dust is found on the surface. (Reference is made here to the different readings in the New Testament due to the oversights of the copyists). Most of us will prefer to build on rock foundations in things on which an eternity hangs, and we shall be more sure in this way that when a downpour falls, and the waters come, and the winds blow, and strike our house, the latter will not fall. We cannot put our New Testament under the Old Testament, and so we hold in regard to the former as Christ and the apostles held of the latter: if we cite it, we may promiscuously call God or the writer, and if we say, "Thus it is written," we have set ourselves on firm ground, and we may stand fast.

I say therefore with Peter, "We have a sure word of prophecy, and ye do well to hearken unto it, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place." In the writings of the apostles, which were inspired by the Holy Spirit, who guided them into all truth, we have an undoubted guiding star "for doctrine, for correction, for chastening in righteousness."

Such are the remarks of the writers in the "Review." It is not to be expected, however, that the controversy over the doctrine of inspiration will in any way be settled among Baptists. The editor of the Review, who is evidently one of those who do not believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God, makes it quite clear that he does not feel comfortable discussing "dogmatic" subjects. He suggests as topics "that urgently require treatment": "The right observance of Sunday and how it can be achieved," "The suppression of trade in spirits," etc. On these topics Dr. Butler, of Memorial Church, Washington, will be pleased. F. P.,

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

From the Norwegian Synod. In the "Kirketidende" it was pointed out by Mr. D. Koren that Schmidt's teaching finally leads a man to the following confession: "I build the hope of my blessedness on the fact that I have allowed myself to be led into the order of salvation, and that my conduct in this respect has been such as it should be." In reference to this it is now said in Prof. Schmidt's paper, "Luth. Vidn." P. 117: "This confession, which both the writers of the holy Scriptures and multitudes of Christians have made, he (D. Koren) paints off as an abominable thing." So says Father Muus, and Prof. Schmidt has nothing to say about it.

Singing in the English Sectarian Churches. In a recent sermon, the well-known preacher Talmage castigated the bad practice in English churches in this country of having a choir take care of the singing in the services of the congregation. Talmage spoke of a "choir craze" and described the situation thus: "You know as well as I do that there are a great number of churches throughout this country in which the congregation is not expected to sing. All the singing is done by a delegation of four, six, or ten, and the audience is silent. In one such congregation at Syracuse, an aged elder insisted on singing himself, but the choir chose a committee to ask the old gentleman to give up his singing. So it is in a great number of churches. If the audience sings, it is considered a disturbance of the service. There they stand, the four of them, opera-glass dangling at their side, singing "Rock of Ages, Cleft for Me" in the same spirit in which they sang "Grand Duchess" or "Don Giovanni" on the stage the night before.... During my recent tour, I preached to a large congregation, but all the music the congregation produced did not yet equal that of a skylark." But Talmage not only criticized this bad habit, but also tried to make his congregation want to sing. He pointed out very eloquently that God wanted all his children to sing. In hundreds of passages in the Bible, singing as well as praying is presented as a duty of Christians. No one should be excused for having a "bad voice". "If we would all sing, the individual inaccuracies would disappear in the sea of song. God is pleased if you do as well as you can. If once you do not strike the right note or keep the right tact, he forgives that defect. The angels do not laugh if you should once fall out of tune or be a little behind.... My ability in this regard is also very low, and my training is nil, but still I want to sing along, though every note should sound like a Chinese gong. God has told me to sing, and there I dare not remain silent. God bids the beasts, and all cattle, and vermin, and fowls, praise him (Ps. 148:10.), and we should not lag behind the cattle and vermin.... If anyone who can only sing in any way remains silent during the singing in the worship service, he commits a crime against God and offends the Almighty.... If we have no taste for this worship on earth, what shall we do in heaven, where they all sing, and that for ever? Let me pronounce a prophecy concerning anyone who has no taste for this heavenly worship: if you do not sing the praises of God on earth,

neither do I believe that you will ever sing God's praises in glory.... Do you not know that a singing church is a living and victorious church? If a congregation is silent, or partially silent, during the singing, that is the silence of death. When the song is stated, and only a low hum is heard here and there, while the great majority of the congregation are silent, the preacher must have a very strong Constitution, if he is not to be overcome with a feeling as if he had a cold fever. It is to be wondered at how some people have voice enough to go about all their business in the world, but as soon as they enter into the house of God they have no voice.... Singing has a great influence on heating. Luther's sermons are forgotten (?!), but his "Song of Judgment Day" ("Judgment Hymn", it is impossible to guess what song Luther T. here.

mine) "will be sung throughout the ages until the day when the sound of the archangel's trumpet brings the day that the song celebrates.... Cajetan said, "Luther has overcome us by his songs. "

F. P.

About the language question in the Pennsylvania Synod we find the following interesting and very correct statement in the "Gem. Blatt": "In the Pennsylvania Synod the 'language question' is once again occupying the church papers and their writers and readers, and things seem to be moving more and more decisively toward a divorce between the German and the English element. Some years ago the word "German" was removed from the official name of the Synod. The Philadelphia Seminary, according to its present form, is more the substitute for the English party. The "Lutheran," which may be regarded as the organ of this party, states quite openly that it considers the formation of two Synods, one German and one English, as the only promising procedure for the adjustment of the abuses which are becoming more and more apparent. The "Lutheran Church Gazette," which serves as the mouthpiece of the decidedly German party in the Synod, makes itself heard in a similar sense, and with great vigor promotes the support and elevation of the institution in Kropp, from which a transfer of original German blood into the veins of the Synod body, which is so strongly Englishized, might be expected. A third party, for which "Herold und Zeitschrift" is the spokesman, is in favor of retaining the old Synod, and it is claimed that this party is by far the strongest. But that this party, whether consciously or unconsciously, is favorable to the strengthening of the English element, is already founded in the circumstance that, as previous experience has taught more than sufficiently, with the almost complete absence of German parochial schools, the years of the adolescent sex, if it is at all devoted to the Lutheran Church, are more and more in the minority, the Lutheran Church, will of their own accord bring ever larger crowds to that part of the Synod where they will hear the language of their youth teachers, their schoolbooks and the majority of their fellow citizens. Yes, if the German party really separated and became independent and introduced its increase of pastors directly from Kropp in unmixed German, then something would only be gained in the long run if German parochial schools were also introduced immediately throughout the entire German synod; For otherwise, in such and such a number of years, such a strong un-German element would have grown up again in the German Synod that a new separation would have to be made, or would be made in any case, and the pastors drawn from Kropp could still experience this time, and their own children could belong to the new English party.

Papist Negroes. A Papist paper, the Catholic Mirror, estimates the number of Papist Negroes in the United States at 100,000.

II. Abroad.

It is very understandable that something very seldom appears for **"Missouri"** in German newspapers that have no connection with us. If, however, something of this kind does occur from time to time, namely something in our defense against certain attacks, we consider it our duty to inform our readers of it. We therefore herewith communicate the following, which is found in the "Mecklenburgische Landesnachrichten" of March 30 of this year: The article contained under the heading "Missourisches" in the number of the Gazette published on February 5 of this year gives the undersigned cause for the following remarks, which, by the way, shall be the last word in this matter in this place. 1) The Missouri Synod has by no means "cast a spell" upon the Lutheran Regional Churches of Germany, as Dr. Münkelt expresses it. It has not occurred to Missouri to deny Christianity and blessedness to the members of the German Lutheran regional churches, as it might seem according to Münkelt's talk. How far Missouri is from this is known to everyone who knows this Synod from its own publications, and especially who has read Professor Walther's book. Rather, Missouri has only "lifted up" the "church and communion" with the German Lutheran regional churches (until further notice), as the wording of the declaration in question also expressly states. 2) Whoever holds with our Lutheran confession that agreement in the pure doctrine of the Gospel is absolutely necessary for the unity of the Christian Church, cannot be at all surprised at this measure of the Missouri Synod. For - if we leave aside Mecklenburg for the moment - one will unfortunately have to admit that Missouri, in that declaration, did not portray the conditions in the German Lutheran regional churches too blackly. An outstanding, non-Missourian clergyman in our regional church publicly lamented in a pastor's meeting that the entire modern Lutheran theology is dominated by synergism. And another eminent theologian, respected even in non-Missourian circles, the blessed Consistorialrath Professor Philippi, writes in his "Kirchliche Glaubenslehre" (Vol. VI. p. 224) of modern Lutheran theology: "There we are offered subordinationism, synergism, kenosis of the Logos, even denial of the vicarious satisfaction (of Christ) and intermixture of justification and sanctification, disparagement of the Word in favor of an overstretched realist-theosophical sacramental doctrine, in short, the radical break with the scriptural Lutheran confession in all its articles as the true doctrinal development on the basis of this confession." And in the same volume, p. 181, it is said, "The handful of antichilastic exegetes, after all, no longer counts. They may take refuge in the virgin forests of America." (!) Cf. also Hochstetter: Die Geschichte der Evangelisch-lutherischen Missouri-Synode in Nord-Amerika. Dresden. 1885 (Heinr. J. Naumann) p. 414 ff. Admittedly, things are far better here in Mecklenburg in many respects than in the other Lutheran regional churches. The Lutheran confession is still in complete legal exclusivity with us, and every pastor is bound to it in lieu of an oath; Protestant unions are not tolerated among the pastors, and our Oberkirchenrath protects us in the exercise of church discipline. And we "Missourians" acknowledge and rejoice in this with thanksgiving to God. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that, even if gross rationalism has lost its dominance among us, the Lutheran confession according to the Scriptures has by no means regained its actual, exclusive dominance in all matters. Even in recent times, the clear teaching of the Holy Scriptures and the Lutheran Confession that man is a pure sufferer in fine conversion, and that our conversion and salvation do not depend in the least on our conduct, has come to the fore among us,

The most serious thing, however, is that even here in Mecklenburg the understanding of the value of pure doctrine, as well as of the corruptibility of all false doctrine in general, seems to diminish rather than to increase. The worst thing, however, is that even here in Mecklenburg the understanding of the value of pure doctrine, as well as of the corruptibility of all false doctrine in general, seems to be decreasing rather than increasing. 3) The present controversy over the doctrine of election by grace and conversion is by no means a matter of theological quibbles or of secondary matters which are of no importance, but in the last analysis it is a matter of whether there really is a "gospel," i.e., a divine message of a free life. a divine message of a free, unconditional grace, which promises and gives salvation and blessedness to the sinner free of charge and without any condition, or whether there is only a gospel that has been made into a cliché with all kinds of conditions in regard to one's own human conduct and has been put on a screwdriver, in which case grace ceases to be "grace" and the gospel loses its actual sweet core of consolation, yes, the certainty of salvation and future blessedness is made shaky for the believing Christian, if not taken away altogether. 4) Missouri has by no means introduced new special doctrines, as is often erroneously assumed, but teaches nothing different, rather exactly what the Lutheran Confessions teach, of which every one free from prejudice can easily convince himself by comparing the said Confessions with the official publications of the Missouri Synod. The now so-called "Missouri" doctrine is therefore the only legitimate one in the Lutheran Church, the same doctrine to which every pastor in Mecklenburg is bound by oath. 5) We who belong to the Lutheran Church in the state of Mecklenburg certainly have no reason to make fun of Missouri or to look down on it with contempt, as is now the fashion in Germany; rather, as Lutherans, we have great cause to rejoice heartily and to thank God that in this "last sorrowful time" He has allowed the light of His Word to "burn so brightly" there and to give His dear Lutheran Church there - even by non-Missourians, such as, for example, Kirchenrath Rupert Rupert - a "new" and "new" church. e.g. Kirchenrath Rupert in Eutin, yes, even by opponents most praiseworthily acknowledged - blossom; cf. Hochstetter, Geschichte der Missouri-Synode, p. 146 ff. and 437 ff, and Preface p. 11 s., a book which cannot be recommended strongly enough to all opponents of Missouri, as well as to all who wish to inform themselves about American ecclesiastical conditions. We also have only reason to be thankful that Missouri so vigorously combats all errors and so unsparingly exposes and punishes the prevailing synergism, syncretism and indifferentism, because under the general doctrinal confusion the Lutheran Church can only be preserved in its purity, 6) It is quite erroneous to assume that the so-called "Missourians" should "feel very comfortable" in our Mecklenburg State Church. If they have nevertheless so far remained in the same, then they have been moved to do so, on the one hand, by the consideration of the historical development of our regional church, then by the relatively good ecclesiastical conditions in the same, as well as finally by the hope, which cannot yet be given up, that the "*consentire de doctrina evangelii*" (the agreement in the doctrine of the Gospel) - Augsburg Confession, Article 7 - will also in fact gradually become more and more effective in our regional church. By the way, it should not be forgotten that this is a matter of conscience, which cannot simply be decided according to a theoretical rule. Qualitz. Walter, Pastor.

Pastor (ret.) Ludwig Grote. That the same (as is well known, the editor of the "Hannoversche Kreuzblatt") in the doctrine of the ministry is not the same as us so-called Missourians.

However, we cannot express ourselves otherwise, but that he is so angry with us, as is shown in the number of his ecclesiastical-political journal of April 4, is something of which we have not yet been aware. After he had taken a passage from the organ of the "Sächs. Freikirche" in which the Hermannsburgers are given the right, on the basis of Rom. 16, 17, that they no longer want to carry Pastor Drewes with his hierarchical official doctrine, Grote adds the following: "There we have the true Lutheran Pabstthum, which, although it uses phrases such as 'papenzende Anmaßungen,' 'Romanizing Lutherans' and 'Romanists,' but at the same time completely grounding itself like the infallible pope when he speaks *ex cathedra*. Truly there is system in the presumption of these Missourians! It is quite in the tone of those proud spirits: 'We have power and right alone, what we set is common, who is he that will master us?' When one hears this diatribe against division and vexation 'apart from the doctrine which ye have learned,' one should think that the main doctrine which the apostle taught in the Epistle to the Romans was the Missourian ministerial doctrine, whereas the Hessian ministerial doctrine was the epitome of all the false doctrine against which the apostle so zealously warned. And if one then reads further: 'however much sin may be attached to it, this separation is nevertheless in accordance with the word of God and therefore pleasing to God,' one involuntarily comes to the thought that the controversy for the right doctrine, may it have any name whatsoever, gives a license for all narrow-mindedness, intolerance, division, and separation. For all this is but a secondary matter, of little or no account, if only - the Missourian doctrine is victorious. But the surreptitiousness that the Missourian doctrine of the ministry is the Pauline doctrine of the Epistle to the Romans is hardly noticed by the clever sheep who know so well how to judge doctrine." So far Grote. It is astonishing how he rejects the open and decisive language of our German confessor by saying that "he is behaving like an infallible pope when he speaks *ex cathedra*," while we know of no one who writes more contradictorily than he does. But the assertion that Rom. 16, 17. can only be referred to the doctrine of the ministry if the "main doctrine which the apostle taught in the Epistle to the Romans was the Missourian doctrine of the ministry" is downright nonsensical. But abominable is the Jnsimulation, when the "Free Church" wrote: "Divorce, however much sin may attach to it, is according to the word of God," that thereby it is asserted that "the controversy for the right doctrine, let it have whatever name it may, gives a license for all narrow-mindedness, intolerance, division, and separation." Grote continues: "It is also a 'clever trick' to make these clever sheep believe that it is only a question of the right to elect pastors and the right to judge doctrine, and that these two rights are absolutely denied to the congregations by the Hessian false teachers. The treatment of the members of the congregation like stupid sheep' is, as is well known, a favorite theme of these normal Lutherans, which they cannot repeat often enough, even where the memory of it does them little honor. Basically, such talk by Missourians is pure humbug, with which they pull the wool over the eyes of even the 'dumb sheep'. For if only one of them were to come and understand the doctrine, e. g. the doctrine of marriage, better than these Missourian shepherds, they would quite infallibly call out to such a 'dumb sheep': you may understand the bleating, but you understand nothing of the doctrine. This saying of judging doctrine is just like the other, that the pastors are servants of the churches for Jesus' sake, and that the latter have a right to command and rebuke them. For as soon as a member of the congregation should take it into his head to reproach his pastor, the latter would

immediately answer, 'How dare you? You say this not as a born-again man, but according to your flesh, and in this I am not your servant.' By the addition 'for JEsu's sake,' and how this is interpreted, all that has been said before is made illusory; for it will not occur to truly born-again Christians to want to play the Lord to their pastors. And it is the same with the assertion that it is the right of the congregation to judge about doctrine. A truly enlightened layman will not assert this right against the pastors and teachers of the church. He is far too humble and modest for that. It is easy, then, to take a mouthful of humility and modesty, and not only to grant the congregations the right, but also to impose upon them the duty of mastering the pastors, by assuring them that they submit to their judgment; but if they do so after all, they have no right to do so, for then they would not be wise, but stupid sheep, on whose voice nothing can be done." So far Grote. First he defends Pastor Drewes by saying that he "unconditionally denies the congregations the right to judge the election of pastors and doctrine," and yet in the same article he had already denied the congregations that right themselves, and now here he denies them even the right to judge doctrine with naked words! But when he declares it to be "pure fraud" that the Free Church grants these rights to the Missourians, and proves it by what the Missourians would do if a member of the congregation stood up against their doctrine and invoked his right to judge doctrine, this is as outrageous as it is ridiculous, since the procedure which Grote ascribes to the Missourians is his own invention. Can a more ignominious proof be conceived? - Grote writes at last: "But, I hear it asked here, is not quite the same thing said in the appendix of the Schmalkaldic Articles as is said by the Missourian 'Free Church'? Surely this is very doubtful." These last words are for once somewhat modest, but reveal the evil conscience of the otherwise determinate writer. In a note, however, he occasionally remarks that the appendix to the Schmalkaldic Articles "is known to have been written by Melancthon after Luther's departure, and not signed by Luther." As if the latter mattered, since Luther did not refuse to sign, but only did not do so because he was no longer present when the signing took place!

W.

National Churches. In the "Kreuzblatt" of March 21 Grote concludes an article "The so-called Irvingians" with the following words: In most of the other Landeskirchen things do not look much better. The sore spot of the national churches is on the one hand the state regiment and on the other hand the mishmash in doctrine. Their apostles are no better than the Roman pope and the Irvingian apostolate, and as far as doctrine is concerned, they are far below the New Apostolics; for in most national churches things are no better than in a Buddhist monastery, where each has his own system, and the most contradictory views of God and the world dwell together in brotherly harmony under one roof. I therefore think that our national churchmen have no reason at all to look down so nobly on the "Irvingian sect."

The "Allg. Kz." reports **about the congregation which Pastor Hübener presides over in the city of Hanover:** The small separated congregation in the city of Hanover, which as the youngest member belongs to the "Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church in Saxony and other states", the so-called German Missourians, has, in order not to be confused with the separated Petrigemeinde, which adheres to the Breslau Synod and from which this congregation has since separated, changed its name and is now called "Freie evangelisch-lutherische Bethlehemgemeinde".

Hochstetter's history of the Missouri Synod is, as far as the products of our community are concerned, exceptionally well reviewed in the "Theol. Literaturblatt" (March 19). The review concludes with the words: "Our exhibitions notwithstanding, we know ourselves indebted to the author for this gift and wish the book, because of its in many respects new and significant content, many attentive readers in Germany as well

Hanover. The "Allg. Luth. Kz." of March 26 reports: "A twofold agitation will presumably soon make itself known in Hanover, which so far seems to have remained hidden: one among the clergy, and apparently especially the younger ones, the other among the teachers. The followers of Ritschl want to found a special conference in contrast to the Hanoverian Pentecostal Conference, which stands on the firm ground of confession and which, founded by Blessed Peter, has for decades been the center of the positively oriented clergy of our national church, but in the midst of which the friends of modern theology apparently do not feel at ease, in order to be able to express themselves more freely among themselves. We would regret if, in place of the rift formed in its time by the founding of the so-called middle party, which has scarcely begun to heal, a new division should arise in this way, which will hardly be avoided if the project is carried out. The (liberal) committee of the Hanoverian Teachers' Association has contemplated discussing at its meetings in the near future whether the elementary school should not be made a matter for the Reich." - Here the ulcers break out. Better that they should secretly poison the whole blood system and leave it in the illusion that everything is glorious, when here and there in the Ministry and among the teachers something of faith shows itself. W.

Chemnitz Conference. (Cf. the previous issue, p. 123.) According to the report of the "Allg. Luth. Kz." of March 19, the unanimity regarding communion seems to have looked more windy than some of the members want to admit. The aforementioned newspaper writes: "Three views asserted themselves during the discussion. One assured that it would uphold the Lutheran confession, but lowered the banner at the altar or believed that it could be regarded there as a sign under which non-Lutherans also had the right to gather. The other held with the speaker that the Lutheran altar was only for the members of the Lutheran church, and therefore believed that all non-Lutherans, especially members of the unchurched church, should first renounce the unchurched church if they were to take communion with us. The third fully agreed with the first sentence of the second view, but thought that the Lutherans within the Union could not be denied the right of home attendance at our altars (thus also v. Zezschwitz, 'Die kirchl. Normen berechtigter Abendmahlsgemeinschaft'. Leipzig 1869, p. 72 f.). The former view evidently had no room within the Chemnitz Conference, and it had to be referred to the statutes of the Conference. The serious struggle of the two others among themselves filled in the main the remaining negotiations, without either of them being able to speak of complete victory." - We fear that those at Nos. 1 and 3 were the most honest. W.

Lack of promotion of theological science is not only reproached to the Missouri Synod, but also to the people of Breslau. Thus the Breslau "Kirchenblatt" of March 5 writes: "Professor Landerer, in his Dogmengeschichte (History of Dogma), p. 224, says of our church, among other unkind things: 'It is especially significant that hardly anything has been done in theological science on this side. There we have received a publicly issued certificate of poverty.

This does not frighten us, for the Lord gives the gifts to His Church as He wills, and we also know that in the kingdom of God only that is a scientific achievement which really increases God's glory and the knowledge of His holy Word, but that which covers both is only hay, straw, and stubble, even if it were considered the highest wisdom among men"

In his "N. Zeitbl." of March 24, Dr. Münkcl reports the following on the **present state of the matter of Bible revision and its prospects**: Bible improvement has not occupied us for a long time, although it does not rest, but continues its work sprightly and industriously in silence. Professor Dr. Kamphausen, himself a member of the Improvement Commission, has given an account of the improvement work in the Evangelical Church Gazette for Rhineland and Westphalia, from which we gather the following. At present there are three commissions of 15 members, five of whom are working on each of the three sections of the books of the Old Testament. The work is a very time-consuming and sometimes tedious one, for they have to work through the great mountain of opinions received on the trial Bible, in order to bring to light the grains of gold out of much rubble, and then to put them up for consultation. Before the year 1887 it is not to be thought of that the three commissions can meet for a common consultation, and this common consultation will hardly be finished before the year 1889. Representatives of the Eisenach Church Conference will take part in it, which must be informed in order to finally decide on the introduction of the new Bible. It should be noted that this concerns only the improvement of the Old Testament, because the improvement of the New Testament has already been finally determined. When the united commission has finished its deliberations in three sessions, a larger final conference will be called, hardly before Michaelmas 1889, which is to put the final touches to the trial Bible in order to transform it into a congregational Bible. In addition to the representatives of the Eisenach Church Conference, suitable representatives of the lower and higher schools and of the Bible societies, together with the above-mentioned Commission and Dr. Frommann as a German language scholar, are to participate. This conference will have to finally decide all questions and make a decision. It is expected that the printing of the entire Bible will be completed before the end of the year 1890, so that it can be obtained from the Canstein Bible Society in 1891. The Eisenach Church Conference, the individual church authorities, the synods, etc. will then decide on the introduction of this new Bible, but in such a way that all coercion will be excluded. The intention, then, is to let the old and the new Bible go side by side in the congregations until the new Bible conquers the field through its goodness. If the new Bible is introduced into the schools, it has all the more prospect of supplanting the old Luther Bible. In this expectation one does not shrink from two different Bibles going side by side in the churches for a time. The objection of Kliefoth and Luthardt against the introduction of a new Bible is not taken into consideration; one continues unflinchingly on the path one has trodden to the goal set, and will reassure oneself that one has the great majority of the Lutheran Church on one's side. Nevertheless, it remains a venture that must be prepared for annoying disturbances. But enough has been said about this, and now that action is to be taken, let us leave it to God to decide how the destinies of the national church are to be fulfilled.

Mecklenburg and the Bible Revision. In the "Mecklenburgische Landesnachrichten" of March 30, we read the following under the heading "Church and School": "Schwerin, March 29. As reported by the "R. Z.", the Ministry, Department of Education, has received a report on the new translation of the Bible, which was published in accordance with the decisions of the Eisenach Church Conference. Z/ reports, the Ministry, Department for Educational Affairs, sent a letter on March 2 to the

Magistrates of the cities the following decree: The undersigned ministry has had cause, in agreement with the Oberkirchenrath, to issue a circular decree to the superintendents concerning the revised translation of the Bible or the so-called trial Bible, and hereby forwards two copies of the same to the magistrates for their information, with the request that they take steps to ensure that Bibles and New Testaments which do not contain the previous text of the Lutheran translation of the Bible, but that of the revised or trial Bible, are not used in the schools there. - In the "Allg. Kz." of April 2 it is reported: Since the British Bible Society only prints and distributes New Testaments with revised texts, the Society for the Propagation of Religious Pictures and Writings in Mecklenburg has contacted the direction of the British Bible Society in order to at least, since the promise of a reprint of the unrevised Testament could not be obtained, acquire for itself the remaining stock of its cheap editions of the New Testament together with the Psalter with the old text for 30 and 40 pfennigs.

In his "N. Zeitbl." of March 31, **Dr. Münkelt** shows **how well he knows how to handle the times and circumstances**. In an article about the attacks on the kind of theological examinations in the regional churches, he writes, among other things, the following: "A second attack is that the examination is too much of a scientific nature and does not take faith into account. The young people should be asked above all whether they stand in the confessional faith of the church whose ministers they want to become. If they are to preach the faith of the church, they must have it. If they do not have it, they either conform outwardly to the formulas of the faith, and by the way pursue their own thoughts, and that would be a piece of the dead faith, which, after all, is always condemned; or they indirectly and directly undermine the faith, and establish their own wisdom. In both cases the church cannot stand, and, what is worst of all, the souls are deprived of the nourishment that is necessary for their salvation. The demand is irrefutable, and as long as there is a church, a Lutheran church, one will have to insist on it. In addition, however, we cannot avoid the question of how far it can be carried out. Our young theologians come from very different homes, schools, and universities, and the prevailing air, the spirit of the age, blows on them not a little either. What can and does happen is that the young theologians must give an account of their knowledge of church doctrine as well as of Holy Scripture. But if they are to give an account of the extent to which this is their conviction, there may well be many a great deficiency. If then it should be said to those who have been tested and have not passed, Stay at Jericho until you have grown a beard, many of them would not soon come home from Jericho. The need for candidates and the lack of pastors would spread alarmingly, depending on whether the requirements were set high or low, and that would not be the only thing. Even if one did not immediately measure the employed preachers with the same measure, as would be fair, a strong movement would form in the national church, which could have a bad outcome. It is better to be content with committing the prospective preachers to the Scriptures and the Confession, and leaving the other things to their conscience, unless in the examination their opposition to both comes out openly and cuttingly, in which case a rejection has certainly taken place. By the way, one takes each one for what he gives himself. This is a procedure which has its reason in the present situation of the national church. If one wants to change it, one must first change the national church and more than that, or one must form a free church, which is based on the same attitude in the same faith. One will shake one's head somewhat apprehensively, because now no surety at all is given to the congregations by the test

is what kind of preachers they get, or whether they are true preachers. But if we consider the candidates who have been examined, and if we consider the individual congregations of the national churches, on the whole we must say that some are more or less like others, and the different state of faith of the candidates is repeated in the individual congregations. There are Christian-minded and enlightened congregations, between which a number of congregations are encamped on all sorts of steps. They are all provided for, and where they have the choice, the same cannot be difficult for them." - If one thinks here of the former Münkell, one must exclaim with

Virgil, "Quantum mutatus ab illo!"

W.

Denial of civil rights because of outspoken atheism. The "Sächs. Kirchen- und Schulblatt" of March 25 reports: A Chemnitz merchant, Almar Martin, was to acquire citizenship in 1874, but refused to take the oath as a Saxon citizen, and declared, when questioned about the reason at the town council on December 8 of the same year, that he did not believe in the existence of a Personal God, but that the oath formula assumed the existence of such a one, and that he would therefore, by taking the oath, be defying the obligation of truthfulness, in that in this way a belief would be testified to by him which he did not have. Should one believe, in spite of this declaration, to be able to take the oath from him, he would be prepared to do so. The City Council of Chemnitz reported this to the Zwickau District Headquarters, which in turn reported to the Ministry of the Interior. The latter decided, in agreement with the Ministries of Justice and Culture and Public Education, that under the present circumstances Martin must be regarded as a member of the municipality who was not able to meet the requirements for obtaining citizenship and who, as a result, could not be granted citizenship. Martin complained about this decision to the Assembly of Estates in 1877-78, which passed the following resolution: to let Martin's complaint stand, but to request the Royal State Government to consider to what extent oaths of obligation can be replaced by affirmations in lieu of an oath. On July 22, 1885, the complainant again came forward to take the oath, but was refused by the Chemnitz City Council and, on complaint, also by the Zwickau District Administration, which is why he addressed the Assembly of Estates with the following request: 1) it should declare that the refusal of the Ministry to allow him to be bound as a citizen without taking the oath is contrary to the spirit of the Reich Law of June 3, 1869, according to which all persons who are entitled to an oath of allegiance are entitled to an oath of allegiance. June 1869, according to which all restrictions of civil and civic rights derived from the difference of religious confessions are abolished; and in consequence of this 2) to cause the Government to determine by way of decree that in the case of obligations as a citizen the promise shall take the place of the oath, or else 3) to cause the Government to instruct the City Council of Chemnitz to take from him the oath hitherto customary and in connection therewith to grant him the full enjoyment of civil rights. The complaint deputation, especially emphasizing that the affirmation in lieu of an oath is ultimately based on the belief in a personal God, proposed to the Chamber to let the complaint rest, a proposal which was also accepted after lengthy negotiations.

The Evangelists in East Prussia. The "Ev. kirchl. Anzeiger" is surprised where so many "evangelists" in East Prussia suddenly come from. Nine of them have joined together, and since January 1 they have been publishing a "Gemeinschaftsboten" to serve their communities and their scattered members, and especially to offer them a substitute for their lack of edification. They are still within the

However, they do not turn their backs on the office and order of the church, and pursue the revival and promotion of "living Christianity" on their own, without a profession. As their paper says, they stand within the national church on the ground of the Evangelical Alliance, do not want to be a party, and only pursue Christianity for everyone, without doctrinal determination. These Alliance evangelists cover themselves with the shield of the Evangelical Alliance, because they know what recognition it enjoys in Prussia, and how it is worked into their hands, especially in Berlin. It will be in vain to try to divert these evangelists from the path that leads to the sects, because they are in themselves sectarian. (N. Ztbl.)

Berlin. The Berlin magistrate as patron of the Jerusalem church does not want to calm down when the rationalist Dieckmann is not confirmed, but wants to take recourse to the Oberkirchenrath.

Beautiful Prospects for the German Reich! - The following dispatch is found in the local newspapers of April 30: Berlin, April 29. A Silesian newspaper reports that Prince Bismarck recently said to Bishop Kopp of Fulda that he personally had no objection to the return of religious orders, even of the Jesuits.

Influence of the Jews in Hungary on the Church. The Jewish landowner Popper died recently in Pest. Poor and without means, he knew how to gain so much fortune as a tenant farmer as a timber merchant, etc., and to buy so many estates that he finally became the patron of 63 Roman Catholic parishes.

Brazil. Pastor Dr. Rotermund of Sao Leopoldo has, as the "Allg. Kz." of April 2 reports, "drafted statutes for a Riograndes Synod, which, on the basis of the Holy Scriptures, is to profess the symbols of the German Reformation, especially the Augsburg Confession, and is to follow the churches of the Reformation in worship, doctrine and discipline. The first synodal assembly, which is to consist of all pastors, as many "congregation members to be elected" and two Protestant (?) teachers to be appointed by the synodal board, is to meet on May 19 of this year in Sao Leopolds. It is to be followed by a pastoral conference on May 20." That sounds quite gratifying! But where is the right material for such a synod? As far as we know the conditions there, it is lacking, and with the twinkling of an eye unionist preachers and congregations cannot be made Lutheran. But let us rejoice in the good intention, and command the matter to the heart's attention. W.

Russia. At the request of the Minister of the Interior, Emperor Alexander III ordered on March 18 that the Lutheran preacher at Palzmar-Serbial in the Walk district (Livonia), C. Brandt, be dismissed from his office for unlawful activity. Pastor Brandt, like 16 of his fellow preachers in Livonia, is under judicial investigation because he is said to have performed official acts on some former members of the congregation who allowed themselves to be seduced into accepting the Greek religion and sought to leave it again. According to the "K. Z." this investigation has not yet been concluded. In addition, a secret investigation has been conducted against Pastor Brandt by the Gensdarmarie, because he is said to have induced several persons of the Greek confession to petition the Emperor for permission to return to the Lutheran Church. For this same "offence" the schoolmaster and the parish clerk in Palzmar have lost their posts. The school of the village is closed.

Corrigenda

P. 109 line 1 from bottom read: "continues" instead of: "continues".

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 32.

June 1886.

No. 6.

What does Scripture say of itself?*)

(With consideration of the just also recently raised objections of the newer theology).

1.

As to the nature and origin of Scripture, the moderns deny what the church has always believed, that Scripture in the proper sense is God's Word, inspired by God, and call Scripture a record of revelation, in the production of which God and human authors collaborated. This is opposed by the Scriptures' own testimony. For:

1) Scripture testifies to the Old Testament as God's Word.

a. The Old Testament gives itself as God's word. Ex. 24, 4, 7. 34, 27. Deut. 31, 9-13. 24-26. Jos. 1, 7. 8. Nehem. 8, 8. 18. - Isa. 8, 16. Dan. 12, 4. Isa. 1, 1. Jer. 1, 1. 2 Chron. 32, 32. Psalm 40, 8. Is. 29, 11. 34, 16. Zech. 7, 12. - 2 Sam. 23, 1-3. - Ps. 1, 2. 119, 105. -

d. The New Testament bears witness to the Old Testament. Christ and the apostles refer to the scripture, the holy scripture, God's word, the scripture, inspired by God. Luc. 16, 19. Joh. 5, 39. Matth. 21, 42. 22, 29. 26, 54. Luc. 24, 32. 44. 45. Matth. 4, 4. 7. 10. 22, 43. - Matth. 2, 17. 23. Joh. 19, 24. Jac. 2, 23. Rom. 4, 17. 3. 9, 17. Gal. 4, 30. 3, 16. 2 Cor. 6, 2. Gal. 3, 8. - Matth. 1, 22. 2, 15. Rom. 9, 25. 1, 2. 3, 2. Heb. 1, 1. 8, 8. - Heb. 3, 7. 8. 10, 15. Apost. 1, 16. 28, 25. 1 Petr. 1, 10-12. 2Petr. 1, 21. 2 Tim. 3, 16.

1) A paper for the Pastoral Conference of the State of Missouri, put into print by resolution of the latter.

- 2) The New Testament gives itself as God's word and revelation.
 - a. According to the testimony of the New Testament the words of the apostles are on the same level as the words and writings of the prophets. Joh. 5, 46. 47. Apost. 26, 22. Rom. 1, 1.2. 1 Petr. 1, 10-12. 2 Petr. 3, 2. Eph. 2, 19. 20.
 - b. According to the testimony of the New Testament the oral proclamation of the apostles is God's word and revelation. 1 Thess. 2,13. 1 Petr. 1, 24. 25. 1,12. 1 Cor. 15, 1. Rom. 1, 1.
 - c. According to the testimony of the New Testament the apostles wrote down the same gospel they preached orally. Rom. 1, 1. ff. 1 Cor. 1, 1. 10. 2, 6-13. 3,1-3. Gal. 1, 9. 10. 6,11.14. 1 Petr. 5, 12. 1 Joh. 1, 1-4. 5,13. Joh. 20, 30. 31. - 2 Thess. 2, 2. 2 Petr. 3, 15. 16. 1 Cor. 14, 37. 2 Cor. 13, 3.

3) The Scriptures testify that the Holy Spirit has inspired the holy people of God not only with thoughts but also with words, that the whole Scripture and all its individual parts are inspired, and that therefore no tittle of Scripture may be broken or changed.

1 Cor. 2, 13. 2 Sam. 23, 2. Ps. 45, 2. Jer. 1, 9. Luc. 1, 70. Apost. 3, 21. Gal. 3, 16. Matth. 22, 43. 44. Joh. 10, 34-36. (Matth. 10, 19. 20. Luc. 12, 11. 12.) - Deut. 4, 2. 12, 32. Prov. 30, 5. 6. Rev. 22, 18. 19. Matth. 5, 17-19. Luc. 16, 17. Apost. 24, 14.

II.

In order to prove their view and against the dogma of ecclesiastical inspiration, the newer ones refer to the form and nature of Scripture before their eyes. But nowhere does this contradict what Scripture testifies about itself. The self-testimony of Scripture is neither annulled nor diminished:

- 1) neither by the own researches and efforts of the writers of the several books, Luc. 1, 1-4...,
- 2) nor by the different individuality of the prophets and apostles, 1 Cor. 12:6,
- 3) nor by "altogether insignificant particulars" mentioned in Scripture, 2 Tim. 4, 13...,
- 4) nor by alleged natural-historical, chronological, historical inaccuracies interspersed in Scripture, Apost. 7, 16.,
- 5) nor by supposed contradictions contained in Scripture, Num. 25:9. and 1 Cor. 10:8,
- 6) nor by the different readings of the Hebrew and Greek texts.

III.

As to the purpose and meaning of Scripture, the moderns regard Scripture, the document of the history of salvation, as the canon of which the church as a whole has need for its historical development, and allow only oral preaching, as distinguished from Scripture, as a means of grace useful and necessary to faith and salvation. According to their own testimony, however, Scripture is the supreme and final authority in matters of faith and conscience:

- 1) Source and standard of all sound doctrine. 2 Tim. 3, 16. Rom. 15, 4. Joh. 5, 39. 1 Petr. 1, 10. 11. 1 Cor. 15, 3. 4. Rom. 16, 25. Apost. 17, 2. 26, 22. 18, 24. 28. 17, 11.
- 2) Reason of faith, rule and guideline of faith and life. 2Tim. 3, 15. Joh. 20, 30. 31. 1 Joh. 5, 13. Rom. 10, 17. 2 Petr. 1, 19. Eph. 2, 19. 20. Jos. 1, 7. Is. 8, 20. Ps. 119, 105. Gal. 6, 16.
- 3) Guide and means to salvation. Joh. 5, 39. 2 Tim. 3, 15. Joh. 20^30. 31. Luc. 10, 25. 26.

The question of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures has recently again taken up the interest of Lutheran theologians, as well as of Lutheran Christianity in general. In the "Preface" to the current volume of "Lehre und Wehre," mention has already been made of the lectures given by Professors Dr. W. Volck and Dr. F. Mühlau in Dorpat in February 1884, in which they presented to an educated audience their opinion of the origin, nature, and meaning of the Holy Scriptures. Both lectures appeared in print in the same year. Volck's lecture is entitled, "To what extent is inerrancy to be ascribed to the Bible?" Mühlau's lecture treats the subject, "Do We Possess the Original Text of the Holy Scriptures?" It has already been announced at the above-mentioned place that the synod of the Livonian island of Oesel has lodged a protest against those statements of the university teachers of Dorpat. Soon other counter-witnesses were heard. On the other hand, Professor emer. Dr. Th. Harnack, in a little paper entitled "Ueber den Kanon und die Inspiration der heiligen Schrift" (Dorpat, 1885), which was intended to be "a word for peace," unreservedly declared his support for the views of his former colleagues. Luthardt also gave his placet in his "Allgemeine lutherische Kirchenzeitung." A year later Volck dres followed up with further lectures intended for the Lutheran Christian people, especially the educated, under the title "The Bible as Canon" (Dorpat, 1885). What Volck, Mühlau, Harnack, and Luthardt deny and assert concerning the Bible is nothing new in the Lutheran Church.

It is the so-called Hofmannian theory, to which the whole Hofmannian school subscribes. And independently of Hofmann, Kahnis had already 25 years ago, to the horror of the whole Lutheran Church in Germany, subjected the old church and old Lutheran dogma of inspiration to a sharp, cutting criticism. But the fact that Volck, Mühlau, and Harnack have lately been especially emphatic in their defense of the modern doctrine of inspiration and in their desire to make it comprehensible to the Christian people is, of course, a sad sign of the times. It is precisely men whose names used to have a good ring in the Lutheran Church, indeed who are now still regarded in the so-called "Lutheran" circles of Europe as representatives of "confessional" theology, who are deliberately contributing to the destruction of the foundation of the Church, the principle of Scripture.

The aforesaid theologians, in justification of their standpoint, refer emphatically to Scripture itself, to the present nature of Scripture. But the first and next thing to be done is to inquire of Scripture whether it does not itself bear witness to its nature, its origin, and its meaning. And this is certainly the case. It is precisely these statements of Scripture, in which Scripture bears witness to itself, that must first of all determine our judgment of Scripture. In the second place, however, we must also examine whether the other characteristics of Scripture do not contradict this self-testimony of Scripture. Thus it is now our task, taking into account the objections of recent theology, to measure the well-known ecclesiastical doctrine of inspiration against Scripture itself and to answer the question: "What does Scripture say about itself?" Even if, praise be to God, in our ecclesiastical circles no sympathy with modern theological wisdom is yet noticeable, we should never forget that the seed of doubt, of unbelief, is naturally implanted in the heart of all of us. And doubt, which rises continually from the natural heart, has always chosen for its object the Scriptures, the source of all divine truth. Such doubt is best warded off when we become conscious again and again of what Scripture says of itself, as what it gives and presents itself to us.

I.

As to the nature and origin of Scripture, the moderns deny what the Church has always believed, that Scripture in the proper sense is God's Word, inspired by God.

That the holy Scriptures are in the proper and unique sense God's Word, that the holy Scriptures are inspired by God according to content and form, that not only the thoughts but also the words, that all

This well-known dogma, which has been the faith and confession of Christians at all times, is contested, denied, bitterly fought against, even poured over with derision and contempt by the newer ones. And we do not mean here the rationalists or union theologians - of whom we here entirely refrain - but those so-called "Lutheran" theologians, those representatives of modern "Lutheran" theology, who allegedly want to serve the church, which has especially chosen the slogan: "God's word abideth for ever."

Let us first hear some testimonies of these modern "Lutherans" about the "old dogmatic", that is, old and genuine Christian doctrine of inspiration.

Kahnis writes in his "Zeugniß von den Grundwahrheiten des Protestantismus gegen Dr. Hengstenberg" (Leipzig, 1862), page 113: "When the old dogmatists carry out a concept, they do not ask what is historical, what is practical, what can go and stand according to human understanding, but always draw their lines straight out, it may be over mountain or valley, over water or fire, over hedges or fences. One sees this especially in the concept of inspiration. They proceed from the judgment that God is the actual author of Scripture. This is, of course, a quite unproved premise, which has no basis either in Scripture or in Christian consciousness. From this unproven judgment they now define inspiration to mean that God the Holy Spirit impelled the sacred writers to write (*impulsus ad scribendum*), and that God gave them both things and words (*suggestio et rerum et verborum*). If the ancient dogmatists had determined inspiration, which is after all a historical fact, according to the Bible as it lies historically, and not according to the concept, they would soon have seen that it is impossible to conceive inspiration in this way."

Hofmann, in his last work, "Die heilige Schrift neuer Testaments. Erster Theil" (Nördlingen, 1862), page 9: "It is not much different with the rest of the doctrine. It is a mere logical execution of the concept of inspiration asserted by Chemnitz. Everything that is necessary for all to know for their salvation is found perfectly in the holy Scriptures, which, as the written Word of God, came into being through an inspiration of the Holy Spirit, which, without distinction of the human authors, extends over the whole and over all particulars: thus the doctrine, which did not arise from the contemplation of the holy Scriptures, but from the concept of the written Word of God. What this meant by calling the Scriptures inspired seemed here to be brought to perfect clearness and certainty. But it was a mere semblance, which vanished as soon as the real nature of the

heity of sacred Scripture was held against it: it was necessary, in order to maintain it, to do the same violence to it as to the history of the New Testament canon, in order to make the difference of homologumena and antilegomena indifferent."

Accordingly, Volck, too, in his first lecture, "To what extent can the Bible be said to be free from error?" Page 9 as follows: "But what is it (the Bible)? The most common answer to this question is that it is that book which teaches in a clear and sufficient manner what one must believe and do in order to gain eternal life. As a book of this content, the Bible is the revelation of God. This answer was the prevailing one in the Lutheran theology of the 17th century, and one still encounters it today in theological and lay circles. Is it accurate? Does that definition coincide with the nature of the Bible as it is before us? It does not require long reflection to answer this question in the negative."

. Further on page 10: "In addition to this, there is another infirmity which is inherent in this definition. For it equates the Bible with revelation; it sees in the Bible a direct utterance of God for the purpose of instructing man. As soon as this equation is advocated, one must necessarily assume complete inerrancy of the Bible in all respects, even in the most trivial and smallest and most external things - for God cannot err -; one must make the biblical writers into completely will-less instruments of the revealing God; one must compare their spirit, for instance, as has recently been done again, to a spindle which the Holy Spirit has set in motion or whose wholly passive service he himself has performed, with the suppression of the human spirit. It is easy to show that, as little as that definition of the Bible, so little can this idea of the influence of the divine Spirit on its authors be correct."

It borders on blasphemy what Volck remarks in his second booklet "Die Bibel als Kanon" (The Bible as Canon), page 48: "The Lutheran dogmatists of the 17th century took over the doctrine of verbal inspiration that had grown on Reformed soil. It has its representatives among theologians and laymen up to the latest times. Unfortunately, even the youth is often still taught in this sense, and thus their faith in the book of books is built on sand from the beginning."

That is the negation. And what is now the corresponding position? What then is the Bible, if it is not what it is unfortunately taken for by so many theologians and laymen and also by the dear youth?

Hofmann gives the following answer to this latter question in his work cited above, page 49: "For the time between the end of the exemplary history of salvation and the realization of its antitype, the following results

the necessity arises for me that the church of the first possesses a uniform and corresponding memorial of the latter, by which it is prepared for the latter. And for the time between the end of the period of origin of the Christian church and the end of the present course of the world, it is necessary for the church to have a uniform and corresponding memorial of its original history, through which it can be led from its beginning to its goal. The origin of these two monuments of sacred history therefore belongs to that history itself, and the fact that they became what they were to be for the church of God was an effect of the Holy Spirit, to be measured according to this, as it has been in sacred history itself."

Thus, according to Hofmann, Scripture is a "monument of sacred history". The "holy history" or the "history of salvation", which has Christ, Christ's work, as its center, is a cornerstone of Hofmann's system. This history is fashioned by God, run through by the Spirit of God. And the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are now a "memorial" or "record" of this history. The Scriptures simply tell this sacred history, as otherwise a history book tells stories. Admittedly, according to Hofmann, this monument came into being under "the effect of the Holy Spirit," the same Spirit who had ruled in sacred history. But the effect of the Holy Spirit, as Hofmann will explain in the following, consisted essentially in nothing else than that the individual writings, which the prophets and apostles composed, were united beyond the intention of the authors into a whole, which whole then gave a corresponding canon for the church of God. According to Hofmann, the activity of the Holy Spirit was reduced to divine providence, which ruled over the production of these writings, and whose effect was finally this well-ordered, complete whole.

And this is now also the wisdom which Volck endeavors to instill in the Christian laity and Christian youth. In his first lecture he never tires of impressing upon his hearers and readers this precious, newly found axiom, i.e., the axiom handed down by Hofmann, that the Bible is the document of sacred history, nothing else. "I emphasize it that the Bible is not the revelation, but the record of the revelation." Pg. 13. But, indeed, we must not form a false idea of that "revelation" of which the Bible gives us an account. He continues on page 13: "By revelation, however, I do not understand a supernatural teaching, but a course of history." So sacred history, on the formation of which God's hand has acted, is really in essence only revelation. The teaching of the prophets and apostles is abstraction from history, reflection on the history shaped by God. And the Bible tells us about this history and the teaching derived from it.

Volck gives the following account of the origin of this report in the same lecture: "Therefore it (the Bible) is divine and human; divine, because it came into being through the self-actuation of God's Spirit and expresses God's thoughts, human, because it was written by men and expresses the human thinking, willing and feeling of its authors. But if the Bible is a work of God composed by men, its relative capacity for error follows from this." The expression "a work of God composed by men" is also repeated in the later lectures. A horrendous term! Who then is actually the author? Men or God? Men have written the Bible, and expressed their thoughts, wills, and feelings. And what has been produced by men is after all a work of God? A work of God, then, evidently not in the sense in which every simple-minded listener and reader grasps the expression. No, what God has done here is nothing else than that he directed the activity, the writing, thinking, willing, feeling of men, who independently wrote these writings of their own accord, to a certain end. Men carried out the work. And God made this work, like other works of men, serviceable to his purposes and intentions. For, according to Volck's and Hofmann's theory, all was here concerned with the production of this whole.

This is what Harnack says in his above-quoted little writing, page 26, in brief words: "On the other hand, however, one spirit overcomes all these writings and unites them all through one content to one final work, so that the divine influence is the overarching and cohesive factor. The sacred writers were, as he page 27 expresses himself, in "most independent activity." They expressed their own thoughts independently. Only that they received the impulse from the Spirit of God, as believers usually do when they set forth their works, and that the One Object, namely, the sacred history or Christ, formed the object of their reflection and the content of their report. The peculiar thing which the Holy Spirit, or rather God according to his providence, wrought in this, is the connection of all these writings into One final purpose, or into a harmonious whole suitable as the Canon of the Church. Harnack, in this connection, page 26, lays all stress on "the par excellence unity and wholeness of Scripture, notwithstanding that it is written in the course of fifteen to sixteen centuries, by quite different authors, in different languages and countries, and under quite different circumstances." And he adds: "The peculiar effect of the Holy Spirit, which emerges from this (that is, from the absolute unity and wholeness), is at the same time a necessary requirement of the Church's faith in her canon of Scripture."

G. St.

(To be continued.)

Against P. Dr. Philippi.

Pastor Dr. Philippi has replied to our article of last year (in the April and May issue of "Lehre und Wehre") in No. 4 and 5 of the current volume of his "Mecklenburgische Kirchen- und Zeitblatt". The reply is in a friendly tone. We would, however, be even more indebted to the author if he had agreed to treat the matter more seriously.

Above all, we miss the fact that Ph. did not respond at all to our discussion of the principle of theology. Ph. had said that the propositions of the Missouri Synod were not actually Calvinistic in themselves, but that "Calvinism lies in the consequence of the Missouri view. In our reply we had, we think, made it clear what we thought of so-called consequences in theology. We had said, among other things: "We take the position that, for the sake of so-called consequences, we do not make the slightest change in a statement which we believe to be clearly revealed in God's Word. We may be called 'foolish,' 'unscientific,' etc., and our faith 'incoherent,' but this does not hold good with us. According to our position, we hold that men cannot draw correct "consequences" beyond the revealed word, nor can they of themselves "mediate" correctly between two revealed truths. We hold that in this life men know only so much of God and divine things as is revealed in the Word of Scripture. .. All knowledge, even of the greatest theologian, is confined within the limits of the Word of Scripture, and never advances beyond it even by one line." We think that Dr. Philippi would have had cause to speak out on this fundamental question, since his criticism of our doctrine culminated precisely in the sentence that "Calvinism lies in the consistency of the Missourian view." Then we also asked Ph. to consider whether he had not himself - in contradiction to the criticism levelled at us - left the standpoint of "consequences" when he suddenly again makes the concession: "For natural logic there always remains the apparent contradiction that our salvation is from God, our calamity our fault."

In his reply, Dr. Philippi wishes to discuss only "three main points. First, he repeats with all emphasis the assertion that it is Lutheran doctrine to assume a participation of the human will in the process of conversion, a participation not of "the natural will" but of "the will liberated by grace," "the will liberated by grace," and "the will liberated by grace."

the will awakened and strengthened by the power of the Holy Spirit". According to Philippi, the *intuitu fidei* in connection with this doctrine of a "cooperation of the will liberated by grace" in conversion is the Lutheran preservative against Calvinism, without incurring the reproach of synergism. We have demonstrated at length that the assumption of such participation in conversion is diametrically opposed to the clear wording of the Formula of Concord and is Laternannian synergism. We will not repeat the proof here. We would simply have to repeat what we said earlier. We have also repeatedly stated that, if one connects the *intuitu fidei* with any cooperation of the human will in conversion, then the *intuitu fidei* theory loses its relatively harmless character and becomes downright heretical; for then an election is expressly taught in regard to human cooperation or good works. - But here we will only point out in a few words Ph.'s repeated attempt to prove that the doctrine of a "cooperation of the will freed by grace and strengthened only by grace" in conversion is Lutheran doctrine. Ph. cites abundant passages from the Formula of Concord. One page is taken up by passages in which the Formula of Concord rejects the idea that man works by natural forces in conversion. In this, Ph. seems to find it implicitly taught that a cooperation out of spiritual powers is to be assumed in conversion. He does not remember the passage we have emphatically reminded him of, where the Concordia formula says that conversion takes place in man "*tanquam in subjecto patiente*, that is, since man does or works nothing, but only suffers". Then Ph. also cites such passages for his thesis in which the concordia formula expressly calls those to whom it ascribes a participation **converted**, thus stating the exact opposite of what Philippi wants to prove. The passages cited by Philippi speak expressly of participation in the spiritual life and in good works, not of participation in conversion. For the fact that the "orthodox dogmatists" also teach a co-operation of the human will in conversion, Ph. cites passages from Chemnitz, in which the latter says that in conversion an inward change takes place with the man, and that thereafter the born-again will co-operates in divine things (*voluntatem renatam esse σύνεργον Dei*); further, that the will is not involved in the conversion, but is involved in the conversion.

In this passage Chemnitz says that the battle of the spirit and the flesh begins with the *prima prima initia fidei et conversionis*. Ph. also says, Quenstedt rightly emphasizes: *hominis conversi esse cooperari, non hominis convertendi*, in German: "eine Mitwirkung kommt dem Bekehrten, nicht dem erst zu Bekehrenden zu zu." We are really-

We are at a loss as to how we can pass judgement on this line of argument without causing offence. It has been possible for Dr. Philippi to find proofs for his thesis in sentences that partly deal with a completely different matter, and partly explicitly state the exact opposite of what is to be proved. Ph. reminds us that the Concordia formula takes the word rebirth in a broader and narrower sense and that this use of language is to be observed. But Ph. does not observe this usage. For the Formula of Concord calls those in whom the Holy Spirit has **begun the** work of regeneration and renewal expressly "converted," 1) "devout Christians," 2) etc., while Ph. only allows the actual conversion to follow in the case of these, and only ascribes to them a "will awakened and strengthened by the Holy Spirit." Philippi speaks of a co-operation in conversion, the Concordia formula always only of a co-operation in good works. Philippi speaks of conversion in such a way that it remains completely uncertain when a man is to be called converted or born again. But to the Concordia formula conversion is a quite definite event in the life of man, it speaks quite definitely of a before and after of conversion or regeneration; 3) it says, "But when man is converted and thus enlightened i st (quando vero jam homo est conversus et illuminatus), then so man wills good." From the disregard of these clear statements of the Formula of Concord comes the whole crooked position of Philippi.

The second point in Dr. Ph.'s reply is formed by exegetical remarks on the $\pi\rho<$ $\gamma\iota\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$, Rom. 8, 29. Ph. repeats

his assertion that $\pi\rho$ " $\gamma\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\sigma^*\epsilon\&$ according to New Testament linguistic ge.

He does not give any proof by induction of the New Testament passages, not to mention that he does not take into account the exegetical explanations that appeared earlier in "Lehre und Wehre" in so far as they concern this word. Such a way of polemicizing leads nowhere. Only a brief remark as to the definition of the term $\pi\rho\gamma\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\beta\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ may be permitted us. We have here not so probably Mr. Rev. Dr. Ph.'s rejoinder, than rather certain widespread Commentaries in view. In support of the view that $\acute{\kappa}\rho\wedge\sigma\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$.

Rom. 8, 29. is to be taken only in the sense of "foreseeing," repeats Ph. from the Commentaries of Meyer and Philippi, the remark that in the Classical Wohl $\gamma\eta\acute{\omega}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ occurs with an accusative of the thing, rem cognoscere, of judicial knowledge (-decernere), but that $\gamma\& \acute{\omega}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ in this sense is "acknowledged to be" never connected with the mere accusative of the person, as it stands Rom. 8, 29:

1) Thus §§ 65. 66 twice. 2) § 14.

3) § 18.

4) § 63.

οὐ? *προέγνω*, "which he recognized before." This whole manner of Argumentation is to be described as a nonsense that has now been going on for a number of decades through the various editions of the Commentaries in question. We leave the use of language "in the Classical" for once. We only ask here: Is there not also a use of language of the Old Testament and of the oldest Greek translation of it, the Septuagint, which was "acknowledged" to be very close to the New Testament writers? The same commentators refer to the language of the Old Testament and the Septuagint. What a series of examples would we have to adduce, if we wished to set forth here all the passages of the Septuagint in which *γινώσχειν* is connected with a personal object (*γινώσχειν τινά*), and in various senses, but in quite a different sense from that of "knowing" and "seeing"! Cf. Amos 3, 2. Nah. 1, 7. Job 19, 13. Hos. 9, 2. Gen. 4, 1. 17. 25. (and the numerous similar passages). "Doctrine and Weal" has also, in the course of this controversy, always referred to such passages as Amos 3, 2. where God addresses Israel: "*Ἰλὴν ὑμᾶς ἐγνων ἐχ πασ& ν των φυλῶν τῆς γῆς,*" "only you did I recognize out of all generations

Of the earth." Here is connected with an accusative of the person, and no understanding person will maintain that it has here the meaning of mere "knowing" and "seeing," but *γινώσχειν* denotes here

the act by which God appropriated Israel as his people out of all nations, factually, but not conceptually - chose him. In view of this state of facts, it almost looks as if the intention was to cover one's eyes with that argument from Classical Greek. *Γινώσχειν τινά*, "to recognize someone" - someone with himself.

To join, to adopt, is therefore a meaning which is undoubtedly established.*) Now how obvious it was to understand Rom. 8, 29: xxx *προέγνω*, "which he foreknew," of eternal appropriation by election, since there the meaning of mere "knowing" or "seeing" is absolutely excluded, if one does not want to a) statuirize an election of all men, or b) in order to gain a limitation, take recourse to arbitrary additions. - Since we are just at the "additions," it may be noted here that Ph. has made a turn from the same Professor Philippi to Meyer. All who do not regard *προγινώσχειν* as a concept complete in itself,

1) Cremer, in his biblical-theol. dictionary under *γινώσκειν*; "Almost without.

Analogy in the Prof.-Gräc. (but cf. *γνωστός*, known, befriended), but well founded in the context of the meanings and prepared by the corresponding use of the Hebrew XXX, is that concise use of language Match. 7, 23. Joh. 10, 14. 1 Cor. 8, 3. Gal. 4, 9. etc. ... So in this context it means as much as to pay attention to someone, to establish a connection with someone or to stand in such a connection."

But those who take it in the sense of "foreknowledge," "foreknowledge," have their trouble with the additions. They must add a quality in which God "foreknew" those who were to be chosen, so as not to get out an election of all men. The "additions" have turned out differently according to the kind of theology one was and is doing. Pelagius*) supplemented thus: quos praevidit conformes futaros *in vita* voluit ut fierent conformes in gloria; ²) Theophylact 1): οὓς προέγνω ἄξιους τῆς γλ-ήσεως³)', the later Lutheran dogmatists: quos praevidit fina- liter *credituros* esse. 4) Similarly the blessed Philippi in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans: 'Now in what quality God has seen beforehand those who are to be predestined to life, is not here particularly stated. They are to be thought of only in general as suitable for this purpose (!). This qualification, however, according to Pauline doctrine, must not be in its moral excellence, or in its content, for otherwise the content of the πρόγνωσις would contradict the freedom of the divine πρό& εσις, and the freedom of the divine πρό& εσις.

ἐχλόγη, but can only be found in the πίστις, and that in the persistent." But Dr. Philippi, sun. now writes that the contents of the πρόγνωσις "according to the context first of all bear resemblance to the

The Son of God is the image of his Son', the 'likeness lost through sin' to the glorious image of the Son of God. Hereafter 'Ph. teaches an election in regard to perfect holiness. For him to go back suddenly, and in the twinkling of an eye substitute faith for perfect holiness, because it comes by faith, is mere arbitrariness. Who gives him the right to employ "faith," when really the "content" of the -ρογ^ώσχειν "according to the context at first

the resemblance to the image of the Son of God must be"? This feat, of course, Meyer has already performed. For Meyer remarks on -ροέγνω: "previously recognized, viz. as such, which the

once in the way of his divine salvation-xxxxxx σύμμορφοι τῆς εἰχόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ (conformed to the likeness of his Son) would become." To this then further on in a note: "According to the matter, namely, in so far as faith is precisely the foundation of future likeness to Christ, our dogmatists correctly: *praecognovit credituros*." That is, to permit oneself frivolous arts with God's word, and to make quid pro quos at will, by arbitrarily interchanging the most heterogeneous terms. Admittedly the intuitu theory is full of arbitrariness everywhere and in every form. Philippi admits, as already mentioned above, in his Commentary, that the quality in which God is

1) Citirt bei Fritzsche.

2) "Of whom he saw beforehand that they would be conformed in life, of them he desired that they would be conformed in glory."

3) "Of whom he saw beforehand that they would be worthy of the profession."

4) "Of whom he saw beforehand that they would believe to the end."

The first one who foreknew those who were to be predestined to life, Rom. 8, 29, was not specifically stated. The things that are to be predestined are "only" to be thought in general as suitable for this purpose. But how can a man take the liberty of determining this quality by way of construction, of saying by way of construction who is "fit" for election, instead of listening with holy timidity to God's word, whether this only source and standard of our faith does not itself say who has the proper "quality" for election, and is to be "thought fit for this purpose"? God's Word speaks here clearly and distinctly in those passages which alone are to be consulted here, namely, in those passages which expressly deal with election. When Christ Joh. 15, 19. says of his disciples, and in them of the church, *ἠελξάμην ὑμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ Μβμου*, , I have separated you from the

If he chooses the world, he gives *disertis verbis* the terminus a quo of eternal election; election does not begin with those who have persevered in the faith to the end, but with the world; election does not take from the faithful, but from the world. There we have clearly determined in God's word the object "suitable" for election. We need not first think of it by way of theological construction as "generally suited to this purpose. "*) Likewise, all passages which deal with the relation of the temporal state of grace of the blessed to their eternal election, represent the temporal state of grace, calling, faith, sanctification, etc., as a consequence and effect of the eternal election, as we have proved over and over again, Eph. 1, 3. ff. 2 Tim. 1, 9. 2 Thess. 2, 14. Apost. 13, 48. Rom. 8, 28. Rom. ii, 4. 5. 7. etc. In short, if someone makes Rom. 8, 29. the "suitable" object of election the persevering believers, that is, if he asserts that those to be elected must first have come to persevering faith in the divine foreknowledge before they became suitable for election, he also has all the parallel passages against him. - Philippi also repeats the assertion that Rom. 8, 29. comes out a tautology, if *προγνώβ- xetv* is not grasped from the foreknowledge of faith. We had rejected this assertion by saying that, according to our interpretation, *προγινώαχειν* and were distinct terms, and that, moreover, *προορίζει*

has with it the goal: "that they should be like the image of his Son"; therefore it is impossible to speak of a tautology here. But Ph. sticks to his first assertion. We simply cannot argue any further about this. If any one thinks that the sentence, "Which he knew before" ("knew" taken in the same sense as Amos 3:2: I have known you out of all generations), "which he ordained," is not a tautology.

- 1) Highlighted by us.

even before, that they should be conformed to the likeness of his Son"-we say, if any one asserts that this proposition contains a tautology, he has quite a different notion of "tautology" from the rest of mankind. But Ph. has not paid any attention at all to our distinction between γινώσκειν and προορίζειν. We have repeatedly set apart: προγινώσκειν expresses relationship to God, acceptance;

For προορίζω says that the κατὰ πρόθεσιν χλητοί are such as God assumed from eternity; "προορίζει," on the other hand, expresses the relation on the target; προόρισεν states that with the assumption also the Destiny is given to eternal glory. When Philippi writes: "Though grammatically the destination (Rom. 8, 29.) is connected with προορίζει alone, yet the same will have to be drawn factually also to προγινώσκειν, or yet from it a corresponding addition to προγινώσκειν." he has not observed that προγινώσκειν, according to our view, is a concept complete in itself, which, in order to be thought, requires no addition at all, just as it requires no addition, Amos 3, 2: πλὴν ὑμᾶς ἐγὼν ἐκ πασῶν τῶν φυλῶν τῆς γῆς, "you only I recognized" (= assumed, chose) "as out of all nations." Rom. 8:29. might also be translated quite literally, "For whom he knew beforehand, he also ordained beforehand that they should be conformed to the image of his Son." But we must then keep in mind that "to know" stands here in the peculiarly biblical sense, as it is in Amos 3:2. Gal. 4:9. etc. "Know" in this sense has already passed into our Bible language. Luther translated Amos 3, 2, "Out of all generations on earth I alone have known you." Likewise Gal. 4, 9. etc. But Luther has Rom. 8, 29. in order to bring nearer to the German that which is signified by προγινώσκειν.

and to prevent a misunderstanding of this passage, translates: "which he has provided before". - This brings us to Ph.'s last remark, the second main point. And here we must express our utmost astonishment. For Dr. Philippi writes: "Contrary to the exegetical tradition of the Lutheran Church, the Missourian exegesis of our passage (Rom. 8:29.) agrees most exactly with the Calvinical." How could Ph. write this? The Lutheran translation of the Bible grasps the προγινώσκειν Rom. 8, 29. just as the "Missourians," and accordingly translates not, "which he, as a persevering believer, knew before," but, "which he provided before;" likewise the προγινώσκειν puts the confession of the Lutheran

Church, as we have proved from the Concordia formula, and Philippi does not undertake to refute it with a word. And yet this version is said to be not Lutheran, but Calvinian. Does not, for instance, Luther's translation of the Bible and exegesis of the Lutheran Confession belong "to the exegetical tradition of the Lutheran Church"? Ph. can be taken from his

Standpoint from which our interpretation of the προγινώσχειν Rom. 8, 29. is wrong. but he is not allowed to call it Calvinistic. Philippi had to write: "The 'Missourian' exegesis of Rom. 8, 29. is Lutheran, for this very exegesis is found in the Lutheran translation of the Bible and in the Concordia formula, but I do not hold with Luther and the Concordia formula and the Missourians in this piece, but with the later Lutheran dogmatists." Philippi's above remark is such a gross violation of historical truth that he should not have been guilty of the same.

