

Doctrine and Defense.

Theological and ecclesiastical
contemporary history

Monthly Bulletin.

Published

by the

German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and
other states.

Edited by

Teachers' College of St. Louis Seminary.

Luther: "A preacher must not only feed, so that he instructs the sheep how they should be true Christians, but also ward off the wolves, so that they do not attack the sheep and lead them astray with false teaching and introduce error, as the devil does not rest. Now you will find many people who may well suffer you to preach the gospel, if only you do 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 throw up stones, and I see another throwing them in again? The wolf can well suffer that the sheep have good pasture, he has them the better that they find hostile; but he cannot suffer that the dogs bark hostilely."

**Twenty-second volume.
St. Louis, Mo.**

Druckeri of the Synod of Missouri, Ohio, & a. State.

1876

Content.

January.

Page

Foreword	1
About Renitence and Separation	11
Da- Dächsel'sche Bibelwerk.	19
Literary	21
Ecclesiastical - Contemporary	26

February.

Foreword	33
What is it about the progress of modern Lutheran theology in doctrine?...	40
About the usury question.-	47
Ecclesiastical contemporary history	51

March.

Foreword	65
Corrigendum	77
To my justification	78
Literature	86
Ecclesiastical contemporary history	87

April.

What is it about the progress of modern Lutheran theology in doctrine?...	97
Concerns and hints for their solution	105
Clear evidence that Rom. 7, 14-25. is only about the one who is born again, which St. Paul presents as his person	111
Rene literature	119
Ecclesiastical - Contemporary	121

May.

Christ is Jehovah	129
Don of the transmission of the sacred office of preaching	138
The Hexaemeron in Relation to Geology	144
Ecclesiastical - Contemporary	152

June.

What is it about the progress of modern Lutheran theology in doctrine?...	161
The Heraemeron in Relation to Geology	169
Literary	177
Miscellaneous	181
Ecclesiastical contemporary history	182

July.

	Page
Is absolution to be spoken of categorically or hypothetically?	193
The Hexaemeron in Relation to Geology	197
Compendium of the Theology of the Fathers	203
Miscellaneous	208
Ecclesiastical - Contemporary	213

August.

A Good Testimony Concerning the Mission to the Jews with Some Remarks	225
About the conscience	231
The Galesburg Rule	234
Compendium of the Theology of the Fathers	240
Miscellaneous	242
Ecclesiastical contemporary history	247

September.

About the conscience	257
The Weimar Regional Church	263
Compendium of the Theology of the Fathers	273
Literary	278
Protest	279
Ecclesiastical contemporary	280

October.

Dr. Philippi's Doctrine of the Church	289
About the conscience	302
Explanation	306
Literary	307
Ecclesiastical contemporary history	311

November.

The "Carrying" of Melanchthon by Luther	321
Open declaration and protest	339
Explanation	341
Miscellaneous	341
Ecclesiastical - Contemporary	343

December.

The "Carrying" of Melanchthon by Luther	353
Missouri and Hermannsburg	373
Also a statement	380
Explanation	381
Ecclesiastical contemporary history	381

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 22.

January 1876.

No. 1.

Preface.

The more God blesses the testimony of our synod for His truth, the more our enemies seek to speak all kinds of things against us in order to defend themselves against this testimony. Should we allow ourselves to be made despondent by this? Shall we not finally allow ourselves to make concessions to our enemies? No, the more the reproaches of our enemies become, the more courageous, the more confident our hearts become, the more determined we become to stand firm and not waver. After all, the grace of God allows us to recognize that the very reproaches that are brought against our Synod are pure testimonies that it is a faithful daughter of the Church of the Reformation. *)

One of the main accusations we face is that of repristination. If one wants to say that we accept the old doctrine without examination for the sake of human prestige as a tradition inherited from the fathers, that we are blind followers of Luther and the old theologians and accept their sayings only because they did the same, then we reject it decisively and with a clear conscience.

We do not want to deny that if we find testimonies of Luther and the theologians who followed in his footsteps, Chemnitz, Gerhard and others, for a subject that we have not yet particularly researched, we have a good presentation. We know what God has accomplished through these men, how he has overthrown the papacy through them, rescued many from the bonds of darkness, brought the heavenly light to many. We see how they always go back to the Scriptures, how they prove what they teach with the Scriptures, how they only stand on the ground of the Scriptures and seek to place themselves on the same ground. Everyone who is concerned about truth

*) This was the subject of the Southeastern Pastoral Conference of the Western District Synod held here last fall. In accordance with the wishes of the latter, the negotiations are taken into account in the above.

people who have to do something for the sake of the world feel attracted to them. What glorious success they have had with their testimony based on Scripture, what unspeakable blessing they have brought. To them, with their strong scriptural evidence, we owe, among other things, the unity of our synod. Who can blame us if we have a good prejudice for our old theologians, Luther at the head, and if we are not ashamed of it?

But - we do not have a papist charcoal faith because of that. We do not accept anything because Luther said so. We are servants of the living God. We do not want to know anything from anyone who cannot tell us: It is written in the Word of God.

God knows that this is so. He knows that we have not accepted anything blindly; He knows how we have struggled, how many sighs have risen up to Him that we might come to a certain conviction. We did not come forward with a confession until we had seriously tested ourselves before the all-knowing God, according to his word, and were certain of our cause. Our opponents know nothing of this. They are not aware of the fact that every righteous Christian preacher, indeed every Christian, must have certainty of heart. They do not know what a delicious thing it is when the heart becomes firm. They may think up all kinds of theories, they may make the most ingenious combinations, they may soar with their thoughts into very high spheres, but in doing so (to speak with Luther) they may get into the land of milk and honey, but not into the paradise of God. So with them there can be no question of a certainty of heart that is attained only through grace. And therefore it is no wonder that they have no taste for the testimony of the ancients, who were so concerned with certainty and who sought all certainty in the words of Scripture, that they cannot find their way into it, just as we are so grateful to God for the Scriptural proof of the fathers.

We can confidently refer to our publications. No one will find expressed in them the principle that one must not examine the teachings of the ancients according to Scripture, but must simply accept them. No one will be able to prove that we have dropped the confession of our church: "Other writings of the old and new teachers, as they have names, are not to be held equal to the holy Scriptures, but are all to be subjected to them, and are not to be accepted otherwise or further than as witnesses, in what form after the apostles' time and in what places such teachings of the prophets and apostles have been preserved". (*Form. Cone, de comp. reg. atque norma, Epit.*) We have never condemned anyone merely because he has not accepted something that our symbolic books, what Luther and others have said. If this were the case, then it would have been possible to find a proof for it in 30 years. We have not been able to prove anything like that until today.

And the course of our synod testifies to the opposite. To make matters worse, a few facts should be remembered.

After many a hot struggle, our synod has come into possession of the pure doctrine of the church and ministry. What has won the victory? God's word alone. And with what did our synod bring the doubters to certainty? By God's word alone. Although the testimonies of Luther and other theologians have not gone unnoticed in this struggle, they have only been heeded because they introduce us to Scripture and are based on Scripture. Therefore, when it became necessary for the Synod to publish a testimony of its faith on these doctrinal questions, it did so in the book: "Die Stimme unserer Kirche in der Frage von Kirche und Amt" ("The Voice of Our Church in the Question of Church and Ministry"), in such a way that it began with the Scriptural proof and first let it be followed by the testimonies of the church in its public confessional writings and in the private writings of its teachers. And she wanted to add these testimonies all the more, in order to show all the more clearly that she was not bringing any new doctrine.

Furthermore, as much as we rejoice in the testimonies of our old theologians, we have never forgotten that they also had their *naevos*, that in this and that point they did not hit the right mark. We have not considered it our job to proclaim all these weaknesses of the good men of God to the world, but we have, where necessary, made no secret of it and confessed that we cannot go along with them in this and that point, because God's Word is above all things to us. This has happened, for example, in the doctrine of Sunday, in which we have openly expressed our dissent from the great Gerhard.

Furthermore, at the colloquium in Milwaukee, the Missourian colloquists insisted that the question of chiliasm be dealt with first on the basis of Scripture, while the Iowans insisted that the question of confession be dealt with first. With regard to this, Professor W. said: "I do not consider this to be the right order, if we begin with the position on the symbols; rather, I fear that the matter would be shifted just by this, namely, as if in this matter our conscience were bound by the symbols and we were fighting against chiliasm only because it is rejected in them. But this is not the case. Our consciences are first bound by God's Word. Therefore, even if there were not a word about it in the symbols, the Holy Scriptures would forbid us to agree with the Iowa Synod in this and similar doctrines. That is somewhat different, how you stand on the symbols, and that will become clear when we come to the question whether you are confessional Lutherans or not; but now it is a question of why we accept or reject a teaching, and there we say: The symbols cannot bind our conscience. ... This is how we have always done it. that we first went to the Scriptures with the opponents.

and showed that our teaching was according to it, before we said: So it is written in the symbols, so you must accept it. (S. 14. 15.)

Finally, we would like to point out the testimony of an opponent, the united pastor H. Krummacher, who, after his return from America, in his book: "Deutsches Leben in America" (German Life in America), 1874, although he also renews the reproach against the Missourians that they ascribed normative dignity to the symbols, nevertheless - what a contradiction - also writes: "As far as the doctrine is concerned, a version of the formal principle is advocated, which has very often been called reformed 'Scripturarianism'. Hereby Krummacher wants to say that in doctrine we go back to Scripture, that we base all doctrine on Scripture. And in this he gives honor to the truth, as incorrect as it is to present this going back to Scripture as a peculiarity of the Reformed Church, which rather always goes back to reason in the last analysis, and as many absurd things as he otherwise writes about us out of prejudice and false reports.

We think this should be enough to convince any unpartisan that we are far from accepting the teachings of the ancient theologians without examination, although we do not deny that we rejoice the more we find testimonies of them in which they came to the same result of scriptural research with us.

What might be the reason that our enemies do not tire of raising this accusation against us? No doubt none other than that these powerful testimonies with their strong scriptural evidence are repugnant to them. They do not want to submit to the word of the Lord, as we did with our fathers. The theology of the Holy Scriptures is too old-fashioned for them, not mediating with philosophy, not noble and aesthetic enough. They prefer to follow the wise and prudent of this world. So we have every reason to return to them the reproach they level at us. They are, in fact, the blind followers of those whom they worship. What a Kahnis, a Luthardt, a v. Hoffmann and others, who are respected in the world, is gospel to them. What a Löhe has spoken, the lowans accept as spoken from heaven. And if one claims that what is not in the symbols must be free, what is that different from putting the principle of tradition on top, by accepting what one calls decided in the confessions, just for the sake of the ecclesiastical decision.

But by accusing us of repristination, we are not only accused of accepting the old doctrine without examination for the sake of human prestige as a tradition inherited from the fathers, but also of praying this old doctrine without carrying it in our hearts in true faith. We are called orthodoxists, dead orthodox.

Some people make this accusation without knowing us. It is not necessary to say what a great wrong this is. May the Lord not keep this sin from them. Many know us and yet accuse us of a dead head faith. They know that they are lying about it.

Let them now who ascribe to us a mere head faith, who they are, we deny them all the right to judge. Men cannot look into the heart; it is the Lord alone who examines hearts and kidneys. Man looks at what is before his eyes, but the Lord looks at the heart.

And confidently we can point to what is before our eyes and say: Come and see! From our ministry repentance and conversion, justification and sanctification are preached, and from the counsel of God for the blessedness of men nothing is restrained. One sees and notices that it is a matter of heart for the preachers that they themselves have experienced what they preach. It is true that they preach especially doctrine, they are not in favor of so-called revivals, they do not resort to new measures, they do not aim only to agitate the minds and thus catch them, but they preach the Word of God publicly and specifically, purely and loudly, according to the ability that God has given to each one, They preach the law in its severity, the gospel in its sweetness, they preach badly and rightly, simple and faithful, certain in their hearts that the word of God has in itself life-giving power, that the true, heavenly, divine life comes only from the word, that it is not their office to give the word extra power and emphasis by their own doing and activity. They punish all sins unsparingly, they pursue the erring, they seek to raise up the fallen, to encourage the pious, to comfort the afflicted, to make the doubtful certain. They do their ministry without fear of man, they do not seek the favor of men, they mostly have to live in poverty and mostly reap hatred, ridicule and contempt for their faithful service. Is this a dead ministry? *) It is not heard in the world that a dead orthodox has done this, but that he has accepted this and that outwardly in order to remain in a fat sinecure and to be able to enjoy honor and reputation.

Where does it come from that congregations after congregations crowd to get preachers from us? Is it because they realize that we are only looking for the wool of the sheep? Or is it not rather because they know that they will not be cheated by our preachers, that they will not be fobbed off empty-handed, but that they will be well provided for. That the people hasten to hear God's word; that they are eager to do the work of the Lord, that they are yearly-

*This, of course, does not mean that those who are of a different mind will not be revealed, but such people do not feel comfortable among us, and as a rule their stay is not forever.

The churches in our country give such large sums of money for the purposes of the kingdom of God, without being compelled to do so by the command of the parish office, out of their own free will, not because it is said that they can earn something by doing so; that our congregations are not content with the meager Sunday school, but also establish Christian weekly schools and maintain them with great sacrifices, so that even the lambs of Christ are led to the green pasture of the Word of God, that they insist on thorough confirmation instruction and on the Sunday catechism examinations, that they practice church discipline, that they do not delegate the church government to individuals, but administer it themselves in their entire representation in community with their preachers, - is that dead orthodoxy?

If in our synodal and conference meetings and in our publications we diligently pursue the doctrine of the divine word, and especially the main doctrine, that of justification, if we seek to bring this doctrine into pregnancy, if we see to it that every member is convinced of the truth and does not rest until he heartily assents to the doctrine, if we work to bring the doctrine right into life, - is this dead orthodoxy? Or is it not rather a proof that the core of the gospel has become our own; that we do not merely hold to the outward form?

It is true that sins are also revealed among us, but this only proves that Satan is raging against the pure doctrine and the doctrine of godliness that prevails among us, against the work that God has among us. We do not encourage such sins against the first and the other table, we punish them, we are not silent about them, we fight against them. And we can confidently ask our opponents to show us communities where things are better than in the majority of our communities. Truly, such a search for grace as God has granted us, so that we are equally zealous for pure doctrine and for godliness, can only be found in church history in the time of the apostles and the Reformation. And what God has given us, we cannot and must not conceal, we do not want to let it be disputed, we must praise it.

On the other hand, let us take a look at our opponents who accuse us of being dead orthodox. Here in America, for many years before God sounded the call through us unworthy ones to return to the pure doctrine, a dead nature had reigned supreme. Therefore, sectarianism was in full bloom and could grow unhindered, since people found some nourishment in it. Now, since God has planted a living Lutheran church here, the wheat of the sects has withered. The work of the Methodists, for example, has since come to a significant standstill. People realize that the Lutheran church shows the right way to salvation.

and that the hustle and bustle of the enthusiasts is only manufactured excitement, only a flash in the pan that will soon die out.

Even now, many still cling to the dead essence. That many of them are enthusiastic about *revivals* and let a fire blaze up from time to time is no proof to the contrary. Where one leaves it at the Sunday powerless *speeches* or *lectures*, which are called sermons, and in which, if not worldly topics, then mostly only commonplaces are dealt with, where so little happens to bring the people to the knowledge of Jesus Christ and the riches of his grace and to promote it, where old and young are so horribly neglected, where the youth is fed in seven days with only one hour of religious instruction, and such poor instruction, where the catechumens, instead of being thoroughly instructed in the catechism, are given only a few lectures, where, in order to please people, one is led to the most horrible misconduct, e.g. to the ungodly debauchery. Where, in order to please people, one is silent about the most atrocious misconduct, e.g., about the ungodly activities of the secret societies, where - especially at church conventions - one has no sense for teaching the divine word or spends only a few hours - without seriousness - on doctrinal negotiations, where one shows no zeal for building God's kingdom or where one has to legislate for it, - can there be any question of living Christianity? *)

The situation is no better in Germany's regional churches. Just look at the ministry. The theologians regard their theology as a science, the pastors do their preaching as a craft or preach over the heads of their listeners, unconcerned whether they understand them or not, whether the assured are frightened, the afflicted comforted, the doubting made sure or not. Many make no secret of the fact that, threatened by their church superiors, they sign many things without conviction, even against conviction, just to remain in the parish. (Compare "Lehre und Wehre," 1874, August issue, p. 240.) The empty churches prove what kind of fodder they fob people off with. The fact,

*The *American Lutheran* likes to compare himself and his co-religionists of the General Synod with the Pietists, but the "Symbolists" with the so-called Orthodox, of whose piety he has no high conception, and to claim that, as once the Pietists were persecuted by the latter, so also they were persecuted by the "Symbolists", because they "advocate religious revivals and make use of effective measures for the conversion of sinners". But not only such men as Spener, Rambach, Fresenius and others, if they came back and saw how the

American Lutheran boasted of its name and "lively piety" and yet, in addition to the most ghastly ravings, brought the most insipid, often blasphemous, jokes (in the permanent Column: *Wit and Humor*) and included many an immoral ad, would be appalled at this, but also Orthodox, such as Pfeiffer, Löscher and others, of whose piety the *American Lutheran* does not have a high conception. has. God preserve us from such "living piety" and grant true repentance to all who boast of it for the time being.

That in some places in a parish of 8000 souls not 100 attend the service is a serious accusation. We know of cases where laymen who came from so-called "dead orthodox" Missourian congregations to such German parishes have lit a fire with their testimony. We have heard very little about life at German conferences. That one has no interest at all for the pure Lutheran doctrine, no joy to decisively confess to the old Lutheranism, that one looks for all kinds of apologies of it and is actually ashamed of it, that one has a paper read by appointed speakers, says yes to it and votes a thank you to the speaker, just to get away quickly, is that a proof of life?

We think that every non-partisan who sees how things are with us and how things are with our opponents must call the accusation of these opponents a completely unfounded one.

In the same way, we must reject as a factual untruth, if by the accusation of repristination we are to say that we deny that the old doctrine can be more and more clearly founded from Scripture, more and more distinctly presented, its connection and its consequences more and more clearly demonstrated, or that Scripture is a source of knowledge that has not yet been exhausted.

We have never denied that the doctrine can always be established more clearly from Scripture. We know quite well that, for example, in the fourth century, as a result of the Arian disputes, the doctrine of the divinity of Christ was more clearly established than it had been before, because the orthodox believers had to gather more and more evidence from the holy Scriptures against the increasing attacks of the enemies. We know that the doctrine of justification was more clearly established from Scripture at the time of the Reformation than before, since the manifold attacks of the papacy on this doctrine made it necessary to seek and assert reasons for this article in Scripture.

We have also never denied that the doctrine can always be presented more distinctly. As such a distincte representation we designate e.g. the expression, which the orthodox in the fourth century held against the Arians, that the Son of God is consubstantial with the Father ($\alpha\omicron\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omega\varsigma$).

Always and always the Arians had apparently accepted expressions of the orthodox, but interpreted them in their own way, until the distincte expression $\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omega\varsigma$ was held out to them, since they no longer escaped, could no longer hide their false doctrine underneath.

We have never denied that the coherence of the doctrine and its consequences can be proven better and better. Without their thanks, the heretics have also had to serve for this. The great importance of the doctrine of the person of Christ for the doctrine of Holy Communion had not been so well known before the Reformation. But when Luther against

Zwingli defended the true presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, and in defense of his false doctrine invoked the fact that Christ as man could not be omnipresent, Luther and others proved to him precisely from the doctrine of the person of Christ that Christ could be present in the Holy Supper, since, through the sharing of natures and their attributes that follows from personal union, Christ as man is also omnipresent, because God is omnipresent, and one cannot say that God became man if Christ, after his humanity, is not also omnipresent. Far from rejecting such progress, therefore, we rather rejoice in all that the orthodox have accomplished in it; indeed, even today we consider such proof to be an important task of the church, in order to preserve the whole doctrine from the enemies. If we give away the consequences of a doctrine, we give away the doctrine itself. A king who seeks to save only his residence, but abandons the borders of his country to the enemy, is in danger of losing his residence as well; the enemy who has taken the borders will soon be able to attack and conquer the residence as well.

We have always held with all orthodox believers that the Holy Scriptures are an inexhaustible source. As much as we appreciate the evidence of our ancient theologians, we have never said that one must stop at the same. The sacred Scriptures are not yet exhausted and will not be exhausted. Therefore, there can be no question of our denying that the doctrine could be still more clearly founded from Scripture, could be still more distinctly presented, its connection and its consequences could be still better demonstrated.

But this is what we say: If God gives grace to a teacher to substantiate a doctrine more clearly than before, to present it more distinctly than before, etc., this does not mean that a new dogma has been invented. A clearer justification, a more distinct presentation of the doctrine is also not a change of it. Thus Athanasius expressly recalls that by the expression *ἀμνούσιος* no new doctrine is created, but that the same had already existed before. Thus, by proving the connection between the doctrine of Holy Communion and that of the person of Christ, Luther did not invent a new doctrine, and it is ridiculous to call the article on the person of Christ in the Formula of Concord, which arose from the defense of the proof of this connection, a new doctrine.

The faith of the Church has always been and will remain the same. Adam had the same substance as the last theologian who has all the so-called achievements of the church before him. Musaeus writes: "The truth in every article of faith is One and simple, but the falsehood by which it is either direct

The way in which the first church can be shaken or overturned indirectly is different and multiple. The first church used to explain and teach it in sufficiently clear words, without regard to strange and subtle interpretations, which were neither known nor existent at that time, but which in the course of time the godlessness of men devised to pervert the true sense of Scripture. But after these (distortions of Scripture) gradually began to penetrate and heresies to arise from them, people also began to explain the truth of the faith more distinctly and to save the true sense of the words of Scripture against the fictitious interpretations of human ingenuity." (*Tr. de eccl.* II, 370.)

True progress, therefore, can only consist in the fact that the doctrine, which always remains the same, is only shown more clearly and unmistakably and, for the sake of the heretics, is expressed in other relations. But for the so-called progress theologians, from whom we renounce, it is not enough to present the old doctrine more distinctly, but they want to replace it by another new one. The doctrine of the millennial kingdom, for example, has been rejected from the beginning by the orthodox believers on the basis of Scripture. The lowans, who pay homage to the theorists of further development, do not look for new reasons of condemnation, do not look for more distinct expressions to counter the chiliastes, but they want to have regarded it as progress that they put the chiliastic doctrine instead of the antichiliastic one.

The day will make it clear who is more faithful to the Scriptures, who has taken the research of the Scriptures more seriously, our opponents, who pay homage to the theory of further development and present their new dogmas as pure results of the research of the Scriptures, while they have only taken them from philosophy and tradition, and who accuse us of not researching the Scriptures ourselves and only repeating from the ancients what they found in the Scriptures, - or we, who truly accept God's word as the only source of knowledge, make an effort to search it, search it with holy reverence and humbly accept everything that the mouth of the Lord says and rejoice as often as a doctrine of the holy scripture is more and more clearly founded on it, is presented more and more distinctly, and its connection and its consequences are more and more clearly demonstrated on the basis of it, as often as we penetrate more and more deeply into the shaft of the divine word.

So far, we have to reject the reproach of repristination. How far we accept it, we will show in the next number.

(To be continued.)

(Sent in by Pastor Wagner in Kleinlinden.)

On Renitence and Separation.

That the Lutheran Church today can no longer be helped by renitence against the church regiment, i.e. by appealing to old rights guaranteed by the state itself, but only by separation from the apostate, formerly Lutheran regional churches, is certainly not doubtful to those who observe the signs of the times a little. So far, we have always hoped in vain that today's renitents in the Grand Duchy of Hesse would also recognize this one day. This joy seems to be fulfilled now, because we have just received in print their last petition to the Grand Duke of June 30 of this year, in which they declare themselves without reservation to be free of the prince's sumpiscopate as well as of any secular church regiment; what else can this mean than separation? But let us be modest in our joy this time, and for the time being rejoice only over a significant step closer to separation. The concepts of renitence as the only worthy fighting position and the shyness before separation have taken too deep roots in the minds of the renitents and are too closely connected with another inner harm to dare to trust the news that they have now passed from renitence to real separation so easily, not as if we wanted to deny the justification of all renitence. But since renunciation means invoking one's right and defying the one who wants to take it away unlawfully, it only makes sense within a church community if this church, whose right one wants to defend, really still has such a right completely and unabridged and also wants to retain it further. In such a case, renitence against all unlawful encroachments on such a right, whether from within or without, is a sacred duty; whether it is endangered by the attempts of faithless members or by rape on the part of the state, all faithful members must stand up like one man for the right of the community, even if it sometimes seems to be against almost the entire community, and in the face of all rape must invoke both divine and human law, and in the face of the state, in particular, the civil rights of the church guaranteed by the state itself. - Separation, on the other hand, arises from the recognition that in a community the right of the true church can no longer be asserted, because either through its guilt quite other authorities than the confession of the church have long since acquired legal force, or at least just now such a community publicly renounces such rights, which it has long since borne only as an oppressive burden. In relation to the state, however, separation means: renouncing human rights and placing oneself all the more firmly on the divine right, surrendering even the

The more we take our coat, the more faithfully we hold on to the eternal goods of the church. From this it is easy to measure whether in our day renitence or separation is the duty of all faithful in a national church. As faithless as it would have been in the times when confession was still regarded as the only justified standard of all doctrine in the church, if our fathers had wanted to clear the field of the secret Calvinists, Pietists, rationalists and atheists, who were intruding by cunning or force, immediately by separation, instead of asserting domestic law against them; It is not only foolish but also presumptuous to want to force a mass that has fallen away from the faith, with such a regime at its head, to recognize the confession by renouncing it, and in doing so to invoke the right that once existed for it in such a community, at a time when one has been quietly watching for years as foreign powers, and especially one's own church government, have snatched away one right after another from the church and completely suspended the confession. In the end, this can turn into a real fight against God, who, by allowing the community to fall away, shows all faithful people clearly enough the way they should go. Where has the house law of the Lutheran confession been for decades in the Hessian regional church? And finally, where have the present-day renitents ever made use of it against its enemies and despisers? This is precisely their incomprehensible self-deception, that they still dream of a Lutheran state church where none has existed since time immemorial; that they can refer to the confessional constitutions from the times of Landgrave Philip 350 and Louis IV years ago. 300 years ago, while the Grand Ducal Hessian Church Constitution (solemnly promulgated in the tiresome "Organizational Edict"), which has been the only legally valid one since 1832, no longer mentions the Lutheran confession at all, but only knows of an "Evangelical Protestant Regional Church" and of "Evangelical Protestant parish offices", and to those who did not want to believe it yet, this changed situation of the things by the not much questioning church regiment of the completely unirritated "evangelical-protestant high consistory" to Darmstadt with its "evangelical superintendents and deans" knew to make tangible enough. From then on, the express official instructions of these superintendents of the regional church included "the execution of the ecclesiastical union of the uniting Lutheran and Reformed religious congregations by means of a solemn church service". Although the Grand Duke's "conviction of the high value that a union of the two Protestant confessions, which are only separated by a few points that are not essentially based on the teachings of Jesus, must have" was expressed at the Reformation Jubilee in 1817, and the subsequent announcement of the Church and School Council in Darmstadt and Giessen to all pastors: "By informing you of the unification of the Lutheran and Reformed religious congregations in the state church of Gießen and Darmstadt, we are pleased to inform you of the unification of the two confessions.

We have no doubt that you will of course be eager to promote the union of the various religious relatives as far as possible", was initially only met by an almost general united communion celebration on that feast day in the whole country, but written complete union documents could only be drawn up for the whole province of Rhine-Hesse and in a number of parishes in Upper Hesse; Nevertheless, the goal, to which from now on the entire state church was to be led by its appointed church regiment, was repeatedly announced; thus by the Ministry of the Interior and Justice in 1822: "that His Royal. His Royal Highness, the Grand Duke, has since further decreed that in the not yet united communities, in which both Protestant confessions have religious practice, for the desirable unification of the same, according to the principles observed so far with such happy success, should be worked"; and from the Church and School Council at Darmstadt in 1819: "that furthermore only a union of all Protestant congregations into one confession can be wisely desired and promoted by the highest state authority, and with many reasons it can be expected that through this the Protestant church of the country will gain new power and strength in its salvific life". Incidentally, the following decision of the Oberconsistorium of 1834 gives a clear enough understanding of the difference between the documented "Protestant Christian Church of Rheinhessen" and the rest of the regional church: "Since the unification of the two Protestant confessions in Rhenish Hesse did not create a new special confession with a special symbol of faith, but rather only a unification of both, still, Protestant parts to the same cultus, the same administration and, with regard to the doctrine of Holy Communion, to the use of the same doctrinal form in teaching, was intended and effected; since this union, which was formed in the bosom of the Protestant congregations of the Grand Duchy, and under the authority of the supreme episcopal power of the Protestant head of state, could all the less have intended and wanted a separation of the Protestant congregations of Rheinhessen from the Protestant congregations of the parts of the country on this side, as this would have produced, instead of the beneficial consequences of the union, the virtually opposite effect of an increase in the number of denominations and an even greater fragmentation of the Protestant Church, which by its nature is indivisible and united; Thus it is based on an error if, after inquiries have been made, it seems to be considered necessary that Protestant clergy who are transferred from this side of the country to the province of Rhine-Hesse must be required to make a special profession of faith, as in the case of a real change of religion. Could it also be said in clearer words that the only remaining

a little more openly that the church of Rheinhessen, which is in union in the administration of the Lord's Supper, forms with the church on this side "an indivisible Protestant regional church"? And whoever still did not want to believe it, would not have to be convinced by a look at the complete communion of the Lord's Supper and the pulpit, as well as at the Upper Consistory at Darmstadt, composed of three ecclesiastical and two secular councillors of "Protestant confession" and the superintendents of Upper Hesse and Rhenish Hesse, which decides on all matters of the Protestant church without distinction, without even an *itio in partes* (as was customary for a time even in the Berlin united Upper Church Council)? It is as clear as daylight: What could not yet be established in all congregations on the occasion of the Reformation anniversary of 1817, the public proclamation of such a union church in the entire Grand Duchy, as in the advanced and therefore by the church regiment specially praised Rhenish Hesse, stands by the Organizational Edict of 1832 as a completed fact, and as this, "by bringing about more uniformity and simplicity in the administration of Protestant church affairs, only wanted to provide the basis for the improvements that will be a sure guarantee for the blessed effectiveness of the church and the clergy; so again the constitution of 1874 is now nothing more than the finished construction on this foundation laid at that time. Where, then, is the secure ground within this church, which, according to the Edict of Organization of 1832, is declared to be "evangelical, embracing the Lutheran, the reformed and the confession united by mutual agreement," and on which the renitents today still want to fight for the right and confession of a Grand Ducal Hessian Lutheran state church? Three years ago, before the most recent state synod, they summed up the hitherto existing plight of the church in the following demands: 1. that each denomination be given its own church government; 2. that Lutherans also be employed at the university and in the seminary; 3. That Lutheran pastorships be filled exclusively with Lutheran pastors; 4. That Lutheran pastors not be required to admit unorthodox and reformers; 5. That upon the introduction of the new constitution, the Lutheran church receive its own synods, deans, and superintendents." But if all such things, which belong to the most indispensable conditions of a Lutheran church, are still to be demanded, does one not admit that a Lutheran church did not exist in the Grand Duchy of Hesse until now? - If we ask where this strange self-deception about the character of the previous state church comes from, it is not difficult to see the cause; if these men wanted to see things as they really were, they would also have to admit that separation from the Lutheran Church was not possible.

The church is the only church in the state of Hesse in which the Lutheran Church is located, and the church is the only church in the state of Hesse in which the Lutheran Church is located. Such an open admission of one's own guilt, however, is very difficult for flesh and blood, especially if one had meant to do essential service to the church through one's actions. Therefore, one prefers to dream of a previously existing legal ground and makes it one's duty to defend it even today, when one would have more important things to do.

However, after all previous experiences with vain appeals to the right of the Lutheran church can leave no doubt that in the future at least the Lutheran church shall have no more right within the national church, they seem to finally begin to recognize what the Lord now demands of them. Therefore, we heartily rejoice in their last petition to the Grand Duke of June 30 of last year as a significant step forward; for although the word separation is carefully avoided in it, what else but separation can be meant, if they are serious about their words, that they solemnly renounce "the sumpiScopate of the sovereign and every secular church regiment"? The words are:

"It is with the deepest pain that we, the undersigned, have to express our conviction before our Princely Throne that, as a result of this sad constitution, Your Royal Highness can no longer grant that time-honored princely protection to faithful servants of your church, indeed, as the paragraphs of the new constitution cited in the decision of the so-called expanded Supreme Consistory show, it no longer seems to be permissible to grant the same, despite the fact that Your Royal Highness and the Most High House still belong to our church. Highness and the Most High House still belong to our church. This much is certain: this new church constitution no longer tolerates faithful servants of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the country, but expels them. - Now that the undersigned have received factual proof that they can no longer count on any ecclesiastical legal protection, our trust in the church authorities, who allow a mass of people alienated from the faith to determine faith and the order of faith without any ecclesiastical restrictions, Finally, the same church regime has placed itself so high above all confessions that one is tempted to call this actually no longer a position, but in any case from here the necessary faithful care and cultivation of the same cannot be exercised; It is at the same time clear to them that this secular church government, which did not come into being for the sake of necessity, can no longer protect our Protestant Church of the Augsburg Confession in the legally guaranteed manner, and that even Your Royal Highness, Most High, is no longer willing to do so. Highness, the Most High in

In their capacity as *sumpiscopus*, they have deigned to approve the application for the removal of faithful servants of that church by resolution of the 10th of this month, thus basically declaring that the rights of the Most High which existed until then are no longer enforceable - and thus faithful servants and members of our church in the lands of Hesse have become completely lawless and outlawed, in that they are simply dismissed and made emeritus without any procedural proceedings, because they want to be and remain servants of the Evangelical Lutheran church of the land. Therefore, above all, out of loyalty and obedience to the eternal Lord and King of the Church, to whom we owe our blessedness and our ministry, we see ourselves compelled to give the most sincere testimony before Your Royal Highness:

once, that we, as servants of the Protestant Church of the unchanged Augsburg Confession, renounce for ourselves, our families and the members who remain faithful to it, any secular ecclesiastical-regimental protection, such as the non-confessional state and its government, or its latest phase, the synodal constitution, which exercises ecclesiastical power over a so-called national church opposed to ours, can bestow upon our Confession; since - according to the testimony of history and experience - the so highly praised and today again so loudly proclaimed confessionlessness of the state is nothing else than complete servitude under a political religion, respectively dissolution of the recognized confessions into the state.

On the other hand, that we, as servants of the Protestant Church of the unchanged Augsburg Confession, with whose 28th article the *sumpiscopate* is already in contradiction per se, now that the conditions for the justification of this unchurchlike emergency episcopate have come into complete discontinuance through the modern state structure and, in connection with it, through the very latest constitutional processes in the churches of the lands of Hesse, hereby publicly renounce the same ").

"Therefore the guilt of the opposite,' we say in summary with our fathers, 'is that the bishops are deprived of obedience, and we are excused before God and all pious people; for because the bishops will not tolerate ours, forsaking this doctrine as we have confessed, and yet we are guilty before God of confessing and maintaining this doctrine, we must let the bishops go and be more obedient to God, knowing that the Christian Church is where God's

*The "Widerkirchliches Nothbischoffthum" should probably mean: that it no longer wants to be a Nothbischoffthum, but that it claims to be an essential predicate of the sovereign power, and thus has become a widerkirchliches, in the same sense as before there was talk of a "secular church regiment" of our days, which "did not come into being for the sake of necessity" - like the first services of the pious electors at the time of the Reformation.

Word is taught correctly. Let the bishops see how they will answer for tearing the church apart and making it desolate'. Apol. We bear this open witness and take this extremely serious step out of loyalty to our ancestral Princely House, in the interest of the Monarchy itself. Henceforth, with the help of Almighty God, we hope in this ecclesiastical exemption of ours, on the basis of our good old church ordinances, not only to better fulfill our evangelical church office received from the Lord in the sense of our fathers to the faithful members of our church commanded to us, but also at the same time to represent the divine right of the secular authorities only quite freely and firmly against all revolution, mostly the spiritual one."

So the truth: "the sumpiscopate is already in itself in contradiction with the 28th article of the Augsburg Confession", once acknowledged by hitherto obedient sons of the State Church Regiment, not merely in words, but by deed! Certainly a seldom enough heard testimony for this truth in our days in Germany, as only the utmost necessity could squeeze it out of them! - For how many things are still to be found in the broad execution, which are not at all right with it, and clearly show how these men have hitherto walked along in quite opposite views. We ask: What can such "complete renunciation of the sovereign sumpiscopate and complete renunciation of any secular church regimental protection" mean other than: Separation from the Landeskirche? especially since they openly call the newest Hessian Landeskirche "one opposed to their own" and describe their future situation as that of an "ecclesiastical exemption"? From the bottom of our hearts we wish them luck for this, however, "highly significant step", as they themselves recognize; We are also confident that, if they now actually make use of their freedom in Christ as separated congregations, experience will of itself open their eyes to the bonds of unbelieving fellowship in which they have gone against God's Word for so many years before 1873, and how they have never satisfied their official and Christian duty, that they - as they affirm - "for decades have only asked that the church superiors would be kind enough to mitigate and abolish unjust burdens and human statutes, which one could not keep without sin, since a change would not harm" (!!).!), and that they have quietly carried on for decades with these burdens and human statutes that cannot be kept without sin. For "although they, as little as their fathers, dealt with taking away the power of the church superiors, but only asked and desired that the ecclesiastical representation and the corresponding ecclesiastical organism corresponding to the nature and confession of each of the three evangelical confessions

(they themselves testify that the Lutheran confession in the previous state church did not even have a representation of its confession and an independent organism by which it could be recognized and identified among the rest of the state church); so the success was no different than that which they themselves report in the following words: "Therefore, they could at least expect that on the part of the church regiment our fundamental, genuinely ecclesiastical concerns and explanations would somehow be met with understanding and love. This, however, did not happen in any way; rather, despite the clear right to be heard as part of the doctrinal state, we were simply dismissed with the assurance that the various confessions existing in the Protestant Church of the Grand Duchy enjoyed in full measure the protection to which they were entitled through the legislation, the organization of the church authorities, and the church institutions". - And at the same time, they still give the highest church ruler the testimony "that the servants and members of this church, to which the Serene Princely House personally still belongs, were still allowed to take comfort in the protection until the very latest time"; yes, as if there had been no need at all for the Lutheran church until now, they continue: "Then, quite unexpectedly, urged only by the current of the times, as they say, the new church constitution was introduced and through it the confessionless union, whereby our Lutheran church was as good as abolished in its guaranteed legal and confessional status and thus completely deprived of the protection to which it was entitled." - No, if they are really serious about separation, then they will soon recognize it as a pure self-deception "that the excellent firm orders for doctrine and life, which our Evangelical Lutheran Church has had for more than 300 years, still have legal force and binding force in the Hessian Regional Church to this day.