The third main point in Dr. Ph.'s reply is the repeated assertion that the Intuitu Fidei is nevertheless contained in the Concordia formula. We give here a sample of his renewed proof. He maintains that Sol. Deci. 708, 23. "clementer praescire" means "to know kindly beforehand." He writes: "We cannot admit that clementer praescivit denotes not an act of the understanding, but of the will, an act of God, in the sense of 'providing beforehand'; praescire means only 'knowing beforehand,' and nothing else; the adverb added, which cannot alter this meaning, has the purpose of denoting also the prescient as an outflow of divine grace." We leave here-to speak with Philippi-"the judgment to all readers free from prejudice," whether he (Philippi) has not here, as above, met with a mishap in regard to logic. For when he calls "presence an outflow of divine grace," he himself immediately takes "presence" in a different sense than in the sense of "prior knowledge. He can only think of "presencing" as an "outflow of divine goodness" if he includes under presencing at the same time the concept of providentiality and loving care and acceptance. Philippi adds: "Otherwise" (than from foreknowledge) "even the German text is not to be understood." For the German text reads, "God hath also provided in grace for all and every person of the elect." Whether this can mean as much as: "God has foreknown all and every person of the elect in grace," we leave to the judgment of all readers who are free from prejudice. - We had raised the reproach against Dr. Philippi that he almost always cites the words of the Concordia formula without regard to their actual meaning, which they have in their definite context. He "protests" against this "insinuation." That is far too little. With respect to the individual passages, he had to try to prove that he had used them in accordance with the context, as we have done at length, citing the passages, with the proof that the passages were not cited in accordance with the context. However, with respect to one passage, Ph. also believes that he can reproach us for not having cited it according to the context. Ph. had, in order to prove that the concordia formula is the

election was based on divine foreknowledge, referred to Sol. Decl. 715, 54 and quotes the words: "There is therefore no doubt that God has foreknown (*praeviderit*) before the time of the world, and still knows which of those who are called will believe or not believe. Item, which of them that are converted persevere," etc. We had charged Ph. that he had cut the citation too short. For the passage concludes, "But because God has reserved this mystery to his wisdom, and has revealed nothing of it to us in the Word, much less commanded us to inquire into it by our thoughts, but has earnestly forbidden us to do so, we ought not to reason, conclude, or ponder in our thoughts, but to abide by his revealed Word, whereupon he instructs us." We had then added that in these words (of §§ 54. 55) the Concordia formula so little "inculcates the grounding of *praedestinatio* on the divine *praevisio*," that it rather expressly warns against such a beginning, because *praevisio* is for us an inscrutable and hidden thing. Now Ph. claims that we have not used that conclusion of the passage according to the context. We should have printed the sentence preceding the closing words, which reads, "So also the number, how many there will be on both sides, is known and known to God beyond all doubt." We cannot see that the printing of these words was in any way necessary to us for a clear and honest proof. For the words, "So also the number of them, how many there shall be on both sides, is known and known to God without all doubt," are parallel to the preceding words, "Item, which of the converts shall remain constant, which shall not remain constant, which shall return after the fall, which shall fall into hardening." And in reference to all this, which comes under the divine foreknowledge and omniscience, not merely in reference to the last clause, the passage concludes, "But because such mystery" (in the Latin text the plural: *talía arcana*, such mysteries) "God reserves to his wisdom . . . we should not infer, conclude, or ponder it with our thoughts," because it is only the object of divine foreknowledge, which is inscrutable to us, but not revealed in God's Word. Thus our proof remains that the Concordia formula 54. 55 does not base the election of grace on the divine *praevisio*, as Ph. asserted, but rather warns against such a beginning here. The train of thought of the Concordia formula in 54. 55 is briefly this: the Concordia formula first makes a concession. It says, surely God foreknew from eternity, and he knows even now a) which of those who are called will believe or not believe, b) which of those who are converted will abide, which will not abide; which will return after the fall, which will fall into hardening, c) so also is the number, how many of the same

The truth of the matter is that the people and the number of believers will be mutual, known and known to God without a doubt. After this concession, the Concordia formula says how this truth of the infallible foreknowledge of the persons and the number of those who persevere in faith is to be practically applied, namely, that it is to be regarded as a secret in which we are not to reason, conclude, or ponder. What is now forbidden here, however, necessarily happens in the case of the *intuitu fidei* theory, as soon as anyone makes the attempt to make practical use of it. According to this theory, a man must imagine the choice of grace in something like this:

God chose all those whom he foreknew would believe to the end;

Now God foreknew that Peter and Paul would believe;

Ergo, God chose Peter and Paul.

Now no Christian is particularly troubled about the election of Peter and Paul; he easily believes it. But as soon as he begins to apply the conclusion to himself; as soon as he inquires, "Am I chosen?" he is also led to ponder what God might have foreseen of him. It does not help when the advocates of the *Intuitu Fidei* theory say that one should seek to know his election from the means of grace. They cannot banish the thoughts they have awakened, since they expressly say that divine foreknowledge is to be thought of by men as normiren of the principle of choice, and that one is to imagine the process of choice according to the above syllogism, if one wants to have the right thoughts of choice. Yes, the *intuitu fidei* theory arose at the study table, and it is fortunate if it remains at the study table. If it is to be used practically, it can only cause confusion in the consciences.

F. P.

Miscellany.

"Ecclesiastical Evaluation of the Banker's Emergency." Under this heading we read the following in the Breslau "Kirchen-Blatt" of April 1: There can be no doubt that everything a Christian does falls under the judgment of the holy ten commandments; outside the framework of divine law there is no morality, but also no transgression that would not be judged here. Even insolvency or bankruptcy falls under the judgment of the divine law, and that of the seventh commandment. For in this commandment everything that constitutes earthly property as "good and food" is summed up and judged.

We have received earthly goods from God to use them for our own and our neighbor's welfare, for we are also to give to the needy. The duty of lending is based on this, Luc. 6, 35, also Sirach 29, 1. 2. By lending to one's neighbor, one serves him with earthly goods, and this is the duty of love. But the debtor also has his duty. He must look upon the loan as another man's property, entrusted to him for a certain time, after which he must repay it, or he would be struck with God's word: "The wicked borroweth, and payeth not." Ps. 37:21, "To deal in other men's goods is a necessity that cannot be avoided; but if the other man's goods exceed his own, then the seventh commandment is in a bad way, for such a man can no longer do justice to his creditors, because his own goods cannot cover those of others. Thus he does not help his neighbor to improve and protect his goods and food, but he shortens or deprives him of what is his. But this is not how the seventh commandment is to be kept. Bankruptcy is the result of unfavorable financial circumstances. When the credit is exhausted, and the creditors demand their return, there is nothing left but the declaration: my debt is greater than my fortune, I cannot pay. In this case it may be that the debtor is unprosecuted, for if special misfortunes, such as fire, war, and the like, have deprived him of his goods and chattels, in such a case the creditor must share the loss, according to the words of the holy apostle: "Bear one another's burdens, and you will fulfill the law of Christ. This kind of bankruptcy, however, is the rarest, and the most common: Without sufficient assets a business is founded and expanded in the hope that it will be profitable, but of course the speculation fails, the profit does not materialize, and on the other hand the debt grows daily through unpaid interest; but in order not to let the sham building collapse, new debts must be incurred under concealment of the true facts, until at last the credit is completely exhausted and everything falls miserably to the ground. No trust in God will help, for the building was built on sand, and God will not be tempted. But the lamentation is now great, because the trust is deceived, and the losses not only hurt, but may even bring distress and embarrassment. In such cases of bankruptcy the words of the holy apostle are confirmed again and again: "They that would be rich fall into temptation, and into snares, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts." With worldly men such bankruptcies are not of much consequence; one must be careful, and if one has done so, ei, one must bear the loss, but if such a thing happens among Christians, then the annoyance is great - and rightly so. For such bankruptcy is a grave sin against the seventh commandment. Therefore

the church cannot remain silent in such a case, but must ward off the offense through serious discipline. The church must demand 1) public acknowledgment of the guilt of not having faithfully administered another's property; 2) public apology for the offense thereby caused; 3) earnest vow to make good the damage to the best of its ability, even if there is no arrest under state law. Only in this way can the church sharpen the consciences of its members, warn them against carelessness in borrowing, and bear witness to those who are outside that justice and righteousness prevail among them. But let the Lord make us all faithful stewards also in the administration of earthly goods.

The Jews in Eastern Europe. (Translated from the Swedish by P. F. Wesemann.) From a lecture by the Jewish missionary Kand. W. Faber from Leipzig, held in Upsala, September 26, 1885 - The speaker gave an account, based on his own observations, of the life and worship among the Jews of southeastern Europe. In the small town of Risjin in Bessarabia one can observe a peculiar spectacle. On the ruins of a formerly splendid palace, numerous Jews sit and weep. They mourn for the now vanished family from which, in their opinion, the Messiah should arise, the family of the Grand Rabbi. These Jews languish under a burden of law which grows heavier with each passing year. Since the days of Ezra, the rabbis and scholars have followed the exhortation which is attached to him by Jewish tradition: "Make an enclosure for the law," adding a thousand and a thousand statutes of men to God's law. With constant anguish and anxious conscience the Jews seek to fulfil them. Against this petty law-keeping, which in most cases was only gymnastics of thought, a man named Baal Shem arose in southern Russia toward the close of the last century. At the same time that Moses Mendelssohn was carrying out a rationalistic reformation among the Jews of the West, Baal Shem was leading the Jews of the East in a different direction. His slogan was, "Our whole life must be a service to God." And he succeeded in bringing about such a movement that at his death he had over half a million personal followers. The number of these so-called Chasidic Jews (from chasid, pious) has now increased to 3½ million, or the whole Jewish population of Eastern Europe, except Lithuania. The Chasidic prayer-book begins with these words, "In the morning, when thou awakest, arise to serve thy God." But yet their worship is only a service of fear and trembling, and it cannot be otherwise, because they know not Him who redeemed them from the curse of the law. Three times a day they perform their worship, and may spend hours wiggling their upper bodies backward and forward, that they may bang their heads against the

The people of the city are to be found on their knees until they are exhausted or fall into a state of rapture, called "Sibuk," which they regard as a sinking into God. On the great Day of Atonement all go dressed in corpse clothes and prayer robes, as a sign of repentance and desire for the Messiah. Missionary Faber himself heard them recite all 150 psalms during their prayers. - The most outstanding leader of the Chasidic movement after Baal Shem's death became the so-called Grand Rabbi, a kind of Jewish pope whose office is hereditary. To him the pious from the remotest regions make pilgrimages; from China's borders to Morocco his influence extends. He has assumed the same position as the pope, in that he lets himself be regarded as a mediator between God and man. The St. Peter's penny, which flows to him from the innumerable pilgrims, may amount to 300,000 rubles a year. For this money the palace was built in Risjin, the ruins of which were mentioned above. The Grand Rabbi, in fact, no longer has his residence there. In 1834 the Russian authorities had the then Grand Rabbi thrown into prison. His friends, however, opened the gates of the prison with a "golden key" and gave him the opportunity to flee to Austria. Since then the Grand Rabbi has been living in an extremely splendid and expensive castle in Sadogora in Bukovina. - Here, in the midst of the headquarters of Jewish Orthodoxy, the missionary Faber was granted the privilege of bearing witness to the Crucified One. Because of his connection with Prof. Delitzsch, who had gained the favor of the Grand Rabbi by his appearance on the occasion of the infamous Tirza-Ezlar trial, he, the first Christian to enter this strictly guarded area, gained access to this Pabst of the Jews, a 36-year-old man. As soon as the missionary began to speak of Christ, many of the subordinates realized that they had a Gentile (Goi) in their midst, and with exclamations of horror and disgust they rushed out of the room. The Grand Rabbi himself, who had studied in Vienna, revealed a great knowledge of Christianity. The missionary felt saved from mortal danger, as it were, when he had this crowd of fanatical Jews behind his back. A distant relative of the Grand Rabbi, who was baptized, was poisoned soon after. - However much this movement contradicts the spirit of Christianity, in one respect it has paved the way for a conversion to Christ by moving religion from the head to the heart. Chastened with the iron rod of the Chasidic coercion of the law, and weighed down by an often earnest striving to attain peace of conscience by the way of the works of the law, they offer a field in which a rich harvest of the seed of the gospel may be expected. And a sowing of this kind has been recently prepared, in that the New Testament has been translated by Prof. Delitzsch into a

Hebrew, about which even the most sensitive Jew can have no complaint. Since the publication of this translation in 1877, 40,000 copies have been distributed in southeastern Europe. As the arid field sucks in the morning dew, so eagerly do numerous Israelites appropriate the water of life there. Some confess this publicly, but more still read their New Testament secretly. Four times missionary Faber met young men who knew the whole New Testament by heart. Hebrew is not such a dead language as is usually thought. It is the common written language in the entire eastern Jewish world; twenty newspapers are published in Classical Hebrew and thirty in so-called Jargon Hebrew, a language created by the fusion of a multitude of different linguistic elements. - It is the Delitzsch translation of the New Testament that has made possible such a thing as the so-called national Jewish Christian movement in southern Russia. - Wonderful is the enthusiasm with which the Good News is greeted in this national form. That the Jews have an aversion to baptism is partly due to the fact that those Jews who have hitherto been received into the Christian Church through baptism have thereby also been torn from fellowship with their people. At the first sermon which the venerable Joseph Rabbimovich preached in Kishinev, about 4000 people gathered, although the local could not hold more than 600-700. This sermon was telegraphed to Odessa, where it was printed in a newspaper, of which the number containing the speech was soon paid for at one ruble a copy. Powerfully this movement is spreading, and is engaging all the forces that are able and willing to be used for it. A relative of Rabbimovich named Lichtenstein is engaged in writing in Leipzig a Hebrew interpretation of the New Testament. One of the most serious obstacles to the healthy development of the work begun is the fact that it is not permitted to distribute the Bible in Russia. Whoever, under the present circumstances, sells or gives away a copy of the New Testament, exposes himself to the danger of being thrown into prison and enduring all kinds of hardships. For this reason, a petition has been submitted to the Russian Emperor, requesting freedom to spread God's Word in his empire. If this goal is achieved, there is a much greater chance that the gospel will find more acceptance among the Jews.

Literature.

On the Doctrine of Conversion and Predestination. Second rebuttal against Missouriian evasions by Dr. **A. W. Dieckhoff**, Consistorialrath and Professor of Theology. Rostock 1886. 148 pp. Gr. 8°.

Just before the end of this number of our journal, the above pamphlet comes to our attention. Dieckhoff tries to prove with increased effort that the Rostock faculty does not teach synergistically when it claims that conversion and election are conditioned by human behavior, but that on the other hand the "Missourians" have fallen prey to "predestinarianism" by denying what the Rostockians claim. The central point of Dieckhoff's discussion, so far as the dogmatic point of view is concerned, is the proposition which is finally served by the extensive historical remarks: the Missouriians do not distinguish between the "sole causation of grace" and the "irresistibility" of the work of grace. More closely: Dieckhoff reproaches the Missouriians for not knowing how to hold the two truths at the same time, that grace alone works everything and yet not irresistibly. In fact, the Missouriians now hold both. Dieckhoff's accusation, therefore, finally goes solely to the effect that the Missouriians are not able to make it clear to human reason how both truths can coexist. D. does not see that the question whether the "sole causation" and the "resistance" of grace can be rationally mediated, factually coincides with the question whether the two truths, "Israel, that thou corruptest, the guilt is thine" and "but that thou art helped is purely my grace" can be rationaly reconciled with each other. The Concordia formula, as is well known, denies this. Brauer, too, had already countered Dieckhoff in this respect, when he described the two statements of Scripture: "that man can resist the effect of grace in the beginning as well as in the course of conversion, and: that grace works conversion omnipotently, creatively, without any action on the part of man," as truths "which exclude logical mediation for our present cognition, which must only be accepted in obedience of faith under the unquestionable clear testimony of God." If Dieckhoff even sneers at this statement of Brauer's, he thereby reveals his regrettable blindness, according to which it is still hidden from him where the difficulties lie in the treatment of this matter. Dieckhoff therefore probably had reason to treat his opponents somewhat less abjectly, as is done almost throughout his writing. D. is in an unenviable position in another respect as well. He wants to rationalize the "sole causation" and the "resistance" of grace, and here he suffers the same fate as all "mediators" between the two propositions of Hos. 13: logic and theology both come off badly. The thorough critic will tear his "rebuttal," which he has evidently compiled with such great effort, to pieces, even from the formal-logical standpoint, by proving that D., where he wants to leave the "sole causality" of grace, does not "mediate," and where he really "mediates," lets the "sole causality" of grace go. D.'s writing is learned, but full of internal contradiction. D. will not escape by pretending to write against "Missourian evasions." In one respect, however, we rejoice in Dieckhoff's writing. It is, without doubt, in its way the most significant thing that has been written against us by German theologians in this controversy. And yet it will not be difficult for those against whom the writing is first directed (Gräbner and Brauers) to refute it and to pull off the mask of synergism even in the finer form in which it is advocated by Dieckhoff. This work will also give rise to a closer discussion of the Laternmann controversy, as well as the relationship of Luther's teaching to that of the Concordia formula. Lehre und Wehre" also reserves a more detailed discussion of Dieckhoff's writing.

F. P.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Is this council theology and council zeal for pure doctrine? "Herold und Zeitschrift"

of May 15 writes: "Because of the doctrine of Sunday the 'Lutheran' calls us to account. A reviewer of two writings by Professor Rauschenbusch, in the number of April 24, in discussing them, spoke of Sunday as 'a divine institution.' To this the 'Lutheran' now opposes the last article of the Augsburg Confession. But we know that we are in full harmony with this article, as we are with all the other articles of our Confession. (?) To be sure, the expression of our colleague can be misunderstood; but we believe that we can easily understand the writer's actual meaning if we explain the words thus: namely, that the first day of the week 'as a day of remembrance of the great deeds of our Saviour' is therefore hallowed to us Christians, and is therefore especially dear to our hearts. Further, according to our Confession, Sunday is ordained by the Christian Church, but under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and may therefore, properly understood, be called a 'divine institution. As long as the keen eye of the 'Lutheran' finds no worse heresies in us than it has spied out here, we nevertheless want to count ourselves quite modestly among the number of Luther's true disciples." - To this we only recall the words of Martin Chemnitz in his "Examination of the Tridentine Council": "If any one had wished to ascribe this to the apostles, while they were still living in the flesh, that they had divine authority to give laws, in respect of which they had no command and no testimony of the Word of God, nay, that they could re-establish what Christ had abolished, or abolish what he had instituted, they would doubtless have made it known with a loud voice and with the tearing of their garments that they neither acknowledged nor approved of this." (Exam. Ed. Genev. p. 179.) w.

From the Norwegian Synod. As Prof. Stub recently reported in the "Kirketidende," at a conference in Zumbrota, Minn., Father Muus put forward the following thesis: "Scripture expresses itself in various places in such a way that the disposition, speech, and works or conduct of men are the cause of their conversion and blessedness. It follows, therefore, that the conduct of men must be, at least in one respect or another, the cause of their conversion and blessedness." This is the exact wording of the thesis, as it was communicated to Prof. Stub at his request by the secretary of that conference. - Father Muus gives the proof in a true papist manner from Matth. 25, 33-46. to which he makes the explanation (especially to v. 35.): "The Saviour gives in this passage the conduct of men" (- that is, the feeding, watering, clothing -) "as the reason that they are translated into eternal life." - Prof. Stub rightly remarks that Father Muus has done a great service to the cause of truth, namely, that in this thesis he makes his error stand out more clearly than ever before. - For when it has hitherto been said to the opponents that they teach with the "conduct" of man a "work" to be done by man himself, which then, according to their representation, is the cause of blessedness, - they gladly rejected this decisively, and asserted that with the "conduct" it is not a question of a "doing," not of a "work," but only of an "omission" of an evil work, namely, of an "omission of wilful resistance. Muus has now openly broken with this, and therein lies a progress, not toward the

He does not believe in truth, but in false doctrine, which is becoming more and more obvious. In the thesis he says quite expressly that the cause of conversion and blessedness is "the disposition, speech, and deeds, **or** conduct" of man, by which he clearly indicates that by "conduct" he does not mean the "refraining from willful resistance," but the "disposition, speech, and deeds" of man, and these are, as Father Muus teaches in truly incredible delusion, "the cause of their conversion and blessedness." That Father Muus here takes the word "cause" in its full meaning is quite clear, since he writes: "But if all the writers of sacred Scripture adduced the thoughts or words or deeds of men, in short, the conduct of men, as a cause of their blessedness, as something that effected the same (blessedness)," it must well be true in one mind or the other."

1) If we add dres, we have as a result: Father Muus teaches that the "conduct" or "disposition, speech, and deeds of men are "cause of their conversion and blessedness," - are a "ground of their blessedness," - are something that effects blessedness. - Rightly does Prof. Stub points out that 5 years ago 2) in a lecture he laid special stress on the fact that there were only two causes of our blessedness, the merit of Christ and God's mercy, and no other third, - no one at that time contradicted him in this matter and dared to contradict him, no one ventured to come before a Lutheran audience with a third cause to be sought in man; but if anyone had done so, they would have departed from him in horror; only now, in the confusion of minds, may one dare to thrust a dagger into the heart of the Lutheran Church in this way.

C. D.

"Luther's 'Judgment Hymn'". In the May number of "Lehre und Wehre" (Doctrine and Wehre).

we cited a debate by Talmage in which the latter attributed a "Judgment Hymn" to Luther. We remarked that we did not know which of Luther's songs was meant. Now Prof. Crull of Fort Wayne gives us the following information about the hymn in question: "In various English hymnals, under the hymn "Great God, what do I see and hear!" the signature "Dr. M, Luther" is found. This song of the Last Judgement, however, comes from Collyer, who copied its first verse from Ringwaldt's song "Es ist gewißlich an der Zeit". Therefore also C. Winkworth writes in "Christian Singers of Germany" p. 149: "Ringwaldt was the author of the hymn so well known in England under the mistaken title of 'Luther's Hymn,' - 'Great God what do I see and hear, The end of things created,' - which is in fact a quotation rather freely handled from a celebrated hymn of his on the Second Advent to Judgment."

The "American Congress of Churches" met this year in May in Cleveland, Oregon. The previous year's meeting in Hartford, Conn. was attended, as far as we can remember, only by those who wanted to be "Protestants". This year, however, one of the speakers was the Catholic Bishop of Cleveland. The "Congregationalist" reports: "At the Tuesday evening meeting, at which 'Religion and Our State Schools' were discussed, Bishop Gilmour, the Catholic Bishop of Cleveland, delivered an address. He spoke with much emphasis, pointing out the necessity of religion for the state, and stating that religion must be recognized as a necessary element in education.

- 1) Lutherske Vidnesbyrd, '86, no. 8, p. 114. Citirt in "Kirketidende" '86, no. 17, p. 258.
- 2) Cf. Lehre und Wehre 1881, p. 376 ff.

The bishop spoke so frankly and freely, and yet so moderately, that he won the hearty respect of all who heard him." - These American sectarians remain foolish and childish. Now and then they can get tremendously excited against the papacy and see our religious and civil liberty threatened by it. But as soon as a clever priest with a winning appearance and some eloquence comes upon them, they immediately lose their minds. The "Church Congress," of course, did not consider that Bishop Gilmour meant by religion, without whose influence the State and school could not prosper, the Papist. - Lutherans were also invited to stand as vice-presidents for the convention. The "Lutheran Observer" named Dr. Krotel of New York and Prof. J. W. Richard of Springfield, O. It is to be noted, however, that Dr. Krotel declined the invitation, as he reported in the "Lutheran" of May 20.

F. P.

The Papist University in Washington. Concerning the Papist University to be established in our Federal capital, a political paper remarks: "The project of establishing a Roman Catholic University in Washington is joyfully welcomed by Catholics in the United States. It is to be not a college, but a university, after the plan of Cambridge or Oxford. The reason that Washington has been chosen as the place for the university is that the students there would like to come in contact with the leading men of this country, and to have access to the many scientific collections which are organized by the government. This is no doubt a good reason for the choice of Washington. It may be remarked in this connection that the Roman Catholic Church seems to have an open eye to the fact that Washington is the capital of the United States." Very true! F. P.

II. Abroad.

Prof. Dr. Kahnis in Leipzig has, as it is said, seen himself compelled by health considerations to resign his professorship at Leipzig University, and Prof. Dr. Theodor Briege from Marburg has now been appointed to take his place. It is a sad sign that especially the believers in Saxony are lamenting this resignation. When Kahnis' apostasy in 1861 with his "Lutheran (!) Dogmatics" became an undeniable fact, many serious believing professors and pastors were horrified. Now, however, instead of having become more faithful in the confession, one has become so indifferent to it that one cannot lament enough to lose a famous man at the national university who believes and teaches Arminian in archeology, Arian in theology and Christology, semipelagian in anthropology, and Zwinglian in soteriology! W.

The Separated Prussian Lutheran Church. Now that the former Director of the Breslau High Church College, Dr. Huschke, who, as is well known, was a jurist, has passed away, it is pointed out in the "Rheinisch-Lutherisches Wochenblatt" that, although the election of a jurist as President of the highest church regiment is initially done according to state church procedure, the Breslau Synodal Community is not bound by any of its church laws to elect a layman as successor. W.

Great increase in the number of theology students in Wuerttemberg. After a report in the "Allg. Kz." of April 16 about a project to support poor pastors so that they can allow their sons to study, the reporter continues as follows: "If one sees, of course, how great the rush to the clerical profession has been in recent years and threatens to become more and more, then one wonders whether it is expedient to have a theological education.

The church is not a place where it is possible to attract a further influx of people by artificial means. At the present time, in addition to the theologians in the Protestant monastery, so many young people are studying theology in the city (oppidani) that one can hardly imagine how all of them will later be accommodated in the patriotic church ministry: instead of about 10-15 oppidani in the past, there are now 90 of them." - If the students in the German universities were properly prepared for the sacred office of preaching, as regards doctrine, life, and administration of the office, this phenomenon would certainly be very gratifying; but what good are false teachers to the Church?
W.

Saxony - Coburg - Gotha. Already for about a hundred years, thanks to the constitution of the bishop, this little country has been the Eldorado of the rationalists. Whichever pastor would have been or was almost rejected by any other church regime because of his unbelief, found welcome reception here. In particular, the recently deceased General Superintendent of Gotha, the capital of the duchy, Karl Schwarz, whose body, by his own order, could not be buried as a Christian, but had to be burned in a good pagan way, did everything he could to de-Christianize the state church he ruled. In his place is now appointed the Consistorialrath at Königsberg, Kretschmar, who is said to be nothing less than orthodox, but of a Christian mind. Dr. Münkel writes about this in his "Neue Zeitblatt" of April 7: "How perplexed the Protestant Association members are before this fact can be seen from the 'Protestantische Kirchenzeitung', their newspaper. There the editor, Dr. Websky, complains: This breaks a hundred years of tradition from 1785 to 1885, carried on by Löffler, Bretschneider, Petersen, Schwarz, all men who would not have found a position in a Prussian Consistory'. Let us say it more plainly: a stronghold of the Protestant Association has fallen, of which it was proud, and which seemed impregnable; and the Protestant Association feels this the more painfully, the more it has experienced losses and been weakened for a number of years. In Gotha it had been wished, and probably expected, that the city superintendent, Dr. Dreyer, would take Schwarz's place, in order to carry out his last legacy, and to provide for Gotha in his sense and spirit. Nothing has come of this, and no consideration has been given to the voice of the State University of Jena. One now expects, and probably not without reason, that Kretschmar will prove to be a friendly, mild, accommodating man, although one lets it be known that his accommodation will have its limits. There will probably be quite a few who will join him, who have taken offence at the previous hospitality, and this will once again cost the Protestant Association victims, and impair its rule. On the other hand, Websky casts a mocking sidelong glance at another circle in Gotha, which does not accommodate the new General Superintendent, who finds himself 'in the salons of those fashionable believers', 'who had desired an anti-black dyed in the wool, and now, as we hear, are determined to continue to have their peculiar spiritual needs taken care of by an external association clergyman'. The Prot. K.-Ztg. usually uses the name "Modegläubige" to refer to the Positiv Unirten in Prussia, with whom the Gotha Circle will be associated. If this suggests an opposition to the middle party, it does not mean that the circle will also oppose Kretschmar. It depends rather on what Kretschmar can offer the community."
W.

Luther's writings in the Prussian grammar schools. The "Allg. Kz." of April 16 writes: A remarkable decree has been issued to the Prussian grammar schools. According to it, "it is of undeniable importance that the Protestant pupils of the upper classes of higher educational institutions know at least some of Luther's main writings.

and not only be made acquainted in linguistic interest with the creations of the first classics of our New High German written language, but also be introduced to the understanding of the first significant 'manifestations of the Reformation movement, from which our Protestant Church emerged, by reading the most distinguished source writings'. - Should we in America have cause to be ashamed of ourselves if we obeyed this decree of an unintelligent authority! We mean no such thing. *Fas est et ab hoste doceri.* (It is right to learn even from the enemy.) Our poor grammar school pupils have to struggle so much with the writings of the old Roman and Greek writers that not enough can be done to give them all kinds of antidotes to their easily poisoned reading. Yes, we think that every Christian grammar school should have an hour left over every week, which would have the purpose of promoting the boys not only in the right literal knowledge of teachers, but above all directly in living, active Christianity. Young men who have a good knowledge of the catechism, but who are ethnicized (paganized) in spirit, are poor candidates for a theological seminary. We say this not to strike a blow at any school of scholarship in the Synodal Conference, but for encouragement, which we hope will be forgiven. W.

The Zwickau "leaflet" (see "Lehre und Wehre" p. 97 of the present volume). In the Breslau "Kirchen Blatt" of May 1, we read: "We have before us a leaflet from the clergy of the Ephoria of Zwickau. They complain of crumbling, apostasy to the sects, and to the Lutheran Free Church, and call the latter an imported, American plant. By this they mean the Missourians, who, however, conversely come from Saxony. When they express surprise that after the "noble enthusiasm" of the Luther Year such a thing should be possible, and that after the unification of Germany one should be too proud to accept what is foreign, they are mixing flesh and spirit. Whoever hopes anything for the Lutheran Church from Lutheran enthusiasm or German national pride would be building on sand. God grant all churches godly sorrow and repentance toward him, and they will unite."

Formula of Concord. In the IV. issue of Luthardt's "Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft" etc. of this year there is an overview of the "dogmatic literature of Germany in 1885" by Prof. Dr. Herm. Schmidt in Breslau. In it, among other things, Prof. Dr. Dieckhoff's paper, "Missourian Predestinarianism and the Formula of Concord," is also listed. The circumspector now declares it to be undoubted "that Dieckhoff is dogmatically in the right," but immediately adds: "One may well ask whether the Formula of Concord has succeeded in balancing with the desirable clarity its propositions about the absolute spiritual incapacity of the natural man with its interest in the earnest calling of all to salvation. One may ask whether in this respect Dieckhoff's interpretation is not now and then a little too optimistic." (A. a. O. p. 222.) The circumspect man thus thoroughly agrees with Dieckhoff's teaching, but does not shrink from admitting that if one supposes to find his and Dieckhoff's doctrine of predestination in the Formula of Concord, this is based on a prejudice and a wrong understanding of the symbol flowing from it. And he is right beyond all doubt. All those who profess to have found in the Formula of Concord a doctrine of election by grace different from that to which we so-called Missourians profess to hold, have arrived at this opinion only by passing over the passages of the eleventh article of the Formula of Concord which say what eternal election is and works, and making the passages of the same article which deal with other doctrines into descriptions of eternal election. By the way

In 1882 Professor Kattenbusch in Giessen, while rejecting our doctrine of the election of grace as dogmatically untenable, conceded that it is, however, the doctrine of the Formula of Concord, that is, genuinely Lutheran, and therefore confessed: "Viewed historically, Walther is in the right vis-à-vis his opponents." (Cf. "Lehre und Wehre" XXVIII, 139. f.) One sees from this: those who are not moved by any self-interest not to betray their disagreement with the ecclesiastical confession, see at once that in the present controversy we have the confession on our side, and also have no hesitation in admitting this; on the other hand, those in whose interest it is, in spite of their anti-confessional or rather synergistic views, to maintain the reputation of the Lutheran Church. synergistic views, do not want to endanger the reputation of faithfulness to the confession, do not want to see this, much less concede it. W.

VilmarianiSmuS. In an article about the events in Hermannsburg, the "Kirchenblatt" of the so-called Breslauer wrote in April: "Finally, the so-called Vilmarian doctrine of ministry has adherents; it was expressed in the rebuttal of a pastor against Harms, according to which the laity should be excluded from decisions in matters of doctrine and discipline, and these should only be matters of the pastors. It seems to have been this exaggerated view of the spiritual office which, judging from his statements, made the new missionary director E. Harms shy away from seeking the ordination he desired within his own church association. What happened now! He turned to the Immanuel Synod, and they, or some of their pastors, examined and ordained him in June of last year. J., without being in any way authorized to do so by his church. This step, as they themselves admit, has aroused the general disapproval of their friends as well as opponents, and their journal feels the need to justify it. But very wrongly, for it is said that the Hanoverian Free Church pastors did indeed reclamation Director Harms for their church district, but that he assured them that he was not theirs. He was, however, theirs when he sought ordination, he was a member of the Hermannsburg congregation, thus of the Hanover Free Church, from which he received the sacrament, to which he belonged. And still on February 10 of this year, the congregation demanded that he should function in it, namely, to help administer the sacrament during the service. The official commission, i.e. the ordination, could only be given to him by his own church, and foreign pastors were only allowed to do this in their name and with their consent. That this was done in Magdeburg by the Immanuel Synod against the knowledge and will of the responsible church community, is an encroachment upon a foreign office, and it is much to be regretted that Harms did not recognize this and did not make amends, which was not difficult."

E. HarmS. The "Hannov. Pastoral Korrespondenz" of May 8 writes in its "Umschau": "Peculiar is the position of E. Harms. From his father he has the aversion to the 'Hessian official doctrine'. He said to the Immanuelites that he did not consider himself to belong to the pastors of the Free Church. According to Father Rautenberg's explanation, he was not opposed to the national church as were the pastors of the Free Church, even though he wanted to remain in the Free Church into which he had come through education. He wanted to take a middle position as a missionary director. Immanuel seemed to him to be the right church community, which did not share the opposition to the national church and at the same time was sympathetic to him because of the opposition to a divinely ordered church government. - It seems to us that already under Th. Harms Hermannsburg was no longer what it had been under L. Harms, who, though caught in many errors, was not only a living believer, but also eminently gifted and powerful and consistent. With E. Harms, however, the beginning of the end seems to have come. His eclecticism, wavering back and forth, is the

This is the worst way to stop the beginning dissolution of a wonderfully blessed work that was obviously once started in faith. The savings work of faith building may still continue for a long time, as A. H. Franke's institution still exists today, but the spirit that once ruled in it is gone. W.

Bleak Prospects for the Hanoverian Regional Church. The "Hannoversche Pastoral-Korrespondenz" of May 8 writes: "According to the papers, Ritschl's followers have united under the name "wissenschaftlicher Verein" (scientific association) in a special conference in opposition to the Pentecostal conference, in order to discuss theological questions "to the exclusion of all party standpoints. We must wait and see what comes of this. It certainly wants to seem to us as if, in spite of the "exclusion of all party point of view," the formation of a party, and such a party, which declares the emptying of our confession, the destruction of the core of it, to be religiously indifferent, is intended." - We must say: so long as the modern-believing theologians develop their theological systems from all kinds of other principles instead of from Scripture as their only principle, so long they must not be surprised if such theological systems as Ritschl's also allegedly appear as Christian ones, so long will they also not become powerful of them. It is not to be remembered here that the modern believing theologians no longer regard Scripture itself, but only the doctrinal system contained in it, as God's Word, and thus open wide the door to human speculation in the formation of systems. W.

"Heretic." The Northeim District Court in Hanover, Germany, has ruled in an insult case that calling someone of a different faith a "heretic" does not include an insult in itself. Very reasonable. It is reminiscent that in the 17th century the Jesuits accused the Lutherans of a crime of majesty against the emperor because they publicly declared the pope to be the anti-Christ, whereas the emperor adhered to the pope. Thus the Lutherans were supposed to have forfeited all rights of the religious peace. It is true that the papist lawyers in Dillingen came to the aid of the Jesuits, without, however, being able to achieve anything in court with their accusation. Cf. Des Ev. Augapfels Hauptvertheidigung. W.

Good Prospects for the Papacy. In the Kreuzblatt of May 16 we read: "In Italy, too, after the events of Bismarck, people are thinking of a reconciliation of the kingdom with the papacy for the sake of Italy's greatness and prestige. A parliamentary deputy, Achilles Fazzari, a former comrade-in-arms of Garibaldi, begins to enthuse about the Pabst, and in a public appeal calls for a similar work of reconciliation to that which has just taken place in Germany. "'The Pabbacy,' he says, 'is an essentially Italian institution, and Italy must make use of the same. Through reconciliation the priest will become a sincere Italian. This is the only means of making Italy great.... It is on the basis of interests that reconciliation can and must be brought about, interests which are identificir in the two institutions and need not depend on the indulgence of a pope or a king. Far from wanting to diminish the prestige of the pope, I would like to see it, on the contrary, possibly increased.' Fine prospects this is for our culture-fighting church builders! In the days of Falk, when it was a pleasure to live, they thought they were already standing on the ruins of Rome and could begin the magnificent construction of a German national church. And now this canossagang of the great German statesman! And behind him come the Garibaldins and the Italienissimi and offer their homage to the prisoner of the Vatican! So it goes with those who rely on men and think flesh for their arm. Mr. Fazzari does not fail to see the great difficulties of the enterprise he recommends. But, he thinks, Bismarck also had to deal with

I have had to struggle with difficulties. By way of diplomatic negotiations from power to power one would nevertheless reach the goal. The restoration of the temporal power of the pope has not been forgotten. The papacy,' says Mr. Fazzari, 'is gaining in prestige, power and influence from day to day. The most powerful rulers and the greatest statesmen vie with each other in proofs of benevolence and reverence for it. The Protestant head of the most powerful empire of our time entrusts to the pope the decision in a question of international law, and although this decision is not in his favor, he not only submits to it, but also proves his recognition by deed. Even republican rulers, who daily make known their aversion to the Catholic Church by new oppressions, are nevertheless conspicuously anxious to avoid a rupture with the Papacy'. In this situation, can the restoration of the temporal power of the pope have insurmountable difficulties? It is only a question of time, and 'if we sincerely seek the way out, it will be found just as Prince Bismarck found the way out of the labyrinth of May laws.'"

Alsace - Lorraine. The Alsatian "Monatsblatt für Christen Augsb. Konfession" of May 14 writes: "The false ecclesiastical union is working in our Alsatian-Lorraine church without interruption: it is continually undermining the ecclesiastical confessional ground; it seeks to erect the love institutions as bulwarks of the false union against the reconstruction of the Lutheran church, and it is degrading the confession to the so-called 'general Protestant', i.e. Calvinist confession, etc.".

"The Autonomist Movement in the Dutch Reformed Church." Under this heading an article in the "Allg. Kz." of April 16 contains, among other things, the following: The Dutch Reformed Church is threatened by a new secession. It seems to be of greater significance and more drastic consequences than the previous crumbling, which, in spite of their apparent insignificance, are not unlike the symptoms of a process of disintegration of the aforementioned church community. The present movement of separation is closely connected with the name of Dr. Abraham Kuyper, professor at the Free Reformed University of Amsterdam.... Abraham Kuyper was originally inclined to the teachings of modern theology. It was only in his later years that he underwent a change of heart. The type of Christianity in which his soul found satisfaction was the reformed one.... In 1870 Kuyper was called to preach at the Lower German Reformed congregation in Amsterdam. This point in time his opponents very sensitively refer to as the "beginning of misery". The aim to which Kuyper aspired from the beginning of his public activity was to provoke an ecclesiastical revolution.... The purpose of the revolutionary movement which Kuyper had in mind should be: the destruction of the synodal church federation of the Dutch Reformed Church and the restoration of the old autonomy of the individual local Reformed congregations. Only in this way did Kuyper believe he could save the reformed orthodoxy; he trusted in the heaven of old reformed piety still present in the people. Whether he had reason to regard the reformed orthodoxy as threatened by the synodal organs may be inferred from the fact that already in 1854 the general synod, which consisted mostly of modern members, had opened the door to unbelief by introducing a very flexible formula for the vows of the candidates for the ecclesiastical office.

Russia. The Russification of the Baltic provinces is continuing apace. Only recently the Minister of Education signed a decree according to which six German district schools are to be converted into Russian schools as of July 1. For the

In the case of the female grammar schools and elementary schools, to which the government has so far paid less attention, corresponding anti-German measures are expected shortly. The spirit of opposition is stirring everywhere; in particular, the subordination of the Lutheran elementary schools to the Ministry of Education has aroused tempers, and preparations have already been made to send counter-petitions to the Emperor, but on the advice of influential personalities they have been omitted. Since it is said to have been noticed in Petersburg government circles that the Baltic consistories treat the charges against Lutheran pastors who perform official acts on persons of the Greek confession with great lukewarmness and delay the investigations, the Emperor has ordered that henceforth such charges shall be decided by administrative means, bypassing the legal instances, and submitted to him for final disposition. Since, moreover, the Aksakov view has been adopted in the leading circles that all Russification measures in the Baltic provinces will be futile as long as Dorpat, the stronghold of Germanism, exists, a further step is now said to be in prospect: either the closure of the German University of Dorpat, or the transfer of it to some Russian city. According to other news, the curator of the Dorpat teaching district, Privy Councillor Kapustin, has already applied in an authoritative position to close the entire university except for the theological faculty, which is to be converted into a seminary for preachers. This would destroy the entire Protestant community life, which is inconceivable without a theological faculty. Kapustin has already obtained a law from the Emperor ordering the transfer of the administration of the Dorpat teaching district from Dorpat to Riga. (Allg. Kz. of Apr. 16).

PariS. Now that religious instruction has been removed from the schools, the church is left only with the school-free Thursday for the religious education of its youth. But this is such a thorn in the side of the free spirits that they are hunting it down in order to secularize it as well. First they tried it with the school battalions, which had to make the boys tired and dull on Thursday; now, according to the "Pariser Kirchenboten," they have come up with a new idea, which may seem to them more effective and more thoroughgoing than the soldiering of the boys. The Paris city council is having plays performed for schoolchildren in the Odeon Theater, in which 1200 children are to take part. The inspectors, the heads of public education, the city councillors and the teachers attend with the children. That must help. Among others, Molière's "Lovesick" and Beaumarchais' "Barber of Seville" were performed. One of the city councilors found the choice of plays incomprehensible. The bawdiness, he said, was finely put, but would be well understood by girls between twelve and fourteen. He would not take his son to these plays. Another thought the matter very important, for it was a matter of the direction to be given to education. Do we want to go down this road of muckraking and hypocrisy that some foreign countries are on? Or do we not rather want to cultivate that old Gaulish cheerfulness which fears no slippery word and utters it without blushing because its heart is pure? By a majority of votes they declared themselves in favor of the plays, and left it up to each one whether he wanted his child to take part in them. One must corrupt the youth so that it will also become corrupt for the church, that is the new direction in education. (N. Zeitbl. of 7 Apr.)

Necrological. On May 23, the famous historian Prof. Leopold von Ranke died in Berlin. Born at Wiehe in Thuringia on Dec. 21, 1795, he had thus already passed the 90th year of his life.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 32. July and August 1886. No. 7. and 8.

Luther and the Concordia Formula.

Prof. Dr. Dieckhoff of Rostock, in his writing "der missourische Prädestinarianismus und die Concordienformel" (Rostock 1885), had asserted that the Concordienformel, in contrast to Luther, rejects two contradictory wills in God; namely, Luther had "predestinarianly placed the hidden and revealed will of God in opposition to each other," and it was precisely this that was rejected by the Concordienformel S. D. Art. 11 §§ 34 et seq. Luther was also thought of, when in the second article of the Formula of Concord "the Stoicorum and Manichaeian nonsense" was rejected. We have not thought it necessary to refute the latter assertion even in a word. Is it not truly adventurous to suppose that the Lutheran Church would wish to refer to the rubric of "Stoicorum and Manichaeian nonsense" a doctrine of the man whom she praises in her Confession as the God-sent Reformer of the Church? Dieckhoff does not return to this assertion in his final rebuttal either, though he has by no means abandoned it. In his writing "The Missourian Predestinarianism," etc., he also used, among other things, a letter of Chytræus of 1595, in which, however, Luther's *de servo arbitrio* is alluded to, and that in a spiteful and very unjust manner. From this letter in particular, D. wants to prove what one had in mind with "the Stoicorum and Manichaeian nonsense". We may return to this subject later, in order to put D.'s historical construction into the light, when he wants to interpret the Concordia formula according to that letter of Chytræus. The letter does Chytræus bad credit, just as Dieckhoff himself does not approve of it factually throughout. The letter is written in approximately the same mood in which Chytræus earlier complained that no word of his had been left in the Concordia formula: "Nihil omnium, quae a me dicta aut scripta essent, Jacobus Andreae, aristarchus noster, probabat, ita, ut ne verbum quidem a me scriptum libro Con-

cordiae insit ideoque non inter autores illius, sed subscriptores recenseri merito possim. Nec tamen, quod semel subscripsi, unquam retractavi." 1) Arguably, Chytraeus never retracted his signature of the Concordia formula. But by the fact that even after his signature he could not refrain from criticizing the final version of the Confession in letters, although he emphasized its factual agreement, he already caused much trouble to the church of his time. But we will not discuss this point any further.

As to Dr. Dieckhoff's assertion that Luther teaches "contradictoriae voluntates" in God, we pointed out that Luther teaches only two apparently, in the imperfect knowledge here, not two really contradictory wills also in *de servo arbitrio*, that Luther still expressly emphasizes at the end of his treatise that the contradiction exists only for human comprehension in this life; in *lumine gloriae* the most beautiful harmony will one day emerge.

To this Dieckhoff has replied in his latest writing, "On the Doctrine of Conversion and of Predestination" (Rostock 1886) pp. 120-125. Not only does he repeat his former assertion, but he treats the objections against the same so much from above that he calls them "merely" based on "lack of understanding."

Dr. Dieckhoff's complete misunderstanding of the relationship between Luther and the Concordia Formula has its reason in the fact that he completely ignores an idea which the Concordia Formula presents in detail in several paragraphs. In this way he then made it easy for himself to bring out a contradiction between the Concordia Formula and Luther.

The passage of our confession ignored by D. is found in §§ 57 ff. of the 11th Article of the Formula of Concord. Here our Confession speaks of unsearchable judgments and a hidden wisdom of God. It says, 1. That there are such unsearchable judgments of God. They are manifested in this, that God dealeth unequally with his equals, "that God giveth his word in one place, and giveth it not in another, taketh it away from one place, and causeth it to remain in another;" and in this, that "one is hardened, blinded, and given to a perverse mind, and another, being in like fault, is converted again. 2. We cannot rhyme this secret work of God with what is otherwise revealed in God's Word. The incongruity lies in the fact that grace is given to those who are "equally guilty" with those to whom grace is not given or from whom it is withdrawn, and that to those affected by God's judgment is given "what we all ought to have deserved, worthy and worthy.

1) Chyträus *Epistolae* p. 873. Citirt bei Balthasar, *Historie des Torgischen Buchs*-I, 19.

Who, in fact, are not affected by God's judgment. 3. The Confession, on the ground of these facts, which it acknowledges and expressly teaches, warns against accusing God of unrighteousness, with remembrance of the majesty of God, "Who art thou, O man, that wilt be right with God?" Rom. 9:20; and with remembrance of the inscrutability of God in this life, "O what depths," etc., Rom. 11:33 ff. Rom. 11, 33. ff. 4. the confession calls back from the rhyme and reason to the revealed word of God, and calls the. The thoughts are based on the two revealed truths, which cannot be rhymed by reason: a. those who are under judgment suffer the punishment of their sins; b. to those who are spared from judgment, "Praise God for His pure grace and mercy without their merit." These are the thoughts which our confession evidently presents. To state it briefly by an expression now much used: According to the Concordia formula, the *discretio personarum* is an inscrutable mystery. The Concordia formula has an answer to the question, "Why are they converted and saved who are converted and saved?" The answer is, "By the grace of God!" The Formula of Concord also has an answer to the question, "Why are they not converted and blessed who are not converted and blessed?" The answer is, "It is the punishment of their sins and their guilt!" But to the question, "Why are some converted and saved before others?" or "Why are some not converted and saved before others?" the Concordia formula has no answer. This it pays to the secret judgments of God; here it reminds us of the majesty of God; for it acknowledges that the converted are "well in like guilt" with the unconverted, and that to the perishing in unconversion and hardening befell what the blessed all well deserved, were worthy and worthy, both by their original sin and by their resistance to God's grace. Dieckhoff completely ignores these thoughts of the Concordia formula. If he had heeded them, he would have been somewhat less confident in his assertion of a contradiction between the Formula of Concord and Luther.

Just consider what Dieckhoff himself cites as the quintessence of the "predestination" fallacy in his most recent writing, p. 121 f. He writes: "I have shown in the reply (p. 62) that Luther, in a predestinarian way, sets the revealed and the hidden will of God in opposition to each other, inasmuch as he asserts against Erasmus that, according to the words in which God lets his will be declared, God wants all men to be blessed, and that, as the Lord says in Matt. 23:37 (How often have I willed, etc., etc., but thou hast not willed), it is the will of God that is to be blessed, (How often have I willed, etc., but thou hast not willed), that it is the fault of our will, if we do not accept him, who comes to all by the word of salvation; but why the divine majesty does not take away this defect of our will, and change it?

The question of why God attributes this lack to man, since man cannot be without it, is not to be asked, and even if it is asked for a long time, it will never be found, as Paul says in Romans 9:10. 9:10; the incarnate God offers to all what is necessary for salvation, though he becomes an offence to most who, forsaken or hardened according to the heavenly will of the Majesty, do not receive him." Thus far D. refers from Luther's *de servo arbitrio*, and after a wry argument of his own on this, which is of no further concern to us, he adds, "These are the two 'contradictoriae voluntates,' which the Concordia formula (sol. decl. § 34 f.) rejects." We say: these are not the "contradictoriae voluntates" which the Concordia formula § 34 f. rejects, but these are factually exactly the same thoughts which the Concordia formula § 57 ff. also inculcates. According to D.'s discourse, are they not the following thoughts which Luther expresses: 1. according to the revealed word, God wants to make all men blessed, the incarnate God offers all that is necessary for salvation; those who perish are lost through their own fault; 2. Why all men are not saved, since those who are lost cannot do otherwise than sin, and their will can only be changed by God, is an inscrutable mystery which cannot be investigated; 3. a secret will of the Majesty is to be acknowledged, according to which those who are lost are forsaken or hardened. Here is only the difference between Luther and the Concordia formula, that the latter attributes the withdrawal of grace and the hardening to God's inscrutable "judgments," while Luther speaks of a "secret will of the Majesty" (*secreta voluntas majestatis*). But who would claim that this is a factual difference! Luther, too, often uses the expression secret "judgments" in *de servo arbitrio*,¹⁾ and the Concordia formula recalls "the will of the Majesty" when it introduces Rom. 9, 20: "Who art thou, man, that wilt be right with God." But we do not stop at Dieckhoff's paper. We immediately recall another passage in *de servo arbitrio* which has been cited before others to prove Luther's "predestinarianism." ²⁾ This is Luther's repeated statement of the condemnation of those "who do not deserve it." But note how Luther p. 328 (Dresd. ed.) expresses himself. ³⁾ He writes: According to the light of grace it is incomprehensible how God can justly condemn one who by his own strength cannot do otherwise than sin and become guilty before God. Then both the light of nature and the light of grace teach that there is no sin.

- 1) Z. E. g. p. 289. opp. lat. cur. Schmidt VII.
- 2) Thus, e. g., von Frank, *Theol. der Concordienf.* I, 128.
- 3) Opp. lat. cur. Schmidt. VII, 366.

The fault is not of the poor man, but of the unjust God. For they cannot judge otherwise of the God who, without all merit, rewards one sinner and does not reward another, but condemns him who may be less ungodly, or ever no more ungodly." Here it becomes clear how the "condemn the innocent" - which sounds so terrible when taken out of context - is meant. Luther is in no way denying that those who are punished "receive wages for their sins." They are "innocent," inasmuch as, according to the limited judgment of man, it is not clear how God can impute sin, since man cannot do otherwise than sin, and they are "innocent" in comparison with others who, in spite of the same guilt, are granted grace. Luther also speaks here from the point of view of *discretio personarum*. Does Luther's ill-slandered statement therefore mean something other than what the Concordia formula inculcates with the words: "One is entangled, blinded, given into a wrong mind; another, even though in the same guilt, is converted again," and, "God shows His earnestness to His own in various countries and persons, which we all would have deserved, would be worthy of, and would be worthy of"? We think that every reader who is free from prejudice must here answer in the negative. *)

How can anyone seriously claim that the Concordia Formula rejects Luther's teaching in *de servo arbitrio* by rejecting the "*contradictoriae voluntates*"? What then does the Formula of Concord reject, § 34 f.? It says there: "But the fact that many are called and few are chosen does not come from the fact that God's calling, which takes place through the word, should be thought to be God's speaking: Outwardly by the word I call you all to whom I give my word to my kingdom, but in the heart I do not mean it with all, but only with a few; for it is my will that the greatest part of those whom I call by the word should not be enlightened and converted, but be and remain condemned, though I declare myself otherwise against them by the word in the calling. *Hoc enim esset Deo contradictorias voluntates affingere*. That is, in this way it would be taught that God, who is the eternal truth, should be contrary to Himself; since God also punishes in men such unrighteousness, when a man declares one thing, and thinks and means another in his heart." Further, immediately after, § 36, it is said: "By this also the necessary, consoling reason is wholly uncertain and destroyed, since we are daily reminded and admonished that we are to learn and conclude from God's word alone, by which he deals with us and calls us, what his will is toward us, and what such promises and promises are to us, that we should certainly believe this and not doubt it."

1) Cf. here also Sol. Decl. I, § 25.

We have diligently added this last paragraph. For what the Concordia formula sees threatened by the assumption of *contradictoriae voluntates*, namely, the reliability of the revealed word, Luther in *de servo arbitrio*, in his distinction between a revealed and a majestic will, does not appear to be threatened at all. Rather, he unreservedly refers every inquirer after blessedness to the Gospel as the infallible, thoroughly reliable revelation of God's will to men. This alone must make a prudent critic of Luther's teaching cautious and urge him to examine whether Luther's distinction between a revealed and a hidden will of God is not something quite different from the "*contradictoriae voluntates*" which the Concordia formula rejects. That a distinction is made at all between a revealed and a hidden will of God cannot, according to the Concordia formula, do any harm to the reliability of the revealed word. We have seen above that the Formula of Concord itself has this distinction. And not merely in such a way that it recognizes hidden judgments of God in the "government and historical proclamation of salvation," 1) but also where it is a question of the blessedness of individuals who hear the word: "One is hardened, blinded, given to a wrong mind; another, so well in like guilt, is again converted." Now how does the Concordia formula keep the revealed word intact for all who inquire after blessedness? In such a way that it remarks right at the beginning: "But a distinction must be made with special diligence between that which is expressly revealed or not revealed in God's will. For over and above what has been said up to now, and what has been revealed in Christ, God has kept secret and concealed much of this mystery, and has reserved it for his wisdom and knowledge alone, which we should not inquire into, nor should we follow our thoughts, conclude, or ponder, but should only keep to the revealed word. Which remembrance is most needful. Then our wit is always much more concerned with this than with that which God has revealed to us in his word, because we cannot make it up, nor are we commanded to do so." The Concordia formula thus proceeds in such a way that it means to withdraw the thoughts from the secret judgments of God, which are indeed there, which seem to contradict the revealed Word, which we cannot "rhyme" with the revealed Word, and to hold to the revealed Word with faith alone. Luther proceeds in the same way in *de servo arbitrio*. It is a definite step forward in Luther's "development" if one cites as a characteristic of the later Luther: "One should

1) Luthardt's expression. "The Doctrine of Free Will," p. 132.

Do not inquire into the predestination of the hidden God, but be satisfied with the predestination which is revealed through the calling and ministry of the Word. Of God, in so far as he has not revealed himself, there is no faith, no knowledge, and no cognition. The rule is this: what is above us is none of our business (*quae supra nos, nihil ad nos*). Such thoughts as seek to investigate something beyond and apart from the revelation of God are devilish thoughts, by which nothing is accomplished but that we plunge ourselves into ruin, because they are directed to an inscrutable object, namely, to the unrevealed God." All these thoughts are not only already found in *de servo arbitrio*, but they are here inculcated again and again. They form, as it were, the refrain when Luther spoke of the revealed and hidden God. Look, for example, at pp. 221-228 1). In these 7 pages Luther six times diverts into the above thoughts, which it is quite possible to assign to the later Luther. "It is enough" - he says here, among other things - "that we know that in God there is an inscrutable will. But what the will creates, how, whither, how far the will goes, that it behooves us not to ask, to inquire, to seek, or to know, but only to worship with all fear and trembling." The inquiry of his secret will God wills to be "much more the more forbidden, than many thousand Coryci caves might be forbidden." "There" (in his majesty) "we have nothing to do with God; neither doth he will that we should have to do with him." "But have to do with the God who became man, or, as Paul speaks, with JEsu crucified, in whom are contained all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, but hidden; through whom we have abundantly that which we ought to know and not to know." 2)

But, one objects, does Luther also speak of God's revealed will in *de servo arbitrio* in such a way that every poor sinner can adhere to it? That Luther teaches such a will, everyone must find probable from the outset, because Luther forbids wanting to inform himself somehow from the hidden will about God's intentions toward us, and on the other hand means clinging solely to the revealed word. He says: "We must govern ourselves according to the Word, not according to the inscrutable will. For who could govern himself according to the will of God, which is wholly hidden and not knowable?" 3) If one does not want to assume that Luther, who was tested in all temptations, was caught in a great self-deception, then one will probably find from the outset that Luther had a general, earnest, and serious desire to be governed by the Word of God,

1) Lat. text after Schmidt.

2) According to the Latin text, *op. cit.* p. 227.

3) *Dresd. Ed.* p. 146.

The only thing he teaches is a certain will of mercy that asks for salvation. And this is also confirmed by his statements in *de servo arbitrio*, especially in the passages that were most appalled. For example, where Luther says that God, according to his majesty, works all in all, death and life, and in this respect does not grieve over the death of the sinner, he says of God, in so far as he has revealed himself: "*deplorat mortem, quam invenit in populo, et amovere studet*". Hoc enim agit Deus praedicatus, ut ablato peccato et morte salvi simus," 1) "he mourns over the death which he finds in the people, and he seeks to remove it. For with this the revealed God deals, that he may take away sin and death, and that we may be saved." So Luther does not know a sham calling through the revealed word, but the revealed God really and truly grieves over the death of the sinner, really and truly seeks to take away death, really and truly deals with taking away sin and death and leading to blessedness. A little later Luther says in a similar context: 2) "*Deus incarnatus hic loquitur: Volui et tu noluisti, Deus, inquam, incarnatus in hoc missus est, ut velit, loquatur, faciat, patiat, offerat omnibus omnia, quae sunt ad salutem necessaria*", "the incarnate God speaks: I have willed, and thou hast not willed; the incarnate God, I say, is sent to will, to speak, to do, to suffer, to offer to all that is necessary to salvation." Here Luther teaches as definitely as possible the general earnest will of grace. Luther says that the Son of God became man for the purpose of wanting, speaking, doing, suffering, and offering all that is necessary for the attainment of salvation. As earnestly as the incarnation, the doing, and the suffering of Christ are meant, so earnestly does he also offer "to all that is necessary for salvation. And to that, and that alone, which we perceive in the Son of God, Luther teaches every inquirer after salvation to adhere.

We therefore say: Although Luther in *de servo arbitrio* emphasizes the existence of an inscrutable will of God as never before, the revealed will of grace remains firm and certain to him on every point. Without reservation, he refers every inquirer about salvation to the Gospel, as in which the gracious God reveals himself to every sinner for salvation. Just as the "*Deus praedicatus*" incarnation, action, and suffering are meant seriously and to all, so also the appeal in the gospel is not only directed to the salvation of individuals, but all hearers' sin, death, and destruction are to be taken away. According to Luther in *de servo arbitrio*, the revealed will is not for the one.

1) Opp. lat. cur. Schmidt. VII, 222.

2) op. cit. p. 228.

The same is true for the whole "people": "To all he offers everything that is necessary for salvation. "So you see," writes Luther 1), "that this word, 'I do not want the death of the sinner,' wants nothing else than that it praises grace, divine goodness, and mercy to the world." It is true that this grace is accepted only by "the terrified consciences," not by the sure, but the latter "despise God's grace, which is promised by the word." The grace, therefore, was intended for them also. When the Formula of Concord, Art. 11, § 29, says that we are to consider the "calling of God, so done by the preaching of the Word," as "no mirror fencing," Luther inculcates this truth precisely also in *de servo arbitrio*. In short, Luther teaches such a hidden and. revealed will of God that the latter is and remains perfectly intact and reliable and certain under all circumstances. Luther remarks on Ezek. 33:11: 2) "I do not want the death of the sinner": "For the Holy Scriptures are half full of such gracious, divine promises, since God offers man mercy, grace, life, peace and blessedness. But what do the words of divine promise mean but the word: "I will not the sinner's death"? Is it not just as much to say, I am merciful, as to say, I am not angry, I will not punish, I will not cause your death, I will forgive and spare? And if the divine promises were not so firm, that afflicted consciences, terrified by the temptations of sin, death, and hell, might be restored, who could hope and wait for mercy? What sinner would not despair?" Luther does not counsel souls in such a way that they are to trust the preached word only when they perceive its effect in themselves, but in such a way, as is evident from what has already been said, that he refers them to the word *par excellence* and calls them to trust the word for the sake of the word itself (as a word certain in itself). This is also a point where, in spite of the often similar-sounding speeches, the radical difference between the teaching of Luther and the Calvinistic teaching stands out, which allows the latter to be certain only afterwards, from the experienced effect of the word or rather from the word, whether God's will of grace toward us is a serious one. Thus we say very definitely against Dieckhoff: Luther does not teach in *de servo arbitrio* the "contradictoriae voluntates" which the Concordia formula rejects § 34 f. Luther does not teach "that God's will of grace against us is a serious one. Luther does not teach "that God's calling, which is done by the word, should be regarded as if God said, 'Outwardly by the word I call all of you to whom I give my word to my kingdom, but in my heart I do not mean it with all of you, but only with a few,'" but Luther teaches that God's calling, which is done by the word, means it so earnestly with all that God

1) Dresd. Ed. p. 144.

2) Dresd. Ed. p. 142.

and thereby take away sin and death from all (*amovere studeat*). The *flere*, *deplorare*, *gemere* 1) of the revealed God is an earnest and true one, and is not done merely for appearance. Luther does not teach thus of God: "It is my will that the greater part of those whom I call by the word shall not be enlightened and converted, but shall be and remain condemned, though I declare myself otherwise against them by the word in their calling," but Luther teaches that God is to be taken at his word in his calling by the word, and that one should give no other thought of God room in the heart than one can grasp from his revealed word. Luther teaches a hidden judgment, a secret will of God. But so does the Formula of Concord, § 57 ff. As little, however, does the Formula of Concord thereby annul the reliability of the revealed will, so little does Luther place the secret will in such contrast to the revealed will that the latter is thereby annulled. The contrast, Luther points out, is only an apparent one, and exists for limited knowledge in this life; in *lumine gloriae*, the most perfect harmony will result.

For the latter thought we had referred to the conclusion of Luther's treatise, *Dresd. Ausg. pp. 324-328, Opp. lat. cur. Schmidt. VII" 363-366*. Now D. finds this quite inconsistent. D. claims "that there is nothing, absolutely nothing at all in the cited passage" that we want to prove from it, that everything that we have "read out" from it "is based solely on the ignorance" with which we would have read. The Herr Consistorialrath, as his expressions prove, has lost his composure here, and this has so deranged his thoughts that he finds "nothing, absolutely nothing at all" of that in the passage referred to, which is nevertheless pronounced *luce clarius* in it. We will only prove from his own words that in his excitement he did not know what he was writing. Dieckhoff writes: "In this passage Luther says that now, in the light of the Word and of grace, it is quite incomprehensible to human understanding that God, who damns those who do not deserve it (*qui damnet immeritos*), namely, those who are compelled by the necessity of nature to sin and perish, is nevertheless kind and just. Only in the light of glory would this be revealed to us; here, however incomprehensible it may be, we must believe it. So Luther is not speaking of the difference between the will of God revealed in the Word and the hidden will of God, but of something quite different, namely, of the difference between our dark knowledge in this life and the perfect knowledge in the life to come." So far D. A strange contrast which D. makes here! Luther, it is true, is said to speak of the difference of un-

1) S. 228.

The first is that we speak of the perfect knowledge in this life and the perfect knowledge in that life, but we do not speak of the difference between the will of God revealed in the Word and the will of God hidden in the Word. What is the reason, then, that imperfect knowledge belongs to this life? It is because knowledge in this life is bound up with the revealed word, and this revealed word does not give us any further information about God in his majesty. Therefore, as certainly as the above passage speaks of the difference between the dark knowledge in this life and the full knowledge in the life to come, so certainly does Luther speak there of the difference between the will of God revealed in the Word and the hidden will of God. D. himself acknowledged this when he began: "In this passage Luther says that now, in the light of the word and grace, it is absolutely incomprehensible, and so on. What is the "light of the Word and of grace" but the light of "the will of God revealed in the Word"? Thus D. contradicts himself in one and the same sentence. Verily, D. would have had every reason to have stepped out a little more reservedly and modestly, and not to speak so loftily of the "unreasonableness" of his opponents. And one more thing! What kindness and justice of God is this, with which the condemnation of "the innocent" seems to be in contradiction? Is it not that which is revealed in the Word of God?

But we hasten to the conclusion. That Dieckhoff takes such exception to Luther's *de servo arbitrio* and specifically to what Luther says about a revealed and an inscrutable will of God, is not at all surprising according to his (Dieckhoff's) position. D. holds the following to be Lutheran doctrine: The reason why only the elect are chosen, as distinguished from the rest, lies in the fact foreseen by God, that the elect do not, as they can according to the freedom left them in the work of divine grace, hinder the work of grace by resisting? in short, Dieckhoff states for Lutheran doctrine: that some are converted and saved before others, of which the reason of the former is better conduct. This doctrine, however, agrees with Luther's teaching in *de servo arbitrio* like fire and water. But who on earth gives D. the right to pass off his monstrosity of doctrine as Lutheran doctrine! Where the Lutheran Confession comes to the question, "Why some before others?" (§§ 57 ff.), it does not say, "Some behave better than others," but, "as well in equal guilt;" and the Confession does not say, "Some behave more wickedly than others," but, "Those who are affected by the judgment of hardening receive what.

1) Missourian predestinarianism p. 78.

We would all be well-deserving, worthy, and valuable. And because this is so, because the Concordia formula, in answer to the question, "Why some before others?" cannot give any difference of conduct as a reason, therefore the Concordia formula, § 57 ff., recognizes an inscrutable judgment of God, which cannot be rhymed with the revealed word hereafter. On this point we hold Dr. Dieckhoff. We wish him not to ignore § 57-64 of the Formula of Concord, but to acknowledge the clear content of the same as Lutheran doctrine. If this happens on his part, then he will judge quite differently about a large part of Luther's *de servo arbitrio*, about Luther's distinction between a revealed and an inscrutable will of God, about Luther's paradox: "God condemns those who do not deserve it," and so on. But if Dieckhoff does not wish to acknowledge the clear content of the above-mentioned paragraphs of the Formula of Concord, then he publicly disavows not only Luther in *de servo arbitrio*, but also the Formula of Concord. Then, outwardly, more clarity and truth comes into Dieckhoff's position.

We know very well that in the foregoing we have touched only a part of the questions raised with respect to Luther's *de servo arbitrio*. The charge of "determinism," also raised by D., must be approached from a completely different angle. But the charge that Luther teaches the "*contradictoriae voluntates*" rejected by the Concordia formula will fall silent as soon as one heeds and believes what the Concordia formula § 57 ff. teaches of the inscrutable judgments of God. We admit that in one respect there is a great difference between Luther's *de servo arbitrio* and the Formula of Concord. What the Concordia formula, according to its purpose, deals with only briefly and more in passing, is set forth in great detail in *de servo arbitrio* as belonging to the actual subject. The Concordia formula speaks of the inscrutable judgments of God in such a way that even the simple-minded cannot be offended by it. Luther's *de servo arbitrio*, on the other hand, is strong food; Luther speaks of high things boldly, so boldly that the reader will stop repeatedly and ask himself, "How can Luther mean that?" But we do not believe that someone in whom the doctrine of the Lutheran Confession really lives can gain the courage to accuse Luther of false doctrine, even if he does not dare to speak as Luther speaks. Dieckhoff assumes an erroneous premise when he seems to imply that we "Missourians" arrived at our doctrine of election by grace from Luther's *de servo arbitrio*. If we are not very much mistaken, the study of this very writing of Luther's is also among us confined to particular circles. But what lives among us all next to God's Word through God's grace is the Lutheran confession. And from the Concordia formula we have arrived at our doctrine of conversion and election by grace. But it is precisely because we have

of the confession fully and completely without rationalistic mediation and modern-theological support, we stand by Luther's *de servo arbitrio* as we stand. And there is no doubt: if Dieckhoff also fully and completely accepts the Lutheran confession, he especially abandons his sentence, which is outrageous from the Lutheran point of view: If Dieckhoff, too, fully accepts the Lutheran confession, and, in particular, abandons his outrageous proposition, from the Lutheran standpoint, that the fact that some are converted and saved before others has its reason in the better conduct of some before others, then he, too, will judge Luther's *de servo arbitrio* quite differently, and will find his present judgment of Luther, "That Luther has not yet become master of the problem in a sufficient manner, "1) just as inapplicable and presumptuous as we do.

F. P.

What does Scripture say of itself?

(With consideration of the just also recently raised objections of the newer theology).

(Continued.)

We repeat Thesis I:

As to the nature and origin of Scripture, the moderns deny what the church has always believed, that Scripture in the proper sense is God's Word, inspired by God, and call Scripture a record of revelation, in the production of which God and human authors collaborated. This is opposed by the Scriptures' own testimony.

We have presented the negation and position of the newer theologians. We oppose them with the testimony of Scripture.

1. Scripture testifies to the Old Testament as God's Word.

a. The Old Testament gives itself as God's Word. We open the scripture as it is and check step by step who is the actual person who is speaking to us here.

The law of Moses makes the beginning. The law is given through Moses, but given by God through Moses. The law is God's word and revelation in the very sense of the word. There can be no doubt about it. God Himself spoke the ten words from Mount Sinai. In the darkness of the cloud, the Lord God made known to his servant Moses all the laws and customs which Israel was to observe. These very words, which God Himself spoke, Moses then wrote in a book. After 2 Mos. 20. the legislation, that is the law of the ten commandments, is thought of and 2 Mos. 21-23. the noblest rights, which Moses presented to Israel.

1) Missourian predestinarianism p. 70.

We are told in Exodus 24:3 ff: "Moses came and told the people all the words of the LORD, and all the judgments. Then all the people answered with one voice, and said: All the words which the LORD hath spoken will we do." And now it is further said, "Then Moses wrote all the words of the LORD." V. 4. The words of the LORD, which the LORD had spoken, were now before us written. And this writing is called v. 7. "the book of the covenant." "Moses took the book of the covenant, and read it in the ears of the people. And when they had said: All things whatsoever the LORD hath commanded, we will do and obey; Moses took the blood." The written law was henceforth the basis of the covenant between God and His people. What Moses read from the book, in the ears of the people, was what God had to say to His people. And the people vowed to God to obey the very words they had heard read from the book. What Moses wrote in the book was from then on the word and law of the Lord. It was God's will that Israel should be judged and obeyed in the future according to the written law. Therefore he gave Moses himself the command to write down all the words of the law which he had revealed to him. "And the LORD said unto Moses, Write these words: for according to these words have I made a covenant with thee, and with Israel." Ex. 34:27.

At the end of the law of Moses, Deut. 31, 9-13, it is again quite clearly stated what Israel was to keep from the law, and especially from the written law. "And Moses wrote this law, and gave it to the priests, to the children of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the LORD, and to all the elders of Israel, and commanded them, saying: For seven years at a time, in the year of remission, in the feast of tabernacles, when all Israel cometh to appear before the LORD thy God in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt cause this law to be proclaimed before all Israel in their ears; even before the congregation of the people, both of the men and women, children, and thy stranger that is in thy gate; That they may hear and learn, that they may fear the LORD their God, and observe to do all the words of this law; and that their children also, which know it not, may hear and learn, that they may fear the LORD your God all the days of your life, ye that dwell in the land whither ye go over Jordan to possess it." So this very "law" which God revealed to Moses and through Moses to Israel was written down by Moses. The written law, the book of the law was to be read annually before the ears of all the people. That which is read aloud, that which is written in the book, is called and is "this law," the law which God gave through Moses, that is, the law of the LORD, God's word. From this book the people, their children and their children's children, are to learn what the will of the Lord their God is. This is in the book. When the children of Israel heard the book of the law read aloud,

Then they shall hear the commandment of the LORD. Israel, their children, and their children's children, shall fear the LORD their God. And what is the fear of the LORD? That they do and keep all the words of the law which are read out of the book. In the same context, Deut. 31:24-26, it is said, "Now when Moses had written out the whole words of this law in a book, he commanded the Levites that bare the ark of the testimony of the LORD, saying, Take the book of this law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the LORD your God, that there it may be a witness against you." The law of God, in which God the LORD has clearly testified to His people of His will, is a witness against Israel, in case Israel sins and transgresses. But the written law, the book of the law, is called and is a witness against Israel. This very book testifies to Israel, to the future generations, the holy will of the Lord their God, and therefore accuses Israel when she does not obey the will of God.

The later scriptures of the Old Covenant put the law book on the same level with the law itself. According to Joshua 1:7, 8, the Lord exhorts his servant Joshua, and through him and with him all the people: "Be of good cheer, and be very glad to keep and do all things according to the law which Moses my servant commanded thee: turn not aside from it to the right hand, or to the left: that thou mayest do wisely in all that thou shalt do. And let not the book of this law depart out of thy mouth, but consider it day and night; that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein. Then thou shalt prosper in all that thou doest, and shalt be able to do wisely." Moses, the servant of God, had died. The work to which Moses was called as a mediator, the legislation, was finished. God gave no more new commandments to his people henceforth. But he did bind the people, who now dwelt in the land of promise, to the law of Moses. Only then, if they did everything according to it and did not deviate from it to the right or to the left, would they have happiness, blessing and success. The law of Moses was to be Israel's rule and guide for all time. But how? God no longer spoke to his people now, as he had formerly done through Moses. God no longer repeated and confirmed, as during the wilderness wanderings, the former words which he had spoken at Sinai. So he directed his people henceforth to the written law, "the book of this law." This book, in which Moses wrote down all the words of the law, Joshua the ruler and his people were to look at day and night, contemplating, praying on their lips, and doing everything according to what was written in it. When Joshua, when Israel took heed to all that was written, then they walked in the obedience of the law, in the obedience of God, and acted wisely, and were blessed and blessed.

Success. "The book of this law" was the law of the Lord for Israel after the death of Moses. Thus Nehemiah 8:8, 18, is expressly emphasized that "the law book of God" was read to Israel. Actually, "they read in the book, even the law of God." The book which Moses wrote is entitled "the law of God," XXXXXX XXXX. This very book, as we say, the five books of Moses, is in truth and reality the law of God itself. As often as one reads, recites, recites this book, one hears from it the very will and commandment of God. In this book, through this book, and by no other means, does God now let us know "his glorious law and judgment," etc.

It is hardly necessary to remark that the Torah of Moses, or the Torah of God, as it was now in use among Israel, the written Torah, contained all that we now find in the Pentateuch, that is, also the history of Israel and the fathers up to the death of Moses, just as the apostle, Gal. 4:22, quotes the story of Sarah and Hagar from "the law.

According to the Scriptures, the Book of the Law, the writing of Moses, is not a mere report of the legislation on Mount Sinai, not a mere document of that great revelation of God which Moses imparted, but is itself the law of the Lord, God's word and revelation. The Lord God revealed to men from heaven what they should and should not do, and declared his will first orally and then in writing, so that all generations on earth might have it before their eyes. All that is now written before us in the book of the law of Moses is for us the will, command, and commandment of the Lord. It is the will of God that we do and act according to all that is written.

As with the law, so it is with the prophets. The prophets spoke to Israel in the name of the Lord. It is said that the word of the LORD came to them. They stood before the people and said, "Thus saith the LORD of hosts." The proclamation of the prophets was God's revelation. There is no doubt about that. But now the prophets, by the command of God, wrote down the very words which they first delivered orally to the people, that they might be preserved to their posterity. Isaiah, the prophet, received the command: "Bind up the testimony, seal up the law unto my disciples." Is. 8, 16. Isa. 8, 16. And Daniel: "And now Daniel, hide these words, and seal up this writing, until the latter time: so shall many come upon it, and find great understanding." Dan. 12, 4.

The written word of the prophets is therefore equally called, as their oral preaching, "prophecy". The book of Isaiah has the inscription "Face of Isaiah, the son of Amoz". Isa. 1:1, which is title of the book. The writing of the prophet is called and is "vision," "prophecy," that is, revelation. The prophet Jeremiah lifts up his

Scripture with the words, "These are the words of Jeremiah to whom happened the word of the Lord, etc." Jerem. 1, 1. 2. The word of the Lord, which was made known and revealed to him, he wants to reproduce in his book. The prophets, as the contents of their books prove, wrote down many things that they did not first recite orally. But their word was always, no matter if they spoke or wrote, "word of the Lord", "prophecy". 2 Chron. 32, 32. we find the remark, "But what more is to be said of Hezekiah, and his mercy: behold, it is written in the vision of the prophet Isaiah." The book of the prophecy of Isaiah is here referred to, Isa. Cap. 36-39. and this book, according to its whole contents, including the stories woven in, is regarded as the "vision," the revelation of God. Psalm 40:8. the Messiah says, "Behold, I come; in the book it is written of me." The opinion is that the Messiah comes to fulfill the prophecy of the prophets. But this is written in the book. The book is identical with the prophecy. Is 29:11, the prophet says of disobedient, hardened Israel that the visions of all the prophets are to them like the words of a sealed book, which he who receives it to read cannot read. It is assumed that the visions and prophecies of all the prophets are written. Is. 34, 16. the writing of the prophet is called "the book of the Lord". It is the word of the Lord in the form of a book. According to the Scriptures the book of the prophets is not a mere historical report about the activity of the prophets, not a mere register of their prophecies, but itself "vision", "prophecy", "word of the Lord". In the book of prophecy were laid down the precious promises of God. Therefore Israel should search and search in the book of the LORD. Is. 34, 16. Israel could and should be sure of the future of the Messiah because it was written about Him in the book. The testimony of God was sealed in the Scriptures and through the Scriptures.

Also the Psalms, as they are in the Canon, give themselves as the Word of God. In his last psalm, 2 Sam. 23:1-3, David, the psalmist, says: "These are the last words of David: David the son of Jesse spake.... sweetly with psalms of Israel. The Spirit of the LORD hath spoken by me, and his speech is upon my tongue. The God of Israel hath spoken unto me; the stronghold of Israel hath spoken." Here David quite deliberately refers to his speech, his song, as the word of the LORD. But he means the song which he sets down in Scripture here, 2 Sam. 23:1-6. "These are the last words of David," etc.-this is the title of this memorable writing.

Finally, if in the Old Testament Scriptures, especially in the Psalms, the "Word of God" is so often praised and glorified, we must take into account all that God has said at various times and in various ways.

He was able to put into thoughts what was then available in a clear and solid form as scripture and book. When David praises the man "who has delight in the law of the Lord, and speaks of his law day and night," Ps. 1:2; when he confesses of himself, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path," Ps. 119:105, he has before his eyes the holy Scripture with which he was familiar from his youth, the Torah of Moses. He prays God to open his eyes, that he may see the wonders of his law. Ps. 119:18: What he sees, reads, and contemplates day and night, he desires to grasp and understand. Therefore he calls upon God to open his inner eye. The "statutes," "judgments," "testimonies," "commandments," and "ways" of the Lord, in which David has all his delight, are the very words of the Lord which we still see and learn from the Book of the Law of Moses. In this book the "law of the LORD" had gained a clear, firm form. God revealed no new rights and commandments in David's day. But in order to understand the praise of the divine word and law, we must add that in David's time the book of the law, the Torah, was not a closed book, but that the Israelites of the right kind kept moving on their lips what they had heard and learned from this book. What was read and inculcated in men, women and children from this book lived on among the people and resounded in constant praise and confession.

d. The New Testament bears witness to the Old Testament. Christ and the apostles refer to the scriptures, the holy scriptures, God's word, the scriptures inspired by God.

Christ, the true witness, who spoke the word of God from his own mouth, directed the people to the Scriptures. There God revealed to them what they needed to know for their salvation. "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear the same." Luc. 16, 29. To the Jews who would not believe him, he proved from the Scriptures that he was the one who was to come. The Jews accepted the Scriptures of the Old Covenant as the Word of God, as the Word of truth. And so they also had to acknowledge Christ as the Messiah, because the Scriptures testified of him. In this sense the Lord says to them: "Search the scriptures; for ye think ye have eternal life in them: and they bear witness of me." Joh. 5, 39. He said to the Pharisees: "Have you never read the Scriptures? The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner. This was done by the Lord, and it is marvelous in our sight"? Matth. 21, 42. To the Sadducees, who denied the resurrection of the dead, he answered: "Ye err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God." Matth. 22, 29. The Sadducees condemned themselves by denying the scripture, the word of the Lord.

They did not know or understand the living God. So also the power of God was hidden from them, so God Himself, the living, almighty God, was hidden from them.

How often does the Lord remind us that the Scriptures must be fulfilled? There is the opinion that what God has said must also go forth, since God cannot lie. Thus, when He surrendered into the hands of His enemies and refused to let Peter strike with the sword, He declared, "But how would the Scripture be fulfilled? It must go thus." Matth. 26, 54. It was the counsel and will of God that Christ should suffer and die. And this counsel and will of God was made known and fixed in the Scriptures. Therefore, what the Scripture says about the suffering of the Messiah had to be fulfilled, because God's counsel and providence cannot be changed and overturned. Even after His resurrection, the Lord took great pains to open the understanding of the Scriptures to His disciples. Luc. 24:32, 45. Even now, after all was accomplished, the Lord took the summa of the gospel, of Christ's death and resurrection, of repentance and remission of sins, from the Scriptures of the old covenant. "And said unto them: Thus it is written, and thus Christ must suffer, and rise from the dead the third day; and cause repentance and remission of sins to be preached in his name among all nations." Luc. 24, 46. 47. He had all things in mind. To prove to his friends and enemies that his doctrine was of God. Therefore he taught from the Scriptures. For all that was written was spoken and taught of God. Christ honored his Father in all things. That is why he was so careful to emphasize the Scriptures. For he saw nothing in the Scriptures but the word and will of his Father. He also used the Scriptures against Satan. With the one word: "It is written" he rejected the temptations of the devil. Matth. 4, 4. 7. 10. That meant so much as: "God has said this." And that settled the matter.

Finally, it should be noted that Christ expressly testified that David spoke "in the Spirit" when he wrote the 110th Psalm, Matth. 22, 43. Thus, according to Christ's judgment, Scripture is the speech of the Spirit of God.

Christ gave testimony to the whole scripture, the whole canon of the Old Testament, when He told His disciples: "All things must be fulfilled that are written of Me in the law of Moses, in the prophets and in the psalms. Luc. 24, 44.

Like Christ, the Lord, also the apostles introduced the Old Testament Scriptures as the *Deus locutus est* in their speech. The evangelists repeatedly emphasize that the scripture was fulfilled: "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet", Matth. 2, 17, or: "by the prophets", Matth. 2, 23, or: "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet.

Scripture which saith," John 19:24. The same formula is common in the apostolic epistles. "And the scripture is fulfilled, which saith, Abraham believed God, etc." Jac. 2, 23. "As it is written, I have made thee the father of many nations, etc." Rom. 4:17. It is a common way of saying, "The scripture saith." E.G.: "What saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." Rom. 4, 3. The Scripture says, speaks, as a person speaks. It is God who speaks here. Thus, instead of the subject "the Scriptures," the other subject "God" readily enters into the speech. "The scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Marry therefore have I (that is, God) raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee." Rom. 9, 17. Gal. 4, 30. we read, "But what saith the scripture? Cast out the maid with her son." What the scripture says here is God's command.

Thus also words of Scripture are simply introduced with it, e. g. Gal. 3:16: οὐ λέγει - αλλά. Luther has correctly translated, "He (i. e. God) speaketh not: by seed, as by many, but as by One, by thy seed, which is Christ." Desgl. 2 Cor. 6:2, "For He saith, I have heard thee in the acceptable time, etc." What the Scripture saith, God saith. Gal. 3:8. is ascribed to Scripture "Foreknowledge:" "Foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, the Scripture declared unto Abraham, In thee shall all the Gentiles be blessed." The Scripture appears here as a rational, thinking subject, yea, as an omniscient person. It is precisely the living God who is thought of together with Scripture.

Now it is often expressly stated that God spoke through the prophets, through the Scriptures. "But all these things came to pass, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, which saith, and so forth. Matth. 1, 22. "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet that speaketh, etc." Matth. 2, 15. "As he (God) speaketh by Hosea, etc." Rom. 9, 25. "Which (the gospel of God) he promised beforehand by his prophets in the holy scriptures." Rom. 1, 2. "After that God spake sometimes and divers manners in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, etc." Heb. 1, 1. "For he (God) reproveth them, and saith (in the prophets): Behold the days come, etc." Heb. 8, 8. Rom. 3, 2. The apostle remarks that the Jews were entrusted with τὰ λόγια τοῦ ἑοῦ, "the words of God," and there evidently means the sacred writings. The more recent contemptuously reject the "dogmatic formula": "God is the actual author of the Scriptures." They deny that God is the actual subject who has spoken through the prophets, through the Scriptures. Thus they deny what Scripture affirms and asserts with emphasis. Scripture asserts and repeats the assertion, "God spoke through the prophets, through the Scriptures." God is the speaking Subject.

The prophets and their writings are the means God uses to speak to people. It is truly satanic to deny the very thing that God affirms. God said to Adam, "The day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." The serpent said to the woman, "You shall surely not surely die." Blinded by the devil, the newer scribes have the audacity to cast aside as untenable the simple, unmistakable self-testimony of Scripture, that God spoke through the prophets, and that therefore God is the actual author of Scripture.

Specifically, the Holy Spirit is mentioned as the author of Scripture. "Therefore, as the Holy Ghost saith, This day, if ye hear his voice, harden not your hearts, etc." Heb. 3:7, 8. "But this also the Holy Ghost testifieth unto us. For after he hath said before: This is the testament, etc." Heb. 2, 15. "The scripture must be fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost spake before by the mouth of David, etc." Apost. 1, 16. "And being divided among themselves, they departed, when Paul spake one word, saying, That the Holy Ghost spake by the prophet Jeshuaam unto our fathers, etc." Apost. 28, 25. The Holy Spirit could not testify more clearly to the nature and authorship of Scripture. Whoever does not understand these clear words or understands them differently than Christianity has understood them from the beginning has a distorted mind.

We now leave three more *loci classici* to follow, which deal with the divine inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures.

St. Peter writes: "For what blessedness the prophets did seek and search, who prophesied of the grace that was to come upon you; and searched for what and what time the Spirit of Christ which was in them pointed, and testified beforehand of the sufferings which are in Christ, and of the glory which is hereafter; to whom it is manifest that they presented it not unto themselves, but unto us; which is now preached unto you by them which preached the gospel unto you by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven." 1 Pet. 1:10-12. The prophecy of the prophets is here spoken of, and that is, the prophecy which they presented unto us, wherewith they ministered unto us, the children of the new covenant; that is, the prophecy which is in the writings of the prophets. And of this it is said, that the Spirit of Christ was in them, and wrote down the very things which they prophesied, the future grace, Christ's suffering and glory, testifying beforehand. So it was the Spirit of Christ who spoke and testified through the prophets. The speech, the testimony of the Spirit, which is in the writings of the prophets, is expressly distinguished from the prophets' own activity, their seeking and searching. They searched and searched with all diligence, to what and to what time the spirit of Christ, who had given them the prophecy, had come.

They searched the Scriptures, their own writings, which they had before their eyes like an alien greatness, to see when the time of fulfillment would come and what that time would be like. But their researches had no result. They knew just so much, no more, no less, than the Spirit of Christ revealed and imparted to them, and this Spirit testified to them and through them the grace of the New Testament, Christ's suffering and glory, but revealed nothing of the time and hour when all this was to take place.

In the second letter of Peter we find the well-known passage: "For no prophecy has ever been produced by human will, but the holy men of God have spoken, driven by the Holy Spirit." 2 Pet. 1, 21. This sentence serves to substantiate the preceding statement, "This ye ought to know for the first, that no prophecy is done in the Scriptures out of their own interpretation," i.e., is dependent on their own human interpretation And interpretation (*Ιδίας Πλάσεως οἷ> γίνεται*). The opinion is: no prophecy, no piece of Scripture can man himself, of himself understand and interpret, rather another, the Holy Spirit, must open and interpret the Scripture, the prophecy. And this is because it was not man's mind and will, but the Holy Spirit who brought forth the prophecy. Both are emphasized, the negation and the position. The negation is: never has a prophecy been brought forth by the will of man. The prophecy of Scripture, the holy Scripture - of which we are speaking in this context - is not a product of men, of the will of men. That "most independent activity" of the sacred writers is expressly denied. The position is: The holy men of God have spoken, impelled by the Holy Spirit. To be sure, those holy men, the prophets, it was who spoke, who wrote-for it is from the Old Testament Scriptures that the apostle deals from v. 19-but as they wrote, set down prophecy, they were driven, moved, carried (*φερόμενοί*) by the Holy Spirit. They were wholly in the ministry, were instruments of the Holy Spirit. It was the Holy Spirit who made known His thoughts and wisdom in prophecy, and used the prophets and their speeches and writings as a medium to make known to men what He wanted them to know. The Holy Spirit, no other besides or apart from Him, is the author of Scripture, of prophecy. Scripture is the product of the Holy Spirit, and exclusively the product of the Spirit, not a work of God composed by men.

St. Paul writes, "All Scripture, inspired of God, is profitable for doctrine," etc., 2 Tim. 3, 16. We are here concerned with the one expression by which the apostle characterizes the Scriptures, the very Scriptures of the Old Covenant, which Timothy had learned from childhood, the expression *θεόπνευστος*. All the commentators, ancient and modern, have unanimously translated:

"inspired by God" or actually: "breathed by God". Only Cremer has recently disputed this traditional meaning in his New Testament Dictionary. He gives to that compound an active sense, "God-breathing." We confess that we do not understand the deduction of that linguist. The adjectiva verbalia on τός have, after all, always a passive meaning in the Greek language. θεόπνευστος may, according to the Rules of grammar only "gehaucht, geathmet" should be, not "breath, breathing". And the compound with *θεός* *does* not change this. All composita of a similar kind have passive sense: *ἁπταίστος*, *θεό-δοτος*, *θεόκλητος*, *θεοδώρητος*, *θεόχριστος*, *θεοχίνητος*, and so also the *θεοδίδαχτος*, "taught by God," 1 Thess. 4, 9. Also in the two passages cited by Cremer from Profane Scribes, Plutarch 904 f.: *τοὺς ὀνειρούς τοὺς θεόπνευστους χατ* ἀνάγκην γίνεσθαι*, and Pseudophykili.

des, 121st : *Τῆς δὲ θεόπνευστου σοφίης λόγος ἐστὶν ἀριστος* is *θεόπνευστος* obviously meant passively. In short, it is linguistically constatirt: *θεόπνευστος* means and can mean nothing else than: breathed by God. All the Scriptures of the Old Covenant, according to the apostle, were breathed by God, all the words of the Scriptures came forth from God's breath and Spirit, just as the words and writings of men come forth from the spirit of men. That which is wafted to us from Scripture everywhere is God's breath; that which comes to us in Scripture is God's Spirit, God's thought. Everything here is the Word of God.

(To be continued.)

Two pleasing debates from German theological circles.

In the recent controversy over the doctrines of election by grace and conversion, a considerable number of the better-known German theologians have gradually taken the floor. Almost all of them have taken the side of our opponents, and we have had to perceive anew that in the leading circles over there a true Christian theology, and even the understanding of it, has completely disappeared. What goes under the name of theology is essentially rationalistic - synergistic speculation. We are all the more pleased to be able to share with you in the following two debates, which are of a completely different nature and show that true theology is still at home in lesser-known, smaller circles, even if the prevailing pseudo-theology still makes one's judgment somewhat uncertain on this or that point.

The "Mecklenburgische Kirchen- und Zeitblatt" and the "Hannoversche Pastoral-Correspondenz" reported the following theses:

Result of the discussion in Bützow on Nov. 19 of last year on the teaching of the Holy Scriptures on conversion in the narrower sense.

I.

Conversion in the narrower sense, i.e. in contrast to the daily repentance of the converted, is according to the holy scriptures the transition from spiritual death, the realm of Satan, the state of law and sin bondage under the wrath of God, into life, the kingdom of God and Christ, the state of grace and sonship to God (Eph. 2, 5. 6. Col. 2, 12. 13. Act. 26, 18. Col. 1, 13. Eph. 2, 3. 2 Cor. 6, 1. Rom. 6, 14. 8, 15. 16. Gal. 3, 25. 26.), therefore being born again (Jn. 3, 5. 6. 1 Pet. 1, 25.) and beginning of a new creature (2 Cor. 5, 17. Jac. 1, 18. Eph. 4, 24. Col. 3, 10. conf. Ez. 11, 19. 36, 26. Jer. 24, 7. Ps. 51, 12.). With it comes the indwelling of the Holy Spirit (Rom. 8, 9. ff. 1 Cor. 3, 16.) (Act. 2, 38.).

II.

It coincides with the beginning of the saving faith; because through faith in Christ man receives grace and forgiveness (Act. 10, 43. Rom. 3, 25.), he becomes a child of God (Gal. 3, 26. Joh. 1, 12.), he comes from death to life (Col. 2, 12.), he is born again (1 Joh. 5, 1.), he receives the Holy Spirit (Gal. 3, 2.).

III.

It is solely and exclusively a work of God (especially of the Holy Spirit); for to Him the holy Scriptures attribute the gift of *μετάνοια εἰς ζωὴν* (Act. 11, 18.), the revival from spiritual death (Eph. 2, 4. ff. Col. 2, 12. 13.), the transfer out of the kingdom of Satan into the kingdom of God (Col. 1, 13.), the regeneration and creation (begetting) of the new man (Joh. 3, 6. Jac. 1, 18. Col. 3, 10. conf. Ez. 11, 19. 36, 26. 27. Ps. 51, 12.), and the bestowal of faith (Phil. 1, 29.), expressly excluding that (Eph. 2, 8. 9.).

IV.

This working of God is to be understood in such a way that it does not only give the possibility of conversion, faith, etc., but everything itself and only; as the words creation and regeneration demand (Phil. 2, 13.). When the Scriptures call for faith and conversion (Marc. 1, 15. Joh. 6, 27-29. Act. 2, 38. 16, 30. 31.), this is a gospel requirement that is fulfilled by the requirement (the commanding words of the Lord in His miracles, especially in the raising of the dead), and it must not be concluded that the fulfillment is in the will of the man who uses the offered power.

V.

Scripture knows no middle or intermediate state between unbelief and faith, wrath and grace, death and life, Satan's kingdom and God's (conf. Thesis I), although there are differences of degree on both sides (conf. Rom. 15, 1. Luc. 12, 47. 48.). Hence conversion, in the strict sense of the word, must take place at a certain moment (which, of course, need not be conscious, or be retained in the consciousness), and though it is preceded by a preparation, yet during it man is still in the state of death and in the kingdom of Satan.

VI.

But there is indeed such a foreshadowing and preparation (Marc. 12, 34.), and it is a task of theological knowledge to comprehend it without taking away any of the glory of the only working grace of God or contradicting thesis V in any way.

It is not surprising if the attempts to solve this task lead to the path of synergism, even against the will and without the knowledge of those who work on it.

VII.

This preparation for conversion consists not only in the effect of the law on the conscience, but also in the effect of the gospel on the human being. It is true that, as there is not yet the beginning of faith, nor the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, nor a new man, nor a truly free will, nor the ability to do any spiritually good work, there is no conversion in this way (see the passages in Walther's Thesis 6, 7); but yet there are inward movements which aim at all this. Perhaps the matter can be summed up in the dogmatic formula: just as man, after he has become a new man through conversion, still carries the old man within him and has to fight against him, so even in the preliminary stages of conversion the nascent new man stirs and fights against the old man, who is still man himself and remains so until the moment of conversion (to be compared is c. gr. s. the embryonic state before birth).

VIII.

The converting grace is a free and by the conduct of man absolutely unconditional (Rom. 9, 15. 26. 10, 20. Matth. 20, 15. 16.).

IX.

That those are converted, who are converted, has therefore its cause not partly in God, and partly in that (also not in the

It is not in the behavior of those who come to faith (namely in the fact that they used the possibility of non-resistance given to them by the preparing grace), but only in God, who gives faith according to His good pleasure (Phil. 2, 13. Eph. 2, 8. Rom. 9, 16.).

It is not enough to acknowledge that the conditional conduct of man is in no way meritorious, although on this acknowledgment a belief is to be regarded and treated as not directly contrary to faith.

X.

On the other hand the cause of the non-conversion and rejection of the unbelievers and godless does not lie in God, as if God did not want to convert all men seriously, but rather in man alone, namely in the persistent resistance of those concerned (Joh. 3,16. 1 Tim. 2, 6. 4,10. Tit. 2, 11. Matth. 23, 37. conf. Hos. 13, 9.).

XI.

Why God overcomes reluctance in some, but not in others; why he converts some, though they are in the same guilt as others, whom he leaves to their destruction, is to our reason an insoluble mystery (Rom. 9:18.); and it is to be held as one article of faith, thesis VIII f. and thesis X, notwithstanding the contradiction between the two, which is insoluble to us.

XII.

In the life of the Church and in reality, it is not necessary to emphasize both the exclusiveness of the divine effect of grace and that which takes place in man before conversion and in conversion, and his exclusive guilt if he does not convert: for it is rather a question of leading to conversion than of averting synergistic error from the converted.

So much for the theses. Theses I-V are quite excellent. While newer theology often distinguishes between rebirth and conversion in such a way that they are factually different and a person who has been born again does not yet need to be converted, here, according to the Scriptures, rebirth and conversion are set as factually identical. It is also very important that it is said: "it (conversion) coincides with the beginning of the saving faith," while Dieckhoff, for example, in his last writing, presents the fundamental false doctrine that with the *initia fidei* there is still no conversion and no justification. In Thesis IV it is clearly and definitely stated that the Holy Spirit does not merely bring about the possibility of faith, but faith itself (the act of faith) alone.

While, for example, Luthardt still wrote: "If God would work the grasping of salvation, the obedience of faith, the conversion ... himself 1), then predestinarianism would, however, be unavoidable. But it works according to the Concordia formula (!) in such a renewing way, that it thereby makes this decisive self-conduct against grace effectually possible. It is true that the presentation of the Concordia formula often reads as if God alone works all things. But" etc. 2) That from the demand of faith and conversion it may not be concluded "that the fulfillment is in the will of man who uses the power offered" is indeed one of the *rudimenta doctrinae* in the Lutheran Church, but this truth has been completely lost to the newer theology. Even Philippi, Jr. wrote recently, in order to prove that a synergism of the "liberated" will took place in conversion: "With regard to the doctrine of Scripture . . we only call attention ... to the fact that the injunction of holy Scripture to conversion does presuppose and demand an activity of the will on the part of man in conversion." 3) It is also very well stated in Thesis V that conversion in the proper sense, although preceded by an initiation and preparation, must nevertheless take place in a moment, while, for example, Prof. Dieckhoff seeks salvation against "predestinarianism" in the gradualness of conversion 4) and Dr. Philippi, Jr. treats this matter in such a way that he completely loses sight of what is actually called conversion, by which a man is transferred from the state of wrath to the state of grace (about which alone the present controversy is concerned), and says that conversion "is not a one-time act, but a process extending through the whole life, in which the will, transformed by grace, is active with the spiritual knowledge and powers given to it by grace." 5) The most pleasing, however, under the present circumstances, are Theses VIII-XI incl. In that the Bützow Conference arrived at the conclusion expressed in these theses, namely, that the cause of conversion lies solely in God and that the converting grace is not somehow conditioned by the conduct of those who come to faith; but the cause of non-conversion lies entirely in the reluctance of those who are not converted, and therefore the so-called *discretio personarum* is a mystery incomprehensible to this life - we say: in that the Bützow Conference arrived at this conclusion,

1) Highlighted by us.

2) The Doctrine of the Free Will. Lpzg. 1863. p. 276.

3) "Mecklenburg. Kirchen- und Zeitblatt." 1886. p. 58. "Will activity"! Ph. means, according to his thesis, a "participation."

4) Cf. e.g. B.: Der missourische Prädest. u. d. Concordienf. Rostock 1885. p. 13,

5) A. a. O. p. 60.

it has shown that in spiritual knowledge it is far ahead of the usual beat of the German theologians. Those who speak as they do in Theses VIII-XI have principally broken with the newer theology in the doctrine of conversion and election to grace, and they must, if they do not go back again in knowledge, soon overcome from their correct standpoint any incorrectness that may still cling to them.

It is hardly necessary to remark that Theses VIII-XI quite exactly reflect the "Missouri" doctrine, and that the contents of the same are diametrically opposed to Prof. Dieckhoff's teaching. When, for example, converting grace is called a free and "absolutely unconditioned by the conduct of man," and when it is said that "that those are converted who are converted has therefore its cause not partly in God and partly in the conduct (not even in that made possible by preparatory grace) of those who come to faith," Dieckhoff calls this simply "predestinarianism." 1) When it is said in Thesis XI, "Why God overcomes reluctance in some, but not in others; why he converts some, though they are in the same guilt as others, whom he leaves to their ruin, that is to our reason an insoluble mystery; and "it is Thesis VIII f. and Thesis X as one article of faith, in spite of the contradiction between the two, which we cannot resolve." The local Iowans called this a characteristic of Calvinism, and Dieckhoff calls it "evading the question to which one has to give an answer".2) Dieckhoff has found the "solution to the problem. That some are converted before others has, according to D., its reason in the better conduct of those who are converted." This is precisely the wretchedness of modern "scientific" "Lutheran" theology, that it "solves" "problems" by extolling Lutheran truths and thereby neither admits nor even recognizes the apostasy from Lutheran doctrine.

In the theses, of course, there are also some questionabilities and inaccuracies. First of all, Theses VI and VII are of this kind. In most cases there is an "initiation and preparation" of the conversion that happens at one moment. This is true. In Thesis V there is also added the cautele that during the initiation and preparation man is still in the state of death and in the kingdom of Satan. And in Thesis VII it is repeated that before the beginning of the state of faith "there is still no indwelling of the Holy Spirit, no new man, no truly (?) free will, no fitness for any kind of life".

1) Missouriian predestinarianism p. 25.

2) On the doctrine of conversion, etc. 147.

Two pleasing debates from German theological circles. 221 Spiritual good works on this way to conversion is present." But if this is true-and it is true-then Thesis VII is wrong in saying, "(it) stirs already in the approach of conversion the nascent new man and fights against the old man." What does not yet exist can neither "stir" nor "struggle." Now, before conversion or the beginning of the state of faith, the new man does not yet exist at all, as has been very properly said before. Ergo. To compare the "preparation for conversion" with the "embryonic state before birth" is without the testimony of Scripture. Scripture compares conversion itself with birth, but not the preparation for conversion with the embryonic state before birth. We see no way of properly understanding the latter comparison, even *cum grano salis*. If it is at all intended to give a comprehensible concept, it is that a new man and spiritual life are already there before conversion. And this is a wrong concept. The operation with this concept is also very dangerous in practice. If one teaches that even before the beginning of the state of faith "the nascent new man is stirring" and "struggling against the old man," the very earnest Christians will hold for this that they are still unconverted, still in the "embryonic state." Following the procedure of the old theologians, it will have to be maintained that in the "preparation for conversion" there are impressions proceeding both from the law and from the gospel, but they are influences of the Holy Spirit from without into the man, without the heart having already become the workshop of the Holy Spirit, or a hearth of spiritual life having already arisen in the heart. As soon as the latter has happened, as soon as spiritual movements come from within, proceeding from the heart as a spiritual centre, and even if it were only a faint desire for grace, the state of faith has begun and regeneration or conversion has taken place. When it is said in the note to Thesis VI: "It is not to be wondered at if the attempts to solve this task" (namely, the task of grasping the initiation of conversion in such a way that conversion in *solidum* remains a work of the Holy Spirit) "lead even against the will and without the knowledge of those who are working on it on the way of synergism," we agree with this completely, provided that those who want to "solve the task" are modern theologians. For these, in examining the "approach of conversion," are interested from the outset in blurring the contrast between the flesh and the Spirit, in seeking the "point of contact" for grace in the flesh. But then they are not led out of the way of synergism only in this investigation, but walked on this way from the beginning.

As for the comment on Thesis IX, very well said:

"It is not enough to acknowledge that the conditional conduct of man is in no way meritorious." With this the Bützow Conference opposes all our American and German opponents, who from the beginning of the controversy until now have not grown weary of asserting that they teach no merit on the part of man, when they allow conversion and election to grace to be conditioned by the "conduct" of those who are converted and elected. But in what follows immediately, the Bützow Conference concedes too much when it continues: "Although with this acknowledgment" (namely, that "conditional conduct" is not "meritorious") "a view is to be regarded and treated as not directly contrary to faith." It is absolutely impossible to disregard how the "conditional conduct" is utilized on the opponent's side. It is true that one says that one does not want it to be a "merit," but one uses it to **explain to** human reason why some are converted and chosen before others, in order to avert "arbitrariness" from God before human reason, in order to answer the question: "Why God overcomes reluctance in some, but not in others; why he converts some, though they are in the same guilt as others, whom he leaves to their destruction" not to have to assume a "mystery insoluble to our reason." Therefore, on the part of the opponent, "the conditional conduct" is always understood to mean "merit," and indeed a proper merit, if one does not want to suppose that the opponent's remarks are entirely without sense and reason.

The last thesis of the Bützow Conference must be criticized. Certainly, "what goes on in man before conversion and in conversion, and his exclusive guilt if he does not convert," is to be emphasized. This would be a foolish preacher, who, in preaching on conversion, would only ever say: God alone works conversion! Enthusiasm must be continually resisted, and the constant handling of the Word, through which the Holy Spirit is active, must be urged. It must also be constantly remembered that there can be no conversion where there is absolutely no inward transformation. But why on earth should not "the exclusiveness of the divine action of grace" be equally emphasized "towards the life of the Church"? Throughout sacred Scripture this emphasis is found. "God, who is rich in mercy" - so resounds the exultation of the faithful in the New Testament - "through his great love, so that he loved us; when we were dead in sins, he made us alive together with Christ, for it is by grace you have been saved," and so on. Eph. 2:4, 5; and in the Old Testament the children of God praise and exhort one another, saying, "Know ye that he is the Lord of all things.

Lord God is: he hath made us, and not we ourselves, his people, and sheep of his pasture" (Ps. 100:3). It is of the utmost importance "that the synergistic error be turned away from the converts. If this does not happen, then they cannot join in the praise given above, nor can they be sure of their present state of grace and their future blessedness. Let us notice how our Confession uses "the exclusiveness of the effect of grace" for the comfort of believers. It says, "In sum, it remains eternally true that the Son of God says, 'Without me you can do nothing.'" And Paul Phil. 2: "It is God that worketh in you both to will and to do, according to his good pleasure." Which lovely saying is very comforting to all pious Christians, who feel and sense a little spark and longing for God's grace and eternal blessedness in their hearts, that they may know that God has kindled this beginning of true godliness in their hearts, and may he further strengthen them in great weakness, and help them to persevere in true faith to the end."1) When the apostles desire to assure Christians that God will hold them fast unto the end, it is on the ground of the truth that God alone wrought the beginning. Phil. 1, 6: "And I am of the same good confidence, that he which began the good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." Cf. 1 Cor. 1, 8. 9. 1 Thess. 5, 24.

These are the defects inherent in the theses. We have pointed them out in more detail than we initially intended. Perhaps the honorable men of the Bützow Conference will see this issue of our journal and be prompted to reconsider what is objectionable. However, we repeat once again: Whoever speaks as is stated in Theses I-V and VIII-XI, stands in the truth, and from here, by God's grace, can easily eliminate the incorrectnesses that are still underway.

Finally, we share a "reply to the question about predestination" found in the "mailbox" of the "Kropper Kirchlicher Anzeiger". It is not from the editor of the "Kirchl. Anz.", Paulsen, whom we do not trust with such a debate, but bears the signature: "Before I can respond to a question about predestination".

When I begin to discuss this question, I must tell you that for our human thinking it is a mystery that can never be fathomed. Our human thinking always leads us to "consequences" that conflict with the holy Scriptures. The Lutheran Church has always recognized this, and has therefore never claimed to know this mystery.

1) Solid. Decl Art. 2. s 14.

but is expressly content to reject the "consequences" of human thought, which are contrary to Scripture and must therefore be false.

"The Lutheran doctrine can be summarized briefly and comprehensibly for the common man in the following two sentences: 1. If a man is saved, he owes this entirely to divine mercy; he can do nothing about it. 2. (2) If a man perishes, he owes it entirely to his own evil will; God neither willed it nor did anything to bring it about. On the contrary, he has done everything possible to save him. - What goes beyond these two propositions is rejected by Lutheran doctrine, e. g. when it is asserted that man himself must in some way help to become blessed (Pelagianism, Semi-Pelagianism, Synergism, erroneous paths taken by the Catholic Church 2) or, on the other hand, that the damnation of men is to be traced back to God's counsel (absolute predestination of Calvin, Zwingli, etc.). The doctrine of so-called free will is connected with this: The natural human will is absolutely unfree, bound, on the positive side, to love and fear God, and in general to do what is pleasing to God; on the negative side, on the other hand, to resist God, it is unbound. He has not, therefore, the ability to send himself to grace (God must give him that), but he has the ability to resist grace, and according as he perseveres in this resistance wilfully and persistently, or allows himself to be overcome by grace, he is damned or blessed. Our Lutheran confessions place special emphasis on the actual, powerful effect of the means of grace. Word and Sacrament are given to us by God so that they may really break man's natural will to sin, and they actually have this power and effect; whereas they would only be an appearance, and would also only be offered to those who are condemned as an appearance, if this very condemnation of theirs had already been determined in the eternal counsel of God. According to this you can also answer your question concerning suicide: It is certainly not God's will that a man goes out of life with this terrible sin and is condemned, and if it still happens, then man has just persistently made use of his ability to resist God - and if it now again cannot be denied that the end of life of every man is determined by God, then he will be condemned.

1) That the word "do" is emphasized by the print may be misunderstood. In recent times it has been said that a man can do nothing for his conversion and salvation, but that he can refrain from doing something, that is, from wilfully resisting, and thereby secure his conversion and salvation before others.

"L. and W."

2) and all "scientific" modern' theology. "L. u. W."

("He hath appointed, and before ordained, how long and how far they shall dwell," Acts 17:26). 17, 26.), this is again one of the mysteries, which our earthly mind is darkened to fathom, so we must put our finger on our mouth, and wait until we come into eternity, when the covering will be taken off our darkened mind, to know God Himself as He is, and the divine things (the knowledge of God also belongs to the things which have been lost to us with the image of God, and will be restored in the regeneration of eternal life). -The Lord Christ also says of Judas, "The Son of man goeth indeed as it is written of him, but woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed." There we have again the (apparent) contradiction, i.e., it is only a contradiction in our imperfect thinking: it must come to pass, and yet the man through whom it comes to pass bears the full responsibility. All things, even the most trifling, are included in the divine counsel; but it must be absolutely rejected that men who do them should not therefore bear the responsibility for them.

We are pleased, as I said, to be able to share the above discussions from German circles. This always raises in us the hope that by God's grace the spell of modern theology might not finally be broken in larger circles and that a return to the simple Lutheran theology of Scripture might take place. F. P.

Miscellany.

Demand for greater independence of the so-called Protestant Church in Germany. Grote's "Kreuzblatt" of May 30 writes about this, among other things, as follows: As the "Reichsbote" reports, the conservative party is preparing a motion that the rights granted to the Catholic Church should also be demanded for the Protestant Church. The deputies von Puttkamer and Stöcker have also already made speeches to this effect in popular assemblies. Among other things, Mr. von Puttkamer said the following: "The Protestant Church unfortunately finds itself in an embrace of the state that threatens to suffocate it. (Very true!) It would be unfortunate if greater freedom did not now come to them as well. It is not against the exalted person of the supreme bishop of the Protestant Church that this petition is directed. But the Emperor is Constitutionen, the secular parliaments have a say everywhere. Their influence extends into the filling of ecclesiastical offices and theological professorships. Every change of mood, every new

The current of the secular parliaments extends its effect into the interior of the evangelical church, which is thereby one of the most delivered to unbelief. If the battle of the spirits is not to swing to our disadvantage, we evangelicals must not rest until we emerge from the embrace of the state. (Is this to be done by declarations for the exalted person of the supreme bishop? Or how else will one "come out"?) When filling the offices of the highest church authorities, the church should at least have a say (!). Likewise, its voice must be fully heard in the filling of theological professorships, in order to prevent unbelief from being preached to the young theologians on the chairs. Court preacher Stöcker expressed himself in the same spirit, not forgetting the physical well-being and demanding "the promised endowment" of the Protestant church. By the deputy von Hammerstein is now in fact a motion made, which aims at a "greater measure of freedom and independence" of the Protestant church. Of the 129 members of the German Conservative faction, however, only 43 signed this motion, and even these could only be won over to it by abandoning those sentences of the original draft by which the demand for a greater degree of freedom and independence of the Protestant Church was to be defined in the sense of Stoecker's theses. The official "Post" gloatingly remarks: "To some extent, therefore, the hope we expressed that the conservative faction would already break off the head of the High Church advance has already been fulfilled. - In a special supplement to No. 20, the "Pilgrim from Saxony" also deals with the development of the Lutheran Church, which it calls "the house of God. Among other things, the following are demanded: binding commitment to the confessional writings through a religious oath, ecclesiastical training of the future ministers of the church, use of real pastors for church service, adherence to the law that only proven men should be admitted to the office of a church leader, abolition of the mode of appointing pastors through elective sermons, the church's right of self-determination, church discipline, legal validity of church marriages, certification of the giant parishes, Sunday rest, and so on. etc. All this sounds very nice, but they are words and remain words, nothing but words, as long as the unconfessional sumpiscopate is not removed from the church and thus restored to its full freedom and independence. But before the sumpiscopate one makes the same bowing down in Saxony as in Prussia. Do they think they can build the church with the help of its guardians? For these are all the officers, whatever their name may be, who, claiming to be representatives of the sumptuary priesthood, are not the only ones.

episcopate, seek to gag the church hand and foot. The "Pilgrim from Saxony" says: "The emphasis of the Lutheran Church lies not in the constitution, but in pure Scriptural doctrine." Quite true! But does not Article 28 of the Augustana belong to scriptural doctrine? Let the constitution of the free church be what it will, that is *juris humani*, and therefore not a main matter separating the church. But that the church should be free, that the two swords should be separated, that belongs to pure doctrine and is *hjuris divini*. . . . But when the "Pilgrim from Saxony" demands that all Lutheran Particular Churches join hands with each other, in order to be able to fulfill the great God-given calling with united forces as one general Lutheran Church, how does the good man think of this business of joining hands? Does he think that the *Summiepiscopi* should come together to decide at a Lutheran Church Congress on the unity of the Lutheran Church and the execution of all those beautiful demands? - On the same subject the "Ev.-luth. Allgem. Kz." of May 28 pronounces as follows: Hammerstein's motion for the granting of a greater measure of independence and free movement also to the Lutheran Church of Prussia continues to meet with the strongest opposition in the official and middle-party press, if, in view of the fact that the executive committee of the Conservative Party, together with a considerable number of members, has joined the motion, it also assumes more lenient forms than would undoubtedly happen if only the so-called extreme right were behind the motion. . . . Because the circles of the centre party, that political mirage, are not to be disturbed, therefore the Protestant Church must remain in the unworthy position in which it at present finds itself. That an organ which claims to represent the views of the leading circles should dare to express itself in this way is a strong thing indeed. But it cannot be denied that the timidity with which the claims of the Protestant Church have hitherto been represented makes this appearance explicable. One believes that one may offer her everything, because one is used to her putting up with everything. It is regarded as a mere "pastor's church," behind which there is no lay public of pronounced ecclesiastical self-consciousness, such as the Roman Catholic Church of the present day has behind it. The moment it becomes evident that the Protestant laity stand by their Church with as much determination as the Roman Catholics do, this would change. But when will that moment come? So far only one Pastoral Conference, the Lower Rhine, has declared itself in agreement with Hammerstein's proposal. That alone would make a certain impression if at least a larger number of similar associations did the same. The hope, however, that this will happen is, as far as little-

sten, than the East comes into consideration, very small. It is therefore quite clear how the parliamentary treatment of the motion will turn out. The government will probably give an evasive, meaningless answer, and the motion will then be adopted, possibly with the help of the Centre, against the National Liberals, the Free Conservatives and the Freisinnige, who in this case will function as a national party ad hoc; we say: possibly, because it is by no means certain that all Conservatives will vote yes. The greater probability even suggests that this will not be the case. So far, at least, the motion has been signed by only a minority of the faction. Even under these less than favorable circumstances, however, Hammerstein's motion will have its effect, and the parliamentary exploitation of the matter cannot be prevented, nor can it be prevented that the press will take hold of it and carry it into the widest circles. But the result will be that the Conservatives, when they come again with their motion in the next legislative session, will find the ground far better prepared than it is now. - Dr. Münkler writes in his "Neue Zeitblatt" of May 19: "The Protestants will not be able to wrest the free and independent church from the church government and the state. The government will have no desire to play beadle and jaherr with the church, which, with the exception of the preaching ministry in its congregation, is its privy, as the Catholic church is a privy of the pope. It can bestow greater liberties than heretofore, but only by revocation, so long as the new liberty does not do too much mischief in the disheveled church. For, strictly speaking, a church like our national churches cannot become independent at all so long as the bitterly lacking unity of faith is not established. If one wants to have freedom and independence as one thinks of it, there is only one way left, that one leaves the national church and forms a free church. - The same writes under June 9: The motion of Hammerstein-Stöcker to the Prussian Diet, "to grant the Protestant Church a greater measure of freedom and independence, and more ample means for the satisfaction of church needs," has found a loud echo many times over in the Prussian regional churches. The approval of the Lower Rhenish Conference was followed by the Bielefeld Lutheran Pastoral Conference, which more closely defined Hammerstein's quite vague proposal, as we believe in its spirit. According to this, the center of church government at all levels is to be transferred to the ecclesiastical office, together with the right that the highest ecclesiastics may communicate directly with the king, as the chief bishop. Through them, the church shall cooperate in the appointment of ecclesiastical regiments, theological professors, and teachers of religion in seminaries and high schools. Finally, the church is to be provided with the promised money.

means will be provided. We do not doubt that many other declarations of approval will follow, which will perhaps cause a greater movement; for one forges the iron while it is hot. On the other hand, there is already no lack of strong opposition in the national church for which the applications are to be made. From the ranks of the Freisinnige and the Protestantenverein, as well as from the Mittelpartei, there is decided opposition to the motions, chiefly because these parties fear from the new hierarchy or priestly rule their suppression and that of free science. For at present the Lutherans and the positively unirkreverent have the rule. The King's government, however, will not be inclined to enter into so profound a change in the constitution, which touches not only the foundation of the Church, but also the supreme episcopal rights of the King. So far we cannot judge otherwise than that it is aimed at a free church with a hierarchy. That von Hammerstein and Stöcker are only treading very cautiously on the ice, to see how far they can get, is shown by their very general and indefinite proposal. The two papers which are close to them, the "Kreuzzeitung" and the "Reichsbote," speak more freely, and demand above all ecclesiastical bishops (with authoritative power, as Stöcker demands), into whose hands the church government will pass, and who will then be in a position, as the mouth of the church, to have a decisive say in the appointment of regimentals, professors, teachers of religion, and so forth. We are not at all concerned that steps will be taken on the part of the government to come closer to this goal; for it will know quite well that the national church will not put up with a Stöcker hierarchy, which would give rise to the most violent unrest and lead to divisions. One could therefore calmly leave the soap bubble to the air current, which knows how to deal with it, if the attempt did not nevertheless have its serious misgivings. One wants to cure the limb-sickness of the church by externally inserting a new limb into it, which increases the sickness. This inclination to help by external means is all the more widespread the further one has departed from the center of the Church's life. The bishops, in particular, will now come on the agenda, and people will complain: if only we had an episcopal constitution, everything could still turn out well! The complaints, of course, fade into the air, but what remains is a sour sediment, the increased dissatisfaction with the national church. In any case, it does not find an abundance of love among its members; but since even a court preacher named Stöcker and so many conservatives have condemned the state church, many will turn their backs on the state church with ease and turn to the free churches, whose outbursts against the state church have received an intensified force, and all the more so, since from the aspired independence of the state church, the state church is no longer the only church in the world.

of the Landeskirchen or Volkskirchen nothing can come of it. Finally, however, the strengthening of the Catholic Church through the Kulturkampf, and the regaining of its rights, its freedom and independence, became the reason for Hammerstein's motion, as it indicates right at the beginning, to strive for a similar strengthening. In order to have some success in preventing the motion from falling through, one has tried to secure the votes of the ultramontane Centre, about which the "Kreuzzeitung" remarks: "That we on the Catholic side will be repaid for the benevolence which we for our part have just had the opportunity to exercise (by accepting the church-political bill for the establishment of peace), we want to doubt just as little." The Centrum will be sufficiently informed what this motion is primarily about. If Luther removed the Catholic hierarchy, and all hierarchy in general, from the Church as a poison, then the Catholics are now to be helpers so that the hierarchical poison may be re-inoculated into the Protestant Church. And why not? The Conservatives have shown such great benevolence against the Catholic hierarchy that they may well be called friends of the hierarchy and ask for such a return gift. Look! the Centrum will say to its people, the Protestants have made bankruptcy with their church, and that precisely because they have rejected our unconquerable hierarchy; now they come at last, and must beg of us that we may procure something for them again, lest their church should crumble miserably. Who, then, has the real strengthening from Hammerstein's motion? And what do the Protestants get out of it? That they must be ashamed of themselves, or that instead of the promised cardboard pillars they would rather choose the pillars of brass. The semi-official "Berl. polit. Nachr." declare that the far-reaching demands of the extreme right for freedom and independence of the church arouse serious misgivings from the general political point of view. It stands in a certain direct opposition to the policy of the government, which aims at removing the obstacles lying in the ecclesiastical field to the unification of all positive elements. The government's endeavor, therefore, is first to establish unity in the church before any constitutional changes, especially of a profound nature, may be considered. - Finally Grote writes in his "Kreuzblatt" of June 13: "Hammerstein's proposal has been received everywhere with the liveliest sympathy. Already several large pastors' meetings have spoken out about it. In Düsseldorf, the pastoral conference of the Lower Rhine, which was attended by a large number of people, "welcomed the motion with satisfaction" and considered it necessary "that all Protestants, apart from their political party position in the present situation, support the independent development of the Protestant Church, as such a development belongs to the old, well-founded demands of the Rhenish-West German Church.

and help to promote them". In Bielefeld, the Minden-Ravensberg Pastoral Conference made a similar declaration. Nor did the ecclesiastical conference of the county of Mark, which met in Hagen, lag behind with its testimony. It sees itself compelled to give testimony of the "deep displeasure which has seized the Protestant community over the rebukes of the Protestant Church and its organs, which have frequently and most recently come to light in the recent church-political events." It is also imbued with the conviction "that the Protestant Church, in order to assert its influence on the life of the people, must be released to a greater extent than hitherto from the bondage of the state, and it is confident that the motion introduced in the House of Representatives will find the strongest support of all Protestant representatives. That all sounds very nice. But they are words of no value, and a "confidence" that has no basis in the real circumstances. How can these ecclesiastical gentlemen indulge in the expectation that the ruling realpolitik will decide to release the church from the "state bondage," that Hammerstein's proposal will find the "strongest support" among the representatives of state omnipotence?! Do these gentlemen not know how to distinguish friend from foe? Do they always want to continue to set the fox to keep the geese?

Literature.

The Rule of Faith and the Doctrine of Inspiration. By *Robert Watts*, D. D. , Professor of Systematic Theology in the Assembly's College, Belfast. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 27 Paternoster Row. 1885. XXIII and 273 pp.

This publication, which we mentioned earlier (cf. L. u. W. 1885 p. 379), has now come to our attention. After having read it, we consider it appropriate to discuss it in more detail. It is, after having read publications such as those of Volck, Mühlau, and Harnack, a real pleasure to read Watts' *Schritt*. While the former think they must abandon the proposition that the sacred Scriptures are God's infallible Word, the latter says he is not ashamed to profess this proposition. To begin with, in order to set the character of Watts' writing in light, we will here adduce a few main thoughts from the preface. Watts says: "The Church has believed, in regard to the sacred Scriptures, that the same, being inspired of God, is, in the strictest sense of the term, the Word of God. This doctrine has been widely departed from, both in Europe and in America. The reason for the deviation was partly the endeavor to reconcile opponents whose aversion to the doctrine of a supernatural revelation was supposed to have been produced or increased by the old doctrine of inspiration. But these attempts at reconciliation have not only proved futile—those whom they hoped to win have not been won—but they have undoubtedly injured the cause which they were intended to serve. It has been found that this kind of apologetics involves modifications by which the truth is in fact abandoned, and instead of winning those who are estranged from the truth, such apologetics reinforce the belief that the claims of the Bible are wholly indefensible. More recent writers, belonging to this class of apologists, have claimed for themselves a greater erudition and higher education, and have rejected the time-honored doctrine of a verbal inspiration as that of

an antiquated dogma, deservedly abandoned by this learned and intelligent age. These claims to higher learning and scholarship have been so persistently asserted that some have taken the self-valorization at face value and have come to the conclusion that all scholarship is to be found on the side of the opponents of verbal inspiration and that this doctrine is now held only by the unlearned. Such fame is as groundless as it is vain. A great knowledge of languages and an extensive acquaintance with literature are valuable things, but such attainments are more a matter of memory than of sound judgment. One may have mastered a number of languages and be familiar with all the critical apparatus known to modern scholarship, and yet prove a most unreliable guide in the various branches of knowledge, whether spiritual or secular. Knowledge of language can never be a substitute for right sound judgment. In view of the fact that learning claims for itself the exclusive right of judgment, we think it advisable to assure the most unlearned reader of Holy Scripture that even the most learned critic cannot point out a single doctrine of faith which would depend on the secrets of his (the learned critic's) science, or which would not have been known before "science" existed. In like manner independent of this science is the great question which is treated in the second part of this writing - the question of inspiration. It is true that an exact acquaintance with the basic languages is of the utmost importance in this investigation. But yet it is also true that without any acquaintance with the basic languages, a believing Christian, with the English translation in hand, can infallibly determine what the Scriptures teach of inspiration. It is an undoubted truth that from any of the existing translations of Scripture the correct doctrine of inspiration can be gathered with as much ease as from any other revealed doctrine. The process of investigation is not shrouded in mysterious obscurity. The simple question is this: "What do the Scriptures teach?" and the answer must be gathered from the properly interpreted passages in which the sacred writers inform us of the extent of the efficacy of the inspiring Holy Spirit. While the sacred writers give us no information as to the nature of the divine activity in its effect upon their spirits, and while we can present no doctrine as to the manner in which the Holy Spirit moved the instruments which he used, yet the assertion made by many that the Scriptures do not furnish the necessary material to formulate a doctrine of the Inspiration is vain. It is true that it gives no doctrine of the manner of the operation of the Holy Spirit, but it presents both directly and indirectly a doctrine of the result, and this doctrine of the result is that the Holy Spirit so moved the human instruments that he also determined the language in which they expressed the truths and facts (whether recalled or communicated anew). Such is the doctrine, and it is as clearly revealed in Scripture as, for example, the doctrines of justification, regeneration, or reconciliation. So far Dr. Watts in the preface to his writing. It can be divided into two parts. In the first part, Watts proves against rationalism, mysticism (Quaker: "inner light") and Romanism: Scripture alone is the infallible rule of faith and life. In the second part the actual and main question is treated, that the holy scriptures are the inspired infallible word of God. At the transition to the second part, W. says about the necessity of an inspired Scripture: "In order to serve as a rule of faith and life, Scripture must be infallible; in order to be infallible, it must be God's Word; in order to be God's Word, it must be inspired by God. We are thus confronted with one of the very most important questions which, even at the present day, occupies attention more than any other, namely, the question of inspiration. Enemies and friends feel that the question is a fundamental one. Faith has for its correlate the testimony, and saving faith is founded on God's testimony. This is not a Christian believing Matthew or John or Peter or Paul (as men). Our faith, our obedience, our love must go to God. Subjective movements that do not have this direction cannot be considered Christian. Faith hears God's word. A man is born again, not of the corruptible seed of the word of man, but of the incorruptible seed of the word of God, which abideth for ever, 1 Pet. 1, 23. The voice that maketh a man's heart to tremble at the reading of the law is not the voice of a man, but the voice of a man.

of God. The voice that makes the spiritually dead alive is the voice of God. The promises to which a Christian appeals before the throne of grace are always regarded by him as promises given by Him who cannot lie, promises vouchsafed as to every syllable by God's truthfulness and faithfulness. In prayer we remind God of what He has said. The language of prayer is, "Hast thou not promised?" What right has a sinner to approach God in prayer, unless the promises of God are God's word, and he can appeal to this as to fine authority? In short, the nature of the spiritual life demands an infallible rule, a rule whose infallibility comes from the fact that it consists in the words of Him who cannot deceive. All theories, therefore, which are apt to shake confidence in the doctrine that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments celebrate God's Word, must necessarily injure the spiritual life, and where the rightful consequences are consciously drawn, these theories must utterly destroy the faith." On this Watts first distinguishes very well between "inspiration" and "revelation" and between "inspiration" and "enlightenment." He inculcates that "revelation" and "enlightenment" should not be confused with "inspiration." Then he explains what "inspiration" actually means. He chooses the term "verdat inspiration" because those who have used the term "plenary inspiration" have not done justice to the matter, and he goes on to explain why inspiration must necessarily extend to all and the individual words. The execution in six lines of thought is quite excellent. But we can now only call attention to the main sections. Dr. Watts gives a detailed and striking account of the "verbat inspiration" of the writings of the New Testament, pp. 120-135, and of those of the Old Testament, pp. 137-155. We cannot go into particulars here. We will only note that the discussion concerning the inspiration of the Gospels of Marcus and Lucas is quite satisfactory. Then the objections which are raised against the old doctrine of inspiration are presented, examined, and refuted in detail. No objection of any importance is passed over here. Especially interesting is the section "Objections from freedom of reference to Old Testament Scriptures". The conclusion of the book is formed by the treatise that the *fides divina* with respect to the divinity of the Scriptures arises from the Word of Scripture itself, as through which the Holy Spirit is operative. "The Word alone the Spirit's sword." „The Revelation self-evidencing." - We have now, of course, also to make some expositions. P. 78 is the speech of "minute metaphysical statements of the Athanasian Creed." P. 77 ff. according to Martensen, the position of the Lutheran Church on Tradition is misstated. The Lutheran Church did not base infant baptism primarily on tradition. The modern "Lutherans" are very unreliable church historians and specifically very unreliable dogma historians. This comes from their principal apostasy from the old Lutheran teaching. To speak of an "inspiration" of Christ, p. 115 ff, is quite improper. There are not only passages in Scripture, such as Deut. 18:15-19. (I will put my words in his mouth), but also passages such as John 3:31, 32.: ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς γῆς, ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐστί και ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ, ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστί, και ὁ ἑώρακε και ἠκονσε (viz. for ever with the Father as ὁ ὢν εἰς τον κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, chap. 1, 18.), τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ (in his preaching on earth). Here the partition is sharply drawn between John the Baptist and all the apostles and prophets on the one hand, and Christ on the other. Christ's speaking of the "Word of God" is from a very different source from that of the apostles and prophets. Pages 167, 230, 231, Dr. Watts rejects the expression "dictation" to denote inspiration. When the expression is pressed, however, it leads to unseemly notions. But the old Lutheran theologians, for instance, did not have in mind inspiration "by an external audible utterance" when they used the expression. P. 200 ff. seems to concede too much to "science" in regard to the age of the earth and the human race, although Dr. Watts, p. 3, clearly and definitely defines his position: "Scripture claims to be an infallible revelation on every subject it treats. . Since the author of the Bible is also the creator of the universe, there is certainly nothing unreasonable in the fact that where he has made a statement, all counter-statements are discarded." But we break off here with the enumeration of *Dubia*, and only repeat the statement that Dr. Watts' book is an eminently readable defence of the right doctrine of inspiration. F. P.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

No lights on the altar. A Chicago paper, the "Inter-Ocean", had reported that there were lights on the altar of the English Trinity Church belonging to the Council. The "Lutheran" now reports a submission to the "Inter-Ocean" in which the pastor of that congregation corrects the report with the following words: "Equally surprising is the information concerning the lights on the altar. Everyone who attends the services in Trinity Church knows that there are no lights on the altar and never have been. In some of the German and Scandinavian churches lights are lighted during the celebration of the Lord's Supper; but **there is** nowhere, to our knowledge, an English Lutheran congregation which has lights on the altar even on the solemn occasion." If the English Lutheran congregations lacked nothing more than "lights from the altar," no one would find fault with their orthodoxy. But neither is there any reason to boast of the absence of "lights on the altar" as a merit, which seems almost to be the case with the Chicago Correspondent. ' F. P.

The "Churchman" of the Episcopalians speaks out about the **possibility of a settlement with Rome on the** occasion of a statement by the English Lord Halifax. Lord Halifax, the president of the English Church Union, spoke quite bluntly at the annual celebration of this society that a unification of the church could only be accomplished by joining with Rome. The "Churchman" calls upon the English Church Union to disavow "the singularly foolish utterances" of its President without delay, and writes, among other things, as follows: "No one can desire a reunion of Christendom more ardently than the Episcopalians. But we do not wish to see these desires of ours fulfilled by a Union falsely so called, which rests on a false ground. If the end is to be attained at all, it can only be so that the *disiecta membra ecclesiae* may unite again in the unity of one faith, which was once made known by the holy Catholic Church throughout the world. The faith of modern Rome is not that of the Catholic Church.... Because Rome is rejected by the great majority of Christendom as lying in deadly error, and shows by her strange doctrines and their fruits that she has strayed far from the Shepherd and Bishop of souls, and has gone astray from the straight path of truth, she must cleanse her garments of the guilt of heresy, schism, and the most pernicious heresy. Rather, Rome cannot even be considered a pure branch of the Catholic Church. But Rome has declared that it has never needed reform and is irreformable. Therefore, union with Rome is impossible until it comes to its senses. And since its first bishop has not only endorse the old, but also the newest errors, and has declared himself to be as infallible as Christ himself, it is evident that, apart from the former presumptions of a privileged position, the Roman pope cannot be looked upon as a patriarch who may claim that the other branches of Christ's Church, which have neither fallen into such gross errors, nor been guilty of such presumptions, adhere to him. " F. P.

Character indelebilis. There seems to be a tendency among Episcopal preachers to resign the preaching ministry and turn to a secular profession. To sharpen consciences on this point, the "Churchman" of June 26 gives the following false reason, besides good: "If a man

When a man kneels down to receive ordination to the priesthood, he is embarking on a path in life from which he can never return. He is about to receive a character of which he can never rid himself. He may become an indolent priest; a suspended, deposed, excommunicated priest; but a priest he must remain forever, even if he has preached to others and has himself become reprobate." One would scarcely think that such an abominable blindness could be found outside the Papacy, as is expressed in the above words. F. P.

"A local university student wants to demonstrate **"the good right of the Union" in the university's "Theologische Zeitschrift**. However, he does not want to do this in his own words, but in excerpts from Auberlen's book "The Divine Revelation", which the author would like to "recommend to the dear brothers in office for study". According to Auberlen, the "dear brethren in office" are now served the following: the entire "development of doctrine" "of the old Protestant churches of both confessions" was definitely deficient, and "a further development and deeper substantiation of the Christian doctrine of salvation" is "necessary. Our time, or rather the Union, has the task of "rebuilding the whole doctrinal edifice from the ground up on the basis of a deeper grasp of the core of Christian doctrine and on the basis of a deeper, more central, and therefore also more comprehensive knowledge of Scripture. Where was the main error? "The old Protestant doctrine stopped too much at the individual experience of salvation and grasped Christianity almost only as an order of salvation, not at the same time as a historical, cosmic power." "One can also describe this doctrinal deficiency as a setting aside of Christ's resurrection against his atoning death, an emphasizing of the juridical side of Christianity against its medicinal, human and world-renewing side: salvation was not regarded both as the healing of the diseased, as the revival of the first to die, but as justification, as the judicial absolving of the. Guilty... Thus the main thing in Christianity was not properly recognized and appreciated: One must immerse oneself in the Risen and Transfigured One if one wants to understand Christianity in its universal meaning as the power whereby not only peace with God is acquired within the old world for all believing souls, but whereby a new, ethical-metaphysical (!) principle is established, that of the pneumatic existence perfected in God, a principle that can neither be set nor replaced by anything else, and which nevertheless proves itself by itself to be the true realization of the idea of humanity and the world. Here one fights all the more into the only, par excellence irreplaceable meaning, into the all-embracing power of Christianity, i. e., of Christ, which leads all spheres of existence to perfection." One should have expected that the "realistic, Lutheran version" of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper would have led out of this point. But by the Lutherans "even this real substance of Christ's body and blood is degraded to a pledge and sign of the forgiveness of sins." "In the doctrine of the last things the defectiveness of the old Protestant theology is especially striking. The concept of the goal, both of the ethical perfection of the individual and of the ethical-physical renewal of the world, is lacking; and as in the goal, so also in the development toward the goal. The two middle links between the present time and the Last Judgment are not at all recognized and appreciated in their importance. The doctrine of Hades as distinguished from hell, and the doctrine of the kingdom of Christ, are simply rejected out of mere opposition to false excesses." But "old Protestant theology" failed to understand as the end, so also the beginning. "Bare and poor, furthermore, remained the very concept of God, because there was no realistic (!) concept of spirit to substitute for the idealistic and spiritualistic one. The biblical-realistic version of the divine and heavenly would have been of the highest importance

The first thing that was said was that God was not a god, but a cosmic principle that was becoming more and more prevalent. Instead, dogmatics moved in abstract definitions of the divine essence, making God as distant and unimaginable as possible. Since the spiritual glory of the transfigured God-man was not recognized, the key to understanding the glory of God the Father, whose reflection is the Son, as well as the glory of the heavenly world in general and the glory of the creatures raised to the state of transfiguration and perfection, was missing. To the newer biblical realism, which is concerned first with the metaphysics of the Spirit (!), it is therefore essential to be at once revelatory-historical and eschatological." But "the old Protestant doctrine of sin, which was conceived merely as formal disobedience and transgression, while the material side, the enjoyment of the forbidden fruit, was not considered at all, is equally defective and imperfect. - Furthermore, in the horror of sin, its consequences were extended to such an extent that free will was denied, and the remnants of creation, which in spite of the fall are still to be found in sinful individual and collective life, the points of connection which salvation has in the conscience and in the search of the people, were not considered deeply enough. - To this day, a Lutheran of Missouri's ilk cannot grasp the fact that God should have been so generous to truth-seeking pagans, such as Socrates, Aristides, etc., that God has prepared ways and means in the other world to lead them to the Son, who alone is and can be the Redeemer and Savior for all the world. To him it is an ungodly doctrine even to think such a thing!" "Further, the position toward the Scriptures remained an external, mechanical, atomistic, almost crude one. One wanted to contrast the infallible papacy with an equally infallible external authority in the Bible. So they put forward a mechanical theory of inspiration, according to which, as Hollaz says, the Holy Spirit dictated the Bible literally, and the human authors were not writers, but only the hands or feathers.... The subtle differences in the inspiration of the different writers of the Bible were fully unrecognized, which yet even the Jews recognized and attested in their arrangement of the canon." - But the writer is inclined to excuse the "ancient fathers": "If the ancient fathers did not yet possess the fullness and all-sidedness in the whole field of theology which we can have at the present day, let us not reproach them too much for this. It was just the standpoint of a still unmediated childhood in the recognition of truth, and a longer period of development was necessary in order to gain the higher standpoint. But all the more wrong are those who would have us simply return to that defective and narrow-minded standpoint of the old fathers, and tempt us to read and understand the Scriptures in the light of fuller and deeper knowledge." - We have excerpted so much in the foregoing to show what is possible among the uninitiated here. Some one can, without being troubled, unearth the most nonsensical theosophical speculations and deny the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, the doctrine of justification, of original sin, of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, etc., and reverse the whole revealed order of salvation. It seems all the more strange, then, when the writer complains of the "unkindness" of the Lutherans, that they refuse the brotherly hand to the unrighteous.