As absolutely as we may be pleased about the now definitely pronounced renunciation of the sum piseopate and any secular church regiment, nevertheless, the future will have to teach whether with it the separation is really pronounced in the sense that they now also want to give up all renitence within the previous state church. Although it is not foreseeable what else will be left to them, the view that they are the legal continuation of the Hessian state church, as it was until 1873, and that they must claim all of its rights, including civil rights, is so deeply rooted in the minds of the renitents that such misgivings about the meaning of their declaration must still seem justified at this time. It is strengthened, moreover, by the very unclear passage where they say: "this new church constitution expels the faithful servants of the Evangelical Lutheran Church from their so-called national church, which we

However, they neither know nor are able to recognize it, precisely because it is not a legal, not an ecclesiastical, not an ecclesiastical concept at all, but only a liberal-political concept, which is out of all relation with the actual tasks of the church of Jesus Christ. If this is simply to say that they are no longer able to recognize it as their church, or even as a community that still has a claim to the name of a church, then this is all the more reason for open separation. But what has the question to do with it, whether the present national church is not once a "legal and an ecclesiastical concept"? Do legal and ecclesiastical concepts belong in the same row at all? Should they not leave this question to the state? And, if the state, as it does in fact, knows very well this church constructed according to its thoughts as a "legal concept" and even recognizes it to the extent that it transfers all civil and state prerogatives of the former national church to the present one, what will their not knowing it even in the legal sense ultimately help them? If you do not know them, you cannot respect their rights. Thus, this not knowing the national church recognized by the state can very easily tempt one, especially if one considers oneself the rightful heir of the former national church, to subsequently claim various rights from those that have already been expressly granted to it. Then, of course, the unfruitful renunciation of external rights would still not be over, but could eventually lead to the state depriving them of the freedom it is willing to grant to honest separation. May God in mercy protect them from such imprudence! One thing, however, we may assume for certain: The Renitents have already come a good step further on the way to God-pleasing separation! And we do not want to hide the joy about it.

(Submitted.)

The Dä'chsel'sche Bibelwerk.

A review of this latest Bible work in the Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie (issue 3 of the year) reveals the dark sides of this work - although this is not the intention at all, but the review is rather done in a recommendatory sense - so that it should not be superfluous for those who would perhaps still be in the dark about the character of this work to draw attention to these dark sides. It hardly needs to be said that the Lutheran preacher and theologian can, indeed must, increase his collection of books with quite diverse material according to circumstances. Even Dä'chsel's work - if one also has the impression that it is not in the spirit of the old Aus-

This does not mean that the work is not useful for Lutheran preachers. In the Old Testament, the work often follows Keil's interpretations, some of which are sound, and in these parts it undoubtedly offers much that is useful - admittedly in addition to much that is inaccurate. However, the work is not intended to be of use to the preacher, but rather to the congregations, even if mainly to their educated members. At first, the author proceeds quite eclectically. For example, he prefaces the prophets with a word from a Lutheran theologian that he likes, or from a non-Lutheran theologian, or even from Calvin. But as this way in the popular works so far has definitely sprung from an unlearned spirit and indifferentism, so it would also have to be broken with, if one wanted to secure oneself against the appearance of indifferentism and against the danger of planting it in the readers. But in what way is the writing treated by the author in certain directions? There we learn that Dächsel excludes himself from Delitzsch; i.e. he inoculates his readers with the rough chiliasm of this theologian and also his annoyance about the sober, spiritual, orthodox interpretation of the prophets, which corresponds to the analogy of faith. So also Dächsel finds with Delitzsch in Is. 65, 25. for the fulfillment of the prophecy of the earth eating serpent no place "in the history of salvation, if not in the millennium". It is to him (with Delitzsch) the prophecy "of the state of peace of the natural environment of the church" (for our learned chiliastes know how to clothe their coarse mind in all kinds of euphemistic phrases and high phrases); but this is nothing else than that lion and serpent change their nature. When Delitzsch accuses the antichilastic interpreters of limiting the concrete content of the prophecy to a few generalities, it is not true. When Delitzsch accuses the antichilastic interpreters of reducing the concrete content of the prophecy to some general *loci communes*, for example, to say of the serpent that eats the earth: Christ has taken away the power of the devil and treads the serpent's seed, the enemies of the church, under their feet, so that they lie powerless to the earth and can do no harm - which, to be sure, is an "overcome point of view" to our chiliastes - Dächsel brings both, the wrong interpretation and also the finding of the right interpretation, only that he translates to his readers the expression *loci communes* into "articles of faith"! The matter is not improved by the fact that Dächsel refers to Thomasius, who does not make chiliasm a moment of his faith, but does not dare to deny it decisively. For it is doubly responsible to teach decisively something about which one is doubtful oneself. And Dächsel has already decisively taught that, which he only does not want to deny decisively afterwards. The shot arrow is no longer in the shooter's power. Then, however, a standpoint which only does not deny chiliasm is also unsuitable and insufficient for the writing of a Lutheran Bible work. And because the author in a morbid interpretation thus

This will be sufficient for the Lutheran preacher not to be able to recommend his work as far as the congregation is concerned. It may be a justified wish to see a work offered to the Protestant Christians of our time that unites the doctrinal purity of the old exegesis bibles with a popular-scholarly layout and comprehensiveness similar to Dächsel's, but this work does not yet fulfill that wish. It increases the chiliastic Bible works of Richter and Gerlach by a third one, even if it otherwise bears a Lutheran stamp. However, in terms of doctrinal purity, it cannot replace the old Bible works, nor has it truly continued them.

D.

Literary.

Of the church and its self-preservation in the present time.

By Justus W. Lyra. Hanover 1875.

This booklet sent to us for review is an extension of a lecture given at the Pastoral Conference in Lüneburg on September 8, 1874. As the title already indicates, we find the author emphasizing the idea that the church "as an ideal-real organism" has an "indestructible life of its own, to which its confession testifies and by virtue of which it maintains itself under various changes of its constitution and its environment in time" (p. 88). For us, as members of the church in a free state, the booklet has some interesting, but unfortunately a predominant number of dark parts. The author, as is only fair, is not well disposed toward "the upper vapor of misty, changeable, airy fluid philosophies of time" (p. 54), nor is he a friend of the "rare hypotheses of which the high church politicians in Germany have hitherto been capable" (p. 36). To be honest, however, we must confess that we must greatly miss in the treatise the clarity and truth of the Scriptural and symbolic teaching on church, office and church government, which alone is the only firm foundation on which understanding and order can be brought to the questions touched upon and a solid new construction can be tackled. A "free church in a free state," says the author, "is not even a concrete reality in America, but has remained an abstraction on European soil" (p. 38). "What was born of the spirit of the Reformation (!?), the community (?) of state and church" - these are approvingly quoted words of Kleist-Retzow - "they want to destroy after centuries of existence. Nevertheless, state and church belong together like man and woman in marriage.... like law and gospel" (p. 49.) Does one not want to say more than this,

that "the one recognizes the other as a divine order", there would be nothing to be said against it (apart from the expression), only that this mutual recognition would not help much in abstracto either of them. In any case, the word "community of state and church" wants to say more, although we do not get any definite information about it. It almost seems as if, if state and church are separated, one should then only see in the state "the carnal messiahdom of the reform Jews" (p. 47). The "present concept" of the state as an "ideal-real organism" had at the time of the Augsburg Confession "still lain in its swaddling clothes" (Art. 28.); but when "the wheel of history has made its round, it will have to repay the loan" (of the definition borrowed from the concept of the church) "with interest or atone for its robbery. - What the author says about church, office (here admittedly almost everywhere called "stand"), ordination and church regiment is in the main downright wrong. Only with a feeling of melancholy can we American Lutherans watch such certainly well-intentioned attempts to bring light and clarification into the sad ecclesiastical situation of the land of our fathers. Our church has long since possessed the right principles, which are so necessary now, as a precious treasure of its scriptural confessional truth, regained through Luther's Reformation, and in the works of our godly forefathers of old there is an exceedingly rich material of fundamental principles and teachings laid down as an invaluable heritage for us and our children. In Germany, however, these treasures are mostly left unused and people try to help themselves on their own, as good (or bad) as they can. For our author, the "church" is essentially only the "visible church," for "there are" (according to him) "not only recalcitrant, lazy and sick, but also moribund and judged members of the church (!), who, in spite of their participation in the outward church actions, are not true Christians or believers, not members of the mystical body of Christ" (p. 84.). And this distinction between the "body of Christ" and the "church," which is absolutely contrary to Scripture and symbolism, is even said to be expressed in the "splendid article of the Apology *De Ecclesia*" (p. 31), while there the exact opposite, namely the identity of these two terms, is expressed and urged in the sharpest and most unmistakable manner. Just as our lowans, as a result of a clumsy confusion of the essence of the church with its characteristics, came to issue sentences like the following: "The church is visible and invisible at the same time" - "The church is, however, on the one hand 'a society of outward signs, on the other hand, hypocrites and wicked people also belong to the church," although the Augsburg Confession already strictly states that "the Christian church is really nothing else than the assembly of all believers and saints," although "in this life there are many false Christians who are not Christians.

and hypocrites (*admixti*)," our author also means "that the church is not par excellence inward or invisible, nor par excellence true only in its invisibility, but its outward manifestation is co-created by the founder of the church himself" (p. 29.). Obviously, the essence of the church, namely the persons of all believers and saints as such, is here confused with its appearance or manifestation in this world among the visible multitude of the called, and this latter is vindicated without further ado as an essential quality and glory, which really belongs only to the church in the "proper" sense, the invisible congregation of true believers. We would like here to call out to those who, through such vexatious confusion of concepts, ascribe to the church an equally adventurous and impossible hermaphroditism, what Dr. Aug. Pfeiffer replied to that chiliast who thought that "the kingdom of grace is not only led inwardly, but also outwardly," and wanted to prove this "by reading in the *Apologie de Ecclesia* that the church has its outward ceremonies as well as outward characteristics. Pfeiffer answered him: "Father Christian (that was the name of the hooded chiliast).

Do not strike at me in this way, but at Christ, who said that the Kingdom of God is within us. But let him gather up his confused thoughts a little, and learn that, although Christ in his kingdom of grace ordains outward means of grace (word and sacraments), which fall on the ears and eyes; although Christians hold an outward service, and therefore one takes outward marks of the church . . . *formaliter* (essentially) the kingdom of grace is inwardly in man, in whom the king does not manifest himself visibly, but dwells invisibly through faith in the hearts of his subjects, Ephesians 3, 17. 3, 17. As he also inwardly regenerates, renews, sanctifies, gladdens, and favors them in such a way that it cannot be seen from the outside who is thus ruled and led by him, but the Lord alone knows those who are his, 2Tim. 2, 19. Therefore also the congregation of the saints is called invisible" (see the "unchristian Christian", pag. 51.). No wonder then that our author, on such a principally Roman basis, sees in the church really only a hierarchical organism, which possesses in ordination to the spiritual office its natural source of all power and all life, as well as in the bearers of the office the actual factors of all ecclesiastical movement. "In the spiritual office constituted by ordination lies the focus of the independent life of the church as a whole" (p. 26). Ordination is therefore a "fact" which "involves the most important concerns and rights of the church," and "we must most definitely hold to the fact that ordination imparts special gifts which cannot be obtained in any other way. We thereby receive powers which no other office has" (p. 4.). "The

Ecclesiastical ordination confers a specific ecclesiastical mandate; the lawfully appointed and ordained holders of the spiritual office are to be the bearers, guardians and interpreters of ecclesiastical consciousness" (p. 88.). The foundation, formation and education of Christian Lutheran congregations, the serious awakening of a firm and sensitive ecclesiastical consciousness, the introduction of the much-needed church discipline, the living and weaving of pure evangelical doctrine and the unceasing pursuit of important doctrines (especially the sun of all doctrine: justification by grace alone through faith), in short, of everything that without question constitutes the essential conditions for the "self-preservation" of the church, there is very little in our writings, and even this little is always only in very diluted doses. Probably the "church regiment" is supposed to take care of this, "to which we have to render obedience" (p. 25.), because "no one may abridge and deny us our sacred right assumed at ordination, except (!) our competent ecclesiastical authorities, who, as God's servant (!), confer the same beforehand and afterwards ... to examine how far the performance of the office is congruent with the obligation and vice versa" (p. 74.). One should be subject to the "ecclesiastical office of government or the ecclesiastical authority of the authorities as a godly order" (p. 86). The "Lutheran postulate of binding the church government to the confessional doctrine of the church" (p. 75) remains self-evident. *) If, however, the case should arise that even after "the mandataries of the church", i.e. the *pastores* together with their superintendents, "to whom we show obedience and reverence as the *pastoribus pastorum*", "have stood up for the self-preservation of the church" (p. 75. - whatever may be understood by this standing up: separation or merely "passive resistance"), yet a high-ranking church regiment should not administer its office "according to the norm to which it is bound," but should encourage false doctrine and practice - how then?! Then it is hopefully with the allegedly "guilty

*) "We also find among the representatives of all directions (!) of Lutheranism, from the North American Missourians to the proclaimers of a pure Episcopal system that does not yet exist anywhere, complete affinity of spirit in the assessment of the main question of church policy, whether the purity of the confession, in the manner of the changeable goods of ecclesiastical economy, may be sacrificed to the postulate of the unity of the constitution or not" (p. 25.). "For this common conviction we see ourselves surrounded by a cloud of new witnesses," even if "Missouri and Iowa, Walther and Fritschel, Brunn in Steeden and the blessed Löhe, Lohmann and Diedrich, Münchmeier and Huschke, Flörke and Haupt, Ueltzen and Morich ... would have to pass the revue" (p. 66.). If only they all meant the same thing when they demand "purity of confession"! But with how many of our newer theologians has the word of "purity of confession" become an empty phrase or must serve shamefully as a cover for the grossest heresies.

Obedience"? Or does this foreboding thought belong only to the "many imagined cases of possible collisions" which we should not "anxiously paint on the wall"? And yet - how can a church be clear about the means of its "self-preservation" if it avoids the question or answers it wrongly: To whom has Christ given the highest and final judgment in the church? By the way, the author does not want to be too precise with the confessional doctrine. For "in the ecclesiastical gears there is not too little room for the free movement of numerous wheels, which nevertheless interlock" (p. 66). What is Lutheran, i.e. formally accepts the confession, is taken as Lutheran, and thus one gains "not too little room" for the free tumbling around of many spirits bursting upon each other under the umbrella of a confession. And of the fact that one may also insist on a doctrine of Scripture in and for itself as necessary for the unity and purity of the doctrine, indeed that one must insist on it under certain circumstances, the author wants to know nothing at all. This is done only by people "to whom the sphere of the concept of the church becomes all the narrower, the more they have recently elevated to the rank of ecclesiastical distinguishing characteristics (*nota ecclesiae*) provisions other than confessional doctrine and administration of the sacraments" (p. 66). Here we Missourians are in any case meant, but fortunately we are not affected; for what is called our "Missourian articles of faith" or "doctrines of distinction" according to Iowa linguistic usage (also popular in Germany), are in reality not only purely scriptural doctrines, but also purely symbolic doctrines, purely pieces of teaching, which are in fact already included in the public confession of our church. But we take it much more exactly with the conception and assertion of what symbolic doctrine is than, for example, our author does, who not only deviates far from the symbols in the points already touched upon and makes symbolically rejected theses the starting point of his *pia desideria* with regard to the threatening dangers, but also even speaks of "the heavenly seed of the divine Word" having become flesh in the form of a servant (p. 57). Where is the difference between the λόγος προφορικός (the "bodily") and the λόγος προφορικός? Word" or *verbum vocale*, as Article 1. of the Augsburg Confession calls it) and the λόγος υποστατικός (the person of the Son) or, as already the old church used to distinguish, the λόγος ού βητός, ἀλλ' ουσιώδης (the not spoken but essential word)? And how else than by deviation from the symbols can the emergence of "different factions of the so-called Communion Lutherans, Official Lutherans, Authority Lutherans," as well as the Open Question Lutherans, Tauseudjährige-Reichs Lutherans, etc. be explained? - As small as the hints are, which the preface (p. 7. ff.) gives about the content of the book by

Although we have to give our full agreement to the basic ideas of Pastor Eckelmann from S. Dionys, who delivered a correction at the same conference: "The clergy are not the church, the congregation also belongs to it, and both, the ministry and the congregation, have to guard the sanctuary with equal fidelity. The vow of ordination does not create an essential difference. It only gives us the mandate to contend and suffer first and foremost." Likewise, it was quite appropriate when he "preferred to replace the ordination vow with the confession of our church (as well as containing the obligation of the congregation)" and further "instead of the obedience to the authoritative church regiment" preferred to say: "The adherence to our church order and constitution, as far as the adherence to the confession is conditioned by it. For "the barrel is not the main thing, but the wine that is in it. But if the barrel is bored in the right place, the wine is also lost." But we do not find in these sentences both "additions to the theses of the speaker" and rather the correct antitheses to the wrong theses of the speaker. Would that in Germany (for whose ecclesiastical weal and woe we "North American Missourians" will always try to preserve a lively interest, even if we should be thrown among the "hypercritical directions") the doctrinal treasures of our church should be more diligently investigated and utilized with respect to the now burning questions. In this way, we would escape many hardships and dangers, for God has not promised to give us the necessary light again and again, even if we despise and spurn the glorious light that has been given to us once or even several times. S.

Ecclesiastical Contemporary History.

I. America.

York, Pa. On the occasion of the dedication of a Missourian church in York, a principal nest of the General Synod, the Missourian Conference assembled there also celebrated Holy Communion. The service was held with full liturgy. An "Adelphos" in the "*American Lutheran*," enthusiastic for its bald puritan services, expresses his surprise at this and senses in it an inclination toward Rome. And yet he must confess that as long as the pure doctrine he had heard was preached, the danger was not yet so near, and that the Missourians did not insist on uniformity of ceremonies as essential to the unity of the church. The dear man does not see that he is rather a "cousin of the Antichrist" with his Carlstadian ideas. G.

Canadian. We find the following in the Canadian "Kirchenblatt": "When in his time in the 'Lima-Proceß' a decision was made in favor of those members of the congregation who were connected with a synod belonging to the General Council, Dr. Ruperti, who was also connected with the council and had been elevated to important positions in it, was overcome by a panic, which he reported in the 'Herald', the 'German' newspaper.

The German Church, which is also associated with the Council, has expressed itself and even stated in Luthardt's Kirchenzeitung in Germany that this favorable decision had acted like a bursting bomb in the camp of the congregations associated with the Council. This fright is unnatural, unreasonable, and a psychological puzzle. And if the assertion were fully true, the Kladderadatsch would find the Concil a rich source for caricatures, and rightly so. And to the General Synod and Missouri we could then appear only as a ridiculous farce. O, poor Concil, we would then have to exclaim that you can still, under such circumstances, play up the farce of inviting all good Lutherans of this continent to a colloquium; that you do not notice the mockery when Missouri grants you the honor of taking the initiative to arrange such a colloquium, which, if Dr. Rupert's assertion is true, would mean nothing less than digging your own grave! And in order to be sure of that, one would then have to consider the action of the Council to add this man with his assertion to the arrangement committee for this colloquium? Wouldn't one have to think: Whom the gods want to corrupt, he first strikes with blindness?" - Here we remembered the old saying: God protect us from our friends, we will deal with our enemies. We think that is how the Council should judge when it reads such gibberish. G.

Losses of Catholicism in the United States. Bishop Rosecrans writes in his newspaper, the Catholic Columbian: "The number of apostate Catholics is a striking phenomenon in the towns on the upper Ohio. Numerous descendants of Catholics reside there who know nothing of the Catholicism of their ancestors and know no other aspiration than to go with the flow. One can learn something from observing the course of development that led to their apostasy. Bad and offensive priests had their share in it. Moreover, there were some not bad, but imprudent priests, who, after having done great things, were bound to adopt a submissive attitude towards the people, and in this way gave many ill-informed Catholics and prejudiced non-Catholics the opportunity to consider themselves masters of the faith they supported. But lack of Catholic education and mixed marriages have been the main tools of Satan to make so many apostate from their faith. The children's instruction in prayer and catechism was considered a secondary matter so as not to lose time for other studies. They had to learn enough to receive Holy Confirmation and First Communion, with the hope that after receiving these sacraments they would be free from the tiresome study of pious books. Thus they entered into life among those for whom God's grace, judgment and eternity are a dream or a mockery. A few more communions after that and they drifted away into the stream of the spirit of the times and their selfish fantasies and were soon no longer known as Catholics. It did not take very long for them to learn to look upon Catholicism as the 'sect' to which they had once belonged by chance through their parents, and to believe that they were completely fulfilling their duty if they put it on the same level with Methodism, Baptism, etc. Then the mixed marriages, which they had been practicing since the beginning of time, were the result. Then the mixed marriages, which the Catholic Church has always abhorred, have their share - perhaps the greatest - in this work of spiritual ruin. Many Catholics marry non-Catholics, for whose eventual conversion they have no hope, and such are unfaithful to their faith from the beginning. Naturally, their indifference increases due to the influence of the non-Catholic environment, and by the time they have children to raise, they have almost forgotten how to teach them."

The State vis-à-vis the Church and School. While we consider it quite improper for church publications to engage in any kind of politicking, we are convinced that a discussion of the relationship between the state and church and school is nothing less than improper politicking, and that such a discussion is in fact one of the professional duties of an ecclesiastical publication. In this latter conviction, we communicate the following from the "Annual Message" sent by our present President to the Congress of the United States of North America on December 7 of last year. "As a first step," it says, "toward any farther progress in respect to anything in which we have already advanced in the past, I earnestly recommend to you an amendment to the Federal Constitution, to be submitted to the Legislatures of all the States for their approval, making it the duty of each and every State to establish and forever maintain public schools for the instruction of all children in the elementary branches, without distinction of sex, color, place of birth, or creed. Schools in which neither religious, nor denominational, nor heathen textbooks shall be used; and by which amendment the appropriation of school funds or taxes, or any part thereof, whether by state, municipal, or other authority, for any other purpose whatever, shall be prohibited." - In connection with this important question, I also call your attention to the necessity of averting an evil which will bring our fatherland into great difficulties before the end of the nineteenth century, if it is not soon controlled. In 1850, I believe, the church property, which paid neither state nor city taxes, amounted to about \$83,000,000. In 1860, this sum had doubled. In 1875 it amounts to about \$1,000,000,000, and if it can grow without hindrance, it will undoubtedly exceed \$3,000,000,000 by 1900. Such an immense sum, enjoying the protection and all the benefits of government, without proportionately helping to bear the burdens and expenses thereof, will not be regarded with indifference by those who must pay taxes on their property. In a growing country where land prices are rising as rapidly as they are in the United States, there is no limit to the wealth that corporations, religious and otherwise, can acquire if their landed property remains tax-free. The concerns raised by such large real estate holdings, from which no taxes are paid, may very easily lead to seizure without constitutional authority, even to bloodshed. I propose that all real property, whether belonging to churches or other corporations, be taxed in the same manner, with *the exception of the final resting place of the dead* and perhaps, under appropriate restrictions, church buildings." In a recapitulation of the proposals made, it also says: "Thirdly, that Church and State shall be forever separated, but each shall be free within its sphere." Indeed, we would not know what could be justified in opposing these proposals.

W.

Mingling of church and state is unfortunately the order of the day here, as much as one zealously opposes it when it concerns other countries. Just now we read in a local political paper, "Two hundred Methodist preachers, assembled in a 'meeting' in Boston, have, on the recommendation of their Bishop Haven, recommended General Grant for re-election as President of the United States." To this the paper makes the correct remark: "If these gentlemen would care for pastoral care and for their catechism, their congregations would be better served also than that

they want to interfere in politics and exert pressure on the political convictions of their congregation members through their confessional position." It is indeed shameful when preachers, instead of their "bishop," have to lecture unbelieving newspaper writers about the duties and limits of their office.

W.

II. abroad.

On the basis of Lohmann's lecture at the previous year's Pentecostal Conference on the present crisis, Pastor Hafermann writes in the Braunschweig-Hannover'schen Kirchenblatt of October 30 of last year, among other things, as follows: "According to Lohmann's lecture, the present crisis of the Christian church is not a crisis; it is not a danger. The situation of things is actually not so bad. We can bear it. - Alas! Unfortunately! Everything that is true in this lecture is not significant, but everything that is significant in it is not true. It is not true that the sovereign church regime is approaching its dissolution, unless God performs a great miracle, for which, of course, the church has to ask. It is not true that the separation of the believing and the unbelieving spirits takes place by itself. It is rather the persecution of the believers by the unbelievers that takes place, and for this purpose the latter know how to avoid the separation. It is not true that we have fallen back into Byzantine bondage, but into a thousand times worse. It is not true that the constitution of the Christian Church can be based on the future of the German people. It is not true that in the ordinary course of events we shall have a free church; we have never been farther from it. It is not true that the Word of God, the confession, the administration of the sacraments are still free under the state church regiment. How might the Pentecostal Conference, which, had the confession been free, would certainly have professed quite differently, persuade itself at such a moment: the confession is still free! Under secular rule, nothing is free in the church anywhere; the whole church is inhibited, disturbed, hindered to the very heartbeat of its life, and for that very reason it cannot bear it. - Zion, wake up!"

Pulpit fellowship. The Mecklenburg Church Gazette of November 17 of last year reports: "On the occasion of the mission festival held last year in Schmalkalden, Director Hardeland of Leipzig and a pastor of the Hessian regional church preached. The former Hessian preacher Rohnert, who had gone over to the Breslauers, therefore requested at a conference in Elberfeld that it be declared that it seems to be an indispensable duty for our church not only to give a decisive testimony against that action, but also to demand from the mission institution concerned a sufficient explanation and immediate abandonment of its pulpit fellowship with the false church, possibly breaking the previous connection with this mission. - It was decided to submit the case in question to the College of the High Church, so that it would deal with the College of the Mission. - Furthermore, it was proposed that, if the connection with the Leipzig mission could not be maintained, the connection of the church's missionary activity with Hermannsburg should be considered, while at the same time initiating the founding of a special missionary system that had been envisioned years ago. As a preparation for the achievement of this goal, the foundation of a seminary for the training of pastors for the Lutheran brothers in faith living in the dispersion should already be considered. That the latter had not been done long ago, that the so-called separated Lutherans had rather had their pastors prepared at false-believing universities, was striking enough, unfortunately also sufficiently explainable from their own position on pure doctrine.

W.

The Commonality of the Pabstical and Protestant Churches. At the Lutheran Conference within the Prussian Regional Church, Chief President v. Kleist-Retzow declared: "Let us not forget what we have in common with the Roman Catholic Church, what a treasure of Christian truth and Christian faith: One God and Lord, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and our Father; One Savior, Jesus Christ, true God and Son of Mary; One Holy Spirit, One Spirit, One Word of God, One Apostolicum. Pastor Kögel from Staßfurt in the province of Saxony then stood up and declared in his name and in the name of many that he could not agree. It is true that we have a treasure of Christian truths in common with the Roman Catholic Church, but the latter has modified each of them very substantially. One God and Father we confess with them; but since they have placed the Virgin Mary beside Him, it is no longer the same first article that we have. One Savior, One Son of God we worship with them; but they have taken away His merit and put instead that of men, of saints; it has become another second article. One Holy Spirit we invoke with them; but not he, but the infallible pope is the source of truth for them, and the third article has also fallen. What is the use of having a word of God with them if they forbid it and place tradition, concile and pabst, in short, human statutes above it. One fights against God's word; if we take his side, we also fight against God's word. Therefore no fellowship with Rome. We do not judge our church in a Pharisaic way: we know and deplore the abomination of desolation in the holy place. This does not change the fact that we decisively confess that there is an immense gulf between us and Rome, which makes it impossible for us to stand by her side. We have an equal struggle with Rome and with the culture fighters, which was shifted by v. Kleist's speech. It could give the impression that Mr. v. Kleist wants to fight arm in arm with Rome against the culture fighters; I cannot do that, we cannot do that, the Protestant Church cannot do that.

Foundation in knowledge of the doctrine. In a review of the "Lutheran Dogmatics of the 17th Century, Popularly Presented by Dr. Schulze" (Hanover by Hahn, 1874-75), the Allgemeine evang.-luth. Kirchenzeitung recalls the following: Many call and consider themselves Lutherans who know little about the essence of Lutheranism, but put it in all sorts of externalities and velleities. How much Lutheran sobriety is lacking, we have experienced again only recently. But this comes from being too little grounded in doctrine. We cannot admonish urgently enough that the doctrine of our confessions and our old dogmatists should be dealt with more seriously than is usually the case, especially at pastoral conferences. Then one would be saved from many follies and be much more certain in one's judgment.

Commitment to the Confessions. The pastor G. Braun in Eyrichsdorf (Bavaria) has written a little paper about the symbols and in it he suggested to go back to the Augustana; this, he says, "still carries the character of the formula" etc. "But", even the General Evangelical Lutheran Church Gazette remarks, "we cannot deny our history in this way; and it has just turned out to be necessary to establish the right understanding of the Augustana. One only takes it exactly with her words, then one will find the whole Concordia formula in it. Let us hold what we have". The church newspaper adds, "Only with right understanding." This addition to that beautiful confession is either very self-evident, or contains something in it which wants to take away our joy in what has gone before.

According to the Allgemeine Evang.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung of November 19 of last year, **an "ecclesiastical middle party" was** formed in the **Hanoverian regional** church on last year's Luther Day, which has since been strengthened almost daily by approvals. It is to have "over not unsightly forces to gerieten". Among others, the superintendents Schulz, Schönhoff, Guden, Fienemann, Beer; the high school directors Haage and Ebeling; the seminary directors Müller, Köchy, Knocke belong to it. They are to pursue a Prussian-friendly and federal direction and to perhorresciren the "confessional roughnesses", want to cultivate communion with so-called Lutherans in the Union in principle and to have Reformed persons admitted to the sacrament as guests. They "want to hold on to the confessions" (!), however, writes the above mentioned church newspaper, "in the mild sense of the, let us not err, Saxon formula of commitment". The country pastors, by the way, are not yet to be represented on this page. We fear that one has to expect more mischief from this so-called middle party in the Hanoverian regional church than from a Baumgarten, Klapp and consorts. W.

The Hanoverian ecclesiastical middle party once again. About this party the Allgemeine Evang.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung of November 26 of last year makes further announcements. From the statutes of this party we extract the following statements: "4. The blessing of a people's church shall be preserved for our people. We consider it reprehensible to abolish or diminish the sovereign church regime, if only in view of the dangers that currently surround our church. - 7) The resolute will to preserve the confessional status and the legal order of our regional church does not exclude the expression of the unity of the German Lutheran church, which rests first and foremost on the confession, and to seek an external connection for the cultivation of common interests. - 8) From the same standpoint, and in view of the ecclesiastical practice hitherto regarding admission to Holy Communion, we hold that members of the Union, if they declare themselves Lutherans, should be granted the right to partake of Holy Communion, and that Reformed members and those who stand on the Consensus should be granted admission to the same as guests: the one, however, as well as the other, of course, under the same conditions under which the members of our national church partake of Holy Communion. - This declaration was signed in the Martini meeting by 40 clergymen and 16 laymen, whose number has since risen to 60 clergymen and 22 laymen. An analysis of the signatures shows that the association counts among its 82 members 25 rural clergymen (thus the urban element predominates), as well as that among the clergymen the fourth part consists of superintendents (thus the ephoral element predominates). It will therefore not be unjustified to conclude that from these two geographical and ecclesiastical centers, respectively, the circles of the movement will soon expand. It is striking that among the laity there are almost no men in independent positions; we encounter only the names of high-ranking officials and schoolmen. It is also noticeable that the provincial districts of Stabe, Osnabrück and Aurich are almost not represented at all." - The Hann. Cour., which is hostile to the church, wrote: "This new direction deals the hardest blow to orthodoxy, far harder than the Protestant Association could have done. For this has led many who want to hold fast to the Lutheran confession into the arms of Orthodoxy; but now a rift is developing in Orthodoxy itself." Further down the Kirchenzeitung says: "Some names have a good sound in church circles, while there is also no lack of those who are inclined to more liberal views." The alliance of those with these takes away the good sound of those. *Inter quos te invenio, inter hos te judico.* W.

Immanuel Synod. The Braunschweig "Kirchenblatt" of October 23 wants to see what this synod established in the fifth of the theses on communion set up at its last meeting also applied to us Missourians and not, as the Immanuel Synod does inconsistently enough, to see us excluded from it. The "Kirchenblatt" writes: "The Immanuel Synod, in theses adopted this summer at Magdeburg, has expressly stated that it cannot have communion with the Breslau Synod, since the false doctrines in the public declaration touched the foundation; on the other hand, it finds that the Missourians have unjustly suspended communion with it, since there are no differences touching the foundation, and now does not want its members to go to communion there, lest they make themselves partakers of sin. Terrible conditions! Our principle is what the 5th thesis of the Immanuel Synod also states: Communion with all church communities that profess the Lutheran confessions, even if only the unaltered Augsburg Confession; but without the glosses in the theses that do not make the principle effective. Away with everything that opposes this principle! Not even the transgression of it, terrible as it is, may prevent us from acting according to the principle."

German polemics are not always as delicate as one would like to conclude from the condemnation of our polemics. Especially when politics plays into theology, one can also speak quite "German" in Germany. Thus we read in the Braunschweig-Hannover'schen Kirchenblatt of October 30 of last year: "A conference of faithful Lutheran clergymen in Erlangen this year even managed to take the side of the state in the struggle of the state against Rome. ... In the fight against Rome! This addition will not help you, you 'believing', 'Lutheran' pastors! May you show yourselves nowhere more publicly, may your voice be heard nowhere more in Christendom, until you repent publicly for your disgrace." Such, then, are only believers and Lutherans with goose feet. W.

"The Lutheran Church Messenger for Australia has recently spoken out against chiliasm. In its issue of August 6 last year, however, we read in a dispatch: "The Sunday shall exist until the time when the personal Antichrist appears, who will be subject to 'change time and law'." Does the "church messenger" still expect a "personal Antichrist"?! The "sent in" probably only got into the "Kirchenbote" by mistake. W.

Darwinist versus" Darwinist. The learned Darwinist Rüttimeyer judges about the writings of the Darwinist Professor Häckel in Jena: "These writings form a kind of, we do not want to hope, future literature, but a fantasy literature, as it enjoys great popularity in another field of thought, but in the scientific field it reminds of a far past, according to which observations served only as mortar for the building blocks provided by the past, while today one is used to demand the opposite relationship. Of the illustrations that accompanied the first edition, this critic suggests that they have hitherto been regarded in familiar circles more as gimmicks of wit. And so he finally protests against such a "playing with the audience and with science".

Mexico. Five persons who participated in the murder of the American missionary John L. Stephens in Acapulco in March 1870 have recently been executed. Mexico is no longer the same, to the great chagrin of the Roman Antichrist, who will probably canonize these murderers as martyrs in his own time. W.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 22.

February 1876.

No. 2.

Preface.

(Continued.)

If, by reproaching us with repristination, it is meant that we profess only the old doctrine which has always existed and do not want to know anything about any new articles of faith, we gladly put up with the reproach and regard it as a testimony for us; for the truth is a good of the church which it has always had and does not have to seek first. "The secret of the Lord is among them that fear him." Ps. 25, 14.

Our Lord Jesus Christ says: "Truly, until heaven and earth pass away, not the smallest letter or tittle of the law will pass away until all is done. Matth. 5, 18. In his sermons he referred to the Old Testament to show that he did not bring any new doctrine. For the proof of his deity he cites the 110th Psalm, for the proof of the resurrection of the dead 2 Mos. 3, 6. His "But I say unto you" in the sermon on the mount (Matth. 5, 22.) he does not speak in contrast to Moses and the prophets, but in contrast to the Pharisaic distortions of doctrine.

Therefore, the apostles also refer to the Old Testament. Paul says: "But by the help of God I have succeeded, and stand to this day witnessing both to small and great things, saying nothing except what the prophets said should be done, and Moses." Ap. Hist. 26, 22. When Peter speaks at the Jerusalem Council: "We believe to be saved by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, just as they also" (the fathers), Acts Hist. 15, 11., he clearly states that the faith of the fathers of the Old Testament was the same as that of the New Testament, with the only difference that they expected the Messiah, but we believe that He has appeared. According to the words of the Apostle Paul: "I thank my God always for your-

For the grace of God which is given unto you in Christ Jesus, that through him ye might be enriched in all things, in all doctrine, and in all knowledge. . and wait only for the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ", 1 Cor. 1, 4. 5., the Corinthian church possessed all doctrine, so does every church that abides by the word of God, and it does not have to wait for any new insights, for any new dogmas, but only for its Lord, who will bring it home into eternal glory.

Therefore, Kromayer rightly says: "We send in advance: 1. that the articles necessary to know salvation are articles of all times, i.e. that they are present in the Old and New Testament, as the apostle says Ephes. 4, 5.: 'One Lord, One Faith (namely, which is believed, not with which one believes, the objective, or doctrine to be believed, not the subjective, which comprehends the merit of Christ and is distinguished from its objects).'" (*Theol. pos.-pol. p. 1.*) And Calov: "Necessary to believe are the articles of faith, and therefore also unchangeable and always of the same nature, as regards the substance of the thing to be believed itself." (*Syst. I, 771. sq.*)

That is why the church of the Reformation sought out the old again and referred to it as proof of its apostolic character. It has not only gone back to the testimony of the prophets and apostles, but also to the testimony of the ancient church. Thus at the end of the 21 articles of doctrine in the Augsburg Confession it says: "This is almost the sum of the doctrine which is preached and taught in our churches for the right Christian instruction and consolation of consciences, and also for the correction of the faithful; for we would not gladly put our own souls and consciences in the highest and greatest danger for God by misusing the divine name or word, nor would we want to pass on to our children and descendants any other doctrine than that which is in accordance with the pure divine word and Christian truth. If this doctrine is clearly founded in the holy Scriptures and is not contrary to the common Christian, even Roman, churches, as much as can be noted from the Fathers' Scriptures, we also take care that our adversaries cannot disagree with us in the above-mentioned articles". (*Ed. M. p. 47.*) In the Concordia formula, it is emphasized at the outset that Scripture alone is the principle of knowledge, and yet for the article on the person of Christ, a list of testimonies of the ancient pure church teachers (*purioris antiquitatis*) is added to the proof of Scripture, so that the reader may see, "that in the book reported" (Concordia formula) "nothing new, neither in *rebus* nor *phrasibus*, that is, neither in the doctrine nor in the manner of speaking, is set, but that just as first the holy Scriptures and then the ancient pure Church did, this mystery is taught and spoken of." (*Ed. M. p. 799.*) Luther writes: "We do not invent anything new, but keep and remain with the old word of God, as the old church had it; therefore we are with the same the right old church.

Church, as one church that teaches and believes one word of God. Therefore the papists blaspheme Christ himself, the apostles and all of Christendom when they call us new and heretics. For they find nothing in us but the old things of the old church, that we are like it and one church with it. (XVII, 1659.)

That's the way we hold it. We have not invented anything new, we do not want to invent anything new, we believe that no truth can be found anew. We hold fast to the old teachings of the old church and are not ashamed of it. We gladly put up with being accused of repristination in this sense. This reproach refreshes us in our struggles and makes us cheerful in the face of all disgrace. It testifies to the fact that we are faithful children of the church of the Reformation. We gladly leave the glory of productivity to others. We know, after all, that he who wants to know nothing of proper reproducing, but only of new producing, produces nothing but error. We gladly leave to the moderns the sad glory that they have brought theology, which in their opinion was in infancy with the ancients, into manhood, and that they have discarded the childishness of the ancients (their faithful adherence to the word) as an outworn position. We know that whoever does not go back with us to the old eternal truth, goes on to darkness.

And if, therefore, along with the accusation of repristination, one also wants to raise against us the accusation that we reject the doctrinal progress of which the moderns boast, then we have nothing to object to that either.

By this we do not mean that we do not want to know anything about what the modern age is really advanced in. For example, we readily admit progress in linguistics. We consider it a miracle of God that Luther, with the limited resources of his time (grammars, lexica, etc.), was able to produce such an incomparable translation of the Bible, the best of all. We admit a progress in the study of antiquity. We are pleased that in recent times more and more manuscripts of the Bible are being compared, described and published, since all *codices*, including the last *codex sinaiticus* found by Tischendorf, must only confirm that the cry of the unbelievers of falsification of the Bible is vain. The newer church historians, apart from their often wrong views, in that they, for example, defend the heretics and do not represent the Pabstism as antichristianism, but know so many praiseworthy things about it, - a certain progress, in terms of methodology, highlighting many important written monuments, etc., is not to be denied; other progress in other sciences here to say nothing.