F. P.

II. Abroad.

What benevolent things are sometimes written about us Missourians in Germany. In the newspaper "Der Mecklenburger" (April 21) you will find, among other things, the reprint of the article we wrote in "Lehre und Wehre" (see May issue of this year).

p. 152 f.) of the article by P. Walter in Qualitz in Mecklenburg. The editor, Mr. Prillwitz, introduces this reprint as follows: Yesterday we read Walter's remarks with joy. Not with pleasure because we somehow identified ourselves with the "Missourians". To be a "Missourian" of the kind we got to know, first of all a strong faith, an energetic personal life of faith, a rich theological knowledge drawn from this faith and this life of faith, not sucked out of one's own dear philosophical ego and artificially built up according to scientific systems - all these things are not inherent to the writer of these lines and with regard to the first two it is in God's hand of grace whether and when he may bestow them on him. Furthermore, before the struggle entered its present phase, we were never able to gain the conviction from frequent discussions with "Missourians" that their separate dogma was derived from the transmission of Scripture and the Confession, and that it was not rather derived from the certainly often enviable conditions of the American Missouri congregations and carried into Scripture and the Confession. Finally, we lack any certainty of judgment concerning the difference that has been pending in recent years, as it has also affected our Mecklenburg regional church in the Dieckhoff-Brauer-Gräbner exchange of writings, because a thorough study of the writings in question is necessary for such a judgment, for which - apart from anything else - we would definitely lack the time. No, the reason for our joy over Walter's remarks in the Tuesday number was that we finally found the first approach to the realization of our repeatedly expressed wish that our "Missourians" in the country should for once publicly state what they actually want in a way that is not edifying, not even technical, but understandable to every educated member of the Lutheran Church. For years it has been so stylish with us that only the word "Missouri" had to be pronounced and a "Hetz! Hetz!" went through the land, that it had only so kind. The strange thing was that one could meet many a "Missourian" for whom the Lutheran Church would be glad to give seven dozen benefices, and, if required, three clerical sportsmen and a chief systematicus in addition. It had long been clear to us that there must be a catch. But it was not until Ruperti, the church councillor, opened our eyes to it when he spoke so warmly in favour of Missouri in Schwerin three years ago, and then pretended not to be heard. "The Mecklenburger" alone was it at that time who had the courage to give the truth the honor and repeatedly point it out: See, this is the judgment of the man who himself was over there, from years of personal experience, about these people, of whom to speak with disdain belongs to good manners with us; a classy witness in his characterful personality, whose testimony is all the more weighty, since he stands nothing less than under suspicion of "genuine Lutheranism." - So far Mr. Prillwitz. If he, as he says, "from frequent discussions with" (probably German so-called) "Missourians" who are in the national church, "could never gain the conviction that their separate dogma (?) is derived from the transmission from Scripture and Confession," we are not surprised. But if he would take the time to study this doctrine in its connection with the doctrine of the church, as the congregation of believers, which is found in every visible church and forms the nucleus of it, he would soon convince himself that the doctrine of the conferral of the ministry through the congregation is not a Missourian separate dogma, but the pure evangelical doctrine of true Christianity, and that the contrary doctrine makes the church a priestly state. Whoever believes that every local congregation has the right of election and calling of priests?

of their preachers, he implicitly believes the doctrine of transference. But there is no doctrine more clearly expressed in Scripture and in the Confession than this one. But as to the expression "transfer," in that connection. It is nothing less than new; on the contrary, all orthodox dogmatists use it in almost innumerable places.

W.

Vilmar's doctrine of office. In the "Mecklenburgische Kirchen- und Zeitblatt" of May 1, in a report on the latest events in Hermannsburg, we read the following: On the other hand, the supporters of Vilmar's theory of office declare this doctrine to be an open question which can remain undecided. The editor of the paper "Unter dem Kreuze", Pastor Grote (ret.), is also on this side, which is not surprising in view of his theological ambiguity. He has recently succeeded in advocating the Irvingians in a series of long-winded articles. He seems to have as little interest in pure doctrine in ecclesiastical questions as in justice in political ones, otherwise he would not defend everything that smacks of separation, just as he condemns with unholy zeal everything that happens on the part of the German Empire and its representatives, even though he lacks the courage to stand up for his assertions with his person, which, as is well known, he has long since made safe. Pastor Grote and the supporters of Vilmar's theory of the office should recognize that this doctrine of the symbolic books has long since been rejected as contrary to Scripture, that it not only contains a little papist leaven in it, but is actually no different from the Roman doctrine of the office and in its consequences leads directly to Rome. It sounds genuinely papist when Pastor Grote asks: "What did the ministerial doctrine of the 'Hessian pastors' concern the Hermannsburgers at all? Is then this doctrine for the congregations, or is it not rather for the pastors?" So only the holders of the office have to judge about the doctrine? Is not, as for every church, so especially for the Free Church, which should be held together by unity and purity of doctrine, agreement in doctrine of necessity? Or are the pastors alone the church? Shouldn't it be in a Free Church that the doctrine of office should also assert itself in practice? The Hermannsburgers, then, are in full rights when they resist a doctrine on which the confessions of the Lutheran Church have long since decided. While it is not the business of the Hanover Free Church to fight out this controversy, it is nevertheless its business to take a stand on this question. Whether this has been done in the right way, of course, cannot be judged from a distance. In any case, it is to be deplored in the deepest way, with the one letter given in the leaflet "Unter dem Kreuze" ("Under the Cross"), that right clarity is lacking almost everywhere, and that the confusion is so great that one would like to ask with the apostle: Is there no wise man among you? Or is there not one who could judge between brother and brother? (1 Cor. 6:5.)

Inconsistency of the boards of the so-called Lutheran Gotteskasten in the distribution of their support. Pastor Dr. Max Ahner of Miltitz in Saxony, editor of the "Pilgrim from Saxony," has written a booklet about the principles and activities of the Saxon "Gotteskasten. In an advertisement of this little paper, Dr. Münkler writes in his "Neues Zeitblatt" of May 12, as follows: Lutheran Christians who hold their church dear will very soon convince themselves of the value of the enterprise, and Ahner comes to their aid splendidly with this booklet. The only thing we noticed was a disparity in the procedure. Ahner says: "Excluded from support, however, are those Lutheran church communities (free churches, separations) which have formed in opposition to the Lutheran national church, such as the Missourians in Saxony." The Missourians did not originally form in opposition to the national church, but as a free church in America,

and for a long time they went hand in hand with our regional churches and were supported by them. Only later did they come into opposition to the Saxon regional church through separation and then to all German regional churches. This is more or less the course that the separation in Breslau took. For years it was supported by Lutheran regional churches and was connected with them; but what has long threatened the Saxon regional church has been accomplished in the Hanoverian one, and in time the opposition will come to all of them, when first some obstacles fall away. Now the Saxon and the other God's castes support the Breslau separation, while the Hanoverian God's castes refuse to support it in view of the Breslau separation in Hanover and the Breslau ban. We are well aware that each Gotteskasten has a free hand in this matter, but it is striking that there is so little feeling of community among the Lutheran boards of the Gotteskasten. If the Breslauers are not supported directly in Hanover, they are supported indirectly elsewhere; for what happens to one member strengthens the whole community and benefits all, to the weakening of the regional churches. How would Saxony have liked to receive it, if a few years ago, when there was no Missourian general ban, Hanover had supported the Saxon Missourians? But the Missourians are certainly still as good as the Breslauers. Finally, the God's castes support the Breslauers and the Hessians of Vilmar. Both of them are reformers by choice, they go for a strong reformation of the Lutheran confessions and church, which they form more into the legal and hierarchical. The desire for such church formations is very widespread, and he who sees his heart's desire fulfilled in them is free to support such separations. It is something new, however, when the church promotes such a thing and wants to draw the congregations into it. One has no right to do this, and where one clearly comes out with it, one confuses the minds and leads in wrong directions. The revenues are not so great that one could be generous to those who see their task in church-making. Whoever wants to procure such satisfaction can also pay for it; in this way the help of those who really need it will not be shortened.

"Colonial Policy and the Mission, a Danger to Mission Life. Under this heading, an article in the "Allg. Kz." of May 21 draws attention to the dangers which arise for the mission through its entanglement with German colonial undertakings. It says that the mission directors present at the Bremen conference of the representatives of the German Protestant mission societies in October of last year were in complete agreement "that if the mission is now viewed from a completely different point of view than in the past, and if great attention and recognition are given to it, then at the same time an hour of serious temptation has struck for the mission. For that recognition would be given to it essentially for the sake of the cultural successes it could show, but not because one began to spiritually appreciate its spiritual work. And in addition, with this questionable, everywhere only relative recognition of the mission, demands would be placed on it at the same time, which it could not meet without denying its actual essence. In any case, it has become undeniably clear that the motives and goals of German colonial policy, as far as it is socially organized for East Africa, have absolutely nothing to do with the principle of all Christian missionary activity. No one can be deceived about this who knows the organ of this policy, the 'Colonial-Politische Correspondenz'. For the German East African Society, the mission is essentially a cultural power; and it is only from this point of view that it promotes missionary efforts. The second number of the aforementioned organ emphasizes that it is difficult for the Europeans to win over the natives in the colonies.

The missionary is the right man to win the sympathies of the natives, to transfer these sympathies to the colonists as his White Brothers. The missionary is the right man to win the sympathies of the natives, to transfer these sympathies to the colonists as his White Brothers (in reality, by the way, they are often quite "black" brothers), and thereby to prepare the natives to be willingly active in the service of the advancing culture! Further it is said: Therefore (and this 'Therefore' contains books) one must address to the missionary societies in Germany the admonition to turn their activity towards the German colonies etc.. So it is the old song: 'The priest bridles the horse, and the Lord rides it.'"

The Martineum in Breklum, a private Christian grammar school, which recently completed its fourth year, has applied to the Ministry of Education for permission to further develop it into a full grammar school and for the granting of the associated rights, but has been turned down, partly because it has not achieved the goal of the state grammar schools, and partly because the latter are also run in a Christian sense. Regarding this second reason, the "Allgemeine Kz." of May 21 remarks: "We deny neither the moral discipline nor the capable academic achievements of the state grammar schools; but that both, discipline and achievement, are supported in all places by a positive, decisive Christianity on the part of the state-employed teachers, we must deny on the basis of a longer experience. At a time when the spirits of the culture war were beginning to rage, we witnessed how a Protestant theologian, appointed as a teacher of religion, seriously denied the necessity and justification of infant baptism before his pupils on the basis of a reading from the Acts of the Apostles. At the same time, a teacher who was a renowned philologist and who was highly revered by his students as a history teacher, occasionally extolled Schopenhauer's philosophy to his students as the right wisdom for life. No school counsellor and no director can protect the pupils from such and similar excesses, and the pupils themselves are too inexperienced to know and judge what false views are being instilled in them. If one adds to this the indifference, not to say indifference, with which many grammar school teachers face church life and its expressions, and one sees in consequence that whole generations of the learned and educated classes of our people display a marked disrespect, not only for church life, but for Christianity in general. If, as a result of this, whole generations of the learned and educated classes of our people show a marked disrespect not only for the ecclesiastical forms of life, but for Christianity in general, then this is proof that we need higher educational institutions which provide real guarantees for the promotion not of the moral-religious sense, but of the religious-moral sense."

W.

Election Guest Sermons. The "Allgem. Kz." of May 21 is written from Saxony: As the public papers report, a synodal bill concerning the amendment of our parish election law is not to be expected. For the time being we would like to express only a few wishes, the possible realization of which would probably not be without profit for the election of pastors. 1) The guest sermons would be eliminated. We are not at liberty to say that under certain circumstances such guest sermons almost appear to be a desecration of the Word of God. In many cases the preacher preaches himself first, and only then God's Word. He will, though perhaps sometimes not quite conscious of it, want to place himself in the most favorable light before his constituents in order to obtain the position. And the congregation, again, does not want to hear God's word at first, but the preacher's; it is certainly not the what, but the how that matters to them. And thus the word of God is set aside, and its dignity is indirectly damaged. The churchwardens can easily decide in another way about the proposals made to them.

teach them. - The scandal of election guest preaching, alas! is known to occur even here in America in synods that want to be genuinely Lutheran. W.

Compulsion to send children to a religious school. The following is reported in the "Allg. Kz." of May 21: The court of lay assessors in Leipzig recently ruled that a person who does not profess any religious society, i.e., who is a so-called dissident, is not entitled to withdraw his children from any religious instruction, and sentenced a defendant who had actually withheld his children from any religious instruction for several months to a fine of 30 marks. It based its decision on § 6 of the Saxon People's School Law, which expressly states that children of such dissidents who do not belong to a religious society must participate in the religious instruction of a recognized or confirmed religious society. The royal district court in Leipzig has confirmed the decision of the court of lay assessors in all respects.

Romanisirende Amtslehre. Father Grote, the editor of the paper "Unter dem Kreuze" (Under the Cross), had rebuked the Hermannsburgers in this paper for having separated from the Hanoverian Free Church especially because the Romanizing doctrine of the Hessians, or rather the Vilmarians, wanted to assert itself in it; in doing so, he had declared the doctrine of the ministry to be an open question and portrayed it as if the Hermannsburgers were in general despisers of church discipline and order. In accordance with the request he received, Pastor Simon Meeske in Luzine spoke out against this in his "Concordia" of June 1 as follows: "You have also kindly sent me the following numbers of 'Unter dem Kreuz', in which Father Grote brings the continuation 'Ueber Hermannsburg'. Everything that Father Grote says therein in defense and maintenance of ecclesiastical order is spoken from my heart, and I would like to emphasize it two or three times so that it will be taken all the more to heart; and if, in the struggle against Romanizing doctrines of church, office, regiment, and order, expressions and sayings are uttered by this or that person which can be interpreted as attacks on ecclesiastical order, then I do not approve of that. I have never fought against ecclesiastical order, but against ecclesiastical disorder. The greatest ecclesiastical disorder is the planting of false doctrine. And I regarded it as such an ecclesiastical disorder already 33 years ago, when at that time in Bavaria representatives of the so-called 'Hessian office doctrine' broke the bond with the Missouri Synod and for the planting of the 'Hessian office doctrine' of church and office called into being a synod of their own in America, and the founders and ministers of this synod, although sworn to the Lutheran symbols, but had them swear on oath after ordination that they would not follow Lutheran doctrine in the doctrine of church and ministry, but their own doctrine of church and ministry. I could not take such action on the part of the then representatives of the Romanizing doctrine of office so lightly as the "Hermannsburgerin" and dear Father Grote speak of it, as if it were quite irrelevant what one teaches of church and office, indeed an "open question" in the Lutheran Church. This disorder was so terrible to me that as a student I refrained: I would rather have remained a whole year in Bavaria without communion than to have expressed the seal of such ecclesiastical disorder. In Erlangen I did not go to God's table, since the unirrets who stood opposite me in Berlin were admitted there, and the Ober-KirchenColleg agreed with that, and I did not want to go to people who at that time were swinging all the way to Rome in the doctrine of church and ministry, even though the Ober-KirchenColleg had suggested it to me. For me, who am accustomed to go often to the Lord's table, this was a great suffering. But the matter is serious. We have no power to seal disorder in the house of God. How much misery and distress has this disorder caused?"

How much hardship and misery this direction has caused us in the area of higher church government! And how much hardship and misery this direction has caused us in the field of higher church government! How I have tried and set everything in motion to avoid the rift, and when it occurred here and there, to eliminate it! How urgently I asked the commissioner of the High Church College not to tear my congregation apart and to 'spare our conscience,' etc., etc. (cf. Testimony and Signs 1866 and 1867); but they actually demanded recognition of their doctrine and practice, and since I could not do that, I was removed and my congregation torn apart before my eyes. And then it was told to all the world that we had made the rift. From this you can see, my dear friend, that in life and in reality things go on and look quite different from what Father Grote writes and allows to be written about them. " W.

The dear Pastor Angerstein, editor of the "Ev.-Luth. Kirchenblatt" in Poland, in an article on the turmoil in the Free Church of Hanover, makes the following astonishing judgment in his paper of May 31: "None of the national churches should be offended by this struggle or even condemn the Free Churches, for it is certain that every Lutheran Free Church, however much we may deviate from it and prove it wrong, is more faithful to God's Word and Sacrament than we are. The very struggle of the Free Churches teaches us faithfulness even in small things." (Underlined by A. himself.)

Hierarchical Theories and the Doctrine of Justification. Dr. Münkler writes the following in his "Neues Zeitblatt" of June 2: "It is striking that all the pastors in the Separation belong to the Hessian party, although only a few of them are Hessians, the others from Hanover and other countries. Theodor Harms was the only one who stayed away from them, and after his departure they had to turn to the Immanuel Synod to get a like-minded successor. How is this to be done? We do not believe that the two Hessians, Gerhold and Bingmann, have converted the other pastors to their views. In Hanover the hierarchical views, directed to a rule of spiritual office, have long before had, and still have, many adherents among the clergy. In this they follow a widespread theological movement, which, for example, has its numerous advocates even within the Prussian Union. The Breslau Separate Synod owes its origin in large part to this movement, and has thereby provoked the struggle of the Immanuelites against their hierarchy. The struggle, however, is not only about the hierarchy. Where the doctrine of the Lutheran confessions of church, ministry, and church government is so substantially changed, there must be even more change. It is a common perception that the change affects the doctrine of justification by faith alone, the so-called "Article of the Standing and Falling Church," which has fallen into disuse today, even though justification by faith alone is still spoken of much, but in a foreign sense. Let every one now make up his own doctrine as it suits him, we do not wish to hinder him; only one thing we ask, let it not be called Lutheran or evangelical, for it is neither. The two directions indicated are well called the right and the left of the church. But the hierarchy has no right in the church, and therefore cannot be its right.

Workers' Party and Atheism. In the "Allg. Kz." of June 11 we read: In response to the recent ministerial decrees against the workers' movement, there is now a lively agitation in the Berlin workers' party for mass resignations from the church.

At the Mainz Congress of 1872 it was decided to recommend to the members that they leave the various churches, since the Social Democratic programme was after all atheistic for once. The experience made with this, however, led the party to declare religion a private matter in the Gotha Programme of 1875. The religious sense which still existed in the lower strata of the people presented considerable obstacles to propaganda, and at the Copenhagen Congress of 1884 it was likewise recommended that religion, especially towards the peasants, should be treated with. with caution. This, of course, did not prevent religion from being ridiculed with the greatest cynicism in party writings.

Proposed introduction of church discipline in the Saxon regional church. With joyful astonishment we read in the "Pilgrim from Saxony" of June 13 that the preachers' conference of Großsteinberg had submitted a petition for the presentation of a church discipline order to the Saxon regional synod assembled in May of this year. It is true that the "proposed" discipline procedure lacks several main points, namely doctrinal and communion discipline, and we are convinced that full biblical church discipline presupposes a church such as the regional churches are nowhere, so that its implementation in the latter is an impossibility; Nevertheless, it cannot be praised highly enough that the aforementioned Pastoral Conference has felt urged and had the courage to petition a competent body for the drafting and introduction of a church discipline ordinance." Predictably, however, the petition was rejected by the Synod. And just as it was Prof. Dr. Luthardt in 1871, through whose influence the old Saxon religious oath was abolished in Saxony and exchanged for a vow made on bolts, which was acceptable even to Protestants (see "Lehre und Wehre" XVII, 287 f.), so it was the same man who, through his influence, brought about the rejection of the petition for the presentation of a church discipline.

W.

Fungiren des Predigers bei Leichenverbrennung. The "Allg. Kz." of June 4 contains among other things the following: In Zwickau a citizen close to 100 years of age had ordered in his will that his body be burned in Gotha, a request which was also heeded by the family. In response to an inquiry from Sup. Meyer in Zwickau to the Landesconsistorium how the clergy should behave when in such cases a funeral service is requested by the survivors, the Landesconsistorium decreed that if the performance of a liturgical church act is requested, whether in the house or in the parish hall, the clergyman could neither be considered obligated nor entitled to comply with such a request, since the type of burial in question is not only not permitted in these lands, but is also incompatible with the existing ecclesiastical custom and the legal ecclesiastical order (General Article XV). On the other hand, it is self-evident that the clergyman in question may not deny the bereaved his pastoral assistance in instruction and consolation even in such cases. However, it is not possible to give general rules about this because of the diversity of circumstances that may prevail. Rather, it must be left to the tact and prudent consideration of the clergyman in question as to how and at what time he believes he can best and most successfully fulfill his pastoral duties, especially with regard to the position that the involved sufferers take in the whole matter and to the attitude that they manifest on such occasions.

"The Director." In an article bearing this as its heading, the Breslau "Kirchen-Blatt" of June 1 seeks to prove that a layman at the helm

A layman who is a member of a church community, as Huschke had been until recently at the head of the Breslau church, is by no means, as has recently been said, a thing in the church that should not occur in a free church community; whoever administers any office in the church, even if he does not work "in word and doctrine" (1 Tim. 5, 17.), is not a layman. According to this, the Breslauers seem to want to fill the vacant position of a director of their Oberkirchenkollegium with a so-called layman according to ecclesiastical usage. It is beyond doubt that they are at liberty to do so, although the decision to do so in the present case seems to be connected with the false doctrine of a special office of government, not already placed in the office of preaching, but in addition to the latter, established by Christ. W.

General German National Hymnal. The Strasbourg Lutheran "Monatsblatt" of June 14 writes: "For some years now, the idea of a general German national hymnal has been haunting some minds, to which all special local hymnals would fall victim, slaughtered, as it were, on the altar of national feeling, which is the ruling idol today. Hopefully we will not experience this sacrificial feast. Common sense already reacts against it, and the Thuringian ecclesiastical conference of May 13 also spoke out against a uniform German hymnal.

The theological seminary of the Breslau Synod is attended by 6 members this semester. Two members left as candidates at Easter, and two are currently studying in Leipzig.

Regarding Prof. Luthardt's conduct in the negotiations of the Saxon Synod on the drafting and introduction of a church discipline ordinance, the "Kreuzblatt" of June 20 notes the following: In fact, the diplomacy of Prof. Luthardt, the editor of the "Lutherische Kirchenzeitung," ensured that the motion was defeated by all votes against 10. Whoever has observed the ecclesiastical activity of this influential leader of the Saxon "Orthodoxy" for the past decade knows how he seeks to avoid anything that might disturb Mr. Omnes in his traditional ideas. Thus, in spite of lively support from one side, Kuntze's motion was brought down by the consideration that it was superfluous; for one already had everything that it demanded, namely - on paper.

Ehlers, the new pastor of Hermannsburg, publishes in No. 24 of the "Kropper Anzeiger" a statement which is directed against a letter from Hermannsburg printed in No. 22 of the same paper. In this Ehlers' statement it says: "The unnamed letter writer derives the origin of the dispute from the Predicanten question. This, however, is incorrect according to all that I hear from credible men. Rather, the origin of the doctrinal controversy over the ecclesiastical office was given immediately with the entrance of the Hessians. With great reluctance the blessed Harms introduced the first of these pastors into Hanover, for he saw beforehand that the entrance of this foreign spirit would not serve the prosperity of the Hanoverian Free Church; for the Vilmarian, so-called 'Hessian doctrine of the ministry' was truly well enough known, and the expression was not (as the letter writer wants) coined only in Hanover.... The predicant question then admittedly intensified the opposition between Pastor Harms and the Vilmar-minded pastors. Only necessity drove to supply the small scattered congregations with only seminary-educated men, who had to administer their office as 'Vicars' under pastoral supervision. They have proven themselves in this position to the blessing of the congregations, and especially in the last difficult times also served faithfully in Hermannsburg itself." Not without reason Fr Grote remarks on this

In his Kreuzblatt: "Accordingly, Blessed Harms foresaw that the entry of this foreign spirit (the Hessians) would not serve the prosperity of the Hanoverian Free Church. Nevertheless, he decided, 'though with reluctance,' to introduce the first of these Hessian false teachers into Hanover. According to the assertion of Pastor Ehlers, Pastor Harms laid the foundation for the destruction of the Hanoverian Free Church and thereby incurred a grave guilt; for he not only tolerated the entry of a foreign spirit into this church against his better knowledge and conscience and 'in foresight of what was to come', as it is said afterwards, but introduced this spirit himself. What do the worshippers of Blessed Harms in Hermannsburg say to this accusation which their new pastor raises against their 'dear father'? I only say to this that one must involve oneself in such contradictions, if by sophistries, instead of openly and honestly admitting wrong, one wants to change it into right." Furthermore, Pastor Ehlers writes, op. cit.: "Certainly the doctrine of church government need not be church-dividing. Not so long, namely, as it remains merely an object of discussion. But as soon as a false doctrine of church government is acted upon, it becomes necessary for the church of the Lord to preserve its liberty. - A strange theology! According to it, false doctrine, which relates to action, is not church-dividing until it is practiced, which, of course, must be done at once, since this is in the nature of all practical doctrines. It is, by the way, the constant way of false teachers that, when they are uncertain of their false doctrine and do not dare to prove it with God's Word, they take recourse to the theory of open questions. By this they only betray their wavering conscience, which then gives vent to scolding those who have become certain of the right doctrine from God's Word, and who therefore never let it become an open question. It is indeed frightful not to want to condemn a false doctrine as long as it does not seem to endanger the liberty of the church, while one does not want to condemn it first of all for the sake of the majesty and honor of God, whose word every false doctrine is a falsification of. W.

Church Regiment. As wrong as it was when Father Meine claimed that it was the Lord Jesus who also exercised the outward church government, it is no less wrong when Grote replied in his Kreuzblatt: "But he does not exercise it directly and in visible presence, but through human agents. Otherwise he would not have written to us through his apostle: **"If anyone governs, let him be careful"** (Rom. 12, 8.) and 1 Cor. 12, 28. would not have listed **governors** among other offices and functions. To be sure, the invisible bridegroom governs his bride; but she also has a visible head, and is not a headless trunk, etc." To this Father Meeske, in his Concordia of May 1, not inaccurately replies: "Yes - so even brethren who are well-meaning toward the Church can sometimes be fooled when, instead of doing right by the Word of God, they rationalistically follow the wise human reason with the new theology. Rom. 12, 8. 1 Cor. 12, 28. are ministerial and not heriliter.

The Bride of Christ is to be understood officially, and not as a regiment of a rabbi, a pope, an imperial pope, a master or magister, or as a head pastor - as a head pastor, which a Christian child of seven years, yes, every Christian village woman in Christian education, can and must know. And when Father Grote calls the bride of Christ without such a visible head as a pope, emperor pope, high church college or high pastor a headless trunk, then I will gladly assume that he is seduced by the rationalism of the newer theology and does not know what he is talking about, because when seen in the light of day, this is actually a blasphemy of the Church of God, which thereby also strikes its head; it is a sin against man.

Son. But I ask the brother Grote, who is so badly mistaken: Is a woman therefore a 'trunk,' because the man is the woman's head: her will is subject to the man? True, she has a head, but she covers it, and testifies that the man is her head. Neither is the church of the living God, the bride of Jesus Christ, a 'trunk,' because Christ alone is the head of the church (Eph. 1:5.) Yes, it is so little a **monstrum** - for that is what he wants to say by 'trunk' - that we rather turn the tables and say: The church of God, which is a spiritual kingdom, would and would become unnature if it were given a visible head, as in the papacy, imperial papacy, spiritual magistrate, or head pastorate; for a spiritual kingdom with a bodily head is unnature, and therefore we condemn it roundly with our symbols as antichristianity."

The Baltic Provinces and the German Language. The curator of the Dorpat teaching district, Kapustin, who has now moved to Riga, has issued a new series of circulars concerning education in the Baltic provinces, aimed at strengthening Russian in the schools and bringing the Russian spirit into the German schools. It is impressed upon the proprietors of private schools that German is only one of the languages of instruction "approved" by the Russian government, and that they must not take it into their heads to place this approved language on a par with the "imperial language of the authorities". Likewise, they must also be prepared at any time to teach in Russian at once on this or that subject as prescribed by the curator. The number of Russian lessons is increased to 12 and 10 weekly in the elementary schools, and no pupil who does not understand Russian can be admitted to the second class at all. In the teaching of history in all Baltic secondary schools where German is still taught in general world history, the textbooks in use in Germany are to be removed and books written by German history teachers working in Russia are to be introduced in their place. The teaching of Russian history, it is said, must work to make the Baltic youth aware of their affiliation to Russia and to its great men who built up the empire.

(Allg. Kz. of June 18.)

Heffen-Cassel. On the grounds of a police order of August 7, 1878, according to which laymen are forbidden to give funeral sermons, Pastor Schmidt of Melsungen was sentenced by the court of laymen in Melsungen to a fine of 5 marks for unauthorized giving of a funeral sermon. The defendant appealed and claimed before the criminal court in Kassel that he had been entitled to perform official acts as an ordained clergyman of the Old Hessian Church and as a lawful pastor of the congregation of Kassel. The criminal division decided, rejecting the appeal, that it was only a matter of interpreting the above police regulation and of defining the term layman in the present case. Laymen were to be understood as all persons who were not clergymen of a religious community recognized by the Prussian state. Since the renitent Old Hessian Church, according to the confession of the accused, had neither sought nor received state recognition, the accused was to be regarded as a layman and punished. Thus reports the "Allg. Kz." of May 30. A more ridiculous distinction between a clergyman and a layman has probably never been made. W.

Steps of the Pope to regain his temporal power. The "Neue Zeitblatt" of May 19 writes: The Papal Penitential Order for the current Jubilee Year 1886, and especially for Italy, contains precise instructions to the bishops under what conditions the priests are to grant absolution to penitents.

The second sentence of the Instruction decrees that those who helped and voted for the unification of Italy and the confiscation of the Papal States can only receive absolution if they show proof of repentance. The second sentence of the order decrees that those who have assisted and voted in the unification of Italy and the confiscation of the Papal States may obtain absolution only if they promise proofs of repentance and obedience to the Holy See and its laws to be enacted in the future. Public officials, servants of the sacrilegious laws, must resign their posts, or if that is not possible, consult with their bishop as to what they must do and perform in that case. The pope wants to have his country back, and therefore seeks to make his subjects disloyal and unruly to the king of Italy. Otherwise the Catholic Church knows how to send itself into every regiment of the state, whether it arose rightly or wrongly. With the pope it is a different matter. Also the former church estates are considered in the instruction. If purchasers and tenants of the same wish to obtain absolution, they must sign a deed before the bishop and several witnesses that they are not owners of the church property, and retain the same as long as the church permits, but deliver the profits to the original owner. Whoever resells a purchased church property must likewise pay the profit to the original owner. The papal penitential authority has issued these decrees several times before, but has achieved no success with them.

Lübeck. In the Lübeck area, all municipal schools became the property of the state on June 1, when the new education law came into effect, and the teachers were sworn in and made responsible by the high school authorities.

Upper Austria. At a court hearing in Linz, the chaplain Joseph Hofmaninger of St. Peter im Mühlkreis, who on the occasion of a Protestant funeral held on January 4 in the cemetery at Obermühl scandalously tried to prevent the Protestant pastor Urbauer from delivering the funeral oration at the open grave, was found guilty of the crime of disturbing religion and sentenced to two months in prison. (General Kz.)

Marriage in Law. The English House of Lords rejected on May 24, again by 149 votes to 127 in the second reading the Bill by which the marriage with the sister of the deceased wife is to be legalized.

Russia. In Estonia, where the mass conversions to the Greek Church began anew in May 1883, this work, eagerly promoted by the Chief Procureur Pobedonoszew, is being continued with special success. Not only in the Wiek, where the conversions were first undertaken, but also in South and West Harria the conversions to the Greek Church are increasing. In some places the Gensdarmen go from jar to jar, from parish to parish, making inquiries about rents and taxes under some pretext or other, and hinting that all who convert to the Greek Church will be exempt from these burdens. In some places these scouts are said to have interrogated the people in a downright mean manner. - The situation of the Protestants in the interior of Russia seems to be worse than has been reported in the newspapers. For example, 120 poor exiles, expelled Herrnhuters, have now come to Berlin from Schadura in the Volhynia governorate. The government had refused to allow them to exist as a Protestant Brethren Church, and for a year and a half they had to do without all church services and the administration of the sacraments. In order to be able to live their faith, they saw themselves compelled to leave house and farm, and since the government did not permit them to sell their lands, not even to transfer them to relatives, they had to move from there, some of them destitute. In a pitiful condition and almost without means of subsistence, they arrived in Berlin, where they were welcomed by the local

Brüdergemeinde in the most abundant way and about 20,000 Marks were collected for them. On 18 May they left the port of Hamburg for southern Brazil.

(All. Kz.)

Spain. On the progress of Protestantism in Spain, the evangelist Juan Fuente of Granada (who came of a Roman Catholic family in northern Spain, and, destined for the priesthood, attended a seminary for seven years, but then, as a student, converted to the Protestant Church in spite of the opposition of his family) recently delivered a series of lectures in Berlin. On Palm Sunday 1869, as he reported, the first evangelical church in Spain was consecrated in Madrid, and since then the work of evangelization has progressed, albeit slowly and with many difficulties. About 60 smaller and larger evangelical congregations have been formed, under the leadership of missionaries or pastors; indeed, there are evangelical congregations in all the larger cities of Spain. All denominations are represented in the evangelistic work. Particularly splendid are the means and efforts of the Scotch English Mission, which distributes the Bibles in many thousands throughout the country. Nevertheless, the number of Protestants who have made a public profession of the Protestant faith is only 12 to 14,000, and if we add to this the number of those who, without having made a public profession, hold to the Protestants and attend the Protestant churches, the total number may reach 26 to 30,000. The return of the Bourbons to the Spanish throne has been a particular hindrance to the work of evangelization. Many no longer have the courage to openly confess their faith, and the powerful opponents are doing everything they can to prevent the spread of Protestantism. There are schools in almost all the larger cities of Spain, attended by about 7000 children. The richer communities, such as those of Madrid, Barcelona, and Seville, bear the maintenance of their schools themselves; but the poorer ones, such as those at Granada and Cordova, require grants. Fuente himself, as has been reported before, has for about two years founded a congregation among gypsies in Granada, in the poorest part of the city, about which formerly no one cared, and whose inhabitants grew up without instruction and without any knowledge of religion. But since Fuente opened a chapel there, which is also attended by soldiers and even by officers, and a Protestant school, in which about 100 children are taught, his opponents have made great efforts, and have not ceased to agitate the population against him, so that the police have repeatedly had to take him under their protection.

Mission among the Hovas. Now it is even said that the French are looking for Protestant missionaries for Madagascar. This would prove that the Hovas really do not want to know anything about Catholicism, and that they know of no other means to oust the missionaries of the London Society, who are harmful to French influence, than to have the Paris Society do the work of a henchman.

(Monthly Gazette.)

Necrological. On May 4 the much-named Georg Müller died in Australia, known to be the founder of great orphanages at Bristol in England, who adhered to the principle of never asking for support, but only accepting that which was offered to him voluntarily. He was born in 1805 at Kroppenstadt in the province of Saxony. - On June 6, the reformed theologian Dr. John Williamson Nevin died in Lancaster, Pa., who had especially endeavored in earlier times to purify the church, to which he belonged, of its false spiritualism, as far as he recognized it, and to prevent the introduction of the so-called new measures of the Methodist sects, the penitential bench and the like.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 32.

September 1886.

No. 9.

What does Scripture say of itself?

(With consideration of the just also recently raised objections of the newer theology).

(Continued.)

2. The New Testament gives itself as God's word and revelation.

a. According to the testimony of the New Testament, the words of the apostles are on a par with the words and writings of the prophets.

Christ says to the Jews, "If ye believed Moses, ye believed me also, because he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" Joh. 5, 46. 47. Here the Lord demands the same credit for His words as for the words and writings of Moses. If the writings of Moses, which no Jew denied, are the word of God, which deserves and claims faith, then Christ's teaching is also the speech of God and is worthy of acceptance.

The apostles taught what they received from Christ. But they do not only emphasize the commission they received from Christ, but also put special emphasis on their conformity with the prophets. In the beginning of the Epistle to the Romans St. Paul writes: "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, set apart to preach the gospel of God, which he promised beforehand through his prophets in the holy Scriptures." Rom. 1, 1. 2. Peter points out in the place already cited, 1 Pet. 1, 10-12. that they, the apostles, who preached the gospel, preached nothing else than what the prophets presented, and that they, like them, spoke through the Holy Spirit. And in another place

2 Petr. 3, 2. he reminds the Christians "that you remember the words that were told you before by the holy prophets and our commandment, who are apostles of the Lord and Savior". The commandments and teachings of the apostles have the same value and the same meaning as the words of the holy prophets. Prophets and apostles appear in the same order in the well-known passage: "Ye are therefore no more sojourners and strangers, but citizens with the saints, and of the house of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the cornerstone. Eph. 2, 19. 20.

In all these passages the writings of the prophets are meant. For it is in their writings that the prophets live on and still speak to Christians. If "the prophets" are called the foundation of the New Testament church, especially of the Gentile church, then only the written word of the prophets can be considered. But this, as we have proved from Scripture, is God's Word and revelation. So the same is true of the words of the apostles, which stand in the same rank with the words and writings of the prophets. And since St. Paul describes in Eph. 2, 19-22 the church of the New Testament in general, which is gathered from Jews and Gentiles and will be gathered, which extends beyond the days of the apostles and grows toward perfection, that is, the church of all times, he already reflects in the expression "built on the foundation of the apostles" on the living and powerful word of the apostles throughout all times, that is, on the written word of the apostles. Rom. 1, 1. 2. he also understands the "gospel of God", for which he was set apart and which is like the holy writings of the prophets, as the written proclamation of the gospel, which the Roman Christians should now hear from him.

b. According to the testimony of the New Testament, the oral preaching of the apostles is God's Word and revelation.

St. Paul reminds the Christians who are won through the preaching of the apostles that they received "the word of divine preaching" from the apostles and that they also received the word of the apostles "as the word of God", "not as the word of men, but as it truly is, the word of God". 1 Thess. 2, 13. St. Peter praises 1 Petr. 1, 24. 25. the word of the Lord, which abideth for ever, the living, incorruptible seed, and then adds: "but this is the word which is preached among you," namely, was preached by the apostles.

The word which the apostles preached was *ἡ εὐαγγέλιον* the gospel. And 1 Pet. 1, 12. Now the apostle emphasizes that they, the apostles, preached the gospel "by the Holy Spirit sent from heaven." The apostles were eye- and ear-witnesses of all that the Lord had taught, done, suffered. What they taught, they had

from the Lord. Nevertheless, when they preached the gospel, they did not simply draw from their memory, but their preaching was done by the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit determined and permeated their testimony, gave them in every case what and how they should speak, and made the things they had known before come alive in them anew. What the apostles spoke was the speech of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit spoke through them. The preaching of the apostles was inspired in the proper sense of the word. St. Paul writes in 1 Cor. 15:1: "But I remind you, brethren, of the gospel which I preached unto you, which ye also received, in the which ye also stand;" and then he gives the Corinthians to understand that what he gave them he received from the Lord. What he taught was therefore revelation and that revelation was for the purpose of communicating it to others. Rom. 1, 1. Paul calls his gospel with the title: "Gospel of God".

The unique dignity, the divine authority of the apostles is beyond all doubt. They were, as it was said above, "apostles of the Lord and Savior." How often St. Paul reminds us in his epistles, as in those to the Corinthians, to the Galatians, that he had his office directly from God, from Christ. From this it is evident that the apostles, when they preached the gospel as apostles in virtue of their office, spoke in God's name, in God's place. They approached Jews and Gentiles with the claim that they should listen to and believe their sermon as the living Word of God.

o. According to the testimony of the New Testament, the apostles recorded in their writings the same gospel that they preached orally.

If the oral preaching of the apostles was truly the word of God, not the word of men, but the word of God in the true sense of the word, the same is true of their written testimony. For this is quite in the same line with their oral preaching.

Especially in their writings the apostles appear as apostles, as those who are called to teach the whole church and to establish the obedience of faith among Jews and Gentiles and to strengthen those who believe in the faith.

So St. Paul in the letter to the Romans. He calls himself Rom. 1, 1. "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, set apart to preach the gospel of God." As such he writes this letter. He has not yet been personally to the Romans, has not preached to them orally, as to other Gentiles, the gospel of Christ. So in this "Epistle" he gives a substitute, gives here a short summary of his gospel, the gospel of God.

The first Epistle to the Corinthians bears a similar title on its forehead: "Paul, called to be an apostle of JEsu Christ, by the will of God," etc.

1 Cor. 1, 1. In the 10th verse of chapter 1 he starts an urgent admonition and admonishes the brethren in Corinth "by the name of our Lord JEsu Christ". As Christ's word, as God's word, they are to receive his exhortation. He preached Christ crucified to the Corinthians, as to the other Gentiles. 1 Cor. 1, 23. And this very sermon he repeats and confirms in this epistle, especially in the first chapters. According to chap. 2, 1-5. he "preached the divine sermon" to them, and not "in sensible words of human wisdom," but "in evidence of the Spirit and of power." From verse 6 on, he says more generally, "We speak of the secret, hidden wisdom of God," (v. 7.) "But unto us hath God revealed it by his Spirit," (v. 10.) "Which also we speak, not in words which human wisdom can teach, but in words which the Holy Ghost teacheth." (v. 13.) This is especially true of his present speech. He now speaks in writing to the Corinthians. That he comprehends this his epistolary speech under his apostolic preaching, "the divine preaching," is proved by the connection of chap. 3:1-3. There it is said, "And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, as unto babes in Christ. Milk have I given you to drink, and not meat: for ye could not yet, neither yet can ye. For since there is zeal and strife and dissension among you, are ye not carnal, and walk after the manner of men?" Since the apostle was with the Corinthians and preached to them orally, he could not, because they were still carnal, give them solid food, but had to give them, as young children in Christ, milk to drink. But even now, as he writes, they cannot stand solid food. Even now they are in need of milk. So even now, in this epistle, as before in his preaching, the apostle gives them milk, the simple gospel of Christ crucified. His epistolary discourse, then, is the continuation of his oral discourse. What he now does, that he writes, he subsumes under his "speaking." In his epistle, as in his sermon, St. Paul waits for his apostolic office. And this is a divine office. What he speaks or writes as an apostle is "God's wisdom", "God's revelation".

In the introduction to the Epistle to the Galatians, the apostle rages against the false apostles who perverted the gospel of Christ which he had preached and confused the Galatian churches and turned them away from the one true gospel apart from which there is no other. Then he wrote, "As we have said before, so now I say again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed!" Gal. 1:9. Divinely certain that his gospel was God's gospel, the apostle curses every other gospel. As an apostle, called not by and through men, but by God, preaches

he curses the gospel. By virtue of his apostolic authority, he curses every other gospel now that he writes. So he brings out his apostolic office in his letters as well as in his preaching.

At the end of his first letter, the apostle Peter speaks of the purpose of his letter: "Through your faithful brother Silvanus, I have written a little to you to exhort and testify that this is the true grace of God in which you stand," that is, in which you have come to stand. The apostle Paul had first preached the grace of God in those parts of Asia Minor in his oral preaching, and introduced into the state of grace the very ones to whom Peter then sends his letter. Peter continues Paul's work and preaching by fortifying those hard-charging Christians in the grace of God through his epistolary encouragement. The oral preaching of the apostles appears as the beginning, their written speech as the continuation of apostolic efficacy. Speaking and writing complement each other, form a whole, a *continuum*.

St. John puts the meaning of his epistle into the light in the beginning of his first epistle. He writes: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have beheld, and our hands have touched, of the word of life (and the life is appeared, and we have seen, and bear witness, and declare unto you the life which is eternal, which was with the Father, and appeared unto us); which things we have seen and heard we declare unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us, and that our fellowship may be with the Father, and with his Son JESUS CHRIST. And these things write we unto you, that your joy may be full." 1 John 1:1-4. The oral preaching and the writing of the apostles have the same content, Christ, the Word of life, and pursue the same end, that those who hear the preaching and read the Scriptures may have fellowship with the Son and the Father, and that their joy may be more and more complete. We have now in the writings of the apostles quite the same thing that the first Christians had in their preaching, the very thing that the apostles themselves heard, saw, touched, Christ, the Word made flesh, and in him the Father. As God revealed Himself in Christ to the apostles, so that they saw and heard the eternal Word and grasped it with their hands, so He now reveals Himself to us in the writings of the apostles. Here we find Christ, the Son of God, and eternal life.

As with preaching, so with the apostles' writings it is on faith that men believe and are saved. "These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God, that ye might know that ye have eternal life; and that ye might believe on the name of the Son of God." 1 John 5:13. The same thing, as with the epistles, is the case with the gospels. "Also many other

Signs which Jesus did in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book. But these are written, that ye might believe that JESus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life in his name." Joh. 20, 30. 31.

We see that the oral and the written testimony of the apostles are two equal parts of the apostolic activity. The latter, like the former, is "truly" the Word of God. It makes no difference whether the apostles speak or write. Thus St. Paul remarks in 2 Thess. 2:2: "We beseech you, brethren, that ye be not soon moved of mind, nor troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letters, as sent by us. . ." Word and pries of the apostles are on the same level.

That the letters of the apostles are holy writings, like those of the old covenant, that in the apostolic writings God's word is present, that the Lord speaks through the apostles, even when they write, is also *expressis verbis* testified in Scripture. 2 Peter 3:15, 16. we read, "as also our dear brother Paul, according to the wisdom given him, wrote unto you, as he also speaketh in all his epistles, wherein are some things hard to be understood, which confound the unlearned and the reckless, as also the other scriptures, to their own damnation." Paul's epistles, then, are in the same sense writings, i.e. holy writings, as "the other writings." He who takes offense at such writings, perverting and confusing them, does so to his own condemnation, for he takes offense at the word of the living God. Paul himself judges of his writings: "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him know what I write unto you: for they are the commandments of the Lord." 1 Cor. 14, 37. Paul does not refer here to previously given commandments of God, but in this connection himself gives all kinds of instructions to Christians, and remarks of this, but in general of all that he writes, as an apostle to Christians: "These are the commandments of the LORD." He is well aware that Christ speaks through him. Therefore he writes another time: "That ye may know him that speaketh in me, or by me, even Christ. 2 Cor. 13, 3. The preceding verse ("and now write it in absentia" v. 2.) shows that Paul here means his written speech.

(3) The Scriptures testify that the Holy Spirit inspired the holy people of God not only with thoughts but also with words, that the whole Scripture and all its parts are inspired, and that therefore no part of the Scripture may be broken or changed.

When we examine the scriptural statements in which Scripture bears witness to itself and to its divine origin, we find that it reveals the inspiration not only of thoughts but also of words.

emphasized. Thus in the well-known passage 1 Cor. 2:12, 13: "Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit from God, that we might know the things which are given us of God: which Mr also speaketh, not with words which man's wisdom can teach, but with words which the Holy Ghost teacheth." That in this connection just also the written speech of the apostles is meant, has been shown above. So also of the apostolic writings the divine inspiration of thoughts, as of words, is testified. The Spirit of God gave to the apostles, as they spoke and wrote, the things which they themselves should know and make known to others; but the words in which the apostles expressed these spiritual, divine things, were also taught by the Holy Spirit. Thus the apostles, as Paul adds, "joined spiritual things with spiritual." This is the opinion of the words: *πνευματιζοῖς πνευματιζά συγγρίνοντες*, In the apostolic, in general in the sacred writings, spiritual thoughts are connected with spiritual words, spiritual content is connected with spiritual expression. Content and form, both are presented, taught, by God, by the Spirit of God.

The holy scripture emphasizes that God, that the Holy Spirit spoke through the tongue, through the mouth of the holy people of God. 2 Sam. 23:2. we read, "The Spirit of the LORD hath spoken by me, and his speech is by my tongue." This is the title of David's last song, which he wrote down at the end of his days for the generations to come. Ps. 45:2 says, "My tongue is the pen of a good writer." This is the superscription of the Psalm that lies before us in the Psalter. The Lord said to Jeremiah, "Behold, I put my words in thy mouth." Jer. 1, 9. These are the very words that are immortalized in the book of Jeremiah's prophecy. Luc. 1, 70. refers the priest Zacharias, Apost. 3, 21. The apostle Peter refers to all that "God spoke by the mouth of His holy prophets", that is, to the prophecy of the prophets as it was before Israel at the time of the fulfillment, that is, to the written prophecy. And it is just from the written speech of God, which was done through the prophets, that it is here brought out that God, that the Holy Spirit, spoke through the tongue, through the mouth of holy men. The tongue, the mouth, forms the words, the expression of the thoughts. And this very expression, the form and shape in which God's speech and revelation in the Scriptures is before our eyes, is from God, is God's work, the effect of the Holy Spirit.

Where Christ and the apostles refer to the scriptures, they do not only introduce general scriptural thoughts, nor only single sayings, but often put their finger on a single word of scripture and draw from it the proof for their cause. Gal. 3, 16. writes St. Paul:

"Now ever the promise was made to Abraham and his seed. He speaks not "through the seed," as through many, but as through One, "through thy seed," which is Christ." On the One word "through thy seed," XXXXX Gen. 22, 18. on the singular of this name, he lays all weight, and proves from it that Christ was already promised to Abraham, and remarks that He, that God thus spoke, that God purposely chose this expression. Matth. 22, 43. 44. Christ testifies and proves His deity to the Pharisees from the HO. Psalm, and that is from the one word: "My Lord". Joh. 10, 35. all emphasis lies on the expression $\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota$, XXXXX, "gods," that title which the 82nd Psalm attaches to the authorities. If this name already comes to the persons in authority, how much more to Him whom the Father has sanctified and sent into the world! Christ and the apostles considered every sentence and every word they found and read in the Scriptures to be the word of God in the true sense of the word.

Matth. 10, 19. 20. and Luc. 12. 11. 12. should only be mentioned in passing as an analogy. There the Lord promises His disciples, the believers in general, that in the time of persecution and responsibility the Holy Spirit will give them what and how they should speak. As in this particular case, so also in other cases, especially in the writing of the Scriptures, the Holy Spirit has power to put his thoughts into the hearts of men and his words on their lips.

The now much maligned verbal inspiration, this "little fist of the dogmatists," has, therefore, solid ground in Scripture. Yes, inspiration that is not at the same time verbal inspiration is in truth no inspiration. In all sensible speech thought and expression are as closely connected as body and soul. The person speaking gives the appropriate expression to his thoughts. Scripture is the speech of the living God. God has here revealed His secret wisdom in language intelligible to man. All is here a casting and a flow, springing from the Spirit of God.

Certainly the whole of Scripture, in all its parts, is the Word of God, the speech of the Holy Spirit. All that is written in the books of Moses comes under the title "Law of the Lord. The books of the prophets are "prophecy" from beginning to end. It is all here under the heading, "Thus saith the LORD." Christ the LORD and the apostles appeal to the Scriptures par excellence, all the Scriptures of the Old Testament. All that is reported in the Gospels is "Gospel of Christ," "Gospel of God." Every letter of the apostles from the opening greeting to the closing vote is apostolic testimony. Each of the sacred writings is a whole into which all the individual parts belong. It is basically a quite nonsensical conception if one, as the newer ones like to do, subdivides the essential from the unessential.

The first is the word of God, and the second is subject to error. This is a "mechanical" construction. Then the Holy Spirit sometimes, when there were unimportant things to report, like the good Homer, celebrated and slept, and the human pen continued to write of its own accord, and, because it was abandoned by the Spirit, often babbled. But in truth the newer ones do not even believe that the essential things concerning the salvation of men are inspired by the Holy Spirit. This is only a human account of the salvation which God has procured for mankind, of the history of salvation which God has shaped. Men have done everything themselves, brought it forth from their will and thoughts, expressed it in their words, and the Holy Spirit has only vaguely assisted them and watched over them so that the individual pieces would finally unite to form a harmonious whole.

If all that is written in Scripture, the whole and every detail, is inspired by God, spoken by God, it follows of itself that no letter may be changed. Every word is an inviolable sanctuary, an infallible, unchangeable word of God. This is expressly confirmed by Scripture. Four times in Scripture we find a serious warning against doing or adding anything to what God has commanded and spoken. Deut. 4:2, 12:32, Prov. 30:5, 6, Revelation 22:18, 19. Any addition is also sacrilege, because then God's word is replaced with man's word. To that warning is added the threat: "Do not add to his words, lest he punish you." "If any man add thereto, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. And if any man do from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part from the book of life." Christ lifts up His voice and says, "I am not come to dissolve, but to fulfill. For I say unto you: Verily, till heaven and earth be rent, not the least letter shall be rent, nor one tittle of the law, till all be done. Whosoever therefore shall destroy one of the least of these commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." Matth. 5, 17-19. Luc. 16, 17. We are warned and confess with Paul: "I believe all things that are written in the law and in the prophets." Apost. 24, 14.

(To be continued.)

(Sent in byl. H. Jox, at the request of the Easter Conference at Fort Wayne 1885).

How can we, the servants of the Church, have and keep a serene heart and a good conscience even in this time?

Even many righteous preachers have to make the experience that the world penetrates more and more into their congregations and that the fullness becomes greater and greater. This is first evident in our youth, even though they are growing up in spiritual abundance. It is also evident in old church members who have had the pure Word of God almost all their lives. This perception often makes us preachers despondent.

But first we have to consider: Our time is the last, the time immediately before the last day. - But what does the Lord say about the last time? He describes it as a terrible time. Luc. 18, 8. He says that faith will be rare then. Matt. 24:12, that unrighteousness will abound, and love will wax cold in many. The apostle continues this in 2 Tim. 3, 1-7. Matth. 24, 37-39. the Saviour compares the last days with the days of Noah before the flood. From this it is clear that much struggle and work is reserved for us and little blessing is promised. We are the gleaners; a gleaner must be content with single ears; if he then once finds a whole handful, or even a full sheaf, it is a special happiness, but not the rule. Let us not, therefore, from the outset, set our expectations too high with regard to the success of our work!

But even though we are living in the last days, the promises of the power of the Word are still firm, even rock solid. Isa. 55:10, 11. We read: "For as the rain and the snow come down from heaven, and return not again; but wet the earth, and make it fruitful and yield seed, and give bread to eat: so shall the word be that goeth forth out of my mouth. It shall not return unto me void, but it shall do that which I please, and it shall prosper when I send it." Rom. 1, 16.: "The gospel is the power of God to save." Ebr. 4:12: "The word of God is living, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of marrow and bone, and is a judge of the senses and thoughts of the heart." - Here also belongs the parable of the sower. Thus the Word of God will not be preached by us in vain. The church will remain in virtue of the promise given to her. Matth. 16, 18. the Lord Jesus says: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it (my church)." To this history says yea and amen. I remind you of the time of Noah, of Elijah, of Pabstism, of rationalism. Here also the doctrine of election by grace is comforting. Where the calling, the preaching of the Gospel, takes place, there are found

have and keep a serene heart and a good conscience? 259. Also elect. So also with us, in all our churches, be it ever so sad, are the elect. And the Lord will save his elect. For thus saith he John 10:27, 28: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish; neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." - What a comfort! So we do not labor in vain, even if we should see no fruit at all, which is not the case.

Let us not lose sight of the glorious advantages we have over many others! Among these advantages I count: a. That the Lord has spiritually opened our ears, eyes, and hearts. This is our blessedness. b. That we have the pure doctrine of the Word of God. - This is a treasure, the value and glory of which my poor words are not able to describe. While all around us it is either pitch-black night, or the rays of the sun fall only sporadically, we sit in true noonday light, in full radiance, c. That we enjoy perfect ecclesiastical liberty, and can and may testify to the truth without hindrance. We certainly all readily admit that there are still faithful preachers in the European state churches, people who mean well by their God and their herd. But what a situation these dear men find themselves in! In their congregations they have all kinds of people. Those who have grown up among us in the state church can only think with horror of such a congregation, especially in the cities. - And what about the ecclesiastical superiors? As a rule, they are no support and help to the pastors who still mean it faithfully, but a plague, in that they stand in the way of wholesome discipline. And the ministers? Well, most of them belong to the big crowd and are therefore against those who want to take God's word seriously in their ministry. The latter, who in many cases still lack a clear understanding, certainly have a hard, hard position. We must not forget this when we judge them. How very different our situation is! In the congregation we do not have to deal with the unbelieving rabble. Of course, there are sometimes people who are not obedient to the word of God and do not want to be. But these cannot do as they please, much less be allowed to rule; they are punished, disciplined, and, if all else fails, separated from the congregation. - However much the evil flesh may stir in our churches, God's Word, to God's praise, still asserts dominion in them. I have experienced it enough in my own congregations as well as in other congregations: as soon as the torch of the Word shone into them in any matter, even the proudest waves subsided. - In addition, those who watch over our churches with us are not the enemies of Christ,

but are his friends, people who care about promoting God's glory and the salvation of the Church. In them we also have a real support and help against the evil that is stirring among us. - And finally, how fortunate it is that we have brothers in office who are of one heart and soul with us! - If someone wants to forget his office, he will be disciplined.

Finally, we should also keep in mind the reward of grace that is coming to us according to God's will. The Lord owes us nothing, yet He wants to give us a rich reward. Dan. 12:3 says: "The teachers shall shine like the brightness of heaven," etc. Therefore, if we are found faithful, we shall not only be blessed by grace, but we shall also be adorned in the most glorious way, and this adornment shall last forever.

Accordingly, it is our duty to carry out the works of our ministry with the utmost seriousness. Of these, I emphasize four in particular: public preaching, confirmation classes, private pastoral care, and the church regiment,

1. The public sermon. We must put all our strength into this, and therefore also prepare ourselves for every sermon and Christian teaching with the greatest care and most anxious conscientiousness. Our motto must always be to offer only the very best to our people. We must severely punish the sins of our time and of our congregations, but in doing so we must be careful not to waste the Gospel in the midst of our punishment. Yes, since the gospel alone brings life to the bones of the dead, it must be our special concern to let this heavenly sun shine in its fullest splendor. Therefore, no matter how evil the times may be, no matter how much apostasy may appear, it is and must always be our main work to advance the gospel with all our might and to reveal it in all its sweetness.

2. The Confirmation Class. We are not only to teach our youth the right understanding of Christian doctrine, not only to give them a good supply of sayings, songs and stories to take with them on their journey through life, but we are also to make an effort to give all our instruction in a serious, fatherly, pastoral manner. Our children must feel that we not only believe what we teach with all our hearts, but that we really seek nothing but God's glory and their salvation with our work on them. The more the devil, the world, and the flesh assail our young people, the more decidedly must we stand up for them and seek to arm them against these enemies. When one experiences that in some

- 1) In branches, especially where there is no regular school, one must be content with the bare necessities. But this should be "firmly established.

young people everything has been in vain, then the thought probably comes: Why such trouble? But for God's sake do not give room to such thoughts, but do the very opposite!

3. Private chaplaincy. In this time we must take advantage of every opportunity to give individual souls what is theirs. It is necessary to keep an eye on the individual souls in the face of the particular sins of the times. We must take special care of the youth. They are especially targeted by the devil. For this reason we must make ourselves a wall for them, partly through prayer, partly through the weapon of the word.

4. The community regiment. The community regiment is also of great importance. By the church government I do not merely mean the creation and maintenance of all kinds of outward good order, but the care that the Word of God be the rule and guide in all that is to be discussed in the church assembly. - The right leadership of the church assembly is very difficult. That is why the church meeting requires serious preparation. If something new is to be decreed, or harm is to be prevented, or an evil is to be removed, then one should consider everything carefully before acting; one should draw one's thoughts repeatedly from the Scriptures. Wherever the glory of God and the salvation of souls are not at stake, let there be no warfare for God's sake. On the other hand, where the honor of God and the salvation of souls are concerned, stand firm, as firm as a wall; there speak, fight, and contend; there give way to no man, not even a hair's breadth, no matter whether it concerns doctrine or life. - So seek to be sure of your cause from God's word. When one has become completely certain of it through God's grace, then stand firm and say why one must stand so firm. He who thus stands firm on God's word also keeps himself in respect before men and builds up God's kingdom. Therefore happy is the church servant, whether he be professor, or pastor, or teacher, who by God's grace is a man and has a firm heart from and according to God's word! But happy also those who are under his command!

But this earnestness and zeal in the ministry is only possible, so the work also only bears the desired fruit, if we, through God's grace, also rightly align the duties of our general Christian profession. There we are to avoid two things with all our heart: Avarice and gluttony. He who is in either of these sins cannot possibly be a faithful servant of God, but lives to himself. These are the very sins that make a man more and more dull. Since these two sins rule the world today, it is truly necessary to have an open eye and a praying heart.

The Pope and the Jesuits.

According to a correspondence of the "Frankfurter Zeitung" from Rome the Breve, by which Pope Leo XIII confirms the privileges of the Jesuit Order, reads literally as follows:

Leo XIII, Pope. In perpetual memory. Among the painful feelings with which the great turmoil of the present time fills our hearts are the injustices and evils inflicted on religious societies. Founded by great saints, they are very useful to the Catholic Church, of which they are an ornament, and to human society, which derives valuable benefits from them. At all times these orders have done great service to religion and science, and have also contributed much to the salvation of souls. We wish, therefore, on this occasion, to bestow upon the religious societies the praise which they have so richly deserved. Like Our predecessors, We also wish to publicly testify to them Our loving benevolence. As We know, a new edition of the work "The Institution of the Society of Jesus" has been in preparation for some years. Our beloved son Anton Maria Anderledy is eagerly endeavouring to finish the work, and only the last part remains to be edited, which will contain the letters addressed to the Society of Jesus, to its founder, Saint Ignatius, and to other generals of the Order. We gladly seize this opportunity to prove Our affection for the Order so highly deserving of the Church and the Society. We therefore approve the edition of the work undertaken, a work so honorable to the faith and useful to society. We praise it and wish its continuation and completion.

But in order to make known Our love for the Society of Jesus, We, by virtue of Our apostolic authority, confirm and approve anew the apostolic letters, all and every one of them, which have for their object the establishment and fortification of the Society, the letters issued by the Roman Pontiffs, Our ancestors, from Paul III, of the same memory, to Our days, whether they exist in the form of bulls or simple breves. We confirm and approve anew all that is contained therein, as well as the privileges, immunities, exceptions, indults, everything and anything that has been granted to the Society, whether directly or in communion with other religious orders, provided that these concessions do not create any prejudice for this Society and are not modified or revoked by the Council of Trent or other Constitutions of the Apostolic See.

We decree that this decree shall continue to be valid and effective in the future and that it shall bring all advantages to those whom it concerns or may concern, without prejudice to the decree of Clement XIV of July 22, 1773.

and certain other conflicting enactments which would be worthy of mention and specific and express repeal. We hereby repeal them specifically and expressly.

May this breve be a sign of the love which we cherish and have always cherished for the illustrious Society, so devoted to our ancestors and to Us, a Society so rich in men, distinguished by the adornment of holiness and science, which is a source and promoter of true and wholesome science, a Society which, in spite of the fiercest persecutions endured for justice, has never ceased to labor in the vineyard of the Lord with joyful zeal and invincible courage. Adorned with so many merits, commended by the Council of Trent, heaped with the praises of Our forefathers, may the Society continue to fulfill the purpose of its foundation amidst the spiteful attacks directed against the Church of Christ, for the greater glory of God and the salvation of souls. May it continue its task of leading the unbelievers and the infidels to the light of truth, of instructing the youth in the Christian virtues and science, of teaching philosophy and theology in the spirit of the angelic Teacher.

In the meantime, We retain Our affection for the Society, which is very dear to Us, and give Our apostolic blessing to the General, his deputy, and all the members of the Society.

Given at Rome, near St. Peter's, under the Fisherman's Ring, this 13th day of July, 1886, in the ninth year of Our Pontificate.

Miscellany.

Does conversion, in the strict sense, take place in a moment, or is it a so-called "process"? On this subject we read from the pen of Father Walter in Qualitz, in the "Mecklenburgische Kirchen- und Zeitblatt" of July 15, the following statement: When Chemnitz (Exam. C. Trid. pag. 134) speaks of "sanatio et renovatio," he by no means intends to designate a different thing by these two terms, but, as the connection shows, both expressions are rather designations of one and the same thing, namely, of the whole work of salvation of the Holy Spirit in man, of which it is quite undisputed that it does not happen *uno momento*, but has its *initia* and *certos progressus*. In the other place, however, 1) it is

1) Chemnitz, Loci, pag. 184: -, "Quando gratia praeveniens, id est, prima initia fidei et conversionis homini dantur, statim incipit lucta carnis et Spiritus, et manifestum est, illam luctam non fieri sine motu nostrae voluntatis."

not at all of the unborn, but of the born-again man. For what is regeneration but the bestowal of the "first beginnings of faith and conversion"? The F. C. calls (Sol. Decl. II, 14.), on the ground of Phil. 2, 13. already "a little spark and longing for God's grace and eternal blessedness," the "beginning of true godliness," which God kindled in the heart, and says of all "devout Christians," who feel and sense this in their hearts, that they should take comfort in it, "God will further strengthen them in great weakness, and help them to **persevere in** true faith to the end." According to this, he is already born again and converted who has even "a little spark and longing for God's grace and eternal blessedness" in his heart, for such a one already has "true faith" according to the F. C..1) But where there is true faith, then man is born again, for according to Scripture and confession, the new birth happens through the development of true faith in man: 1 Joh. 5, 1. cf. Gal. 3, 26. Joh. 1, 12. Apolog. III, 171. 194. F. C. Sol. Decl. III, 19. 20. The regeneration coincides with justification, which is by faith, "for if a man be justified by faith, it is truly a regeneration, because he is made a child of God out of a child of wrath, and so is translated out of death into life." (F. C. I. c.) - Whether, further, the passages from the sacred Scriptures, the symbolic books, and the ancient dogmatists, cited by me in No. 20 of the preceding volume against Mr. ff aä 2, were really, as he thinks, nothing but "pranks and quixotries," I can safely leave to the reader's judgment. In any case, it will remain incomprehensible to every unprejudiced critic how Mr. ff, from his point of view, can explain the propositions of the Concordia formula, that man has no *modus agendi* in spiritual things before conversion, that he behaves purely as a sufferer in conversion, that the unborn man's understanding and will alone are *subjectum convertendum*, and that conversion is nothing but a revival from spiritual death - cannot object that he teaches only the participation of the human will, in so far as it is made free by grace. For before the new birth, the will is still completely unfree, even spiritually dead: Rom. 6, 16. 19. 20. Eph. 2, 5. Before the new birth, man has no organ to receive the powers of grace from God and no power to use them. For the natural man receiveth not that which is of the Spirit of God (οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ), for it is foolishness unto him, and cannot

1) It is well to note that the 6th does not say, Such may take comfort that they will come to faith in the future.