But from the newer theory of the gradual emergence and development of dogmas we decisively dissociate ourselves. The very reason for their emergence in the Lutheran Church makes them suspect. The intention is to give certain dogmas, which are clearly expressed in God's Word and are

The author does not agree with the doctrines known from the symbols, e.g. of the church and its office, and tries to justify his favorite opposing opinions with this theory. Therefore, it is said that at first there were only a few doctrines of faith, but over time the church drew more and more of them from Scripture; as long as the church has not spoken, has not decided, has not symbolically fixed a doctrine, it must be regarded as an open question and no opinion on either side must be regarded as separating the church.

In this sense, Dr. Kahnis, Superintendent Münchmeier and Dr. Besser spoke out in the letter of admonition which they sent to our Synod on behalf of the Leipzig Conference: "In the doctrinal points of the church, the spiritual office, ordination, etc., the two Synods (of Buffalo and Missouri) have very different teachings. The order of the church, the ecclesiastical office and what is connected with it, are without doubt such, which our symbols... have not led to the full theological elaboration and conclusion. This seems rather to be the task of our days. Therefore, the divergent opinions concerning these questions should be . . . as long as the Church has not yet spoken, should both find room side by side in this Church."

In the expert opinion of the theological faculty of Dorpat (written by Drs. Harnack, Kurtz and others) requested by the Lowans, it says: "The symbols are, as it were, the landmarks of the course of development of the church. Accordingly, our confession also contains, in addition to the already symbolically developed and fixed articles and dogmas of the faith, such elements of the general Christian and ecclesiastical creed, we mean of the apostolic symbolism, which in part are still in the midst of development, in part have not yet entered the historical dogma-forming movement at all or only to some extent, because the church has so far only been prompted to speak about them from one side, or because they have not yet become the object of their closer explanation or determination. In both cases, what has already been symbolically won and established will be the regulating prerequisite and basis for further ecclesiastical confessional activity, but during the latter, divergent opinions and convictions are not only unavoidable, but also justified and permissible. However, they are permissible only on condition that, first, they conform to the conditions to which the symbol-forming movement of the church itself is bound, i.e. that they do not contradict the word of God and the ecclesiastical *consensus doctrinae*, and that, furthermore, they do not claim for themselves the dignity of publicly recognized dogmas, i.e. of church-forming or church-dividing truths, but only want to be valid for what they only are at present - private and individual, even if in themselves so well-founded Christian *doctrines*."

The church will be able to tolerate even relative errors, which are unavoidable in this state of affairs, without endangering doctrinal unity. Even relative errors, which are unavoidable in this state of affairs, the church will be able to endure without endangering doctrinal unity; and it will have to do so, because in this case it is not yet in a position to state the error as such ecclesiastically. . . Only after this explanation of the difference between confession and confessional writing, as well as of the historical nature of the confession, which is in the process of constant growth and development, from which we have derived partly the contrast between fixed and developing, not yet completed dogmas in the symbol itself, and partly the distinction between ecclesiastical dogmas and Christian and theological convictions, do we see ourselves in a position to settle our question ... definitively. . . . For the church and its existence, and this is the only thing that matters in our question, at present only that is fundamental - as we have already demonstrated above - which it has hitherto gained in the knowledge of salvation from Scripture and laid down in its symbols as a confession. ... An articulated and explicit unanimity in such doctrines, which have not yet become dogmas of the church, but also do not contradict the *consensus fidei* in the previously established dogmas, cannot possibly be demanded, simply because there is still no recognized standard for their ecclesiasticism and the question of their scripturality is still an undecided point of contention." Similarly Löhe, his American followers and others.

Among other things, the words of the apostles and the first Christians at Jerusalem are invoked: "It pleases the Holy Spirit and us," Acts 15:28, to prove that the decision of the church is that of the Holy Spirit. 15:28, to prove that the decision of the church is that of the Holy Spirit; but in vain; for if this were so, the apostles and first Christians should have said: It pleases us and the Holy Spirit; but these first prove their case from the prophecy of the prophet Amos, thus showing what the Holy Spirit has taught, giving it their believing assent, and exhorting to the acceptance of it, because the Holy Spirit has revealed it.

According to God's Word, we cannot grant the church the right to make articles of faith. "The Christian church has no power," we say with Luther, "to make some articles of faith, never has, never will. . . . All articles of faith are sufficiently set forth in Holy Scripture that no one may set any more." (Some articles, so Martin Luther etc. Erl. A. Vol. 31. p. 122.) Further: "The Pope's hypocrites have fallen into such gross foolishness that they do not think otherwise, that the Concilia have power and right to set new articles of faith and to change the old ones. This is not true. . Nor have any concilia done so, nor can they do so. For the articles of faith do not have to be changed on earth by the concilia, but from a new secret.

They must not grow from inspiration, but be publicly given and revealed from heaven by the Holy Spirit, otherwise they are not articles of faith. (Of the Conciliis and Churches. Erl. ed. vol. 25. p. 267.)

Those who adhere to the theory of the formation and fixation of dogmas by the church must necessarily blame Luther for opposing Rome without the church having spoken and commissioned him; indeed, they must condemn the Reformation itself. For it was a return to the old One Truth and a fight against all the new dogmas that the papist teachers and theologians had formed in opposition to the old apostolic doctrine and that the so-called "church" had fixed on the Conciliar, e.g. the new dogma of the Costnitz Council, which fixed that Holy Communion, although Christ had instituted it under both forms, should nevertheless (*hoc non obstante* *) be administered under one form.

The theory of dogma formation is therefore well papistic. What the pope claims for his person, the newer theologians also ascribe to themselves. Their decision should be the decision of the church, as in the papacy of the pope's decision should be that of the church. With this theory they build a bridge to the papacy. Their attacks against it are air-brushes, which it does not respect much.

With the papacy they undermine the authority of the holy scripture. Clear doctrines expressed in God's word shall nevertheless (*hoc non obstante*) not be valid, these gentlemen theologians have given their decision. Doctrines are not to be accepted as unquestionable, because they are first symbolically fixed by the church; and then they are to be accepted precisely because the church has fixed them, not because they are expressed in God's word. Indeed, if Luther were to return today, he would not spare even these new "fruit dancers" in holy wrath.

With the papacy they overthrow the poor consciences who "cry out for truth and right instruction from God's Word" and to whom "death is not so bitter" "as it is bitter to them where they are in a piece of

*Luther therefore called the Costnitz or Constance *Concilium concilium obstantiense*. He writes: "The laudable city has a fine name: *Constantia*, which means firm or solid, manly mind; therefore they call it *Constantiense Concilium*. But I, Doctor Martinus Luther, baptize it after its proper name, which they themselves give to it, *Obstantiense Concilium*; *Obstantia*, however, means resistance. For here they have not only acted against Christ and his church, but also boast about it and confirm that Christ may well do as he pleases. But the Lords *Obstantiensis Concilii* want to oppose this and do not want to look at him or his church. *Non obstante Christo et Ecclesia*, they say freely: Christ together with his church shall not resist us, we are indeed a higher and different Christ and church than they are, for they are nothing against us". (Etlche Sprüche etc. Erl. Ausg. Bd. 31, 392.)

doubt" (Apol. p. 191.) by their theory in loud doubt. They demand that a truth discerned from God's Word be regarded as an open question until the church speaks, that is, that it be doubted for so long. So long the poor consciences must hover in uncertainty, and even then, when the verdict of the theologians is proclaimed, they can have no certainty whether the whole church has really spoken, whether now the doctrine is really finished.

In the final analysis, therefore, this theory leads to unbelief and overthrows the foundation of the Christian religion.

There is hardly a doctrine left that the newer theologians have not shaken. Above all, the main doctrines of the Holy Scriptures and of Christ are attacked in order to deal with the others more easily.

It is claimed that the Holy Scriptures are not inspired by the Holy Spirit according to words, not even according to things, and that they also contain errors. And the newer theologians consider it their task to separate the true from the false. In this way, the Holy Scriptures are deprived of their prestige; in this way, wretched, vain men set themselves above the great majestic God who speaks in the Scriptures; in this way, all the foundations of Christianity are pulled out from under the feet. If this error were truth, if the Bible were a book that contained errors, if it had to be decided first what was true and what was false in it, then our Christian faith would be built on sand; for if something is uncertain in the Bible, then the entire Bible, which claims to be God's Word, is uncertain.

One claims that God the Son is not true God, but subordinate to the Father, one empties Him of His divine attributes in the state of humiliation, one denies vicarious atonement. Has not all the foundation of Christianity been overthrown with these teachings? If this error were truth, then we would not be redeemed, then the belief in redemption, which came about through Christ, would be a delusion, a dream, a lie.

It is said that the current level of science requires such a treatment of theology and that whoever does not admit this is an unscientific person. But this is not so. Science is misused to destroy the old Christian faith: for true science is not opposed to Christianity, but serves it. As highly as we esteem true science, so earnestly do we renounce such abuse of it. It is said that the form of exposition in the old dogmatics is so scholastic. But whoever knows the newer ones must say that they often express themselves much more scholastically and incomprehensibly. It is said that our time demands that the old truth be taught in a new way. Well, if only one did not teach new dogmas, but really the old ones. But in truth, what remains of the old dogmas in the hands of these theologians are

not much left. Musaeus writes in his review of the *consensus repetitus*: "Accordingly, these two pieces must be together and kept unchanged; one, that the Christian articles of faith remain unchanged and are neither increased with new additions, nor diminished with the removal or mutilation of one or the other; the other, that, as far as the thorough explanation and defense of the true doctrine of the faith, the interpretation of difficult sayings and the like are concerned, the *profectus religionis* and the growth of the Christian church, and first of all of the teachers in the thorough knowledge of the true doctrine of the faith, remain free, uninhibited and unhindered." (*Hist. syncret.* v. Calov. p. 1013.) In the opposite case there is no *profectus*, but a *defectus*, no progress, but a falling away. So it is with the newer theologians. If one compares the quotations from their works, which are given in the current articles: "What is the progress of modern Lutheran theology in doctrine?", one will find that they do not teach the old truth in a new way, that they do not seek new weapons from the old armory of the divine word against new heresies, but that they rather fight the old truth, overthrow it.

This is what our struggle is directed against. Our fight is a fight for Christianity. Whether we are reviled about it, what harm does it do. We do not seek glory from the world. From God we want our glory, that we have stood faithfully and firmly in the floods of unbelief that rush along in our time.

(Conclusion follows.)

What is it about the progress of modern Lutheran theology in doctrine?

(Continued.)

VI. What is the right Christian faith of the true God?

A. Theses.

The general Christian Athanasian Creed: "Whoever wants to be saved must first of all have the right Christian faith.

Whoever does not keep the same whole and pure will undoubtedly be eternally lost.

But this is the right Christian faith, that we honor one God in three persons, and three persons in one Godhead.

And do not mix the persons into one another, nor dissect the divine essence.

Another person is the Father, another is the Son, another is the Holy Spirit.

But the Father and Son and Holy Spirit is one God, equal in glory, equal in eternal majesty.

As the Father is, so is the Son, so is the Holy Spirit.

The Father is not created, the Son is not created, the Holy Spirit is not created.

The Father is immeasurable, the Son is immeasurable, the Holy Spirit is immeasurable.

The Father is eternal, the Son is eternal, the Holy Spirit is eternal.

And yet are not three eternal, but it is one eternal.

Just as there are not three uncreated, nor three immeasurable, but there is one uncreated and one immeasurable.

So also the Father is all-powerful, the Son is all-powerful, the Holy Spirit is all-powerful.

And yet they are not three Almighty, but it is one Almighty.

So the Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Spirit is God.

And yet it is not three gods, but it is one God.

So the Father is the Lord, the Son is the Lord, the Holy Spirit is the Lord.

And yet there are not three Lords, but there is one LORD.

For just like us, according to Christian truth, every person must confess God and the Lord for himself:

So, in the Christian faith, we cannot call three gods or three Lords.

The Father was neither made nor created nor born by anyone.

The Son is of the Father alone, not made, nor created, but born.

The Holy Spirit is not made, not born, but proceeding from the Father and the Son.

So now there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Spirit, not three Holy Spirits.

And among these three people, none is the first, none the last, none the greatest, none the smallest.

But all three persons are equally eternal with each other, equally great.

So that, as has been said, three persons are honored in one deity, and one God in three persons.

Whoever then desires to be saved must therefore think of the three persons in God." *)

*Of the Athanasian Symbolum, Luther wrote in 1545: "Which is so composed that I do not know whether anything more important and more glorious was written in the church of the New Testament in the time of the apostles. (On Joel 2:28, 29. Tom. VI, 2314.)

B. Antitheses.

Kahnis: "What reason and Scripture demand, an absolute personality, finds its truth in the basic doctrine that the Father is the divine original personality. *) ... If the Father is the divine original personality, the Son emerged from the divine original personality in a mysterious way, then it is already here undoubtedly expressed that the Son is God only in the second sense of the word. **)... The symbols and rules of faith express in the most definite way that the Father is God in the only and actual sense of the word, in that they call only Him God." (The Lutheran Dogmatics. First volume. Second Edition. Leipzig 1874. p. 351. 361. 399.) "In the New Testament, Jesus Christ, conscious of His pre-worldly being (John 17:5), that is, not as man, but as Logos made flesh, calls His Father the only true God (τὸν μόνον ἀληθινόν & εὐόν), expressly calling Himself the Messenger of God, distinguishes from him. ***Where God is in the subject, the Father is always meant. . . . No one (!) will refer to the passage 1 Tim. 3, 16. since the reading has critically fallen (!)." (S. 353.) †) . . . "In the doctrine that the Son and the Spirit have their ground of origin in the Father, it is logically necessary that the Father, who has no ground in anything else (αγέννητα), is God in the only sense of the word." (p. 400.) "But in and of itself, in this name (Son of God).

*) Where K. wants to go with his "original personality", he discovers in the first edition of his Dogmatics, when he writes there: "If according to reason and scripture God is a unifier and absolute person or infinite spirit, then indisputably the unity of God must fall into his personality. According to the traditional doctrine of the Trinity, however, the unity of God falls into the original personal being common to the three persons." (111,226.) Thus Kahnis believes and teaches only One truly and really divine Person; he is in this respect a Socinian or Unitarian.

**In the first edition K. expresses it in such a way, the son is "secondary way God". (I, 461.)

***) Who understands Greek and does not want to be blind, sees that if Kahnis' interpretation should be compelling (which every interpretation must be, if a doctrine is to be founded from it), the word does not stand before 0^Λ. would have to be. See also the thorough interpretation of the passage Joh. 17, 5. by Gerhard *Exeges. loc. II, § 100.*

†) Such passages as Ebr. 1, 8. 9. and Act. 20, 28., where it is said of God in the Subject that he shed his blood, are not in the holy scripture for K.. And where Christ is described as "God over all" (Rom. 9, 5.), he helps himself with detorted punctuation (p. 354.), and where he is called "the great God" (Tit. 2, 13.), he helps himself in spite of grammar with the *ἀρχην λαμβάνει*: "that such amplified expressions for the Godhead can only be attributed to the Father" (p. 355); indeed a shameful *petitio principii*! In the passage 1 Tim. 3,16. to put the neuter *δ* instead of *ἡ*, as K. wants, leads just in the predicates to an absurd sense.

not the divine personality of Jesus Christ. This lies in the attributes, which Jesus attributed to himself, the apostles to him." (p. 360.) *) "Finally, in the concept of a divine personality, which becomes man, in order to carry mankind forever as nature in itself, lies the fact that it cannot be equal to the original personality, which, unchangeable as it is, cannot take finiteness into itself, as then Jesus Christ does not subordinate Himself to the divine original personality merely in individual words (Joh. 5, 19. ff. 10, 29. 17, 3. ff.), but in His entire conduct toward the Father." ** (p. 362) "In any case, this mysterious emergence of a divine personality from God is different from the creation and in the passage Col. 1, 15. is only combined with the creation in so far as the begetting of the Son formed the transition to the creation." *** (p. 361.) "What is certain, however, is that Scripture says nothing about the origin of the Holy Spirit from God." (How Kahnis takes the word "origin," quite true!) "The judgment of the church about the origin of the Spirit, that he comes forth from the Father (*ἵχπορεύεται*), has its" (alleged) "scriptural ground in the words John 15:26, which, however, as noted, signify the economic going forth of the Holy Spirit." † (p. 367.) "One often appeals to the word *ὑποούσως*, which was used at Nicaea and Constantinople was attached to the son. But this word was of very different meaning. . . . This word is only to express that the pre-

*) As if Christ was not absolutely called the Son of God with the article and therefore Rom. 8, 32. his own (*ἰδιος*), that is, the Son of God in the proper sense and thus not already "in and of itself" his "divine personality pronounced!"

**The Son of God is therefore a changeable God. If Kahnis worships Christ with the Socinians, he therefore commits with his worship nothing else than idolatry. According to this, Hengstenberg still said too little when he declared in 1862 in the preface to his *Ev. Kirchenzeitung* that Kahnis "especially begins to shake the article of the standing and falling church, the doctrine of the deity of Christ, to which he wants to substitute a vague divinity", because according to Kahnis Jesus is "not Jehovah", but only "of divine nature, a divine being". Kahnis' representations are "socinianizing seductions". More clearly Dr. Delitzsch already wrote of Kahnis: "He thus lapses into a subordinationism, which threatens the unity of the triune Godhead" (only threatens?) "and inferentially places in the place of the One Triune One God and two subgods." (Rudelbach - Guericke'sche Zeitschrift of 1862. p. 23.)

***With this, Kahnis gives to understand that for him pre-worldly being and being from eternity do not coincide at all. For him, rather, procreation is something that could quite well also be an emergence of being out of non-being, as we will see more clearly below.

†) That the words: "He who proceeds from the Father" (Joh. 15, 26.), do not express the eternal inner relationship of the Holy Spirit to the Father, like the words: "Today I have begotten you" (Ps. 2, 7.), that of the Son, but that those words mean the "economic proceeding", is an empty assertion that cannot be proven with anything.

The personality of Jesus was divine in the same way as the Father's. . . . We see here clearly that the homousia was not coordination." *(p. 399. 380.) "It is only in the concept of every person that he, who is his own ego with the powers of thinking, willing, feeling, has the divine qualities in a peculiar way. To have misjudged this is a great fault of the older theologians. They thought of the qualities as a common possession of the three persons. But how could one ascribe to Christ a divine nature, which was intimately connected with the human nature, if this nature was at the same time that of the Father and the Spirit? One was then forced to go on to the doctrine of the incarnation of the Godhead, which is against scripture (!) and church doctrine (!). If qualities are the moments of the divine personality, but father, son and spirit are special personalities, then also each of the three persons must have the divine qualities in a special way". **(p. 404) "Before the foundation of the world the Son and the Spirit were with the Father. Whether the time before the foundation of the world was a heavenly time, when the Son and the Spirit were not yet? Whether the process of witnessing and breathing was extinguished with the generation of the Son and the coming forth of the Spirit? How witnessing and breathing differ? These are questions that cannot be answered." *** (p. 403.) "Since Petavius, the father of the

*) We see here that it is just as jugglery with K. when he appropriates the word "ὁμοούσιος" as it was jugglery when Arius appropriated the word "God" as a predicate of Christ. No expression is so accurate, heretics always finally know to interpret the same according to their sense.

**Here, K. documents his flat tritheism, according to which he, as Dr. Delitzsch says, "puts a God and two sub-gods in the place of the One Triune", in a clarity that is sufficient for everyone. K. does not want to know anything about the fact that the procreation and the letting go out is a communication of the divine substance, by virtue of which that of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit is numero una, it is only supposed to be *specie una*. According to him, not "the whole fullness of the Godhead dwelt in Christ bodily". God's essence and God's attributes are not identical for him. God did not become a man to him, but a person who has a certain divinity and possesses divine attributes apart from God. His Trinity is a triplicity, a true idol monstrosity. O cursed doctrine of the devil!

***If according to Kahn's system also the question cannot be answered: "Whether before the world time a heavenly time (!) was, when son and spirit were not yet", then at least the question is answered: Whether Kahn's teaches that son and spirit are truly divine persons and therefore necessarily eternal with the person of the father. According to this, K. does not teach this; his concessions that Christ is a pre-mortal God are nothing but blue vapor. Rightly wrote Dr. Delitzsch, op. cit.: "The author (K.) fell back into that Arian *ἦν ὅτε οὐχ ἦν*, the overcoming of which cost the old church so much sweat and blood and tears." Kahn's system places its author not only outside the Lutheran, but also outside the general Christian church, and makes him a

Dogma history, it is generally conceded that the pre-Nicene Fathers subordinated Son and Spirit to the Father. But more recent researchers (Baur, Dörner, Ullmann) have added the sure (!) result that also the Nicene (!) Fathers teach a subordination of the Son." *) (S. 398.)

Dr. v. Hofmann's antitheses against the doctrine of the true God or 'of the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity' have already been communicated by Pastor Fick in Boston in an article entitled "Dr. v. Hofmann's Unitarianism" in the May issue of the previous volume of this journal, to which we therefore refer the reader back here. Idolaters and blasphemers. As the Apology of the Augsburg Confession clearly testifies in the first article after the explanation of our church's doctrine of the Most Holy Trinity: "*Et constanter affirmamus, aliter sentientes extra ecclesiam Christi et idolatras esse et Deum contumelia afficere*". The fact that Kahn's colleagues treat him as a brother does not help him, but is all the more serious a testimony against them; all the more so because the "Ev.-Luth. Kirchenztg." of October 30, 1874, in an advertisement of Kahn's writing: "Der innere Gang," could even write: "The author shows himself in the whole book to be a faithful Lutheran." (!)

*) As far as the pre-Nicene Fathers are concerned, it cannot be denied that some of them sometimes really speak in a subordinate manner. But here the following is to be considered: 1. the voice of these so-called fathers is not the voice of the church of the pre-Nicene time; without doubt the "common priests" have preached more correctly than these learned gentlemen; just as in our time; only a pope (or traditionist versus a seducer) will want to justify his heresies with the errors of the fathers. 2 Many of the so-called church fathers of that time were philosophically educated men, who, even if not in evil opinion, but often out of apologetic interest, mixed their philosophy with theology and falsified it by the latter; just as in our time. 3) Often the meaning was better than the expression, because they spoke more carelessly (*securius*), more unclearly and more misunderstandably in a time in which certain doctrines had not yet been fought by heretics and had not yet been fought through by orthodox believers. 4 The pre-Nicene fathers had to defend themselves against the pagans especially against polytheism and therefore to emphasize the unity of the Godhead with special seriousness, which then, unfortunately for God! Or, conversely, they had to defend themselves against the confusion of the persons and therefore urge the diversity of the persons, which, unfortunately, again sometimes led them to present the person of the Father as the principle in such a way that they led their readers to subordinate ideas. Most, however, who are guilty of this, teach correctly, and only stray into error when they venture into the field of speculation apart from Scripture. Finally, the majority, including all the so-called apostolic fathers, are not only pure in the doctrine of Father, Son, and Spirit, but also unequivocal in their expression of them. - As far as the "Nicene Fathers" are concerned, however, the "newer scholars" do not impute subordinationism to them in any other way than in which the same gentlemen, Dr. Kahn included, impute it to the holy Scriptures themselves.

allow us. Here we only have what Dr. Philippi and Dr. Kliefoth remark on v. Hofmann's doctrine of the Trinity. The former writes: "Only by artificial exegetical processes is it possible to look at the sacred metaphysics of Scripture in divine historical processes, and to proceed to the assertion that Scripture teaches the Trinitarian relationship in God as eternal only by calling it historical, and that it names it not according to how it is eternal, but according to how it is historical. Compare Scripture Proof 1, 177, also p. 85. Rather, the immanent Trinity is not only a prerequisite, but a direct and explicit teaching of holy Scripture. Compare also Delitzsch, Psychol. On the other hand, according to Hofmann's system, God is made so dependent on his historical revelation, and the correct relationship between the trinity of essence and the trinity of revelation is so decisively reversed, that God is said to have set himself up from eternity as the triune one only because he wanted to reveal himself trinitarianly in time. Compare Scripture Proof 1, p. 36. p. 177. f. Will it be possible to go back from such premises to the ecclesiastical doctrine of the Trinity, which is completely attached to the concept of the eternal generation of the Son out of the essence of the Father, or will it not rather be possible, according to Hofmann, to call the second person in the Godhead, as Dörner (Von der Veränderlichkeit Gottes. A. a. O. p. 388.) calls it, only "the unknown divine greatness", "which in the world of revelation (in Christ) is called Son"? And should this doctrine of a divine person only willed for the sake of the world creation and world redemption itself, who is, in addition, changeable by virtue of his will (a God who ceased to be God in order to become man, Scripture proof 1, 146.) be unjustly accused of Arianism by Dörner (ibid. p. 389.)?" (Kirchliche Glaubenslehre II, 208. f.) The latter, Kliefoth, writes: "The theology of v. H. is a theosophical system, which, by raping the Scriptures, distorts the history of salvation by fanciful but untrue combinations, and decomposes the ecclesiastical body of doctrine in the double direction that it replaces the more theoretical dogmas of God, the Trinity, etc., by interwoven theosophical dogmas. by interwoven theosophical elements, and weakens the more practical dogmas of sin etc. He claims to be conform to the ecclesiastical doctrine, even to form and promote it by his theology. . . . This is a falsehood which irremediably confuses the minds, especially of the younger generations." (Kirchliche Zeitschrift. Edited by Kliefoth and Mejer. Sechster Jahrg. Schwerin 1859. p. 799. f.) Already in the introduction of the relevant critique of Hofmann's "Schriftbeweises" Kliefoth had written: "If v. H. wants to be fair, he himself will have to admit that after all that has happened, he has left his old friends nothing else than to agree with the judgment that his theology is not

a new way of teaching old truth, but an old way of teaching new school opinions is to be expected of the church." (And we add: "And who does not see from all this that the alleged progress of the modern Lutheran theologians in doctrine is nothing other than the overthrow of all the foundations of our holy church? - But may they overthrow in their part the foundation: "He that dwelleth in heaven laugheth at them, and the Lord mocketh at them!" "God is with her in it, therefore she will remain well." If "the wise and prudent" do not want to accept God's mysterious counsel for man's salvation, God will still find crowds of "underage" people who will do so; so that even many a wise and prudent person will finally be overwhelmed, as Augustine once was, who, when a pious soldier had told him about several miraculous conversions with great joy, finally cried out to his Alypius, deeply moved: "What is this? What have you heard? The unlearned are setting out to seize the kingdom of heaven, and we with our sciences without heart, oh where do we wallow in flesh and blood? How? are we ashamed to follow because they have preceded us, and are we not ashamed at least not to follow them?" *)

(To be continued.)

On the Usury Question.

In the *Lutheran* of January 6, Rev. Dr. Krotel writes: "Some years ago Professor Walther and some others were fully convinced that the Word of God and the great teachers of our church had forbidden usury, not only as it is generally understood, but also the taking of interest. If the Missouri Synod had agreed to that doctrine, as to the others so ably set forth by the same authority, the same would have become one of the points by which any claim to Lutheran name would have been tested. But the announcement of this doctrine aroused such a storm, especially among the laity, that it was not insisted upon." -

To this we reply as follows:

1. The author obviously judges our synod according to his council. For in the Council, however, the acceptance and rejection, the implementation and abandonment of a truth is not guided by

*) "Quid est hoc? Quid audisti? Surgunt indocti et caelum rapiunt, et nos cum doctrinis nostris sine corde, ecce ubi volutamur in carne et sanguine? An quia praecesserunt, pudet sequi, et non pudet nec saltem sequi?" (Confess, lib. 8. e. 8. s. 19.)

The first thing to be done is to carefully probe the people, especially if a truth or practice is disagreeable or offensive to the world and the misbelievers. There, however, one first carefully probes the people, especially if it concerns a truth or a practice based on it that is disagreeable to the Fletsche or offensive to the world and the unbelievers, and immediately withdraws it if Mr. Omnes, namely the rich, distinguished, is found to be antipathetic to it. The most recent example of this is that the Council last year in Galesburg made a correct statement about pulpit and altar fellowship, but when this aroused a tremendous "storm" among Mr. Omnes and it was realized that the probe had hit an all too sensitive spot, the most respected representatives of the Council, the President of the Council at the head, immediately set out to reverse the dangerous movement for the better, by dishonestly reversing the facts, as even a member of the Council, A. J. W., in the "*Lutheran*" of January 20, strikingly and

irrefutably. With us, however, the opposite of such a procedure takes place. The manner of asserting a doctrine does not depend on the sympathies or antipathies of the people, but on the nature of the doctrine in question. While we therefore insist on unanimity under all circumstances in all fundamental articles of faith which constitute the true church, we make no exception to unanimity in other points which are biblical dogmas, e.g. in the question of usury. On the other hand, we do not make ecclesiastical unity dependent on unanimity in other matters which are biblical dogmas, e.g. in the question concerning usury, without making the same and similar matters open questions, but depend on whether the contradiction reveals only weakness of knowledge, or whether conscious rejection of God's word, the *fundamentum organicum*; in which latter case we regard every error against God's word, even the apparently slightest, as separating the church, and treat it as such. As Aegidius Hunnius explained in the Regensburg Colloquium: "An error contrary to the ground of blessedness is when someone denies a fundamental article of religion; as the apostle Ebr. 6. states such articles, the denial of which is contrary to the ground. But there are lesser errors, which go against less Principle Articles, which articles the apostle compares to straw being burned in the fire of temptation, but in such a way that the erring person himself is saved by holding fast the foundation of blessedness, by grasping the rock, namely Christ, and that he suffers damage to his work, which he had built on the foundation, 1 Cor. 3, 11 -15. But it is something else if someone speaks out of contempt: the ground of blessedness is enough for me, and it is enough for me that I believe rightly in this article, and at the same time do not want to accept better instruction in the other articles: such a person would indeed err in regard to lesser articles, but not because of simple error, but with contempt of the divine, the divine, the divine, the divine.

word." *) This is not a theory that we formed for the sake of the doctrine of usury only after those negotiations of our Synod about it (autumn 1869), in order to be able to take refuge in it against the reproach of inconsistency. Leaving aside other even much earlier declarations, rather Schreiber publicly declared this already in 1867, i.e. two years before those Synodal negotiations, on the occasion of a colloquium held in Milwaukee between representatives of the Iowa and Missouri Synods: "It is true, there may be doctrines which are decidedly revealed in the sacred Scriptures, and through the devil's envy delusion has taken hold of hearts; wherefore it would not be in place for him who has known the truth to exercise a certain dominion over those who do not yet know it. He cannot consider anyone an unbeliever who has not been convicted; yet these are not open questions, but would have to be testified to over and over again as against error. Here, too, a distinction must be made between preachers and laymen. With a preacher it must be taken more strictly, and there it will soon become apparent whether he is willing to submit to the word of God; but an ordinary man cannot comprehend the teaching of divine word for a long time, and we would be far from putting him under the spell. However, there can also be cases where such a person willfully wants to act against the recognized truth. In St. Louis we have already had to put one beyond the doctrine of usury; but only when he testified that he recognized that taking interest was usury, but asserted that in our time the commandment against usury could no longer be kept, and thus made it known that he was an unchristian. ... Only he who teaches that he attacks the *fundamentum personale* (Christ himself), or the *fundamentum dogmaticum* (the sum of all fundamental articles), or the *fundamentum organicum* (the tool foundation or the holy scripture itself), and in spite of repeated admonition stubbornly declares that he wants to stick to his doctrine, I declare to be a heretic, but not he who does not attack the foundation or who is mistaken in other points but wants to be taught. I know that we will not get further in this life than a fundamental unity." **)

2. Now how does Pastor Dr. Krotel know that if all the members of our congregations had already been unanimous in that meeting of our synod in 1869, we would have made the doctrine of usury a test point? - He should be ashamed to impute this to us and thus to accuse us of such a dishonest policy in high matters of faith and conscience, since he can produce no other proof of this.

**Colloquium Ratisbonae habitum. Lauingae. p. 433. s.*

**Stenographically recorded colloquium etc. published by I. P. Beyer, Rev. Chicago, Ill, 1868. p. 71. 76.

as that such a procedure would have been in accordance with American church policy, with which, however, we of all people, as is known, have not yet defiled ourselves by God's grace. Rather, where God's Word did not permit us to deviate, we stood firm, even if our entire influence, indeed the existence of many of our congregations and even of our entire synod were at stake. At first, many of our assertions, demands and institutions were ridiculed as fools who would never carry out what they had made their program, but would be mocked and disgraced by it; but we did not let ourselves be misled, did not deviate one step from our intention, and were finally allowed to experience that God certainly helps those who, unconcerned about the consequences in God's hands, do in simple obedience what they know God has commanded.

3. It is a falsehood that the Missouri Synod did not insist on the teaching of the whole Christian Church except Luther and Luther himself, as well as other great theologians, such as Melanchthon, Urbanus Rhegius, Bugenhagen, Aepinus, Chemnitz, etc., about usury *) or rather on the teaching of the true and clear Word of God about it. Rather, the synod in 1869 finally unanimously "decided: That the editors of our periodicals be instructed that, as in all doctrines, so also in the doctrine of usury, they are to be guided by God's Word and to continue in the previous manner." (p. Fourteenth Synodal Report, 1869, p. 106.) Unfortunately, we must admit that not all members of our congregations have yet been convinced of the correctness of Luther's teaching on usury, and not only because more and more congregations are joining our Synod in which this teaching is *terra incognita*, since the same has unfortunately been taught for 200 years (like some other, even fundamental teachings, e.g. that of the Sabbath). It is now, in particular, in this time of an all-consuming flood of usurious sin, regarded as something quite monstrous. Above all, we have to thank the failure of our teachings in some cases to those advocates of usury outside our synod, who have made it their business to put the awakening consciences to sleep again in regard to a doctrine that is admittedly highly inconvenient to the flesh; which, therefore, not we but they, if they do not repent, will one day have to answer for before the judge of all flesh, but which fills us none the less with deep pain and sorrow. Incidentally, all this will not prevent us "with all patience and doctrine," as our synod (loc. cit.) expressly asks of each of its pastors

*Not to mention the pagans, Jews and Turks who have already recognized the doctrine of usury from the light of reason and from the evil fruits of it through experience.

demands that we work towards bringing all members of our dear congregations to a clear and firm conviction about this important practical point of doctrine. If we do not achieve this goal, let us console ourselves with Luther, who wrote in 1540: "We cannot prevent your usury (for this has now become impossible, not only for our preaching, but also for the entire secular regime), so that we may still snatch some from such Sodoma and Gomorrah by our admonition. But if we must also let some good friends perish in it with Lot, through their courageous will, that we do not remain in it, nor make ourselves partakers of its sin and punishment with silence; but, as much as we can, let the cry be heard that usury is no virtue, but great sin and disgrace." (X, 1024. f.)

4. Our opponents, who accuse us of false exclusivity, would, if they were only concerned about the truth, about God's honor and about the salvation of souls, be glad that we do not make the doctrine of usury your test of the right to the Lutheran name. But because they know that here they have on their side not only all usurers (and how many of them there are now!), but almost the whole world, they cannot resist the desire to attack us again and again because of our doctrine of usury, even to impute to us an assertion of this doctrine that has never occurred to us. If David had to lament: "I keep peace; but when I speak, they make war" (Ps. 120, 7.), we have to add: Yes, even when I do not speak, they make war. W.

Ecclesiastical - Contemporary.

I. America.

Various debates on the latest state of affairs in the Council. It will be of interest to our readers to hear what other church papers have said concerning the latest statements in the "*Lutheran*" about the Council's statement on Galesburg. The *Standard*, in a lengthy editorial, says: "The Council has so long indulged in ambiguous expressions calculated to satisfy people of opposite opinions and convictions, that it is not at all surprising if ardent admirers of the Council should think it a foregone conclusion that no words used (on Galesburg) could be meant to discard its theories and practice." And just here it becomes apparent where the rotten spot in the Council is. From the beginning there has been no sincere action and no open and unambiguous use of language. Since the Council's inception, there have been men in it who have defended true Lutheran practice as an honest acceptance of the Lutheran faith requires. And there have been unionists in it from the beginning who have advocated the adoption of

The people were willing to agree with the symbols, but they wanted to be free to do whatever they wanted in their practice, whether it was in accordance with the symbols or not. Instead of discussing these differences in the light of the Word of God, the difficulties were avoided in order to preserve a semblance of unity, and declarations were adopted whose purpose was not to explain anything, so that each party could interpret them in favor of its own opinions. To this day there are men in the Council who have allowed themselves to be deceived into believing that from the beginning the Council has taken precisely the same standpoint as the Synodal Conference, and some probably still believe this today, in spite of all the counter-sanctimonious declarations of the *Missionary*. But can a blessing rest on a body which is guilty of such dodges and such duplicity?... Each party will, as before, interpret the statements of the Council as it sees fit. But such a course of action cannot bring blessings. Little by little, the true and the right will make themselves felt in spite of all maneuvers and language arts. There are already men in the Council who desire an honest discussion of the 'four points' and who will not put up with being fobbed off with ambiguous phrases. Their number is also growing steadily, and sooner or later a crisis must occur." - The "Luth. Kirchenztg." (Columbus) of December 15 expresses itself similarly in an article entitled: "Now it's nothing again!". Of the joy over the declaration of the Council at Galesburg it says: "Admittedly, it was a joy combined with fear and trembling, because it was not certain how the Council people would understand and interpret this wording of the beautiful resolution. Experience made cautious in this matter, because for years the Council has been content to explain how its declarations are to be understood. The limping messenger also soon complied, and much more limping than could be expected from all acquaintance with the unreliability of Council resolutions." (Hereupon the inquiry of J. A. K. [Kunkelmann] to the "*Lutheran*" is communicated, which is already in the December issue of the "Lehre und Wehre", and then continued:) "Weeks passed, however, and no answer came. The matter became more and more suspicious and the suspicion was justified: In the end, this decision means nothing again! Finally, in the number of the '*Lutheran*' of December 2, the expected answer arrives and comes like a real thunderstorm, in form and language, and completely destroys the joyful hope that one was allowed to cherish for decidedly Lutheran practice in the Council on the basis of the above decision: The '*Lutheran*' declares most definitely: It remains the same with us. The decision in Galesburg, made recently, was unnecessary and should at most only calm the restless spirits among us. It has no other meaning at all than the earlier resolutions passed in this matter in Pittsburgh, Lancaster, O., in Akron and in Chicago. . . . To the German members of the Council, especially the New Yorkers, the '*Lutheran*' is particularly harsh. He says: "They have too much Missourian spirit in them and therefore misunderstand the meaning and significance of the Galesburg decision. He warns them and all who rejoiced in that decision not to rejoice too soon, for it is purely impossible that the Council can become '*exclusivist*' or agree with '*Missouri exclusivists*' on these points." - The Wisconsin "Gemeindeblatt" in a longer article, entitled: "How the '*Lutheran and Missionary*' Blows Back", quotes the words of Dr. Krauth: "Nothing in the former declarations of the Council has been abrogated; the convictions of the pastors and congregations stand on the same point as before", - and adds: "So also the Mr. President, who knew how to designate the different periods of the Council in such an excellent way, already agrees and writes: It is all

remained the same! Well, and aren't we supposed to believe them? Oh yes, we have to. The beautiful days of Galesburg are now over. It was all a sweet dream from which we are awakening to the sad reality. But didn't they really speak out more clearly and Lutheran there than before? Well - that's what the Herald people believed, and we and others with them, but - we got them wrong. You see, the Iowans have had no small influence on the Council, one has already learned from them the theory of misunderstandings.... But in this easy Iowa way we do not let them go. It is certain and beyond all doubt that the Council, at its last meeting, spoke out more decisively and clearly and abandoned its former position. ... If one now nevertheless wishes to sound the retreat and let everything remain as it was, one should openly and honestly confess and say: the Council meeting held in Galesburg has dared, without the permission and consent of the '*Lutheran and Missionary*', to make a genuinely Lutheran declaration of its position on the pulpit and communion question, which differs from the earlier debates; but since the declaration has now been made from the editorial throne, because everything must remain as it was, therefore it remains so, we now most dutifully leave everything as it was and remain most obedient servants to Dero Gnaden." S.