Only in the rebirth God awakens man from spiritual death through the effect of faith: Col. 2, 12: Col. 2, 12. And only through faith can man accept the powers of grace from God, yes, faith itself is nothing else than an acceptance of Christ and the grace of God in the word: Joh. 1, 12. 17, 8. Thus the impartation of powers of grace cannot happen before, but only in regeneration or conversion, as Scripture also describes conversion as a reception or acceptance of grace: 2 Cor. 6:1, cf. Col. 2:6 - When my opponent, in support of his doctrine that conversion is a gradual process, appeals to experience, which furnishes "innumerable proofs of the very gradual progress of conversion," he confuses the preparatory effects of God's law, which are directed to the conscience, with conversion itself. That there are such preparatory effects, and that they often, indeed usually, drag on for a very long time, because man is so hard to be convinced of his sin and guilt, of his lostness and damnableness, I cannot think of denying. But this I deny, that Scripture and the Confession regard conversion in the strict sense, or regeneration itself, as a process. Because Scripture knows no middle or intermediate state between unbelief and faith, unconversion and conversion (Luc. 11, 23. Matth. 6, 24.) and conversion according to Scripture consists precisely in the transfer from the state of wrath into the state of grace (Eph. 2, 3. 1 Petr. 2, 10.), from death to life (Eph. 2, 5. 6. Col. 2, 12. 13.), from the kingdom of Satan to the kingdom of God (Act. 26, 18. Col. 1, 13.), then the conversion must necessarily happen in one moment. It will still remain that man cannot at the same time be under God's wrath and under grace, in death and yet at the same time in life. Our opponent's reference to the canon "*omne simile claudicat*" does not obscure anything here. For every simile, if it be otherwise a true simile at all, is only defective in respect to those points which are not considered in the comparison, but not in respect to the actual point of comparison, which here lies precisely in this, that, as the bodily dead cannot move nor act in bodily things, so the unregenerate cannot in spiritual things. If, therefore, the Scriptures were to suppose that man began to live spiritually before he was born again, they would be using an inaccurate simile, if they were to call the unregenerate "dead in sins. How seriously and exactly our confession takes this expression, is shown, among other things, by the following passage: F. C. Sol. That conversion, in the narrower sense, must be thought of as occurring at one moment, follows, by the way, with necessity, from the fact that it is connected, as shown above, with the conversion to the right.

The same is true of redemption. By the very fact that God declares the sinner righteous for Christ's sake, the sinner is at the same time born again, because he thereby becomes a child of grace, a child of God, out of a child of wrath, and is thus transferred from death to life: F. C. Sol. Now, as little as justification is a gradual process, so little can regeneration, which takes place at the same time, be a process; but, like the former, the latter must be a momentary act. If, on the other hand, conversion (in the sense of being transferred from the state of wrath to the state of grace) be regarded as a gradually progressing process, then stages and degrees in justification must necessarily be assumed, which evidently contradicts the clearest statements of Scripture. All doubt, however, as to the position of our confession on the present question is finally excluded by the following passage of the F. C.: "Novit etiam Dominus procul dubio tempus et horam, eamque apud se constituit, quando videlicet unumquemque vocare, convertere et lapsum rursus erigere velit." (Sol. Decl. XI, 56.) Immediately after this it is again said, "tempus et hora conversio- nis." - But though conversion in the strict sense takes place in a moment, it is by no means said that this moment must necessarily come to man's consciousness, so that he could afterwards state exactly when and at what hour he was converted. Nor does this deny that, as in the state of unbelief (Luc. 12, 47. 48.), so also in the state of faith there are stages and degrees (Rom. 15, 1. Isaiah. 42, 3.), the difference of which may be so important that John (Ev. C. 2, 11.) could write of the disciples, after they had seen the miraculous sign of Christ at Cana: *καὶ ὀπίβησαν εἰς αὐτόν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ*, which MÜN yet Only Translate. and his disciples came to believe in him and became believers. The evangelist does not want to deny that the disciples already had faith before, but their weak faith, which they had before, was to be counted against the faith, which they now received, almost as no faith. - It has remained incomprehensible to me how † Luc. 22, 32. can adduce for its view of conversion as a process. It is supposed to follow from this that one can stand in faith without being converted. But this would only follow if the Lord had said that Peter was still unconverted when Christ spoke this word. But this the Lord does not say at all. With the words, "If thou be converted some day," etc., Christ does not deny that Peter was converted at that time, but only points to his future conversion after his deep fall into denial.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The Lutheran Synodal Conference of North America met in Detroit, Mich. from August 11 to 16. The doctrinal discussions were based on "Theses on the Divinity of the Holy Scriptures" (written by Prof. Gräbner), which we will follow here verbatim: "1. The doctrine that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are of divine origin, both in content and expression, is a doctrine by which the foundation of the Christian faith is abandoned. (2) The doctrine of the divinity of the holy Scriptures is itself an article of faith, and therefore can only be known from the Scriptures themselves, and by virtue of them be accepted or believed with full confidence. 3. The doctrine of the divine origin of sacred Scripture is clearly revealed in Scripture in several ways, a. The Scriptures teach that the sacred writers were not the actual authors of these Scriptures, but wrote as instruments of the Holy Spirit. b. Scripture teaches that all that is written in it is the work of the Holy Spirit, not only in content but also in expression. c. The sacred Scriptures claim such validity and demand such conduct toward them as only sacred Scripture originating in content and expression from God Himself can claim and demand." What is confessed in these theses is, after all, denied by the newer theologians, even those calling themselves "Lutheran." It was therefore exceedingly timely that the Synodal Conference should deal with this very subject, in order to realize both the good reason and importance of the old doctrine, and the untenability and desolation of the newer theories. The negro mission formed the principal subject of the business negotiations. This mission is in a prosperous condition. In particular, the weekly schools established among the Negroes are proving to be a seed of the Church. A fourth mission station with a mission school is soon to be opened in New Orleans. The election of the officers of the Synodal Conference resulted in the following: President: D. J. Bading (Wisconsin Synod), Vice-President: P. J. H. Niemann (Missouri Synod), Secretary: P. T. J. Große, Treasurer: Mr. H. A. Christiansen. The next meeting of the Synodical Conference will be held, D. v., in two years at Milwaukee. F. P.

New Seminary. The "Kirketidende" reports in its July 23 issue: "In Prof. Schmidt's paper, 'Luth. Vidnesbyrd', of July 10, there is the following - and no further - news of the meeting of the Iowa District of the (Norwegian) Synod: During the synodal meeting of the Iowa District, the anti-Missourians held several private meetings concerning the founding of their own seminary for preachers. The result, to which, after due consideration, it was unanimously agreed, was this, that they desired to commence in the fall with a seminary of their own, with two or three teachers, and preferably at Northfield, Minn. This only for preliminary news. The enterprise will no doubt be greeted with joy in wide circles." Hereafter it would seem that the Norwegian Synod was in for one last decisive struggle. For Schmidt-Muus's party will not, for instance, withdraw from the Synod, but will, as it were, form a Synod within the Synod, a Church within the Church, and will now approach all the congregations with a request for friendly and abundant support. - Rev. Muus's plan, according to the "America" of July 21, is this: to turn St. Olaf's High School at Northfield, Minn. into a college, and connect it with a theological seminary; besides the

The first thing to do is to appoint Prof. Schmidt, who "has promised to accept a position as professor of theology", and to win Pastor Böckmann as a second theological teacher, who has also already "promised to accept the position with the permission of his congregation". Th. Kohn.

About this year's district meetings in the Norwegian Synod we take from the Boston "Lutheran Gazette" the following news coming from Norwegian circles. According to this, an unexpected change for the better - as far as the strength of the parties is concerned - has occurred in the Synod. The Boston "Anzeiger" reports: Three district meetings of great importance have been held in the Norwegian Synod during the month of June. Although it could not be expected that the sad doctrinal controversy over the election of grace would be entirely settled, so much has nevertheless become evident during these meetings that this controversy, by God's grace, will soon be at an end. For a reaction has occurred. In the Eastern District the "anti-Missourians" had hitherto had a majority of 10-12 votes; this time all the offices were filled by "Missourians" and that by a majority of 30 votes! In the Northern District, likewise, the "anti-Missourians" have made only retrograde progress, in spite of all the agitation. In the Western District, where the main battle was fought, the "Missourians" had a two-thirds majority of the votes. By the election which has taken place, the new Church Council of the Synod, with one exception, will consist entirely of "Missourians." Prof. Schmidt is now in a peculiar position. At the seminary in Madison he can no longer work as a professor of theology. It was expected that he would apply for admission to the Norwegian Augustan Synod. According to the latest news, however, he wants to start a "Schmidtian" high school and seminary in Northfield, Minn. If this is a fact, then he and those who follow him have thus renounced the Norwegian Synod forever. So much for the news in the Boston Gazette. Prof. Schmidt, of course, seems to have no desire to openly renounce the Synod. He is rather making a last desperate attempt to blow up the Synod by founding an opposition seminary. It is to be expected, however, that he will not succeed in this, but on the contrary that some who have hitherto gone along with him will now turn away from him. God forbid the blinded destroyer of the Church, and strengthen and comfort our brethren in the Norwegian Synod in this (God grant) last stage of the hot struggle!

F. P.

In "Herold und Zeitschrift" of August 28 there is an article which at first is supposed to be a report on the state of the dispute between Prof. Gräbner and Prof. Dieckhoff. But the report is written in such a way that it takes sides with Dieckhoff. Proof of this are, for example, the following words: "In the same" (namely, in his writing "The Missourian Predestinarianism and the Concordia Formula") "he (Dieckhoff) treats a threefold matter: First, he defends the opinion of the Faculty against the accusation of synergism. For the Rostock professors had declared that the reason for the selection of persons, if it were a matter of the election and rejection of individuals, was to be sought in man's conduct toward grace. This was to be the synergism. Here it is well to note that only in this point lies the possibility of escaping the Calvinistic doctrine of unconditional election. But Missouri at once smells synergism when there is talk of man's conduct." "H. u. Z." thus takes sides decidedly for Dieckhoff against Prof. Gräbner and "Missouri." This paper accordingly teaches, as is evident from what has just been stated, that "the reason" of the eternal election of the elect of the latter is "conduct." Only by this doctrine, which the

overturns the whole Gospel, it shall be possible to escape the Calvinistic doctrine of unconditional election. "Herold und Zeitschrift" wants to advocate Dieckhoff's conclusion: because the Concordia formula teaches that the non-conversion and rejection of the lost is to be sought in the evil conduct of men, so the Concordia formula also teaches that the reason of the election of the blessed of the latter is good conduct. Will not the "Zeitschrift" then kindly show how it is **able to** prove the latter from the Concordia formula? Further, according to the above, this paper writes after Dieckhoff that one escapes the Calvinistic doctrine of an unconditional election only if the reason of election, why some are chosen before others, lies in man, namely, "in the conduct" of the same. Thus this paper owes its readers an answer as to how it does not contradict the Lutheran confession, which has "official" validity in the Council, to its face. For it rejects this confession as "false and unjust": "when it is taught that not only the mercy and most holy merit of Christ, but also in us is a cause of God's election, for whose sake God has chosen us to eternal life." (Concordia Formula, Sol. Decl. XI, K 88.) Further, this paper writes literally as follows: "Thirdly, Dr. Dieckhoff has also demonstrated the source from which the entire Missouri error in this doctrine flows, namely, that the doctrine of the Formula of Concord concerning the election of grace is interpreted in the sense of Luther's book of the subjugated will, and thus an unconditional election is to be found in this confession, while in the Formula of Concord Luther's book is not referred to at all, and it follows an entirely different exposition from the latter, and even rejects many things contained in it, especially in the second article concerning free will. Luther's teaching, especially that of his earlier period, is not always identical with the teaching of the Lutheran Church as set forth in the Confessions." According to this, "H. u. Z." announces to its readers that there is "Missouri error" in "Luther's book of the enslaved will." Does "H. u. Z." not want to go into more detail about this error in Luther's book and present it to its readers, so that they can beware of Luther's book? But the "Zeitschrift" must not make its work so easy for itself that it simply copies from Luther's book a few torn-off sentences, such as are found in more recent works on the history of dogma. Likewise, the "Zeitschrift" should indicate where the Concordia formula "even rejects some of what is contained in it" (in Luther's book *de servo arbitrio*) "namely, in the second article on the fallen will?" If it sets out to comply with this reasonable demand, it will again recognize that it is not good simply to copy the assertions of others. Further, according to Dieckhoff, "H. u. Z." submits that "an intermediate state" is to be established, "during which the conversion proceeds." This intermediate state is then described in more detail in such a way that in it man is already longing for salvation and the battle of the spirit against the flesh is already taking place. Now, in order that its position may be clear, does not the "Zeitschrift" also wish to tell its readers whether a man in this assumed "intermediate state," in which he is already longing for salvation and is experiencing in himself the struggle of the spirit against the flesh, belongs in hell or in heaven, is still a child of wrath or already a child of grace? The question is of such great practical importance that the "Zeitschrift" should not refuse its readers a clear answer. Moreover, "H. u. Z." appears within the ecclesiastical community which wants to accept the Lutheran confession. The Lutheran Confession, however, does not place those who feel and sense even "a little spark and longing for God's grace and eternal blessedness in their hearts" in an "intermediate state," but calls such people already "pious Christians" (Concordia Formula, Sol. Decl. II,

§ 14). So how does the "Zeitschrift" agree with the Lutheran Confession? The "Zeitschrift" should in all seriousness attempt to answer questions such as the foregoing. Otherwise, one would have to assume that its report on the state of the controversy was intended only to slander the Wisconsin and Missouri Synods.

FP.

The long-planned union of the Lutheran Synods in the South of this country finally came to pass at Roanoke, Va. in June of this year. The united church body is called "The United Synod of the Lutheran Church of the South" and comprises the synods which hitherto formed the "Southern General Synod", i.e. the synods of North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Southwest Virginia and Mississippi (the synod of Georgia has not yet joined), as well as the hitherto separate synod of Tennessee and finally the Holston synod which formerly belonged to the General Council. The doctrinal basis on which the union took place was established by the meeting at Salisbury, N. C., (November 12 and 13, 1884) and has been extensively reported in this journal. (See Jahrg. 1884 p. 419 f.) According to this, "The United Synod of the Lutheran Church of the South" confesses the entire confessional writings of the Lutheran Church, as contained in the Concordia Book of 1580, as a correct exposition of the teachings of the Holy Scriptures. One member of the congregation proposed that the new church body confess only the Augsburg Confession, but limit the acceptance of the other confessions to the "system of doctrine contained in them. But this proposal found no support. One wanted an unconditional acceptance of all confessions. The "official" confession of the "United Synod" thus leaves nothing to be desired. The new church body must now prove that the will and the power are there to put the "official" confession into practice. It must be noted that in the "Southern General Synod" there has always been more love for the Lutheran confession than in the Northern "General Synod". Also, in a document submitted to the concurrent assembly of the "Southern General Synod," there is an open confession that the practice of some pastors and congregations of the synods represented has not been truly Lutheran. This is a good sign. Also present at the Roanoke meeting were Dr. Schmucker of the General Council and Rev. G. U. Wenner of the Northern General Synod. How "The United Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the South" will continue to relate to the Council and the Northern General Synod, we find no information in the reports we have received. We do not find any information about this in the reports we have received. Hopefully, it is more serious about the Lutheran Confession than either of them. - The "United Synod" is also going about starting a general theological seminary (Gesammtseminar).

F. P.

Will that help? The Synod of Southwest Virginia, belonging to the newly formed. "The Synod of Southwest Virginia, belonging to the newly formed "United Synod of the Lutheran Church of the South," decided at its last synodical meeting to call the attention of the **Century Company**, which intends to publish a lexicon, to the necessity of correctly presenting certain points in which the Lutheran Church is usually misrepresented. A committee appointed by the Synod is to communicate with the "Century Company" for this purpose.

F. P.

General Synodical. The "Lutheran Observer" of September 3 discusses the subject, much discussed also in secular newspapers, that at the marriage of President Cleveland the copulating pastor (Dr. Sunderland) did not oblige the bride to "obey" her husband. The "Observer" appropriates on this occasion the

The following ungodly statement of another paper: "To demand obedience from the woman may well preserve the 'lordship' of the man unharmed, but nevertheless such a demand smacks strongly of oriental tyranny and oppression. Surely one should not think it possible that a paper calling itself Lutheran could carry on such blasphemous and ungodly speech beyond all measure. What the Holy Spirit so emphatically inculcates through the apostles as God's unbreakable order, Col. 3:18, "Wives, be subject to your husbands in the Lord, as is fitting," the Holy Spirit further illustrates by comparing the relationship between Christ and the church, Eph. 5:22-24, "Let wives be subject to their husbands as to the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church, and he is the Saviour of his body. But as the church is subject to Christ, so also the wives are subject to their husbands in all things," which the Holy Spirit calls the most beautiful outward adornment of the woman, by which the Christian woman is also to preach before the unbelieving world, 1 Pet. 3:1, 2. The Observer judges that this "tastes strongly of Oriental tyranny and oppression," and that "women ought to be subject to their husbands in the same way, so that even those who do not believe in the Word may be won over by women's walk without the Word, when they behold your chaste walk in fear. Such is the "advanced" American sectarian spirit, which unhesitatingly throws away God's Word when it contradicts its godless swindle of liberty and humanity.

F. P.

A German assessment of the Lutheran Church in America. In the report of the "Mecklenburgischen Gottes-Kasten" for the year 1885 there is also a report written by Kirchenrath Chrestin-Bützow about the state of the Lutheran Church in the United States. It is evident from the report that the reporter has a warm heart for the Lutheran Church. But in his desire that the Lutheran Church should prosper, he has painted the situation too rosy as far as a large part of the Lutheran Church is concerned. He writes: "There are now 57 synods in North America. A synod is an association of several pastors with their congregations, based on one confession. They have a president at their head, elect a committee to administer the common affairs of church and school, establish their schools, and have common institutions of higher learning, usually a high school and a seminary for preachers. Such a synod is independent of the state in the administration of its affairs, but must also raise itself what is necessary for the maintenance of church, school, and higher educational institutions, and for the salaries of the employees. In this community, however, the individual also has the great thing that every preacher and teacher must prove before he is employed whether he stands on the foundation of the confession, whether he is capable; every individual has the certainty that the pure Word of God is taught in the school and church, the certainty of pure doctrine. And this assurance is the more delicious, because free America is full of sects and false teachers." Would to God that in all "57 synods" the pure doctrine, as known in the Lutheran Confession, were preached, and "every individual" who is in said synods would have "the assurance" "that in the school and church the pure Word of God is taught." In fact, the "Lutheran" "General Synod" differs little or not at all in doctrine and practice from the sectarian congregations. The position of the well-known epistle of 1845 is still the position of the "General Synod" today: "In most of our ecclesiastical principles we stand on common ground with the united church of Germany. We do not regard the doctrines of distinction between the Old Lutheran and the Reformed Church as essential.

lich. The direction of the so-called old Lutheran party seems to us to be behind our age. Luther's special view of the bodily presence of the Lord in the Lord's Supper has long since been abandoned by the great majority of our preachers." That church fellowship is unobjectionably maintained with the sects in the "General Synod" is self-evident according to the principles of this body. - The "General Council" admittedly "officially" professes all the confessions of the Lutheran Church. But even the most enthusiastic supporter of the Council will not claim that it teaches and acts consistently according to this confession. In the "Lutheran," the most widely circulated English paper on the Council, one can read mocking remarks about the "pure doctrine" to this day. The only censuring remark found in the report of Herr Kirchenrath Chrestin refers to the Synodal Conference. Of this it says, page 18: "The Synodical Conference includes the great Missouri and four other Synods, which follow Missouri's doctrine, I would say, which follow Missouri's rule unconditionally." This is based on Iowa coverage. Through Iowa, then, the "Mecklenburg Box of God" wants to help build the Lutheran Church in America; that is where he is sending disciples. Next, he seems to be most attracted to the Buffalo Synod. It says in the report, "Besides these four great church bodies, there are ten stand-alone synods, of which the Buffalo Synod is near to us before the others." There is something truly tragic about this preference in light of the zeal for the expansion of the Lutheran Church which is expressed in the report. The Buffalo Synod perished in its struggle against Lutheran doctrine. What remains of it now floating about as a wreck is of no consequence. The Iowa Synod was hitherto the most important representative of modern theology in America, especially of synergism, and its practical effectiveness in the West consists chiefly in creating confusion among the ignorant and building counter-altars on the mission fields through suspicion of the Missouri Synod.

F. P.

II. Abroad.

German Imperial Church and the Saxon Regional Church. In June the Meissen Church and Pastoral Conference met again. Among other things, the Leipzig professor Dr. Maurenbrecher gave a lecture "on the relationship between state and church in the age of the Reformation with a comparative view of the present. This lecture, as well as the discussions of the assembled people caused by it, revealed only too clearly how little one in the Saxon regional church is united in the attitude of wanting to preserve, even outwardly, the form of a Lutheran particular church. Towards the end of the lecture, the speaker reminded us: "In view of the fact that we are in a transitional stage in the ecclesiastical area, while politically we have come into clear, orderly circumstances, the observer is forced to make a pious wish: May the right master builder be found for the German Reichskirche, which, leaving to each his own, unites the individual national churches in a higher unity. The German Reichskirche is the future ideal of German Protestants." As to the impression which the lecture made on the assembly, the "Sächs. Kirchen und Schulblatt" of July 22 reported the following: "The lecture was listened to with the most rapt attention and was often interrupted by loud applause. His idea of a German Reichskirche met with much sympathy; some remembered that the desire for such a church had already been expressed at the 1884 conference.

had come. However, the speaker was at odds with some of the members of the conference on this very point, as well as with his judgment on the Union. Various speakers maintained the position of the Lutheran confession of the Conference with respect to the Union. If it was accepted that a unified Protestant church was indeed an ideal, the realization of this ideal was described by the same side as being in the far reaches, if not hopeless; finally, it seemed questionable to some whether an imperial church was so desirable - in any case, it was not in the interest of the confession. - These were the main points of the lively debate. Both points of view found warm defenders. In favor of the Union, it was argued with great emphasis that within it the (Lutheran) Confession had become more and more dominant in the course of the years. As proof that a unification of the separate Protestant churches was possible, reference could be made to the Gustav-Adolf-Association and the Eisenach Conference, both of which contained the seed of a church unification in a significant way. And so, no matter how weighty the reservations of the representatives of the Landessonderkirche, the hope of a large part of those present that the *pium desiderium* of a Protestant unity church would one day be realized with God's help could not be stifled. - In the discussion decided differences came to light, but there were no differences." - How long will it take for the Saxon regional church to be absorbed into the newest union, called the German Reichskirche? How quickly will the Lutheran heroes who are still in the Landeskirche give up their censoriousness when the latter will appear in the royal-imperial wedding state? W.

Working towards greater independence of the regional churches. In the "Ev.-luth. Allg. Kz." of August 6, the following is written from Hanover: "The striving for greater independence of the church has now also found its expression in our synod. On July 20, at the synod of the Buer district in Osnabrück, the church council of Arenshorst brought the motion: The district synod should resolve to address the soon to be convened state synod with the motion to work towards: 1. that the sovereign decision-making in matters belonging to the business of the Regional Consistory be effected directly by the Regional Consistory without the mediation of the Ministry of Culture, and 2. that the Regional Church be granted a share in filling the theological professorships at the Regional University. - After the chairman of the Arenshorst church council had briefly explained the reasons for the motion and Pastor Heintze in Lintorf had added his wish to influence religious instruction at the high schools, Dr. Düsterdieck, who had first introduced himself that day as the General Superintendent of the district, took the floor. He first stated that it was doubtful whether the motion belonged to the business of the District Synod. Furthermore, as once in 1882 in the regional synod on the occasion of the discussion about the theological professorships of our universities, he directed the attention to the scientific field and took occasion from this to oppose the proposal most decisively. He said that the Synod was not in a position to make such a motion; there would be an untruth in it. Therefore, he proposed that the Synod move on to the motivated agenda, and this motion was accepted by the District Administrator of the Melle District. There was something captivating in Düsterdieck's reasoning, and therefore it is probably to be explained that the Synod accepted his motion. For our part we can only deplore this. There is no untruth in it when I complain: the shoe pinches me, even if I cannot make a new shoe myself. It is possible to have a well-founded judgment about something without having been in the same situation oneself.

can be active in this area. - That above all the professors would be against the striving of the regional churches for greater independence and freedom of self-government, and that in this opposition they would also have the present church regiments in their favor, was to be expected. Since modern theology is a science in the true sense of the word, has nothing to do with piety and beatitude (cf. Luthardt's Compend. p. 3.), to work for, but beside the church in a kingdom independent of the latter, and to be bound above all to the interests of science, it must fear, if the church becomes independent, that it will not want to entrust those whom it wants to equip as its servants to "theologians" who, instead of wanting to serve the kingdom of heaven, declare themselves to want to serve the kingdom of science, and deny to the simple pastors, yes, to the whole church of believers, all competence to have a say in the choice of scientific theologians.

W.

Scripture Inspiration. In the "Hannoversche Pastoral-Korrespondenz" of July 17 there is an account of the proceedings of this year's Hanover Pentecostal Conference, from which we extract the following: Pastor Dr. Wyneken thinks that part of the blame for these struggles does fall on the church. Today's criticism is a natural reaction against the earlier doctrine of inspiration, which has overshadowed the living Christ, and it is, after all, the merit of the critical direction of our century that the preaching of Christ has again come more into its own. - Pastor Dr. Büttner: The idea has sufficiently come forth that Christology and Bibliology are placed in parallel. Against the other point, that it was only through a newer school that the person of the historical Jesus was placed in the foreground, he had to protest decidedly. Especially in the time of the revival it was especially emphasized. He reminds us of Menken. (!) In going back to the treasures of the Reformation, the love of JEsu was emphasized; L. Harms, who had great importance for our national church, had preached JEsu above all. The reproach does not apply to the church movement, since we did not preach the Word in Missourian stiffness. (Rightly understood, quite true. L. and W.) - Pastor Dr. Wyneken remarks that he did not want to reproach the church for having completely forgotten Christ. But at that time a lesser faith in the power of the Word prevailed, and therefore that version of the doctrine of inspiration was sought to be used as a human remedy. He who touched the old doctrine of inspiration was condemned as unbelieving, and we will give him up to criticism altogether." - The mildest explanation of this appalling concession is this, that many pastors neither know the old Lutheran doctrine of Inspiration, nor that the same is the doctrine of the whole Christian Church of all ages.

W.

Scripture Inspiration. The "Mecklenb. Kirchen- und Zeitblatt" of August 15, communicates Prof. Dr. Dieckhoff's theses "on the holy Scriptures" for a pastoral conference in Mecklenburg, which at first sound quite good, but finally get into the fairway of modern-faith theology and arrive at the same destination with it. In the third last Thesis it is said: "The old dogmatic" (should be called the old Christian) "concept of inspiration cannot be held, since it is in contradiction with the nature of the holy Scriptures" (should be called, with our reason) (here it should be added: although the apostle himself erroneously testifies that all Scripture is inspired by God). In the penultimate thesis it says: "Certain uncertainties and errors in the holy Scriptures do not contradict the fact that they are the inspired (!) and thus divinely certain word of God's revelation of salvation to men, for by them the apprehension of the truth of salvation according to the analogy of faith in Scripture is not affected.

(Here the main proof of this modern view of Scripture is evidently omitted, probably from excessive modesty, namely: because the scientific theologians indicate exactly where "uncertainties and errors in Scripture" are to be found, and where not). It seems to belong to Dr. Dieckhoff's peculiar

τρόπος παιδείας that he always first speaks in a highly orthodox manner, but only in order thus to earn the liberty of speaking in a highly heterodox manner. Wmigg at least he observes this procedure as well here as the other day in his writing on synergism. W.

The Hanover Lutheran Free Church. The "Allg. Kz." of July 16 reports: The Synodal Committee of the Hanoverian Lutheran Free Church has removed from office Pastor Schonecke in Groß-Oesingen, who had resigned from the Regional Church in his time of depressed church discipline, because in two cases he practiced church discipline in such a way that he thereby transgressed the ordinances of the church and did not recognize the decision of the Synodal Committee, and it turned out that with his position of conscience he could not remain a pastor of the Hanoverian Free Church. "The Synod," said the Praeses at the Synodal Assembly of the Hanoverian Lutheran Free Church on June 22, "may perceive from the dismissal of a pastor that the Committee wishes to uphold the ordinances of the Church against everyone " - Rightly does the Sächs. "The Saxon Free Church of August 15 rightly remarks on this: "However, in such a serious and important matter, one should expect other evidence than that which, in a genuinely papist manner, speaks only of "orders of the church" and "decisions of the synodal committee," but knows nothing to say about God's Word, God's order, and God's decisions.

Hermannsburg Pastor Election. In the "Kreuzblatt" of August 8 we read: On July 18 a congregational meeting was held in Hermannsburg concerning the election of a new pastor. An eye and ear witness wrote the following about it: "Pastor Ehlers, who, as is known, had been temporarily administering the pastorate in Hermannsburg for some time, opened the meeting with singing and prayer and then explained the purpose of the meeting. Since his own person was in question for the election of the pastor, he had to resign from the chair. He proposed that Mr. Harms, Missionary Inspector, should take charge of the proceedings. After the congregation had given their consent to this proposal, Pastor Ehlers spoke again about his candidacy. He emphasized that he was very weak. Should he be elected, he would not be able to preside without the help of the congregation. After this remark, which was probably not meant to be a commendation, he left the meeting. Missionary Director Harms, who now took the chair, recommended the election of Pastor Ehlers and then asked anyone who had reservations about it to voice them. Teacher Elbers then stood up and asked the position of the recommended candidate. He believed he had a right to do so because Pastor Ehlers belonged to the Immanuel Synod, and yet this Synod did not agree with Hermannsburg on various points. As is well known, Immanuelites have a different view of marriage and the church than that which is represented in the Lüneburg church order. One must therefore ask whether Pastor Ehlers is also willing and able to observe the church and congregational order in force in Hermannsburg. For the Immanuelites taught that it must be left to the conscience of the individual pastor whether he wanted to observe the existing orders or not. Furthermore, teacher Elbers emphasized that the Immanuel Synod had petitioned the Reichstag in 1871 for the introduction of civil marriage. And yet this civil marriage would have caused the introduction of the new marriage formula and the whole subsequent movement, and would thus have been very disastrous and painful for Hermannsburg. One had to ask oneself whether a clergyman, who had such a position on

would be the right man for Hermannsburg. After teacher Elbers had voiced these concerns, Mission Director Harms took over the defense of Pastor Ehlers and the Immanuelites. In doing so, he was doing nothing other than leading his own cause, since, as is well known, he had allowed himself to be examined and ordained by the Immanuelites and then made the explicit declaration that he did not belong to the Hanoverian State Church. In this way he clearly declared his allegiance to the Immanuel Synod, which he now defended. First, he emphasized that Pastor Ehlers would become a member of the Hermannsburg congregation through the election, but that the Hermannsburg congregation would not become members of the Immanuel Synod. According to this, Director Harms seems to make a distinction between Hermannsburg and Immanuel; whether also between himself and Immanuel was not made clear. Furthermore, he said that for the time being (!) the people of Hermannsburg should not ask about the position of the Immanuel Synod, but only about that of Pastor Ehlers. This sounds quite Immanuelite, for in a genuinely independentist way the Immanuelites do not care about the church fellowship, but only about the individual pastor, who today can belong to this church fellowship and tomorrow to that one. Here, it is just discretion that decides, and neither confession nor church order provides a fixed standard. It is not membership in the church, i.e. no objective mark, but the subjective faith of the individual that is decisive. This pernicious principle was virtually acknowledged by the chairman and asserted in favor of Pastor Ehlers. Missionary Director Harms then went on to say that he had had various conferences with Pastor Ehlers, in which they had talked through the disputed doctrines, and lo and behold, they had both always agreed. As far as the marriage was concerned, Director Harms believed he could give the congregation very reassuring assurances. Pastor Ehlers taught the same thing about this that "Father Harms" had always taught, namely, that engagement is not marriage, but only a preparation for marriage. Regarding the petition for civil marriage, the Immanuelites were forced to do so by the then existing orders (!). Not quite so certain was the answer which the chairman gave to the accusation that the Immanuelites left it to the discretion of each individual pastor to observe the church order or not. Meanwhile, it did not become popular to examine more closely Pastor Ehlers' views on church ordinances. The assembly was satisfied with the assurance of the chairman that Pastor Ehlers would in any case (?) observe the Hermannsburg ordinances. Admittedly, he added, the Lüneburg church order could not be kept in the Free Church according to the letter, because it was adapted to the state church. - Then Missionary Assessor Burmester appeared and described the dangerous situation in which the congregation would find itself if it did not elect Pastor Ehlers. Since he had been so visibly brought to her by God, she should not hesitate to bind him to Hermannsburg by her election. The chairman agreed with this, adding: "If you do not elect Pastor Ehlers now, the congregation of Liegnitz, which can no longer do without him, will call him back. And now came a passage which provided the most convincing proof of the affiliation of Missionary Director Harms to the Immanuelites. For he identified himself so completely with them that he exclaimed: 'If you do not vote for Pastor Ehlers now, then I see it as if you do not want me either, and I will not help you to officiate any further'. That helped! If there were still any misgivings, they were absolutely removed by this appeal of the chairman to his own person. For when they now proceeded immediately to the election, Pastor Ehlers was unanimously elected pastor." - Further down, the "Kreuzblatt" says: "It is said of the candidate Wöhling, who was considered for Collaborator, that he is quite Missouriian."

Hermannsburg. The "Allg. Kz." of August 13 reports: According to the annual report of Dir. Egmont Harms (at the mission festival on June 23), the Hermannsburg Mission now has 31 pupils in class in its mission houses, 17 of whom are studying at their own expense. To this number will be added two more sons of missionaries in the Transvaal. The teaching staff consists of Director E. Harms, Inspectors Schüren and Barteld, and Cand. Wöhling. The teaching course, which formerly lasted only four years, has been increased to at least five years for the actual missionary pupils. In addition to the Latin language, the pupils are now to learn the Greek language, the more gifted also the Hebrew.

Removal of Missionaries. In the Hermannsburg Mission Report, which can be found in the relevant missionary bulletin of July, it says: "Unfortunately, I must also inform you that Missionary Fuls had to be dismissed, because he did not want to comply in spite of warnings. Missionary Hoyer has left for the same reason." Unfortunately, it is not said what the unwillingness to comply consisted of. **W.**

Something good from a state church. Under the heading: "Non-confirmation of a pastor appointed by the Directorate (in Strasbourg) on the part of the imperial government," the Strasbourg "Monatsblatt für Christen Augsburgischer Konfession" of July 14 reports the following: Mr. Theodor Beck, hitherto vicar of his father in Mundolsheim, was appointed pastor of Mundolsheim by the three liberal members of the Directory, Inspector Ungerer, Mr. Böckel, and Mr. Goguel, against the motion of President Petri and the Imperial Commissioner, Mr. von der Goltz. The meeting is said to have been a rather excited one. Mr. Beck belongs to the most radical and fanatical deniers of a revelation of God apart from nature and the reason of (sinful) man. - The official newspaper now reports that by Directorial decision of June 22, Mr. W. Baldensperger, candidate of theology, was appointed pastor of Mundolsheim. Mr. Baldensperger is a native of Mülhausen. Presumably the three liberal members have again enforced this appointment. - Whether such an appointment was made merely for lack of candidates is, however, a question. - Even more important, however, is the question of why the Directorialblatt, which otherwise reports every little thing - for example, that a candidate who did not pass his Hebrew examination in time was deprived of the right to pulpit - did not simultaneously report such an important event as the non-confirmation by the Imperial Governor of the so unfortunate appointment of Mr. Theodor Beck, as successor to his father, to Mundolsheim. - Here, however, the Imperial Government has shown itself to be more careful for the honor of our regional church of the Augsburg Confession than the liberal majority of the Board of Directors, which, despite the protests of the better and ecclesiastical part of the congregation, held so tenaciously to this appointment, which was objected to for the most praiseworthy religious and political reasons.

Proceedings against a Lutheran who insists that his children be educated Catholic. The "Allg. Kz." of July 16 reports: In response to the inquiry of the synodal committee of a district synod, the Consistory in Hanover has recently pronounced that in the conduct of a Lutheran husband who, on entering into a marriage with a Roman Catholic bride, out of indifference to his own church or for the sake of some advantage, promises the Roman Catholic education of all his children, a course of conduct may undoubtedly be found which justifies the refusal of the marriage, because in this case the blessing of the marriage cannot be granted without annoyance.

could. From this it follows at the same time that in cases of this kind the conditions are given under which the active and passive right to vote and the synodal capacity should be withdrawn from the church members concerned. It is also advisable to combine the announcement of such events, without naming names, with the announcements to be made to the congregation at New Year's regarding the number of baptisms, marriages, etc. The church is to be informed of the number of members of the congregation who have been baptized.

On the question of Bible revision, writes the "Sächs. Kirchen- und Schulblatt" of August 12, it should be remembered that when the translation of the New Testament by Dr. Dr. K. Weizsäcker, 2nd ed. Buchh. von Mohr-Tübingen, a review of this translation in the supplement of the Augsb. Allgem. Zeitung No. 238, of the year 1882. - There it said: "It is a peculiar fact, which is no less true because at first sight it seems to contain a contradiction, that Luther's translation of the Bible is irreplaceable, but also insufficient. It is irreplaceable because it speaks to the high and low of the German people in a language that is comprehensible to the lowliest and is an inexhaustible source of pleasure and learning for the educated in its stout strength and noble simplicity, and because it speaks in such language of things that are accessible to the simplest sense and are an object of inmost interest and at the same time pose ever new questions to the most advanced spirit of inquiry. Thus it has not only the historical significance of dating a new epoch of the German language from its first appearance, but also the eminently practical significance of forming one of the most essential links between the various strata of the population, insofar as it is primarily based on the possibility of speaking to the common man in the language of the educated. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that it no longer fully fulfills its immediate purpose of conveying the content of the documents of Christianity as precisely, as completely, and as comprehensibly as possible to the layman. For this purpose, textual editing and the art of translation, as well as the German language, have made too much progress, even if along the path laid out by Luther. As is well known, there has been no lack of attempts to improve in these respects. But all attempts to preserve and emend Luther's translation of the Bible, in spite of all diligence and expertise, bear the seeds of failure from the outset, insofar as one of these two intentions can only be achieved to the extent that the other is not. A truly comprehensive revision, covering all passages in need of improvement, would actually have to replace Luther's translation with something new; those who want to avoid this must limit themselves to slight, superficial changes that ignore the essentials. Of such original spiritual works, as Luther's translation of the Bible is, it is most true: *Sint ut sunt aut non sint*."

"The Doctrine of the Means of Grace. According to the Word of God and the Lutheran Confessions, by W. Rohnert, P. Leipzig, Boehme." (P. 364, M. 3, 60.) In an advertisement of this writing, Dr. Munkel lets himself be heard in his "N. Ztbl." of July 28, as follows: The author, who belongs to the separated Breslau Synod, has worked this book for his fellow ministers and for the laity who wish to inform themselves more thoroughly, in a simple understandable presentation. Not only the contrasts of the churches and sects, but also the contrasts within the Lutheran Church are discussed, thus also the author's high-church Breslau standpoint in office, church, and church government. But he declares these high church doctrines to be open questions, which would still have to be experienced and learned in the future last days. Since they are already certain to him, it may be assumed that he has already experienced them. The rest of us would wish that the dogma factory would at last come to a standstill. We have without-

They have already experienced that every new doctrine brings a new rift into the church, without the congregations being blessed by it. The Separates of Breslau have made two attempts to restore unity with the separated Separations, one with the Separates in Hesse last year, and one with the Saxon Missourians this year, to be followed by a third attempt with the Hessian party in Hanover. So far nothing has been reported of success. Usually such negotiations lead to the parties becoming more clearly aware of their differences.

The Lutheran God's Box in the Kingdom of Saxony is in the leading position among the German God's Boxes, insofar as it receives requests for help from the congregations and makes suggestions to the God's Boxes as to how the gifts can be distributed appropriately. According to the report on the year 1885, the total income of all the God's Boxes amounted to 40,611 Marks, of which 9774 Marks came from Saxony, with which Saxony is also at the head of the associations in terms of income. Mecklenburg, with its 7563 Marks, is in second place. The third place is taken by Bavaria. In Saxony, both decline and progress are noticeable, but the Saxons are far too industrious to allow the decline to gain the upper hand; and even if their revenues are still very small in relation to the emergencies that are to be countered, one must nevertheless concede that they are already quite respectable in relation to the aversion or indifference to the casket of God. The report bears the pretty motto: "Do not leave the God-box empty, your Saviour sits there, He does not ask about the sum, only whether it is a sacrifice." But if the sacrifice should ever become quite large, it would be welcome. If we assume that about one third of the income is used for the separated Free Churches, the remaining two thirds go to the congregations in the national churches, persons and institutions, to which Bohemia, Moravia, Upper Austria, Switzerland and Paris belong. Among the Separates, the following are supported: the Breslau, the Hesse, the Immanuel Synod. The Saxon God's Box especially takes care of the needy congregations and preachers of the Breslau Synod, which is probably closest to it according to old connections. That the Hessians and Immanuelites are also supported is, of course, a contradiction. However, if one does not want to dissolve or fragment the God's Box, then one must let five be straight. For the members of the association do not themselves hold the same views, but are of the faith of one or the other free church.

(N. Zeitblatt.)

The state a bad believer of the church. The "Pilgrim from Saxony" of August 8 writes: In 1810 a large number of church estates were confiscated by the Prussian State with the promise that the interest would be used for the Protestant Church. This promise, however, has not been kept. It has now been calculated that in Prussia the Protestant Church has received 174 million marks too little only in proportion to the Roman Church up to March 1887. While a Protestant General Superintendent receives 9000 Marks salary and some 1000 Marks housing allowance and bureau expenses, a Roman Bishop has at his disposal sums up to 210,000 Marks.

Return of an apostate to the bosom of the Church that is the only one to be saved. The "Allg. Kz." of July 16 reports the following: Paul Grass: had been a Protestant (?) for 12 years and was last a member of the Baptist church. With him the purse decided to renounce the "heretical errors". The good Grassi never got out of debt, and the leader of the Baptist mission had the pleasure of paying these debts from time to time in order to prevent scandal. At length, however, it became too bad for him, and when, the previous autumn, and then

again paid considerable sums (into the thousands!) for Grassi in January, he declared: Now no more centesimo! When he stuck to this firm decision, Grassi returned "repentant, enlightened by the grace of God" to the Roman Church, "the only source of truth". The "Osservatore Romano" of April 9 published his letter of renunciation, in which he prostrates himself at the feet of the Pope, "the Vicar of Christ, and hopes for forgiveness of his sins through the intercession of the Most Holy Virgin. Savarese purified himself from his old Catholic leanings by spiritual exercises in a Redemptorist monastery in Naples. Grassi, however, still has to expect a trial before the secular court, since he simply wanted to regard his legally valid marriage, which he had entered into, as non-existent on his resignation to the Roman Church and leave his wife to public charity. Since he signs himself in the "Osservatore Romano" as a "sacerdote," the "holy city" has at present a married priest who has maliciously abandoned his wife.

A new Doctor of Theology. The Kreuzblatt of August 15 writes: "At the announcement of the honorary doctorate (during the jubilee celebration of the University of Heidelberg) in the Heil. Geistkirche, the Grand Duke Friedrich of Baden was also appointed Doctor of Theology. So we finally have a Summusepiscopus who, even if not ordained a priest, is nevertheless appointed a Doctor of Theology."

Russia. The "Pilgrim a. S." of August 1 reports: The Russian Grand Duke Vladimir, married to a Lutheran German princess, and known as a friend of the Germans, recently made a journey through the Baltic provinces. This was taken as a sign that from now on the Russian Government would take a friendlier attitude towards the Germans and the Lutheran Church than hitherto. But this was only a pretence. The Balts were to be forced to kiss the ruff that beats them. The reception ceremonies were precisely prescribed. They had to be as brilliant as possible by order of the Czar, but no German letter was allowed on the gates of honor, the toasts at the banquets had to be in Russian. Instead of "Hoch" the people had to shout "Urra." The Grand Duke was not allowed to say a word in reply to any toast, for fear that he might say a friendly word. In Dorpat he had to deliver a speech to the effect that all measures for Russification would be applied here in the sense of a greater rapprochement with the Russian family, in accordance with the firm will of the Emperor; the Emperor hoped that the country would meet these measures with confidence. In private intercourse, however, the Grand Duke used the German language. When the Governor of Curland wished to prevent the attendance at a Lutheran church, the Grand Duchess said, "I find that unpardonable of you; you know how attached I am to my church."

Russia. The Allg. Kz. of Aug. 6 writes: The Russian propaganda still continues. As the Russian "Church Messenger" reports, two Czechs have recently converted to the Greek Church. At Pilten in Courland so many Lutherans have joined the Greek Church that an Orthodox Church is to be founded there; an Orthodox school is also to be opened there this summer, and a similar foundation is imminent at Hasau. In the parish of Rist in Estonia 111 persons were recently anointed, at Baltischport 33, and on the island of Neue 13, and thus received into the Orthodox Church.

Metrological. On July 18, at the age of 62, Professor of Mineralogy at Erlangen, Dr. Frdr. Pfaff, one of the few faithful and important natural scientists of our time. - On July 20, after a long period of suffering, Professor of Theology Dr. Gerhard von Zezschwitz also died in Erlangen.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 32.

October 1886.

No. 10.

What does Scripture say of itself?

(With consideration of the just also recently raised objections of the newer theology).
(continued ^)

II.

In order to prove their view and against the dogma of ecclesiastical inspiration, the newer ones refer to the form and nature of Scripture before their eyes. But nowhere does this contradict what Scripture testifies about itself.

What the Scriptures say about themselves, about their nature and origin, is decisive for us. The self-testimony of Scripture is clear and distinct and, when viewed in context, overwhelming. The newer scribes have a cover over their eyes that they do not see this bright light. They ignore the authoritative evidence. Volck, in his writing "The Bible as Canon," is content with a brief reference to 2 Tim. 3:15, Heb. 8:8, 10:15, p. 33, or, if they enter into a discussion of them, they immediately subordinate their own confused concepts to the simple, unmistakable statements of the Bible, and refrain from examining in what sense the "Word of God," the "speaking of the Lord," the "inspiration of the Holy Spirit" is spoken of there. By thus more or less setting aside those passages of Scripture in which the question as to the nature of Scripture is answered *ex professo*, they generally refer to the "nature" of Scripture before their eyes, to the Bible "as it lies historically." Let us now examine the objections taken from hence, and see whether thereby the Scriptural grounds hitherto adduced for the ecclesiastical dogma of inspiration are in any way invalidated. We shall see:

That self-testimony of Scripture is not abrogated nor diminished:

1. neither by the own researches and efforts of the writers of the several books, Luc. 1:1-4.

Kahniss writes in his "Zeugniss von den Grundwahrheiten des Protestantismus gegen Dr. Hengstenberg," p. 114: "I must repeat that one cannot better convince oneself of the complete impossibility of that theory than by living quite vividly into it. The evangelist Lucas, who asserts in the opening of his Gospel that after many had undertaken to write down the evangelical facts, he too (thus placing himself in the same line) would do so, after carefully examining everything (thus on the basis of historical research) - the evangelist Lucas, who undoubtedly used both oral and written sources (according to my conviction also Matthew), is supposed to have written down what the Holy Spirit dictated to him?"

Thus one can only ask if one attributes to the orthodox teachers a childish, grossly sensual conception of the dictation of the Holy Spirit. The dictation of the Holy Spirit was not a mechanical audition, to which a mechanical rewriting would have gone by the side. The holy men of God did not sleep and dream as they spoke, as they wrote, driven by the Holy Spirit. Their inner being, will and mind, was in motion. They really spoke and wrote. And this is a rational activity of rational persons. In writing, they kept to the common human way, used the means that writers are also wont to use. Lucas, however, since he wanted to report the stories that had taken place in Israel, the deeds of Christ, had first investigated everything exactly from the beginning, as he himself testifies in Luc. 1, 1-4. Matthew and John, who were eye and ear witnesses, remembered what they saw and heard when they wrote their gospels. The apostles had a definite plan and purpose in their writings. Matthew wanted to show in his gospel that Christ had fulfilled the prophecy of the Old Covenant. John in his Gospel gave proof that Jesus was Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world. So not only the pen, but also the spirit of the holy scribes was active in the creation of the holy scriptures.

But in all this they were driven, carried (φερόμενοί) by the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit set this whole apparatus, human inquiring, thinking, disposing, in motion, took it into his service, made it the medium of his efficacy, of his speaking. Not the stylus, with which prophets and apostles wrote on paper or parchment, no, the prophets and apostles themselves, the living persons with their will, thinking, researching, conceiving were stylus,

calami, the Holy Spirit. When they wrote, the Holy Spirit did not only protect them from error or guide their writing to a certain goal, no, under their research, thinking, and writing, the Spirit of God gave them his heavenly wisdom, the eternal thoughts of God, and also the right words, and, as it were, gave them them under his hand. This is what the ancients mean by the *suggestio rerum et verborum*. Here, too, there is an incomprehensible mystery which the human mind cannot unravel. That the Holy Spirit is the actual author of Scripture and has spoken through the prophets and apostles, we believe and confess according to Scripture. But the how is hidden. How the inspiration took place, how the Holy Spirit imparted His own to holy men, we cannot fathom. No man has seen into this workshop of the Holy Spirit. We have enough in the final result, in the word of the prophets and apostles, which is truly God's word. On this hangs our faith, our blessedness. To follow the way by which it came to this result. To follow step by step has no interest for our faith, for our blessedness. At the most, a "scientific" interest can move one to ponder over it. But over such scientific musings one loses only that certain fact. We hold, according to Scripture, renouncing all rational mediation, the two propositions that the Holy Spirit is the actual author of Scripture, but that the Holy Spirit spoke through men, prophets and apostles. All that we read in Scripture is speech of the Holy Spirit; but the Spirit of God spoke through organs, and then spoke freely in such a way that the organs and their peculiarities were in no way violated. Thus, however, the Spirit of God has in no way violated willing and thinking of human organs. He hath infused from them willing and thinking, but *ὑεοπρεπως*, he hath infused, as the ancients say, *suaviter*, *leniter*, as it were unnoticed, as under the hand, his divine wisdom, spiritual thoughts, spiritual words, into their minds. The spirit of the sacred authors, after its kind and nature, moved freely, poured freely into the sacred writings. But yet it was entirely in the hand of the Holy Spirit. What gushed forth from the spirit, the mouth, the pen of the prophets and apostles was not their own, not human wisdom, human word, but from beginning to end outpouring of the Holy Spirit. From the first conception of the thought to the finished expression, all was the product of the Spirit of God. An analogy of this wonderful process is, for instance, the miracle of conversion. The conversion of a sinner is in *solidum* a work of the Holy Spirit, to which man does not contribute the least thing of his own. And yet conversion is not an act of compulsion, not a mechanical change, but a mysterious, inexplicable influence of the Holy Spirit.

God's will on man's will, man's thoughts, which so determines man's will, man's thoughts, that man now wants and just likes to want what God wants and to think what is divine.

The very nature of Scripture as it lies historically, the nature of the Gospels, for example, to stop at this initial example, is, if we look at it rightly, a proof of inspiration. The very report of those facts which the apostles themselves saw and heard, and then wrote out, is inspired. This is proved by the nature of them. In Matthew and John we find long discourses of the Lord. They give themselves as the sayings of Jesus. Though the Lord in His oral discourses often elaborated the thoughts expressed in the Gospels, yet the very words which we now read in Scripture are *verba ipsissima* JEsu. This is shown by the title of JEsu's discourses, "He spake." How now? Did the apostles, when they heard these sayings, at the same time write them down, stenograph them, or excerpt them? Certainly not. Well then, did they preserve those long speeches word for word in their memory? That is impossible. Then their memory must have been beyond human limits. No, as they wrote and exercised their power of thought and memory in writing, the Holy Spirit reproduced all this and brought to life what they themselves had once heard from the Lord. He reminded them of all that Jesus had taught them. Thus alone, on the supposition that the Holy Spirit taught and imparted all that the holy men wrote, is explained the nature of the narrative of the deeds and miracles of the Lord, in which even the slightest incidental circumstances are mentioned. The Gospels, as they exist, are obviously a special work of God. The Spirit of God, through his organs, the apostles, recorded the words and deeds of Christ in writing and brought them into a short, fixed form, in which they were to be handed down to the memory of all following generations.

What the Scripture testifies of itself is not alterit:

2. By the different individuality of the prophets and apostles, 1 Cor. 12, 6.

Kahnis, in the above-mentioned writing, p. 113, 114: "One cannot fail to recognize, for example, that the apostle Paul wrote exactly as he spoke in life, as the comparison of his letters with his speeches in the Acts of the Apostles shows. He spoke and wrote from revelation, but not in such a way that every word is revelation, but that he wrote as he spoke, on the basis of the revelation that had come to him, which he had worked through conceptually with the help of the Holy Spirit - hence we speak of a Pauline doctrinal concept: with the help of the Holy Spirit, but not like a mouthpiece of the Holy Spirit.

Spirit, but as a personality standing in the. He was a personality in the Holy Spirit. This is the only explanation for the dialectic, the style, the many personal things etc. in Paul's letters. Those who have only some sense of style can feel how Paul often struggles with the concepts and words. These are really elementary truths."

Similarly Hofmann, "Die heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments. Erster Theil", p. 9: "Neither the questions arising from the nature of the language, nor the authorial idiosyncrasies of the writers, nor the next purposes and the peculiarities of the individual writings stemming from them, nor the diversity of the doctrines, nor the diversity of the historical accounts could be done justice to without coming into contradiction with that dogmatic statement as to the divine inspiration of the holy Scriptures.

And Volck, in his first lecture, p. 10, remarks: "If the individual peculiarities of the Biblical writers do not appear to be suppressed, the nature of the divine influence upon them must be quite different from that according to that (namely, the ecclesiastical) account."

What is said here about the various doctrinal concepts of the authors of the Holy Scriptures has no support and foundation in Scripture itself. The so-called Pauline, Petrine, Johannine doctrinal concept exists only in the minds of the newest interpreters of the apostles. It is not the place here to go into detail on this subject, which is very popular in modern theology. But it is clear that the authors of the sacred writings, the apostles Paul, Peter, and John, each had his own special language, his own special style, his own special way of presenting things, and that their special individuality is expressed in their writings. Paul, for instance, by frequent use of particles, makes the order and connection of thoughts stand out clearly; John simply adds sentence to sentence, one paragraph to another; Peter brings weighty thoughts to the shortest possible, concise expression. But how far this fact shall contradict the divine inspiration of the sacred writings, so clearly and strongly attested by the Scriptures themselves, according to their whole extent, is not to be foreseen. The Holy Spirit has spoken through the prophets and the apostles, has made these living persons, with their willing, thinking, also with their special peculiarities and abilities, his organs. Just as in conversion and sanctification the Holy Spirit does not abolish or change the nature, the natural powers and faculties of man, or injure and shorten them, so in inspiration he does not strip the men whom he has chosen as his instruments of their natural constitution, their peculiar character.

The Spirit of God, who worketh all things in all, hath taken the divers gifts of the apostles, as well as of the prophets, their natural gifts, as well as their spiritual gifts, into his service, and used them for his purpose. It pleased him, therefore, not to speak in unspeakable words, as Paul heard them in the third heaven, not with the tongues of angels, but in human language, in the manner in which men usually exchange their thoughts, to make known the divine mysteries, in order to bring them near to the understanding of men. He poured his heavenly wisdom into the manifold talents of men and thus made it known to men in their own way.

It is pure distortion to reproach the "dogmatic" version with degrading the sacred writers to mere mouthpieces of the Holy Spirit. The dogmatists, then, want to know nothing of the fact that they expressly acknowledge an accommodation of the Holy Spirit to the individuality of the human authors. And this is not meant as if the Holy Spirit only borrowed from the latter their particular manner, as if he only assumed a foreign color here. No, what the ancients meant was precisely this: that the Holy Spirit had condescended to the ways of men and had communicated His own to men through men who thought and wrote according to their usual ways.

An example may clarify what has been said. The sharp dialectic of the apostle Paul is rightly praised. This is Pauline style and peculiarity. In his epistles, e. g. in the Epistle to the Romans, he lets one thought follow from another, inserts one link into the other, raises questions which he then answers, brings objections which he then rejects, explains the position by contrast. In this way, in the Epistle to the Romans, he sets apart the main subject, of justification by faith, on all sides, shows the right understanding of the divine doctrine, excludes the misunderstanding. Does it follow from this that the apostle was given from above only this main proposition, that man is justified without the works of the law, by faith alone, and that he then independently "worked through" this subject with his thinking, and thus essentially presented his own work to the Roman Christians? We would conclude something like this if Paul did not himself testify that he was ministering the gospel of God, that Christ was speaking through him. What he preaches and writes is truly God's word, God's speech. God speaks through him. In this dialectical movement of speech, God, the Holy Spirit, directed and turned his thoughts in such a way that just that certain form and shape of doctrine came out of it which was especially conducive to the knowledge and edification of the readers. It is therefore the dialectic of the Holy Spirit that is before our eyes in the Pauline epistles. The conclusions drawn and guided by the apostle

Evidence is absolutely binding and compelling because Paul was also driven and determined to do so by the Holy Spirit.

Furthermore, this self-testimony of Scripture is not diminished:

3. by "altogether too insignificant particulars" which are mentioned in Scripture.

Such an insignificant detail, over which the newer scribes cannot get over, is Paul's coat left behind in Troas, 2 Tim. 4, 13. Volck, "Die Bibel als Kanon" (The Bible as Canon), p. 45. Here, one thinks, the purely human character of many parts of Scripture comes to light. How, then, if it has pleased the Holy Spirit to converse with men even about such purely human things? Has not the Spirit of God power to make known to men what is great and what is small, what is important and what seems unimportant, in short, whatever He wills? Do we want to dictate to the Holy Spirit what and how he should speak, teach him what is worthy of him alone? If we did, we would have to take offense at the fact that the great, immeasurable God created the gnats and the worms of the earth. What strikes us everywhere is what the Holy Spirit himself has revealed to us in Scripture concerning his position in relation to Scripture. And there we have just seen that each of the sacred Scriptures in its whole extent presents itself as prophetic or apostolic Scripture, as God's Word and speech. We do not find in the Scriptures the slightest indication for separating out from the context of the speech, the speech of the Holy Spirit, individual purely human, frail parts. And if, in the second place, we ask what interest the Holy Spirit had in communicating such trifling data, we shall see, if we look more closely, that they are useful for teaching, for edification, or that they help to clarify a wholesome doctrine or exhortation, or a story in which they are interwoven.

As for the objects returned by Paul at Troas, which, besides the mantle, included his books and parchment, we refer to the fine remarks of an English theologian. Haldane, in his little paper, "The Canon and Inspiration of Holy Scripture," pp. 107-109, thus expresses himself concerning this: "vr. Doddridge, in his Commentary on this passage, has the following note: '-bring the mantle.' If *Φηλονην* here means robe or cloak, it is, as Grotius rightly remarks, a proof of Pauli's poverty, who was induced to send so far for such a garment, which, moreover, was probably not quite new. As this remark of Grotius seemed to Dr. Doddridge, as we see here, to be a correct one, the same ought to have deterred him from treating the matter so rashly and lightly, as is done in his remark above quoted.

and to think that it was 'not reasonable' to defend these words as inspired by the Holy Spirit. The remark of Grotius to which he refers is this: 'Know from this the poverty of the apostle, who regarded so insignificant a thing left at so great a distance as a loss!' In the same passage Erasmus says: 'Behold the apostle's household utensils, a cloak to protect him from rain, and a few books.' Here, then, we learn by chance (a way in which the Word of God often instructs) the poverty of Paul. In the oppressive, afflicted situations of the apostles the proclamation of the Lord is fulfilled, concerning the reception which would be given them in the world, and the troubles and complaints which they would have to endure. The proof of the truth of the gospel, which comes from the sufferings of those who were first chosen to spread it, is calculated to produce in our minds the strongest conviction of its divine origin. It seems that the divine wisdom had this intention, and therefore in the whole history of the apostles we are again and again made aware of their sufferings. 'But I hold that God presented us apostles for the very least, as given over to death. For we have become a spectacle to the world and to angels and to men. - Until this hour we suffer hunger and thirst, and are naked, and are beaten, and have no certain place.' 1 Cor. 4:9-11.

"Paul also asks Timothy to bring .the books, but especially the parchment'. Whatever this parchment might be, Timothy certainly knew quite well what Paul wanted to use it for, and from it he could take another example of the apostle's zeal and untiring effort in the service of God. But we learn from this that even those who had been given such high gifts were not exempt from the necessity of using ordinary means for their own instruction and for the awakening of the gifts that rested in them; how much more must it be our duty to preserve and increase the knowledge of divine things with all diligence! We are convinced that the books which the apostle requested from so far away were not useless. They must either be of use to himself, or in some way beneficial to the cause which was his only desire to promote, and for which he was about to suffer. Considered from any or all of these points of view, the verse affords us both instruction and example; and we can by no means perceive in this verse any more of an interruption of inspiration (as indeed nothing of the kind is implied in the Bible) than we believe was the case in regard to the verse above considered."

G. St.

(To be continued.)

To Rom. 14, 5. 6.

The passage Rom. 14, 5. 6.: "One keeps one day before another, but the other keeps all days alike. Let every man be sure in his own mind," etc., has often been misinterpreted, especially in recent times. One wants to find in it a proof of the "Christian Sabbath. Quite recently someone, in the "Lutheran Observer" from In this passage, we do not see how it can be substantiated that in the apostolic church two days were celebrated at the beginning, the seventh and the first day of the week. The first day then took the place of the seventh day by apostolic example (!). In the Hanoverian "Pastoral-Correspondenz" someone wrote not long ago: "If St. Paul Rom. 14. has nothing against someone keeping one day before the other for his person, he certainly has something against someone wanting to 'abolish' the Sabbath, or claiming that 'the church is also very well conceivable without Sunday celebration'." The latter writer evidently intends to infer from the passage under consideration that the celebration of a certain day is divine ordinance in the New Testament. He also says, in the same passage, citing Vilmar for himself: "The completion of God's creation and rest is the foundation of the seventh day; the third commandment is equal to the others; the continuance of the circle of revelation, that is, indirectly the blessedness of the individual, is also bound to this commandment, in that sanctification is not complete unless the seventh day is sanctified."

But everything that one wants to take out of Rom. 14, 5. 6. for the divine order of Sunday is merely put into the passage. First we pay attention to some main thoughts that stand out clearly and sharply in the text.

1. There can be no doubt about the fact that was involved. It was so in the church at Rome: One part of the Christians believed that it was in accordance with God's will if they set apart and observed certain days as holidays; another part, on the other hand, believed that there was no commandment of God by which certain days were set apart as holidays, and that therefore all days were to be observed equally. This fact is clearly stated in the words, "One keepeth one day before another, but another keepeth all days alike." The same difference existed in regard to the eating of food, v. 2: "One thinketh he may eat all things (φαγεῖν πάντα = eat all things), but who is weak, he eats herb." On the question discussed by the commentators, whether those who believed themselves bound to the observance of certain days, and to the avoidance of the eating of meat, were originally Jews, or members of a Gnostic ascetic sect, etc., we shall here

...but we won't go into that. We think the former is correct. From the words of the passage this much is certain: Christians at Rome believed themselves bound in their conscience to celebrate certain days and to abstain from eating meat; again, other Christians in the same church believed themselves bound neither to the one nor to the other.

2. The Apostle, in view of this fact, first says, "Let every man be sure in his opinion" (& τῷ Ἰδίῳ νοτ πληροφορεῖσθῶ). The

The apostle does not discuss which of the two parties is right or what is objectively right, but he exhorts to conscientiousness. Let everyone be careful not to act contrary to his conscience. Let him who observes the days take heed whether his conscience also stands thus; let him who recognizes no commandment in regard to certain holidays take heed whether in his conscience he is also really free from certain holidays. To such conscientious action the apostle attaches a very praiseworthy predicate: It is divine service, both on the part of those who in their conscience keep bound on the days, etc., and on the part of those who omit to do so from conviction of conscience. The apostle says: "He that keepeth the days doeth it unto the Lord; and he that keepeth nothing doeth it unto the Lord. He that eateth, eateth unto the Lord, for he giveth thanks unto God: he that eateth not, eateth not unto the Lord, and giveth thanks unto God." The word "give thanks to God," which is added here, is taken into consideration as a sign that both eating and not eating are done with a good conscience and thus in the service of God. No one can come before God in prayer who has an evil conscience.

3. Nevertheless, even in the context of this passage, the apostle is quite definite as to what is right in itself: to keep to the days or not to keep to the days, to eat all foods or to be conscience-stricken about certain foods. He says, v. 14: "I know and am sure in the Lord JEsu" (note the emphatic expression: *οἶδα και πέπεισμαι ἰν Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ*), "that nothing is common" (*xorvov*, profane, unclean) "is in himself." And v. 22. "Blessed is he that maketh himself of no conscience in that which he receiveth." The apostle thus gives factual or "dogmatic" justice to those who believe themselves bound by no dietary laws, and, of course, to those who respect all days alike. And this is not merely his human opinion, but he knows it, and is certain of it "in the Lord JEsu." Those who think they must keep certain days, and avoid certain foods, he expressly declares to be "weak," v. 2: "but he that is weak" (*ὁ δὲ ἄσθενών*), "eateth herbs."

These are the three main thoughts that are clear enough in this passage. It is therefore quite wrong when the writer in the "Pastoral Correspondence" says so plainly that St. Paul has "nothing against" Rom. 14, that someone for his person one day before the other

hold. The apostle also has so much against it in this place, that he declares of such a one that he errs, that he is weak in the faith. And would the apostle say of him that keepeth not the days, that he doeth it unto the Lord, if the keeping of the days were a divine ordinance? Is it possible to serve God by omitting to keep the seventh commandment?

But how can the apostle here speak so mildly of those who keep days and observe dietary laws, while he cries out to the Galatians, "Ye keep days, and months, and feasts, and seasons. I fear yours, lest perhaps I have labored with you in vain"? 1) The gospel was in danger with the Galatians, but not with the Romans. In the Epistle to the Galatians the apostle is dealing with those who, seduced by stiff-necked Judaistic false teachers, thought that in order to attain justification and blessedness they had to keep days, moons, feasts and seasons. The apostle expressly writes to the Galatians, "ye have lost Christ, who would be justified by the law." In the Epistle to the Romans, on the other hand, he has to do with "weak in faith," (Cap. 14, 1.) with "brethren" who stood in the right faith; mii such as were inclined to think the stronger a little too free, (v. 3. 4.) but yet did not base blessedness on the observance of their own way. They kept days, and did not eat certain foods, but they gave thanks to God (v. 6), that is, they praised him as the one who had made them righteous and blessed before. They walked in certain old-established statutes, because they thought that they, as justified and blessed by grace, should still walk thus for their own persons. Therefore the apostle says that they also serve God in their own way. Selnecker, in his interpretation of Rom. 14, remarks: "Those who are still weak in the faith, and still observe the days which they formerly celebrated, without considering it necessary (for salvation), and seeing in it a merit or the proper worship of God, do not sin against God, but observe the difference (of food and days) for the glory of God, until they are best instructed." (*In omnes epistolas Pauli commentarius*. Lipsiae 1595. p. 289.) Because thus with the Romans the faith was not in danger, the apostle exhorts the stronger to abstain from the use of Christian liberty: "It is better that thou eat no meat, nor drink wine, or that at which thy brother offendeth, or is vexed, or faint. If thou hast faith, have it with thyself before God." (v. 21. 22.) But to the Galatian false teachers, who held that the observance of the Jewish laws was necessary to salvation, the apostle exhorts to the use of Christian liberty: "Now therefore in the

1) Gal. 4, 10. 11.

Freedom, that Christ might set us free; and be not entangled again under the bondage yoke." (Gal. 5, 1.)

The writer in the "Pastoral Correspondence" therefore wrongly refers to Romans 14. His case is rather identical with that which the apostle judges and condemns in the Epistle to the Galatians. To assert that "the existence of the circle of revelation, that is, indirectly the blessedness of the individual, is bound to this (the third) commandment, inasmuch as sanctification is not complete unless the seventh day is sanctified," is a Judaistic false doctrine, repugnant to the Gospel. Senecker writes (op. cit. p. 288): "Those are very much mistaken who obstinately want to hold on to the introduced abuses of a distinction of meals and days, and try to support their self-chosen worship from this passage, as with a divine testimony." One leaves out of view the whole scopus of this passage. The apostle does not want to teach faith, but love, v. 13, 15. The apostle does not tell us what to do when the gospel is in danger, but how to spare the consciences of those who have accepted the gospel, but have not yet come to the full knowledge of the truth, especially of Christian liberty. Rom. 14 is therefore also a *locus classicus* for the doctrine of Christian conscience. Here it is stated *ex professo* that a Christian must be convinced in everything he does that it pleases God. If a man does that which in itself is quite right with an evil or doubting conscience, he sins, and in such a way that he falls from the faith. V. 20. "Though all things are pure, yet it is not good for him that eateth it with a stumbling of his conscience;" v. 23. "He that doubteth thereon, and eateth, is damned." Senecker reminds (op. cit. p. 304), "All our actions must be of such a nature that we do nothing contrary to faith and conscience. For he who acts contrary to conscience builds to hell. True faith and an evil conscience cannot at the same time exist in a man, as the ancients said. The doubting conscience always sins and wholly defiles the person and the work before God." When, during Luther's stay at Wartburg Castle, the Augustinian monks at Wittenberg, at Carlstadt's and Didymus' urging, had abolished the Papist sacrifice of the Mass, Luther was concerned that some might not be sufficiently convinced in their conscience of the godliness of their actions. On this occasion Luther wrote his treatise "On the Abuse of the Mass," in which he remarks at the very beginning: "It has been made known to me verbally and in writing, dear brethren, that you are the first of all who have begun to abolish the abuse of the Mass in their collection. And although it has pleased me greatly, as a work in which I feel that the word of Christ is at work in you and that you have not received it in vain, I have done so out of Christian love,

who omits nothing, great concern that you have not all of the same steadfastness and good conscience begun such a great noticeable thing. . . I feel daily with myself how very hard it is to lay aside long-lasting consciences, and to be imprisoned with human statutes. . . Our consciences will make us sinners before God in many ways, and will condemn us eternally, unless they are guarded and protected with the holy, strong, and true word of God, which is built on the one rock. And he that doeth this is sure of the thing, and cannot fail nor waver, neither be deceived. Such a certain unconfessed fortress we seek and desire." (Erl. ed. 28, 28 ff.)