How it rumbles in the Council. Praise God that at last, for once, the spirits in the Council are bursting upon each other and telling each other the truth ever more openly and thoroughly. The Galesburg resolutions have been a great blessing in that they have caused the clouds of confusion and ambiguity that have always covered the Council statements and obscured their true meaning to become at least impossible in the future. For we dare to seriously doubt that even the cracks now yawning in the Council will be covered up by explanations that are again ambiguous and limp on both sides, despite the earlier history of the Council. On the one hand, the "Herald", the "Pilgrim" and even, although only after a longer silence (probably in order to get to know the situation for the time being), Brobst's "Luth. Zeitschrift" are now unanimously claiming that the Council has progressed and officially accepted the Lutheran principles of pulpit and communion at Galesburg. This is, however, strongly supported by the fact that the Council officially recognized the theses of the Swedish Augustan Synod, which were reported in the September issue of "Lehre und Wehre" last year, as a "genuine Lutheran declaration" and "expressed its sincere satisfaction with the progress of a more faithful practice in the various synods. And since the Council itself refers to the "principles included in that declaration (of the Augustana Synod)" as a commentary on its own declaration (in which the sentence about the justified exceptions is omitted), it is easy to understand why the men of the right wing claim an advance of the Council to the decidedly confessional (so-called exclusive) position. On the other side, however, stands the "*Lutheran and Missionary*" with its assertion that this latest declaration contains nothing new, but must rather be interpreted according to the earlier ones, which have already sufficiently decided and explained the Council's position. Although the editor of the above-mentioned paper (Dr. Seiß) was not present in Galesburg, he knows exactly what the Council alone can and may mean, want and declare, and can therefore confidently assert: "Since we are convinced that what we communicate here must be the meaning of a legally authenticated report of the real position of the General Council, we undertake to declare that it is so" - Punctum! And the Doctor does not seem to be quite wrong, if any consideration is to be given to it,

That Dr. Krauth, the president of the Council and as such chairman of the meeting at Galesburg, publicly declares: 1. that nothing in the earlier declarations of the Council has been repealed or made invalid; 2. that even the earlier statement concerning the exceptions (despite the fact that it was discussed at Galesburg) has not been deliberately revoked, but is still valid today as it was at that time; 3. That the convictions of the pastors and congregations in the Council today still stand exactly where they stood before (i.e. even the decided unionists are no more in contradiction with the new declaration than with the old one); 4. That only this is the new thing in the declaration of the Council, that now it is declared that the previous position of the Council with regard to pulpit and communion (of course with regard to the exceptions as well as with regard to the rule) is in harmony with Scripture and the Confession, whereas this had not been asserted before. Thus, the same impenetrable darkness prevails over the Galesburg Declaration that always made the meaning of the earlier declarations so inscrutable over the still earlier declarations and earned the Council the evil fame of the people in Elijah's time, namely, that it limped on both sides. We dare to hope, however, that this game will finally be put to rest at the next meeting to be held at Bethlehem in Pennsylvania. Both wings of the Council are already arming themselves in all seriousness, and each is striving for the high goal of enabling the Council to legitimize in an unequivocal manner the view of the latest resolutions which it itself considers authentic. It is also said openly that - whatever the decision may be - it will have to come to a rupture. "How long will it be possible that such opposites as are found in the General Council can continue to work peacefully side by side? - is the question that "haunts" the "Herald" "in the whole affair. Even Pastor Brobst, after a long period of silence, openly confesses: "The synods of Pennsylvania and New York, as well as the General Council in general, are facing a crisis, an important turning point. This became apparent on various occasions during the past year. . . . We freely and openly confess that we were mistaken in our expectations; we believed that there was greater unity between us than is now really to be found, and we hoped that everything could and would soon develop in a peaceful manner. Out of love for peace and fear of the strife that hinders so many good works, we kept silent, with good intentions, although at times we should have been more resolute. But now we see that a hard struggle is absolutely necessary for the sake of peace, and that it would be a sin, as things stand now, to want to avoid or evade it. The rule is: do your duty and leave the consequences to the good Lord, who in the end makes all things well." The "*Lutheran*" also sees the crisis coming and strives to bring it to a favorable conclusion for himself and his party. "Indeed," he says, "things have gone so far that it must be assumed as certain that the Council cannot remain as it is now. The absolute exclusivism which some have accepted as the law of God, of logic, and of Christian love"-a polemical side glance at Doctor Krauth! - "it may or may not be found in the Galesburg declarations, will now be denounced in all our synods and will have to hear a direct and swift sentence. This judgment will not be able to leave the General Council in its present state, one way or the other. The communities are determined and are already moving. Many of them will not, under any circumstances, consent to remain even one year longer in connection with synods which refuse to legitimize a more lenient and liberal conviction and practice than that insisted upon by the Missourians, or than that contained in the Rule, even as it may be.

this is declared by their more moderate friends. Formal petitions concerning this matter will be presented to the synods of the coming summer and fall, and to an extent which will prove even to those who least wish to believe it, what they have unhappily too much ignored" (namely, that it was not time to proceed to exclusive principles). The "*Lutheran*" also already contains the resolutions of St. John's congregation in Philadelphia, in which the delegate of the same is instructed to obtain a recognition of the (liberal) position of the congregation from the Council through the Pennsylvania Synod. The "*Lutheran*" thinks that the Council must make a "*new departure*" and, completely withdrawing from the resolutions at Akron and Galesburg, return to the declarations at Pittsburgh, in which a liberal position was clearly expressed. "If these salutary declarations," he says, "are too moderate for some, they would do better, for the sake of peace, to follow the example of the synods of Wisconsin, Illinois, and Minnesota." *Insulanus* (Dr. Krotel) also looks to the future with trepidation, and says: "If the answer to the four points should be that which Missouri and the Synodal Conference have given and are still giving, and therefore the majority in the Council decide that this is the right answer, the minority, because they would not be able to endorse such a declaration, would find themselves compelled to resign. Then the next and most natural step for those who remained and formed the General Council would be to unite with the Synodal Conference, and that would put an end to the Council. .. If, however, the majority should come out in favor of the milder position taken by the Council years ago, the more energetic minority might feel compelled to go its way, and the majority might then feel willing and strong enough to maintain the existence of the General Council. But before the General Council can assemble in Bethlehem, this great question will and must be discussed and concluded by individuals, congregations and synods. Before there is division in the Council, divisions will have occurred in the ecclesiastical bodies which compose it." - The position of the founders and friends of the Council is obviously not an enviable one. How very different the Council's prospects might have been if, at the time of its founding, it had listened to the voices which at that time spoke out against "immediate formation" of the Council and advocated a thorough discussion of the pending points of difference at free conferences, or if it had at least later dealt with the agitated questions in a comprehensive and thorough manner and thus carried the torch of scriptural and confessional truth to the synods and congregations of its association. The Council is now reaping the internal storms that so seriously threaten its nave, what it has sown with its previous refusal to enter into doctrinal discussions.

S.

What advice the "*American Lutheran*" gives to the leaders of the Council. After recounting the latest happenings in the Council, this paper gives vent to its compassionate heart as follows: "If this" - namely, what the "*Lutheran*" of December 2 presents as the unchangeable position of the Council - "is really the true position of the Council, and if the Herald men have erred in their interpretation of the above-mentioned rule, will they not also sever their connection with the Council? Will not more synods of the Council have to be sacrificed? The secession of the New York ministry-almost all German-seems inevitable; then probably the Canada Synod and the Texas Synod, both German bodies, will also depart; and at last the Germans in the old mother synod of Pennsylvania will pass over to Missouri, and only the English preachers and congregations in the Pennsylvania Synod

and leave a few behind in Ohio. That will be all that's left of the Council then. It will then be as good as blown up. Now, if we could think these brethren would take it kindly, we would give them the following advice r^aLet your General Council *go in pieces (go to sticks)*; you will never be able to get along with the Germans after all, come back to the General Synod you should never have left; conduct yourselves modestly and peaceably, and you will enjoy perfect liberty of conscience in regard to the subject in question, and a great field of undisturbed labor in the vineyard of the Lord will open up." The advice is not so bad for people like Insulaners and Dr. Seiß. S.

An honest confession from the General Synod. In the "*Observer*" of

November 26, a Pastor Ort from Louisville, Ky., among others, lets himself be heard thus: "I think it is true that we Lutherans speak less of General Synod than the people of any denomination do of its distinctive features. If we do take it upon ourselves to speak of our Zion, it is mainly only in order to reproach our church for its method of directing Christian work and to tell the world what a sleepyhead it is. When we speak of its existence, we do so more to excuse it for its existence than to extol its virtues. We are Lutherans, but to a certain extent we are ashamed of our Lutheranism. If one were to ask us about our church home, everyone among a large number of us would answer in a low voice: 'I am a member of the church that upholds the teachings that Martin Luther, the great reformer, espoused.' But then he would continue in a stentorian voice: 'But I never preach Lutheranism or speak of it. I am a Christian of the most broad-minded type. My ecclesiastical love is not constricted by any church boundary..... I am in the Lutheran Church, but I feel completely at home with Methodists and Presbyterians &S well. I love them just as much as I love my own church.... I wish no more progress for the Lutheran Church than I wish growth for any division of Protestantism.' ... The fact is that if one of us who is so broad-minded in his church love leaves our church and becomes a Methodist or Presbyterian, he is then a Methodist up to his ears and a Presbyterian from the top of his head to the sole of his foot. ... His broad-minded love of the church has suddenly become quite narrow-minded. Now all churches are no longer considered equal. No, from now on it is to be Methodist or Presbyterian, first and last. Now Methodism is preached in its most extreme form; or Presbyterianism in its most naked, hardest type is thundered down from the pulpit fifty-two times a year.... And now if Methodists and Presbyterians can love their church dearly, why can't we Lutherans love ours in a similar way?" - Yes, why not, you quasi-Lutherans of General Synod? Simply because you think you can discover nothing lovable in the old and true Lutheran church, while in your new and false, after-Lutheran church there is in fact nothing lovable either. S.

II. Abroad.

Marriage. The editor of the *Sächs.* In my opinion, neither the state nor the church concludes marriages, but man and woman conclude the marriage; the state confirms it as a valid one, the church sanctifies it through God's word and prayer according to 1 Tim. 4, 4. and 5. This is the only conceivable dispute between the legitimate factors. Moreover, the marriage ceremony does not make the marriage a Christian one, but it does not make it a Christian one.

contains only the declaration of the church that it recognizes the honor to be concluded as a permissible one according to Christian principles, and the request for the blessing of the Lord for the Christian leadership of the same.

Mecklenburg-Schwerin. The sovereign executive order concerning civil marriage of August 14 instructs the registrars to limit themselves to the legal act and to avoid anything that could cause misunderstandings, especially the opinion that church copulation has become superfluous with the introduction of civil marriage. The civil and parish offices are instructed to remain on good terms with each other and to support each other in every way.

Chiliasm. Pastor Weber in Neuendettelsau has published Bible lessons on the prophet Isaiah. In an advertisement of this writing, the "Pilger aus Sachsen" of December 19 of last year says: "The 'realistic'" (i.e. roughly chiliastic) "interpretation, which does not evaporate the content of the prophecies (especially about Israel) into mere ideas of the Kingdom of God, but reserves their actual fulfillment (thus also the bringing back of Israel) to the final history, comes to its full right in it, and is also theoretically represented in the noteworthy treatise used as a preface. So the "pilgrim" is also a chiliast!

W.

The Real Presence, by R. Rocholl (Hanoverian Superintendent). Recently we read in a short review of this new work in a German newspaper: as long as such books are published, one should not despair of the Lutheran Church in Germany. However, we have just read a review of this work in the *Erlanger Zeitschrift* (October issue 1875), and from the quotations taken from Rocholl's work we have seen with dismay that it contains, substantiates and develops nothing less than the biblical Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence. Rather, it gives a Gnostic-Manichean-Jakobo-Bohemian-Theosophical system, albeit in a highly spiritual manner, according to which the author affirms the presence of Christ's body and blood in Holy Communion with the Lutheran church, but denies Christ's omnipresence, yes, even the omnipresence of God. That is how reliable German reviews are!

W.

Patriotism and the Church. In a report on the proceedings of the last extraordinary Prussian General Synod, two characteristic omissions are reported, which preceded the vote on the adoption of a paragraph of the "definitely" proclaimed synodal order of 1873, unilaterally amended by the government in favor of the masses. The *Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kz.* of December 24 writes: "Professor v. d. Goltz from Bonn, however, took the opportunity to surpass himself in his closing speech and to win the palm of the sentiments with the confession, surprising in such frankness even from this side: We Prussians are accustomed to show not only obedience but also respect to the orders of our authorities. If now the leaders of our church system assure us that these regulations are indispensable for the further development of the same, then I resign my difference of opinion up to the limit of fundamental convictions, and tell myself that in the end I am not on the right path with respect to these authorities, and I stand up for these regulations with a clear conscience. With a voice trembling with emotion, General Superintendent Dr. Wiesmann from Münster then objected to making his vote on such a question dependent on his patriotism or royalism: 'If I could preserve one day of my king's life, I would give my

We will give our last drop of blood for this. But do not dare us, in the name of our patriotism, to approve these provisions. To the best of my knowledge and conscience before God and man, I cannot approve this paragraph."

Brunswick. On November 18, the Criminal Senate in Wolfenbüttel sentenced Pastor Ueltzen in Hehlen an der Weser to two months' imprisonment. On November 18, the editor of the "Kirchenblatt für die Angelegenheiten der lutherischen Kirche in Braunschweig und Hannover," Pastor Ueltzen in Hehlen on the Weser, was sentenced to two months' imprisonment for a small article which the Hanoverian "Wahlblatt" had taken from the "Kirchenblatt" in the fall of last year under the editorship of Jacob, the owner of the printing press in Hanover, and for which the latter recently completed two months' imprisonment in the cell prison in Hanover. That article contained the criticism of the well-known decree of the Berlin Ober-KirchenRath, which began with the words "Authorized by His Majesty the King. The courts found the article in question to be an insult to His Majesty.

Hanover. We read the following in the "Hannoversche Pastoral-Correspondenz" of December 16 of last year: "A petition, which, prompted by the highest decision in the matter of the installation of Holdermann, calls upon the synod to stand up for the right of the Lutheran Church, has been received by the regional synod, covered with 432 signatures of clergymen, and has the following wording: To the Reverend Regional Synod of the Lutheran Church of Hanover. The most respectfully undersigned feel urged to express their serious reassurance to the Reverend Regional Synod that by the decree of His Majesty the King of May 28 of this year, our Regional Consistory has been instructed to withdraw the decision it had made in the matter of filling the vacant pastorates at the Kreuzkirche in Hanover and at the Katharinenkirche in Osnabrück. According to the content of that decree, the city vicar Holdermann in Mannheim, who in both cases was brought to the election record, would not be considered ineligible for a pastorate in the Evangelical Lutheran State Church of Hanover simply because he holds a clerical office in the united Evangelical Protestant State Church of the Grand Duchy of Baden. To us, on the other hand, it seems self-evident that only a man who is already a member of their confessional community can be presented as a minister of the Word in a Lutheran congregation. Since, however, the united Baden and the Lutheran Hanoverian regional churches obviously do not belong to one and the same denominational community, but rather in the Baden Union there is a sharp opposition to the Lutheran confession, we can only consider that the decision of that decree does not correspond to the rights of our regional church. We also cannot conceal the danger that by accepting this decision without contradiction, a protective defense of our regional church against the Union would be eliminated and the full significance of our Lutheran confession as the legally valid foundation and norm of our entire church system would be impaired. Since, according to the order of our regional church, the regional synod is called upon to represent the confessional principles and the good law of our church to the sovereign church government as well, we, in view of the grave seriousness of this matter, make this plea to the synod: Reverend Landessynode should assert with all firmness the principle that the ability to present oneself for the office of preacher within our Lutheran Landeskirche is conditional upon belonging to the Lutheran Church." - These Hanoverians do not seem to hold with our American Council and its pulpit exchange theory, nevertheless that they easily incur the wrath of the Emperor with their "petition" in question, while the Council betrays our church, without being somehow urged to do so from the outside, so completely *con amore* to its opponents.

Lutherans in the Prussian Regional Church. At the so-called "Evangelical Lutheran Conference within the Prussian Regional Church", which took place this year, a pastor of the Lutheran Regional Church in Mecklenburg was also present and welcomed the conference in the name of his fellow countrymen. Several pastors of Mecklenburg published a protest against this, in which it says, among other things, as follows: "We should now be very sorry if really 'compatriots' of that pastor sympathized with this as well as with that conference. They would prove that they do not know the history and meaning of the Union very well. This much is certain, however, that the Mecklenburg regional church did not send that pastor, nor did it commission him to be its mouth there and to express its sympathies; rather, we are convinced of the decided antipathy of some of our compatriots toward that conference, who will heartily regret with us that the members of it hold high the flag of the Lutheran confession in speeches, but have not yet given any actual proof of their loyalty to the confession. What does it help that they call themselves a Lutheran church within the Prussian state church, since everyone can know that this is a confessionless, a factually unchurched church and declares the confession of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, founded in God's clear words, to be indifferent, to protest again and again that a denier of the deity of Jesus Christ may have a preaching ministry in the Lutheran church, and yet remain in the same church fellowship with the deniers and communicate with them? Or should they already be a Lutheran church because they claim to be and speak Lutheran in their meetings? Do they not, in spite of their empty and completely unheeded protests, pull on the foreign yoke with the unbelievers? How can they claim that they stand on the foundation of the Lutheran confession, since it literally says: "And Paul commanded that false preachers should be shunned and cursed as an abomination. And in 2 Cor. 6 he says: "Do not pull on a strange yoke with unbelievers, for what fellowship has light with darkness?" (*Tract. de Pot. et Prim. Papae.*) Or is the Prussian national church, to which they belong, a *congregatio sanctorum, in qua evangelium recte docetur et recte administrantur sacramenta?* *) - We feel urged to publicly express our protest against the above assurance of Father R. in the hope that many .We feel urged to publicly voice our protest against the above assurance of Father R. in the hope that many 'compatriots' will make it known in word and deed that they refuse such paternalism, that they have no sympathy with that conference and cannot regard it as belonging to the Lutheran Church as long as its members remain in the Union and thus do not learn to act like Luther, who at the Marburg Colloquium rejected the brotherly fellowship offered to him by Zwingli with the words: 'You have a different spirit than we!

The free Lutheran conference in Eisenach on October 5 and 6 for the unification of the contending brethren heard little of itself, except that it published three sentences as the result of its deliberations. The matter, which in itself is very laudable, did not meet with any approval, for only seven members and one guest were present. The conference must have believed that unification could not be achieved in this way. Nevertheless, it has appointed a committee which is to make further attempts and give an account of them. (Münkel's Ztbl.)

Prussian Regional Church. The Pilgrim from Saxony of December 12 of last year writes: On October 31 the General Synodal Draft for the Prussian Landeskirche was confirmed by the King and on November 24 the extraordinary General Synod was opened. The liberal press has declared that essentially

*) That is, as it reads in the German Augsburg Confession Article 7: "An assembly of all believers, in which the Gospel is preached purely and the holy sacraments are administered according to the Gospel."

the demands of the Protestant Association are fulfilled in that draft. According to this, everyone already knows what to make of it. For a more detailed characterization of the draft, however, the following should be said. The foundation on which the synod is to stand is to be the Protestant confession. But which one? is not stated anywhere. The composition of the synod shall be by appointments and elections. But the sovereign appointments are so numerous that they are able to give the synod a different character, and one third of the elections are at the mercy of the intelligent but church-poor large cities, i.e. those who say: we do not go to church, we do not build a church, we do not need a church, but the big word in the church - that is ours. Finally, the decisions of the synod are confirmed by the king only after the minister of spiritual affairs, who is responsible for the confessionally "strongly mixed" representation of the people, has declared that there is nothing to be recalled against it by the state. Henceforth, there are no ecclesiastical matters in which the state would not have a say. According to the present draft, for example, the state, which examines the state fitness for office of the clergy as strictly and inconveniently as possible, nevertheless has a right of supervision over the ecclesiastical fitness for office determined by the synod. "It is obvious," says even an ecclesiastical body, which is accustomed to go through thick and thin with the church regiment, "that the state's authority is thereby raised above any measure, and the church's authority is permanently established.

The General Synod of the Prussian Regional Church also "takes cognizance of the relations of the Regional Church to the other parts of the German Protestant Church, decides on the institutions serving the further development of its community and participates in any representative bodies of the German Protestant Church through deputies elected by it"! In addition makes the general Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung of November 19 of last year makes the following remarks: "And the motives only give the short, timid and meaningless, but for that very reason so meaningful explanation: 'That the General Synod is involved in those relations which the Prussian Protestant Regional Church maintains with the other parts of the German or non-German Protestant Church, by taking cognizance of them and, as far as the conditions are such (!), by participation in representative bodies; that the regional church as such cannot be involved in international or interdenominational meetings without its consent is a consequence (!) of the position which it has to fill in community with the church regime of the regional church! That is clear: this is more than Eisenach! This is not only a resumption of the Prussian plan, by which the former Eisenach Conference went out of joint, to include also synodal deputies in its deliberations: here, by an understanding hint, the seed is laid for the future Reich Synod and for the German National Church. So we have not yet had enough of misery: from now on we must also directly resist the Prussian plans for majorization, unification and centralization! "This is the consequence of the position it has to fill in community with the church regiment towards the national church, and like the latter, it will therefore already know how to find the right means to achieve its plan. It is only good that it is at least already indicated to us what awaits us; we still have time to equip ourselves, and hopefully we will not be found all together unequipped." - Unfortunately, we must fear that the armament in which the "future Reich Synod" will be opposed will not prevent the Reich Synod from finally annexing the Landeskirchen just as the Reich annexes the Länder.

W.

Old Catholicism. The former Breslau cathedral chaplain Freiherr v. Richthofen has, according to the Neue Evangel. Gemeindeboten, he left the community of the Old Catholics and joined the "Protestant" church. On December 12 of last year, he communicated in the Nikolaikirche in Leipzig. In this change of confession, he follows the example of the penultimate Archbishop of Breslau, who resigned from his office and also became a "Protestant".

"German thoroughness" has become proverbial in our time. What German "scholars" write is therefore usually regarded as an oracle, especially in our unlearned America. Even about the most distant foreign countries, one thinks, nothing is reported in the learned journals of Germany about which one is not informed there in the most reliable way. Unfortunately, this is very often not the case. It borders almost on the unbelievable what one lets oneself be told in Germany, e.g., about American conditions and confidently passes on to one's readers as cash coin. Proof of this can be found again in the Neue Ev. Kirchenzeitung, which is published by the Doctor and Professor of Theology Messner in Berlin, in the number of November 20 of last year. In an article "A Look at North America", for example, the following fantasies about our synod are given to the readers: "As is known (!), the Missourians have made strong efforts in recent years to bring about a union of the Lutheran church communities under their leadership. This enterprise must be regarded as having failed for the present. The one large association, the General Synod, has broken off the negotiations; between the General Council on the one hand and the (Missouri) Synodal Conference on the other, not the points of unification but the points of difference are increasing" (this is unfortunately true!); "even within the Synodal Conference there is a threat of discord, for the Iowa Synod, united with the Missouri Synod in the same, has found it necessary to declare loudly that for its part there is no question of becoming Missourian. The Missouri Lutheranism proceeds ruthlessly and, as is the nature of confessionalism, prefers to push its special doctrines. Even Lutheran (!) luminaries are not safe from its anathema; thus, Blessed Harms is now accused of fundamental un-Lutheran errors, and his brother, who defended him and above all called the belief that the Pope is the Antichrist a Missourian quirk, has been terminated from fellowship." - That the New Evangelical Church Newspaper, as an organ of union and mediation between the world and the church, finds any loyalty to the confession an abomination is quite in order. But it is downright scandalous that a newspaper edited by a German doctor and professor of theology can let so many gross untruths go out into the world in so few lines. In front of the local readers, who know the course of events, the paper makes itself downright ridiculous by such communication of fictitious facts from the church history of the present, and by this the editor not only deprives himself of all credit, but also damages the reputation of thoroughness and historical objectivity of the entire German scholarly world. W.

Heidelberg. The theological faculty of this city currently has a total of six students, with a number of eight doctors, a ratio that is probably rare. Baden still has about 12 theology students at this time, but they are so unpatriotic as to seek their education at other universities. W.

The theological faculties at the German universities. We read the following in the "Evangelische Chronik": "The magazine 'Im neuen Reich' contains an article in which it is proposed to abolish the theological faculties at our universities altogether and to leave to each church community the kind and measure of the education of its clergy. Professor Geffcken in Strasbourg is also of the opinion that

the non-denominational state should not interfere in such matters and, only in view of the advantages it grants to the servants of the privileged churches, should be authorized to demand from them, for example, a one-year course of study at a philosophical faculty and a corresponding examination. - A sad sign of the times, but one must be prepared for it. At least it is still better than that an unbelieving, possibly even non-Christian minister of culture has to fill the theological professorships. The Allgemeine Ztg. polemicizes against it; the national liberals probably prefer that the state has the power to make theological science at the universities serve its own purposes. - That even now, after the state has dissolved its marriage with the church and kept the latter only as a servant of the house, one can still mourn in Germany over the fact that the church alone should provide for the equipping of its servants, is indeed a sad, exceedingly lamentable symptom. W.

Saxony. In Chemnitz, a Social Democrat who refused to swear the oath of allegiance because he did not believe in a personal God was not accepted as a citizen. The government found the concerns of the local authorities well-founded and confirmed the rejection. (Kreuzztg. 172. Ev.-Luth. Kztg. p. 742.)

Saxe-Meiningen. At the end of June, the presynod adopted the paragraph that the confession should not be the subject of debate, after heated debate, but deprived it of all meaning by the addition, also adopted, that this would not restrict free research in the Scriptures and the further education of teachers according to the results thereof (!). (Kreuzztg. 155.)

Saxe-Coburg. Here, the government allowed the introduction of optional cremation.

Schleswig-Holstein. From October 1, 1874, to April 1, 1875, only 69 percent of newborn children were baptized and 16 percent of marriages were not blessed by the church. In Holstein the ratio is less favorable than in Schleswig, and in the cities less favorable than in the countryside. (Kreuzztg. 154 supplement.)

Genuine Jewish. The statutes of the Jewish community in Hamburg impose the community duties and offices only on married persons. Since a civil marriage is not considered a Jewish marriage, but rather those who are married in the community are considered unmarried, only half of those who entered into marriage had themselves married in the synagogue in 1873-74. (N. Zeitbl. p. 224.)

Weimar. When the institute of justice of the peace was introduced in Weimar, pastors were elected several times as justices of the peace in the countryside. The Ministry of Culture did not object to such an election, but in the "interest of the service" demanded that those elected seek permission to accept it.

Tyrol. In December of last year, the Austrian government approved the establishment of two so-called Protestant communities in Tyrol, namely in Innsbruck and Merano.

Strasbourg. At the previous year's meeting of the Upper Consistory of the "Church of the Augsburg Confession" of Alsace in October, a petition of the Consistory of Drulingen was received and read, stating: "The conditions at the theological faculty in Strasbourg, namely, on the one hand, the lack of discipline among the academic youth, on the other hand, the fact that not only is there no longer a collegium on Lutheran dogmatics (!), but that there is no doцент at all who works in a confessional sense corresponding to the church of the Augsburg Confession (?): these are all circumstances that prevent serious-minded families from educating their sons.

to the clerical office". The representative of the seminary protested against this statement, but the assembly, which was finally questioned by the president, declared that it fully agreed with the content of the petition, i.e. with the expressed wishes.

The German in Paris stands to the French quite similarly as the German in our eastern large cities to the English. The following is written about this in the Allgemeine Ev.Luth. Kirchenzeitung of November 12 of last year: "At present, the absence of a German children's congregation makes a peculiar impression on a German clergyman in Paris. The colony of Hessian street sweepers no longer exists in Paris since the war, and with it, of course, the rich flock of children of the old, large Hessian congregations. Therefore, when we speak of German children, we can only mean the children of the German and Alsatian families who were born and educated in Paris, who found their livelihood here and only very rarely return to their home country. Of these children, however, experience teaches that even if they have been taught and confirmed in German, they become thoroughly French after a few years. This is not only the case with the sons and daughters of the lower and middle classes, who, of course, usually learn a trade, or go into a factory, or become servants, and thus, as a rule, come into a completely French environment, but even the adult sons and daughters of the noble families escape the tremendous superiority of the French element only very exceptionally. With each passing year, they forget more and more German, and when their parents, who still speak German, have died, they often do not speak or hear a word of German for months. The worst thing about this is that the confirmation lessons, even if they are not completely lost for these children, do not have the benefit they should have. They think and feel French; they pray French; French is their heart language. A German sermon sounds strange to them, they do not read German books, and they have forgotten their catechism, their Bible and hymn verses. But they do not know the French Bible either, they have not learned the French catechism and the French songs, they have not attended the French church service, the French church is foreign to them, and so they are also lost to the French community and almost all live without religion. German schools alone cannot remedy this evil, for the children are dismissed from school at the very moment when they are completely thrown into the French element, and it would therefore be an erroneous opinion to rely on German schools to preserve a German generation in Paris. But once a pastor has come to this realization, the great question naturally arises before his conscience as to what counsel he should give to German parents in regard to the religious instruction of their children. And if he considers that it is a question of the inner life and the eternal welfare of a soul, he will, if he is a selfless servant of God, overcome his flesh, however painful it may be to him, and direct the child to where the Gospel is offered to him in the language of his heart for his whole life. Only in this way can the second generation of Germans in Paris be educated for the Kingdom of God. Thus the French congregation builds itself up from the German one, but the German one sustains itself through the ceaseless influx of German-speaking Protestants, and in this way the Parisian Lutheran Church unfolds as a unified, organic whole." If, according to this, one does not hope for the preservation of German in Paris, even from German schools, then this is quite correct, if school, house and church do not work together. It is different where this happens, as we experience here in relation to English. If the German is not bound to his German by religion, then he will of course, for the sake of business in Paris, easily make it with the

But if he knows what treasures he is giving away with his language and robbing from his own, he will not easily exchange it, be it with the French or with the English. W.

Australia. We read the following in the (Löhle) "Kirchliche Mittheilungen" No. 11 of last year: "It is, at least in part, no longer unknown to our readers that a connection has recently been established between our Society and the so-called Immanuel Synod in South Australia, of which we hope and wish that it will prove beneficial to the cause of the Kingdom of God. The connection has already progressed so far that we have given the Immanuel Synod the promise of wanting to support it with spiritual workers." We also learn from the "Mittheilungen" that the first Sendling from Neuendettelsau, Stolz from Rothenburg, has already started his journey to Australia. The Immanuel Synod currently counts four preachers and, among other things, pays homage to chiliasm, which was once transplanted there by Pastor Kabel, who, according to the "Mittheilungen," even expressed the conviction that the Lutheran symbols contain errors in regard to the last things, but who, nevertheless, is not supposed to have established "teachings of the last things that are contrary to Scripture. If only the Neuendettelsau chliastes would be as honest as once Kabel, then things would be better for them. W.

Mission statistics. The "Freimund" of December 2 of last year writes: According to a compilation of the pastor Dr. Grundemann, who is particularly competent in the field of mission statistics, 2132 evangelical (i.e. neither Roman nor Greek) missionaries are currently active in 1559 stations; 420,944 communicants are counted, 1,537,074 Christians in general, 389,059 students. The total annual expenditure is estimated at 12,146,281 Marks. Of the missionaries, England sent 1060, Germany with Switzerland 502, America 460, Holland 43, France 22, and the North (Sweden, etc.) 45. - For evangelical missionary purposes England sends out about 12,301,000 marks, America 7,120,000 marks, Germany with Switzerland 2,140,000 marks, Holland 375,000 marks, France 175,000, and the North 34,000 marks. -. Of the converts, 449,170 come from Asia: of these, 229,135 are from the Indian subcontinent, 150,649 from the Indian subcontinent and the Indian archipelago, 20,684 from China, and 25,614 from Turkey and Egypt. Then comes Africa with 472,052 converts, and 283,204 in Madagascar, respectively East Africa, with 124,208 in South Africa and 64,640 in West Africa. America is listed with 352,033, of which 308,260 are from the West Indies and 43,723 from North America. Polynesia and Australia close the list with 263,556.

Irvingians in Mecklenburg. The Allgemeine Leipziger lutherische Kirchenzeitung writes: The agitation of the sendlings of the Irvingian sect, which took place in Ludwigslust during the summer, has not been without success. Some time ago, some members of the Lutheran congregation there enjoyed communion with the Irvingians. On October 31, this was announced to the Lutheran congregation from the pulpit during the morning service, with the remark that they had in fact expressed their departure from their previous church and their entry into the Irvingian sect.

In Hamburg, writes the Freimund, they want to introduce street preaching "in a manner corresponding to German style and idiosyncrasy. A man suitable for this has already been found.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 22.

March 1876.

No. 3.

Preface.

(Conclusion.)

Another accusation that is made against us is that of fanaticism and sectarianism; much is what our opponents bring forward here; but partly it does not apply to us, partly it is no proof of fanaticism on our part, but a testimony for us. Therefore, with regard to this accusation, we will first have to show how far it does not apply to us. If, for example, in order to seemingly substantiate this accusation, we are accused of making an article of faith and a test of orthodoxy and a condition of church fellowship the doctrinal formula that the office is conferred by the congregation, even if those who reject the formula teach evangelically about the office, this is simply not true. Our opponents always shout to the world that we deny Lutheranism to those who do not use the expression "transfer" and deny them church fellowship, but they have never indicated where they have found such a thing in our writings. Nor can they find anything of the kind. We have not denied anyone ecclesiastical fellowship because he does not use the aforementioned expression, if he would otherwise have had the right doctrine of the ministry.

That the expression "Uebertragung" is a new one, only adopted by us, we strongly deny. Polycarp Leyser uses the word *deferre in Harmonia* ev. c. 92, Hülsemann in *Praelect. F. C. p.* 838. the word *commissio*. Similar synonymous expressions are used by Luther and others, e. g.: "on account of the congregation", "instead of the congregation". *) Furthermore, this expression is involved in the comparison of the church with a free church, which is found among our theologians.

*) How well-founded these expressions are is shown by the words of the apostle 2 Cor. 2:10: "For even I, if I forgive anything, forgive it for your sakes in Christ's stead. "For your sake" cannot mean: for the sake of

The first is that of a state whose citizens all have equal rights, but who elect certain persons to govern the state in the name of all and by virtue of the right of the community. Compare the beautiful passage in *Harmonia* *ev. c.* 85, in which Leyser uses the term *demandare*. Even if the expression is not found in Scripture and in the symbols, it is nevertheless an expression that necessarily arises from the teaching of Scripture and our symbolic books about the priesthood of the faithful and about the key power given to the congregation of Christ and to each member of it, just as the "*ὑποούσιος*" used by Athanasius can also be understood as "*ὑποοούσιος*". is not found in Scripture and in the *Apostolicum*, but is nevertheless based on the doctrine

of the sacred Scripture and the *Apostolicum* is based. And we keep it all the better, since, as the *ὁμοούσιος* of Athanasius has the Arians, the same has the The "arrogant" spirits who do not want to be servants and slaves of the believers for the sake of Jesus are exposed.

But we do not insist on the expression, but rather on the doctrine. We have not yet bound anyone to it who otherwise accepts the correct doctrine of the ministry, as it is confessed especially in the Schmalkaldic Articles, namely, that the congregation, and indeed each of its members, has the ministry originally, that the ministry is not transferred from one preacher to another, but comes by election and calling of the congregation, which uses the ordaining preacher only as an instrument. Whoever holds this to be true, we regard as orthodox in this question, even if he does not use the expression "transfer" and would not like to use it. For one possibility cannot be denied, that one might have the right doctrine of the ministry and yet not find himself in the expression. But it would also depend on the way in which he rejects this expression. If, for example, it were due to a misunderstanding that he thought we were denying the divine endowment of the ministry, declaring it to be an intermediate thing ordered by the church, etc., then he would have to be open to our explanation that we do not deny this divine endowment but praise it highly.

If the lowans claim that they only reject the expression, the symbolic doctrine they accept, this is Fritschel's swindle. They have also attacked the pure doctrine and have not yet revoked anything. Compare

but can only mean: in your place, on your behalf. Consider: This is how the apostle speaks, whom Christ himself had called! He administers his office and absolves here "on behalf of the church"! The newer ones are appalled by this. On account of citizens and peasants we are to administer our office? they say contemptuously; to be called royal Prussian or royal Bavarian pastors, that is their glory. How blind they are that they seek their honor in shame and do not realize what a great honor it is to administer the office on account of Christians. There are no greater people than Christians in the world; they are served by angels, heaven is opened above them, God descends to them, they are clothed with the priestly adornment of Christ's righteousness.

F. A. Schmidt, *The Iowa Misunderstandings*. p. 134 f. and the declaration of the conference at Wilton, Iowa, in the "Lutheran", No. 3, p. 18. If they had only had reservations about the expression in the case of otherwise pure doctrine, we would have let them have it.

That we do not make the expression a shiboleth, our opponents must now also let themselves be told and proven from the East Indies. Compare "Lutherans" No. 3, p. 17.

If, furthermore, we are accused of fanaticism and sectarianism, of making the doctrine of the Antichrist, of Sunday, of usury primary articles of faith, this is not true either.

As far as the doctrine of the Antichrist is concerned, we do not believe that it is a primary article of faith, without the knowledge of which one cannot come to the saving faith, like the doctrine of Christ, of salvation; we also do not consider it a secondary article of faith, but a dogma, an article of faith. Compare Quenstedt, *Theol. did. pol.* IV. e. 16. s. 2. p. 1688.

However, the fact that this doctrine of the Roman pope, as the actual Antichrist, is neither a primary nor a secondary article of faith does not detract from its great importance. It is important because it is clearly revealed in God's Word. It is not only a conclusion from history, but from the historically fulfilled Scriptures. The characteristics of the Antichrist are precisely stated in Scripture. All these characteristics are found only in the Roman pope and indeed completely, so that the scripture does not have to say first still with express words: the pope is the Antichrist! Did not Jesus of Nazareth also have to be recognized as the true Messiah by the fact that all the characteristics were found in him, which according to the Old Testament prophecies the Messiah was supposed to have, since God did not want to call out to everyone from heaven: "This is my dear Son"? Before there was an Antichrist in the actual sense, it was not necessary to know that there was one and who he was. But when the Antichrist arose, the Church of God soon realized that it was the Pope of Rome, and Luther and the old theologians proved it mightily that all the prophecies of Scripture about the Antichrist were literally fulfilled in the Pope. Dannhauer therefore rightly says: "Either no Antichrist will come, or he is the one who presides at Rome, on whom all the marks are puffing." *L. consc. I*, 536.

But this teaching is also so important because the Antichrist is so dangerous. It is said, of course, that the expression "man of sin" does not apply to the pope. And yet there is no expression that characterizes the pope more accurately than this one. He rages with all his might against the holy gospel, which is supposed to redeem our sins; he makes sin everywhere and falls into sin, as he himself is full of all sins. Can there be an abominable

What sin could be more sinful than to persecute and curse the gospel of the free grace of God, of the merit of Christ, of faith in him? All his actions are against Christ; he is the greatest enemy of Christ, even though he speaks the name of Christ. This is what makes him so dangerous. And it is truly nothing other than the wicked enemy's cunning that he leads many to deny his existence as well as the existence of his most active ally against Christ. Spener writes: "This truth and matter, how the Roman Pontiff is the Antichrist, we have diligently to remember and not to repent of the time we have now listened. This article is one to which our church expressly professed itself in the Schmalkaldic Articles, and we must not let go of this truth either; as I consider it certain that whoever does not recognize the papal kingdom as the antichristian kingdom is not yet certain that he will not be seduced to it by this or that temptation; but whoever finds himself convinced of this in his heart will be quite safe from apostasy." (Reformat. Pred. 1687.)

And finally, we would be guilty of the most shameful ingratitude against the benefits of Luther's Reformation, through which the Antichrist has been correctly unmasked and the doctrine of the same has come to right clarity, if we did not hold on to this doctrine; we would not be worthy to enjoy even the slightest blessing of the Reformation, if we did not also gratefully accept this blessing.

Regarding the doctrine of Sunday, we hold that it is only a secondary article of faith based on the primary one of Christian liberty. Nevertheless, it is an extremely important article. Whoever is not clear about it cannot have understood the article of Christian freedom; whoever is mistaken about it is in conflict with the article of freedom in Christ and is in danger of losing it completely. Gal. 4, 10. 11. Col. 2, 16. f. Therefore, the Augsburg Confession in its 28th article describes the error in the Sunday question as a great one ("they err greatly").

The fact that even great theologians deviate from the Augsburg Confession does not make the error a truth, nor does it make it at least a tolerable error. Great people are also missing. We leave the Fritschelians the pleasure of collecting the *naevos* of the old theologians to reinforce their error. We do not let ourselves be moved by any human appearance to depart from the truth. We rejoice that we live in the time of the New Testament and have such a glorious freedom in Christ Jesus, and we want to prove our gratitude also by the fact that we, mindful of our task in this Puritan country, testify to the pure doctrine of Sunday in an unabridged way.

With regard to the doctrine of usury, we do not say that it is a primary, or even only a secondary article of faith, but refer to it only as a moral dogma, that is, always as a doctrine of the Divine.

We believe that this doctrine is an important one, and we believe that it is necessary to practice it, especially in our country and in these terrible last times, when "usury and avarice have been torn down like a flood and have become vain law. (Preface, Schmalk. Art.) Our opponents will not be able to prove that we have made this teaching a condition of church fellowship. For further information, we refer to the essay "On the Usury Question" in the previous issue.

This, too, we must firmly deny when, in order to accuse us of fanaticism, we are accused of engaging in an unchristian, quarrelsome, arrogant, heart-judging, crude polemic.

Our polemics would be unchristian if we put the honor of God and the welfare of our neighbor out of sight. Can our opponents prove this to us? What have we been fighting for? What are we still fighting for? Was it and is it not for the rule of the divine word? And is this not for the glory of God and the salvation of our neighbor? We cannot remain silent when we see God's word attacked, for God's honor is thereby robbed and the welfare of souls endangered. But, say our opponents, you are thereby creating strife! What harm does it do? Such discord is nothing against an attack on God's honor. Our opponents reveal by such speech that they do not esteem God's word, they show that people are higher to them than God; they do not want to see people attacked, but they do not care if God is attacked in his word.

Our polemics are supposed to be quarrelsome. Do our opponents want to show us where we have quarreled over trivial things, where we have fought over mere words? How little do our opponents understand the context of pure doctrine! Even if we fight for a doctrine that lies in the outermost periphery, we are still fighting for something that concerns the glory of God and the salvation of souls. Major errors have always arisen from minor ones and therefore these are not to be regarded as minor, but are to be fought at times. A little leaven leavened the whole dough. How far our flesh has interfered in such a fight is a matter that we have to settle with God, not with our opponents.

Our polemic should be arrogant. Of course, we do not submit to any man, but only to God's word. And if all the wise and clever people of this world came together to persuade us of the opposite, we would laugh at them. If we said yes to all their fantasies, we would be fine humble people. God protect us from such false humility, which is an abomination before him, and increase in us the divine hopefulness, since one is sure of his word, praises this heavenly wisdom and despises all wisdom of the wise men of this world as foolishness.

Our polemics are called judgement of the heart, because we also attack the persons, not only the things. But can the per-

What do we do to separate them from the misguided? Are they not always together? And can we find even one scriptural word to the effect that we should fight against error but leave the persons untouched? We know of none. Certainly, a distinction must be made among those who harbor error, and the weak must be treated differently, and those who are willing to do wrong differently. This is what God's Word demands. But the proof that we have ever judged the hearts of our opponents, if they have not revealed themselves as ungodly, will have to remain guilty.

Coarseness is supposed to be our polemic. The opinions about coarseness are different. In any case, we have not done it as coarse as the prophets, as John the Baptist (Matth. 3.), Christ (Matth. 23.) and his apostles, e.g. Paul (Phil. 3, 2.). We also know that we are no longer living in the 16th century and that the world has become finer, but we also know that it has not yet become better, but is still the world, that is, an enemy of God. The world is not helped by the way of the modern times, that one first gives a eulogy to the opponent and then attacks him with ice gloves. By complimenting the opponent, the tip of the truth is broken off. In other respects, too, the newer way of polemicizing has not exactly appeared exemplary to us. In matters of the divine word, where it is a matter of God's honor, one wants to appear fine, but when one's own honor is attacked, one speaks more than roughly.

This is not true either, if we are accused of heresying even those who err out of weakness. For what does it mean to condemn someone? It means to declare him to be a man who errs against the foundation of faith, who willfully holds on to his error and spreads it. Have we ever, out of weakness, looked upon and treated erring people in this way? Never. What is declared in the preface to the Concordia Book in regard to the "*condemnationes*, suspension and condemnation of false and impure doctrine," namely, that with it not "the persons who err out of simplicity and do not blaspheme the truth of the divine word, but that with it alone the false and "seductive" doctrines and their stiff-necked teachers and blasphemers are actually *condemned*" (Ed. Mueller, p. 16. f.), is also our confession and we have always acted accordingly. In the preface to the 14th volume of this periodical it was stated: "We do not want to say that no distinction is to be made among the members of the church and that an equally correct judgment must be demanded of all, even about such points of the biblical doctrinal content that do not belong to the dogmatic foundation. It can happen that a simple-minded person, because he is unable to see the correctness and necessity of a consequence, denies even a secondary fundamental article until his death, without being regarded as a "false dogmatist" for the sake of this mere persistent denial or merely for the sake of maintaining a secondary fundamental error.

can exclude a heretic from -the communion of the Church, how much more will this be the case with regard to such doctrinal points which do not belong at all to the fundamental articles of -the Christian faith! Therefore Kromayer writes quite correctly: The degrees of evidence in conclusions derived from the clear word of God do not change the authority of the divine word, but only serve to excuse the weakness of some Christians (in that they cannot immediately recognize all (conclusions)) and demand toleration of them on the part of those who see through those (conclusions) more deeply". (p. 67.68.) Now this applies especially to erring laymen, since such erring ones, who want to teach others, must be judged differently on the whole. That those who love false peace consider some of those we attack to be weak is not decisive. They themselves will hardly want to be regarded as such. And we are by no means bound by the commandment of the Lord to call such "dear brethren" who, having been admonished once and again, do not turn away from error. But we have always borne with patience those who have really erred out of weakness.

Therefore, we must also reject as untrue when, in order to label us fanatics, we are accused of recognizing only a community that is completely correct in doctrine as a true church. For if we exercise patience against individuals, if they are weak, why should we not do the same with regard to whole communities? And if our opponents wanted to give honor to the truth, they would have to confess that we have neither thrown away individuals nor whole communities because errors were still found among them, as long as no heretical spirit prevailed among them. We have always held that it is much more important that the right spirit prevails in a community than that every doctrine is presented in the most correct way. Where a false spirit prevails in the correct presentation of doctrine, there also prevails arrogance, the mother of all heresies; but where the right spirit prevails, and the right doctrine of justification prevails, there false doctrine is gradually consumed. Therefore, the aforementioned preface declared: "We do not want to say that, if in an ecclesiastical community there still exists some error which does not overthrow the foundation of faith, but which is in conflict with God's clear Word, that the same has already lost the character of a church with which a right-believing Christian can maintain fellowship. To admit that each individual true member of the church can err and at the same time deny that the whole true church can err would be a shameful contradiction of which only a pope can be guilty. Therefore, as long as a church does not harden itself in its error, its error, even a more serious one, does not form a dividing gulf, least of all if it has already taken the path to unity in the full truth." (p. 66. f.)

This does not mean, of course, that if we do not deny recognition to a community that is not entirely correct in doctrine, we must remain silent about its errors. This is a strange view of our opponents, that if one criticizes something in a recognized community, one thereby cancels the recognition, "breaks" with it, even "banishes" it, that recognition of a community also involves approval of everything that is found in it. While the enemies of polemics consider silence in such cases to be demanded by love, we believe that we are acting unlovingly when we remain silent.

Oh, if only people would realize that punishment for error is not at our discretion. We are servants of the Lord, from whom he demands faithfulness. The doctrine is not ours, but his property. As faithful servants, we must faithfully guard such entrusted property.

However, the stock of accusations of the opponents is not yet exhausted. We have proven the ones mentioned so far to be null and void. But they also accuse us of things that we do not deny. Will we now be guilty of fanaticism and sectarianism? Let us see.

You alone want to be right, they say, and not let your opponents also be right, in spite of the fact that your little crowd is so small and unlearned, but the crowd of your opponents is so large and learned! Are you not fanatics? - That is a strange speech! How can that be fanaticism, which God's word demands of every Christian! "I am right," so every Christian must be able to speak. For "faith is a certain assurance of things hoped for, and not doubting of things not seen." Hebr. 11, 1. A Christian must be so sure of his cause that even if all the world, even angels from heaven, stand against him, he will still stand firm. He who says that others may be right is a doubter and lacks faith. If we believe that we are right, we cannot assume that others who say the opposite may also be right. Truth is only one. Yes and no cannot be together in one thing, according to the same relation.

The fact that pious and learned people come to our side can only be pleasing to us, but it cannot establish our faith. The reason for it is the word of the Lord. But the fact that the number of those who believe differently from us is great cannot make us mistaken in our faith. *Multitudo errantium non parit errori patrocinium*. That on the side of the great multitude are the wise and prudent of this world cannot move us either. "Not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called," etc., 1 Cor. 1:26 ff.

One writes such certainty, which one expresses to others, on the account of a Bornirtheit. The disgrace actually hits God's word, not our person. It is called a lack of humility and arrogance that one alone is right and one's opponents are not also right.

to let us have it. It would be arrogance if we brought our own wisdom and believed that we were not subject to error. But we do not bring our wisdom, but we hold to the word of truth and therefore believe with certainty that we are right and that all others who believe differently than the word of God teaches cannot be right. Luther calls this a "good, godly hopefulness," but "if I were to let myself be driven by the divine word, that would be a real devilish and cursed humility, and such humility would do no good anywhere, for you would be humble here, since otherwise you should be hopeful. (Erl. ed. 46, 193.) We therefore thank our opponents most sincerely for this reproach; they thus give us a testimony that we are right.

If, furthermore, our opponents, in accusing us of fanaticism and sectarianism, also want to accuse us of testifying earnestly against all scripturally contrary error and manifest mischievousness, we cannot find any fanaticism or sectarianism in such testimony. We have the measured command not to deviate from God's word, neither to the right nor to the left, not to do anything about it, not to add to it. We cannot forgive anything from God's word, we must be zealous for every word of the Lord, thus also seriously reprove every error.

The mischievousness revealed in opponents also falls under the discipline and punishment of the divine word. We must therefore also rebuke it seriously. This requires the love of the neighbor, both of the one who is in this sin and of the one who can easily be led astray by it. False teachers who act openly are not as dangerous as those who act mischievously. Christ acts more harshly against the mischievous Pharisees than against the openly speaking Sadducees. That is why the church has always punished mischievousness. Such a rogue was Arthur, such were and are the Papists, such were the cryptocalvinists who tried to sneak into Lutheran preaching offices after Luther's death, the syncretists of whom Paul Gerhardt said: they are neither faithful to God nor to man, such are today's Unirten and others, not to forget the Fritschelians. Whoever wants this cunning and mischievousness to go unpunished is aiding and abetting it and error. God's Word forbids us to do so. Our opponents therefore bear witness to us with this accusation that we are doing what is our duty according to God's Word.

For this reason, too, we are said to be fanatics and sectarians, because we consider and declare the Lutheran church to be the orthodox one and its symbols to be absolutely pure in doctrine. In this time of general doubt, even despair of all truth, it is not surprising that we are reproached for this.

But our opponents should not leave it at that, but should also give the proof that our church is not the orthodox church. On close examination, they would find that it remains strictly in the speech of Christ, thus it is the true visible church *); with the exception of such impudent fellows, of course, who no longer consider even the holy Scriptures to be entirely free of error; these, of course, will not declare the Lutheran church to be the right one either, even if they see that its doctrine is that of the Bible.

When our opponents say that we declare the Lutheran church to be the only one that saves, this is dishonesty. We do not declare it to be the church apart from which there is no salvation. Our confessions testify to the opposite, namely that the invisible church of God is everywhere. However, we do not want to be deprived of the glory that we are the only orthodox church together with all true Lutherans. But the fact that the false churches are still churches comes from the fact that they still have pieces of the truth that the Lutheran church has entirely.

Therefore, it cannot be fanaticism if we consider the Lutheran church to be the orthodox one. Other churches opposing it cannot also be orthodox; the truth is only one and this is completely accepted by the Lutheran church alone. Nor can it be fanaticism if, after careful examination, we have found the Lutheran confessions to be thoroughly consistent with the Holy Scriptures and therefore consider them to be thoroughly pure in doctrine. The mere clamor of the enemies cannot mislead us in our conviction. To this day, no false doctrine has been proven in our confessions. As often as opponents have attempted to prove something contrary to Scripture, they have been greatly disgraced.

If opponents who reproach us with declaring the Lutheran Church to be the orthodox one and its symbols to be absolutely pure in doctrine want to be Lutherans, they give themselves the testimony that they are not, but that we are.

It should also be fanaticism that we reject all external ecclesiastical unification without internal unification in doctrine and faith, that we regard the whole doctrinal substance of the symbols and also the consequences resulting from it as binding, and that we demand unity not only in the so-called symbolic doctrines, but in all doctrines of Scripture.

That the rejection of outward ecclesiastical unity without inward unity in doctrine and faith is not fanaticism, not sectarianism, is easy to see. The apostle says: "Be diligent to keep unity in the Spirit through the bond of peace. One body

*Compare: The Evangelical Lutheran Church, the true visible church of God on earth. By C. F. W. Walther. Available from M. C. Barthel. - Price: 50 Cts.

and One Spirit, just as you were called to one hope of your profession. One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism." Ephes. 4, 3-5. Further, "Now I exhort you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye always speak one word, and that there be no divisions among you, but hold fast one to another in one mind and in one opinion." 1 Cor. 1, 10. Of the first Christians it is said: "But the multitude of believers was one heart and one soul." A community can therefore only be regarded as united if it is truly united inwardly in faith. If it tries to present itself as united outwardly without being united inwardly, this is nothing but hypocrisy and therefore an abomination before God. Zeal against such hypocrisy is surely not fanaticism. And if our opponents reproach us for our rejection of all such outward unity, they bear witness on our behalf that we do not want to participate in a matter that is an abomination in the eyes of God.

There is a good reason why we consider the whole doctrinal substance of the symbols, and also the consequences resulting from it, to be allied. Who gives the law the right to consider only certain doctrines in the symbols they designate as valid? They set up such a proposition to avoid certain doctrines of the Confessions. This is dishonest. In the Confession, everything that is doctrine, that is, the entire doctrinal substance, is binding. We say doctrinal substance in order to exclude things that belong to the realm of grammar, criticism (e.g. whether this or that writing attributed to Augustine really originated from him or not), etc., and which therefore cannot be considered binding on a symbol. A Lutheran accepts the whole doctrinal substance, therefore also the consequences that necessarily result from the words of the confession, e.g. that the holy Scriptures are inspired by the Holy Spirit, according to Apol. Art. 4. ed. garbage. p. 104. 107. that every Judaizing chiliasm is to be rejected, according to the Augsburg Conf. art. 17. Conf. art. 17, that man in his conversion cannot decide for himself, according to Concordimformel art. 2. Such consequences are quite justified, for God has given us reason. Let us only make a distinction with the ancients between *usus rationis realis et instrumentalis*. It is wrong for the reformers to let reason decide in matters of faith. Insofar as they do this, their consequences are therefore contrary to Scripture. But it is pleasing to God if we use reason as an organ to conclude truths from truths that he has given us. Christ himself proves the doctrine of the resurrection to the Sadducees by a conclusion and compels the Pharisees to make such a conclusion. Matth. 22, 31. 32. 43-45. If we recognize the words of the confession as true and we honestly accept them, we do not have to shrink back from such consequences. *Ex veris*

non nisi verum.. Only true things can follow from true things. Therefore, there can be no question of an honest acceptance of the symbols if the consequences that correctly follow from their words are denied, just as there can be no question of an honest rejection of the heresies rejected in the confessions if everything that follows from such heresies is not also rejected. At the end of the Concordia formula it says: "These and similar articles and all that is attached to them and follows from them, we reject as unjust, false, heretical, etc." Ed. Müll. It is an illusion, therefore, when the lowans speak of accepting the symbols and pretend to reject only the Missourian conclusions. They should prove that we have drawn wrong conclusions. But they have their reasons, like others, why they do not want to know about such consequences. They do not accept that from which the consequences are drawn. Fanaticism will therefore be sought on the side of our opponents, who do not want to accept these consequences, thus also rejecting the *usus rationis* instrumentalis, and thus basically prohibiting thinking. If, on the other hand, we do not shrink from the conclusions that are correctly drawn from the words of our confessions, the opponents who reproach us with them will only give us the testimony that we are serious in accepting the symbols.

The fact that we demand unity not only in the so-called symbolic, but in all scriptural doctrines, is also no proof of fanaticism and sectarianism. On the contrary, those who do not want to believe more than what is taught in the symbols are quite fanatical and sectarian. God has saved us from such sectarianism. We accept what is written in the symbols not because it is written in them, but because it is written in the Scriptures. In our symbols we confess the Word of God as the only source of all truth, as the only rule and guideline of faith and life. Our confessions bind us to the holy Scriptures themselves. They do not intend to be a compilation of all the doctrines of the faith, but only of the most important articles, which were particularly controversial at the time; and our confessors declare to give further account where necessary. Thus it says in the Augsb. Conf. at the end of the 21 articles: "this is almost the summa of the doctrine" etc. (Ed. Müll. p. 47.) and at the end of the whole confession it is said: "these are the most distinguished articles which are considered controversial. And if anyone is found wanting in them, he is further required to report them on the basis of divine holy Scripture." (pp. 69, 70) The delusion that unity is to be demanded only in the so-called symbolic doctrines, and not in all scriptural doctrines, is a hiding place of the dishonest, who, in the face of an obvious rejection of scriptural doctrines, e.g. of the inspiration of holy Scripture, still rely on the

Lutheran" and want to justify the claim by saying that the doctrines in question are not expressed in the Lutheran Confession. If we are therefore reproached for demanding unity not only in symbolic doctrines but also in all scriptural doctrines, this only testifies to our honesty, our heartfelt commitment to the Word of God, our non-sectarianism, and our unwillingness to have our church labeled a sect.

May our opponents therefore only continue to shower us with such accusations. In some respects, these accusations are obvious, tangible lies; in other respects, they are only testimonies for us.

G.

Correction.

In the October issue of "Lehre und Wehre", Pastor Wagner from Kleinlinden attacked me as a result of a conversation on the railroad that had already taken place before Pentecost. I do not want to publicly capitalize on what he said to me. I do not consider such a thing to be right and proper. My public writings are available, and they should be judged publicly, not misunderstood, confidential conversations. My public writings, however, have been found irreproachable by every Lutheran up to now, from 1849 until 1875.

Pastor Lucius, as well as all Lutherans in Hesse-Darmstadt, stand not only on the Augustana, but on all confessional writings of the Lutheran Agenda of 1566. That the Concordia Formula was not accepted in Darmstadt had apologetic, well-founded (?) reasons at that time. However, we all profess the entire doctrinal content of the Concordia formula. Pastor Lucius at Usenborn did not mention other confessions than the Catechism and Augustana in the merely provisional congregational statute only because these were not yet known to the congregation at that time, and he did not want to demand a confession from them, which was not clear to them. If Pastor Lucius behaved in a friendly manner towards the small congregation in Gedern, but made no attempt to deprive them of their pastor at that time, Pastor Hein, this is also not hostility. If I made use of the friendly offer of Pastor Diederich to confirm my confirmands in his church, not out of affiliation to the Immanuel Synod, but to the Lutheran congregation of Ulfa, then every reasonable person may judge that. And when I agreed with Pastor Diedrich to compile the points on which the various German synods agree, and to expose and clarify those in which they differ, I only wanted to prepare the colloquia for Germany, which the venerable presidium of the Missouri Synod also held with Wisconsin and Iowa in America, which

which was also held in former times with Grabau and von Rohr. And when I strive for unity in the free Lutheran churches, I think of the word: If you bite and devour one another, take care that you are not consumed together. When I rejected the union, one of my friends resigned from us, pretending that he did not know where to go, to Breslau, Missouri, Immanuel, or Fromme! or Haag. Pastor Dieffenbach also uses this disunity in his justification writing to keep his faithful in the unruly Darmstadt State Church.

Quite untrue and truly ridiculous is the assertion attributed to me by Pastor Wagner, as if four of five rebellious clergymen of Hesse had sat down in the church regiment, and that in 1873. Only in 1874 the fight began. Then 15 pastors remained steadfast, and not five. Such mockery and ridicule of ourselves, such foolishness and silliness can only be put into my mouth by a man who is mentally ill. On the contrary, we do not yet have a church regiment, and none of us will even sit down in it. The assertion that we only want to establish a national church in Darmstadt, as it was before 1873, is astonishingly ridiculous, and not a word can be said in reply, except: God have mercy on the man who lives thus in the eighth commandment.

Ulfa, November 10, 1875.

Baist, Lutheran pastor,

**

To my justification.

The article in No. 10, 1875, which is opposed by Pastor Baist, was not written by me, but by Professor Walther. However, since the main content of the article is based on written communications from me at the beginning of July of last year, I confess to being the reporter without reservation. It saddens me that Pastor Baist sees in it nothing but unjust attacks against his and the other Renitenten's position on the Lutheran confession and accuses me of untruthfulness, without me being able to see how he can justify these accusations. How much we few Hessian Separates desire a real agreement with the Renitents, above all on the entire confessional content and then also in our ecclesiastical position vis-à-vis the Hessian Regional Church, and have by no means given up hope of this, can be seen by everyone from some essays in "Lutheraner", No. 23, 1875, and in "Lehre und Wehre", December issue 1875 and January issue 1876, which I had sent to the editors two months before I received notice of the use of my correspondence. That both should go hand in hand, serious pain about what still separates and some joy about every sign of a rapprochement, but that also on both sides a mistake can easily be made.

I do not need to prove this. However, recent experience has taught us that in our days the danger of giving in too quickly to the hope of a reconciliation of the differences lies closer than the other, since, for example, Pastor Schüller, also one of the renitents, from whose admittedly unclear book I have communicated a few pleasant passages, has in the meantime not only openly gone over to the army camp of the Breslauers himself, but has also done everything in his power to bring about a Breslau congregation in Allendorf. - I was urged to write these letters by Psarrer Baist by the request of my congregation, which had just made the bitterest experiences of what great damage the opposing position of Pastors Schedtler and Luzius was doing to it. Since I only complained about these two at first, but only mentioned Pastor Baist in passing, one would almost assume that he also wanted to stand up for the position they had taken against us. But at least Rev. Schedtler's opposition to the Lutheran confession, which is clearly evident in his book, is not glossed over by Rev. Baist, and since the statements made in it have remained unchallenged, I simply refer to them. For Pastor Luzius, on the other hand, he stands up with the assurance that he, along with all other Hessian Renitents, stands on all confessional writings, not excluding the Concordia formula, - and yet it is a fact that the same has declared to one of my parishioners that "Luther, when he expresses himself in the Schmalkaldic Articles to the effect that in times of need even a layman can absolve the other, was in any case very much mistaken"! But Pastor Baist does not say a word about whether he would also approve of the erection of a counter-altar under the Lutheran name in Allendorf by Pastor Luzius in relation to our congregation, which had gathered there for years around the unadulterated Lutheran confession. And it was precisely about this that I complained most decisively. It will probably be difficult for him to deny the following facts: In Allendorf, where for a long time many Christians had felt the confessionalism of the national church and especially the obviously false doctrine in their congregation as a deep distress, they had all united for a number of years to fight for the reassertion of the Lutheran confession; When this proved fruitless, they had at least obtained permission from the government to be officially served by Pastor Brunn in Steeden; this went on in perfect peace until Pastor Brunn felt compelled to seriously emphasize the Lutheran doctrine of church and office in the face of the Vilmarian and Schedtlerian falsifications that were being spread around; then many of them left and no longer walked with ours. They preferred to go to Dreihäusen, an hour away, to pastor Schedtler, and when the official service was no longer possible there, they turned to him with the request to

to Pastor Luzius. And Luzius accepted this task without even trying to come to an understanding with our congregation! If Luzius knew that he was in agreement with our congregation, was it then possible for him to found another congregation next to it, instead of directing the separated ones to where they belonged, if they wanted to be Lutheran? But if he, like the separated, also saw himself separated from our congregation by our confessional doctrine of church and ministry, how did he come to emphasize his good agreement with the Missouri Synod in Allendorf so strongly, as was repeatedly asserted to us by his followers? Our supporters must have recognized in this the intention to undermine our congregation all the more surely, in that our supporters were also to be caught by the pretense, as if their previous pastors, Brunn and Eikmeier, still wanted something special besides the Lutheran confession and if their claimed confessional unity with the Missouri Synod itself was very questionable. Who can blame them for their righteous anger over such an attempt to seduce innocent hearts with sweet words (Rom. 16, 18.)? Did they not know in the most definite way that the others kept themselves apart from them only out of aversion to the confessional doctrine in the aforementioned articles of faith, in which ours are in complete agreement with the Missouri Synod, and likewise that Pastor Luzius himself had expressed his deviation from our doctrine in the most definite way against one of ours in Usenborn, while declaring himself in complete agreement with Schedtler in the doctrine? How else would it have been possible for him to satisfy such unconditional followers of Schedtler? Can it be blamed on a small congregation, standing quite isolated in the midst of the most diverse opponents, which sees its whole existence attacked by such artifices, if it informs its faithful comrades in faith on the other side of the sea about how they actually stand by the confession and by them, who boast of being their best friends? Upon repeated emphatic questioning by my congregation, she declared that she in no way wanted to blame Pastor Luzius for having sought out our people in their homes in order to make them turn away by persuasion, and that she felt obliged to justify his honor against such a misunderstanding of her complaint; He insisted, however, that in this pretense the intention to keep the others away from us, as well as to draw ours to himself, was clearly recognizable, and that such an intention was in fact fulfilled at his first communion in Allendorf by the indiscriminate admission of partly those from the national church, partly those who had previously been our communion guests, without his having previously demanded any declaration of resignation from our congregation or having consulted with them about the reasons for their renunciation.

Schedtler and Luzius, whose contrast to the doctrinal content of our Confessions our congregation gets to experience in the most direct proximity.

I have described them as our determined opponents. The other Renitenten's position on the confession is not discussed in detail in the article; but the basic falsity of their position on the Hessian regional church is, that they continually raise Renitenz high above the simply required separation from a false church, i.e., that they dream that they have had a Lutheran church within the Hessian regional church up to now and that they can continue to maintain it. But insofar as they make common cause with these two opponents of our congregation, we must certainly include them among the number of our opponents. And the more and more they take up a position against us, the more they force us to do so, as little as we thought of them at the beginning. Does Pastor Baist disapprove of Pastor Luzius' position towards our congregation in Allendorf with only one word? Yes, was it not pursued with all seriousness in the last few months and was it not close to the point that a recalcitrant pastor took up residence in Allendorf, and was this plan not shattered only because Pastor Schüler finally preferred the call to the Breslau congregation in Rade v. W.? Not only do we find Luzius signed in all publications of the Renitenten, but also Schedtler participating with them in the consultations at the Usenborn church consecration in brotherly fellowship. What are we to make of the repeated assurances of their common unwavering adherence to all Lutheran confessions, if even Schedtler's unconfessional sentences are not able to disturb their doctrinal unity?

From these facts it is clear that the fault does not lie with us if we have to see in the Renitents our opponents for now. How welcome it would have been for our people to unite with a more numerous separation on the firm foundation of the confession is easy to understand in view of their longstanding isolated position. Therefore, when the Usenborn congregation, which was constituted under its newly appointed pastor Luzius in June 1874, issued an invitation through its leader to the Usenborn congregation in Gedern and Klein-Linden that they and all those who had either already left or still wanted to leave would like to be present at the intended declaration of resignation of the Usenborn congregation, Several of us accepted such an invitation with heartfelt joy, but were deceived in their expectation by the fact that in the congregational statute read out by Pastor Luzius there was not a word of mention of a withdrawal from the national church, but this time, too, the congregational formation proceeded only under the form of renitence; even more so, that among the confessional writings of the new congregation there was no mention of the Apology, the Schmalkaldic Articles and the Formula of Concord; which Pastor Baist explains by saying that these were not yet known to the congregation and that the Formula of Concord was not yet known to the congregation.

The fact that the formula of service was not included in the old Hessian church order sounds very innocent, although one must be surprised that Pastor Baist allows such a reason; however, the matter had very other reasons, Pastor Luzius' inner opposition to the doctrine contained therein, which he expressed quite openly when questioned by one of us in the above-mentioned judgment on the Schmalkaldic Articles. It must also have caused offence among our people that in a special paragraph of the congregation's statute, the church regiment of the new congregation (whether under the name of Inspectoren or any other is irrelevant) was immediately made up of the four pastors: Bingmann in Höchst, Ulrich in Beyenheim, Baist in Ulfa, and also Schedtler in Dreihäusen, were appointed; two of us could not help but express to Pastor Luzius their deep sorrow that Schedtler had been elected to the church regiment, since their heartfelt desire to proceed together with them had thereby been made impossible from the start, given the serious contrast in doctrine between Pastor Schedtler and their Pastor Brunn, which had certainly become known to him; Pastor Luzius then declared in no uncertain terms that in the doctrinal dispute, which was well known to him, he was in complete agreement not with Pastor Brunn, but with Schedtler, and that he would prefer to have him as Superintendent.

This is the fact which I, together with that ear-witness from my congregation present in Usenborn, held up to Father Baist in all seriousness at our meeting on the journey, but which not we, but rather Father Baist used in his usual manner to joke about the, however, strange-sounding occurrence, that four out of five pastors, none of whom had really left their previous church yet (thus even in 1874 not yet, as Rev. Baist instructed me), were already elected to a church regiment over one that still remained to rule; In his joke, he himself did not mention anything about the other 15 he had recently mentioned; in the meantime, some of them had probably already moved to other regional churches or to the Breslau or Immanuel Synod. As little as I could believe that Pastor Baist wanted to mock himself with this joking turn that he gave to our serious conversation, I do not believe that I gave him reason to complain about bitter mockery and ridicule by occasionally mentioning it in a private letter, but least of all to accuse me of untruthfulness; I was, as already mentioned, not alone with him, but my parishioner, Mr. Adolf in Klein-Linden, testifies with me to the event; also, if it should be necessary, I hope that Pastor Luzius will be willing to provide us with the relevant paragraph from the parish statute at our request.

I cannot find anything else with which I have aroused Father Baist's anger. For even the other two brief mentions from our conversation, that he, urged by the difficulty of his situation at that time, had his confirmands confirmed by Pastor Diedrich, and that he will shortly publish, together with Pastor Diedrich, a compilation of the doctrinal points in which all now separated Lutheran synods are in agreement, he only confirms in his "correction"; Admittedly, anyone who has read the compilation published in the meantime by Pastor Diedrich, and at the same time knows the real state of the doctrinal dispute, will hardly find it useful for the purpose indicated; as far as the colloquia to be initiated by it are concerned, I have already reproached Pastor Batst at that time with the fact that Pastor Diedrich has for several years rather rejected our offer to deal with the doctrinal dispute by way of a colloquium, with his well-known: "With Missouri, Breslau and Union hold colloquium, who has desire to do so, only Diedrich does not". But that the Hessian Renitents, if they do not succeed in founding their own Hessian Synod, are in great danger of seeking refuge either in the Immanuel or Breslau Synods, if not in other apostate regional churches such as Frankfurt, has in the meantime been confirmed by experience; for in all three directions some of them have already entered the preaching ministry; the most obvious saddening fact is in Rade v. W., The most obvious fact is in Rade v. W., where two Hessian renitents are already standing opposite each other, one of whom, Pastor Urich from Beyenheim, serves the congregation of the Immanuel Synod there, the other, Pastor Schüler from Breungesheim, serves the Breslau congregation standing opposite him. I wanted to indicate this danger just by mentioning the confirmation sought from Pastor Diedrich.

What remains, then, which in my communications causes Pastor Baist first to laugh and then to say: "God have mercy on you"? The outrageous foolishness, that I trust the Darmstadt Renitents, "their fight is only for the restoration of the national church as it was before 1873"! If one were to believe that someone who is compelled by the urge of circumstances to give up his former oppressive position would not gladly accept an incomparably more advantageous position that presents itself to him, then that would be ridiculous, although the unbelievable case is by no means unheard of in today's church struggles. I have not the slightest doubt, however, that the Hessian Renitents, if their insistence on the revocation of the constitution of 1873 fails because of the resistance of the rulers, will, with the then unavoidable break with the national church, also take over the Uniate Consistory, the Protestant, i.e. Uniate superintendents, the Protestant deans, indeed expressly only Protestant parishes, together with the theological faculty at Giessen, which has advanced a good deal beyond the usual union.

and the similar seminary for preachers at Friedberg, where the future pastors have to be trained, the ordination obligation to the "Confessions of the Reformation", the clean Hessian hymnal and the mixed communion, will gladly throw overboard. Whoever still longs for a Lutheran church, how could he not wish to be relieved of such a burden and disgrace sooner rather than later? But what one has been able to bear calmly until 1873, the abolition of which, if one now, compelled by even more outrageous burdens, finally allows oneself to be moved to resistance, cannot be regarded as the actual goal of the struggle, but only as a welcome addition, which then, of course, will not be rejected. Unanimously, however, the resisters state as the reason for their entire struggle only the constitution of 1873, i.e., the abolition of the constitution of the Hessian state church that was valid until 1873, and Rev. Baist himself teaches us, contrary to expectation, that his and his friends' earlier numerous petitions for the abolition of this or that "unconfessional" condition were not a real struggle, because "their struggle only began in 1874," i.e., with the final abolition of the conditions that existed before 1873. What else can others conclude with me from this than: "if only the conditions had been left to the Renitents as they were before 1873, the Hessian regional church would have remained forever secure from their struggle"? Thus the joint statement of the Renitents, but probably also Mr. Pfarrer Baist's, is entitled: "Why a number of Lutheran Christians did not accept the new constitution?", printed by Baist in Frankfurt, 1874: "In the Darmstadt region the Lutheran faith remained undisturbed until this year things changed. (pag. 2.) Through this constitution, a completely new state church came into being, without having a specific confession. (pag. 6.) Even if the congregations were formerly called Lutheran or Reformed and were so, they are no longer so after the new constitution." 8) One sees from the otherwise excellent booklet throughout that one would have been completely satisfied if one had only been allowed to retain the legal title of a Lutheran confession, and that one knew how to comfort oneself with this mere legal title against the facts in the church that looked far different. Also Schedtler and Luzius, whose position I wanted to characterize first, confirm my assertion with their own words. In the *Blättern aus Usenborn*, No. 3, Luzius himself shares an earlier letter from his head, Mayor Vogel, (written before Luzius took office), who at least seems to have recognized the necessity of a present separation much more clearly than Luzius himself, although with him, too, only the latest church constitution is decisive; it says: "I have always expressed myself when the new church constitution does not turn out well, i.e., when, according to the same, the divine revelations of the church are not to be followed.

Since the doctrines and customs do not have to be taught, but doctrine and cultus are to be decided by majority vote, we in our congregation leave the national church with man and mouse and form our own Lutheran congregation. For whoever wants to be blessed must above all have the right doctrine. So I finally explained it to the assembled congregation council, and some of them spoke out quite decisively in favor of leaving the national church and made the motion that I would like to assemble the congregation and explain the matter." But Luzius immediately adds the correction: "The Lutheran congregation of Usenborn did not leave, but from the first to the last petition it declared that it could not place itself under the new constitution for the sake of the Word of God, its confession and conscience; it is therefore renitent in order to remain true to its faith. For the question: to leave or to become a renitent? we recommend: Die Stellung der evangelischen Geistlichen und Christen zu den staatlichen Kirchengesetzen. By a Hessian clergyman. Frankfurt." - With Schedtler, everything that happened in the church of Hesse before the Prussian seizure of possession, it may have been as crude as it likes, even the violent and complete reversal of the church of Lower Hesse into a reformed one under Landgrave Moritz in 1605, finds an excuse; indeed, with true enthusiasm the man can speak of the church of Hesse in 1873, page 17: "While the old ecclesiastical castles in the great German fatherland have crumbled far and wide and have been laid in ruins and replaced by airy new buildings, the old ecclesiastical rock castle in Hesse has remained firm, admittedly also damaged here and there by an unappointed hand, but still healthy and firm in its foundations, in its foundation walls and in its internal furnishings in part exemplary. In 1873, however, such a violent storm hit the ecclesiastical castle in Hesse that a large part of its defenders were thrown into fear and despondency. The introduction of the four well-known points of improvement by Landgrave Moritz in 1605, which brought about the expulsion of fifty-four faithful Lutheran pastors and even the denial of the Lutheran name and adoption of the reformed one for the church of Lower Hesse, which now even had to send its deputies to the strictly Calvinist Dortrechter Synod, meant so little to him that, in his opinion, it nevertheless remained well Lutheran: "With the introduction of the points of improvement in 1605, no legal change in the confessional status was effected, especially since the Concordia formula was not a symbol in Hesse. This was also expressly assured by Moritz. This assurance was later often repeated by the government of Lower Hesse, that in the substance of the doctrine not the slightest thing was changed, but only in the ceremonies something, which latter by the religious peace of 1555 was indeed left free", page 25.

In spite of all this, yes, in spite of the fact "that it cannot be denied that the theology of Lower Hesse from 1618-1731 even taught strict predestination (Calvin's)", page 27, "the church community of Lower Hesse nevertheless has Lutheran confession"; for Vilmar has said so and The strictly Lutheran churchmen L. Hatms and W. Löhe have held communion with the Lower Hessians; page 42. On the other hand, what has happened in the ecclesiastical field since 1866 must be measured by a completely different yardstick; from then on, Prussia continued the work of the Hessian sovereigns, and "the shattering blow that was struck against the Electoral Hessian ecclesiastical rock castle in 1873" could only come from Prussian hands.