F. P.

The Lutheran Church's doctrines of discernment are both clearly revealed in Scripture and exceedingly important.

A pamphlet "Ueber den confessionellen Indifferentismus unter den Gläubigen unserer Tage" ("On confessional indifferentism among the faithful of our day") has been sent to us by a friend. It is a separate reprint of a series of articles which Pastor Walter in Mecklenburg published in the Mecklenburg "Kirchen- und Zeitblatt" in 1883. After the author has stated the confessional indifferentism among the believers of our days and then proved the high importance of pure doctrine, he continues:

But one objects on the part of the opponents: We do not at all deny the great importance and significance of pure doctrine, if we understand by it the essential basic and fundamental doctrines of Christianity, namely, the doctrines of the universal sinfulness of all men, of the deity of Christ, of the atonement through Christ's blood, and of justification by grace through faith. With these doctrines, however, Christianity stands or falls. One may strive for these, for faith in salvation is based on them, and only they are clearly attested in Scripture. On the other hand, it is useless and harmful to dispute about secondary doctrines, e.g. the doctrines of the means of grace, because they are not clearly stated in Scripture. For if they were, how could it be possible that men who seek the truth have argued so much about this doctrine, and are still arguing about it?

Here we must first of all strongly object to the last conclusion mentioned. From the fact that the doctrines of distinction in the various churches have been and still are much disputed by men seeking truth, it does not follow that the Scriptures do not contain a definite and clear teaching on these matters. On the contrary, the reason for this fact may well be that the Scriptures are often interpreted according to

The Lutheran theologians are not only able to interpret the passages in question according to wrong principles, but they also demonstrably do so on the part of the Roman and Reformed theologians. And this is not only possible, but also demonstrably true on the part of the Roman and Reformed theologians, the reason for their interpretation, contrary to the Lutheran, of those passages of Scripture about which the doctrines of distinction are concerned. According to Roman doctrine, sacred Scripture is known to be obscure and ambiguous in itself, and only the Church (i.e., the assembly of bishops at the general councils or, according to the most recent teaching, only the pope) is able to determine the meaning of sacred Scripture without error through the promised assistance of the Holy Spirit. The Church, however, interprets Scripture according to tradition or, as the Tridentine Council puts it, according to "the unanimous consensus of the Fathers. What the fathers taught, or rather what the pope wants the fathers to have taught, must therefore also be taught by Scripture.*) Now as in the Roman Church the supreme *judex*, who determines the meaning of the holy Scriptures, is the pope, so in the Reformed Church it is reason. As is well known, Zwingli himself openly admitted in his controversy over the Lord's Supper with Luther that the actual reason why he could not accept the literal explanation of the words of institution was not this or that word of Scripture, but rather only the incomprehensibility of the bodily presence of Christ in the Holy Supper for reason. Because it is incomprehensible to human reason that Christ's body and blood are present in the earthly elements and are distributed and received with them at the same time, therefore, in Zwingli's opinion, Christ's word cannot be understood literally, as it reads, but only figuratively.

The different interpretations of the passages of Scripture which come into consideration in the doctrines of distinction have their reason, therefore, in the erroneous principles on which the Roman and Reformed sides proceed, and in the preconceived opinion with which, bound by these principles, they approach the exposition of the passages in question, but not in the fact that these passages of Scripture are themselves obscure and ambiguous. To prove the latter would be very difficult. Besides, no evangelical Christian will easily maintain that the scriptural passages on which our church relies in relation to the Romans are unclear. But this opinion can be heard more often today from "Lutheran" Christians.

1) So it is said in the decret. de edit, et usu S. S. Cone. Trid. Sess. IV: *Ad coercenda petulantia ingenia decernit [synodus], ut nemo suae prudentiae innixus in rebus fidei et morum ad aedificationem doctrinae Christianae pertinentium sacram scripturam ad suos sensus contorquens contra eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione scripturarum sanctarum, aut etiam contra unanimem consensum patrum ipsam scripturam sacram interpretari audeat etc.*

I would like to hear you speak out in regard to those biblical passages that are the subject of the doctrines of distinction between our church and the Reformed church. But I ask every unprejudiced man: Can one speak more clearly than Christ when he said, "This is my body"? and are not Paul's words Tit. 3, "God hath made us blessed (saved) through the bath of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost," clear and plain? What unbiased person will explain these passages: The Lord's Supper is not the body of Christ, and baptism is not the bath of regeneration? as the Reformed Church actually teaches, though she seeks to veil this crying contradiction of her doctrine with the clear words of Scripture by all sorts of artificial explanations? How the Heidelberg Catechism twists and turns in its explanation of the words of the Lord's Supper (Question 79) and of the above-mentioned words of Paul Tit. 3 (Question 73), in order to escape the simple clear sense of the word! Zwingli, after all, striking all laws of language in the face, asserted that the copula in the words of institution is = significat, and the great majority of the half-educated of our day follow him in declaring: "This is my body" means as much as: "This signifies my body," although they would be very angry if, in cases of sickness, someone handed them a glass with the words: "Take it and drink, this is medicine," and yet there would have been no medicine in the glass. Then these people would hardly accept the explanation: This is medicine means only this: this means medicine.

Furthermore, could Christ testify more clearly that He, according to His whole person (that is, also according to His human nature), always wants to be present with His church than when He said to His disciples: "Behold, I am with you always, even to the end of the age" and: "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them"? And finally, is not God's general will of grace expressed as clearly as possible in the sayings: "God does not want anyone to be lost," and: "God wants all men to be helped and to come to the knowledge of the truth," and: "Christ Jesus gave himself for salvation for all," etc.? - How then can it be said that the controversy between our church and the Reformed church has its cause in the obscurity of the scriptural passages under consideration? Verily, if the scriptural passages referred to are obscure and ambiguous, the whole word of God is obscure and ambiguous. If these words of God can no longer be relied upon, then no word of God can be relied upon. He, therefore, who asserts the obscurity of those passages of Scripture, thereby renders the whole Word of God unreliable and uncertain, and undermines, nay, robs us of all firm ground of faith. And this, and nothing else, is what Satan has in mind when he persuades man that this or that word of God is unclear and ambiguous.

But it is further objected that the doctrines of distinction between our church and the Reformed church concern only secondary doctrines, and that it is therefore useless and harmful to argue much about these questions, because it does not much matter whether one teaches Lutheran or Reformed doctrines in the matters in question. This view, which is so widespread in our day, is based on the almost general ignorance, especially nowadays among the laity, of the doctrines distinguishing between the two churches. A lady once asked me what the difference was between the Lutheran and the Reformed doctrines, and when I began to give her a lengthy argument on the subject, she interrupted me with the words: "Isn't that so? The Lutherans say at the Lord's Supper: 'That is,' and the Reformed say: 'The Reformed say, 'That means.' That's not much of a difference." The good lady had heard the bells ringing, but did not know where they were hanging; she did not consider what this "that is" and "that means" were really about, namely, to put it quite roughly and straightforwardly, that: Whether in the Lord's Supper I receive but a morsel of bread and a sip of wine, or whether in these earthly elements I receive the body of Him whom all angels adore, the body which became a sacrifice for my sin and the sin of all the world, and the most holy blood of God, whereof "one little droplet can make the whole world clean, yea, even out of the devil's mouth free, loosed, and delivered." And further: Does it then make no difference whether baptism is only a bowl full of water, which may signify all sorts of beautiful things, but yet gives and brings me nothing of God's grace and heavenly goods, or whether baptism is "the water of divine majesty." "the red flood, dyed with Christ's blood, that healeth all hurt, grounded from Adam, even committed by ourselves," "vain grace of the Father, vain blood of the Son, and vain fire of the Holy Ghost," as Luther praises baptism. - Further, is it then the same whether God's Word, as the Reformed Church teaches, is only a mere signpost, which outwardly shows me the right way to life, but does not give me the power to go there, indeed exerts no effect of grace on me at all, or whether, as our Church teaches, the Word of God is full of divine, living, regenerating power and effect, because the Holy Spirit works powerfully through it as the means of grace ordained by God for salvation? - And further, how can the question be indifferent whether Christ is now present on earth only according to his divine nature, but not also according to his assumed human nature (as the Reformed Church teaches), or whether the whole Christ, that is, also Christ according to his human nature, is present all the days with his church and personally in the midst of his faithful, as our church testifies? For by that reformed doctrine the faithful are deprived of the great consolation that he is with them as their helper and protector, who became our brother, our flesh and blood, who lay for us in the manger.

and hung on the cross: the gracious Saviour of sinners; yea, in truth, the presence of Christ with his church is thereby denied altogether, for if Christ is not wholly with us, he is not with us at all, because there is only One Christ. And thus, by this reformed doctrine, the church is lowered to the level of other religious societies, which have only the doctrine and memory of their founder, but not their founder himself, alive and bodily in their midst.

Finally, who may say that it matters little whether Calvin teaches that Christ died only for the elect, and that God created the greatest part of men for eternal damnation and does not want them to be converted and saved, or whether Luther teaches that Christ died for all men and that God created no one for damnation, but rather wants all men to be helped and to come to the knowledge of the truth, that therefore also all those who perish perish not by an unchangeable decree of God, but rather only by their own fault, because they rejected the salvation powerfully offered to them in unbelief?

But if the opponents further say that the faith of salvation rests only on the most fundamental doctrines of salvation, and not on the doctrine of the means of grace, and want to conclude from this that the argument about this doctrine is useless and harmful, it is to be replied that precisely the doctrine of the means of grace is of the greatest importance for the attainment, preservation, and strengthening of the faith of salvation. How then am I to attain to the certainty of my blessedness if my faith cannot rest on the unshakably firm rock of my baptism, where God has promised me eternal grace and forgiveness? And how am I to hold on to the certainty of such grace and forgiveness in spite of all temptation, or to regain the lost certainty, without the word of absolution, which promises me forgiveness again and again, and without the sacrament of the altar, which guarantees me this forgiveness again and again? What can be more faith-strengthening than the word especially promised to me: "Your sins are forgiven you," on which word of absolution (because it is God's word, spoken in His name and by His command) I can rely as firmly and confidently "as if I heard God's clear voice from heaven"? And finally, what an exceedingly delicious, indeed irresistibly sure pledge of God's grace and of the forgiveness of his sins has a Lutheran Christian in the body and blood of the Lord presented to him in Holy Communion! Truly, all doubt of God's grace must vanish when I myself receive the sacrifice offered for my sin and enjoy the ransom paid for my guilt. But I must do without all this strengthening of faith and assurance in the Reformed Church, as a consequence of

the fundamentally different doctrine of this church concerning the means of grace, which amounts to a denial of the means of grace. Nor is it to be objected that this proposition nevertheless suffers a restriction through Calvin's doctrine of the spiritual use of the body of Christ through faith; For since, according to Calvin, the body of the Lord is not objectively present in the Lord's Supper, but a spiritual union with Christ takes place only through the upwelling of the believing soul, then, according to his doctrine, the most secure pledge of God's grace, which so powerfully strengthens the weak faith, is also lacking in the Holy Supper, and the Holy Supper, according to Calvin, cannot both strengthen the weak faith and require a particularly strong faith for its blessed enjoyment.

But the opponents further object that blessedness in any case does not depend on whether one is attached to the Lutheran, Catholic, or Reformed confession. To this we reply: It is undeniable, of course, that in all Christian church communities there are true children of God who are saved. But this is not because the doctrines of distinction are unimportant and of no consequence for the faith of salvation, but because God's hand of grace preserves his elect children, that they suffer no damage to their souls through error, but, notwithstanding the corruption prevailing in their church in many points of doctrine, come to faith through the gospel, which has not yet entirely perished, and are preserved in faith unto salvation. Although it is possible to be saved in the Catholic or Reformed church, it is certainly much more difficult than in the orthodox church, which teaches the way to salvation clearly and correctly, so that it is much more difficult for him to reach the goal who is shown a wrong way or a detour than for him who is shown the right, straight way.

Miscellany.

"The Protestant Church and Theology in Germany." Under this heading the "Independent" of New York expresses certain misgivings of American pastors here, who deplore the fact that hundreds of gifted young men from the various church communities of this country annually cross over to sit at the feet of "the most eminent teachers of theology in German universities".

Those who indulge in such complaints, according to the "Independent," cite the following points: "That Germany is the seat of a negative criticism both as to the Old and New Testaments; that it is the

That it is the home of the Protestant Association, an entirely liberal association of professors, pastors, and congregations, whose intimate bond of unity is the denial of those traditional boundary markers of the Christian faith, including those fundamental articles of the Holy Trinity, of the person of Christ, and of the work of reconciliation; that public morals, under the dominion of skepticism, are in a deplorable condition, both among pastors and laity, as is proved by Oettinger in his *Moral Statistics*; that, notwithstanding the depth and thoroughness of German theological research, the influence of such doctrine and such life upon young men can only be detrimental." But the sender of the above article declares those misgivings to be exaggerated; although they are based on a few grains of truth. He emphasizes that, on the other hand, just now, as never before, a conservative and apologetic theology is found in Germany; that in the field of New Testament research, it has completely struck its enemy on the head. Not a single objection that raised any kind of dust had been raised that had not been quelled by half a dozen replies; in short, German theology could boast that no significant attack on Christian truth had ever been made that had not met with strong resistance.

It is interesting now how the sender speaks about this "conservative" direction in the circles of the Protestant Church in Germany. He writes: "When we speak here of a conservative theology in Germany, we naturally do not mean that this theology is in every respect a reproduction of the orthodox theology of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. If, of course, every deviation from the symbols, testimonies, and dogmatic systems of that heroic period of Protestantism is regarded as a deviation from the spirit and evangelical truth, then the theology and church of Germany must, in a greater or less degree, be guilty of this charge. Professor Beyschlag of Halle, at a recent second General Synod of Prussia, on which occasion he took the teachers at the universities at their word, that they had the right to teach according to their own convictions, - made the remark: 'That not one of the Protestant professors of Germany, not even the most conservative, is orthodox in regard to the doctrine of the person of JEsu Christ.' This sentence, taken out of context, has often been used and abused to show that German theology is quite dangerous, while the real meaning of these words is no other than this: that not a single one of Germany's Protestant professors is a true believer.

of this teacher adheres more to the exact formulas and definitions which the great dogmatists of that time used on this subject. In the great fundamental truths of Christianity, the leading theological teachers of Germany are one in the faith of their fathers, while as to the manner of explaining and expounding these truths, and in regard to less important truths, they have taken their own paths. They could not be satisfied with a mere reproduction; they had also to produce for themselves." The sender has probably himself sat at the feet of the "conservative" theologians of Germany and allowed himself to be persuaded by the same that they teach the "old truth" in a "new way," while they have, however, by their "new way" completely cast off the old truth. Or is it only a question of different terms and a changed method of teaching in comparison with the old truth, when the "conservative" theologians now deny that the holy Scriptures are God's infallible Word, and quite unsparingly present synergism, Arianism, etc.? Ch. A. Weisel.

Literature.

The first part of the book is the first part of the book, which is the first part of the book, which is the first part of the book, which is the first part of the book. With a preface by D. Johann Ludewig Schulze. Halle 1787, newly published with historical explanations and notes from the archives of the Fränkische Stiftungen in Halle by Dr. W. I. Mann and Dr. B. M. Schmucker, with the assistance of Dr. W. Germann. Volume 1. Allentown, Pa. By Brobst, Diehl and Co. 1886.

The present volume, comprising X and 724 pp. (Lexicon format), forms the first volume of this new edition of the "Hallesche Nachrichten". As already mentioned earlier in the description of the individual issues, this new edition is not a mere reprint of the Hallesche Nachrichten in their original form of 1787, but because they contain a "multitude of allusions to events, persons and circumstances on this side and the other side of the sea", "which were known and understandable to the generation living at that time, but have largely moved very far away from us", the editors Dr. Mann and Dr. Schmucker have added continuous and often very detailed explanations to the original work. The material for these explanations is taken from the archives of the Fränkische Stiftungen in Halle (through the mediation of Dr. W. Germann), as well as from Mühlensberg's Familienpapiere, church registers dating from that time, parish minutes, etc. "What we" - say the editors in the introduction - "have been able to ascertain about persons, local parishes, circumstances and conditions of the striking area of that time from sometimes rich, sometimes thrifty treasure troves, we have gathered not without expenditure of time and energy, and have perhaps saved many things from complete oblivion." The editors have not only worked with excellent diligence and great expertise, but obviously also with great love, and every Lutheran who is interested in the history of the Lutheran Church in this country must know how to thank them for their work. The price of the present volume, bound and sent postage paid, is \$5.00. - Only one remark in the introduction, p. VIII, we cannot pass over with silence. There, in discussing the importance of the "Hallesche Nachrichten" also for our time, it says: "Neither

the blurred characterless sentimentality which, rejecting everything Specific-Lutheran, believes that it may call itself Lutheran after all, nor a one-sided and repulsive orthodoxism which claims a monopoly of Christianity for itself, will be able to lean on the Halleian News with good reason." This remark is at least very superfluous. First of all, here in America we know of no "one-sided and repulsive orthodoxism that claims a monopoly of Christianity for itself"; secondly, hopefully, no one will look at and use the "Hallesche Nachrichten" as if the ecclesiastical conditions described therein were in all respects model conditions, no matter how diverse the teachings they offer in some respects, and no matter how beneficially touched by the great Christian earnestness of Mühlmburg and his like-minded comrades. F. P.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The "Antimiffourians" in the Norwegian Synod, led by the Rev. Muus and Prof. Schmidt, have now carried out their intention of opening a Gymnasium and Seminary in connection with St. Olaf's Academy at Northfield, Minn. There is one pupil in the high school for the present. There are eleven pupils in the seminary, according to the "Northfield News." Seven more pupils are expected. - Of the eleven pupils in the Seminary, five are from the Synod of Ellingians. This synod, otherwise called Hauge's Synod, had until this time a seminary of its own at Red Wing, Minn. The same, however, for want of teachers for this year, has, it is said, gone out of business. The students have found admission to the new seminary at Northfield. - An attempt is also being made to make contact with the Norwegian faction in the Augustana Synod. An extra meeting of this faction is to be held to discuss whether it would not be expedient to let their own seminary go and to send the students with a teacher to the new Muus-Schmidt seminary in Northfield. - In the past, these two synods, the Ellingian and the Augustana, wanted nothing to do with the Norwegian Synod because of their doctrinal position. Now they can go along with 'Pastor Muus, Prof. Schmidt and comrades. Accordingly, they seem to be convinced that a change has taken place in the doctrinal position of Prof. Schmidt and Pastor Muus. H. Schulz.

The General Council and the Iowa Synod. The fact that the Council was tired of Iowa's "waiting position" was already clearly evident when the Iowa Synod last year, after a thorough discussion of the matter, postponed formal access to the Council. Now the unknown editor of the "Lutheran" takes occasion from the printed synodal report of the Iowa Synod to make the latter's position still further clear. He has always held "the brethren of the Iowa Synod" in very high esteem, but what they want, according to their Synodal Report, namely, to remain longer in their waiting position until the practice in the Council shall be still more in harmony with the official confession of the same, "is a little too much for us to swallow." What interests us in this discussion of The Lutheran is the statement that the Iowa Synod is falsely accusing the Council of "inconsistency" because the resolutions of the Council concerning church fellowship, etc., were never meant as Iowa understands them. The Lutheran notes: "The Iowa Synod reads into the Fundamental Principles and into the various deliverances

of the General Council into something that the General Council as such has never approved (legitimated).... To exclude members from church fellowship because they may be connected in some way with a secret society is something the General Council has never officially called for. And denying church fellowship to all except those formally connected with the Lutheran Church is not a law of the General Council. The Iowa Synod's assertions on these points are erroneous and should not be allowed to stand as true." So there we have in the "Lutheran" the definite statement that the Council is "officially" still united. The Council will have a fresh opportunity to declare the "Galesburg rule" at its next meeting in Chicago. Perhaps the writer in the "Lutheran" has just now published his article to drive it to a break with the "Germans" in the Council. For it is obvious that the point of the article is no less directed inwardly than outwardly. If only the "Germans" in the Council do not fall out of the frying-pan into the fire by renouncing the obvious unionism and entering into fellowship with the equally obvious synergism of the Iowa Synod!

F. P.

"Reunion of Christendom." Such a reunion has recently been sought by members of the American Episcopal Church. They have prepared a memorandum for the next General Convention in Chicago, requesting that "this body take such measures as in its wisdom it may deem expedient to promote an organic union of Christians in this country, and thus hasten the fulfillment of the prayer of our most blessed Saviour that his disciples 'all be one,' John 17:21." In support of the motion, among other things, the following is stated: "In this new land the factions among the Christian people have not yet become so entrenched as among the older nations, but these too might be acted upon by the measures here taken. - The desire for union is growing stronger and stronger among those who publicly profess to be Christians. Outside our fellowship great interest is manifested in the work of the Episcopal Church.... On the other hand, members of the Episcopal Church are also now more willing to acknowledge how much Christian truth other Christian bodies hold in common with them.... There is a growing desire for liturgical worship and for the observance of the Christian church year on the part of those who were formerly unaccustomed to these things. It is also noticeable how the various communities adapt a kind of episcopate to their needs and thus acknowledge a felt need. - With the long and metaphysical doctrinal determinations of the confessions, which are now in use in some communities, one is dissatisfied and one wants to return to the simple and scriptural determinations of the church of the first centuries." To the framers of this memorandum the "apostolic succession" is certainly not in their conscience. They seem to be satisfied already with "a kind of episcopacy," while not long ago Someone wrote in the "Churchman" that with a "counterfeit" episcopacy the Church was not served; it must be the right "apostolic" one. The distaste for the "long and metaphysical doctrinal determinations of the Confessions" fits with the "report" published by the "Churchman" of former bishops of the Episcopal Church who held that a "unity of mind rather than a unity of doctrine and practice" should be sought first. "Unity of mind" apart from "unity in doctrine" is such an outlandish kind of unity that the bishops should have described it in more detail.

F. P.

Moody and the doctrine of inspiration. Under Moody's direction in the month of July at Mount Hermon, Mass. was the "Moody summer school for Bible

study". This "summer school" is a new, quite unique institution of Moody. Through it he wants to work for a living Christian knowledge among college students (high school students). This year, according to the report of the "Springfield Republican", 250 students from 90 colleges were gathered at Mt. Hermon. Moody and his assistants not only gave instruction in the reading and study of the Scriptures, but also preached sermons and lectures in which the main articles of Christian doctrine were treated. Thus the doctrine of inspiration also came up. "Dr. Brooks (one of Moody's aides)"-reports the "Springfield Republican"-"delivered an address on the verbal inspiration of the sacred Scriptures, which, on account of its extreme attitude, excited much discussion among the students. The theory, now so popular, that the words of Scripture are not inspired, has been invented to account for errors which people think they find in the Bible. When you find something in the Bible that does not fit your ideas, you retreat to this theory, to the dishonor of the Word of God. But if the individual words need not be believed, you may at once extend the theory a step further, and reject whole sentences, passages, and passages as unreliable. I maintain that if a man has only a particle of logic and consistency, he will be through with the whole of inspiration in a week. It is strange that the very passages which are first thought by men to be uninspired are confirmed by Christ himself in the New Testament as God's Word. ... It is nonsense to say: 'I believe in Christ, but I do not believe these things!' No man, with a thimbleful of sense, can take that position.... How will you stand on the Scriptures? Will we men, who do not even understand how to bend the little finger, or how a blade of grass grows, sit in judgment on Christ the Lord, and say that he has committed an oversight? Further, suppose that in the Scriptures we had God's thoughts in human words, as some think. Then we would have a jewel-box, which God indeed gave us, but to which he threw away the key. I cannot get at the jewels if I depend on human fallibility and ignorance in the presentation of the precious contents. If someone does not accept the verbal inspiration, he can no longer study the holy Scriptures salutary. ... I said before that human authority rises against the inspiration of the Scriptures. But the best men, preachers like Spurgeon and theologians like Dr. Hodge, are' unbending advocates of verbal inspiration. My young friends! it would grieve me greatly if you entertained any doubts on this point. You go back to professors and teachers whose shoe-straps I am not worthy to undo, but I earnestly beseech you: read God's word for yourselves, and then when you hear from those men this or that learned exposition against the inspiration of holy Scripture, tell them that you have read God's word for yourselves, and cannot agree with them. "

F. P.

Odd Fellows. The "Lutheran Observer," through its Washington correspondent, addresses all "good and God-fearing people" among the "Knights Templar," "Freemasons," "Odd Fellows," etc., and calls upon them to advocate on their part that more religion come into the country again, namely, that "God's Sabbath" be kept holy in this country and not be "trampled under foot" by Sunday excursions. He cries out to the "God-fearing people" in these societies, "What is your religion worth if it does not keep you from going to the devil with the crowd?" If Dr. Butler were not such a blind leader of the blind, he would call upon the "God-fearing people" in the lodges, especially from those lodges which reject Christ as the way, the truth, and the life,

and not to "go to the devil" by fraternizing with the enemies of Christ. "God's Sabbath," as Dr. Butler understands it, cannot be "trampled under foot," because God Himself has abolished the Sabbath nearly 1900 years ago. Col. 2, 16. 17. But one can despise God's Word and the Gospel on Sunday, and this is done by "Freemasons," "Odd Fellows," etc., not only on Sunday, when they hold their annoying Sunday excursions, but every day of the week by their humanistic, anti-Christian association. How utterly nonsensical a swarming spirit Dr. Butler is, is evident from the fact that he finally declares the keeping of the Sabbath to be expressly the chief article of the Christian religion. He writes: "Let all questions which divide the churches be put in the background, for the ark of God is in danger. Symbolism, confessionalism, ecclesiasticism, sectarianism, together with the dogmatisms (!) belonging to them, have now no more importance for God's truth and kingdom than the ark had for Israel after God had left the disobedient and contradictory people. The Sabbath is the sign of God's covenant with man, and woe to the man, the family, and the nation who does not keep and sanctify the Sabbath." After such a debate, one feels led to ask whether Dr. Butler had the slightest idea of what Christian religion was. F. P.

A New Catechism. Dr. Conrad of the General Synod has published a new catechism. In recommending it, a writer in the "Lutheran Observer" says, among other things: "It is sound and conservative in doctrine. It is faithful to right Lutheranism, as the same is taught in the Augsburg Confession. He presents the doctrine of the Reformers" (!) "on the Sacraments in its clarity and with its foundation in Scripture, but in so doing avoids those harsh extremes (extra-scriptural and extra-confessional extremes), not founded in Scripture and not contained in the Confession, which crept into the Church in the post-Reformation period and unfortunately still live on now as a fruitful mother of disunity and division in the Church." If this recension be proper, the new catechism is ill advised. F. P.

II. Abroad.

Those two theses of Prof. Dr. Dieckhoff, in which he renounces the Lutheran doctrine of inspiration and ascribes "uncertainties and errors" to the Holy Scriptures, also cause the open-hearted editor of the "Mecklenburger", Mr. Prillwitz, no little trouble. He does what he can to save the orthodoxy of his state university, which was made famous among the Lutherans by the blessed Philippi, but he does not succeed. Since Dr. Dieckhoff is undoubtedly not such a confusing head that he meant something else than he clearly says, Mr. Prillwitz obviously cannot believe this himself in regard to those theses. Most strange, therefore, is the way in which he expresses himself in his paper, in which everything else has hand and foot, in the number of Sept. 11. He writes there: The embarrassing sensation which the theses⁶ and 7 have excited in wide circles is considerably lessened when one becomes acquainted with the genesis of these theses and accepts with pleasure Dieckhoff's subsequent interpretation, which, however, first had to be vigorously provoked. In the meantime, however, it is said everywhere in still Lutheran circles: "Look at the Mecklenburg State Church. An outstanding teacher of their university is allowed to publicly state and defend before the officially assembled clergy the proposition that 'the old dogmatic concept of inspiration is not held fast'.

The Bible says that 'the truth of the Scriptures cannot be accepted, since it contradicts the nature of the Scriptures' (Thes. 6). The Lutheran Church is called the Lutheran Church, and it is called the Lutheran Church. And this is called the Lutheran Church!" But no one who has not been there himself can have any reason to object to this. We have seen with great joy, as we will explain in more detail below, that Dieckhoff ad Thes. 6 actually means something quite different from what one had to assume here according to the wording, and that he only chose this unfortunate "intentionally sharp version" (!) in contrast to Dorpat, just as we do not doubt in the least that, if the "certain uncertainties and errors" of Thesis 7 had still come up for discussion, an explanation on the part of the author of the thesis would also have been given, if not fully sufficient, then at least somewhat satisfactory. The Lutheran world outside, however, learns nothing of this until and unless the appointed editor of the "Meckl. Kirchen- und Zeitbl." finds it necessary. In the meantime, Thesis 6 and 7 have long legs, and it will be difficult for the subsequent corrections to catch up with them in their effects. But we regret this for the sake of the good Lutheran reputation of our national church, which would have been irretrievably lost if those theses had been meant as they read. "Old Philippi" would still have to turn over in his grave: "And to these people I have written my 'Christian Doctrine of Faith'? " W.

Female students. In response to an inquiry addressed to him on August 9, the Prussian Minister of Education decided that women may neither be admitted as students nor as guest students at Prussian universities.

P. Grote on the ecclesiastical position of the German Immanuel Synod. We have already reported on this subject in the previous volume of "Lehre und Wehre", p. 304 ff. and 339 ff. an excellent article by P. Hübener in the Sächs. Free Church. However, we cannot refrain from including an article by P. Grote in his "Kreuzblatt" of August 22, which deals with the same subject and also contains much that is excellent. It reads as follows: The Immanuel Synod, which was assembled in Magdeburg in June of last year, only now claims our special attention. What is of particular interest to us is a lecture by Pastor Zöller on the national church and the free church, on the discussion of which a full day was spent. A report on it states: "It was the lecturer's object to take a stand against the enthusiasm for the Landeskirche, which wants to hold fast the unity of the church body even in the face of doctrinal differences, and therefore clings especially to the sumpiscopate. which, even if it has correct doctrine, no longer regards the Free Church as a church, but as a sect, because it is not recognized and influenced by the state; and in contrast to the enthusiasm for the Free Church, which principally rejects the national church form from the outset, and praises the Free Church as the higher, more perfect manifestation of the church. At the end of the animated discussion we remained with the statement we had already made in Magdeburg in 1875: Of the present Lutheran regional churches we cannot hold communion with any of them in such a way that we admit each of their members to the Lord's Supper without further ado because of their affiliation with them, but we must examine the person and the matter in each individual case. We know that we are at one with all the faithful confessors of the Lutheran National Church by the grace of God, and we gladly declare this. Regarding the question of whether one should call for a general resignation from the Lutheran Church, Pastor Vollert remarked that he would have to say "no" in the strongest possible terms. Every pastor should only wait faithfully in his office as a servant of Christ, not allow himself to be distracted from obedience to God's Word by human law, and then wait calmly to see what happens. In the same way, the laity should also wait

They should do their Christian duty and avoid false prophets, for example. Both would then want to suffer what comes upon them for the sake of obedience to God's word. With such pastors and laymen who would stand thus, we would gladly hold communion and acknowledge them as our brethren." At first glance, one might think that the same views were expressed here that we have always held in the Kreuzblatts. Yet on one point there is an essential difference. Pastor Zöller declares it to be a free-church enthusiasm if one principally rejects the state-church form of church government from the outset. We heartily agree with this, provided that by the word "principally" no objection is meant to be raised against Article 28 of the Augustana, by which, however, the mixture of the two swords, i.e. the regional church form of church government, is principally rejected, but provided only that it is meant to be said that the regional church government, once it has been introduced into our church under God's permission, even if in contradiction to our basic confession, for known reasons, it can be borne as a state of emergency and that, if it otherwise stands right with the regional church, one does not need to separate from it for the sake of the church regime. But Pastor Zöller goes one step further: he also declares it to be a rapture when one praises the Free Church as a higher, more perfect manifestation of the church. We must protest strongly against this. For this sentence is directed against Article 28 of the Augustana. It does not declare the regional church regime to be a state of emergency, that is, a lower, more imperfect manifestation of the church, but it virtually puts it on a par with the free church constitution. This is a grave error and a very alarming weakening of the Free Church principle, such as one will probably find among the Free Churches only among the Immanuelites. Pastor Zöller thereby takes the standpoint of the vulgar national church. He ignores the state of emergency of the national church, and even declares it to be an enthusiasm, when Andre, while bearing it, nevertheless feels it painfully, and says with the Augustana that the constitution of the church could and should be a different, a better one; a purely ecclesiastical regiment should take the place of the royal authorities; that would under all circumstances be more salutary for the prosperity of the church. But we will not dwell on this point. Rather is it dear to us today to discuss another point, namely, the communion of the Free Churches with the existing national churches. For here, too, we find a lax practice among the Immanuelites which separates them from us and puts them on a par with the national churches. At the last Synod, the Immanuelites, as they had done earlier in Magdeburg, again stated: "Of the present Lutheran regional churches we cannot hold communion with any of them in such a way that we admit each of their members to communion without further ado because of his membership in the same, but we must examine the person and the matter in each individual case. This alone does not at all meet the point at issue. There is nothing special or new in the fact that the Immanuelites examine the person and the matter in each individual case where a Christian coming from abroad wants to come to their altars. Surely every conscientious clergyman does this, whether he is Lutheran or unchurched, whether he belongs to a national church or to a free church. Surely no one holds communion with a church in such a way that he would admit every member of it to Holy Communion unseen because of his membership in that church (!!!). It is not a question here of the individual person or the individual case, but of the church community to which the individual person belongs. And this is where the lax practice of the Immanuelites comes to light, in that they genuinely independentistically do not focus on the church community, but on the individual person.

grasp. It is true that in the above report it says: "With all faithful confessors of the Lutheran national church we know ourselves to be one by God's grace, and we gladly declare this. According to this, it seems as if the Immanuelites not only examined the person and the matter in each individual case, but first and foremost asked about the church community to which the individual person belonged. But this is contradicted by the preceding sentence. Both sentences: "We examine person and matter in each individual case" and "we know ourselves to be one with all faithful confessors of the Lutheran national churches" contradict each other. In order to discern what is meant, we would have to refer to the practice of the Immanuelites. If we do this, we can easily see that the word "Lutheran" in that sentence is only a meaningless epitheton ornans, and that they know themselves to be at one with all the so-called faithful Lutherans of the national church, whether they be Lutheran or more or less addicted to the Union. The surest proof of this is what we reported in the previous issue of the Pastoral Correspondence about the friends of the Lutheran church in Hanover. No one will persuade us that the Hanoverian Regional Church, with its long-standing practice of union, is a Lutheran one. And whoever would have been of the opposite opinion up to now, can be proven wrong by this report of the Pastoral Correspondenz. "As long as we continue to support Free Churches which take the front against the Union and the State Church, we shall not be able to hope for the granting of a Collecte." So it is written there in scanty words. After that it is seriously blamed on the friends of the Church of God that they make a front against the Union and the State Church. The State Church in the modern sense can only be the Uniate Church, which is why the Union is expressly placed before the State Church. Can this then be a Lutheran church, whose regiment reproaches the clergy for resisting the intrusion of the Union? What would one say of a German general if, in the war with our western neighbors, he ordered them not to take up arms against the French and the Republic? Would he not be declared a traitor? And would one still be able to consider an army whose commander was likely to be guilty of such treason with impunity a German army? Would one not have to say: such an army has fallen away, has openly gone over to the enemy? How can one declare a church to be Lutheran whose ministers are virtually prevented by their superiors from waging war against the Union and the State Church? Truly, such a church must have sunk quite deeply into the unrighteous state church! Dr. Munkel has shown us once again how deeply this has sunk in the words we quoted in the previous issue on page 261 in note 3. But the Immanuelites principally hold communion with this Hanoverian church. Thus, even if someone belongs to the unchurched regional church of Hanover, they still admit him to Holy Communion, if he assures to be Lutheran for his person. Thus they do not look at the church community, but at the individual person. According to the same principle they must and will also admit the so-called Vereinslutherans of the Prussian Landeskirche. For their position is not a whit different from that of the friends of the Lutheran church in Hanover. Since this conclusion is so obvious, I said in No. 32 page 251 in a note: "As is well known, therefore, the Immanuelites also hold communion with the Vereinslutherans within the united Landeskirche." By the "united national church" I have understood not only the old Prussian, but also the Hanoverian. However, the expression "Vereinslutheraner" points first to Old Prussia, and I think I have also heard of such cases where individual Immanuelites were in communion with the Prussian Ver-

Lutherans held communion. It would at least be a great inconsistency if they did not. This assumption is confirmed by the conclusion of the above report, where the question is raised whether one should call for a general resignation from the national church. The answer is: no, but every pastor should faithfully attend to his office, etc., and likewise the laity should act according to their Christian duty. To which the remark is attached without any restriction: "With such pastors and laymen (thus also with the Vereins Lutherans) we would gladly hold communion." In any case, they hold communion with individual altars within the united church of Hanover. This is also expressly testified to in the report of the Pastoral Correspondence. There the question is addressed to Immanuel: "How it stands to the communion question, whether it excludes none of the members of the Hanoverian regional church merely because of his affiliation to the (united) regional church from the Lord's Supper?" The answer to this is: "The Synod of Immanuel stands in such a way that it would not without further ado (!) admit (them) every member of the Hanoverian Landeskirche as such (!) to its altar, but (they) examined each individual case." We have here again the same obscurity which we have already reproved above. At one point the "Immanuel Synod" is confused with the individual Immanuelites, and then it is emphasized "that they did not readily admit every member of the Hanoverian Regional Church," which does not touch the *punctum saliens* at all. It is not at all possible to admit someone to Holy Communion without further ado because he belongs to a regional church, but it is possible to exclude him from Holy Communion merely for this reason. The Immanuelites do not, however, principally reject communion with those who belong to the unchurched regional church of Hanover. Should the Immanuelites not grant the same privilege to the so-called faithful confessors within the Prussian Landeskirche, then I would have better avoided the expression "Vereinslutheraner" in the note in question and instead said: with so-called Lutherans within the Union. Therefore, I will subsequently specify my expression and explain myself as follows: "As is well known, the Immanuelites (and the Immanuel Synod may then be substituted for them) hold communion with the so-called Lutherans within the Union." To this Immanuelite practice we hold fast the early church principle, "Communion is church communion." The abandonment of this principle has already caused unspeakable confusion, which unfortunately seems to be increased by the latest events in Hermannsburg and by the principles imported by the Immanuelites. It is all the more necessary to recall that these principles not only contradict the practice of the old church, but also the practice followed by the blessed Harms. For, as was already mentioned in the previous number, under the presidency of Blessed Harms and with his approval, the following resolution was passed on October 5, 1880: "With regard to the admission of members of other church communities to Holy Communion, not only the personal position of the same, but primarily the church affiliation shall decide." Accordingly, Blessed Harms had a different practice than the Immanuelites. He admitted members of such regional churches that are recognized as Lutheran, but he did not admit members of the Hanoverian regional church to Holy Communion, because the latter must be denied the character of a Lutheran church. Do the people of Hermannsburg want to deny this correct principle of their blessed father Harms, on whose teaching and practice they otherwise give so much, for the sake of the Immanuelites? An answer to this question is urgently requested.

The doctrine of the Scriptures, which the Dorpatians brought to light, was also discussed at the pastoral conference in Malchin in August of this year. In the "Mecklenburgische Landesnachrichten" of August 28th there is a report about the conference negotiations, in which it says among other things: "Mission Director Dr. Hardeland said: The faith rests on the word of the prophets and apostles. Today we have the word of the apostles and prophets nowhere but in the Holy Scriptures. The Dorpatians declared that an "independent" (that is, not a continuous stream flowing out of Scripture) "stream of spiritual testimony lives on in the Church to this day. This is a fundamental error, it is swarm-mindedness, or it approaches Romanism. In our day we must not abandon the fact that we have God's Word as the Word of the prophets and apostles only in the Holy Scriptures. If the" (alleged) "Holy Spirit wants to reveal something to me, something entirely new, I say to him, Lift yourself away from me, Satan." - Excellent! But is this true - and no Lutheran Christian or theologian will deny it - how then does it stand with, for example, Prof. Dr. Luthardt, who is known to have identified himself with the Dorpatians? W.

Collision. After one has begun to speak at conferences in Germany of the necessity that the so-called Protestant regional churches should be given greater freedom and independence by the state, one comes into collision with the free churches, which use the public admissions of the regional churches, how sad things are for them under the present constitution, to beat the regional churches with their own weapons. Dr. Münkelt writes about this in his "Neues Zeitblatt" of August 18, among other things as follows: "The separatists and sects interpret the damage to the national church as a treasure trove to prove that one cannot remain in the national church with a good conscience, and do very good business with it. Probably for most of them it is the chief motive why they leave the national church, for it is palpable. Abundant food is now being fed to this. A multitude of clergymen and the spokesmen of the national church declare aloud that the conditions of the church are intolerable. What are the many to do who still have only one foot in the national church, and the others to whom it is now being shouted aloud for the first time that the rotten building may soon collapse on their heads? Of the Catholics we will speak no further, although in places they will also get their share of the harvest. For this very reason,' they say, 'we want to improve the constitution and repair the damage, so that the departures and apostasy from the church will be prevented. When we have accomplished what we want, you shall see how it becomes better.' We have already hinted above what we expect from all this, and repeat again that we think the beautiful designs are milkmaid's thoughts. The King will not limit himself in his regiment or allow himself to be made the master of a synod, the Council of Ministers and the Diet will not depose themselves. There is no doubt about it; only the greatest need could push them to do so, and then it would be over with the national church. But if nothing comes of it, what then? Look, it will be said, the Landeskirche has always been desolate, but now its physicians have given proof that it is incurable and incorrigible. " W.

Hammerstein motion. The conservative papers of Prussia take great offense at the fact that during the vote on Hammerstein's proposal, which is well known to our readers, all the ministers left the Chamber. One concludes from this that Prince Bismarck is opposed to it.

is rejected. - Nevertheless, with the support of Windthorst and the Centrum, it is hoped to get it through the House of Representatives next winter. This hope is based on the following calculation: the Centre will go further and further in its demands concerning the revision of the May Laws and finally also demand the recall of the religious orders, e.g. the Jesuits. Such a demand, however, would fail because of the resistance of the other parties, and in order to win over the Protestant Conservatives, who are now indispensable, Windthorst will promise them his help for the Hammerstein proposal. It is thus a most simple business: at the price of the return of the Jesuits, the Protestants hope to enforce an extension of the power of their Church! And serious ecclesiastical papers report on such a church policy without making a face! Should the spirit of the order just mentioned have already had an infectious effect on Protestant circles? - The delegates of the German Protestant Association held a meeting in Berlin on June 24 to decide on their position with regard to the Hammerstein proposal. The resolution adopted stated, "The motion is an attempt to reorganize the church of the Reformation according to the Roman pattern. This would transform our Protestant Church into a Catholic Church of a lower order. We reject any endowment of a Protestant hierarchy, and regard union with the state as the best protection for the independence of our congregations."

(Strasbourg Monthly, Aug. 14).

Brazil. In the "Allgemeine ev.-luth. Kirchenzeitung" of August 20 there is a report on the constitution of an unspeakably miserable thing by a synod. We extract the following from the report. As already reported in this issue, Pastor Dr. W. Rotermund, in agreement with several clergy and laity, had called a pre-synod on May 19 and at the same time worked out a draft of the statutes. The area which was entered with this convocation could be described from various sides as a very uncertain, indeed in part not without danger'. The "German Protestant Synod of the Province of Rio Grande do Sul", founded about nineteen years ago by Pastor Dr. Borchard, had only met once after its constitution, and the memory of it was generally not a pleasant one, neither for the clergy nor for the congregations. S. Leopold's had been chosen as the place of meeting. After the opening of the meeting it was first ascertained that 23 persons had accepted the invitation, who were therefore also entitled to vote. After the president (Rotermund) and the secretary (husband) had been elected, Dr. W. Rotermund read an address in which he explained that the local congregations, as caretakers and guardians of Christianity and folklore, are worthy of the service we intend to render them, and that they need this service in many ways. Then an address by the "Evangelical Association for Protestant Germans in America," signed by Dr. Fabri, was read. In it, the joy was expressed that the attempt at a synodal union should be made, and it was presented as a matter of honor for the German Protestant congregations to bring about a unification by setting aside everything that separated them. Entering into the negotiations, it was decided to make the draft statutes the basis. It must be especially emphasized that the statutes were edited with painstaking precision in such a way that the independence of the individual congregations does not appear to be affected or endangered in any way. The following points gave rise to lengthy discussions. Some wanted to add the attribute "German" to the name "Riograndens Synod", others "Protestant". And when it was suggested that the confessional status of the Protestant congregation should be added to the name "Riograndens.

When it was suggested that we define our congregations more closely as "united", this proposal also received much support, it was pointed out that this would be an obstacle to unification for us. We have clergy from Switzerland, Wuerttemberg, Baden, Hesse, Prussia, and Hanover; our parishioners over there have belonged partly to confessional, partly to united congregations. In fact, therefore, there is no common confession. If we wanted to separate ourselves strictly confessionally, then under the present circumstances an external union would also be impossible, and we would carry the dispute into our motley congregations ourselves. For the time being, it was a matter of getting under roof and under lock and key; once the outer building was finished, then one could approach the confessional question later; for the time being, this was impractical, and in the word "Protestant" we had for the time being a common banner that was held high by all (!) and was sufficient in the fight against the existing enemies. According to these considerations, the relevant resolutions were also passed. A longer discussion followed the proposal that the synodal board should have the right of ordination, i.e. that it should constitute itself as a church authority. In fact, we are without an ecclesiastical head; the clergy here are either ordained as clergy of some German national church, or by order of some consistory specifically for Brazil. It was acknowledged that this situation was untenable in the long run, and that the Protestant Church of this country must in time have its own authority; but in order to avoid present practical difficulties, it was decided to wait with the establishment of an authority with ordination authority until we could train clergymen, and until provisions had been made concerning the course of education through which the candidates for ordination to the preaching ministry would have to pass. For the time being, we are still dependent on other ecclesiastical bodies to train clergy for us and on "foreign church authorities" to ordain them to the office of preacher. The synodal board has to examine the ordained for their qualification and then possibly induct them into office. The synodal board consists of five persons, namely four members of the congregation (two clergymen and two laymen) and one teacher. The same is to be elected for a period of three years. The negotiations lasted for two days. It was not until the afternoon of May 20 that the statutes were established and the synod was constituted. A special record was made of this, which may be included here for the very reason that it constitutes a memorable document for all time: The following clergy and congregational representatives constituted themselves this day as the "Riograndens Synod" on the basis of the statutes which form the annex to these proceedings, namely: 1. Dr. W. Rotermond and Luiz Bier as representatives of the congregations of S. Leopolds and Lomba Grande; 2. Konrad Schreiber and F. A. Engel as representatives of the congregation of S. Sebastiao do Cahy; 3. Sebastiao do Cahy; 3. Friedr. Hildebrand and Günther Greßler as representatives of the parish of Santa Cruz; 4. Rudolf Dietschi and Philipp Kruse as representatives of the parish of Mundo Novo; 5. Friedr. Pechmann and Jacob Maurer as representatives of the parish of Santa Maria da Bocca do Monte; 6. Friedr. Brutschin and Joh. Friedr. Brusius as representatives of the parish of Baumschneids; 7. Ferd. Häuser and Joh. Hüther as representatives of the parish of Teutonia. The aforementioned persons attest to this by signing the present, self-read proceedings. (The signatures follow.) Since only seven congregations constituted themselves to the Synod, the remaining clergy and lay representatives, although personally agreeing to the statutes and wishing to join, had no authorization to do so.

The following addition to the statutes was proposed and accepted: "At the constitution of the Synod, its executive committee is provisionally elected for one year. The election which now took place resulted in the following: Dr. W. Rotermund (President) and Br. Brutschin as clerical members; Th. Grimm as teacher, and F. A. Engel and G. Greßler as secular members .

Russia. The "Allg. Kz." of August 20 is written: In Riga the Oberprukurator had brought suit that the Livonian Court of Justice, in matters concerning Pastors Döbner, Treu, Sunte, and others, accused "of seducing persons of the Greek Confession to Lutheranism," had made representations against the jurisdiction of the court on the basis of provincial sources of law, and had held up the matter. Thereupon a senate ukase was issued, by which the provision of the imperial law, by virtue of which "matters concerning seduction and those who have apostatized from the lawful faith, as well as the unauthorized building of churches of foreign confessions" are tried outside the ordinary proceedings, is also extended to the Baltic provinces. - At the instigation of the curator Kapustin, to whom the Lutheran elementary schools are now subordinated, the holding of elementary school teachers' conferences in the Baltic provinces, although only pedagogical questions were discussed at them, has henceforth been forbidden by the Ministry of National Enlightenment. - The curators of the Petersburg, Moscow and Vilnius educational districts have issued a decree that Protestant religious instruction is henceforth to be given in Russian. - At the instigation of the Procurator of the Holy Synod, Pöbedonoszew, the fast days of the Russian Church, which are known to be not few (in the time before Easter, for example, seven weeks in succession), are now also to be observed within the army. In the decree in question special emphasis is laid on the maintenance of church customs as well as the promotion of the religious sense among the soldiers.

Cameroon area. The "Allg. Kz." of August 29 writes: The Chancellor of the Reich has informed the German governments that it is intended to establish elementary schools for the natives in the Cameroon region, and that for this purpose a teacher is to be sent there for the time being, who will commit himself to this mission for two years, is still young and unmarried, and of strong constitution. In addition to free travel there and back and free housing, he is assured an annual salary of 5000 Marks.

Providing for Roman Converts. In France there is a society for the support of former Roman Catholic priests who leave the Roman Catholic Church for reasons of conscience. So far six priests have been supported who, after having studied Protestant theology at the theological faculty of Montauban, are now active as Protestant assistant chaplains or missionary preachers. They are now active as evangelical assistant chaplains or missionary preachers. In addition, the Committee has also helped some former priests whose faith did not seem to be firmly enough founded to become Lutheran pastors, and who desired to earn their living in a civil position. (Ibid. p. 822.)

Japan. As is well known, the ruling circles in Japan have for some time been searching for a new state religion, since the old pagan cults no longer arouse any enthusiasm anywhere and one would also like to become as European as possible in matters of religion. Now one suddenly hears that Roman Catholicism has the best chance of winning the prize. Friendly relations are said to have already been initiated between the pope and the Mikado.

(Strasbourg Monthly, August 14.)

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 32.

November 1886.

No. 11.

What does Scripture say of itself?

(With consideration of the just also recently raised objections of the newer theology).

(Continued.)

What the Scriptures testify of themselves is not abrogated nor diminished

4. by alleged natural-historical, historical, chronological inaccuracies interspersed in the writing.

In his lecture: "To what extent can inerrancy be attributed to the Bible?" Volck writes: "If the Bible is a work of God composed by men, then its relative capacity for error follows from this.... But how far does this capacity for error go? What is its limit? The answer to this question follows from our statement that the Bible is the document of the history of salvation. If it is this; if it expresses the historically revealed, eternal thoughts of God concerning salvation, then its capacity for error must be admitted with respect to all that 'which either does not at all fall within the sphere of the history of salvation, or, being quite unessential, in no way touches the substance of the history of salvation.'" (p. 14, 15.) Thus, e. g., all natural-historical, world-historical notes are purely human, and therefore often erroneous.

He was not the only one who had been in the world, but he was the only one who had been in the world, and he was the only one who had been in the world, and he was the only one who had been in the world, and he was the only one who had been in the world. For those parts that do not belong to the substance of the history of salvation are most closely interwoven with the substance of the history of salvation. Nay, the newer men deny, at bottom, the inspiration of those "eternal thoughts of salvation. But is not inspiration in the proper sense of the word, in the ecclesiastical sense, which we have proved to be scriptural, in reality determined by

those notes of subordinate content questioned? Certainly, if errors and inaccuracies of any kind can really be proven. Errare humanum est. But the Holy Spirit cannot err. If the Holy Spirit is the actual author of Scripture, of all that is written, the possibility of error is excluded from the outset. The Spirit of God, the omniscient One, however much He has accommodated Himself to the peculiarity of human organs, can never sanction a human error. We would be mistaken about Scripture, about that self-testimony which Scripture bears about itself, if, in inspecting and examining the "nature" of Scripture, we came upon manifest *falsa* and *errata*. But whether such are to be found is just one of the weighty questions about which we contend with the newer scribes.

Do we read in Scripture erroneous statements, false judgments about nature and things of nature? For this area is, of course, subject to human understanding. Here it is sight and experience that decide. One may well expect that the moderns, when they want to state that Scripture is capable of error in this area, will cite the most striking and striking examples. Volck remarks, op. cit.: "To explain by examples what I mean: The question whether Scripture teaches a movement of the earth around the sun or of the sun around the earth has nothing whatever to do with the history of salvation." He means to say that the "Sun, stand still" of Joshua arose from the old erroneous popular belief that the sun moves around the earth. Another widely trodden example of the kind is the reference to the biblical account of creation. We ask, first: Is the Copernican system, according to which the earth revolves around the sun, really a foregone conclusion, which no sensible man, at least no astronomer or mathematician, dares to contradict? Is the proposition that the earth revolves around the sun as empirically firm and certain as that a good tree bears no rotten fruit, and a bad tree no good fruit? Are these heavenly creatures, the sun, moon, and stars, subject to man, and therefore also to man's inquiring mind, in the same way as the animals on earth, the fish in the water, and all that lies within man's range of vision and power? We ask, secondly: Are those millennial periods of creation, from which modern natural science makes the present stock of the earth emerge, really based on sight, perception, empiricism? Is it not the *πρώτον ψευδός* of modern geology, that it dates back the laws of development now in force, since the completion of heaven and earth, to the time of creation, to the time of which no man can know anything, of which Almighty God speaks, "Where wouldst thou be, when I founded the earth? Tell me, art thou so wise?" Was it to Almighty God,

who created all things out of nothing, not a little one, if he would, in a moment, give to the substance of the earth, which was hidden in the waters, the form which is now before the human eye? Compared with the desolate cosmogonies of the ancient pagans, compared also with the confusion of modern "scientific" hypotheses of the origin of the world, does not the simple biblical account of the six-day work of God bear the stamp of truthfulness? Does not a simple-minded reader of the Bible receive the impression from Genesis 1 and 2: Here God, the Creator, who alone, according to His wisdom, without counsel, created and ordered all things, has given revelation to man about His origin and about the origin of heaven and earth, that is, about a thing which no man could otherwise have found out? Here man, the creature, must simply hear and listen to what God, his Creator, tells him. If man, the creature, speaks and speculates about his and the other creatures' Genesis, that is, about the Creator's doing and working, out of his own, with his created, limited mind, this is the same folly as if the creature wanted to call the Creator to account, as if the clay said to the potter, "Why do you make me thus?" Truly we feel little tempted to be mistaken from this side of the revelation of God. On the other hand, when we consider how none of the strange and perverse ideas of the ancients about the earth as a disk, about the arrangement and grouping of the parts of the earth and the oceans, have passed into the Bible, we cannot fail to recognize the higher hand which has kept away and excluded all human delusion.

Or does the profane history give the lie to the sacred history? Volck refers to the results of the Egyptian and Assyrian researches of modern times. It is true that what we learn about the prehistory of Egypt, for example, from the excerpts from Manetho and the research on monuments, does not correspond with what the first and second books of Moses tell us about the stay of Jacob's family and then of the people of Israel in Egypt. We find in the Egyptian sources, in the mention of the rule of an Asiatic pastoral people, or of the rule of the lepers over Lower Egypt, echoes of familiar events in sacred history. But on closer inspection the dissimilarity is greater than the resemblance. Shall we now correct biblical history according to isolated notes of old tradition or the dark language of monuments? That would be folly. The latter partly contradict themselves and are so fragmentary that even if one wanted to consider them credible as a whole, there would still be room for the story of Joseph and the great deeds of God under Moses. Yes, whoever superficially compares the Egyptian sources with the biblical account, will see a difference here as between myth and history, as between poetry and reality.

Only if the history of the Oriental peoples or Greco-Roman history could be used as an example to counter a contradictory statement in the Bible with a date that is reliable and certain according to the general opinion of experts, would we find it understandable from their point of view when modern critics speak of a historical inaccuracy that is found in the Bible. We can safely wait until they find such an example. Different accounts of one and the same fact prove nothing. Who will prevent us, where witnesses stand against witnesses, from believing the testimony of the Bible? In most cases of this kind, however, one can believe the Bible without denying all credibility to the profane-historical tradition. For the most part, we lack an accurate, complete picture of history. If we had such a picture, we would easily recognize how the various individual features are connected and how they fit into the whole.

A comparison of sacred history, in so far as it mentions world-historical persons and events, and world history, in so far as it rests on a secure foundation, shows every unprejudiced person a marvelous correspondence. And there are plenty of examples that the newer monument research, which tries to decipher the oldest documents, has confirmed the biblical account and refuted the reports of later profane scribes. Until recently, in most textbooks of world history, one found the note, taken from Greek authors, that the Assyrian king Sanherib succeeded Salmanassar in 716 BC. In the Bible, on the other hand, Isa. 20, 1., an Assyrian king Sargon, who must have reigned after Salmanassar and before Sanherib, is named. Thus it seemed most advisable, since in this point the profane scribes are regarded as authorities, to set aside Sargon as a mythical person. The latest research of the cuneiform inscriptions on the Assyrian monuments, however, has now shown that Sargon was the most powerful and glorious ruler of the later Assyrian empire and that in importance, deeds and victories he surpassed both his predecessor Salmanassar and his successor Sanherib. A well-known historical tradition, for which especially Herodotus is the guarantor, and which most readers of these lines will have impressed upon their memory in their grammar school lessons, makes the Persian king Cyrus the successor and heir of his grandfather, the Mede king Astyages, and records the conquest of Babylon as one of the first great deeds of the young ruler of the empire of the Medes and Persians. This, of course, does not accord well with the historical account of the prophet Daniel, chap. 6, 9, according to which the king of the Medes, Darms, conquered Babylon and resided in Babylon as the first great king of the Median-Persian monarchy. However, it is now generally accepted by historians that not

Cyrus, but the Mede Cyaxares II. followed Astyages in the regiment and put an end to the Babylonian empire. This fits well with the king of the Medes, Darms, in Daniel. These examples show what a frivolous beginning it is to introduce the first best data of a celebrated Greek or Roman historian without further ado as an instance against the correctness of a biblical statement.

Volck remarks in the lecture referred to, p. 15: "If, on the basis of an examination of the chronology of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel according to the results of Egyptian and Assyrian researches of modern times, differences were found which were due to errors in the biblical sources, this would not in the least diminish the authority of the Bible as a document of the history of salvation." True, there are differences between the Bible's statements about the reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah and the corresponding statements of the monuments. Monuments and Bible meet in the determination of the year of the destruction of Samaria, 722 BC. But from this point forward and backward the chronologies diverge. According to the Bible, Ahab of Israel reigned 918-896. According to the monuments, Ahab delivered the battle of Carkar in 854. The Bible places the campaign of Sanherib against Hezekiah in 714, the monuments in 701. But is this proof that "the biblical sources are based on errors", that witnesses stand against witnesses? A third and fourth witness, who would stand for the monuments against the Bible, are missing here. Thus every impartial man must let the dissonance rest upon itself, and it would be unjust from a purely human standpoint to charge the Bible with error here. We, however, who are convinced of the truthfulness of the biblical statements in large and small matters for quite different reasons, give the Bible the benefit of the doubt here. By the way, when one looks at the result of the cuneiform researches as a whole, the differences disappear against the agreement. Schröder, the rationalist, judges in his work "The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament": "Incidentally, the Bible also receives from the monuments a justification in chronological respect, as one can only wish for the same." S. 304.

A significant historical "inaccuracy" from the New Testament is cited by Volck in his book "Die Bibel als Kanon", p. 45, namely Apost. 7, 16, where Sichern is said to be named instead of Hebron. It says: "Now Jacob went down to Egypt, and he died, and our fathers, and they were brought over to Sichern, and laid in the sepulchre, which Abraham had bought for money of the children of Hemor at Sichern." First of all, it must be stated that the matter is not settled by changing "Sichern" into "Hebron," and by attributing to Stephen an error of memory made in the flow and eagerness of the speech.

holds good. If Stephen had had Hebron in mind, he would have caused an unholy confusion. Abraham may have bought a field for a burial place in Hebron for money. Gen. 23, 16. 17. But not from the children of Hemor, whom Stephen mentions, but from Ephron, the Hittite. Furthermore, Jacob was buried in Abraham's hereditary tomb near Hebron, Gen. 50, 13. But of the fathers of Israel, the sons of Jacob, whose burial is first mentioned in Acts 7, 16. 7, 16. is mentioned, the same is not reported. Rather we read Jos. 24, 32. that the bones of Joseph were really buried at Shechem, in the piece of field which Jacob bought from the children of Hemor according to Gen. 33, 19. Stephen, therefore, in calling Shechem instead of Hebron, would have been guilty of a threefold falsum, confounding Shechem with Hebron, the children of Hemor with Ephron, and the burial of Joseph with that of Jacob. And Lucas, since he wrote his writings after a thorough investigation of the sources, would have considered this confused confusion of the biblical reports worthy of being handed down. Is this plausible, judged from a purely human standpoint? Certainly, the matter has its difficulties. But it is no help here to attribute to those holy witnesses, Stephen and Lucas, a number of Fasel's errors. On the contrary, we are most likely to arrive at a correct understanding of this passage if we stick exactly to the wording and also leave the cited statements of the Old Testament intact. Especially Stephen speaks here of the sons of Jacob. Where they were buried is not mentioned in the Old Testament. But since Joseph was buried in Shechem, in the field bought from the children of Hemor, it is not so improbable that the same thing happened to his brothers. Yes, Stephen, and with him Lucas, affirms this, and thus completes the narrative of the Old Testament. Other examples are found of the kind, that in the New Testament data are added to the Old Testament history, of which we find nothing in the Canon of the Old Testament. Is not this very circumstance also a proof of the authorship of the Holy Spirit, who can bring forth forgotten things from the past, and in his teaching and revelation disregard the difference of times? Or, if Stephen here followed an unwritten tradition, the Holy Spirit, by the very fact that this tradition was publicly proclaimed and then written out, made certain truth out of the uncertain. But if that note of the burial of the sons of Jacob is a novum, it is natural to regard also the more distant remark that Abraham already bought a field in Shechem from the sons of Hemor as an addition to the biblical account. What the Old Testament reports about Jacob's purchase and about the purchase of the field in Hebron is not altered in the least. Abraham lived in Shechem for a long time, according to Genesis 12:6,

and one would have to assume that he lost this field with his departure, so that Jacob had to pay for it anew. We want the above to be seen only as a possible solution to the present difficulty. But if the matter may have turned out this way or somewhat differently, we are by no means obliged, even from a human point of view, to assume an error. This assumption only increases the difficulty. As in this passage, so in other cases, too, we will convince ourselves, on close examination, that alleged "inaccuracies" are far from being proved as such. Even if we lack the necessary material to prove the correctness of this and that statement, this does not yet prove that the Scriptures have erred here.

The last example discussed, in which the account of the Old Testament is used as a standard of truth for the evaluation of a New Testament statement, at the same time touches on a further objection against the all-round inerrancy of Scripture that we have asserted. If Stephen's remark were proved to be false, a contradiction within Scripture would at the same time be stated. That the Bible contains all kinds of contradictions, at least in subordinate questions, is a standing argument of the opponents of the ecclesiastical dogma of inspiration. But we counter this without hesitation with the proposition that the self-testimony of Scripture concerning its origin, its author, is also not damaged or diminished.

5. by supposed contradictions contained in Scripture.

I am not sure," he said, "but I am not sure," he said, "but I am not sure," he said, "but I am not sure," he said, "but I am not sure," he said, "but I am not sure," he said, "but I am not sure," he said. One would think that the example given by Volck in both writings would best serve the cause. In his first writing, p. 15, in his second, p. 50, he refers to the "contradictory" statements in Numbers 25:9 and 1 Corinthians 10:8. According to the former, there were 24,000, according to the latter 23,000, who were struck by that plague in the wilderness. But how does this stand? If we read the two passages quoted one after the other and spare ourselves further reflection, we may well come to the conclusion that the Israelites who perished in the wilderness were counted differently and that only one of the totals given could be correct. But a closer examination of the story in Numbers 25 reveals a difference among those who were struck down by the wrath of God. The chiefs of the people, the real ringleaders, who had seduced Israel to fornication and idolatry, were to be hanged, others were to be strangled by the judges with the sword. 4 Mos. 25, 4. 5. Most of them were taken away by the plague. How, if now Paul 1 Cor. 10, 8. has in mind by the 23,000 those who were directly struck down by God, in distinction from those executed by human hand, whose number may have been about 1000, while 4 Mos.

25, 9. are all those who died summarily taken together? Or, if all 24,000 mentioned by Moses really died of the plague, it is not said that the 24,000 died in one day, while according to Paul those 23,000 fell on one day. Paul describes the plague of that one day, while Moses speaks at all of the judgment provoked by Israel's fornication. It is obviously a premature judgment, even according to natural reasoning, if one here badly contradicts the one number with the other.

And so it is in other cases. If in two different places of the Bible one and the same event is described differently, it is obvious that different features, different sides of the same thing are emphasized here and there. We would have to know all the secondary circumstances and details of the main fact in question in order to see how these different features are connected. But since, as a rule, only a few details are communicated to us, since many circumstances are unknown to us, since all kinds of intermediate elements are missing, it is often impossible for us to say with certainty how the various traits were in reality connected and how they had a place in one frame. Various possibilities can be thought of. And it is subjective arbitrariness, yes, a crying injustice, which one inflicts on Scripture, if one reduces different kinds of reports to contradiction and contradiction of the reporters. As long as no contradictory opposition is proved in the various statements, the recognition of contradictions demanded by the science of Scripture today is nothing but a scientific hoax.

What has been said is especially applicable to the differences that exist in the four Gospels. Volck writes, in his first lecture, p. 14: "Who, for instance, has not yet discovered differences between the individual evangelists in the Gospels, which cannot be eliminated by any harmonistics, and which it is better to admit openly than always to let opponents advance them." It is true, harmonistics must be within modest limits. In many cases it is impossible to construct from the various statements of the evangelists, for instance, about one and the same miraculous work of JEsu, a complete, exact general picture, and to assign to each of the various secondary features mentioned by the individual evangelists its place in the whole. It is much better to answer the question of how the various individual circumstances are connected, and what the chronology of the individual events was, with a non-liquid answer, than to assume that a self-described combination is evangelical truth. But as long as the different traits do not cancel each other out and exclude each other - and this can never be brought to evidence - it is, even in purely human terms, foolishness and foolhardiness to turn the differences into contradictions.

sayings. In the four accounts of the resurrection of the Lord, for example, with which one is used to maneuver against the freedom from error of the Scriptures since the days of Lessing, there are of course different statements concerning the number and names of the women who went to the tomb and the number of angels who were at the tomb. John mentions only one woman who went on pilgrimage to the tomb of Jesus, Mary Magdalene, Matthew two, Marcus three, Lucas even more women. Matthew and Marcus mention one angel, Lucas and John mention two. In which order and grouping the pious women went to the tomb on Easter morning and returned from the tomb, how the angels were positioned at the tomb, whether first Mary Magdalene went alone and saw two angels, and then the other women made the same journey, and whether they also saw two angels or only one, whether one of the two angels was the actual preacher, behind whom the other stepped back, or whether what Mary Magdalene experienced took place later than what happened to the women at the open tomb of Jesus, we cannot decide. We lack sufficient support for this in the words of Scripture. The one was possible, also the other, also a third. It has not pleased the Holy Spirit to reveal to us a complete harmony of the Gospels. If we take into account and consider the individual details of the life and work of Jesus, as reported by the various evangelists, we receive enough light on the days of Jesus on earth. But, to hold to the example just introduced, it is folly to conclude from the circumstance that we cannot show the pragmatic connection of the individual incidents of the story of Easter morning, precisely because the Scriptures have not preserved all the individual details for us, that this or that information must be based on error. It really does not require much understanding to understand immediately on reading and examining the four Gospel accounts of the resurrection that one thing reported by one evangelist could very easily have happened without prejudice to another thing reported by the other. Moreover, we see from this diversity of the Gospel accounts that the holy evangelists, in composing their writings, were truly not guided by prudent calculation and calculation of the impression the readers would receive from their Gospels. Otherwise they would have harmonized more. The following would then have followed more closely and more anxiously the writing of his predecessor. No, a higher hand has here ordered and fashioned all things. The Spirit of God has here, according to his own free will, controlled and regulated, as it were, quite carelessly and impartially, without fearing that the future criticism of his holy work might do some harm to his authority.