Was I therefore right when I claimed that Schedtler's struggle, and that of the Grand Ducal Hessian Renitents no less, was only aimed at restoring the state church as it was before 1873? and when I recognize in their own confession that they had not fought before 1873, that they had not found it necessary to fight, the clearest testimony that they still do not know where the root of all the present-day devastation of the church lies, in the communion with false doctrine that has been cultivated for a century?

Finally, I repeat my hope, which I still hold, that Pastor Baist, and hopefully also other renitents, will once again take his solemnly assured agreement with the entire confession so seriously that he will absolutely renounce all fellowship with doctrines contrary to the confession, such as those of Schedtler and Vilmar. Then, without much effort, we will certainly also be united in our ecclesiastical position towards the Hessian regional church. Perhaps the experiences still to come in the struggle he has begun will be most helpful in this regard. After all, "contestation teaches us to pay attention to the word".

Wagner, pastor in Kleinlinden.

Literature.

School Newspaper. Published monthly by the Teachers' Association of the Lutheran Synod of Wisconsin. Edited on its behalf by Dr. F. W. A. Notz. First year. 1876-1877. Milwaukee, Wis. published by G. Brumder. 1876.

Under this title we have received the first number of a journal whose appearance we welcome with the best hopes for the promotion of the holy cause of the school through it. These hopes are based in particular on the fact that Dr. Notz, a recognized excellent schoolman, edits the journal. In the preface, he writes, among other things, of his school newspaper: "To put it briefly, it is to defend the way of education in high and low schools,

whose reason and goal is Jesus Christ, true God and true man, and whose guideline is his pure and honest word revealed to us. But, he further says, it is also important for him "not only to teach what is right, but also to ward off what is wrong. Our school newspaper will therefore not be afraid to take up the fight in God's name with the open and secret enemies of Christian education, however numerous and however powerful they may be in these last evil times." We can only approve of the fact that the *Schulzeitung* "has made it its business to treat the whole field of schooling"; indeed, nothing would correspond more to our wishes than if this periodical also granted appropriate space to the cause of the higher schools. In addition to the preface, this first issue contains two leading articles by contributors: "Our Position on the State School" and "On the Teaching of German Spelling in American Schools," on which, since they have not yet been completed, we do not yet permit ourselves a final judgment. The conclusion is formed by news from the area of the American school system. May the Lord endow all those who will work on this publication with the richest gifts of His Holy Spirit, so that it may also help in its part the work of the Reformation, which has been put into the hands of us Lutherans by God's wonderful grace, to the blessing of school and church. The present first booklet comprises 16 pages in octavo together with the title cover. Unfortunately, we do not find the price.

W.

K irchlich - Zeitgeschichtliches.

I. America.

Dr. Krauth's excellent testimony on the pulpit and communion question. In the *Lutheran* of January 27th, Dr. Krauth published a second article on the Galesburg "Rule". It is true that there is still a darkness hanging over this rule, because Dr. Krauth wrote in his first article, which seems to be only a historical introduction to the following ones: "No one in the Council at Galesburg took the position that there were no exceptions to the rule. No one among those who were present will deny that when the words: 'and no exception shall be made to this rule,' would have been added, the body would have rejected such a lineup." It is to be hoped, however, that by the so-called "exceptions" Dr. Krauth means only apparent, not real exceptions. For he takes a firm stand against the unionist position held by other members of the Council (e.g. Seiß, Krotel, Kunkleemann) and promises to refute the reasons of his opponents in further articles. We share some main passages from the second article. "The existence of our Lutheran Church, with its claim to legitimate existence vis-à-vis the other Particular Churches, is in and of itself a tacit, but in the fullest sense factual assertion of the necessity and appropriateness of the 'Rule' There are three all-

common official ways in which the recognition of unity in the church can be expressed. The first is the acceptance of the same confession; the second, permission to teach; the third, admission to Holy Communion. The question now is whether there can be a real reason for giving the second and third forms of recognition in a case in which one neither recognizes nor wants to recognize unity in the first way, but on the contrary expressly or actually objects to it. To have a rule of faith and yet at least give oneself the appearance of confusing those who use it rightly with those who apply it wrongly, trample it underfoot (whether partially or completely), or stubbornly deviate from it in voluntary ignorance; - to have a creed and yet to equate those who deny it wholly or in part with those who accept it, or at least to give oneself the appearance of so equating them; - to bear a name which ceases to mean what it ought by all rights to mean: - what is all this but fraud and deceit? ... There are sects which charge with the greatest readiness into their pulpits almost every one who is only called a preacher, and allow almost every one who only calls himself a Christian to partake of the Lord's Supper with them, but which will under no circumstances allow any one who is not wholly of them, let him be otherwise as wise and pious as he will, to have a word to say in the matter of their purse. What is God's, they give away; what they regard as their own, they carefully seek to preserve..... If there is any general principle that is decisively stated above others in God's Word and in the Lutheran Confession, it is that of the high value, power and holiness of divine truth. This truth must be secured, held fast and defended at all costs. It is not to be shortened, mutilated or deprived of its hardness. It is to be proclaimed according to its undiminished scope. No comparison may be made with those who falsify it in any degree; and silence may not be kept about the fact that it is ignored in any part. We must not open our pulpits to those who have officially committed themselves to something which we know to be in contradiction with the truth, or who mutilate what we recognize as truth by their false or incomplete faith. If we do, we give them the opportunity and, in a sense, the temptation to hold back what they believe to be the truth for fear of either offending us or being rude, or to preach in our pulpits, which are dedicated to the pure faith, something that denies, conceals, or misjudges that faith. We have no right to open the door to the perversion of the truth or to place the truth in a false light by concealing it in whole or in part. We have no right to turn the pulpit, which is the throne of God's truth on earth, into a speaker's platform or to degrade the altar into a social hall. Otherwise we lay dangerous nets for the consciences of others and for our own conscience. Only a rule which claims for the pulpit not merely freedom for the truth, if the person in question should really know it or be willing to preach it, but which insists that the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, be obtained unconditionally, is in accord with the divine word." May God bless this glorious testimony on quite a few hearts of the English speaking members of the Council. S.

More about the gratifying rumor in the Council. Each week brings us a whole collection of articles on "the burning question." The *Lutheran* alone delivers about half a dozen every week, unfortunately almost exclusively from the pens of those to whom the Galesburg decision has fallen like a stone on the heart. Even in the

Observer, "men of the Council" give vent to their pressed hearts and let their brethren of the General Synod know that the Council with the previous "rule" and the "exceptions" did not want to say anything more than what is also found as a principle in other denominations. More and more decisively, however, the opinion breaks through that the Council at Galesburg has really left its former "moderate" position and has essentially placed itself on the so-called exclusive or "Missourian", i.e. faithful to the confession. Dr. Passavant tries to appease his indignant English brethren by saying that all the earlier declarations of the Council were still in full force, for "the whole discussion had only been about the one point, whether such a rule as that which the Council had already adopted years ago was really in harmony with the Word of God and the confession of the Church". Krauth had declared (in Galesburg) that nothing of the former declarations, whether concerning the rule or the exceptions, was in any way affected or altered by the present resolution"; - and "before the vote was taken, the Chairman (Dr. Krauth) was publicly asked whether the adoption of the present proposal would have any influence in pushing aside the exceptions, to which the Chairman clearly and publicly replied: 'In no respect at all; the proposal simply explains where we get the rule from.'" The indignant brethren, however, did not quite trust such assurances. One Pastor Hentz, who was himself present in Galesburg as a delegate, thinks that Dr. Ruperti is perfectly within his rights when he claims that the Council did not want to legitimize the "exceptions" again. "It is not merely a few men," it continues, "who are making all this noise about the Galesburg rule; it is the united voice of the English-speaking portion of the General Council which has risen in rebellion against the attempt to impose Missourian exclusivism upon them without their having been consulted in the matter." As to Dr. Krauth's remarks, Rev. Hentz, while conceding that Dr. Passavant correctly lectured them, adds, "But in his closing speech he left no room for exceptions. If what he said then and has since repeated in his second article in the *Lutheran* is true, there can be no exceptions. How, then, are we to understand him? The Germans, who saw through the force of his argument, saw at once that the Herr Doctor practically destroyed again the exceptions which he allowed to hold good in theory. They understood him correctly and have a right to claim him for the side of absolute exclusivism. That was the impression we received at Galesburg, and nothing that has been said or written since has changed the least of it. His speech at Galesburg and his article in the *Lutheran* reduce all exceptions to a mere shadow - an absolute nothing." But it was precisely these "exceptions," left undefined, that left room for the Unionist-minded for their "liberal" practice! If they now fall away, only the exclusive rule remains. No wonder, therefore, that one fights here as if *pro aris et focis*, since the most extensive use can be made of these elastic "exceptions". The unionist wing of the Council is indeed not lacking in the tireless presentation of its arguments. Again and again one must hear that there are children of God outside the Lutheran Church, that the Lutheran Church is not the Church, that Holy Communion is not ours but Christ's, that it is "instituted for us Christians (not for us Lutherans) by Christ himself," that one should receive the weak in faith, that the unity of the Church is a unity in *fundamentalibus*, etc. But do all these reasons not prove that the Lutheran Church is not the Church? But if all these reasons do not prove in the least the matter at issue, they serve all the more as proof of how, in spite of all the high and splendid praise of our Lutheran church, we are still inwardly very distant from it.

and be a fanatical arch-unionist. For example, Rev. S. L. Harkey gives the keynote that can be heard in all the articles against the Doctors Ruperti and Krauth, when he triumphantly points out that in the third article it does not bite: "the communion of Lutherans", but "of saints", and then freshly concludes: "We can thus arrive at no other result than that the 'communion of saints' in the apostolic faith demands of all Christians that they regard one another as standing on entirely equal footing, as jointly entitled to enjoy all the rights and privileges of the children of God everywhere, under all circumstances, and at all times. Absolutely nothing may be claimed by the one that would not be a rightful inheritance of all." But what is the use of a Lutheran church with Lutheran congregations, Lutheran confession, etc.? Only in a true mishmash church, which does not want to know anything about any kind of confession, can Harkey's principle of church fellowship be realized. All "rights and privileges" in all ecclesiastical communities should, according to him, be a "rightful inheritance of all", and all should be able to make claims to them "everywhere, under all circumstances and at all times". But also other reasons are mentioned. Dr. Krotel thinks that if our Lutheran Church is to become known among the English and bear witness to the truth, it must not establish rules by which "every other door is closed to it in the most effective way" and "a Chinese wall is erected around the Lutheran Church, on the outside of which the words are painted: 'Within this wall you can hear the full truth.'" However, the Doctor has probably not considered that, according to his way of looking at things, we would also have to hold pulpit and communion fellowship with pagans, Jews, and Turks from time to time, if we did not want to erect the deliberate "Chinese wall" between us and them. Unfortunately, the consideration of the judgment of other denominations and of the ignorant crowd in our own congregations seems to be a main driving force in this "rebellion" against the exclusive rule, which is why the "rebels" generally suggest that the congregations should first cast their votes and the synods should then instruct their delegates to the next council, because the council "must necessarily speak again". We can only agree with the enclosed wish: "If it does so, it is to be hoped that there will then be an end to misunderstandings as to the exact meaning of its declarations. Some are, of course, against any official statements at all. Pastor R. Hill remarks, for example: "The main objection to be made to the Council's latest resolution is not as much to the matter as to the manner. The church should day its unalterable protest that a right is claimed to create new dogmas and to impose the same on the church. This is what the congregations of the Council have to do, otherwise they leave the 'fundamental principles' on which the Council is founded. For besides the Bible, these know of no authority, except the Augsburg Confession. What the latter leaves to the freedom of the church, must also be left to this freedom by law' ... The great mistake of the General Council was made at Pittsburg. When certain persons at that time waved the 'four punctums' about as if they were bare swords, they should have been answered, 'We were not sent here to create new dogmas with which to bind the Church.'" Similarly, Rev. Harkey thrusts in his trumpet of liberty - "It will now be seen whether the Council will make an attempt to enforce its law in a hierarchical manner in free churches and among a free people, or whether the churches, in their sovereign character, from which all violence springs, will say to the Council, 'Wait until we have commissioned you to establish such a law for us.' The attempt of some 40 or 50 men, preachers and laymen, for the consciences of 500,000

To give laws to communicants without consulting them is the greatest presumption that has spread on this mainland up to the present day. Not without reason the "Pilgrim" remarks to such speeches: "Really pharisaic! When the General Council was founded, the founders left the congregations pretty much behind them; but now that the theory has been established and is to be put into honest practice, they put the congregations before them. O woe to you scribes etc!" And Pastor Brobst aptly remarks: "After the four points have been discussed for almost ten years in conferences, synods and in the General Council, it strikes the gentlemen of the *Lutheran* For once, let the matter be brought before the congregations, in which the power of the church rests first and foremost! Yes, certainly, but where have you been during this long time? Have you not yet told your congregations about it and taught them about these questions of life? You come far behind with your congregational rights." In spite of all this, the *Lutheran*, who has only the Canada-Kirchenblatt secondarily among the German papers, does not give up hope that the Council will reverse the Galesburg decision. "We stand on the side of the Council of the past," he says, "and wish that the same may be maintained as the Council of the future.... We accept it as true that the Council in its proper self-hood has not said, nor can say (!), that the majority of its preachers and congregations believe or admit that it is a requirement of God and necessary to proper Christianity, as our church professes it, that only professed Lutherans can enter our pulpits or be admitted to our Lord's Supper." Summa Summarum: "The Galesburg decision has stirred up much mud" (Dr. Rupert). Unfortunately, the "*Our Church Paper*" (organ of the old Tennessee as well as the North Carolina Synod) sides with the *Lutheran*. The old hero David Henkel, the father of the Tennessee Synod, would not have done so. But who knows if God does not want to use this pulpit and communion question as a means of awakening honest hearts to penetrate deeper into Lutheranism. God forbid!

S.

How the Methodists overturn the doctrine of justification. In the "Apologist" there is an essay from which we extract the following words of Fleischer, an assistant of Wesley, the founder of the Methodist Church: "This doctrine of the imputed righteousness and holiness of Christ flatters corrupt human nature. Will not the impenitent sinner be persuaded thereby to continue in his sins, and the penitent to return to the old nature, deceiving himself that Christ's perfection is imputed to him, and that therefore he has no need of personal purity in Christ? Who does not see in this the direct tendency to promote godlessness and to support gross antinomianism? ... The doctrine of imputed obedience is based on the same false premises and stands and falls with the same evidence. We add: The Bible often speaks of a vicarious suffering of Christ, but never of vicarious love or vicarious obedience. If we obey by proxy, we may sin as much as we please; for it is evident that if another's obedience is accepted in place of ours, while we ourselves continue to sin in a certain degree, the other's obedience might also be accepted if we sin still more, and continue to do so until we again lie entangled in manifest sins." - According to this, the apostle Paul would have intended his Epistle to the Romans to "promote ungodliness and support gross antinomianism," yet he says, "How then do we abolish the law by faith? Far be it from that, but we establish the law." (Cap. 3, 31.) And, "What shall we say to this? Shall we then in

persist in sin, that grace may be the more powerful? Let this be far off. How can we want to live in sin, to which we have died? (Cap. 6, 1. 2.) But who can be surprised that to such enthusiasts, who are puffed up by their own holiness, the preaching of Christ crucified is a foolishness and an annoyance!

G.

II. From land.

State of the German National Churches. A few weeks ago, a member of our synod received a letter from a preacher in a church government position in Germany, from which we take the liberty of informing our readers of the following: "We are entering ever deeper into a crisis in Germany. The great mass of the people is deeply de-Christianized and is becoming more and more so to the bottom. The godless leaders, the godless newspapers, materialism, the headless art of government, they are all literally storming at the last remnant. The old joints should and must be loosened and for new formation there are small or few elements. Therefore, the individuals who are still standing firm are approaching a catastrophe in which they will have to consider good and honor, perhaps also freedom and life. Nothing else is in store for me either. The national churches have long since become so ill that one can only be in them with a troubled conscience. But now, through the new synodal constitutions, the transition from the confessional church to the national church and majority church is also being completed in legal institutions. This is going over the heads of those who are faithful to the confession. As soon as 'this constitution-making comes to us, I too am delivered.'"

At present, only the following are listed in public documents **as Lutheran princes in** Germany: Saxe-Weimar, Meiningen, Altenburg, Coburg-Gotha, Brunswick, Hesse-Darmstadt, Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Strelitz, Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt and Sondershausen, Wuerttemberg, Oldenburg, Reuss older and younger line. But even Dr. Luthardt exclaims: "How many are among these who consciously and resolutely stand by the Lutheran confession and the Lutheran church, and who are determined to act and to do something for it? Quite a few; but how many?" We further ask: And what are these "quite a few"?

W.

The Hanoverian Central Party. About it - it calls itself "the Lutheran Association in the Province of Hanover" - the "Kirchenblatt" of Breslau of December 15 of last year writes, among other things, the following: "The Association wants to grant the members of the Union, if they declare to be Lutherans, the right to participate in the Lord's Supper and to admit the Reformed and the Unity-minded as guests. One can see, it is our Prussian Union Lutherans in the flesh, who have come to life in Hanover, also as 'Union Lutherans'. The Neue evangelische Kirchenzeitung is of course exceptionally pleased about this 'middle party', and we are actually pleased too. We are also sorry that there is such a party in Hanover, which protests against the Union in tz 3 and advocates the Union at the altar in § 8: now that it is there, it could have quite a useful effect. It could give the resolute Lutherans there a strong push to break all the more clearly with all unionist nature and to renounce all half measures. Such a push would not be unnecessary. For as far as we can see, a part of those who belong to the Pentecostal Conference stand on the same position as the unionists as far as the communion of the Lord's Supper is concerned. Another part only does not go quite so far, but only wants to admit the unirreformed Lutherans 'as guests', as the first criticism of the Hannover Pastoral-Correspondenz is content to say that this has gone 'quite far', and a correspondent of the General Lutheran Church Newspaper passes by with the remark, concerning the communion of the Lord's Supper, that the Lutherans are 'not allowed'.

There is still a great diversity of views in the community, which is quite unavoidable in view of the iridescent character of the Prussian Union. - Yes, that is the misfortune. In the form of the communion of the Lord's Supper, the regional churches, including the Hanoverian, have long since had the Union. Since 1866 they have begun to fight the Union somewhat more seriously. And now they cannot agree that the beginning of all fighting must be to expel the already invaded Union and to refuse entry to the daily invading one! Now they are looking for reasons to justify the admission of at least the Union Lutherans, and since there are actually no reasons for this, they assure that there is no other way, and at the same time they defend themselves against church-regimental union! And yet it is so easy to see: where communion can and may be granted, all other ecclesiastical communion can and may in principle also be granted. For communion at the altar is the crown of all ecclesiastical communion and meets the innermost sanctuary. To grant communion at the altar and to refuse church fellowship in principle means to say to the union: in the greatest I recognize you, but in the lesser I do not. - If now in the declaration of the 'Middle Party' in Hanover the contradiction emerges quite glaringly, that they indeed fight against the .If in the statement of the 'middle party' in Hanover the contradiction appears quite glaringly that they fight against the 'union' but want to maintain the union in the Lord's Supper, then those who do not intend to take 'middle paths' but truly Lutheran paths could well take from this a suggestion to re-examine their position on the Lord's Supper question, and at least for themselves no longer to let 'different views' prevail about the fact that Unirte, Reformirte and Unirte Lutherans belong at Unirte, Reformirte and Unirte Lutheran altars, but not at Lutheran ones. Whoever cannot be clear about this would do best to give up the fight against the Union altogether. If one never wants to attack the enemy where his strength is, one carefully avoids him when he comes with his main force in order to be content with side battles to the right and left, - then one will be beaten." - What here the "Kirchenblatt" chastises in that "association" is just what the "*Lutheran*", of January 20, praises in the same. The syncretists in the Council, who have hitherto been quite cautious, are of late becoming more and more brazen and forward. Hopefully, however, this will bring the true Lutherans in the Council to a decision. W.

The editor of the Mecklenburgische Kirchen und Zeitblatt comments on the **Hanoverian Mittelpartei** in the number of January 26 as follows: For the Lutheran Church, apart from the introduction of the Civil Status Law and the related instructions of the various Lutheran church governments, the founding of the Hanoverian Central Party or, as it calls itself, the "Evangelical Lutheran Association in the Province of Hanover" is probably the most disastrous event of the past year. Although nothing can yet be said about the effectiveness of this association, which only entered the public sphere on November 10, the program that was issued shows the principles for which the association wants to stand up. These principles need all the more illumination, as the material for such middle parties is not only available in Hanover. Probably in all Lutheran regional churches there are those who are hopelessly afraid of "confessional brusqueness" and who perhorresce "exclusive Lutheranism" because they want to be "popular" at all costs and therefore squint upward and flirt downward. ... The most alarming thing (in the program of the party) is its position on the church confession. The very first paragraph reads: "We stand on the foundation of the Gospel of Christ JEsu, as it is contained in the Holy Scriptures as the sole rule and guideline of Christian faith and life, and as it is testified to and known in the symbolic books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. We recognize in the confession of our church the norm for public teaching,

for the cultus, for the discipline and for the constitution of the same, in particular for their relationship to the state". This sounds quite innocuous, but whoever pays close attention to the diplomatic expression of this paragraph and remembers the Saxon formula of obligation and the negotiations connected with it, will not be able to deny that after the wording of the sentence in question, in truth nothing remains of the confession but the gospel of Christ JEsu, whereby everyone can think what he wants. This vague position on the confession is especially evident in the last provision, which not only grants members of the Union, if they declare themselves to be Lutherans, the right to partake of Holy Communion, but even grants guest admission to Reformed Christians and those who are from the Consensus. If the former is explicable, especially "in view of past ecclesiastical practice," the latter is absolutely reprehensible, because it abandons what we are to hold, the scriptural administration of the sacraments. If, moreover, it is true that the party has come into being at the instigation of the government, then it will probably form a docile tool in the hands of the government, in the manner of all middle parties, and thus help to gradually initiate the introduction of the Union. Despite all assurances, the new party thus seems to have a strong political and unionist streak. God preserve the Hanoverian Landeskirche from the fragmentation prepared for it by its own members. May He teach the Lutheran Church to heed the admonition now more than ever: Hold what you have, that no one may take your crown.

Relationship of the school to the church in Prussia. We find an article about this in the *Kirchenblatt für Braunschweig und Hannover* of January 14, which states how serious Christians think about school conditions over there, which are quite similar to those here, in some respects not yet so bad, in other respects, however, worse than those here. In it we finally read: "According to the previous explanation, the present situation of the school is this: The state has taken over the sole management and rule of the school, the teachers have to perform their duties on behalf of the state, and have to obey its instructions with regard to the teaching materials, the method, the time, etc.; religious instruction in the school may also only be given on behalf of the state and only by men employed by it. The pastors, as such, have nothing more to do in the name of the church, only if the state commissions them to do so. *) The civil municipalities have the right, with the permission of the state, not to take into account the confessional relationships in the schools, but, if they wish, not only to establish new simultaneous schools, but also to merge Lutheran, Reformed and Catholic schools that already exist and to make simultaneous schools out of them. At the moment, therefore, Article 24 of the Constitution is as good as repealed. The private schools, however, are subject to the general regulations on subjects of instruction, etc., just like the other schools. Compare this with the statement made by Ministerial Director Dr. Förster at the Berlin General Synod. When Professor Dr. Kähler had pointed out that the synod must be entitled to some kind of participation in filling the theological teaching positions, since the theological faculties had always been regarded as ecclesiastical bodies, Dr. Förster thought it advisable to remove any doubts about the position of the government in this question from the outset, saying: "The universities are state educational institutions, the theological faculties are integrating parts of the

*) They may, according to various decrees, attend the religious lessons, but they have nothing to say and with any complaints to turn to the state supervisors or authorities.

Universities - consequently, they are also state educational institutions". - Accordingly, the church would no longer have the right to take care of the education of its own servants or its children. One should hardly think this possible. - The church, if it does not want to give itself up, cannot exist without schools. The church needs church schools and has a divine right to establish them. Therefore, the new education law will necessarily have to grant the church communities the right to establish independent church schools, high and low, in which the church has to determine, direct and order the teaching, while the state has the right of superintendence, i.e. the right to see that nothing dangerous to the state is done in them. - There is at present no country in which this freedom of instruction is not granted to the churches, which are tolerated therein; it would also be an unparalleled tyranny of conscience, where the public schools have become state schools, if the church were to be deprived of this right to have its own schools; for the parents, who have to care for their children, would then be compelled to entrust them to schools which offer them no guarantee whatsoever that the souls of their children would be properly cared for."

Saxony. It sounds quite oracular when Superintendent Anacker writes in his "Sächs. Kirchen- und Schulblatt" (Saxon Church and School Gazette) of December 30 of last year, among other things: in the Saxon regional church the "renewed recognition of the ecclesiastical confessions is not a mindless slavish one, but a free one based on inner appropriation, which is best recognized from the attacks that are being made by the Missourian right and the Protestant Union left quite unanimously against the representatives of the confession on chairs and pulpits of our regional church. - That the renewed recognition of the ecclesiastical confession is not a mindlessly slavish one, we willingly concede to the Saxon regional church and do not blame it at all. It was, of course, disgraceful when the crypto-Calvinists once signed their wives' exhortations: "Write, dear sir, write that you will stay with the parish. But how the "free" recognition of the ecclesiastical confessions in the Saxon regional church, which can best be seen from the Missourian attacks, is a praise to the same, goes beyond our horizon. For Superintendent Anacker will hardly want to claim that in his regional church the entire doctrinal content of the confessions is not mindlessly slavish, but freely recognized; rather, he will have to admit that the freedom of recognition consists in the freedom to recognize one confessional doctrine and to reject the other. Or is this supposed to justify the Saxon regional church, that in the attacks on this arbitrariness Missouri meets with the Protestant Association? We think this only makes matters the worse for the Saxon regional church. Or is it not a terrible annoyance that the faithful in Saxony punish the rationalists because of their departure from the confession, while the latter can call out to them themselves: How can you punish us, who are "in the same damnation" with us?

W.

Austria. The following is written in the Allgemeine Ev. - Luth. Kirchenzeitung of Nov. 12 of last year: Hardly anyone in Austria will want to claim that the spiritual greatness and the material welfare of the empire have experienced an increase since 1861. Day after day, even from the liberal camp, cries of pain are heard, and even more bitter is the complaint raised by the conservatives. The liberal press has become a many-thousand-voiced apostle of unbelief; it systematically preaches the cult of pleasure and naked sensuality. For more than a decade the poison of such "enlightenment" has been penetrating the masses of the people; indeed, it has become the daily spiritual bread in town and country. No wonder therefore that

The fact that religious indifferentism is increasing to a terrible degree, that the middle class and the lower social strata are almost corrupted, and what makes the evil appear even more alarming is the fact that religious radicalism is beginning to take root even among the peasants and has attained an almost predominant position in the vicinity of large cities. The more powerful and unrestrained the liberal propaganda unfolds, however, the more luxuriantly nihilism flourishes, and there is not the slightest symptom to be seen that could suggest the thought of salvation from such bleak conditions.

Engagement and Marriage. Rudolph Sohm, professor of law at the Imperial University of Strasbourg, has written a book entitled: "Das Recht der Eheschließung aus dem deutschen und kanonischen Recht geschichtlich entwickelt" (Weimar 1875.), wherein the author, according to the Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenztg. of January 21, among other things, proves the following: "In the 16th century, the Roman Catholic Church, as a result of a development that had already begun in the Middle Ages, abandoned the opposition of betrothal and marriage, while the Lutheran and Reformed Churches preserved this dualism inherited from German law, even recognizing it more openly than the Church of the Middle Ages had done. According to the Protestant law of the 16th century (as it is also represented by Luther in particular), marriage is concluded by betrothal, and only put into effect by the church wedding. Thus results for the church of the Reformation time: extra-church marriage and church marriage beginning. Only since the second half of the 18th century has the ecclesiastical marriage ceremony become an ecclesiastical marriage ceremony, and the betrothal a mere promise of future marriage." The consequence of the latter view was that the annulment of a marriage vow was not considered adultery, but the annulment of a contract, which was then legal, if only both contracting parties agreed on it. W.

Refusal to be married in church. Regarding the consequences of such a refusal, the Oberconsistorium in Munich issued the following decree as early as July 26: "In assessing the question of whether exclusion from Holy Communion is to occur as a consequence of the persistent refusal, repeated despite pastoral assurances, to have a concluded marriage blessed by the church, it must be noted above all that Holy Communion is a means of grace. The Church has no right to deny the means of grace to one of its members who does not himself show himself incapable of its blessed use. This latter occurs through manifest impenitence and manifestly witnessed unbelief. The refusal of ecclesiastical marriage cannot in itself be regarded as such a testimony. It is therefore subject to pastoral or pastoral investigation whether such a reason for rejection of Holy Communion really exists in the person desiring it, or whether this desire itself does not rather prove the opposite." Certainly quite correct. For good reasons, a right-believing Lutheran would rather be married by a civil servant than by a false prophet. W.

Necrological. On January 8, the senior of the theological faculty, Oberconsistorialrath Dr. Aug. Detlev Christian Twesten, born in Glückstadt on April 11, 1789, died in Berlin at the age of almost 87.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 22.

April 1876.

No. 4.

What is it about the progress of modern Lutheran theology in doctrine?

(Continued.)

VII. What is the creation?

A. Theses.

Chemnitz: "Creation is the action of the One God, and God alone, and the undivided work of the three Persons of the Godhead, by virtue of which the Father, together with the co-eternal Son and co-eternal Holy Spirit, brought forth everything, visible and invisible, apart from His divine essence; not from a matter existing from eternity, but from nothing, i.e., when things were not yet, they suddenly began both to be and to exist at God's command ***).

Hollaz: "The three persons of the Godhead are not three social causes (each contributing to its part), not three originators of creation, but One Cause, One Originator of Creation, One Creator. For to social causes belong 1. diversity of essence, 2. diversity of power, 3. partial influence. Now the three persons of the Godhead have one and the same essence, and one and the same creator-power, and it is contrary to the divine majesty to assume that the persons of the holy Trinity each have influence only in part. For the Father has created everything, the

*) *Creatio est actio unius Dei, et quidem solius Dei, ac indivisum trium personarum divinitatis opus, quo Pater una cum Filio coaeterno et Spiritu S. coaeterno condidit omnia, visibilia et invisibilia, extra suam divinitatis essentiam ; non materia ex qua, ab aeterno existente, sed ex nihilo, i. e. cum res non essent, dicente Deo, subito et esse et existere coeperunt.*" (Loc. theol. I, f. 106.)

Son All, the Holy Spirit All. As the divine being is one and undivided, so also the act of creation is one and undivided." *)

Quenstedt: "We deny that Father, Son and Holy Spirit are cooperating or interconnected causes of creation. Here no cooperation takes place where the simplest being, One Power, is One causative influence and therefore One efficacy. There is also no connection of causality necessary, where there is only One simplest causality, since connection includes union in itself, but union is found only between several (beings)." **)

J. G. Carpzov: "There are people who think that the patriarchs have set up annals, each of his age, which Moses used in the narration of things that happened long before him. . . . But all this, though supported with great nepotism, is shaken by the One wall-breaker, the divine inspiration; for if we sincerely believe that Moses enjoyed it, we shall be little anxious to search for the monuments whose assistance he may have used. And even if there had been annals of the patriarchs, Moses would not have had to rely more on the credibility of them than on the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit, so that all his writing was inspired by God. 2 Tim. 3, 16. Therefore, we do not agree with those who believe that Moses drew what he himself did not participate in from the tradition of the fathers and put it in writing. For although he could have gotten some of what he reported in Genesis from Amram, his father, who, for a time a contemporary of his forefather Jacob, could have heard him tell how Jacob had told Abraham and Thara, his father, Noah, whose father Lamech lived with Adam for 56 years, which fathers God had commanded to pass on his works to their children.

Tres divinitatis personae non sunt tres causae sociae, non tres auctores creationis, sed una causa, unus auctor creationis, unus creator. Prob. Ad causas socias requiritur 1. diversitas essentiae, 2. diversitas potentiae, 3. partialis influxus. At vero tres divinitatis personae eandem habent essentiam eandemque creandi potentiam, et alienum est a maiestate divina, statuere, quod personae S. Trinitatis partialiter influant. Nam Pater condidit omnia, Filius omnia, Spiritus S. omnia. Sicut una et indivisibilis est essentia divina, ita unus et indivisibilis actus creandi est." (Examen theologic. Ed. Tellerus. Holmiae et Lips. 1750. p- 353.)

) Negamus, Patrem, Filium et Spiritum S. esse causas coefficientes vel conjunctas creationis. Nulla hic coefficientia, ubi simplicissima essentia, una potentia, una causandi influentia, adeoque una efficientia. Nec ulla opus est causalitatis conjunctione, ubi una tantum est simplicissima causalitas, cum conjunctio involvat unionem, unio autem inter plura tantum reperitur." (Theol. did.-polem. P. I. c. 2. q. 3 fol. 605)

If he had not been able to announce it, so that the descendants would learn it, Ps. 78, 5. Gen. 18, 19: we attribute everything more correctly to the divine inspiration alone; because if he had lacked this, no human memory would have easily kept the circumstances of so many times, places, persons, names and especially the genealogies and could have communicated them without the danger of an oversight and error. (*Introd. ad lib. can. Bibi. V. T. Ed. 4. Lips. 1757. p. 62. s..*)

B. Antitheses.

Kahnis: "The begetting of the Son is the beginning of creation, *) because what is created is created in him (Col. 1, 16.) i.e. the Son is the immanent middle cause of creation. Closer the world was created through and to him. The through expresses that he is the middle cause, **) the to, that he is the goal of everything created. Through and to, however, are only the unfoldings of In, which denotes, first, the transcendent, second, the immanent cause, i.e., expresses that Christ is the idea underlying all finite being, whence it follows that Christ is also the goal recapitulating all finite being." †) (Die luth. Dogm. Leipzig 1861. vol. I, p. 464. f.) "As.

*One sees from this that according to K. there is not a specific, but only a gradual difference between the begetting of the Son and the creation of the world from nothing. Kahnis' theology is just a variety of Arianism and Socinianism.

**The "through" does not always express the middle cause, but often also the principal, e.g. Gal. 1, 1, where it is said of Paul that he was called to the apostolate through Jesus Christ and God the Father, 1 Cor. 1, 9, the Corinthians were called by God to the fellowship of His Son, Rom. 6, 4, Christ was raised by the glory of the Father, and Ebr. 2, 10, through the Father are all things. "Incidentally," writes Gerhard, "not only are all things said to be made through the Son, but creation is also ascribed to Him in casus rectus Ps. 102, 26. Ebr. 1, 10. Prov. 8, 30. We appeal to the general saying Jn. 5, 19.: 'All things whatsoever the Father doeth, the same doeth (τάῦτα ὁμοίως) the Son.' Hence the Photinians' objection goes up in smoke that the particle 'through' denotes not the first, but the tool cause, which objection they borrowed from the ancient Arians." (*Exeges. loc. IV. § 56.*)

†) Dr. Dieckhoff rightly says: "In this way Dr. Kahnis imputes to the word of the apostle a philonic-pagan sense, which destroys both the true deity of the eternal Son and the true concept of creation". (Theol. Zeitschrift. Schwerin, 1862. p. 312.) Incidentally, it is not Christ who "underlies" "all finite being" as its idea, but the "*ideae singularum creaturarum in intellectu divino*" (of the entire highly holy Trinity) as Baier expresses it, and it is not Christ who is "the goal recapitulating all finite being," but the salvation of the world or the communication of the love of the Triune and its glorification. It is only shown here how the blasphemous doctrine of Kahnis, that Christ is a sub-god brought forth for the realization of the world, also destroys the doctrine of creation. After he, like all the modern Lutheran

As in the case of the story of creation, we have to assume also in the case of the story of the Fall that the sacred writers took an old sacred tradition as a form, in which they set down the faith consciousness of their people". (S. 245.)

Dr. v. Hofmann: "That it" (the Mosaic creation report) "stems from a special revelation, which was given to him, whose history book begins with it, has, however, the absence of any hint, which would betray this origin, against itself. ... What he reports about the creation is a tradition, not a view that arose at some time and was handed down from there, but a knowledge that goes back to the beginning of which it deals. That it does not want to go back further than to the first-created man, to be handed down from him, is then self-evident. So we take the creation report as it appears: for the expression of the knowledge we take it, which the first-created man had of what preceded his existence. But he could have such knowledge without needing a special revelation, if only the presence of the world was as clear and transparent to him as the biblical account leads us to believe. Similar to the natural scientist of our days, who understands the initial history of the earth from its present condition, the first created man will have understood the presence of the world, which he recognized in its relation to him just as purely, as directly, into a history, how this world became. If then in the narrator" (Moses), "who has distinguished this knowledge that came to him through tradition, by virtue of the effect of the divine spirit, which enabled him to understand prehistory in general in its salvific, spiritual and spiritual form, the story of the world will have become a story.

The same way, when the builders rejected the stone that had become the cornerstone, he does not leave one stone upon another in the whole construction. The theory supposedly built on the *particulæ diacriticae* ἐχ, &α, xx, is built on Mr. Kahnis' own fantasies, since the same are open to us only so far as the scripture in other places excludes the concrete content of the same to ourselves. (What else could an ingenious head put into them!) These particles are also used so differently in holy scripture in relation to the three persons that no doctrine can be built on them without drawing on sun-clear passages, while the interchange of them just irrefutably indicates the essential equality of the persons, xxx is, as we have already seen, not only used by the Son, but also by the Father; ἐχ not only by the Father (1 Cor. 8, 6.), but also from the Son (Joh. 16,15.), not only from the Son (Col. 1, 14. 16. 17. Ephes. 1, 3. 4.), but also from the Father (Jud. V. 1.), eic likewise not only from the Son (Col. 1, 16.), but also from the Father (Ephes. 1, 5. 1 Cor. 8, 6.) and Holy Spirit (Rom. 11, 36.), compare Ebr. 2,10. where it is said of the Father, "because of whom all things are", for Zc' obviously says the same thing, which εἰς δ".

The first thing is that the report of creation, which is to report "historical" (that is, not absolute) "truth," has again that view of the first-created; Thus this report of creation has a historical, that is, a salvation-historical value, however much it may have lost of its original value on the way from its origin to the form in which it is present, already in the mouth of the first-created, who fell from the immediacy of his existence, how much more through the language of late-born generations - a loss, by the way, that may be amply balanced by the gain that the knowledge of salvation brought to it." (Der Schriftbeweis. Erste Hälfte. Nördlingen. 1852. p. 231. f.) *) "The self-realization of the divine Rathschluss has taken a beginning . . . But we say, secondly, that this beginning of the self-realization of the divine will has as its prerequisite that the inner-divine relationship has entered into a historical self-fulfillment, and thus into inequality. **) In the passage (Gen. 1, 2.) the spirit of God, as outside of him, is thought to be active in the object of the divine creation. . . . And so God's spirit is still in God, as man's spirit is in man, but no less the one that is inherent in the created, namely in man, and God sends him to be and to work as the life of the world.

*Dr. v. H. refers for his theory to the fact that Moses in his creation report gives no hint of the fact that the same is based on revelation become to him; as if this would not understand itself with a prophet, but, where he does not mention this source expressly, the reported by him must be either handed down to him coming from other men or must be healthy from him himself by own speculation! Christ is different. When He, the Lord, quotes from the Scriptures, He declares the quotation to be God's unbreakable word or revelation, precisely because it is a quotation from the Scriptures. Joh. 10, 35. By the way, v. H. does not declare the Mosaic creation report itself to be absolutely true and reliable. The "cosmogony" (Kliefoth) of the "fallen" Adam is "already in the mouth" of Adam and even "much more" in that of "late-born generations" falsified, but through the "effect of the divine spirit" only so much of it is saved as is "necessary for the history of salvation", i.e. as men, like von H., can use for the basis of their system. By the way, also Luthardt says of the creation report: "The report does not come from vision (Kurtz), but from tradition, as also the related (!) traditions prove; and namely from tradition and original knowledge of the firstborn. (Compendium. 3rd ed. p. 95.) Delitzsch, on the other hand, derives the report "not from traditional view of the first-created, but from traditional positive revelation". (Bibl. Psychol- p. 39.) Which latter opinion, if here of a revelation is spoken in prophetic writing, would not contradict the analogy of the faith, although it is nothing but a human worthless hypothesis.

**In the "Lehrganzen", which is sent in front of the "Schriftbeweis", it is said: "It is the unequal Trinity, which has set the beginning of the historical realization of the eternal will of God with its first self-actuation. (S. 37.)

We say, therefore, according to the scriptures (!), that the creation-state has for its prerequisite a process, by virtue of which the inner-divine relationship is as well a historical as an eternal one, and carries out its eternal self-sameness in a historical inequality. It is now a relationship of God and his spirit, of the sender and the one who sends, of the supramundane and the one who accomplishes the will of the supramundane in the world, thus, as we have expressed it, of God, the supramundane creator, and God, the inworldly effective reason for life. ... The fact that it (the history that takes place between Jehovah and man) aims at the incarnation of the Son, in whom mankind as his congregation and thus the world in general is to attain transfiguration, is not sufficient merely to prove the scriptural validity of our statement, according to which the inner-divine relationship, especially of the Father and the Son, to set the beginning of things, has entered into a historical self-fulfillment, but also to prove that our designation of the inequality into which it has hereby entered, the inequality, namely, as God of the supramundane Creator and God of the archetypal world purpose" (the Son of God!), "may be regarded as scriptural. . . . One is used to teach that God created the world from nothing. With us it is said instead that God, by placing his relationship, which takes place in himself, in historical self-fulfillment, thus by placing the eternally equal in historical inequality, has set the beginning of the self-realization of his eternal will, whose object is the man of God, thus the beginning in general. Not that the beginning of the world would be one and the same with the becoming unequal of the inner-divine relationship, but it is the beginning of the self-actualization of that which has become unequal. . . . We have convinced ourselves of the scriptural validity of the following four statements: First, that the self-realization of the eternal will of God named in our first doctrine has taken a beginning; second, that this beginning is the precondition that God has entered into historicity with the eternal relationship that takes place within Himself, and that this relationship has thus become unequal in itself; third, that this inequality consists in the fact that it is now a relationship of God the supramundane Creator in God the inworldly effective reason for life to God the primordial world goal; finally, fourth, that God the supramundane Creator in God the inworldly effective reason for life has become the primordial world goal. Finally, fourthly, that it is the self-actualization of this relationship through which, without any other conditionality, that beginning of the self-realization of the eternal will of God has been set." (A. a. O. 231. 234-237. 241.) *)

*Regarding these and similar gnostic fantasies of v. Hofmann, Dr. Kliefoth remarks: "This is what v. H. knows to tell us about processes and metamorphoses of essence within the divine Trinity, which resulted in the creation of man and the world. God has not only executed his will in the creation by his word, but he has executed himself there; the Holy One.

J. H. Kurtz: "We take the codex of the holy revelation documents in hand, and meet immediately in the first line with the mysterious Tohu va Bohu, with that desolation, emptiness and darkness, in which the first look of the holy seer saw the earth, which should become the place of the light and the fullness of life by the six-day-work. . . . We have already in prehuman times an earth, and no less a history, which unfolded on it and in it. The prophet of the prehistory saw this earth as desert and emptiness. The chaotic state of desolation and desolation was preceded by a state of order, of light, of life, as it befits every work of God; and likewise a creative restitution followed in the work of six days, by which light was called forth from darkness, order and fullness of life from desolation and desolation, by which our present earth was founded.

Spirit has become in worldly, and indwells the world as its immanent reason of life; the *&εὸς πρὸς τὸν &εὸν* lives through in the creation of man.

In this way, the original goal of the world, which he is, is realized. In short, the deeds of the triune God for the creation and redemption of the world are transformed into processes of becoming of the divine being, of the Trinity itself, from which then, and indeed if it were so rightly, the conclusion is drawn that the equality in the Trinity has been lost with the fact that now the second and third person are subordinated to the first. But Scripture and the Church know nothing of these theogonic and cosmogonic speculations. The latter has always opposed such theories most decidedly, and that on the basis of the Scriptures. So much is certain in Genesis 1:2 and similar passages, that the Holy Spirit is involved in the creation and preservation of the world; but what he did and does in the process, like all divine activity, is done by his omnipotent word and speech; of an entrance of the spirit of God into the world, of an in-worldliness of the same, of his being in charge of the world phenomena, like a world soul, the Scriptures know nothing, so little that it is hard for Christian ears to hear. Furthermore, the Scriptures know that, as the world, so also man was created by the eternal Son of God, and the latter in God's image, that the same eternal Son of God became man in Jesus, and that through him mankind is redeemed and transfigured; but they tell of these as deeds of the eternal Son of God, and not as changes in his being; they know nothing of the eternal Son of God having accomplished himself historically in all of these. And so it knows nothing of an inequality that has become in the Holy Trinity. By the fact that the Holy Spirit, the Son was sent, they do not become unequal; they would only become unequal if the Holy Spirit would really become inworldly, if the eternal Son of God would really accomplish himself, which is not true. So also v. H. does not know to say that in the Scriptures something is taught about this process in God; he only thinks to be allowed to follow it as a prerequisite of the economic works of the Trinity. No one can prevent him from doing so, if he does not want to leave it; but whoever would like to follow him on this way, he should know that he has to choose here between v. H. and the church". (In any case, a choice without agony!) (Kirchliche Zeitschrift. Schwerin 1859. p 263-265.)

The devastation was a consequence of the fall of the angels. The devastation was a consequence of the fall of the angels, from which we further conclude that that primeval earth was the dwelling and training place of that part of the angels who rebelled against God and thus lost their principality and were forced to leave their dwelling. The restitution, on the other hand, was a result of the divine council, by which he does not allow his world plan to be disturbed, by which he raises a whole world of life, which had fallen into ruin, out of the floods of ruin, exiles the destroyer from it and places a new inhabitant and ruler, man, on it, from which we further conclude that man, placed in the place of Satan and his angels, was also called upon to carry out his omitted task, to restore the disturbed harmony of the universe, the broken connection of the whole, and to defeat and judge him himself, the destroyer and' outrageous one." (Bibel und Astronomie. Zweite Anst. Berlin, 1849. p. 94. 96.) *)

Dr. Philipp: "If we now ask in what special way the individual persons participated in these outward works of the one, whole and undivided Godhead, the nature of their participation in Creation will be revealed to us by an analogous conclusion from the nature of their participation in Redemption. Just as the redemption proceeded from the Father, who conceived the redemptive plan from eternity and sent the Son to realize it in time, and was mediated by the Son as the organ of the objective execution, and became powerful in us in the Holy Spirit as the potency of the subjective appropriation of the redemption: so we shall also have to say with respect to creation, that it is accomplished by the Father through the Son and in the Holy Spirit (hence the so-called *Particulae diacriticae* ἐξ, διὰ, ἰν), and in the form of preservation it continues to be accomplished. The Father is the ultimate reason and source of the Godhead, as well as of the creature, the Son is the one whose mediation the Father made use of at the creation, and the Holy Spirit is the one in whose power the Father, through the Son, accomplished the creation rath in that-

*Kurtz himself writes in a note: "The view defended here is already very old..... Also in later, newer and more recent times it is very widespread, and not only theosophists and theosophically tinged commentators, such as J. Boehme, St. Martin, J. M. Hahn, Fr. v. Meyer, Hamberger etc., are devoted to it, but also such prudent and sober men as Reiche! Stier, G. H. v. Schubert, Kniewel, Drechsler, Rudelbach, Guericke, J. P. Lange, Schmieder, Ebrard, M. Baumgarten, A. Wagner, Michelis, Wichart, Lebeau, F. W. Krug etc. have spoken out in favor of it." (p. 95.) The aforementioned were later joined by Dr. Delitzsch (S. System der bibl. Psychologie. Leipzig 1855. pp. 42-45.), also Vilmar (Dogm. Gütersloh 1874. I, 242. f.). The holy scripture, however, to be silent about other reasons, does not say that Satan was expelled from the earth, but thrown out of heaven.

material reality. We see here the effectiveness on all three rather equally distributed, even if the creation seems to be related to the father in original predominant way." (Kirchliche Glaubenslehre. Stuttgart 1857. II, 125. f.) *)

Dr. Delitzsch: "Therefore the holy scripture does not say that God created the world out of nothing (*ex nihilo*). . . . The world, far from being nothing before its creation, had an ideal existence in God, and its creation was a transfer from this ideal existence into a real one. . . All worldly being is born out of the being of God and is not so set apart from it that it does not remain conditioned, supported and enclosed by it." ** (Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche. Jahrg. 1876. p. 61. 65.)

(To be continued.)

Concerns and hints on how to resolve them.

A member of our synod has been presented with certain concerns about the "sentences on forbidden marriage degrees", which were communicated in the October 1873 issue of this journal for the purpose of resolving them. At the request of several pastors, both the concerns and the suggestions for resolving them are communicated herewith.

I. The concerns are as follows:

My reservations concern what was said in thesis VII and thesis IX. Especially the sentence that God, the Lord, according to His wisdom and supreme perfection, allows the same commandment to exist wherever the same cause is found. For 3 Mos. 18, 12, 15, 16. (prohibition of marriage with the father's sister, with the cord, with the brother's wife: in all three cases "of the flesh") there is one and the same cause, and 3 Mos. 20, 12, 19, and 21. nevertheless occurs for

*With such an alleged "mediation" by the Son, with such a "being involved" of the three persons and such a "rather equally distributed" of the effectiveness on them, the doctrine firmly founded in God's word, that the *opera ad extra indivisa finb, servato tamen ordine et discrimine personarum*, is lost, which doctrine the holy Dr. Philippi wants to hold on to.

**When Dr. D. denies that the world was created out of nothing, insofar as the nothing could not be the matter out of which God formed the world, and when he speaks of an "ideal existence" of the world before its creation, then this certainly suffers a good interpretation; but when he adds that all worldly being was "born" out of the being of God, then this is not only wrong and that is Gnosticism, but also makes the preceding assertions suspicious.

These three things are by no means the same ordinance of the commandment, but very different punishments. But as 3 Mos. 20, 21. for the marriage with the brother's wife only childlessness is set as a punishment - and this already marks it as a not real incest - so God has commanded such a marriage even for certain cases as a duty of love, 5 Mos. 25, 5. and the refusal of the fulfillment of this duty of love is punished with shame ("the house of the barefoot"). Although it is true what is said in "Lehre und Wehre" 1873 pag. 298 about the levirate marriage as the only means to achieve God's purpose, it must be concluded that this means itself cannot be unholy and unnatural. -

But since God Himself does not only permit but even commands exceptions even in the cases specifically mentioned, I cannot see where we get the right to declare even things not mentioned in the law as binding for the conscience, as such has been expressed as a principle in thesis VII and has been done in fact in thesis IX.

Furthermore, I cannot quite understand how it can be said, p. 299, that in certain cases true repentance is sufficient for the less guilty. If the matter is wrong, then one of the main parts of true repentance is that the wrong is avoided from now on. "Never do" is the best repentance, says Luther. But if the thing is to continue, what is the use of repentance? In this case, the logical consistency that prevails in the theses seems to be very precariously broken. - I would be very grateful if I received a clear answer to my unclear concerns, and at the same time a more detailed answer to the question of how God can so strictly forbid and yet command marriage to a brother's wife. The answer on p. 298 seems to me not at all sufficient. -

Still a second concern, namely in regard to Luther's judgment about the marriage with the deceased wife's sister.

I am aware of two direct judgments by Luther on this matter. 1. the brief objection to Leonhard Beier, "Lehre und Wehre" pag. 298, together with Jonas and Melanchthon, from 1535. 2. the detailed sermon on married life from 1522, Erlang. XX, 57. Walch X, 706, in which Luther deals *ex professo* with the 18 marriage impediments of the papists, and advises the consciences. In this writing, he clearly declares marriage with the deceased wife's sister to be permissible and generally rejects the jurists who count the members, while God counts the persons. (Is this not against thesis VII?) Erlang. XX, 63.

3) Did Luther declare the principles stated in that earlier writing to be false and retract them, or does the explanation lie in his writing "von Ehesachen" from 1530, Erlang. XXIII, 91 Walch X, 893, in which he again refers to the impediments to marriage in the appendix.

and seems to stick to his principles of 1522, but for the sake of the wild, coarse and savage people, who despise the gospel, to their courage abuses, advises to stay with the secular law (Erlang. XXIII, 148. ff.), which secular laws already forbid marriages in the second degree (and for example, I interpose, also marriage to the deceased wife's sister), but one should not let one's conscience be bound, but in case of need "confidently tear through the law, like a millstone through a spider's web, and act as if no law had ever been born. Erlang. XXIII, 153.

You will not misunderstand me as if there is any attack against Missouri or even against Luther in what I have written. I only wish to have clarity and certainty. -

11. Wave to resolve above concerns:

1. As often as God forbids a whole species, he forbids every species of it, except for the one concerning which God himself makes an exception. If, for example, God forbids the whole species of killing (XXX = human killing), then, according to Christ's interpretation, he forbids not only killing with the hand, but also with the mouth, the mind and the heart, not only the killing of the pious, but also of the godless, etc. The same is shown by the prohibition of adultery and the killing of my children. The same is shown by the Lord in the prohibition of adultery and perjury. This is also shown in the commandment of banishment (1 Sam. 15, 3. ff.), the prohibition of denial (Matth. 10, 33.), hierarchy (Matth. 20, 25. f.) and so on. There, too, every species is forbidden or commanded with the genus. On this principle of subsumption, according to which the particular is included in the general, rests the certainty of syllogism and all discursive thinking. If I have pronounced the general, then I have also already pronounced the particular *implicite* and *virtualiter*, hence the conclusion by means of the *minor* is so irrefutable, since the whole operation is nothing but the direct pronouncement of what was already pronounced indirectly. Without this principle there would be no indirect knowledge of truth, no dogmatic nor ethical development, no application to concrete cases. - From this it follows that if God forbids marriage with a person who is my flesh, that is, with a whole species of persons, every species of this species and every individual of this species is forbidden to me, unless the legislator himself makes an exception. *) The expression in "Lehre und Wehre" (Doctrine and Wehre): "Wherever there is a single cause, God allows the same commandment to exist", can, however, be understood in this way.

*From this it also follows that Lev. 18, 6. contains a general rule and that, as far as this reaches, not only the persons mentioned in Lev. 18. are to be counted, but also the degrees of relationship indicated with it.

as if every species of the forbidden kind must be of the same degree of sin and punishability; which is not the case. Every denial is forbidden; but Peter's denial out of fear of death, that is, out of weakness, was obviously a lesser sin than that of Judas Iscariot's denial of Christ out of greed for money. This is also indicated by the Scriptures themselves, in regard to the degrees that hinder marriage, with the causes that are sometimes added to the prohibition, e.g.: "For it is thy father's shame; for she is thy father's nearest blood friend; for she is thy cousin; for she is thy son's wife; for she is her (thy wife's) nearest blood friend." Lev. 18.

2. That God sometimes permits, even commands under certain circumstances, what he has generally forbidden to men is a fact. God generally forbids the killing of a human being, and yet commands it of the authorities under certain circumstances; God generally forbids stealing, and yet he commands what would have been stealing without God's commands to the Israelites. Thus Sabbath rest, usury, obedience to parents and authorities, etc. God's commandment is not abrogated by this permitting or commanding, for 1. God cannot contradict Himself, 2. God can indeed dispense with His commandments or prohibitions in a given case, but not man; for God is the Lord, man is His servant. From the fact that God commands levirate marriage under certain circumstances, it is therefore not to be concluded that it is permitted under other circumstances and that the prohibition of Lev. 18:16 is therefore not binding. No one may conclude from Exod. 11, 1. 2. that he can take the withheld wages from the employer by trickery or force. Here also applies: *exempla illustrant non probant*; or, as the Apology says: "*Exempla juxta regulam h. e. juxta scripturas certas et claras, non contra regulam sive scripturas interpretari convenit.*" (Article 13, p. 290.)

3. Not everything that God forbids contradicts in itself the holiness of God, because many things become sinful to the creature only by certain in itself not necessary and in this sense accidental relations, in which God has put him either originally, or in which he has come only later, or by God's inexplicable prohibition. To this belonged, for example, the eating of the tree of knowledge, good and evil, and beyond doubt all divine positive laws that do not lie in the law of nature. Therefore, it cannot be argued from the holiness of God: What is sin to us, God cannot allow in any case. Rather, the correct conclusion is that what God permits, or even commands under certain circumstances, cannot be sin in itself, but must have become sinful only through God's prohibition or through certain accidental circumstances.

4. Fleshly mixture of two persons who are already by nature One Flesh, i.e. all such persons who rise and fall in straight-

The fact that people who are related to each other by blood in the lineage (of course their spouses who are one flesh with them, including the parental relationship) is not a use of the marriage instituted by God, which consists in the becoming one flesh of such persons who were not one flesh before (Gen. 2, 24.), but the abomination of self-abuse or incest. Therefore God put death and a curse on it, Lev. 20, II. 12. Deut. 27, 20. 22. 23.

5. Since God arranged it in such a way that the first siblings had to marry each other, the human race, which was to be propagated in the order of marriage, should not soon cease to exist on earth again, preferably die out, and since God also dispensed with many other things, yes, Since God also otherwise dispensed in many cases, even commanded the marriage with the childless deceased brother's widow, these unions cannot in themselves contradict the holiness of God, not in themselves sin, not in themselves incest and an abomination, but in all such cases (*caeteris paribus*) real marriages must have been established thereby.

6. Many things should not be done which, if they have been done, do not necessarily have to be annulled, indeed, often may not be annulled, nor can they be, if the act was indeed illegitima, *non recta*, but *rata, valida*. A layman, for example, should not administer the sacraments without the most urgent need; if he does so, the sacramental act remains a valid one, if it was performed in *substantialibus* according to the institution, and may not be repeated if it was baptism. To seek to enter the office by crooked ways and to obtain it involves a great sin; but if a person has really entered the office in such a way through those who have power to do so, the office is nothing less *ratum, validum*, and the person so entered, if he is capable of it, has neither duty nor freedom to abandon the office in which he now stands. It is a great sin to marry without God "whom you will" (Gen. 6:2); but the marriage thus contracted, if everything else is right, may not be dissolved. This is not contrary to the saying, "Never to do is the best penance." The only thing against this saying would be if the layman wanted to baptize again except in an emergency, if the pastor wanted to get into office again by crooked means, if a widower wanted to marry again without God, or if he did not repent of his deed and sought mercy for it. It follows: If a union has been entered into in a forbidden degree, the question is whether a marriage has been realized by the union entered into or not. In the former case, it must not be separated as a sign of true repentance under all circumstances; in the latter case, upon God's wrath and disgrace, the abomination must cease. Thus Herod had to dismiss his still living brother's wife, Paltiel David's Michal (2 Sam. 3, 13. ff.) and that Corinthian his stepmother, for all of these were not in marriage with the persons mentioned, but lived in adultery, respective

in incest. (In which case, however, no marriage is dissolved, but a union, which lacked the essence of marriage, is declared to be a non-marriage, and that for an abomination, or for an incestuous abomination, for an incestuous "fornication" [1 Cor. 5:1] and must be annulled as such). In the other case, namely, if the union has been entered into in violation of a divine commandment, but nevertheless a marriage has been established, the same is not to be dissolved under all circumstances; namely, not if God imposes temporal punishments on the same, e.g. with childlessness (which presupposes the continuation of the marriage), but does not declare it to be a union worthy of death (which involves separation), thus not an abomination (as this really happens with regard to the marriage between siblings, including the step-sibling relationship, Lev. 20, 17. Deut. 27, 22.). However, marriages that do not fall into the category of abominations worthy of death may not be tolerated where they are either frowned upon as incestuous unions by the secular authorities, who can give laws that go beyond God's law, or where and when they are considered to be incestuous and would therefore be the subject of constant grave annoyance. For example, a marriage between a brother-in-law and sister-in-law was to be dissolved and the copulator punished. *Opp. Hal.* XXII, 1758. f. Erlanger Vol. LXI, 245. f., compare *Opp. Hal.* X, 834. f. - For more on dissolution and non-dissolution of unions entered into against God's order and on the concept of incest, see American Lutheran Pastoral Theology pp. 256-261.

7. Finally, as far as Luther is concerned, he obviously did not have any clarity at first with regard to the doctrine of the degrees of relationship that prevent marriage, which he only reached later. As far as the marriage with the wife's sister is concerned, it is not only clear from the letter to Leonhard Beier (where he describes this marriage as "forbidden by nature" in 1535) and from the cited Consistorial Decree that he later rejected it; he even speaks of a "revocation" on his part in this regard: "How?" he writes to Johann Hess in Breslau, "are there not enough women in your country who are still virgins, that one has to be so close to free, in another and even closer degree? than the sister daughter and two sisters one after the other. Yes, Luther has let a note go out that such a degree is true; but may one not, on the other hand, also look at other following books, since such has been corrected or, if one wants to say it, renovated?" (Walch has instead of "Grad ziemen" - "degree, line" etc., and instead of "renovirt" - "revociret". XXI, 1570. The text given here is that in de Wette's "Luthers Briefe, Sendschreiben etc.. Berlin 1828" V, 606. f. of December 10, 1543).

W.

Clear proof that Rom. 7, 14-25. is only about the one who is born again, which St. Paul represents as in his person.

Arminians" and pietists have always interpreted this passage as dealing with the state of the unborn. That this is not so, however, but that it deals with the state of the one who has been reborn, will emerge irrefutably from the interpretation itself, to the comfort of the true believers of weaker knowledge and to the salutary shame of the work saints who can be healed.

Verse 14: "For we know that the law is spiritual. But I am carnal, sold under sin."

With the "for" the apostle refers back to v. 12 and 13, where he proves that the holy, right and good law of God or the holy ten commandments have the effect on the sinner to make him feel in his conscience his disobedience against the will of God expressed in the law, even his carnal mind, his hatred and enmity against God and therefore his curse-worthiness and damnability before God. Cf. 7:7-11.

Where this effect comes from is explained by St. Paul when he says: "For we know that the law is spiritual, but I am carnal, sold under sin. In this he means to say, That effect of the law upon the sinner cannot be otherwise, because there is a decided contradiction between the law of God and its sacred demand, and man, as I and all others are by nature; "for the law is spiritual" both according to its origin and its nature; for it has God Himself for its author, wherefore it is also verse 12. "It is the eternal, immutable and unchangeable rule and guideline of God's will, which demands with unrelenting, inexorable severity and under threat of His wrath and curse and eternal damnation, that man should be perfectly holy and righteous in himself and that he should prove himself accordingly in all his desires and thoughts, words and works. In sum, he demands from every human being the divine image that he created in our first parents; he demands that every human being be a perfect living fulfillment of the law in the love of God and neighbor, that not even the smallest deviation from this guideline, not the slightest inner impulse, e.g. of unbelief or evil desire, be present at any moment.

"But I" - and by this the apostle understands himself and every individual human being, according to his natural constitution - "am carnal.

sold under sin", i. e. the basic corruption of original sin, this poisonous plague, this innate unbelief, disobedience and evil desire pervades me in soul and body, completely, through and through, so that all my desires and thoughts, words and deeds, all my actions and omissions are vain sin; Yes, like a slave under the will of his master, so I am "sold" under sin, only with the difference that while the latter only submits to the will of his master with compulsion and unwillingness, I steadily consent when I, e.g., give up my inherited bodily desires. For example, if I am tempted and lured by my inherited evil desire to do against God's will and to fall into real sins inwardly or outwardly at the same time. Summa, as I am by nature, instead of the divine image, I only wear the devil's shell; I am constantly a living transgression of the law.

But when the apostle says in verse 14, "We know," etc., he says this of himself and others, provided they are born again or believers in Christ and have the Holy Spirit; for the natural, unregenerate man, no matter how respectable, righteous and religious he may appear to men's eyes, has no understanding either of the spiritual nature of the divine law or of the original sinfulness of human nature. Rather, he is under the delusion that he has kept the law of God when he outwardly refrains from doing what is forbidden and does what is commanded; for he does not realize that both are worthless before God, are vain hypocrisy, and are criminal and damnable; for his refraining is done only out of fear of punishment and without all true fear of the true God, without abhorrence of sin, even while the evil desire to transgress is present. Likewise, he does not realize that his outward observance of the commanded is done only out of a desire for reward and without true love of God. By both, however, he proves his ignorance and blindness about the spiritual nature of the divine law and the original sinful nature of the natural or unregenerate man. Only the born-again or believer in Christ is freed from this ignorance by the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit from His Word and has come to the right knowledge of this; and the longer the more he recognizes that by nature there is an unfathomable abyss of satanic wickedness in his heart.

This factual condition, that also the born-again, according to his natural inherited sinful nature, is sold under sin, is now proven in verse 15. The Christian is suddenly and unawares overtaken and seized by the naughtiness and wickedness of the flesh, so that even if it does not always break out in words and deeds, it nevertheless inwardly manifests itself in desires and thoughts, and also in various sinful unwillingness, e.g. to pray, to hear, to read the divine word, to read the divine word. This is why the flesh is not always seized by words and deeds, but it shows itself inwardly in desires and thoughts, and also in various sinful unwillingness to pray, listen to and read the divine word, for example,

According to the old man, he really does what he hates with all his heart according to the new man.

This includes, for example, sudden doubts about God's providence, grumbling and impatience under the cross, disgust and displeasure with God's word, feelings of despondency or presumption, unwillingness to do one's job, revenge for insults received, gloating over the misfortunes of one's enemies, and all the rest of this nastiness. All this the believer, as such, hates from the bottom of his heart; and yet he cannot deny the fact of such processes, to prove that he is carnal by nature and sold under sin.

But since he, according to his ruling mind, does not want this doing, he gives his consent to the judgment of the divine law, which condemns this doing, what the apostle expresses in verse 16. in the words: "But if I do that which I do not want, I consent that the law be good."

This verse also makes it clear that the apostle in his train of thought from verses 14-25. is about the condition and habitus of the born-again; for the unregenerate hates the demand of the divine law, insofar as he leaves room for the innate evil will when it strikes his conscience and exposes to him his God-opposing lawless nature; and he heartily desires, since the law at the same time pronounces God's wrath and judgment against sinners, that neither a law nor a lawgiver exists and that he may live undisturbed and unpunished according to his will, which, however, by nature wants only what God does not want and does not want what God wants. Only the true believer or born-again gives God's law, as in its demand, so also in its curse, right and loves it, even if it punishes his sins.

Accordingly, the apostle continues in v. 17: "So I do not do the same (namely, the unlawful, hostile to God), but the sin that dwells in me"; i.e.: If I agree with the law that it is good, then I do not do evil according to the will of the new man, according to my actual self. Rather, it is the original sinful corruption that constantly clings to me in this life and holds me captive as a power foreign to me according to the new man (compare verse 14), which breaks out in all kinds of real sin.

But since St. Paul here, according to the new man as his actual self, puts himself in opposition to sin, it also follows that here only the born-again is spoken of; for the unborn or unbeliever loves and wants sin. He delights, for example, in blaspheming God as unjust if he does not immediately punish the obviously ungodly and, moreover, outwardly shows them all kinds of good deeds; he pursues thoughts of revenge with pleasure, even if circumstances and considerations prevent him from carrying them out against his real or supposed offender; he broods with inward comfort and pleasure.

over all kinds of plans of profit or pleasure, even if he is not yet able to carry them out. Summa, his whole heart and will, his real I is absorbed in all this sinful being and no opposition and contradiction is present in him, because he has no spiritual being at all, no new man. It is just the pride of reason and virtue when the unbelievers, be they pagans, Jews, Mohamedans or baptized so-called Christians, avoid the gross outbursts of sin, but not the fear and love of God, which only the believer in Christ can have and the dominion of the spirit over the flesh, of the new man over the old. And even if reason prevails over sensuality - according to modern usage - back and forth in the unbeliever, it is only so that, as it were, only the white devil casts out the black one and self-righteousness and sanctimoniousness are strengthened all the more.

Now St. Paul substantiates the truth of verse 17 in verse 18 by continuing: "For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing; though I will, yet accomplish I none."

By flesh here, as well as in other places where it is compared to the spirit, such as Joh. 3, 6. and Gal. 5, 17., is not understood the human nature in itself, according to soul and body, such as Joh. 1, 14. but the nature, according to soul and body, corrupted by original sin, as we come from our mother's womb and as children of unbelief are also children of wrath. Now the apostle, considering himself to be in this state, testifies that there is nothing good in it, not even the slightest stirring of the true love of God and neighbor; and he finally expresses this even more strikingly in verse 25, where he says: "he serves the law of sin with the flesh."

But when he says: "I can will, but I cannot do the good," he sees himself in the state of the born-again, who, as such, wills only the good, i.e. the will of God in His laws, but is always hindered and interrupted in the constant accomplishment of this will by the naughtiness and wickedness of his flesh, so that this will does not become a perfectly pure deed, as God demands it in His law with unbreakable, unrelenting severity.

The parallel passage Gal. 5, 17 belongs to this, where the apostle finally says that through the mutual opposition of the flesh and the spirit, the will of neither the one nor the other comes to full fruition, even though the spirit has dominion over the flesh, otherwise man would fall from grace and faith and would lose his rebirth and would again come under the dominion of sin and the devil.

Also from verse 18. it can be clearly seen that and how St. Paul in the present passage only speaks of the state of the born again or

For in the unborn there is no desire for good at all; for as evil by nature and a born sinner he cannot desire what God desires and therefore commands in his law, and can desire nothing but what God does not desire and therefore forbids in his law. He cannot fear, love and trust God above all things, and therefore he cannot do otherwise than transgress and refrain from all other commandments. According to Romans 8:7, he is carnally minded and an enemy of God, because he is not subject to the law of God, nor is he able to be.

The apostle further testifies how his wanting good does not become accomplishing it, when, explaining verse 18, he continues in verse 19: "For the good that I want I do not do, but the evil that I do not want I do." This is a factual repetition of verse 15 and a new affirmation of verse 14, that he is carnal by nature and sold under sin. So he wants to say in verse 19. in connection with verse 18. say: If I, according to the impulse of the Holy Spirit and according to the new man, want the good according to the law of God, then immediately, according to the impulse of the corrupt nature, the evil, the unlawful, comes in between and attacks me, as it were, like an armed man or like a robber from ambush, so that I do it instead of the good, which I, according to the new man, originally wanted; and even if this evil does not predominantly break out in words and works, it nevertheless happens inwardly, as Luther says in his marginal gloss: "To do here is not to accomplish the work, but to feel the lusts stirring; but to accomplish is to live without lust; this does not happen in this life."

This truth in verse 19 is confirmed by the inner experience of the believer. He wants, for example, to pray the holy Our Father, either alone in the closet or aloud with his companions; but no sooner has he begun than all kinds of strange thoughts, which spring from worry or the lust of the world or elsewhere, run through his head, *) or he does not pay attention to the meaning of this and that petition and utters it thoughtlessly and without devotion. And even if he is able to suppress this evil by the will of the new man, it has nevertheless been there and has hindered and interrupted the accomplishment of the good. Another example. The Christian man is given the opportunity to work for the preservation or expansion of the church or otherwise to exercise his faith through love in a good work. According to the new man, he is immediately ready to be a quick, cheerful and, depending on his circumstances, abundant giver; but immediately the selfish, stingy, worldly-minded, lazy old man comes forward in him and tries his best,

*It is different with the fiery arrows of blasphemous impulses, thoughts, works, images, etc., which the devil sometimes suddenly shoots into the heart of the worshipper.

Sometimes, even under pious pretenses and as a householder-minded prankster, the gift and benefit either does not take place at all, or is diminished, or is postponed as long as possible. Indeed, without Christ's vicarious and sufficient fulfillment of the law and endurance of punishment, which the born-again person also holds fast in faith in his good works, he would still lead to hell with all his praying and giving, since none of his good works is a perfect fulfillment of the law that God demands.

The apostle continues in verse 20: "If I do what I do not want to do, I do not do it, but the sin that dwells in me. In these words he confirms and reaffirms verse 17 and again expressly and emphatically testifies that his real self, precisely according to the will of the new man, has nothing to do with this doing, but that the sin that always clings to and dwells in him does evil against this will of his.

Now St. Paul elaborates on this truth in the following words, verses 21-23, and traces the inner process, writing: "I therefore find a law, which I will do that which is good, and that which is evil: for I delight in the law of God, according to the inward man. But I see another law in my members, which opposeth the law in my mind, and taketh me captive to the law of sin, which is in my members."

When the apostle begins verse 21: "So I find a law," the expression "find" does not mean that he had previously searched for it, but "I find" here means just as much as: I experience, perceive, perceive, which later St. Paul verse 23 says: "but I see another law in my members"; for it is Hebrew idiom to also deal with inner perceptions in the soul under the expression of sensual seeing.

But what kind of law is this, of which the apostle writes here and which he calls verse 23 "a law in its members, even the law of sin"? This is the inconceivable and unspeakable basic corruption of original sin, this poisonous plague that permeates all the powers of the soul and all the members of the body in every human being as he comes from his mother's womb. This is an inherently evil nature, which is the exact opposite and antithesis of the divine image that God had created for our first parents, but which was lost with and in their fall for all of us who are descended from them. For instead of childlike faith and obedience to God, instead of the holy fear and love of God, unbelief and disobedience, servile fear, hatred and enmity against God now reign in the hearts of all of us by nature; instead of the true knowledge of God according to His nature and will, ignorance and blindness now reign in the minds of all of us in all spiritual and divine matters.

Instead of the unity of our will with God's will, there is now a will in all of us that is at odds with God's will, unruly and wrong, so that we want what God does not want in His commandments and do not want what God wants in His law and demands of us.

And this inherent evil nature, this fundamentally corrupt condition, clings to the born-again until his last breath, and he would be as old as Methuselah, which is exactly what the apostle wants to say with verse 22: "So now I find a law, who will do good, that evil may cling to me."

The apostle elaborates on this in verses 22 and 23 by saying: "For (as the one who desires good) I delight in God's law according to the inward man. By this he means: As far as I am born again or a new creature (for the inward man and the new man are essentially the same), I not only agree with the law of God, according to verse 16, but it is my heart's joy and desire; for the "thou shalt" of the law is now my innermost desire, and the love of God and of my neighbor, as the fulfillment of the law, now lives in me through the grace and the impulse of the Holy Spirit dwelling in me.

But he continues, "But I see another law in my members, which is contrary to the law in my mind, and takes me captive to the law of sin which is in my members."

As far as the law in the members is concerned, this is nothing else than the inherited sin, which permeates and corrupts the heart, mind and will, as well as all members of the body, and manifests itself in many ways in the real sins in desires and thoughts, words and works. This law, which St. Paul explicitly calls the "law of sin", contradicts the "law in his mind", namely the law of God given into his heart as a born-again person, together with the desire and power to keep it through love, and the impulse of the Holy Spirit, who has his dwelling place and workshop in the born-again person (compare Ezk. 36, 26, 27.). And indeed, if this opposition (Gal. 5:17) were not always present in the believer, he would already be a living personal fulfillment of the law in this life through the perfect love of God and his neighbor. But how far away from this the born-again person is in this life, the apostle testifies in the closing words of verse 23 - and the inner experience of every true believer confirms it - when he says that he is held by this law as in a prison and by nature, just according to verse 14, "sold under sin" like a slave.

Luther writes about this in the preface to the Epistle to the Romans: "He (namely St. Paul) calls both the spirit and the flesh one law, because just as the divine law drives and demands, so the flesh also drives and demands and rages against the spirit.

and wants to have his pleasure. This strife continues in us as long as we live, in some more, in others less, after which the spirit or flesh becomes stronger. And yet the whole man himself is both spirit and flesh, contending with himself until he becomes wholly spiritual."

Also from this fight and conflict between spirit and flesh, or the new and old man in the same man, it is clear and obvious that it can only take place in a true Christian, in a true believer or born again and that also in these words verses 21-23. there can be no talk of the unborn or the natural man. For in this there is no faith, no spirit, no new man at all, but the unrestricted dominion of nature or flesh, which is corrupt according to soul and body. It is true that in some of these people there is also a kind of struggle between reason and sensuality, as is often expressed. But in the light of the divine word, this is only a struggle between the finer and the coarser flesh; For it is not true faith in Christ, the Holy Spirit, the fear and love of God, which keeps many an unborn person from manifest vices and gross outbursts of sin, and moves him to civic righteousness and worldly respectability, but it is nothing but the pride of reason and virtue, self-righteousness and sanctimoniousness, at the same time not without servile fear of death and hell, which works such things; Therefore, this outwardly moral behavior of respectable worldly people, insofar as it strives against God's grace and Christ's merit within Christianity, is doubly sinful, reprehensible, cursable and condemnable before God. It is, as Luther says back and forth and already mentioned above, the white devil that casts out the black one, but takes possession of the soul all the more tenaciously and persistently.

This constant strife of the flesh against the Spirit, yes, this being sold to sin, this being a prisoner of sin, presses the dear apostle, as every true Christian, much harder than all the enmity of the world, all the sickness of the body, all the loss of his possessions, along with all other accidents and heartaches, yes, even than all the wickedness of Satan, and forces out of him the cry of lamentation and help, verse 24: "I wretched man, who will deliver me from the body of this death?"

Luther says in his marginal gloss: "Death he calls here the sorrow and the trouble in the fight against sin, as Ex. 10, 17. Pharaoh says: Take this death (that were the locusts) from me."

Therefore, the words "body of this death" are not only to be understood as the body subjected to death through sin, but as the whole of the basic corruption of original sin that constantly clings to and permeates him according to soul and body, in which he is caught and under which he is sold and which constantly breaks out in all kinds of real sins and which is more bitter and more burdensome to him than death itself.

St. Paul himself answers his cry of lamentation and help with the words: "I give thanks to God through Jesus Christ, my Lord". In this he gives glory to God that Christ not only redeemed him from the guilt and punishment of sin, from the dominion of spiritual, physical and eternal death and from the tyranny of the devil, acquired forgiveness of sin, life and blessedness for him and gave them to him through faith, but has also earned and procured for him the final and complete redemption from the naughtiness and wickedness of the flesh, and has also communicated this to each and every one of those who persevere in the faith, according to the soul, when it leaves the body of death and is carried by the angels into the heavenly paradise, into the kingdom of glory, for the beholding of God; to the body, when it will be resurrected in transfiguration and glory at the call of the Prince of Life on the last day.

The apostle then concludes with the words: "So then I serve the law of God with my mind, but the law of sin with my flesh"; that is: In this life it cannot be otherwise than this: As far as I am born again and renewed, so I serve the law of God in faith and love; but as far as the inherited sinful nature still clings to me, so I serve this law of sin, even if, by virtue of the lust of the spirit against the flesh, I neither inwardly consent to the activity and stimulation of the flesh, nor outwardly let it break out in words and deeds.

New Literature.

I.

Bibliotheca Lutherana; a complete List of the Publications of all the Lutheran Ministers in the United States. By John G. Morris. Philadelphia 1876.