That the Scriptures are in the proper sense God's Word, this faith of ours is not, after all, impaired either

6. by the different readings of the Hebrew and Greek texts.

This instance is asserted, for example, by Professor Mühlau of Dorpat in his lecture, "Do We Possess the Original Text of Holy Scripture?" against the conventional opinion of the "laity. That in numerous places different readings have been handed down to us in the various ancient documents, and that in many cases we cannot determine which was the original reading, is, of course, an undeniable fact. This fact, however, proves nothing against the divine origin of the Scriptures, but only that the Scriptures, after they were finished, were subject to the human weakness of the copyists. The inspiration had no relation to the later work of the copyists. They could easily, by mistake or on purpose (for example, in the good opinion of improving a supposed error), change individual words or syllables in their laborious work. Nevertheless, it is a miracle of divine providence that no more has been changed in the text. None of the divergent readings alters the original meaning of the passage in question. For the most part it is only a difference in the form of speech, in the order of words, and the like. And if now and then we are uncertain whether a short interjection is later omitted or added, yet by such addition or omission the actual opinion which the Holy Spirit wished to make known to us in the passage in question is not modified in the least. None of today's critics will dare to claim that any of the holy thoughts of God which God's Spirit has put down in Scripture have been lost to us in this way. Thus, on the contrary, the preservation of the text of the Bible through the ages of the world bears witness to the way in which the Lord God has watched over the Word that has gone forth from His mouth. And the fact that we are now and then no longer able to give an exact reading of the original text is of as little consequence to our knowledge and faith as the fact that we no longer understand some obscure passages of Scripture. The weakness of those who write, read, and contemplate the Scriptures does not detract from the value and content of the Word itself.

Finally, one more question. Why did the Holy Spirit not completely eliminate or avoid these difficulties? He could easily have spoken so smoothly and evenly everywhere that all appearance of error or contradiction would have been excluded. We do not want to fathom the hidden wisdom of the Spirit, and we do not want to be right with God. Only this one thing may be remarked. It is also written, "He exalteth the wise in their prudence." And, "With the perverse thou art perverse." The simple are not offended at such seeming offences. The perverse...

The fullness of the divine light that flows to them from the Word is lost to them. But those who willfully shut their eyes to the bright sun of heaven will find the word of God a stumbling block, a snare of destruction, according to God's righteous judgment. God keep us by grace in the simplicity of faith!

(Conclusion follows.)

From the minutes of the Rhenish Pastoral Conference of February 23 and 24, 1886.

The subject of this discussion was the doctrine of conversion, in particular the question of the "*primi motus inevitabiles*," which the so-called prevenient grace works in the still unconverted man, that is, before the entrance into the spiritual life.

First of all, in order to understand the remarks of our old dogmatists on this point, we must keep in mind the difference which is found in their use of the expression "*gratia praeveniens*". Chemnitz and others understand by the term "preceding grace" not only the grace which precedes conversion, but also the grace which brings about the latter; that is, all that which Quenstedt and others designate by the expression, "*gratia assistens*." *Gratia, praeveniens*," Chemnitz calls the converting grace, because it precedes the will of the one to be converted, cf. Baier III, cap. A much narrower sense is connected with that word by Quenstedt; he designates by it the first "stage" of *gratia assistens*, the first beginning of the work of grace of the Holy Spirit on man, aiming at conversion, but not yet actually bringing it about. Quenstedt says: "The grace of God is twofold: one is *gratia assistens*, which acts on man from without; the other is *gratia inhabitans*, which penetrates into the heart of man himself and inhabits it by transforming it spiritually. The reason of the distinction of *gratia* into *gratia assistens* and *gratia inhabitans* is that common saying that certain acts are done by the Holy Spirit, but not with the Holy Spirit; but some are done by and with the Holy Spirit. The *gratia assistens* has various degrees, the first of which is the *gratia incipiens* or *praeveniens*. The second stage is the *gratia praeparans*, which is called by some the *gratia subsequeris* is called, the third kind is the *gratia excitans*. 1)

1) It cannot be denied that there is something confusing about this division of so-called antecedent grace, in that it is difficult to distinguish between the individual parts, and it is very easy to call something the effect of "antecedent" grace which only occurs through conversion itself. Chemnitz's terminology is decidedly preferable.

(Doctrine and Weir.)

The fourth degree is the *gratia operans*." (Baier-Walther III, p. 221.) It is the latter which, according to Quenstedt, effects conversion in the proper sense. The three first stages of Quenstedt's *gratia assistens* together are what is commonly understood today - in contrast to Chemnitz's as well as Quenstedt's use of language - by the "preceding" or "preparatory" grace. By this we now also understand that work of the Holy Spirit on man which precedes conversion in the narrowest and most actual sense, the transfer from the state of wrath to the state of grace.

What, then, are the effects of grace - thus understood - which precedes?

We say: It is God's intention to bring about the conversion of man by means of this. It is the fault of human reluctance that this intention is not achieved. The scribes (Matth. 2, 4. ff.) were completely unconcerned about what they read about the birth of Christ in Micah. Others, like Herod (Matt. 2:7 ff.), only become more fierce in their enmity against Christ and his kingdom, so that it progresses to open persecution; with others, the work of grace brings them to a dull consciousness, for instance, of the truth of the word preached, of the misery in which the hearer finds himself, of the beauty and sublimity of the divine word, but without the enmity against God and his word, the spiritual death, being thereby abolished. It remains a mere, soon passing emotion, an excitement of feeling, in which neither mind nor will already experiences any change or renewal. It is precisely these **impressions of feeling**, produced by grace even in the still unconverted man, that the ancients call "*primi motus inevitabiles*." Let us now go into the meaning of this expression in more detail.

It is, as is well known, Calvinistic heresy that God converts only the elect, and that by an irresistible grace, by producing movements of the heart, which man cannot resist-"*per motum irresistibilem*" (Quenstedt in Baier-Walther III, p. 233. Antithesis). Thus it is said in the Dordrecht Resolutions: "To the work of regeneration itself man behaves perfectly passively" ("so far as is right," adds Quenstedt, from whom we cite after Baier-Walther III, p. 233, we also add), "and it is not in the will of human power to hinder God by directly incarnating in this way." In contrast to this, our dogmatists emphasize the fact that man has the sad capacity to resist grace. The assertion of the absolute irresistibility of grace they - and we with them - decisively reject. On the other hand, they concede that grace is also present in the mind of the not-yet-begotten man.

The fact that the word "*motus inevitabiles*" (motives of the inevitable, sed non irresistibiks) is *not only* a motive for people who have returned, but also a motive for people who have yet to be converted, creates impressions which people cannot avoid, but which they can make unsuccessful through their resistance and immediately shake off again. Quenstedt

says: "The first motions (*motus primi*) produced by the preceding grace are indeed inevitabiles, i.e. the unregenerate man, hearing the word of God, cannot prevent a spiritual motion 1) from arising in his heart, namely, a thought about sin committed, about the necessity of fleeing from vice, etc.; nevertheless, they are not irresistible, for he can prevent those motions from taking root and becoming permanent (*perdurent*) in the heart; he can stifle them, drive them out, etc.; he can prevent them from becoming permanent in the heart, Nevertheless they are not irresistible, for he can prevent those movements from taking root and becoming permanent (*perdurent*) in the heart; he can stifle them, drive them out, etc., as the example of the Jews shows, Luc. 4, 22." (Who marvelled at the blessed words that proceeded out of his mouth, and said: Is not this David's son? and yet after v. 28. for his preaching they were all filled with wrath, and thrust him out of the city to cast him down from the rock), "of Felix, Apost. 24, 25." (who was quite glad to hear Paul preach; but when he spake of righteousness, and chastity, and judgment to come, he was afraid, and answered, Go to this time, etc.), "of Agrippa, Apost. 26, 28." (who, struck by Paul's words, says, "It lacketh not much, thou persuadest me that I should become a Christian.").

Far be it from us to suppose, therefore, that, because these movements, which the so-called preceding grace produces in the heart of man, are "inevitable," the conversion which is to be effected by these movements would come about in an irresistible manner; on the contrary, every time such movements arise in his heart, man can oppose them with such resistance of will that conversion never comes about in him. And even when conversion does finally take place, what a long labor of grace often precedes it! How God must knock on the heart again and again with the hammer of the Word before he succeeds in opening it and bringing about the blessed work of conversion! How much work it costs the Holy Spirit to remove the obstacles that stand in the way of the reception of the Word! Therefore it cannot be called wrong when our dogmatists—who call conversion itself (the word in its narrowest and most proper sense, as a transfer from the state of wrath to the state of grace) wrought "in the twinkling of an eye," in momento, as an instantaneous effect of the *gratia operans*—precede conversion, thus understood, by a "preceding" grace. Only, for instance, the misunderstanding is to be warded off, as if the so-called ante-

1) How far these movements can be called "spiritual", although man himself is not yet "spiritual", but still entirely carnal, will be discussed later.

grace in progress would not also be from the outset an earnest, vigorous grace, desirous of effecting conversion itself.

From the circumstance that there is an antecedent grace in the sense described, the synergists, first of all those of Latermann's school, whose comrades in spirit are at the same time almost all of the newer theologians, for their part conclude, as is well known, the proposition that *liberum arbitrium* is restored in man through the effect of the antecedent grace, so that man can now convert himself, contribute to his conversion, or choose between conversion and non-conversion, "decide" himself for conversion, "by virtue of the powers bestowed by antecedent grace". They acknowledge that man may well behave purely passively, mere passively, in the case of those first impressions of *gratia praeveniens*, the so-called '*primi motus*,' which they, too, therefore have no hesitation in calling inevitable, but not in the case of the following ones. They thus evidently conceive those "*primi motus inevitabiles*" as the first germ of a new spiritual life already stirring (with the aid of which man himself "completes" his conversion), while they nevertheless think of man in this state as still unconverted. But this is a false doctrine no less horrible than that of the Calvinists. But we do not want to consider here all the individual sides of this error, e. g. We do not want to go into the contradiction that lies in such assertions (in that they ascribe to man spiritual powers of life, the "germ" of a new spiritual life, and yet call him still unconverted, lying in spiritual death), nor do we want to go into the inconsistency that through the "germ of life" given by the Holy Spirit they place man only in a neutral, indifferent position, in a relationship that is between good and evil, between the spiritual and the spiritual, and evil, between God and the devil, and by virtue of it let him take up a position where, in spite of the "spiritual powers" he has received, he is still undecided, still has to choose between the one and the other-as if the Holy Spirit, whose effect such "powers" are, himself took up a neutral, indifferent position between good and evil, between the devil and God! - We remark only this much in passing, that this so-called fine synergism once advocated by Latermann is essentially nothing different and nothing better than that coarse Pelagianism of the older synergists, only veiled with a cover of orthodox-sounding phrases, the same synergism which a Victorin Strigel and others once defended, only with an open visor and with clearer pronunciation. For even if, according to this, man is to convert only by virtue of certain spiritual powers given to him, yet they expressly attribute the use of these powers, their use for the purpose of conversion, to the not yet converted, na-

natural, spiritually dead human being. The conversion, therefore, appears here no less than with Strigel and his associates, in reality, as an effect of one's own natural powers, as the result of a spontaneous decision of the will of the natural man. - What chiefly interests us here is the erroneous idea which the aforesaid cherish of the "primi motus inevitabiles," inasmuch as they call them the first stirring germs of a new spiritual life in the heart of the (yet still unconverted) man. We emphatically deny this.

The knocking of the "leading" grace, so long as it is such, does not yet make man spiritually alive, but acts upon him from without (though from the outset with the intention of bringing about the awakening from spiritual death, the conversion); it has the spiritually dead man for its object; the movements which it produces are blows to the heart, destined to break, to shatter the hard, stony heart, but they are not movements of the heart (gen. subj.), not movements of a heart already awakened to spiritual life, consenting to it, cooperating in its production, in short, not spontaneous expressions of existing life; they are effects of the *gratia assistens*, but not of the *gratia inhabitans*. They are "spiritual movements," indeed, because they are produced by the Holy Spirit, but they are not the stirrings of a new spiritual life; rather, they are movements like those which are perceived in a corpse when it is set in motion by a foreign power, in the production of which the corpse itself has not the least share. Of course, man is not a block or a stone, so that, as is the case with a corpse, he does not himself feel these impressions, which the preceding grace produces in his heart, and has no consciousness of them - no, these movements really take place in his interior, in his mind, in his soul, and he knows that he receives the impressions in question; but his will has no part in them; they are not his own; he does not give them his consent. On the contrary, while his emotional life - be it through the consciousness of his sinful end in consequence of the preaching of the law, the truth of which his conscience testifies to him, be it through the conception of the power, beauty, truth, and sublimity of the divine word and of the thoughts of God revealed therein, yes, be it also through the conception of the devoted love of the Saviour - as it is, for instance, when he listens to a passage of the Bible, his will has no part in it; it is not his own property; he does not give it his consent, as it arises in him, for instance, when he hears a sermon on the Passion - is perhaps most vividly affected, so that he may even shed tears of emotion, it may nevertheless happen that at the same moment his mind, in hopeful darkness, scoffs at the "fable" which seems incredible to him, and his will rebels all the more hostilely.

Against the gracious God, who for a moment has come so near to him, that he is ashamed of the softer emotion and is angry about it, and even consciously resolves to keep his heart better for the future, i.e. to harden it still more, and really carries out this resolution. Thus it may come to pass that just such a man, who is seized with what is called forward grace, is filled with more and more vehement wrath against God's word, and at last grits his teeth like the Jews in the face of Stephen's sermon, Acts 7:54. In the same way, the pleasure that such a man as Herod takes in John's sermon, in the word of God, is at bottom only a carnal pleasure, such as man takes in worldly stories and lectures, especially when they are presented in a captivating form that appeals to the emotions. This apparent pleasure, how often it turns immediately into aversion and evident hatred, as soon as man is touched by the word of God in a particularly sensitive place, as Felix was touched by his avarice and unchastity. In view of all this, one has reason to be cautious in judging such movements caused by the word of God, lest one see in them signs of a conversion that has already taken place. Those emotions which are so often seen, for instance, at the beautiful edifying end of a Christian, in the bystanders, or in the hearers during the sermon; Those tears which a vivid description of sin and its consequences, awakening the conscience, may at times bring to a man's eyes, are, as I have said, only too often mere emotions, but not symptoms of a change of mind and will which has occurred or is occurring, and in which alone the true conversion consists. It is true that, through repeated work of the "leading" grace, the conscience is finally plunged into terror and anguish, and a state of contrition is produced in the soul, so that the sinner feels most vividly the whole misery in which he finds himself, and becomes conscious of it really and in a lasting way - yet even this emotion, this contrition, is only a worldly sadness, a state of servitude to the law and of servile fear, a sadness which, as long as faith is not added, is only a worldly sadness, a state of servitude to the law and of servile fear, A sadness, which, as long as faith is not added, as such only gives birth to death, drives the sinner, like Cain, in despair only more away from God, but not that divine sadness of which the apostle writes, in which, beside the fear for sin and in spite of it, through the effect of the gospel, faith - though for the time being only in the form of a sincere longing for Him who came to seek and to make blessed that which is lost - already quietly but powerfully stirs. "To such an office of the law"-so it is said in the Schmalk. Articles (M. p. 312, 4. ff.) - "the New Testament quickly adds the comforting promise of grace, through the Gospel.

Gospel... And before him John is called a preacher of repentance, but for the remission of sins, that is, he shall punish them all.... ... that they might know themselves to be lost, and so be ready to receive grace from the Lord, and to wait for and receive forgiveness of sins from him. . . But where the law alone does its work without the help of the gospel, there is **death** and **hell**. Only then, when, besides that repentance of sin, that first little spark of true living faith is present, is conversion (stricte sic dicta) really come to pass. Accordingly, if conversion is to come to a man, a state may, nay, or rather must, as an effect of the "preceding" grace, finally come about in which the man, as that Christian scholar, Marc. 12:34, says, is "not far from" the kingdom of God. But therefore in this state he has not yet spiritual powers, the germ of a new life. Far from this not being far from the kingdom of God involving a real positive ability to decide for God's kingdom, the possession of spiritual powers by virtue of which man could now convert himself, in a word a greater disposition to the kingdom of God than other unconverted men have, the same is in reality nothing but a state in which certain external hindrances to conversion are removed, without the removal of which man - not only cannot convert himself, no, also - cannot be converted by the Holy Spirit. The effect of grace "leading on" is not the impartation of a positive ability to supposed self-conversion, but negatively the removal of outward hindrances which stand in the way of the transfer from death to life, from the state of wrath to the state of grace, of carnal security, of pride, of one's own righteousness, and so on. Preliminary grace seeks to place man in a state where it is not man, but the Holy Spirit, if the expression may be used, who can accomplish conversion.

Let us summarize the result of our discussion: The "primi motus inevitabiles" are impressions and effects of the preceding grace on the heart of the still unconverted man, caused by the Word, Law, and Gospel; as such, therefore, they are not stirrings of an already beginning spiritual life, not signs of a transformation of the mind and will which has already occurred or is occurring, but mostly excitations of feeling, which, however, in the further course of this work of the Holy Spirit, through the effect of the ministry of the law, may progress to real, though for the time being only worldly, sadness and a kind of contrition of heart; Sensations and feelings produced by the Holy Ghost with the intention of

To prepare man for that supreme good, the transfer from the state of wrath to the state of grace, for the reception of salvation in Christ.

In the course of the debate on this subject, the Pietist error was also touched upon, according to which a false distinction is made between revival and conversion, in that the initial state of a true believer may well be regarded as revival, but not as true conversion, and conversion is rather understood to be that which is already an advanced stage of sanctification. According to the biblical view, however, both terms are identical; that state of weak faith presupposes a real conversion, since the latter itself is nothing else than a revival, namely, from spiritual death, Eph. 5:14. If a distinction is to be made between revival and conversion, without violating the analogy of faith, revival may be called that state of the unconverted, but under the effect of "prefatory" grace, when he, struck in his conscience by the ministry of the law, and startled out of his security, begins to be uneasy, to feel terror and fear over his sin. - The biblical expression of Christ taking form in man (Gal. 4:19) is sometimes abused in the same way as the word revival, in that it is too easily applied only to converts who have already attained a certain spiritual maturity, have outgrown infancy, and have already advanced to manhood in Christ (Eph. 4:11 ff.). We acknowledge, however, that there are different stages in the spiritual life of the convert, different degrees of sanctification, states of weaker and stronger faith-there are "weak in faith" (Rom. 14:1), "young children in Christ" (1 Cor. 3:1), and stronger, tried men in Christ.) and stronger, tried ones (*Mxtpot* 1 Cor. 11, 19.), "righteous," which latter "by habit have exercised senses to discern good and evil" (Ebr. 5, 14.) - must, however, beware of the idea as if that saying of the apostle Gal. 4, 19. applied only to the latter. No, as this very passage shows, it is the new birth, the conversion, with which at once Christ also "takes form" in man, regardless of the fact that faith is still weak. What, indeed, does the expression signify otherwise than the addition and appropriation of Christ's merit, which takes place in justification by faith (the bestowal of the nuptial garment in which the sinner stands before God), the next consequence of which-not in temporal but in causal relation-is the *unio mystica*, in which latter we likewise, whether weak or strong, immediately have the whole of Christ dwelling in us? C. Hempling.

Miscellany.

Distribution of the Holy Scriptures. On September 20, the 1000th edition of the Bible was completed at the v. Canstein'schen Bibelanstalt in Halle. In 1785 the first edition of 8000 copies appeared, in 1788 the second of 12,000 copies. Since then, ten editions have been published every year on average. Printing has been done for many years according to stereotypes, after several attempts at format and type had led to the adoption of the octavo format in petit type. By 1844, three million Bibles and more than one million New Testaments had been produced by the institution. How large the total number of copies of all thousand editions is, we do not find any indication. But we may safely assume that the Institute distributed at least as many Bibles after 1844 as before that year. And these are only Bibles distributed by a German Bible Institute. Other Bible societies exist in Berlin, Hamburg, Dresden, Nuremberg, Stuttgart, Frankfurt, Bremen, Lübeck, Hanover, and other places. - Even more splendid than the effectiveness of these German Bible societies is that of the British and Foreign Bible Society in London, which was founded in 1804 and set itself the task of spreading the Bible not only in the British Empire, but in all countries, whether Christian, Mohammedan or heathen. Since then similar associations have been meeting everywhere, notably in Russia, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland, Holland, and France. The effectiveness of the Russian Bible Society, which was founded in 1809 and had the Bible translated into seventeen new languages in a short time, was extremely significant. It distributed nearly a million Bibles in 45 languages, but was abolished by an imperial ukase of 1826. The English Bible Society had a rival in the American Bible Society, founded in New York in 1817, which by 1860 had more than 1200 societies and an annual income of \$400,000. It distributes annually about 250,000 Bibles, and nearly twice as many Psalters and New Testaments. - From these figures it is self-evident that the Bible, the Book of Books, is the most widely circulated book in the world. After it, Thomas a Kempis' *The Imitation of Christ* is the most widely distributed. The third place is said to be occupied by Goethe's novel *Werther's Sorrows*.

Literature.

Gustav Seyffarth. A biographical sketch by Karl Knortz. New York. E. Steiger & Co. 1886. 8°. 122 cts. 50 cts.

This book is in more than one respect to be recommended to the readers as an interesting and instructive reading. It gives an insight into the memorable life story of an extraordinary man, who from his youth until his death at an advanced age held fast to the holy scriptures as the word of God and publicly confessed the same, acquired with astonishing diligence a scholarship encompassing almost all branches of knowledge, with a strength of mind that does not shy away from any difficulty to enter the dark territory of ancient Egyptian scholarship, which does not shrink from any difficulty, went into the dark area of ancient Egyptian learning, with unspeakable effort and by ingenious combinations of philological, astronomical and historical knowledge forced the hitherto in their enigmatic language completely misunderstood monuments of Egyptian prehistory a communication of their mysterious tradition to the present time, laid down to his successors firm rules for the reading of the immense amount of hieroglyphs preserved unmutated until the present time, which in the course of the millennia underwent manifold changes, who for a short time was highly celebrated abroad during his researches in the museums of Europe, returned to his fatherland and, appearing as a witness for the truth of holy scripture, was ridiculed by his German scholarly colleagues, Finally, feeling the intolerability of his situation, he sought a refuge in America, and here, only rarely appearing in public, but restlessly working for the Kingdom of God, although tormented by the painful thought of having worked in vain, he nevertheless closed his earthly career contentedly in God.

The present book contains a brief outline of his life, and then excerpts from his letters to his parents from Munich, Verona, Milan, Turin, Rome, Livorno, Florence, Paris, London and Rotterdam, which contain information about his research, but also occasional interesting views of the environment that touched him. Then follows a compilation of what this scholar himself regarded as the results of his scientific activity, distributed among biblical, Egyptian, Roman, Greek, Persian, and Babylonian history and chronology, philology and paleography, general religious history and mythology, and astronomy and the astronomical monuments of the ancients. The most interesting thing in the appendix appended to these Mittheilungen is, first, an essay by Professor Dr. Heinrich Wuttke, most vaunted by his learned researches, printed in "Europa, Chronik der gebildeten Welt," November, 1856; and, secondly, a criticism, written by an unnamed scholar, from the "Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung," May 20, 1843: "Seyffarth und de Bribre." These articles lead the reader in such a clear, comprehensible and thorough manner into the understanding of the work which has set itself the decipherment of the hieroglyphics as its goal, that they recommend themselves to the attention of all who are not indifferent to to gain a more exact insight into the audacity and impudence of those German scholars who use the means taken from the church to discredit the word of God with their poetry in the field of ancient history among the scholarly and unscholarly admirers of "science" who are known to be very gullible in this respect. -However, these articles are worth reading in another respect. They are a protest by honorable German men against the kind of treatment the immortalized man had to endure, and let the reader see the entire wretchedness of those so-called men of science who, when it is necessary to destroy faith in the Scriptures, will give up some, especially foreign, "scientific greatness. They all have to run after it, like children, as soon as such a Hamelin rat-catcher blows his whistle, at which tone their enchanted eyes see all supposed vermin creeping out of the darkness of Scripture and eliminated. It is undeniable that the sincere and noble researcher, who was ridiculed by his opponents, and who was completely taken in by his sometimes ingenious thoughts, seemed at times to have no eye for the uncertainty of their foundations, but this does not excuse the contempt which came from opponents who, as is well known, owe their own fame mainly to this very weakness. The work concludes with a chronological list of Seyffarth's numerous writings and treatises. An adornment of the book is the enclosed speaking-like and finely executed bust of the immortalized. R. L.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

And that is still supposed to be Lutheran? Under this heading Fr. C. Dreyer writes in the "Luth. Volksblatt" from Canada on October 15: "Three candidates, who in the doctrine of election by grace held the same position as the Norwegian Prof. Schmidt, who had fallen away, asked Fr. Harstad, the President of the Minnesota District of the Norwegian Synod, for ordination some time ago. But he could not grant it to them. For Father Harstad had demanded their consent to the following statement: "We reject as false the assertion that man is the deciding factor 1) whether he is converted and saved, and also that man's works are a cause of his conversion and salvation." Now, while every good Lutheran Christian, from the oldest old man to the youngest confirmand, gladly confesses this proposition, the Schmidtian candidates could not bring themselves to accept it. They teach, then, to begin with the last part of that proposition which they do not recognize, that man's works are a cause of his conversion and blessedness, so also (since being converted and having faith are fundamentally the same thing) that our works are a cause of our coming to faith. But how can even an unlearned Lutheran Bible Christian entertain such a thought for a moment? For, "Whatsoever cometh not by faith is sin." Everything that a man does or omits to do before he is converted, or, what is the same, before he has faith, - these are sinful, evil works, and these sinful, evil works, or such a sinful, evil work, ought therefore to be "a cause of true conversion and blessedness"! - We do not wish to dwell any longer on this ill-concealed, quite Papist doctrine of works righteousness, which already proves from the foregoing to be unscriptural and therefore also un-Lutheran. It would be impossible at this point to cite the many passages from our confessional writings where, on the basis of the divine Word, it is denied that anything in and about us, our good conduct, our thoughts, speeches, or now even our "works," are or could be a cause of our conversion and blessedness. For us Bible Christians, Eph. 2:8, 9 is sufficient when it says: "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God, not of works, lest any man should boast." But it was especially the first part of the above-mentioned sentence, submitted to them by the Presidium for approval, which they wanted to have "deleted." So they hold (and in this they and the Ohio Synod, and in general the "opponents" of Missouri, still want to be Lutheran), - so they hold that man "decides" (actually: that man settles) "whether he shall be converted and saved." - How they thereby get along with the Lutheran interpretation of Scripture, Lutheran catechism, and Lutheran confessional writings, is scarcely conceivable. Of the sunny interpretation of the 3rd Article we will not speak further here. As far as the Confessions are concerned, we will only briefly refer to one passage. Supposing a man were to give the decisive factor in his conversion, this would be - everyone will admit this! - something "good and wholesome in divine matters." But our Confession says: "Therefore it cannot be rightly said" (i.e., it is wrong to say) "that man, before his conversion, has a *modum agendi*, or a way, namely, something

1) that the man settles it, Norwegian „at Mannesket afgjør".

I have no way of working anything good and wholesome in divine things. (Müller, Symb. Bücher 603, 61.) According to our confession, therefore, there is absolutely no way for man to work anything good and salvific in divine things, - whether in the way of doing "works" (cf. the second part of the above sentence), or in the way of refraining from doing them, - consequently, there is also absolutely no way for man to "determine" whether he will be converted and saved. - And where could this be? - Not to mention other passages, where could this be more clearly stated than in Phil. 2:13, where it says: "It is God that worketh in you both to will and to do, according to his good pleasure?" Accordingly we also confess in our hymnal, which has now appeared unchanged for years, in the second verse of hymn No. 373:

"Thou, my God, to whom nothing is hid, Knowest
that I have nothing of myself, And of all my
sorrows, - All, O Lord, is thy gift; All that I am in
me, That there is good, I have from thee, Even
faith to me and to all thou givest according to good
pleasure."

Our Lutheran Church sings of all such grossly un-Lutheran character, as is once again so openly shown in those candidates, where God is so blatantly robbed of the honor of being the beginner and perfecter of our faith:

"They teach vain false cunning, What their own wit invents, Their heart is not
of one mind Founded in God's word."

It is generally known that the "opponents" have different views among themselves in their un-Lutheran doctrines. It is true that they "shine beautifully from without. But we pray with the first verse of a hymn from the time of the Thirty Years' War, when papist error also stood in opposition to evangelical truth:

"Save, O Lord JEsu, save thy honor, The groaning of thy church hear, The foe's
plot and power destroy, Who now thy doctrine pursue." -

We can only thank God that our opponents are so rude in the thoughts of their hearts. For this saves many honest and simple-minded Christians from being seduced by those pseudo-Lutherans who have completely fallen away from the Gospel. W.

An example of the berserker rage with which our opponents, who want to be Lutheran, fought against us, is given by the "Volksblatt" with the following words: In the "Watching Church" of September 15, one man, named Hennicke, who calls himself pastor of the Buffalo Synod, blows his evil-sounding war trumpet and speaks of the "sectarian Missouri Synod," of "Missourian glory," of "Missourian poison," of "Missourian triumphalism," and crowns it all by the assertion: "the three characteristics of a true Missourian are: Disputing, boasting, lying." Such blasphemies, of course, do as little harm to our Missouri Synod as the simple praise of the Buffalo Synod, with which this whole tirade closes, will do it any good. We communicate this to our readers only to show: 1) that our Missouri Synod is still the one about which all weathers go and all loose mouths run; and 2) how just those who continually boast of their love of peace are able to accomplish truly incredible things in selected blasphemies and suspicions.

The essay by Fr. Jox in the September issue of this magazine (on the question: "How can we servants of the Church have and keep a serene heart and a good conscience even in these times?") appeared in Swedish translation in "Augustana och Missionären" of October 20. It is introduced with the following remark by Dr. Hasselquist: "This question" (namely, that of the subject of the aforementioned essay) "has often moved us, and we have often felt the hot desire to be able to awaken and cheer in suitable words those who are at the service of the Word. There is danger that we do not all understand the nature of the present time and what it holds within its bosom. We have found in a German magazine, "Lehre und Wehre," a serious... We have found a serious answer to the above question in a German magazine, "Lehre und Wehre," and want to reproduce it here for the benefit not only of pastors, but also just as much for the congregations and individual believers, whose spiritual and eternal welfare is in danger, and who should therefore consider what the work of faithful preachers means, so that they do not put obstacles in their way, but rather support them with all their strength, and thus not only make their work easier, but also contribute to the blessed progress of the same." C. D.

The annual meeting of the General Council was held this year in Chicago, October 21-27. We report according to the information in "Herold und Zeitschrift". Dr. A. Späth of Philadelphia was again elected President. A principal subject of the proceedings was again the agendized bills. "The Order of Confirmation" and "the Order of Confession and Absolution" were discussed and adopted. From the report of the Committee for Heathen Mission we communicate the following: The expenses of the past year amounted to \$9,339. For the coming year the Committee asks for \$14,000 to carry on the work properly and to pay off a debt of P1M0. In the service of the Mission are 5 missionaries, 2 native ordained ministers, 7 "non-ordained evangelists," 56 teachers. The number of students is 381, of those baptized in 1885 311, of all confirmed Christians 1901, of those communicated in the year 734. - According to the report of the committee for "English native mission", "English churches and missions were supported in Chicago, Toledo, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Red Wing, Fargo, Bismarck, Decatur and at other points". For the "German native mission" \$5,927 was expended last year. The committee for this mission is requested to omit from its report everything that does not relate directly to its effectiveness; it should also "submit a clear report on the relationship of the Council to the institution in Kropp before the end of this meeting. The report presented on the last day about this relationship and "the bonds received because of it" is returned to the committee as "unsatisfactory, to be completed and submitted next year". The Swedish Augustana Synod apparently developed a great deal of missionary activity. This has "hundreds of mission stations," especially in the Western States and Territories, and expended \$5,000 for this purpose last year. The delegates of the Michigan Synod declared "that their Synod is not yet satisfied with the answer of the Council last year to their protest against preaching in other than Lutheran pulpits." "The Concil, however, is not prepared to give any further explanation." The relationship of the Iowa Synod to the Council also came up in two sessions. We had expected a principal controversy. The Lutheran recently wrote that the Council as such has never declared that membership in secret societies is incompatible with membership in the church; nor is it a "law" of the Council to deny church fellowship to all except those who are formally connected with the Lutheran Church. But it seems, according to the Be-

The "Journal" did not come to a principled discussion of the matter. It was finally "decided that we know of no reason why the Iowa Synod should not for the present be permitted to continue in its present relation, as we entertain certain hopes that in the not too distant future the Iowa Synod will enter into organic connection with this body, without disturbing the peace and unity within its limits." Dr. Späth was seconded as a delegate to the next meeting of the Iowa Synod to present to that Synod the resolution of the Council. The Journal still reports, "A full mutual debate took place, and to the great joy of the Council, it appeared that the body could come to a decision almost unanimously. Individual members preserved their position for their part against the strict view which the Iowa Synod put into the declarations of the Council, and the same (?) were quietly accepted." These words are understood in connection with the declarations in the "Lutheran."

The party in the Council, which is represented by the writer in the "Lutheran," has declared in Chicago that it intends to continue to follow an Unirte practice. Has "the Council as such" sanctioned and repudiated these declarations? If not, however, there would be serious question as to whether the Council was "officially" Lutheran. Incidentally, from the more detailed report in the "Lutheran" we see that in discussing the "Order of Confession and Absolution" such men as Dr. Schmucker, Dr. Späth, P. Hinterleitner, P. Norelius, Dr. Jacobs, and others aptly asserted the genuine Lutheran doctrine of private confession against Dr. Fry's objection. F. P.

Who is right? The "Lutherische Kirchenblatt", published within the General Council, had written under the headline "Wo die Unirten ihre deutschen Pastoren herbekommen" ("Where the Protestants get their German pastors"), among other things, the following: "In Wuerttemberg, a Pastor Kauffmann is especially active for the 'Protestants'. Last year he sent five young men. He has also written a very interesting (!) booklet for the good of the 'Evangelicals', which was sent to us these days by Dr. Späth. It is an address book of the congregations and pastors of the German Protestant Synod of North America. Edited by F. Kauffmann, pastor in Zaberfeld, Kingdom of Wuerttemberg. Stuttgart 1886.' Here all the unirten pastors appear. So under the 'Winks for Emigrants' he beckons to the Lutheran Wuertembergers: 'Another point to be considered in the question of where to settle is the ecclesiastical conditions. This is a very important point. It has mainly prompted this writing. There are areas in the Western States where there is no church at all, neither an English nor a German one. It is not advisable to settle in such a place. There are regions where there are English churches, but no German ones. Even these are not to be recommended for settlement, because an English church is of no use to a German who does not understand English, and even if he learns English, he will never feel at home in an English church. But even in a German church, which does not correspond to his native church, in which he was baptized, educated and confirmed (here this Swabian means the Lutheran!), he cannot feel at home. Therefore, this address booklet has been prepared for Protestant Christians, especially those of Württemberg, Baden, and Prussia, who wish to emigrate. This German Protestant Synod of North America corresponds most closely to the Protestant Regional Church of Württemberg, Baden and Prussia.' You Württemberger, aren't you amazed, who brought the Lutheran confession with you from Württemberg and have remained faithful to the Lutheran church here, and feel at home in it, that a Württemberger pastor can thus 'wave' and advise outside.... So what kind of guide should this be for German Lutheran emigrants, which even

knows nothing of Lutheran congregations and pastors in America?" The "Theologische Zeitschrift" of the local Unirte, which cites the foregoing, has the following to say about it: "If now the author of the article thinks that our" (Unirte) "Synod corresponds so little to the Württemberg Landeskirche that one must even put in brackets with an exclamation mark: If this Swabian means the Lutheran Synod here, he is at any rate making the claim that the General Council corresponds much more to the Württemberg Regional Church than does our Synod. Probably the writer of the article in question is not a Swabian, for he seems to take some credit" (? L. u. W.) "for the fact that he is not one; but whether he is thereby secured from all error in regard to our Synod, as well as to the Lutheran Church of Wurttemberg, is another question. - First of all, this 'Swabian' is in any case in a position to know both our Synod and the Protestant Church in Württemberg quite precisely, at least more precisely than the writer of the article, who just this time "refers to him with very badly applied mockery" (? L. u. W.). After all, this same 'Swabian' has worked for a number of years at the teaching institutions of our Protestant synod, and as a 'Württemberg' pastor, his own regional church cannot be unknown to him. - Since the writer spent two of his high school years and two of his university years in Württemberg, he may well take the liberty of noting that the Evangelical Synod is similar to the Evangelical Church in Württemberg in many respects. And if, according to the own testimony of the President of the General Council" (? L. u. W.) "even today every Protestant clergyman in Wuerttemberg makes the vow: .If every Protestant clergyman in Wuerttemberg vows today 'not to permit himself any deviation from the Protestant doctrinal concept, as it is especially contained in the Augsburg Confession,' this is quite consistent with the confession of our Synod, which professes the interpretation of Holy Scripture 'as it is laid down in the symbolic books of the Lutheran and Reformed Church, which are mainly the Augsburg Confession, etc.'. - When, however, the writer of the article in question makes the claim, not exactly explicit, but self-evident according to the whole article, that the General Council of the Württemberg Regional Church corresponds completely, he is thereby in contradiction to what the honorable President of the General Council himself declared at the time: There has never been a Lutheran Church here that would have taken the "peculiar" mediating position of the Württemberg Regional Church, that it would have allowed "the Lutheran element in doctrine, the Zwinglian element in worship" to prevail. element" would have prevailed.' - Furthermore, as far as we at least know, the General Council professes *in quali et quanto* the Book of Concord. This, however, is by no means the actual position which is taken in the Württemberg Regional Church. One may only have read or heard what was expressed in his time by Palmer, Beck, and Landerer, the well-known professors of the University of Tübingen. Palmer says: 'Some attempts have been made to proclaim modern confessionalism; for example, Vilmar's Pastoralblätter, various writings by Löhe, and others are printed in Stuttgart. But it is more than doubtful whether this seed will flourish on the ground and soil of the Württemberg Church, which is historically quite different.' With respect to the Reformed who have now merged with the Württemberg Church, it is said: "If a few do not like this state of peace, if they think they must sharpen Lutheranism according to foreign models by polemics against the Reformed, then they are very isolated; they will never be able to alter the spirit of the regional church. Beck says: "That the symbolic books contain the eternal, unchangeable core of the truth of Scripture, all good Christians will be convinced of this, but not that the whole and complete truth of the Scriptures is to be found in them.

Truth in them has received its infallible' (? L. u. W.) 'and unchangeable version'. And in relation to the Lord's Supper he says: 'The Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper has well the expressions, but not the full sense. It exercises well the office of guardian, but not the office of interpretation.' Likewise in the same respect: 'O, how close Luther and Calvin would have been if the light had come from the anthropology of Scripture.' Must this gaping wound now be torn open again? Why not go into the unity that divinely stands there? Least of all must one draw conclusions from mere dogmas. And whoever does not accept it - expelled! Did the Lord drive Nicodemus away? Christ's mind is at stake, and his way or method. So he did not force the people.' Professor Landerer sums up the whole matter succinctly when he says: 'Württemberg has hitherto been only insignificantly touched by this Lutheranism.' The Union in Württemberg has brought about a change only with respect to the few reformed congregations, which now received their teachers from the regional church, but did not have to give up the reformed type with respect to worship. In spite of its Lutheran denomination, the Württemberg State Church has, from the very beginning, taken in Reformed things, and has also peacefully left room for Pietism. In addition to this, the following remark is made: "Of course, there have also been those who wanted to take a more strictly Lutheran standpoint. If, according to a recent declaration, they want nothing more than to rally around the Lutheran confession, then no one will deny them this, as long as they also do not deny others to go their way, and as long as they do not claim to intervene with church measures against the differences in the Lutheran state church, which at least a well-known voice in Luthardt's Lutheran church newspaper seems to have in mind." - Such is the position of the Lutheran Church in Württemberg. If, in such a state, it corresponded to the General Council, the doctrinal basis of it could by no means lie in the Book of Concord in such a way that one would have to accept it from the outset as standing in complete agreement with one and the same "scriptural" faith. But if it is true that the General Council unconditionally accepts the Book of Concord as the basis of doctrine, it cannot be true that it corresponds to the Württemberg Church. But if the second is true, the first cannot be." So far the Unirte "Theologische Zeitschrift." We think the "Lutherische Kirchenblatt" should let the Unirt Synod have the credit of being most like the Württemberg Church, without thereby admitting that the individual Württembergers immigrating here, who often know nothing of the prevailing doctrinal confusion and simple-mindedly hold to the Lutheran catechism, are Unirt.

F. P.

A misleading judgment. "Herold und Zeitschrift" writes in an advertisement of the first volume of Thomasius' Dogmatik, which has appeared in a new edition: "The blessed Thomasius may have presented individual and fundamental points of the Lutheran creed in a somewhat peculiar manner, which does not literally correspond to the confessional version of the dogmas. Lutheran creed in a somewhat peculiar manner that does not literally correspond to the confessional version of the dogmas, such as the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and the state of Christ's exinanition, he had nevertheless not abandoned his standpoint in the right center of Lutheran doctrine, but rather, according to his individual conception, formed the complex of the doctrine in a lively manner from this living center." The reviewer thus presents the matter as if Thomasius had deviated from Lutheran doctrine only in expression, not in substance, in the points mentioned. This, however, is a great error. Thomasius' doctrine of the Incarnation and humiliation clearly comes to the conclusion that Christ in the state of humiliation was only a kind of demigod. He teaches that

The Son of God had already, through the Incarnation and for the purpose of it, completely given up a part of the divine attributes, the so-called "relative" attributes of omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence: Omnipotence, Omniscience, Omnipresence. He writes: "We simply say, then, that the Redeemer was neither omnipotent, nor omniscient, nor omnipresent during his earthly state of life. But this we say of the whole undivided Person of Him, of the incarnate Son of God. Nothing can be farther from us than the idea that, though according to his humanity he had given up those divine attributes, whether their possession or use, according to his divinity he possessed and used them." (Christ's Person and Work. 2nd ed. 1875. II, 240.) The Lutheran Church, in the Concordia Formula (Epit. Art. VIII. Müller p. 550), thus judges Thomasius' and all Cenotics' doctrine: "Accordingly, we reject and condemn as contrary to God's Word and to our simple Christian faith ... (20) where it is taught, and the saying of Matt. 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 restored to him, as if in the state of his low estate he had also, according to the Godhead, relinquished and forsaken it. 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 finally Christ's eternal deity is denied, and thus Christ is lost altogether together with our blessedness, since such false doctrine would not be contradicted on the constant ground of divine word and our simple Christian faith." "Herold und Zeitschrift" should therefore see itself induced to revoke its judgment that Thomasius had only "presented the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and the state of Christ's humiliation in a somewhat peculiar manner, not literally corresponding to the confessional version of the dogmas," in order not to approve and spread fundamentally overthrowing false doctrine. F. P.

Apt words about true union can be found in an article of the "Lutheran Church Review", in which also Goesswein's writing "A Union in Truth" is discussed. The author of the article is Prof. Dr. Schäffer of Philadelphia. Dr. Schäffer says, among other things, "A compromise is often a suitable way of settling disputes between men and men. *Humanum est errare*, and so the wisest thing both parties can do is to acknowledge their errors, give and take, make mutual concessions, and end the dispute by a compromise. But when it is a question of a doctrine of the divine word, there can be no question of a compromise at all. It is given from above, it is absolute, and neither an iota nor a jot can be yielded. Luther was perfectly aware of this. During all the preliminary negotiations for the meeting in Wittenberg (1536) he spoke out decidedly against any union which should demand that the simple meaning of the Word of God be abandoned. True, times have changed since then. Wonderful advances have been made in every branch of human knowledge. But it is just as true now as it was then that 2x2=4 is true; and the principle of the absolute authority of the divine Word is just as firm now as it was when Luther fought for it so zealously. Of course it is necessary to get rid of the doubtfulness of this doubting age, and to admit that it is possible, beyond the perhaps, to ascertain exactly what the teaching of the revealed Word is." F. P.

There are at present 28 students in the **theological seminary of the** Hon. Wisconsin Synod at Milwaukee, a larger number than ever before. F. P.

II. foreign countries.

The Hermannsburg Controversy. We read the following in the "Hannoversche Pastoral-Correspondenz" of October 9: "The Hermannsburg controversy has sharpened the old antagonisms again, and the fights are raging through all the free church papers. Immanuel", which opens its columns to Fr. Ehlers, brings particularly in-depth articles. Opposite him is the 'Kirchlicher Anzeiger für die ev.-luth. Freikirche' and the Kreuzblatt. The Australian Church Messenger (Missourian) *) sides with Hermannsburg. "From this little everyone will be able to see clearly how the congregation of Hermannsburg stands in full right when it resists such teachings contrary to Scripture and confession, and has therefore finally withdrawn from the Hanoverian Free Church." He opposes the Hermannsburgers only in one point, namely, that they "by no means gave up church fellowship with the confessionally faithful members of the Hanoverian Free Church when they broke away from the Synodal Committee. First the Hermannsburgers said that the doctrine of the Hanoverian Free Church concerning the ministry was contrary to the confession, for the sake of which the sheep of Christ had to flee, and then: with the confessionally faithful members of the same the church fellowship was not abolished. At the same time he rebukes that "Immanuel" still holds communion with the national churches and "even with the Hessians.

Landesverein für Innere Mission in Bayern. On September 14, the Conference for Inner Mission met in Nuremberg and carried out the long prepared foundation of a regional association. However, this year's General Assembly of the "Society for Inner Mission in the sense of the Lutheran Church", which was founded by Löhe, expressly declared that none of its members could at the same time become a member of the Landesverein. Among other reasons, also for this reason, "because there is a difference in direction between the two associations, since the Löhe Society, according to § 8 of its statutes, rejects the confederation of denominations in the work of the Inner Mission, which is not excluded in the direction of the Landesverein.

Württemberg. The "Allg. Kz." writes: Of the 173 high school graduates in Wuerttemberg, only 12 intend to study Protestant theology and only 3 Roman Catholic theology. These grammar schools, instead of inspiring their pupils to serve the Church, seem to be arousing reluctance to do so. W.

Religious education after the death of the father. In a decision of November 2 of last year, the Berlin Court of Appeals denied any legal validity to all declarations about the confessional upbringing of children made on the deathbed. The Court of Appeals ruled in such cases "that if the father has otherwise instructed a child in the confession of faith of the mother throughout the last year before his death, the instruction must be continued in the same manner even after his death until the child reaches the age of 14, and that no significance is to be attached to a contrary determination of the father made on the last bed of sickness in relation to the earlier decision proven by continuing facts, since the law wants to protect the children from a sudden change and the religious dangers connected with it. (Allg. Kirchenzeitung, Aug. 20.) The probable reason for this decision is that the Roman priests do not administer the so-called last rites to those fathers who do not declare beforehand that, according to their last will and testament, their children may not continue to be trained and educated in the faith of their Protestant mother, which is often nothing less than a voluntary, but a forced declaration. The reasoning, however, of the Court of Appeal is very miserable. W.

1) The predicate "Missourian" has added the pastorate correspondence.

From the Waldensian Church. According to brief annual statistics published in the Italian *Rivista Cristiana*, the Waldensian Synod has 13,205 members in 18 Waldensian communities (15 in the Valli, 1 in Turin and 2 in South America), 467 new members, 82 Sunday schools with 286 teachers and 3290 pupils, 198 weekly schools with 4986 pupils. Summa of annual contributions 62,186 lire and 65 centesimi (- about P12,000). - The report of the Evangelism Committee of the same Synod reports 44 churches, 36 stations, 126 areas visited (i.e. areas where their missionaries made home visits), 606 new admissions, 55 weekly schools with 1961 pupils, 59 Sunday schools with 170 teachers and 2434 pupils, 18 evening schools with 773 visitors. Total annual contributions 70,325 lire and 2 centesimi (- about P14,000). - It held its meeting this year at Torre Pellice. The main subject of discussion was the union of the Waldensian Church with the *Chiesa libera* of Italy. A 12-point proposal for the unification of the nearby Waldensian and Free Church (cf. *Chiesa libera*) congregations, which concerned only external matters (such as the name and powers of the new body), was adopted by 67 votes to 3. The new church body is to be called for the time being the Waldensian Evangelical Church (*Chiesa Evangelica Valdese*), until it has absorbed the other Protestant congregations, whereupon the name Evangelical Church of Italy (*Chiesa Evangelica d'Italia*) is to take the place of the above designation. "The theological seminary of the Waldensian Church at Florence remains, under the supervision of the Synod, the seminary of the United Church in prospect, while the theological seminary of the *Chiesa libera* at Rome is converted into a school for teachers of evangelists (*maestri evangelisti*), where students with less previous knowledge are accepted, and is under the supervision of the Evangelization Committee, which will take up its seat there." - The Waldensian Synod also has a mission. We read in the report, "In the same week in which the Synod was held, the ordination of the second missionary who is going from Torre Pellice to Africa took place. It is Luigi Jalla. The 'noble' ceremony (of ordination) was presided over by the President of the Paris Missionary Committee, Mr. Bögner, the son-in-law of Senator de Pressense, Ge Appia, the Vice - President of said Committee, assisted." The new missionary is going to the missionary Coillard in Zambese, Africa.

C. D.

Americanization in Italian church circles. In the Italian Protestant congregations, too, there seems to be an Americanization. The "*Rivista Cristiana*" has on the back of its cover an announcement that the Evangelical Reformed Church at Triefth has a vacancy for a preacher, that it has so much income that the preacher must be able to preach in German, Italian and, if necessary, also in French, and concludes with the sentence that is found especially often in marriage announcements: "Reflectors are kindly requested to enclose their photograph."

The Lutheran Church in Poland. On the occasion of the synod of this church held in Warsaw on September 14, as reported in the "*Ev.-Luth. Kirchenblatt*" from Lodz of September 30, a Pastor Buse from Lipno made a motion that church discipline be introduced and administered. He said among other things: "Church discipline is based on divine command, it is a daughter of love, it is every Christm right and duty. The minimum of this is the discipline of the Lord's Supper, which sees to it that public unrepentant sinners are not admitted to Holy Communion, in which the pastor must be supported by the churchwardens, who must therefore faithfully adhere to the Lutheran faith. The prerequisite of communion discipline is personal registration for Holy Communion. In foreign (Lutheran?) congregations it is never allowed to-

Only then would admission be possible if a faithful Lutheran should, in conscience, receive the sacrament from a unit or rationalistic pastor. Only when communion discipline has been introduced can the second and third degrees of admonition (Matth. 18.) also be carried out. Fallen girls are not allowed to put on a wreath for a marriage ceremony." "After a heated debate, the synodal almsmen agreed to the need for church discipline, but demanded that the manner of administering it be left to the conscience of the individual pastor. The registration for Holy Communion was also emphasized again, and it was demanded that it be insisted upon that all must register for Holy Communion and that each one may receive it only in his own congregation." - Many preachers see that this and that should be done according to God's Word, but the dear cross, which immediately arises when one is serious about his obedience to God's Word, frightens them back. W.

Russia. The "Pilgrim from Saxony" of August 29 writes: A fine example of courageous standing up to the tyrannical state power in Russia is related by the N. Wests. Vz. from Livonia: "When an official brother, Spaling in Ermes, refused to answer the interrogations conducted by the secret police, because we have our place of jurisdiction at the Consistorio, our General Superintendent Girgensohn was appointed governor. He made two strict demands: **1, that** the Consistory order us to answer all interrogations of the secret police; the General Superintendent simply refused, since our place of jurisdiction is with the Consistory, and in criminal cases at least one delegate of the Consistory must be present at the hearings. The governor explained that this was not a "court" but a "police force", and that everyone was equally subject to it. Our Gen. Sup. replied that he was not lawyer enough to understand the distinction, as, after all, these were evidently interrogations intended to furnish the material for judicial harassment. But even apart from the fact that for this reason the Consistory must refuse to give us the requested order, according to the general law of the whole world, even according to Russian law, no man is obliged to make statements to his own detriment. Even the murderers of Alexander II. had had full liberty in all interrogations to refuse to answer the questions put to them, without any coercion being allowed to be exercised; with what semblance of right would one even dare to make the request to the Consistory that it should order us pastors and force us to give answers to questions put to them for the purpose of making a case? The Governor was very much incensed at this language. The 2nd demand was that we pastors should remove from the 'church records all Reconverts who have returned to the Lutheran Church since the 60's and return them to the Greek Church. To this our Gen. Sup. simply and roundly: "Neither will the Livonian Consistory ever give such an order to its pastors, nor would pastors be found in Livonia who would obey such an order. This request goes against the Word of God, which obliges us to preach the Gospel to everyone, and nowhere gives us such a right over the consciences that we simply strike out and expel members of our church who profess its teachings. Furthermore, however, and the state authority that makes such a demand must be aware of this, it is also against all the rights of our country to make such a demand that makes a mockery of freedom of conscience. We were sworn to freedom of conscience in the Peace of Nysted with an imperial oath, and we would never, ever waver from this good right of ours by fulfilling a demand to that effect. After all, one has the power and authority, and one may use this against the

He said that we need the guaranteed right if we do not shun God and right; but he was firmly confident that all Livonian pastors would have to be deposed and imprisoned before they would abandon a single soul of their congregations. The governor was upset and scoffed at our rights of freedom of conscience, but our Gen. Sup. was not misled. The conversation lasted over an hour until our Gen. Sup. broke it off and left the governor.

Russia. The "Pilgrim from Saxony" of September 12 writes: The newspapers recently carried the news that an order had been issued for the St. Petersburg and Moscow teaching districts that Lutheran religious instruction should henceforth be given only in Russian. However, only in one isolated case in Poltava did the director of the secondary school there demand that the Lutheran pastor, as a religion teacher, teach in Russian. His complaint was unsuccessful, and so the pastor now has the trouble of assembling the individual pupils in his house for instruction. But this is a new proof that the governors have the freest scope for their arbitrariness where it touches German and the Lutheran Church. What has been ordered in Poltava without legal reason can be ordered everywhere without further ado. - According to a compilation of the Kurland Statistical Committee, the following converted to the Greek Church in Kurland in 1885: 594 men and 400 women, together 994 persons, namely 588 (325 men and 263 women) in the cities and 406 (269 men and 137 women) in the districts. If the Lutherans there are already leaving their glorious church as a result of all kinds of drudgery and, as it seems, even more as a result of windy pretenses of earthly advantages, and are falling away in whole droves to the thoroughly and horribly corrupt Russian-Greek church, what can be hoped for if it should come to bloody persecutions?

W.

Russia. The "Pilgrim from Saxony" of October 10 writes: While in the Moscow and Petersburg teaching districts religious instruction had been required in Russian only in an isolated case, the curator of the Vilna teaching district, with the approval of the Minister of Popular Enlightenment, has ordered that Lutheran religious instruction be given in Russian from now on in all schools in which it has been given at all. Accordingly, since the beginning of the current school year, i.e. since August, this instruction has already been given in Russian in both grammar schools, in the secondary school and in the girls' institute. The same regulation has also been issued to the church school in Vilnius, which is financed by the Lutheran congregation. How and with what success this regulation has been fulfilled cannot be determined, since only very few of the pastors employed within this teaching district are likely to be proficient enough in the Russian language to be able to give religious instruction in this language in any adequate manner. However, the damage that the maturing Lutheran youth will suffer from this decree is very much to be discounted - in any case, it will depend on whether the religious teacher is up to the task he has been given or not. Even more drastic and far-reaching is an order that the Livonian governor issued to the Livonian ordinance and parish courts on August 30 of this year. As is well known, it was decreed by the highest order of May 14 of this year that under no circumstances should any taxes be levied on persons of the Greek Orthodox confession for the benefit of the Lutheran Church and the Lutheran pastors, so that they themselves are exempt from the real burdens attached to the land. For execution

of this order, the Livonian governor has now decreed that the confession of the taxpayers, or those to be exempted from tax, is to be determined on the basis of the personnel registers of the Orthodox churches to be sent to the municipal administrations. - By this decree, the governor has, as it were, drawn a line through the whole mighty movement of converts from the forties into the Lutheran Church, which has inexorably taken place in spite of all the balking of the Lutheran pastors under the pressure of the awakened conscience in this time. The converts themselves, whether they want to or not, whether since their resignation to the once disowned Lutheran mother church they have rooted themselves with their hearts in the same church, and not only they, but also all children born to them since their return who have been baptized and confirmed Lutheran - they are officially declared to belong to the Greek Orthodox Church with this one stroke of the pen. What misery will grow out of this decree cannot be measured.

Netrological. On September 28th, after a short illness, Dr. theol. et phil. jub. died as a result of a stroke. Hermann Gustav Hölemann, full honorary professor of theology at the University of Leipzig, born August 8, 1809, at Bauda near Großenhain in Saxony, 1834 private lecturer in philosophy at Leipzig, 1835-'44 teacher of religion at the Gymnasium at Zwickau, 1844 private lecturer in the theological faculty at Leipzig, since 1867 full honorary professor of exegesis. - Professor Dr. Delitzsch has set up a beautiful memorial to the dear deceased (although not to himself) by saying the following at his coffin: "He, who in the last decades has become more and more an almost complete exegete. The older generation of the Saxon clergy therefore reveres him gratefully as a theologian after God's own heart, and even since his sphere of activity became more and more narrowed, a small group of mature students surrounded him from semester to semester, who revered and loved the venerable veteran like a father. He loved the Saviour, loved our Church as the bearer of the pure Word and Sacrament, loved God's Word, and if he lagged behind progress in some biblical questions, it was because his conscience, bound in reverence for the Holy Scriptures, did not permit him to keep pace with progress. But whatever newer science may find fault with him, it does not make him inferior to God. In his outward social and official appearance he was the model of a spiritual man: serious and yet cheerful, strict and yet moderate; even where his tender soul felt offended, self-controlling, always gentle and soft and conciliatory. Quietly and more and more lonely he passed away alive, but after he left us dying, we feel all the more what we lost in him. It is a pure, noble, edifying picture which his person leaves behind." So also writes the "Sächs. Kirchen- und Schulblatt" (Saxon Church and School Gazette) of October 14: "Firm and undaunted, manly and faithful - this is how he exercised more than fifty years of academic activity, at the same time for many years as a member of the royal examination commission for theologians. He has experienced many setbacks - only in the middle of the sixties he was recognized as a full honorary professor in the theological faculty - many bitter and painful experiences, but he has not gone astray in his faithfulness. His conscience, bound in God's Word, prevented him from following a 'progress' which he could not recognize as right. To this inner position of his he sacrificed a more influential position which was due to him for the sake of his outstanding scientific efficiency."

W.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 32.

December 1886.

No. 12.

What does Scripture say of itself?

(With consideration of the just also recently raised objections of the newer theology).

(Conclusion.) **III.**

As far as the purpose and meaning of Scripture are concerned, the moderns regard Scripture, the document of salvation history, as a canon, of which the church as a whole has need for its historical development, and allow only oral preaching, as distinct from Scripture, as a means of grace, useful and necessary for faith and salvation.

The theologians of Dorpat express their views on this as follows.

Harnack, in his protective pamphlet for Volck, "Ueber den Kanon und die Inspiration der heiligen Schrift," pp. 6: "There is a widespread view, even in our country, which bases the Christian church faith itself on 'faith in the holy Scriptures'; a view which regards the Bible as the divinely ordained means of grace, declares it to be the 'apple of the Reformation's and the Protestant faith's eye', and thereupon asserts the absolute necessity of Scripture for the saving faith. This view contradicts both sacred Scripture itself and the testimony of the ancient and Reformation Church, as well as, finally, that of Christian experience. It is therefore untenable from all points of view. For we believe not in a book, but in Jesus Christ our Lord and Savior."

Likewise p. 6. 7: "Nothing else but Christ and him alone - not even the Bible - has the church and in it me, the individual,

into this everlasting life. Therefore I do believe the Bible, but only on the basis of my faith in Christ, i.e. because He guarantees it to me and it guarantees Christ to me with all the deeds of God that preceded Him; because He is its core and star and because the Spirit who speaks to us from it is the "Comforter" promised and sent by Him. The Bible is not revelation, but God's witness to it, the Word of God in its documentary form; and for this very reason it is above all things dear and valuable to us. The question of Scripture is therefore always only the second; the first is and remains Christ."

Further, p. 22: "The testimonium internum Spiritus sancti is not based on the subjective 'impression' of the healing power of individual passages or passages of Scripture, but on the unanimity of the Word of God, recorded in Holy Scripture, with the Gospel preached in the Church and witnessed in the hearts of the faithful."

Volck remarks in his second writing, "The Bible as Canon," p. 14: "What is it, then, that brings the individual to faith in Christ and thus makes him a Christian? Is it the reading of the Bible? No! but the testimony of the Church to Christ, which comes to him in this or that form. "'Faith comes from preaching,' says Paul. If it were awakened by reading the Bible, the task of mission would be a simple one. It would then only be allowed to send Bibles in their own language to the various heathen nations, provided they knew how to read. Such attempts have indeed been made. They have been fruitless. That Ethiopian eunuch of whom the Acts of the Apostles tells us, reads eagerly in his Bible. But the reading does not benefit him. For he does not understand what he reads. How can I - he answers Philip's question - if no one instructs me? Do not refer me to the New Testament epistles which the apostles wrote and sent forth. For I ask, Is there found in the New Testament a single letter, a single writing, addressed to Gentiles for the purpose of their conversion? They are all addressed to churches which are already Christian; but Christian by what? By the living word of apostolic preaching."

And p. 14. 15: "The Word of God existed before there was a Scripture; and just as the written Word is not the foundation of the church, so it is not the source of the individual's faith. The latter springs from the living testimony of the church, in order, of course, to find its object again in the written word and thus to attain to full inner certainty. In this way Luther came to believe in the Scriptures. It was the verbal word of his confessors that led him to his, for him personally, faith in the Scriptures.

decisive, evangelical knowledge. This testimony then proved itself to him as divine in the Scriptures; and as such it became the foundation of his life and work."

This is the well-known Hofmann theory, to which, for example, the Erlangen theologian Frank also pays homage. See his *System of Certainty*. II, 195 ff. According to this, the oral sermon is the proper means of grace. The "self-testimony of the congregation, or of the individual preacher," is a "stream of the living Word of God," which constantly flows forth from the life that has existed and reproduced in the church since Pentecost, and which, as soon as it is once clouded by false doctrine, purifies itself again.

According to this modern-believing view, then, Scripture has only secondary importance for faith, for the salvation of men. The main thing is Christ, Christ in distinction, detached from Scripture. The oral word, the preaching of the gospel, testifies of Christ above all. It draws from itself, from its own experience, and normalizes and corrects itself. And from preaching, as distinguished from the written word, comes saving faith. Scripture comes into question here only in the second place. If one then takes the Scriptures at hand, faith, which has sprung from the living testimony of the church, certainly finds its object again here, in the written word, and thus attains "to full inward certainty. But Scripture is not absolutely necessary for the saving faith. A Christian can, after all, arrive at the goal even without Scripture, if he has only "the oral word." And Scripture is by no means the standard and touchstone for oral preaching, but the reverse. A Christian hears the *testimonium internum Spiritus sancti*, and is convinced of the divinity of the Scriptures, only when he finds the Scriptures in harmony with the Gospel preached in the Church and witnessed to in the hearts of the faithful. The latter, *verbum praedicatum*, is the decisive, the final authority. Oral tradition is the principle of faith, of blessedness. Scripture, too, must be measured by it. Truly, true papist theology!

Christians could thus dispense with the Bible altogether, without suffering any essential harm. The consequence of this system, like Papism, demands the total elimination of the written word. However, in order to keep up appearances, these modern Protestant Papists still concede to Scripture a special significance, an independent purpose. Individual Christians do not need it for faith and salvation. But the church as a whole needs such a historical document for its purposes, for the path it has to travel here.

Volck says of this in the cited text, p. 27: "Nevertheless, I maintain that the Bible is diminished in its importance if it is allowed to be nothing more than a book of edification for the individual, which is what Pietism has made it. It is this too; but it is not first and not exclusively so. It has a higher meaning, namely, that of serving as a norm and guide for the church. What makes it so? It would not be suitable for this purpose if it contained a sum of doctrines and precepts, a collection of directives, in order to recover counsel in case of need. For what collection would suffice 'for the infinite possibility of the most varied situations' into which the Church may come! No! What can guide and direct the Church on the road she has to travel, what can help the erring, support the stumbling, humble the questioning, is solely the history of divine revelation, of which she herself is the result and product."

This is nothing but a phrase and a fraud! What, who then is the "church," as distinguished from individual Christians, and so also from the summa of Christians? And what is the path which the Church pursues, what is the goal towards which it strives, in distinction from faith and blessedness? If one wants to extract any sense and understanding from those lofty words of the Dorpatian theologian, it can only be that the ecclesiastical "theology," which admittedly pursues quite different, much higher goals than faith and blessedness, purely scientific purposes, does, however, need a document of the history of salvation, a substantial foundation, in order to spin out of it its broodless arts.

We now ask the Scriptures themselves what use they are to us. According to its own testimony, Scripture is the supreme and final authority in matters of faith and conscience:

1. Source and norm of all wholesome teaching.

This is how we stand by the Scriptures. We measure all teaching and preaching by the Scriptures. What we teach and preach, we do not give as a good, pious opinion, but we give as the truth. And that is because we have tested it against the Scriptures, because we can prove it with the Scriptures. The Scriptures are God's Word, and what God says is the truth. But we also draw all teaching and preaching from the Scriptures. We do not give our own. Our minds are darkened. We would know nothing ourselves of the things we discuss in teaching and preaching if God had not taught and revealed it to us. But God has revealed it to us in the Scriptures. Scripture is God's speech and revelation. We know that we are on the right path from the self-evident testimony of Scripture.

Rom. 15, 4. The apostle remarks, after he has read an Old Testament

And the prophecy of the Lord referred to Christ, and used it for the instruction of Christians: "But whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning." This, then, is the purpose of Scripture as intended by God, to instruct Christians.

The teaching of the Scriptures alone is the right teaching. 2 Tim. 3, 16. says: "All scripture, inspired of God, is profitable for doctrine." The apostle St. Paul, in this connection, warns his disciple Timothy against false teachers, who are themselves deceived, -misleading themselves and leading others astray, 2 Tim. 3, 13. and admonishes him, "But thou abide in that which thou hast learned and trusted." 2 Tim. 3, 14. He adds, "since thou knowest from whom thou hast learned." Timothy learned from Paul, the apostle of JEsu Christ, who received his gospel directly from Christ. In the apostle's doctrine Timothy is to persevere, and then he will not go astray, as those deceivers did. But Paul also refers Timothy to the scriptures that he learned from childhood. 2 Tim. 3, 15. He should hold on to the teaching of the scriptures and keep it faithfully. Then he is and remains safe from error. For this very reason, the apostle emphasizes 2 Tim. 3, 16, because the Scriptures are inspired by God, they are useful for teaching, they give us the right doctrine, the truth. Whoever does not remain in what he has learned, in the Scriptures and in the apostles' teaching, which is also written in Scripture, errs from the truth and leads others astray. Thus the scripture, because it is God's word, is the standard and guide of doctrine.

The summa of Christian doctrine is Christ, the Lord, the Saviour, Christ's death and resurrection, the grace of Jesus Christ. But this very content of Christian doctrine and preaching is not only proven by Scripture, but also taken from Scripture.

Where Christ wants to prove to the Jews that He is the promised Messiah, the true Christ, He points them to the Scriptures: "Search the Scriptures." Joh. 5, 39. "This is the scripture that testifies of me." The Scriptures, which even the Jews acknowledged to be the Word of God, the infallible truth, bear witness of Christ. The very Scriptures can make everyone certain who Christ is, that this Jesus is really Christ, the Son of the living God. Christ, the eternal, true witness, who spoke God's word from his own mouth, appeals to the Scriptures as proof of his teaching and his testimony, and thus wants to determine that we should give honor to the Scriptures and obtain certainty from the Scriptures about the teaching that is going on among us.

St. Paul reminds the Corinthian Christians of the gospel he preached to them, the gospel of Christ, 1 Cor. 15, 1. ff. and exhorts them to persevere and emphasizes for this purpose that he received this gospel from Christ. 1 Cor. 15, 3. But moreover, to confirm his doctrine, he adduces the Scriptures.

as the last and supreme authority. He recalls that Christ died for our sins, and adds, "according to the scriptures." He recalls that "Christ was buried, and that he rose again the third day," and adds, "according to the scripture." 1 Cor. 15:3, 4. The Scriptures, which prophesied of Christ's death and resurrection, are the seal of those great saving deeds of Christ, which constitute the substance of the Gospel of St. Paul. If St. Paul, an apostle who himself had revelation directly from Christ, considered it necessary to authenticate his teaching with Scripture, how much more are we now, who no longer receive instruction directly from God, directed with our teaching and preaching to the standard and authority of Scripture! Paul, speaking from revelation, based his teaching on Scripture. And those modern teachers of the church, who speak from their own experience, believe they can dispense with Scripture, as the foundation of doctrine. Surely he who learns from them, who believes them, is put on the slippery slope.

That it was a general practice among the apostles and the disciples of the apostles, and in the apostolic churches, to measure the doctrine, the preaching of Christ, by the Scriptures, to prove it with the Scriptures, to test it according to the Scriptures, is shown us by the Acts of the Apostles. Paul confessed before Agrippas the king, "I testify both small and great, and say nothing save what the prophets have said." Acts. 26, 22. Bon Apollo we read, "Now there came to Ephesus a Jew, named Apollo, of the birth of Alexandria, an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures. Who overcame the Jews continually, and proved publicly by the Scriptures that JESUS was the Christian." Acts 18, 24. 28. The Christians of Berea have this praise: "They received the word very willingly, and searched the scriptures daily, whether it were so." Acts 17, 11. 17:11 According to modern theory and practice, doctrine and preaching have in themselves their norm and corrective, and those who listen and learn are instructed to test what they hear in their own hearts and feelings. Scripture is set aside for the time being as a proving-stone. But where these teachers and their pupils have gone is evident. With the Scriptures they have lost Christ, the biblical Christ.

The scripture is the source of all doctrine. We recall again 1 Peter 1:10-12 where the apostle teaches that the prophets prophesied of the grace that was to come, that the Spirit of Christ testified through them of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that was to come. He speaks of the things which the prophets have presented to us, that is, he speaks of the writings of the prophets. But the very things which the prophets testified have now been preached by those who preached the gospel, that is, by the apostles, *ἀνηγγέλη*. The evangelists have Christ's suffering and glory, Christ's grace

proclaimed, made known. If they had not proclaimed these things, the Gentiles, who have now become Christians, would know nothing of them. What the apostles proclaimed, as the apostle points out, is nothing other than what the prophets had already testified to in their writings. So by the writings of the prophets, by the preaching of the apostles, which is now also written, Christ, Christ's suffering and glory, the grace of JEsu Christ is made known and manifest. Without such testimony and manifestation no one would hear of it. Thus the Scriptures are the testimony of the prophets, as well as of the apostles, the source of the wholesome doctrine of Christ.

Likewise St. Paul testifies Rom. 16, 25. 26. that the "mystery which was kept secret from all eternity", the very mystery of Christ, was "revealed through the prophetic Scriptures", from which the apostles also drew the preaching of Christ.

And the Acts of the Apostles report of Paul that he "spake unto the Jews out of the scriptures," that he "opened and set before them the scriptures," namely, "that Christ must suffer and rise again from the dead." Acts 17, 2. 3.

This was the attitude of the apostles. Although they themselves spoke from revelation, they took their teaching and preaching from the Scriptures, driven by the Holy Spirit. So we, who now have no more revelation, are all the more bound to take the teaching and preaching of Christ out of the Scriptures, out of the writings of the prophets and apostles, to open the Scriptures and to present them to those who hear us.

Well, we also spend our teaching and preaching for God's word. We inculcate in our hearers: what we say to you is God's word, God's wisdom, it is the truth, it is firm and certain. But solely because Christian doctrine and preaching is drawn from the holy Scriptures, and is drawn from them continually, and is guided by the Scriptures, and is proved by the Scriptures, it is entitled to this title: God's Word. There is in truth only One Word of God. God's Word is what God Himself speaks, what He Himself has spoken, directly or indirectly, through prophets and apostles. That is now available in Scripture. We hear no more prophets and apostles at this time. So there is no Word of God for us outside of Scripture. But of course this very Word of God, the Scriptures, is now also made known and revealed through the mouths of Christian teachers and preachers. Yes, of course, God's Word is a living stream. The Scriptures are not only given to individuals to read and contemplate in silence. The noblest use of the Word, of Scripture, is that it should be freely read aloud in public, recited, presented, interpreted, applied to particular circumstances and needs. The Christian sermon, when it is rightly preached

The words, as they read, as they were given by the Spirit, are presented to the congregation, imagined in the hearts of the hearers, and the meaning and understanding, as they are given by the words, are brought to the attention of the hearers and brought to their minds. Thus, of course, what we teach and preach is pure Scripture and the word of God. On the other hand, those who, according to the modern *regula docendi*, walk outside of Scripture in teaching and preaching, who really practice their principle, draw from experience, from the life of the church, from their own experience, from their own brain, and regulate themselves with their own judgment, certainly do not teach and preach God's word, but man's delusion and the devil's lie.

According to their own testimony, the Scripture:

2. Ground of faith, rule and guide of faith and life.

The holy scripture, because it is God's word, is the norm and source of salvific teaching. And therefore also the ground of faith. This is the peculiarity, the inherent power of the divine Word, whether the individual draws it directly from his Bible or whether it confronts him in the teaching and preaching that spring from the Scriptures, so that it produces and sustains saving faith. The Scriptures, the Word of God, are essentially the testimony of God concerning Christ. And this testimony is convincing, working faith, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. The Scriptures teach this clearly and distinctly.

According to 2 Tim. 3, 15. the Scriptures instruct us to salvation "through faith in Christ Jesus". By instructing us to believe, it instructs us to salvation.

Joh. 20, 30. 31. and 1 Joh. 5, 13. the apostle assures that he wrote what he wrote for the purpose that those who read and hear it "believe in the name of the Son of God". It is to faith that the Scripture is directed.

Rom. 10, 17. St. Paul writes: "So then faith comes from preaching." So far Volck. What devil induced him simply to omit the indispensable addition to this sentence? Which is, "but preaching by the word of God." This last sentence explains how far and why just also the preaching, the oral proclamation of the gospel works faith. Precisely because and insofar as preaching comes from the Word, from the Word of God, from the Word that God has spoken, from the Word of God that is set before us in Scripture. God's Word alone can produce faith. What then is faith? Faith is a divine light in the heart, divine assurance. Who else can kindle such light, give such certainty, but God?

...himself? And he does it through his word. God's word is in motion, in flow. It is taught, preached, passed on from mouth to mouth. It is also in motion and activity when the individual reads, considers, and contemplates it for himself. And this movement of the divine word finds its goal in the heart of man. When the Word meets and touches the heart, God Himself takes hold of the heart and captures the heart of man. If the newer theologians detach preaching from the Word of God and derive faith from such preaching, such faith is, of course, a purely human construct, self-deception and the deception of Satan.

The Word of God, the Word of Scripture, is the ground from which faith grows and on which it rests, its unshakable foundation.

Peter describes it as a tendency of his epistle, and that is part of the inspired scripture, to testify to the Christians that this is the true grace of God in which they stand, thus to strengthen their faith. I Petr. 5, 12.

And when Peter, in his second epistle, 2 Pet. 1, 19, calls the Scriptures "a firm prophetic word," and Paul, Eph. 2, 19, 20, says of the church, the congregation of believers, that it is built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, that is, the Scriptures, Scripture affirms precisely what the moderns cold-bloodedly deny, that the Scriptures are the foundation of faith, the foundation of the church.

Every believing Christian also knows from experience that in fear, challenge and temptation the word that is written is the last refuge, that in the end one cannot resist and control the devil in any other way than by holding out to him: "It is written." To be sure, modern scientific theology is not the theology of the cross and of temptation which Luther extols. It knows no counsel for the plight of death.

As the source, strength, and ground of faith, so Scripture is also the rule and guide of Christian faith and life. We simply quote some well-known passages of Scripture, which need no further explanation. "Let not the book of this law depart out of thy mouth, but consider it day and night, that thou mayest observe and do all things according to that which is written therein. Then thou shalt prosper in all that thou doest, and shalt do wisely." Jos. 1, 8. "Yea, according to the law and according to the testimony. If they say not, they shall not have the morning light." Isa. 8, 20. "Thy word is a lamp unto my foot, and a light unto my path." Psalm 119:105. "We have a sure word of prophecy: and ye do well to hearken unto it, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the morning star arise in your hearts." 2 Pet. 1:19. "As many walk according to this rule" (the

just described before), "on them be peace and mercy." Gal. 6, 16.

Finally, think of such psalms as the 119th, in which David praises God's word, which is "the book of this law," as the joy, the comfort, the light, the only support of the faithful. Yea, he that wandereth through the Scriptures with a simple mind, findeth the sentence confirmed in every leaf: "All Scripture, inspired of God, is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for chastening in righteousness; that a man of God may be perfect, fitted unto all good works." 2 Tim. 3, 16. 17.

It is almost unbelievable that a theologian of Scripture should seriously assert that Scripture is primarily and essentially not a textbook and book of edification for individual Christians. And it is even more incredible that a so-called believing theologian dares to deny that Scripture is necessary for the saving faith, that is, for salvation. For a simple-minded, righteous Bible Christian it is almost an insult if one first endeavors to discuss and prove the proposition further:

3. Scripture a guide and means to blessedness.

If the Scriptures are the source of salvific teaching, the foundation of faith, if they are the Word of God at all, then they are also useful and necessary for salvation. The blind Jews had even more light than the "scripture-believing" "Christian" theologians of today. For they seriously thought, as Jesus acknowledged, that they had eternal life in the scriptures, in the written word, Joh. 5, 39. A child who has only learned a little from the scriptures also knows that the scriptures instruct us to salvation, that one can learn from this book and only from this book how to become blessed. 2 Tim. 3, 15. The preached word can also make our souls blessed. Jac. 1, 21. The verbally preached gospel is also a power of God for salvation. Rom. 1, 16. but only because and in so far as it is God's word or, since there is no prophet or apostle preaching to us anymore, because and in so far as the word of Scripture is applied to our hearts and consciences through preaching. What John the Apostle wrote, what is written at all, aims at our believing that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that we "through faith have life in His name. Joh. 20, 31. When a scribe once put the question to JEsu, "Master, what must I do to inherit eternal life?" - the Lord answered, "How is it written in the law?" "How readeest thou?" Luc. 10, 25. 26. The Lord directed him, the Lord directs us into the law, that is, into the Scriptures, if we desire an answer to the question, How shall we obtain eternal life? He who has some an-

Whoever seeks other things in the Scriptures than eternal life desecrates God's word. And he who seeks his salvation elsewhere than in the Scriptures misses the mark, he will not escape damnation. Even that "living Christ" who is to live in the church independently of the Scriptures, in whom one is to believe before approaching the Scriptures, even that "faith in Christ" which is not generated by the Scriptures and is not founded and rests on the Scriptures, does not save from death and from the power of the devil. God help us that we may believe the written word, and for that word's sake believe in Christ our Saviour, and so, by word and faith, be saved! G. St.

Are the 70 weeks in Dan. 9, 24-27. fulfilled with the dawn of the New Testament or is their final fulfillment still in the future?

A series of instructive articles appeared in "Lehre und Wehre" under the title: "Weissagung und Erfüllung" ("Prophecy and Fulfillment"), the last of which is found in Nos. 7 and 8 of last year. This last article, however, presents an interpretation of Dan. 9 which we believe to be incorrect. We believe that the traditional interpretation of this passage should be retained for good reasons.

In that essay it is asserted that the standing interpretation of the weeks of years does not agree either with the words of the prophecy or with history. For the latter, a year is given as proof; for the former, the literal translation of the words of Daniel's prophecy is given as proof. We want to examine this above all things and therefore also try to reproduce the Hebrew in German words.

Verse 24: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon the city of thy holiness" [the sense of "city of thy holiness" is probably: the holy city so dear to thee] - "to destroy iniquity, and to seal up sin, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in the righteousness of the ages, and to fulfill the vision and prophets" [= prophecy), - "and to anoint the sanctuary of holies" [= holy of holies). V. 25: "And know and take heed: from the going forth of the word" [= command] - "to return and to build Jerusalem unto the Anointed, the Prince, [are] seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks shall be restored, and streets and ditches shall be built, and [that] in the distress of times." V. 26: "And after the 62 weeks Messiah shall be slain, and not because of him" for his own fault). "And the city and the sanctuary shall be devastated by a people of the prince that is to come, and his end (shall be) in the flood," Flood, cf. chap. 11:22.), - "and unto the end of the war be-

concluded" [or the judgment of] "desolation". V. 27. "And he shall strengthen many (the) covenant a week and the" [= in the] - "midst of the week he shall make to cease" [= bring to an end] - "sacrifices and meat offerings, and over (the) wing" [or pinnacle, pinnacle, cf. Matt. 4:5.] "(shall be) the abomination of a desolator, and unto the determined destruction" [= the gargoyle] - "it shall be poured out upon the desolate." 1)

If we first compare the translation given in "Lehre und Wehre" 1885 p. 230 f. with the above and Dr. Luther's, the main difference is that the former separates the first 7 weeks from the following 62 weeks by a period, so that the latter only begin with the appearance of Christ. The justification for this is probably based on the punctuation of the Hebrew Bible (? the editor), where there is an Athnach (= semicolon) at the relevant place. To the separation of the two parts of the sentence, however, on account of the athnach, Calov 2) replies: "Too slippery and weak is this reason to bear such a burden. For it is known that the Athnach does not always divide in such a way that it separates the sentences, or divides the verse into two parts according to the sense, which is already evident from the first verse of the Bible.... And why should not a repetition of the same manner be performed here? ... Until Christ the Prince, there are seven weeks. And, I say, 62 weeks; that is to say, not only do I say that 7 weeks will have elapsed by then, but also another 62 weeks (namely, until Christ the Prince). . . . Nothing else can be inferred from this than that for a certain reason those 7 weeks were specially divided, and that for the sake of a clearer distinction that principal sign of separation was used." - This much is certain, that the punctuation marks in Hebrew do not necessarily decide, since in some places they take their place only for the sake of rhythm, as is well known and easily proved. The prophecy itself, however, evidently combines both periods of time into one again, since it speaks of the out-

1) By accepting the above translation unchanged, the editors do not declare that they agree with it in all parts. The passage Dan. 9, however, presents special difficulties for the translation.
The Redaction.

2) Calov: "Nimis lubricum atque infirmum hoc est fundamentum ad sustinendum tantam molem. Notum enim est, Athnachum non semper distinguere ita, ut separet voces, aut versum, quantum ad sensum, in duas partes secet: quod e primo versu Bibliorum constat. ... Et quidni repetitio ejusmodi hic ibidem statui potest? . . . Usque ad Messiam Ducem septimanae septem. Et septimanae, inquam, sexaginta duae, q. d. non solum autem septem dico septimanas eo usque effluxuras, sed etiam alias sexaginta duas (scii, usque ad Messiam Ducem;) . . . Nihil aliud inde colligi potest, quam quod certa de causa septem illae hebdomades peculiariter distinctae fuerint, et distinctionis evidentioris gratia imperator ille distinctivus adhibitus sit." -

He begins with the beginning of the command to build Jerusalem, and after determining the 62 weeks he puts the building of the streets and the trenches into both periods together and calls the time a time of tribulation. We can dispense here with the examination in what way both periods differ.

But let us have a closer look at the prophecy. The context shows that it is a divine answer to the prayer of Daniel, in which he firstly laments the sins of Israel in the deepest humility of a truly penitent heart, and asks for the redemption of the guilt and for reconciliation through divine forgiveness; and secondly, he looks to God for the restoration of the temple and worship, the rebuilding of the city and the return of the people, as promised by the prophet Jeremiah. But the chief aim of all the divine promises and prophecies of the Old Testament is Christ's future in the flesh and His work of redemption. These are the kernel and star of all the true hope of Israel, and of the longing and desire of all the prophets and believers, as Christ Himself expresses it in the words, "Many prophets and kings desired to see," etc. To this also aims the divine answer which the angel has to deliver to Daniel. According to it, the fulfillment of the lesser, nearest prophecy of the outward restoration of the temple, the city, and the people is to be the beginning of a new destiny, after the expiration of which the core, the sun of all prophecies, is to burst forth in punctual fulfillment. Thus the angel's message begins with a main prophecy of Christ and His work of redemption, together with a definite time when this was to take place (v. 24). He then further separates this time, and expressly states (v. 25), as the beginning of it, the command, "that Jerusalem should be built again." But its chief end, by which it comes to a conclusion, is the atoning death of Christ, on which the prophetic view not only rests in all the Old Testament prophecies of Christ, but to which Christ Himself, as well as the holy evangelists and apostles, refer as to the consummation and perfect fulfillment of the glorious promises of the Old Testament.

However, we only want to hold on to the conventional exegesis in this passage if it has better and more certain grounds. Now it is claimed that history overturns the interpretation of the 70 weeks as a period of 70 times 7 years. It is said: "From time immemorial numbers have been reckoned here, the weeks have been regarded as weeks of years, and 70 weeks of years, or 490 years, have been inserted between the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the appearing of Christ. But this calculation does not agree with the prophecy. . . nor with history; for the return of the Jews from exile falls in the year 536 B.C." On the other hand, the writer conceives of the 70 weeks as an "ideal time," i.e., as an unmeasured, but indefinite, period of time.

The essay itself says that the "70 weeks" correspond to the 70 years of the Babylonian captivity. But this view refutes itself; the essay itself says that the "70 weeks" correspond to the 70 years of the Babylonian captivity. These would thus also have to be a merely ideal time. If God the Lord contrasts the 70 real years of the captivity with the 70 weeks of the promise, the latter again divided into two halves, one would have to have very urgent reasons and proofs for the acceptance of such an idea, in which the number of years is not taken into account. - Just consider the ardent, earnest longing of the prophets, the core of which is the hope of Israel, namely the promise of the Savior and Redeemer, the fulfillment of which he cannot even imagine without Jerusalem's restoration and the establishment of the kingdom of Israel. In answer to his eager plea for the same, the angel comes from heaven with the divine message, "Seventy weeks are determined," etc. And now this divine appointment of time is to be a mere indefinite one! The second period is said to be much longer than the first, which is said to be 536 years. How far, then, does this much longer period extend? This is not stated. The third period would then have to be a very short one; where does it begin? Probably with the power of the papacy. But where, then, is the brevity of it?

But let us further examine the objection to the conventional explanation of the 70 weeks as a period of 70 times 7 years, and its tenability. This calculation is said to be inconsistent with history, because Cyrus (or Cyrus) issued the first edict in 536 B.C. birth, permitting the Jews to return to Canaan. With this, however, the account is not correct. But such orders went out from several kings and at different times. What is meant here, according to the words of the angel, is that command according to which "the streets and walls of the city shall be built." But this was not done at the first command given by Cyrus. See Neh. 1, 3. 2,3. Before Nehemiah the permission was always disturbed and as good as suspended. So we are speaking of the command, which was followed by the execution. The time is at any rate that given in Neh. 5:14. The Artasastha there mentioned is, according to general opinion, Artaxerxes Longimanus. In the seventh year of this king Ezra was sent to Judea. This, according to the historical canon (see Schulbl., vol. VIII, p. 11.), would have been 457 B. C. But since in the common chronology Christ's birth is given at least 3 years too late, after deduction of the same 454 or 453 would come out. If we add to this 30 years until the solemn anointing of Christ, the princes and his proclamation (cf. "This is my dear Son" etc.), we have 483 years or 69 weeks of years. But no sooner had Christ appeared in his public teaching office, than

The murderous enmity of the Jews was already planning his death and extermination, until, according to God's eternal counsel, the sacrificial death of Christ occurred in the middle of the last week, and thus the burnt offerings and grain offerings of the Old Testament were completed. Thus we see why the prophecy of Christ's death is connected with "the 62 weeks" and how aptly not one's own but another's guilt is indicated as the cause of it. This interpretation of the basic text is also the basis of the explanation of the Weimar Bible and agrees better with the Hebrew words than the other: "And there shall be no more room for him," because the word "room" is not there at all. But the preposition X has among others also the meaning "because of". Therefore XX XXXX above is translated, "And not because of him." 1)

But let us return to our calculation! We have referred above to Neh. 5, 14. There the twentieth year of Artaxerxes is called Longimanus. Calov in Bibl, illustr. gives citations, 2) according to which, by means of the Olympiads and Julian calendar, 473 years are to be calculated from the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus to the baptism of Christ, namely, according to the date of world history. The 10 years missing hereafter would then have to be looked for at the beginning of the calculation, since Artaxerxes presumably reigned as co-regent of his father and Nehemias also counts the years of the co-regnum. Strangely enough, also the note to the mentioned historical canon in the "Schulblatt" (loc. cit.) says: "To Xerxes the canon gives 7 years too much, to Artaxerxes I. 7 years too little" etc.. According to this, too, the full number of 69 weeks of years would again result, though not with the same definiteness. Luther rightly urges us to be content with an approximately correct numerical relationship. (Erl. A., Vol. 41, p. 248.)

Concerning the seventy weeks, there is still a little to be said about the last of them. The words: "He will strengthen the covenant of many for one week" are most simply understood by the spreading of the gospel, which Christ proclaimed among the people of Israel in the first half of the week with His own mouth and which was spread afterwards by the apostles, who remained among the Jewish people for some years after Christ's ascension. - The desolation, of which Daniel speaks further, is best dealt with in the following discussion of Matth. 24, 15. ff., where Christ Himself refers to the fulfillment of Dan. 9. Only one point in Daniel's prophecy should be mentioned first.

1) We do not consider this translation by the honored sender to be correct, but give preference to Luther's translation. The ed.

2) Calov: "Jacobus Tirinus e multis autoribus probatae fidei confirmat, Artaxerxem non a morte demum patris, sed multis ante annis una cum patre imperium administrasse."

which concerns the difference between the translations "the holy of holies" and "the holy of holies". The former we find in Luther and older Lutheran exegetes. The author of that article adopts the latter; is also fully justified in doing so, since Kodesh Kodashim (XXXXX XXX = Holy of Holies) was the designation of the Holy of Holies in Tabernacle and Temple. But here we must dispute the interpretation of the "anointing of the holy of holies" to the dedication of the triumphant church as the eternal temple of God on the last day. If the church of the New Testament is contrasted with the Old Testament temple as a counter-image, then there is nothing to be said against a comparison of the triumphant church with the holy of holies of the temple. But the interpretation of the words mentioned here in this sense is already rejected by the fact that they are connected with the atoning death of Christ, and that the anointing and redemptive work of Christ precede the prophesied desolation. - But what does the angel's message about the "sanctuary of sanctities" and the anointing of it point to? The proper center of Old Testament worship was the ark of the covenant, the lid of which was sprinkled with the blood of the greatest of all sacrifices, the annual sacrifice of atonement, by the high priest for the reconciliation of the people with God, and was therefore called the mercy seat. This made the place where the ark of the covenant rested the holy of holies, and there can be no doubt that in it a model was given of Christ, "whom God hath set forth to be a mercy seat through faith in his blood." There we have the true "sanctuary of sanctities" in Christ, which in the Old Testament was briefly called the "Holy One in Israel," and by the angel Gabriel Luc. I, 35. "the holy one". As the Anointed One (Christ, XXXX) He comes forth with His baptism, and as such is divinely confirmed by His resurrection. The meaning of the prophecy is thus completely fulfilled by Luther's translation "the holy of holies".

In close connection with the passage Dan. 9. is Matth. 24, 15. ff. where Christ Himself teaches about the desolation prophesied by Daniel and especially speaks of the abomination of desolation that would precede the final and complete destruction. Now does Christ interpret the prophecy of Daniel as referring to the last days of the world or to the destruction of Jerusalem? According to the interpretation objected to, the former is the case; according to the vast majority of exegetes, the latter. Now which interpretation is the correct one? - First of all, we must seek the understanding of the words in question from Christ's own speech and from the context. As in Daniel the divine answer was given to his fervent prayer, so here the answer of Christ to the question of the disciples. The question and the answer both refer to the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world, but they both

for different reasons: the disciples at least because they still thought Jerusalem and the temple had to remain until the end of the world. Christ, on the other hand, because he wants to point to Jerusalem's end as a model and prelude of the end of the world, the former also being a certain sign of the future of the latter. Therefore also in circumstances and portents is found the antitype of Jerusalem's destruction in the end of the world, such as the false prophets and Christs. - Already at His entrance into Jerusalem Christ had denounced the utter destruction of the city in pitiful lamentation; He had also in the following days proclaimed to the Jews in the temple, "Behold, your house shall be left unto you desolate." Now when the disciples showed the Lord the mighty building of the temple, he told them again that "there shall not be left in it one stone upon another, which shall not be broken." Since, in the opinion of the disciples at that time, this event could only coincide with Christ's return and the end of the world, they asked him when this was to happen and by what signs the approaching of the time would be recognizable: If we then look at Christ's answer, we certainly find parts of speech in it that can be related to both, but also those that can only be related to one of the two events, without doing violence to the text. When he begins to describe the terrible time preceding the end, this is certainly true of both things, and it will be hard to blame him if he regards the signs and portents of the destruction of Jerusalem as exemplary of the last days of the world, and sees this also summed up in the words of Christ. In the other part, however, where he instructs his followers how to behave in such times and dangers, he speaks in certain words so clearly of one or the other that one would have to violate the clarity of Scripture if one wanted to interpret the meaning of the words here to the end of the world, there to the destruction of Jerusalem. Compare, e. g., vv. 16 and 27. This is also true of the "abomination of desolation" (v. 15), though we do not wish to deny that it is a model of the abominations of the last days of the world.

Although, according to most commentators, the "abomination of desolation" is a harbinger of the destruction of Jerusalem, they differ greatly as to what is actually meant by it. Luther and other commentators understand by it the image of the emperor Caligula, which was set up in the temple at Jerusalem by the Roman governor with terrible violence. Nothing can be said against this in itself; for the actual "holy place," the sanctuary *κατ' Εξοχήν*, was reserved for the emperor.

But the most abominable to them were the graven images. Here it was also the image of a pagan ruler, which they hated, by which they saw their worship devastated. But shall

from other sides the objection was raised that this omen as a warning sign to flee was premature because decades still lay between this incident and the destruction of Jerusalem. - Others understand by it the horrible desolation itself, by which the people was ruined inwardly and outwardly, since, for example, a band of soldiers occupied the temple itself as their fortress and committed the worst abominations in it, and another band of soldiers entered the temple on Easter and caused a terrible bloodbath among the former, whereby the same became a bodily pit of murder. As the most horrible devastation from within was before the eyes of all, so also that from without by the Roman armies drew nearer and nearer, until they enclosed the holy city, and with it the idols on the heathen flags and standards stared the people in the eyes. Against this version of the desolating abomination in general, some contend that the *ἔστως ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ* implies a formal setting up of such an abomination. But if we now allow this to stand, there remains as perfectly true the explanation taken from Scripture, that the Roman armies, with the commencement of the siege, also set up the "abomination of desolation." There he stood before (? Red.) the holy city; there he stood opposite (? Red.) the temple on the near Mount of Olives, as it were above the pinnacle of the temple, until at last destruction and utter desolation fell upon it like a flood. The objection that it was too late to escape at the time of the siege does not hold good, for the beginning of the siege does not yet necessitate the cutting off of all avenues of escape. But above all, what Christ says, Luc. 21, 20. f., applies here: "But when ye shall see Jerusalem besieged with an army, then perceive that her desolation is come. Then let him that is in Judea flee to the mountains; and let him that is in the midst of them depart; and let him that is in the country come not in." When he there adds (v. 23.), "For these are the days of vengeance, that it should be fulfilled which is written," we think also of the writing of Daniel, "And a people of the prince shall come and destroy the city and the sanctuary," etc., which desolation shall endure to the last end.

-

If we wish to make an application of this fulfilled prophecy to the last days of the world, we find it quite in order. Delicious is the application which Chrysostom makes. He writes: "When you see an ungodly sect, which is a force of Antichrist, in the holy place of the Church, then let him who is in Judea flee to the mountains; that is, let him who is in Christendom turn to the holy Scriptures, for true Judea is Christendom, but the mountains are the writings of the prophets and apostles. Knowing full well that in the last days there will be such great confusion, the Lord therefore commands those Christians who are in Christendom and want to attain firmness of faith to go to

should take refuge in nothing but the Scriptures. Otherwise, if they looked to anything else, they would be vexed and lost, for they would not know which is the church, and thereby fall into the abomination of desolation that stands in the holy place of the church." (S. "Lutherans," V, 159.)

In retrospect of all that has been discussed, we must repeat what "Lehre und Wehre" says (Vol. XVI, p. 74): "Whatever may be the meaning of the translation of chapter (Dan.) 8, 19 (for Luther translates differently than Delitzsch), at any rate, the extreme limit of the time about which Daniel received revelations is not to be thought of. The proof is found in chap. 9, where the time to the appearing of Christ is given, the nature of the New Testament economy is exactly described, and the death of the Son of Man, as well as the destruction of Jerusalem following it, is described, as the Lord Himself, Matth. 24, 15, describes the fulfillment of this prophecy as imminent at the destruction of Jerusalem."

H. Kanold.

Literature.

The Lutheran Calendar, 1887, Allentown, Pa. Published by T. H. Diehl. Price 10 cts. 75 cts. per dozen. 90 cts. postage paid.

Church Almanac 1887. Lutheran Bookstore, Philadelphia. Single copy 10 cts. 12 copies 75 cts; with postage 85 cts.

Both calendars give the statistics of the whole Lutheran calling church in the United States. That of the "Brobst's" calendar is more accurate, as a glance at the Synodical Conference statistics will show. The **Church Almanac** has the following: Wisconsin Synod 135 pastors, Missouri Synod 881, Minnesota Synod 40, English Conference of Missouri 5; Summa 1065. The "Brobst's" calendar: Wisconsin Synod 121 pastors, Missouri Synod 938, Minnesota Synod 44, English Conference 5; Summa 1108. F. P.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The Congregationalists and "progressive orthodoxy". It really does appear that among Congregationalists the so-called progressive orthodoxy, as represented by the Andover Seminary, is being seriously proclaimed. The introduction took place at this year's meeting of the American Board for Outer Mission at Des Moines, Iowa. During the year the Board of Missions had refused to send missionaries who were known to be adherents of the second probation theory, taught especially at Andover, i.e., the doctrine that those who did not hear the gospel here on earth would be given an opportunity to repent in that life. At the meeting in Des Moines a great fight broke out, because representatives

of Andover, e.g. Professor Egbert Smyth, were present and enjoyed full freedom of speech. But the Mission Board carried the day. On a vote, more than two-thirds of the voting members declared the doctrine of a "probation after death" to be "second probation." Prof. Smyth, formerly of an Executive Committee of the Missionary Society, was not re-elected. But the proceedings at Des Moines were only a prelude. A complaint had been filed with the Board of Visitors of Andover Seminary by former students of that institution (among them the editor of the "Congregationalist," Dr. Dexter), that Professors Smyth, Tucker, Harris, Hincks, and Churchill, the editors of the "Andover Review," had espoused in the columns of that periodical and elsewhere a theology which in important doctrines was radically contrary to what they promised to teach when they took their professorships. The investigation before the supervisory authority began at the end of October and is still in progress. The charge is, first of all, in general, that Professor Smyth and his aforementioned colleagues are teaching doctrines by which the original character of the theological seminary, as determined by the constitution and the statutes, is being robbed. Then, in the indictment, the individual points of doctrine in which Smyth and his colleagues are guilty of deviation are specified. We report according to a telegram in the local "Globe-Democrat". Prof. Smyth teaches: 1. The Bible is not the "only perfect guide to faith and life." 2. Christ, in the state of humiliation, was but a finite being, in that he was but limited in all his attributes, faculties, and knowledge; in other words, Christ was not "God-man." 3. ... (The third point is unintelligible in the Dispatch. L. u. W.) 4. Men are sinners only when they have received knowledge of the "historical Christ," or if they are sinners beforehand, yet their sinfulness has not the character of running the risk of being lost thereby. 005 No man can be lost unless he has first heard of Christ. 006 The reconciliation made by Christ consists essentially in his becoming identified with the human race by his incarnation. (7) The Trinity is only a modal or monarchical, and not a personal one. (8) The work of the Holy Spirit is mainly directed to the sphere of historical Christianity. (9) Blessedness is not by grace alone. 10. Faith should be more scientific and rational than scriptural. (11) There is yet a probation after this life for all men who do not decisively reject Christ in this life. This should be decidedly emphasized, nay, made the center of a systematic theology. - Prof. Smyth first replied to this that he did not teach what he was accused of.

F. P.

The Episcopalians and the Proposed Union. As we reported in the September issue of this magazine, a memorandum was submitted to the last "General Convention" of the Episcopalians in Chicago, to the effect that the Episcopal Church would also like to take measures "to promote an organic union of Christians in this country. Now the bishops assembled at Chicago, in a "Declaration by the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Council Assembled," made known the conditions under which they would enter into a union with other communions. After affirming their desire for union, and conceding that all those baptized in the name of the Triune God are members of the Holy Catholic Church, and that human orders should not be invoked as obstacles to union, the bishops continue: "However, we hereby declare,

that the Christian unity so earnestly desired by the framers of the Memorandum can be restored only when all Christian communities return to the principles of unity which we see in practice in the undivided Catholic Church in her early days. We believe that these principles are the substantial deposit of the Christian faith and order, entrusted by Christ and his Apostles to the Church until the end of time, and therefore not to be compromised or abandoned by those who are ordained to administer them for the good of all men." Then the bishops state in detail the following "as essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom": "1. The sacred Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the revealed Word of God. 2. the Nicene Symbolum is a sufficient exposition of the Christian faith. 3. in the administration of the two Sacraments, Baptism and Holy Communion, the words of Christ's institution and the elements ordered by Christ must be used. 4. the historic episcopate, adapted in its operation to the various needs of the nations and people called by God into the unity of his Church, local, (is to be recognized)." On this the "Presbyterian," Nov. 30, makes the following remark:-"Some of the conditions which are stated to be essential may at once be accepted by ALL. The first will not be questioned by all who are really professors of the Christian faith. As to the second, many will remark that the Nicene Symbolum is certainly orthodox, but they will have misgivings whether it is a sufficient statement of the Christian faith. The third article, which concerns the Sacraments, may be considered a sufficient exposition of the truth of Scripture for the purpose of ecclesiastical union." (?) "The fourth 'essential' point is not conducive to union. The 'historic episcopate' blocks the way. The original apostolic episcopate was not a diocesan episcopate. Even the greatest Anglican scholars now confess this, and with regard to the claim contained in this part of the Declaration, we must say: Your episcopate is not sufficiently 'historical' so that with the acceptance of it the Church would come to the apostolic position. It arose later, as some of the Fathers testify. This article in the Declaration would further require, in its practical application, the repeated ordination of the whole ministry of the 'communities' to which the Declaration is addressed." Incidentally, not all Episcopalians who attended the General Convention in Chicago insisted on the "historic episcopate." But it will remain with the declaration of the "Episcopalians." Incidentally, the Episcopalians have to put up with a good deal of ridicule from the "other communities," in that it is held against them that their "historic episcopacy" is, after all, the only article of faith to which they adhere unalterably. The ridicule is not undeserved. For it is precisely among the Episcopalians that the "do right and shun no one" religion has become very widespread under the outward ecclesiastical garb.

F. P.

"Rev." Sam Jones. At the invitation of the Methodist preachers of Boston, Sam Jones will preach a series of "sermons" in that city in a short time. The Baptist and Congregational pastors, after consultation, declined to be involved in the Jones movement. But we do not find the right reason given for the non-involvement. Jones has quickly progressed from Hanswurstiades to insolent blasphemy of the main doctrines of Christianity. For some time he has been mocking with his unwashed mouth the doctrine that Christ's death was substitutionary. That nevertheless still sectarian preachers prescribe to Jones, in order to

his ministries to produce a "revival" in their congregations clearly shows that even such preachers have fallen away from Christianity altogether. F. P.

A new Lutheran journal. The Augustana Book Concern will soon begin publishing a Swedish theological quarterly. This, as we see from "Augustana och Missionären", will not be so "learned" "that only the most learned people can profit by reading it", but will be written in a language "which is comprehensible to every man with some education, yes, to the common man". The new quarterly appears at the price of \$2.00 the volume @ 4 issues. C. D.

Not the Right Reviser. The Century Company, as previously reported, intends to publish an ecclesiastical lexicon, and the Synod of Southwest Virginia (part of the United Synod of the Lutheran Church of the South) had a committee request the Century Company to provide a correct presentation in the articles pertaining to the Lutheran Church. Now, as reported in "Our Church Paper", Dr. Conrad has been appointed by the General Synod as revisor of the articles concerning the Lutheran Church. The Lutheran Church will come off badly enough in this very latest English-American Lexicon.

F. P.

United Presbyterians. At a meeting of the United Presbyterian Church at Pittsburgh, the nonsensical raving that the use of organs, etc., in worship gatherings is sinful was expressed as follows: "Because we believe that instrumental music in worship in the New Testament covenant has no divine appointment and is therefore a corruption of worship, it is our duty not to favor or countenance its use in any way. And we hereby counsel all our brethren to stand fast, and not to defile and wound their consciences by consenting to anything that is against their conscience, or of which they are in doubt in conscience." F. P.

Necrological. Dr. A. A. Hodge, Professor of Dogmatics at Princeton Seminary, well known in wider circles, died November 12.

II. Abroad.

Bavaria. A booklet of more than ordinary interest is the newly published, 62 pages long, and with a preface: Illumination of the Negotiations of the Bavarian General Synod of 1885 in Three Points. Published by G. Löhe's Buchhandlung in Nuremberg, 1887 - The preface says, among other things: "These sheets are not intended to be a review of the entire proceedings of the Bavarian General Synod of 1885; otherwise, many other things would have been objected to, such as the resolution on intercession for Israel and the wording of the provisions on the burial of suicides, but on the other hand, good things that this General Synod brought to light would also have had to be acknowledged. We have considered only three of its decisions, which concern us most, since they are of great importance in principle. That the General Synod, in these resolutions, so decisively and summarily rejected, without further elaboration, three motions aimed at the decisive assertion of recognized ecclesiastical Lutheran principles, is a saddening sign to us that there can be no question of progress in the shaping of the Regional Church on the basis of the Lutheran confession at the present time, since, on the contrary, the representation of the Regional Church is evidently making more of a stand against a decidedly confessional direction than before. - The pamphlet itself contains three parts, each of which

each has a resolution of the General Synod as its subject. These three articles also have three different authors, who, however, do not give their names, but only declare that "these sheets do not come from the Society for Inner Mission in matters of the Lutheran Church, nor from pastors of the same, but only from some who did not want to involve anyone else in the responsibility. The writing, therefore, comes out of the Bavarian Church itself, and is all the more weighty. - The three resolutions of the Bavarian General Synod in question were prompted by three corresponding motions which were submitted to it. The first of these motions was: "Reverend General Synod shall request the Royal High Consistory to successfully oppose the Hörger separation by exparochising the members of our church living in the parish of Herbishofen and Grönenbach. This motion was aimed at putting an end to the abominable union in the Memmingen deanery, and according to the information in the pamphlet, nothing would have been more natural and self-evident than for a church that wants to be Lutheran to have immediately laid a hand on this rotten spot. Not so the General Synod of Bavaria. It simply rejected this motion. And how disgraceful the procedure was in doing so is shown by the very first of the three articles. - The second motion concerned the pastoral and sacramental service of the Lutheran soldiers in the united Rhine Palatinate. Already in 1881 such a motion had been submitted to the General Synod and had been accepted by it. But the Royal State Government, by resolution of Nov. 2, 1882, in agreement with the church regiment, had rejected this application. Therefore, a new motion with the following content was brought before the General Synod of 1885: "That a military chaplain be sent twice a year to the Palatinate to minister pastorally and sacramentally to the Lutheran soldiers there." As the second part of the pamphlet shows, this request was also rejected under the most trivial of pretexts. The writer of the article says of it: "What is sorely missed at this hearing is, above all, a clear and decisive statement on the Union, which, after all, the situation of the times so imperiously demands." - The third motion was: "Reverend General Synod should request the church government to ensure that no pastor who believes in conscience that he cannot serve Holy Communion to divorced, unmarried couples in violation of the Scriptures, can be forced to do so." One would hardly think it possible that a Lutheran body would not immediately grant such a request as a matter of course. And yet the hardly believable happened: it was unanimously and flatly rejected, and under such circumstances that the pamphlet writer exclaims in view of it: "It is the most deplorable hearing of the whole General Synod." He also shares the principles that were expressed when the relationship of the pastor to his church government was discussed. Of the latter it is said quite naively that "without its inviolable authority there would no longer be any guarantee for the uniform leadership of the pastoral office in the congregation. Even in the worst case imaginable" - this is the case, according to the pamphlet writer's judgment, "that an" (ecclesiastical regimental) "order is made against God's word" - that is, even in this worst case, "the occurrence of which no one fears, a pastor burdened in his conscience by an ecclesiastical regimental order would not have the right, would not have the right to place his subjective considerations, from which he has formed his judgment, higher than the opposing ones, which are the basis of the order and arise from a point of view, which, because it is really a higher one and widens the circle of vision, in complicated matters finally makes possible not only a different judgment, but also a corresponding action.) "rgehen to a sacred duty...." The

The pamphleteer duly rejects this papist filth, and shows how in this debate "everything was turned upside down," and that Luther, according to it, committed the greatest injustice, "to place his subjective considerations higher than the opposing ones, which arose from the higher standpoint and enlarged sphere of vision of the Papal See!" Truly sad fruits of such a general synod of the regional church! The conductor of it was the well-known Oberconsistorialpräsident A. v. Stählin, who never tires of praising the excellence of his Landeskirche before others at every opportunity. Whoever wishes to test the truth of this praise should read the pamphlet, written with great earnestness and skill, but should not forget to check it, and know that its position on the separation question, among other things, is to be explained precisely from the wrong standpoint of the regional church writer. J. Fackler.

How to build churches in Munich. The Luthardt'sche Kirchenzeitung of Oct. 29 reports: Three Roman Catholic parish churches are to be built in Munich. A lottery has been approved for the construction of the first of these, St. Benno's Church, which is to be begun as early as this spring, and the entire clergy is invited in the official gazette for the archdiocese "to promote the completion of the same by accepting lots and also to encourage the faithful in a suitable manner to participate in it. However, the motivation should not be the prospect of obtaining rich monetary profits, but the desire to contribute to the promotion of a work that is to be founded for the glory of God, for the glory of our holy city and country patron dimen and for the salvation of immortal souls". But for what purpose does one then hold out the prospect of rich pecuniary gains at all? - In order to promote the purposes of the Protestant Church Building Society, which has been formed to build a third Protestant church in Munich, a public bazaar is to be held in Munich in November. - So far the Kztg. This unity in practice seems also to foreshadow an inner kinship. F. P.

Hermannsburg. In Hermannsburg, the part of the congregation that left the old congregation under the leadership of Father Drewes is in the process of building a church. A wealthy follower of Drewes donated a house and property and 6000 Marks for this purpose. So reports the Luthardt'sche Kztg.

Jesuits. The Luthardt'sche Kztg. writes: Baron von Schorlemer, formerly an officer and as a volunteer already involved in the campaign against France in 1870, since then ecclesiastical Inspector of the Episcopal Boys' Convict in Fulda, has resigned his position and will enter the Jesuit Order. One son of the family v. Schorlemer, write the clerical sheets, is already Jesuit; another, formerly trainee teacher, prepares for the priestly ordination; four daughters have become nuns. - The same newspaper later reports: "As recently announced, two members of the baronial family v. Schorlemer have entered the Jesuit Order. It deserves to be pointed out again to the very remarkable circumstance that just members of distinguished Roman Catholic families of Germany become members of the Jesuit Order. Apart from the above-mentioned, there are at present still in the Jesuit Order: Prince Wladislaw Radziwill, then a Count v. Brenken from the vicinity of Paderborn, three members of the Haza-Radlitz family, and a Count Hoensbroech, whose brother has placed his castle Blyenbeck, situated in Holland, at the disposal of the Jesuits. One reason for this phenomenon will be found in the fact that the noble Roman Catholic families had their sons educated in Jesuit grammar schools. In the educational institution at Feldkirch in Austria, which has been completely under the direction of the Jesuit Order since October 1, 1856, there were 381 pupils in 1885, 238 of them from the German Reich, among them sons of Prince Blücher, the Counts Chamaré, Praschma, Strachwitz, Matuschka, Henckel, Droste, Galen, the Barons v. Fürstenberg, and the Baron of the Holy Roman Empire.

and v. Loe, and even clerical papers admit that this list is far from complete. Another number of German noblemen have their children educated in the French and Belgian Jesuit institutions. A strange phenomenon indeed! Because of its dangerous aims and means, the Jesuit Order is forbidden by Imperial law to reside and, as a consequence, to work in the German Empire, and this law is now being circumvented by educating German youth in Jesuit institutions outside the Empire!

An Archbishop's toast. The Archbishop of Cologne offered the following toast at Aachen on June 19, d. l.: "To the welfare of the two sovereign powers in State and Church. Our holy father Leo XIII, our exalted Emperor William - long live he." On June 19, the Archbishop of Cologne already knew the Pope's Encyclical of Nov. 1, 1885, according to which he can only have thought of the word "sovereign" in relation to the German Emperor in quotation marks. In this Encyclical, the Pope recognizes only those authorities as ordered by God who profess the "right" religion, i.e., the Papist religion. If an authority does not do the latter, it commits a "crime" and then - this can be read between the lines - the provisions of Nicolaus I and Gregory VII take effect, as Leo XIII expressly refers to all his papal predecessors for his view of the relationship between ecclesiastical and secular authority. F. P.

Victory of the "Church" over the State. The "Luthardtsche Kirchenzeitung" of Oct. 22 reports: Canon Dulinski at Gniezno publishes the following declaration: "Obedient as a priest to the command of my *Celsissimi ordinarii*, I hereby retract wherewith I may have given any offence." The offence which Dulinski atoned for by his servile declaration had consisted in the fact that, at the beginning of the Kulturkampf, he had publicly declared that he still felt obliged to obey the laws of the State.

The Leipzig Mission. Father Willkomm reports in the "Freikirche": The Leipzig Mission held its annual celebration on June 16, which was also a jubilee, since on August 17, 1836, the Dresden Mission Association was constituted as the Association for Lutheran Mission. From the annual report of Director D. Hardeland, which has just appeared in the Mission Gazette, the following is reported: In 1840, Missionary Kordes began work in Tranquebar and the surrounding area, where 1400 souls from the old Halle Mission were still left who wanted to remain Lutheran. In 1850 there were 6 missionaries working with 15 catechists and 33 teachers and had 2957 church members and 833 pupils. In 1860 there were 9 missionaries, 2 country preachers, 150 other assistants, 4846 souls, 1047 pupils. 1870: 16 missionaries, 4 country preachers, 4 candidates, 70 catechists, 35 other assistants, 113 teachers, 8930 souls, 1811 pupils. 1880: 19 missionaries, 9 country preachers, 107 catechists and other assistants, 173 teachers, 11,981 souls and 2438 children. For the current year the number of souls is given as about 14000; there are 22 missionaries working outside, after two returned to the homeland last year, namely the Swedish missionary D. Blomstrand, who, after 28 years of uninterrupted work, is so weak that he can no longer hold office in his homeland, and the Mecklenburg missionary Ihlefeld. The reporter says of the latter: "Missionary Ihlefeld had initially only asked for a longer leave of absence and then hoped to be able to resume his old work. A bathing cure, which he used, did not remain without the desired success. But since the doctor nevertheless declared with certainty that his ailments under the tropics would return immediately and to an increased degree, and since just now, when 7 young brothers could fill the gaps, there seemed to be no particular need for his return to India, he nevertheless believed that we should ask for his release.

which we could not deny him under these circumstances. He has now taken up a pastorate again in his Mecklenburg home." - In the last year 934 heathens were baptized. The income amounted to 296,533 M. 89 Pf. in offerings, and 13,621 M. in other income, so that with the previous year's cash on hand (39,404 M. 74 Pf.) the total income comes to 349,559 M. 86 Pf., which is offset by a total expenditure of 308,282 M. 52 Pf. - Referring to the occasion of the jubilee, the constitution of the Dresden Mission Society, which until then had served the Basel Mission, as a Lutheran society, D. Hardeland says the following: "We know well that God has his work everywhere and that children are born to him wherever his word is still preached, and we rejoice in all the blessings that he places on such preaching everywhere. But what we confess at home for his glory, we cannot conceal outside among the heathen, and we would be found unfaithful servants, if we wanted to bury the pound of knowledge from his word, which he has bestowed on our church, in the sweat cloth, instead of usury it according to his will and command." These words are true and worthy of heeding, but have still further consequences than D. Hardeland draws from them. Noteworthy is also the remark beforehand that from the ecclesiastical development (namely in the domestic church) also the mission cannot remain untouched. This remark is true not only when the church, as happened 50 years ago, returns to the confession, but also when, as happened afterwards, it becomes unfaithful to it again. Yes, "it is a groundless opinion, as if the ecclesiastical differences of the homeland were of no importance in the practice of the mission and, as it were, blurred themselves. If you only look around a little more closely on the mission field, you will soon find that every mission, in its doctrinal position and overall attitude, bears the characteristic features of its home church, as indeed it cannot be otherwise"! Yes, it cannot be otherwise, and therefore the Leipzig Mission should renounce the syncretism of the native churches, so that the Tamulen Church outside may become a truly Lutheran one. - While this syncretism and church policy have so far been strong enough to hold the Leipzig mission societies together in spite of existing differences in doctrine and practice, they have proved powerless in the face of the national efforts connected with the colonization movement in the German Empire. For a part of the Bavarian mission friends has organized itself as the "Lutheran Mission for Astafrika" with Pastor Jttameier at its head and, as it seems from the report of the director, which he gave to the General Assembly, at first rejected any connection with Leipzig, among other things, as it seems, because a different constitution is considered necessary. - We know only the report from Leipzig, and therefore refrain from making a judgment, but cannot suppress the remark that on the part of the Leipzigers greater sobriety seems to us to be necessary, since in fact the Tamulen Mission still requires work enough before one can go to new fields of work. So far the "Free Church". In the "N. Zeitblatt" of October 13 we read that the new Bavarian Missionary Society has already sent two missionaries to East Africa, the new field of work.

F. P.

A Conservative Verdict on the Centrum. The paper of the conservative party, the conservative Correspondenz, writes after the "N. Z." as follows There is no question that a large part of the Centrist press has nothing at all in common with us, stands politically on radical-democratic ground, flirts with all efforts hostile to the Reich, hardly takes the trouble to conceal its hatred of Prussia and the German Reich, and through the hypocritical cloak of positive-religious and conservative phrases, with which these abysses

are obscured by destructive work and fierce enmity, only increases our reluctance to enter into this political mixture. But even the positive activity which for years has united us with the Centrum in certain fields is for us, under present conditions, tainted with an unpleasant aftertaste; for the same popular reforms with which we meet the needs of the people together with the Centrum must, as things stand, also serve to strengthen the position of Centrum leaders who immediately use this advantage in a different direction and for the pursuit of quite different aims which are antipathetic to us." Even v. Hammerstein, in a meeting at Barmen, which had met on the occasion of Hammerstein's motion, assured that his motion did not seek any closer connection with the Centrum.

F. P.

A moving complaint from Saxony. In the "Sächsisches Kirchen- und Schulblatt" (Saxon Church and School Gazette) of November 11, we read the following, which is meant quite seriously: "Various complaints have again been heard recently about the vexatious mode of filling vacancies. First of all, it is complained that in many cases the choice of those to be presented as guest preachers is already determined before the position is advertised in the Leipziger Zeitung and in the Konsistorialblatte; the latter is therefore empty form, and so and so many come forward and present themselves in person, perhaps through a longer journey to the collator completely in vain. In another case the patron presented one candidate to the church council, but left the other two to present themselves as guest preachers to the church council, and now the applicants presented themselves to the church council members. In E. near R., a position of 5100 M. excluding housing, of 34 applicants just the youngest was elected, a man of 31 years, although among the applicants was a worker who excelled in the field of Christian works of love, whose gift to captivate the spirits is well known. One wonders, however, whether these are, to use a word from the last Synod, "well-earned rights" when such a young theologian moves into an excellent position, and whether this inequity cannot easily be controlled by the simple provision: only at a certain age does one have the full enjoyment of a high position. In the case of several good positions that have recently been filled, the number of applicants has been very large - not a pleasant sight either. - Again, there are complaints about the fact that ecclesiastical positions are filled with non-Saxon theologians. The income conditions of the parishes, which are ordered by the acknowledged care of the state, may have a lot of attraction for clergymen in such countries, which "do not provide themselves with such blessings" (!). But even if it can only be to the advantage of the spiritual life in the regional church if one is careful to fill influential offices with capable theologians without regard to the nationality, the justification of the desire cannot be denied that what the Saxon state does for the pastorates should first of all also benefit the children of the state, and that if, for example, out of approximately 1100 clergymen, the state does not provide the necessary income for the clergy, the state should also provide the necessary income for the children of the state, and that if, for example, out of approximately 1100 clergymen, the state does not provide the necessary income for the children of the state, the state should also provide the necessary income for the children of the state. e.g., of about 1100 clerical positions in Saxony, 112 (about 10%) are filled by non-Saxons, the above-mentioned complaints do not seem to be unjustified." How about thinking here of some sort of protective tariff to assure the Saxon "clergy" of the "blessings" of their national church?

F. P.

Papist Missionary Zeal. The "Allgemeine Kz." reports: The Roman Catholic Mission House at Reichenbach in the Upper Palatinate, in spite of its short existence, already numbers 70 pupils (four times as many have enrolled), and is in a position to establish a branch, the Seminarium Asticanum, at Münster, as already mentioned. The first sending out of missionaries is planned for the coming year. For the Christian education of the female pagan youth, a female branch of the

missionary society (missionary sisters) be formed. For this purpose, a Munich family provided Rector Amrhein with a country house on Lake Starnberg.

Church discipline in the Saxon regional church. The "Sächsische Kirchen- und Schulblatt" (Saxon Church and School Gazette) of October 28 very naively remarks: "The church must still come to the point of excluding from Holy Communion such sellers of brandy who knowingly sell brandy to notorious drunkards and knowingly corrupt them in body and soul." It is very sad that it must "come to this." F. P.

Ecclesiastical Artistic Spirit in Saxony. In one of his missives, Superintendent Meyer-Zwickau announced that the so-called whitening of the churches was also to be reported to the inspection and that permission was to be obtained for this. This is a very practical order, which all superintendents of the country should issue in the same way. For it is well known how not infrequently pictures on ceilings and walls are buried under the whitewash of the wise rationalistic church renovation, similar to the magnificent mosaic work in the Church of St. Sophia at Constantinople, of course not of the same value as there, but nevertheless not infrequently quite appealing, despite their origin in the way of a more handicraft painting and incomparably better than whitewash, also like wood carvings, etc., which have lost all beauty through whitewashing. (We know of a crucifix. During the whitewashing of the church, it was completely whitewashed along with the wood of the cross and the body of Christ, and otherwise broken here and there, and looked completely worthless and ugly. It was desecrated, repaired and painted and now presents itself in private ownership as a magnificent wood carving). Also in the Zwickau Ephory, one has recently discovered such pictures on the whitewashed ceiling in Hirschfeld, which was just about to be whitewashed again. In addition, the whitewashing of churches is a barbarism which must stop. ("Sächs. K.- und Schulbl.")

Reserved Church Seats in Prussia. In response to the complaint of a villager in the district of Guben about reserved church seats, the Royal Consistory has replied that the acquired entitlement refers only to the actual church service and is conditional upon the timely appearance of the entitled persons. The privilege expires if the entitled persons have not arrived at the beginning of the service, and the churchgoers present are then free to take the seats.

Roman propaganda in Potsdam. The "Allgemeine Kz." of Oct. 22 writes: On the occasion of a hearing of the District Synod of Potsdam on the conditions of the municipal hospital there, the speaker on this question, Rev. Persius, had also mentioned the Roman Catholic St. Joseph's Hospital there and, on the basis of circulating rumors and a printed document from Teschen, in which reference is made to proselytizing in the hospital there, put forward the suspicion as not unfounded that something similar, as in Teschen, could also happen in the St. Joseph's Hospital. Archpriest Beyer in Potsdam had published a brochure against these statements, in which he not only described all rumors of conversion attempts in St. Joseph's Hospital as "groundless slander", but also presented the facts reported from Teschen, based on the inquiries he had made, as completely groundless and fictitious. On the basis of the negotiations held at the district synod and the information that was partly collected and partly voluntarily received, the synodal board of the Potsdam district synod now publishes an open "Declaration Concerning Catholic Propaganda in Potsdam," in which it is stated that the fear expressed by Preacher Persius with regard to attempts to convert Protestants in the St. Joseph's Hospital is well-founded, and therefore both the accusation made directly against Preacher Persius and the accusation against him are justified.

The Synodal Board resolutely rejects the accusation of grave suspicion as well as the indirect accusation of groundless slander. As proof of the correctness of the expressed fear, the synodal board publishes a number of documents, among which is also a series of authenticated protocols, from which it emerges that in St. Joseph's Hospital, attempts were made to persuade various Protestant convicts to convert to the Roman Catholic Church.

Papist Character Picture from Silesia. At Domb in the district of Katowice in Upper Silesia a great movement has broken out since the middle of October among the Roman Catholic population, which shows anew how powerful superstition is among these people. Two schoolboys told me that they had seen an image on the cut surface of a sawed-off branch on a tree. A woman who heard about it immediately made an image of the Mother of God with the Child Jesus out of it; later a knight was added, who was keeping watch with drawn sword. Since October 14, the tree has been surrounded day and night by hundreds and thousands of people, and traffic has been impeded. Neither Gensdarm nor Amtsvorsteher, neither the local teacher nor the Roman Catholic clergymen of the surrounding villages were able to talk sense into the people. Every leaf, every piece of bark was picked up and used to make a miracle potion. The lame and the blind waited before the tree for their recovery. Finally, there was nothing left to do but to cut down the tree. But even this did not help; for now the crowd wants to see the image of Our Lady on the cut surface of the tree stump that was left standing!

("General Kz")

State church weapons. According to the "Allgemeine Kz. the Methodist preacher J. Sträßler in Greiz has also been sentenced in the second instance by the district court in Greiz to eight days in prison for holding a church service. About 30 members of the Methodists have left the state church; however, their repeated petition for the establishment of free religious practice in the Principality of Reuß ä. L. has not yet been considered. L. has not yet found consideration.

Schoolchildren in Prussia. According to the latest statistics, the total number of school-age children in Prussia is 5,500,000, of whom 4,800,000 attend the public elementary school.

Private confession in Lübeck. In the Lutheran churches of Lübeck, private confession existed exclusively until a few years ago. After the Jakobi church first went ahead with the introduction of general confession, the Marien congregation now also intends to apply to the Senate as the higher church authority for permission to introduce general confession, and the Dom congregation also wants to follow this example, as it is said. In contrast, the Aegidien and Petri congregations insist on private confession.

("Allgem. Kz.")

Papism in England. The "Neue Zeitblatt" of Oct. 20 writes: The increase of Catholics in England is a parade-horse which the Catholics like to ride forth to show that their Church is victoriously overcoming Protestantism. Nor is it to be denied that conversions to Catholicism are comparatively numerous in England; but this does not prove what it ought to prove, even with the aid of exaggerations. The Englishman Crockery has published a very thorough study of the subject, from which we learn some things. Of decisive importance would be what he teaches about the proportions of the population; that the Protestant population of Great Britain and Ireland has increased by 10 million in the last 40 years, while the Catholic population has decreased by 2 million; likewise that the number of Catholic souls has not grown in the same proportion as the increase in population for 20 years. But it must be added that for years a strong emigration of Catholic Irishmen to America has taken place, admittedly also

to England. This last may give the appearance that conversions to Catholicism have grown in England, and so they are interpreted by Catholics. There are 2514 Catholic priests in England, and only 200 of these alone are from the State Church. The apostates are often enough listed by number, name, and rank, and form a handsome number, if one does not add that they are divided over a long series of years, and have greatly diminished in recent years. They brought with them to the Catholic Church immense fortunes, which have greatly benefited Rome. The state church of England, the Anglican Church, is governed by bishops, whose head is the king at the head of parliament. Its number of souls in 1851 was about 5 millions and 200,000. All the other ecclesiastical communities and sects are grouped together under the name of Dissenters, whose number in 1851 amounted to 5 millions and 600,000. Since then no official census has been made, although it is concluded from some facts that the number of souls of the Dissenters has still further exceeded that of the State Church. Now it is certain that not a single Dissenter falls away to the Catholic Church, unless he had previously become an Anglican. Apostasy to Catholicism exists only in the Anglican State Church, and even here it is the high and low estates that read the apostates. The middle classes everywhere shut themselves off from apostasy, for even the dissenters belong for the most part to the middle classes. That the Anglicans in particular develop such an inclination towards Catholicism is mainly due to their church system, which has retained much papist leaven, and in recent decades has often taken on a papist form, especially in the prevailing ritualism.

Lutheran Parishes in Russia. The "Pilgrim from Saxony" of October 31 writes: "According to the census of 1883, there were 457 Lutheran parishes in Russia with 468 pastors; in addition, without Poland and Finland, there are 7 independent Grusinian parishes." Concerning the size of individual parishes, the same paper reports the following: The St. Petersburg "Ev.-luth. Sonntagsblatt" reports: The parish of Roschischtschi in the northern part of the governorate of Wolhynien, which is served by a single pastor, consists of more than 300 settlements, which are divided into 108 school parishes, and these again into 10 school teacher council districts. In 1885, 2197 children were born there, 878 children were confirmed, and there were 17,761 communicants! The number of souls in this parish, according to the figures given, must amount to 30-40,000! Shitomir is probably as large, if not larger, with 38,000 souls. Medveditsko-Krestovo-Bujerak on the Volga with 20,000, with as many souls as the parish of Raue in Livonia. We must make a concerted effort to divide such truly enormous parishes.

Russia. The "Allgemeine Kz." of Oct. 22 reports: The curators of the Vilnaschen and Kiewsche Lehrbrzirk have ordered that Lutheran religious instruction shall henceforth be given in Russian instead of in German as hitherto. Since the implementation of this decree would mean that the pupils would no longer be able to follow the service in their church, which is conducted everywhere in German, the pastors who work as religious teachers at the institutions in question have refused to participate in the implementation of such a measure and have turned to the Lutheran General Consistory in Petersburg, without whose approval nothing may be changed in this regard. Until the decision of the General Consistory has been made, everything is to remain as it was, i.e. Russian is to be used only for those pupils who are no longer completely proficient in their mother tongue and church language. Quite in contrast to this decree, the

In addition, the curator of the Dorpat teaching district has recently expressly stipulated that religious instruction in the schools under his jurisdiction is to be given in the language in which the child prays at home, i.e. in its mother tongue and church language. - At the opening ceremony of the first Russian secondary school in Riga, Kapustin, the curator of the teaching district in Dorpat, gave a speech in which he outlined the government's programme for the education of the Baltic people. The curator called the existing Baltic school "a political institution for the maintenance of foreign, predominantly German culture". From a Russian, social, and governmental point of view, such an occurrence was abnormal. Therefore, he said, the Baltic youth must be educated in the patriotic spirit and in the imperial language to a true understanding of the meaning of Russian sentiment and Russian life. In conclusion, the curator said literally: "Join in friendship with the Russian people and walk together under the holy banner which is in the hands of the mighty Czarist leader and which bears the motto: 'Hail, honor and glory of Russia!'"

Bishop Bryennios. This discoverer and editor of the "Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles" (see "Doctrine and Defense" 1884 p. 272 ff.) has recently made his name "famous" in another way. At Sardivan, in his diocese, there are a number of people who have converted to Protestantism. Last year the bishop visited that town and excommunicated all the converts, who were terribly maltreated as a result. The "Presbyterian", which reports the above, adds: "It would be good if the bishop also discovered a copy of the New Testament, in order to recognize what a brainchild he is

Bulgaria. The "Allgemeine Kz." reports: The German Protestant congregation in Sofia has been deprived of its protector and maintainer, Prince Alexander, by the political upheavals in Bulgaria, and at present stands helpless. The former pastor of the congregation, court preacher Dr. Koch, has also left Sofia, and the young congregation, which had to form itself anew, does not yet have the necessary means to hire another preacher, indeed, it is not even in a position to be able to reopen the German school.

Dante's "Divine Comedy" among the Turks. The "Presbyterian" of Nov. 13 reports: The Turkish Minister of the Interior has forbidden the circulation of Dante's "Divine Comedy" in all the provinces of the Turkish Empire. He says the book is nothing but a mockery of all religions.

F. P.

Bible Knowledge in Roman Catholic Italy. Although unbelief prevails today in a terrible way in our country, in England, Germany, and other countries, it is still generally considered a necessary requirement of an educated person to have a historical knowledge of the contents of the Bible. Only in Roman Catholic Italy does the same ignorance seem to be found in this respect as was by no means rare in the whole Christian world before the Reformation. This is shown in the "Rivista Cristiana" from Italy by some "blossoms". At the introduction of a new "series" of these blossoms, Tito Pesci, the correspondent who brings these blossoms, says: "My explanation is not yet finished, since the ignorance concerning the greatest book, on which mankind may do itself some good (!) is infinite, and I do not mean the ignorance among the wholly uneducated (analfabeti), which after all usually recedes in silence, but that which shows itself among the educated, nay, among the masters, under the appearance of knowledge, as has been seen" (namely, from earlier articles by the same correspondent). "Therefore let us still record some "crabs" 1) which "catch" those who are

1) "Catching crabs", Italian expression for "shooting bucks".

Contemporary history.

cite the Bible, without knowing it, in their ignorance." Among the "bucks" (or "crabs") which the Italian correspondent brings, we will single out only a few. Thus, for example, the "Gjornale di Sicilia" speaks of Christmas Day as the memorable day "which all Christendom, or at least a great part of it, honors and sanctifies, because on that day Mary of Magdala (Maria di Magdala) gave birth to him who afterwards was the great philosopher of Nazareth, who afterwards became the great philosopher of Nazareth, Jesus Christ, the sacrifice of Juda and Pilate (la vittima di Gjuda e di Pilato), the alp (incubo) of the Romans and the founder of the Catholic religion". - One of the editors of the "Nazione," Jarro, otherwise known as "witty," wrote on May 31, 1885, in his dramatic review in that same "Nazione": " 'Vox, vox praetereaue nihil' as Jacob said to Esau." - After all this, Italy is still today the land of darkness.

C. D.

Italy. The convent law is now very strictly enforced in Italy. The authorities are instructed to see that all girls newly clothed contrary to the law are returned to their parents. Twenty convents are again to be vacated shortly and handed over to the civil authorities. In contrast to this, however, is the fact that the minister Tajani has given his son to the Benedictines for education. The radical papers attack him vehemently for this.

(General Kz.)

Jews in Spain. In the whole of Spain there are at present only 276 men and 130 women of the Jewish religion. So reports the Luthardt'sche Kirchenzeitung according to the Israelite Alliance.

The Fliedner "Mission" in Spain. The "Allgemeine Kz." reports: The evangelistic work in Spain represented by Pastor F. Fliedner in Madrid

is, according to his report, making slow but steady progress. Not a single evangelical school has yet been permanently closed. The same are now attended by 6000 children of indifferent Roman Catholics and by 2000 children of Protestant parents. There are about 70 small Protestant missionary congregations, the number of which is constantly increasing. Recently, as already mentioned, Pastor Fliedner opened a summer station and holiday colony for Protestant orphans near the Escorial. As a result of the delay caused by German objection to Spain's taking possession of the Caroline Islands, the existence of the American missions on them has been secured. The Spaniards would hardly have understood themselves to promise the toleration of this Protestant mission if the possession of the islands had not been disputed with them.

The Bible in Finnish. As the "Kirketidende" reports from a bulletin, Lars Hätta has translated the Old Testament into Finnish (Lappish) at the instigation of the Norwegian Bible Society. For economic reasons, however, only the 1st Book of Moses will be published for the time being. The Bishop of Tromsø (whose district includes the mission among the Finns) calls in circulars addressed to the pastors for an attempt to collect contributions from the congregations, so that other parts of the Old Testament could be published more or less simultaneously with Genesis 1. We add that the New Testament has been in circulation in Finnish for some time.

C. D.

Japan. The "Neue Zeitblatt" of October 20 reports: In Japan an association has formed under the name of the "Enemies of Jesus" to oppose the growth of Christianity. However, the Japanese government has forbidden the use of the name "enemies". The number of baptized Christians is growing considerably, and this is the reason why the Association of the Enemies of Jesus was formed.