This booklet contains, as the title indicates, a catalog of those preachers and members of the "Lutheran" Church of America who have been literary active in some field and in some way, along with the titles of their literary products. Attached is a specific list of the relevant periodical literature in chronological order, while the former list is arranged alphabetically. The compiler states on the title page: "*Si ecclesiae est utilis, compensatus est labor*", and we do not doubt that this certainly laborious work will not be without benefit for the church. It is a pity that the German in it is distorted by very frequent printing errors, even in the names, e.g. Baumstork, Dumling, Foklinger, G. Fritsche, Hennicken, König, Körner, Köstering, Müller, Röbbelen, Volkering; also the first names are not seldom incorrect. The true benefit literary

However, the quality of historical works depends to a large extent on the correct indication of the authors' names. We do not want to make a big deal of such printing errors as: Cherry leaf (Iowaer). Sometimes a writing is not attributed to the real author; e.g. the "Shepherd's Voice from the Confessional Vespers" to Pastor Brauer. It was necessary that each number contained the title completely (above all with indication of the year in which it was published) and, if at all possible, the extent of the writing was indicated according to the number of pages, which unfortunately often did not happen. Misleading in the judgment about the productivity of the so-called Lutheran church here is the inclusion of such writings, which the authors had already published before their entry into the same. Finally, the work of Dr. Morris would be even more meritorious if it had been possible for him to make a diplomatically accurate record, especially of the earlier American Lutheran literature. Even the following famous writing is incorrectly cited in the list: *Grondlyke Onderricht van sekere voornamste Hoofdstuecken der waren, loutern, saligmakenden, Chrystelyken Leere, gegrondet op den Grondt van de Apostelen en Propheten, daer Jesus Christus de Hoeksteen is. Angewesen in eenvoudige, dog stigtlyke Vragen en Antwoor den door Justus Falckner, Sax-Germanus, Minister der Christelyken Protestansen genaemten Lutherschen Gemeente te Nieuw-York en Albanien etc.. Gedrukt te Nieuw-York by W. Bradfort, 1708 in 8.* V. E. Löscher praises this writing highly, and he calls it, after giving a detailed excerpt from it, a "*Compendium doctrinae Anti-Calvinianum*". (S. Unschuldige Nachrichten, Jahrg. 1726. p. 411-417.) Falckner, otherwise still known by his wonderful revival song: "Auf, ihr Christen, Christi Glieder", *) was a native of Zwickau and may have died around the year 1723, since in that year Wilhelm Christoph Berckenmeyer from Bodenteich in Lüneburg received an appointment as Falckner's successor in office from New York, which office he also finally took on September 22, 1725. The complete title of a writing of this Berckenmeyer is: *Getrouwe Herder-en Wachter- Stern aan de Hoog-en Neder Duitsche Lutheriaanen in dese Gewesten, eenstemmig te zyn, vertoont met twee Brieven en andere Redenen Lutherscher Theologanten; aangaande't Van Dierensche Beroep en de Henkelsche Bevestiging. Te Nieu York, by J. Peter Zenger, A. C. 1728.* **) It is a voluminous work in quarto format, 23 sheets thick. Also from this work Löscher gives an extensive excerpt, which, if

*) Included in the appendix to the St. Louis "Prayer Treasure" p. 39.

**) This is: Faithful Shepherd and Guardian Voice to the High and Low German Lutherans in these regions, to be unanimous, shown with two letters and other reasons of Lutheran theologians, concerning the profession of van Dieren and the Henkelian ordination.

(See also O. Jahrg. 1731, pp. 72-10.) We do not mention the above to disparage Dr. Morris's work, which he did with love. (S. a. a. O. Jahrg. 1731. p. 72-105.) We do not mention the foregoing to disparage Dr. Morris' labor of love, but rather to encourage him to present us, if possible, with an even more complete American Lutheran literary history in a second edition of his work, which could not only serve the historical interest well, but also, by God's grace, bring great blessings to the church of the present. W.

II.

Church directory for congregations of the Lutheran Church. By G. u. Wenner, pastor of Christ Church in New York. New York, 1875.

This booklet consists of two parts. The first part contains on 28 pages an Agende, which is intended to be given into the hands of the parishioners, among other things for the purpose that the parish may be able to hold a liturgical service even in the absence of the preacher. The second part contains on 150 pages the songs adopted by the Eisenach Conference with the melody set over them, which are mostly given according to their original tones and rhythms. The changes that occur here may not have been chosen very happily. Both parts are such that a Calvinist can use the book without hesitation, if he does not take offense at the title "for congregations of the Lutheran Church", as well as at the (most gratifying) recommendation of the Altenburger Bibelwerkes found in the preface. Incidentally, it is a remarkable testimony to the turnaround that even the General Synod, to which Pastor Wenner belongs, has experienced in recent years, that one begins to feel the bleakness of the Puritan cult and to gain a taste for the liturgical forms of worship of the old Lutheran church, which until a few years ago was branded as a dead formalism of the confessional Lutherans. The layout of the book is tasteful. W.

Ecclesiastical Contemporary History.

I. America.

The manners in American pulpits are described by the "Happy Ambassador" as follows: "One stands in the pulpit or on the altar with one hand in his trouser pocket and with the other hand he lays the truth on the people's hearts. Another fences with both hands, so that it is dangerous to sit with him in the pulpit. Another stands there with a clenched fist, as if there should now be straight blue eyes. Another beats in and on the Bible, so that it cracks, and also probably

the leaves are knocked loose. But this is then a right preacher, who preaches in the "power". Another beats the pulpit with the knuckles of his hand like card players on the card table. Another puts both hands behind his back and says his sermon to the people in a leisurely manner. Another reaches into his coat pocket a few dozen times and takes out a cloth to wipe his sweat or tears and just as often puts it back into his pocket. And oh, the beautiful beard is stroked so often during the sermon, and nowadays there are so many moustaches that need to be twirled as well. Another plays with the tail of his skirt with his hand behind him. Another 'stands as if spellbound, stiffly on the pulpit and hardly moves, like a statue. Another leaps about violently, stamping his foot so that the platform shakes. Another almost screams his lungs out, as if speaking to deaf ears. Some have the unseemly habit of telling all kinds of ridiculous stories in such a droll way that people laugh, and others slam the Bible shut at the end of the sermon in such a way that it seems they are quite angry with the dear book.

Judaism. An important insight into the sad decline of Orthodox Judaism is provided by the following remarkable information, which came to light during the proceedings of the Rubinstein murder trial. An Israelite correspondent of a local political journal writes the following: A few weeks ago Rubinstein concluded an agreement with a poor fellow believer, according to which the latter, against payment of \$45.00, undertook to take upon himself all the sins that Rubinstein had committed since the last Day of Atonement and to atone for them in the other world. The contract was written down in Hebrew, signed by both opponents and some witnesses and sealed. When the sinner returned home and informed his wife of what had happened, she was almost beside herself with fright and horror and made her husband return to Rubinstein and give him back the money and cancel the contract. Rubinstein refused and was then cited by the other before a rabbinical tribunal which met at No. 69 Ludlow Street and was presided over by Chief Rabbi Abraham Joseph Asch of No. 11 Suffolk Street. The decision was against Rubinstein for the following reasons: "1. there are sins for which not only the transgressor of the commandments or the person who assumes the sins has to suffer, but also his wife and children, which is why the wife, although it is not proven that Rubinstein is guilty of such sins, is entitled as an interested party to forbid the contract if she has not been consulted beforehand. There is a Talmudic law that forbids a Jew to overcharge another Jew by more than one-sixth of the amount involved in a transaction. It is not clear what Rubinstein's sins were, and the question of whether he was not in the other party's favor by more than one-sixth of \$45.00 could not be decided. The contract can therefore not be upheld." Rubinstein appealed against this decision to the "Beth Hamidrash" in Bayard Street and there the matter was settled by compromise, according to which the transferee was allowed to keep the money, but had to make a commitment to recite a certain number of psalms and prayers for Rubinstein every day for the duration of a year. The story was published in a Jewish newspaper in November.

(Herald.)

Pearsall Smith. Regarding him, the "Sendbote" writes the following: "For some time now, dark hints have been made about the perfectionist R. Pearsall Smith, which filled us with sadness and concern. We could

We did not believe them because they were too vague and especially spread by his opponents. We did not want to believe them because we sincerely wish that what was biblical and of God in Smith's work may remain and be established in the hearts of believers. For various reasons, however, we can no longer withhold from our readers the correct facts. Among the various accounts of the matter, perhaps Theodore Monod, a friend of Smith and his Holiness meetings, gives the best description. He says something like the following: 1) Smith had already accepted very dangerous teachings from one of his compatriots for a long time and had partly presented them in private without his closer friends knowing anything about it. What these teachings are is not known in detail; it is sufficient that they touched sensuality with a purely spiritual intention and attitude. Smith himself now speaks with the deepest bow about the fact that he did not immediately recognize the danger of these teachings. 2) After the meetings in Brighton, Smith should have taken a rest, but he did not do so, but threw himself into new activities, prepared new meetings, but gradually became so agitated that his friends could only watch him with concern. From some things it was clear that he was no longer sane in all his actions. Under these circumstances, he once behaved in a religious conversation with a lady in a rather conspicuous manner, so that she felt it was her duty to inform others. He was advised not to come out in public anymore, and he followed the advice with a willingness that one has to respect. - A sad end of a perfectionist!

At the meeting held by the American branch of the Evangelical Alliance in Pittsburg last fall, a Presbyterian, Dr. S. M. Hopkins, professor at Auburn Seminary, read a paper in which he defended the doctrine that the celebration of Sunday is not commanded by God, citing, among other things, testimonies of Luther in support of this doctrine. Since now not only in the Presbyterian, but also in the other American church communities the false doctrine is firmly held that Sunday is instituted by God, one can imagine that in consequence of this lecture, especially in Presbyterian circles, not a small movement has arisen. But the reader will be surprised to hear that one who calls himself a Lutheran, vr. Valentine, president of Pennsylvania College at Gettysburg, has been in the meeting, and that the latter has not only not sided with Dr. Hopkins, but has even stood up against him and sought to defend that Sunday is of divine appointment. Yes, the "*Lutheran Observer*" calls the testimony of Dr. Hopkins an *assault* on the Christian Sabbath, and not only declares itself that the Augsburg Confession, if rightly understood, teaches the divine institution of Sunday, but also takes up an article from a Presbyterian paper in which the same is to be proved. - Who does not think of the word of the Lord: The first will be last and the last first.

G.

The Missourians in India. Under this heading the *American Lutheran* writes: "It seems that the Missourians want to try to conquer the world. Recently we read that they have sent a missionary to Germany, the land of Luther and the Reformation, and now we read in the Church Newspaper that five missionaries in India have declared for Missouri. What will our (the General Synod) poor missionaries do when they meet these Missourians? I think the best way for us to show our bravery is for all of us to surrender.

II. Abroad.

The declaration of the five missionaries in the East Indies, which was published in the "Lutheran", has, as we have learned through private letters from Germany, caused a great stir in the circles concerned against the authors and us Missourians; in the public papers, however, one seems to want to keep the unpleasant "declaration" silent. Only a few have taken notice of it. The Leipziger Ev.-Luth. Missionsblatt writes about it under the heading "Verwahrung" (safekeeping) in the number of January 15 as follows: "Five of our missionaries in the East Indies have turned directly to Mr. Pastor Brunn in Steeden and asked him to publish a declaration, of which they have only sent a copy to us. Father Brunn was obviously pleased to comply with their request and hastily published a tract entitled: The Bitter Enmity of Luthard's so-called General Lutheran Church Newspaper against the Confessional Faithfulness of the Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio and other North American States. Mannhafte Erklärung von fünf Missionaren der Leipziger Mission in Ostindien etc. Zwickau, 1876.' About the statement itself, as far as it is directed against said church newspaper, our paper can remain silent, since neither the editorial staff of the latter nor our mission as such is responsible for statements of other papers, namely also not for any articles of the General Evangelical Lutheran Church Newspaper. As for the rest, we have to deal first of all with the missionaries concerned with regard to the declaration itself, and may omit all further remarks about it for the time being. But the preface of Pastor Brunn uses this opportunity to publicly attack our mission by clearly stating that the declaration he publishes is also a testimony against the 'state of the Leipzig mission, which goes hand in hand with the national church, as is shown not only by the composition of all its bearers and participants, but also its entire leadership', and in that he apparently for this reason accuses our mission of 'tolerating false doctrine and fellowship with it' and throws it together with those whom he accuses of sharing 'all the confusion of faith and the indifferentism of our time, which peacefully coexists with the greatest errors and heresies'. We cannot remain silent about this completely misleading presentation. We are bound neither to a national church nor to a free church, but stand solely and completely on the confession of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and accordingly reject neither national church nor free church as such, but only insofar as the latter and the former reject our good confession. Our missionary college is not affiliated with any national church and has already proven that it is willing to be supplemented by free churches. The Missouri Synod itself has actually participated in our mission until recent times. Such is the state of our mission, and we must resolutely defend ourselves against the attacks of Pastor Brunn as against unjust and untrue accusations." - So much for the missionary bulletin. Although we cannot see how the Leipzig Mission Society can defend itself against the accusation of "tolerating false doctrine and fellowship with it" when we look at its organization, it is nevertheless gratifying to us that it feels it must defend itself against it. God help her to do so. - In the "Hannoversche Pastoral-Correspondenz" of January 29, we read the following: "For Missouri, five missionaries of the Leipzig Mission in the East Indies (Schaeffer, Zucker, Zorn, Grubert, Willkomm) have raised their voices against 'the bitter hostility of Luthard's so-called General Lutheran Church Newspaper' in a 'manly declaration' published by Joh. Hermann in Zwickau and available through J. Naumann in Dresden. They accuse the 'Wochenschaue' (No. 35 of the aforementioned journal, year 1875) of having put Lutheranism on its banner.

and warns against Missouri, which must be accused of Pharisaism, the theology of the "Staare" and be called the disturber of the peace. So far, the missionaries have remained silent about this; now they claim that they can no longer remain silent and pronounce the verdict on the weekly reader of Luthard's church newspaper: He bears a double false witness against Missouri, in that he lies: 1. that Missouri is not arguing for Lutheran doctrine, but for new Missouri doctrines; 2. that Missouri, for the sake of articles of faith of its own making, is sacrilegiously causing division and separation'. In particular, the five missionaries stand up for the two specifically Missouri doctrines, that the office of the keys is 'transferred' from the Lord through the church to the preachers, and that the Pope (but not a 'future' world ruler) is the Antichrist. - Pastor Brunn in Steeden, who published the above-mentioned document, expresses in the preface "his great joy" about the step of the Leipzig missionaries. We cannot fully empathize with this joy, but must rather confess that, with all our respect for Missouri and with all our appreciation of its seriousness and determination, we can only very much regret the missionaries' step, since on the one hand they have a completely different field to plow than that of controversial theology, and on the other hand they are throwing down the gauntlet to missionary friends. It must also seem alarming to them to speak out against the organ of their own vice-president with such expressions. May God prevent all harm!" We, on the other hand, must add: May God not let the manly testimony fade away without success!

"Breslau" Lutheranism. In an advertisement of A. Wagner's "Urgent Request" in the *Guericke'schen Zeitschrift* of this year, Lic. Ströbel writes: "The Breslau church association calls itself Evangelical Lutheran; it should rather call itself statutory Lutheran, because it expects the continuity and peace of the church from the law alone, but not from the gospel. From time immemorial, the entire confidence of the people of Breslau has rested on synodal resolutions, on church ordinances, on efficient discipline and fine external discipline, on all kinds of commandments, works and statutes; they hoped for nothing from unity in faith, doctrine and confession." - In the announcement of Wagner's little book: "Bericht über den Erfolg" (Report on the success), Ströbel exclaims: "Truly it is better to join the Roman Catholic Church right away than to first join this Roman Lutheran one in Breslau!"

Pastor N. v. Nolcken has, as we have already indicated, written a brochure: "Zur missourischen Uebertragungslehre. On the occasion of an advertisement of it, Lic. Ströbel writes the following: "It is probably wrongly called: 'A Word for Peace'. It is a harnessed argument for the Immanuel Synod against the Missourians. It is up to them whether and what they can and want to reply to it. We have only the following to note. If the author could prove his accusations, we would consider it advisable never again to write a word in Missouri's favor. But there can be no question of an adequate proof, because Pastor v. N. expressly declares that he "confesses" to Missouri. expressly states that "he freely admits in advance that he has not studied the writings of the Missourians, but that he has been reading the 'Lutheran' for several years and owns the protocol of the Buffalo Colloquium published by the Missouri Synod, and otherwise knows the matter only from Diedrich's 'Dorfkirchenzeitung' and the 'Immanuel'; this is "perfectly sufficient for him to form a judgment on this matter," etc. We consider such a basis for judgment to be very deficient. But even apart from this, we find such things in the pamphlet that deprive a condemnation of the Missourian 'errors' of its conclusiveness: on closer examination we find 1) many ambiguities and sophisms; 2) also many misunderstandings, overstresses, and

Jdiosyncrasies; 3) an insufficient understanding and appreciation of the Protestant Reformation, the symbolic books and the old Lutheran theology; 4) the approaches to rationalistic and syncretistic theories; and above all, probably 5) the spirit of unionism and its indifferentistic yes-no doctrine. In a word, the pamphlet really testifies to a principal contradiction between Immanuelism and Missouriism, but does not show how the opposing principles could be reconciled without violating the truth. Immanuelites and Missourians will then for and for, according to their heterogeneous basic conviction, call out to each other: You have a different spirit than we have! They will, like Calvinists or Cryptocalvinists and Lutherans, remain divorced people, and this would also, according to the real *causae et controversiae*, be the most profitable for both. Where one part (Missouri Synod) holds to faith, the other (Immanuel Synod) to the means of grace as the church-forming thing, there is little room for true unity in spirit." - So far Ströbel. As far as we Missourians are concerned, time is too precious for us to pick out from the jumble of empty insinuations found in the rebuttal of a man who did not take the trouble to first thoroughly inform himself about his opponent's true opinion, that which we really teach, and then to defend it against such conscienceless attacks. Whoever has to make an admission like Pastor v. Nolcken has already refuted himself before his readers and has forfeited the honor of even being refuted as an honest opponent.

W.

Immanuel Synod. In an advertisement of Wagner's booklet: "What still hinders the communion between the Missouri and Immanuel Synods at present?" Lic. Ströbel expresses himself, among other things, as follows: "This booklet is a commendable work for which we express our thanks to the author. The brochure also sheds light on the spirit, doctrine and practice of the Immanuel Synod in a way that was previously little known. The conduct of the Immanuelites against the Missourians, if correctly portrayed, reminded us vividly of that cunning, untruthfulness, dishonesty of which, especially in the 16th century, the Sacramentarians were guilty against the Lutherans. The Immanuel Synod accuses the Missourians of everything that is false, and denies them everything that is true. The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are Esau's hands. One should read the present scripture for oneself. However, we believe that we also have to draw attention to a few things. In the Immanuel Synod, it is customary to "mercilessly lash out at the Missourians as the most dangerous of all people and to insult them before all the world as the New Canossa, as the papacy under the Lutheran name. One needs from them the bitter words: 'All spirits praise JEsum, dey one Christ, who came into our flesh, that all flesh can have Him without popes (at Rome, Berlin or in Missouri), if one only wants to hear the voice of the apostles.' Yes, one writes, regarding a proposed conversation between the Immanuel and Missouri synods: All colloquy is in vain with people who are stubborn, vain, and held by their worldly interest, and heretics are to be avoided; therefore let those who have time and desire hold colloquies with Breslau, Missouri and Union! The Missourians are thus declared to be 'heretics' to be avoided, for papists and the like; and nevertheless the Immanuelites find it "quite inexplicable that undisturbed communion could not exist between them and such heretical, papist people"; indeed, they reckon their refusal to the Missourians a great sin, because the existing doctrinal differences are quite minor. But the doctrinal difference between the two synods is by no means minor; it is principal, according to what our booklet proves in detail."

Marriage-obstructing degrees of relationship. A contributor to the *Allgemeine ev. - luth. Kirchenzeitung* of January 21 writes in it concerning Bavaria: "For our part, we deplore the fact that the *respectus parentelae* has found no mercy in imperial legislation, and marriage to the sister of the father or mother is now permitted without decency." This is by no means only a violation of the *respectus parentelae*, but an impudent disregard of the clear divine prohibition: "No one shall "do" to his nearest blood friend" (to his flesh). If, however, the pagan state would like to disregard God's word, then the servants of the church should "keep the doctrine" (Mal. 2, 7.) also in this matter and rather depose themselves than be forced to bless such marriages forbidden by God. W.

In Hefsen, the judicial persecution of the renitents has begun again in an extensive manner. After the prosecution of them on the basis of the so-called church laws had been abolished by the Supreme Tribunal, one has recently gone back to § 132 of the Imperial Criminal Code and has made the attempt to understand the clerical office as a "public office", which view, however, is contradicted by the Criminal Code itself. While at the beginning of 1874 the charges based on that § 132 had all been withdrawn by order of the Chief Public Prosecutor as impracticable, recently two district courts have affirmed the applicability of this paragraph to the clerical official acts, another has acquitted in correct consequence of the charge based on the same free of charge, two other district courts, however, are still behind with their verdict. One of these two convicting district courts, the one in Marburg, even extended the applicability of that paragraph to the house services of the renitents, and as a result the house services of the renitent parish *Dreihausen* were immediately blown up by the *Gensdarmrie*. Even during the holidays the services of the renitents were prevented by the *Gensdarmen*, so that a common prayer could not take place. This has happened and is still happening without a legally binding court decision in the matter, which will most likely never be issued.

(Allg. Kirchenztg.)

In Hamelin, the municipal colleges recently negotiated the sale of the *Garrison Church* to the Jewish community, which had already been concluded on September 17, subject to the approval of the Consistory. The latter, however, referred the magistrate to the Ministry of Culture as the competent authority to decide on the matter, but at the same time left it to the magistrate to consider whether he would not be inclined to rescind the contract concluded with the Jewish community, since it would hardly be bearable for the church-minded inhabitants of *Hameln* to have *St. Spirituskirche* given over to the Jewish community in the future. *Spirituskirche* to be handed over to Jewish religious customs in the future and to be de-Christianized in such a way; on the contrary, this conversion of a place of worship, which has not yet occurred in the country, must challenge the judgment of all those who are not indifferent to their faith to a far greater extent than when unused church buildings in individual places are used for profane purposes. However, the mayors and the magistrate found no reason to approach the Jewish community about dissolving the contract, and it was decided to obtain the approval of the Ministry of Culture. (Allg. Kz.)

Hungary. The Hungarian Ministry has forbidden all confessions and churches to accept support from abroad. Of course, this only applies to the Old Catholics.

Holland. The newly appointed Jansenist dignitaries, Archbishop *Heykamp* of *Utrecht* and Bishop *Rinkel* of *Hartem*, reported their election to the pope according to the old custom, and were excommunicated by him in the usual manner.

Greece. What the late King Otto had desired soon after his accession, but could not achieve, has happened. The Roman Curia has decided to introduce into Greece the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church as it exists in England and Holland. Athens will then become, like Naxos and Corfu, the seat of a Catholic archbishop. As a result of this decision, the existing titles *in partibus infidelium* for Greece will cease, of which there are eight at present.

Irvingians. The university pastor Prof. Dr. Bachmann and the pastors of the city of Rostock have issued an address to their congregations on the occasion of the repeated public appearances of the Irvingians Rührmund and Rothe, the latter of whom has taken a longer stay in Rostock, in order to point out to them the manifold errors of this sect, so that the false teachings do not gain any room in them. The Irvingians are accused of the following three false doctrines: 1. that they have new apostles, whom it is the duty of every Christian to obey, since they are called by God and endowed with special gifts of grace; 2. that the Second Coming of Christ can be expected with certainty in this generation; 3. that only the few true believers who listen to the voice of their apostles and adhere to their fellowship will be caught up to heaven before the tribulations of the last days. After briefly refuting these heresies, the pastors exhort their congregation members to remain faithful to the confession based on God's Word and to the fellowship of our church.

(Leipz. Allgem. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenztg.)

On modern pedagogy. The *Kreuzzeitung* writes: "The 'enlightened' Rhenish Palatinate provides most of the recruits who can neither read nor write, despite the elementary school having been raised to the highest level. The schools in the countryside are prescribed the following aids, for example, for the teaching of nature: A two-armed lever on a tripod with metric division and several weights, which can also be used as a one-armed lever with a fixed pulley, a movable pulley, a pulley model (wheel on a shaft), communicating vessels and hair tubes of various widths (glass fountains), hydrometer in the form of a wine scale, brandy scale or salt spindle), barometer, prick and suction siphon, glass tip and suction pump, herons ball, glass fire hose, thermometer, cooking bottle with tripod and spirit lamp, magnets, strong sealing wax, sulfur, glass and horn rubber rod!! That with such 'scientific' tasks for the plebeje arithmetic and writing time and desire are missing, is explicable.- Also in the Austrian schools there are enough of the enlightened teachers. Nevertheless, even here the schools do not seem to be doing very well. A progressive deputy said in the Lower Austrian parliament: There are so many different things taught in the elementary schools now that the children stick their noses into many things, but in the end they cannot read and write. My own twelve-year-old daughter has to learn higher mathematics, chemistry, history, etc., but in writing, reading and arithmetic she is completely ignorant. The government representatives were silent on these words because they could not refute them." - The new educators were to write over the doors of their schools, "*Ex omnibus aliquid, ex toto nihil.*" This is evidently the principle of this age of polymathy. W.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 22.

May 1876.
(Submitted.)

No. 5.

Christ is Jehovah.

Motto: With our power nothing is done, we are soon lost. The right man, whom God himself has chosen, fights for us. Do you ask who he is? His name is Jesus Christ, the LORD of hosts, And there is no other god, He must keep the field.

In the wonderful song: Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott, Luther and with him the entire Lutheran church confesses that Jesus Christ is XXXXX XXXX, the LORD of hosts. Dr. v. Hofmann denies this by inventing a new false Messiah, who is nothing more than a miserable sub-god. For he says in his Scripture Proof I, 150: "Not is Jehovah Christ and Christ Jehovah, but the appearance of Christ in the world has taught to distinguish in God, who in the Old Testament is called Jehovah without distinction, the one who is God - χ &εός - and the one who is God - $\$$ εός - with God. Now what the Old Testament says of Jehovah is true, in that of him also who is &εός $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma$ τον ^εόν."

It is a shameful blasphemy and an obvious denial of the Christian faith to say: Christ is not Jehovah; and to want to prove this from the holy scriptures is nothing else than lying and deceiving in God's name, i.e. twisting God's word by false interpretation and passing off false teaching for divine truth. Hofmann's evil conscience also shows in the fact that he does not mention the passage Jer. 23, 5. 6. with a single syllable in his entire proof of Scripture. There it says about Christ: "And this shall be his name, that they shall call him: 'XXXXXX XXXX, LORD, who is our righteousness.'" What should Hofmann also argue against this? God the Holy Spirit testifies here with sunny clarity through the prophet Jeremiah that Christ is Jehovah.

Thus the question: who is he? is decided for Christians, to whom it is spoken from the heart, what our symbolic books confess: "after God also respects some prophets for a world treasure." Apology: Müller 178.

So God says: Christ is Jehovah. If a Turk, a pagan or a Jew said: Christ is not Jehovah, this could be explained. But that a Lutheran professor and doctor opposes the divine yes with his no, strikes the word of God in the face and publicly denies Christ, that is an abomination above all abominations. However, we read something similar in Genesis 2 and 3, where God threatened in verse 17: "The day you eat of it, you will die of death. But how does the devil explain this in 3, 4? He says: "You will certainly not die of death". That is why the devil is also called "a liar and father of the same", namely of lies, Joh. 8, 44. Woe therefore to the unfortunate courtier! He follows the example of the devil by lying against the clear word of God. May he consider the shattering threat: Do not be mistaken, God is not mocked! and repent of his blasphemous lies.

It would be ridiculous if someone would throw up dust and then pretend that he has extinguished the sun with it. It would also be ridiculous if someone would understand Jer. 23, 5. 6. differently than Christ. Grotius, for example, does this by referring our passage to Zorobabel. But if you do not want to be rash, you must admit that all the circumstances of the text, the context and the meaning of the words make such a relationship impossible. Luther rightly says: "Therefore, let us take good note of this text here, when the heretics and sects will rise up and challenge this article of our faith, that Christ is not a true natural God (as this heresy will surely come), so that we may be prepared and hold this saying up to their noses, against which they can easily raise nothing." Luther then tells how the rabbis, with whom he spoke about this text, were disgraced by it: "I spoke of it myself with the Jews, even with the most learned, who knew the Bible so well that there was not a letter in it, they understood, and held this saying up to them; but they could raise nothing against me. At last they answered and said: They believed their Talmud, that is, their interpretation, which said nothing about Christ, and the same interpretation they had to follow. That is why they do not stick to the text and seek excuses, because if they stuck to this text alone, they would be overcome. For this saying is too strong that this seed of David is a true and natural God; for he shall be called by name, that the true right God may be called." Walch VI, 1393. By the way, not even all rabbis are so blind as to deny that the promised Messiah is Jehovah.

For example, in Echa Rabbathi it says to Klagel. Jer. 1, 16: "What is the name of the King Messiah? Rabbi Abba said: XXXX, LORD is his Name wherewith they shall call him, the LORD, which is our righteousness." *Cal. bibl. ill.* II, 427. *)

But the divine secret that God, Jehovah, would be revealed in the flesh was not only proclaimed by Jeremiah, but was already announced by God to the first humans in paradise with the words Gen. 3:15, when God said to the serpent: "I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed. He shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." This glorious promise is rightly referred to Christ by the whole of Christendom, and also by our fathers in the symbolic books, where they confess: "For Adam, when he had fallen, was first punished, that his conscience 'was troubled and came into great anguish; the same is the right repentance or *contritio*. After this, God promises him grace and salvation through the given seed, that is, Christ, through whom death, sin, and the devil's kingdom are to be broken; there he again confers grace and forgiveness of sin on him." Müller 175. How the first people believed and understood this promise, we see from the words of Eve at the birth of her first son Gen. 4, 1: XXXX-XX XXX XXXX,, I have the man, the LORD, as Luther has translated it correctly. Eve was mistaken in believing that the divine prophecy had already been fulfilled in Cain, but she was absolutely right in believing that the promised wife-seed would be Jehovah, the true God.

Hofmann denies this by saying: "No promise of the restoration of the fellowship between God and man has gone before, which would be so formulated that one could trust the exuberant joy of faith of the woman at her first birth, that she thought to have in the child at the same time the coming God. Scripture proof I, 440. Why he believes that under the Gen. 3, 15. promised female seed Christ could not be understood, he says Scripture proof I, 194:

means in the Genesis, as everywhere, neither the whole descendants of someone, nor a part of it, but a seed, whether with or without reference to soil and root, from which it came out, thus a belonging together entirety of people, whether with or without reference to the origin, to which it traces itself back. ... It denotes the united humanity originating from the female." "For that XXXXX XXX is the united humanity does not now seem to be doubted." Scripture Proof II, 2, 460.

*Quid est nomen Messiae? Dixit R. Abba: XXXX Dominus est nomen ejus, quo vocabunt ipsum, Dominus justitia nostra.

The first rule of all true exegesis is not to attach a new, foreign, false sense to words, but to take them in their natural, literal meaning. This rule is also valid among all reasonable jurists. Thus, for example, in the Code of the State of Michigan, among the rules which are given for the interpretation of the laws, it is set forth as the first: "1. All words and phrases shall be interpreted and understood according to the ordinary and accepted usage of the language." *) Hofmann transgresses this rule by pretending that.

everywhere a seed, a united whole of people". As in nature the seed does not always appear in masses, but also individually, so also the term seed serves to designate an individual as well as a collective, as e.g. a single grain of wheat is just as well called seed as a whole heap of wheat. But that "everywhere means one seed, a collective of people" is obviously not true. For the Holy Spirit speaks through the Apostle Paul: *"Τω δε Ἀβραάμ ἐρβιβήσαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι χα'ι τω σπέρματι αὐτοῦ. Ὁ δὲ λέγει' ,Καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν' ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἰφ' ἑνός - ,Κα'ι τω σπέρματι σου' , ὅς ἐστι Χριστός.* Now is ever the ver

to Abraham and his seed. He does not speak, 'through the seed', as through many, but as **through one**, 'through your seed', which is Christ", Gal. 3, 16. In the clearest words God the Holy Spirit himself testifies, that the one promised to Abraham does not mean "many, but only one, your seed, which is Christ". In spite of all this, Hofmann has the forehead to claim that everywhere means one seed, one whole. However, this requires an impudent impudence.

But in Hofmann also the judgment must be fulfilled, which is threatened to all those who deny Christ and invent false gods: "Because they thought themselves wise, they have become fools", Rom. 1, 22. As is known, Eve said at the birth of Seth: "God has set me another seed, XXX XXX, for Habet." According to Hofmann, Eve would now have been in

Seth is not a single individual, as it is given in the text, but he is taken for a collective, for a "seed, a unified whole of people". Furthermore, if according to Hofmann XXXXX XXX is even "the unified humanity", then Gen. 22, 18. would have to be explained: through your seed, i.e. through your unified humanity all nations on earth shall be blessed, thus all nations would be blessed through themselves. Therefore Michael Walther rightly says against Beza, who understands Gal. 3, 1. by the seed only the church, the people gathered from Jews and Gentiles: "Only in this way would all nations be blessed.

*Rules of construction of statutes. I. All words and phrases shall be construed and understood according to the common and approved usage of the language. The revised statutes of the State of Michigan, 1846. p. 35.

Nations would not be blessed in Christ, but in the church, and the church would be blessed for its own sake; nothing more absurd can be thought of. **) Furthermore, seed only refers to a single person Gen. 15, 3. 21, 13. 2 Sam. 7, 22. 1 Chron. 17, 13. Ruth. 4, 12. 13. It is therefore certain that Hofmann's assertion that "seed" has "everywhere" only a collective meaning, is contrary to the express declaration of the Holy Spirit and the common and recognized usage of language, and is the greatest absurdity, which loses nothing of its distastefulness even by passing it off as science.

According to this, only one person is to be understood under the promised woman's seed, and that only our Lord Jesus Christ. Luther rightly says of this explanation: "And because this rhymes with the testament of repentance, we Christians, according to the rule we have made, should allow neither Jews nor devils any other understanding. Summa, this seed of the woman is to be a man, that is certain: over it he must be truly also God, or Moses will be an idolatrous devil prophet. For he gives to this seed the power which belongs to God alone and to no creature, namely, that he should put away death and the slayer of death, sin and God's wrath, and bring back righteousness and life." Walch III, 2861.

Since this promise had preceded, there can be no doubt about the meaning of Eve's words at the birth of her first son. Excellently Luther: "So Eve wants here: I have given birth to a son who will become a man, yes, he is the man, God himself, who is to do it and trample the serpent underfoot, as God has told us. How is it possible? How could it occur to her to speak of her child in this way: I have the man, the LORD, when she had not understood the saying, that the seed of the woman must be God, who should do what God had spoken?" Walch III, 2863.

In vain Hofmann objects against this interpretation: "I must continually consider it impossible that in this connection an apposition to be added. Schriftbeweis I, 440. Linguistically and grammatically, not the slightest objection can be raised against Luther's interpretation. Very often the holy scripture uses the apposition with accusatives. Immediately in the word following our passage, in which it is said of Eve: she gave birth to XXX-XX XXXX-XX. Likewise Gen. 17, 8. 22, 2.

26, 34. 48, 1. Jos. 24, 3. 1 Kings 2, 35. But especially the following passages, in which, as also Calov and M. Walther point out, the apposition is formed completely according to ours, namely Jer. 17, 13: "XXXX-XX XXXX-XXX XXXX, they leave the spring of living waters,

*Sed hac ratione non in Christo, verum in Ecclesia benedicerentur Gentes, et Ecclesia propter se ipsam esset benedicta, quo nihil absurdius potest cogitari. Officina biblica M. Waltheri p. 603.

the LORD." Furthermore Ezk. 4, 2: "Design the city of Jerusalem XXXXX-XX XX", Calov rightly remarks after quoting these passages: "From this it is clear that the Hebrew words must be translated like this: I have attained or received the LORD, because this is required by the ordinary and constant Hebrew way of speaking, from which it is not right to deviate." *) Likewise Aug. Pfeiffer: "When nx stands between two nouns, it usually denotes an accusative apposition." †) Also it is said in the book published by DD. Keil and Delitzsch (available to us only in English), translated by J. Martin: "So far as the grammar is concerned, the expression XXXX-XX might be rendered, as in apposition to XXX, 'a man, the Lord' (Luther), but the sense would not permit it." We are not disturbed by this last remark in our conviction that Luther's explanation is the only correct one; but we call attention to the fact that those scholars, although they believe Luther's interpretation to be wrong, admit that his translation is in accordance with Hebrew grammar.

Finally Hofmann errs with many others in that he takes XX for a preposition in our passage and explains: "In Eva's exclamations after her first son's birth I now recognize, after Delitzsch has referred me to the passages, where XX indeed means the helpful community, the expression of her joy that God, and indeed the God of promise and redemption, has given her a son". Schriftbew. II, 1. 64. We are referred to the passage Gen. 21, 20.: "God was with the boy, XXXX-XX", and to similar Gen. 39, 2. 21. etc., in which

XX means helpful community. But these passages prove nothing. Luther's opponents are supposed to cite a single passage in which XXXX-XX means with helpful fellowship of the Lord. But this is impossible for them. Rather the observation is decisive, which A. Pfeiffer states: "The phrase: with the help of the LORD, with the assistance of the LORD, with God is never used with XXXX-XX or XXXXX-XX, but always with XXXX or XXXXX Ps. 60, 14. 108, 14. Jer. 3, 23. Hos. 1, 7. Deut. 33, 29, and once 1 Sam. 14, 45. expressed with XXXXX-XX." *Dub. vex. p. 36. ‡*)

The only correct interpretation is the one Luther gives, taking nx as an accusative participle and translating it; "I have seen the man whom

**Unde manifestissimum, verba Ebraea ita reddi debere: Acquisivi virum, vel possedi Dominum: Quia postulat hoc ordinaria et perpetua loquendi ratio Ebraica, a qua recedere fas non est.* The further execution in Calov shows that *vel possedi* must be directly connected with *acquisivi*; namely, he explains the word *kanah*: *quod significat possidere seu acquirere. Bibi. ill. I, 252.*

†) XX *interpositum duobus nominibus (uti hoc loco) ordinarie infert appositionem Accusativorum. Dub- vex. p. 36-*

‡) *Phrasis: Auxilio Domini, juvante Domino, σὺν -&εὖ nuspiam exprimitur HliT-BK vel OTi^X-BK, sed per HiTTil vel per . . et semel D'Bbx DJJ. . .*

LORD." This interpretation is followed by all the famous exegetes of the Lutheran Church in its heyday: Förster, Brenz, Rhegius, Chyträus, Selnecker, Osiander, Hunnius, Leyser, Rungius, Gesner, Schindler, Glassius, Helvicus and others. This interpretation is irrefutable because it is based on Hebrew usage. For "XX, when preceded, as in our place, by an active verb, is always a sign of the accusative, and there is no example deviating from it," as A. Pfeiffer, *) Calov, M. Walther and others prove. Especially by this interpretation Luther proved that he was the reformer sent by God also in the field of exegesis, by recognizing and asserting the right sense of our passage against the authority of the Septuagint, the Vulgate, **) the rabbis and scholastics, against the wrong traditional interpretation. It is only a pity that not all newer Bible translations †) have followed him. But let us hear Luther himself about our passage:

Here someone might ask, "How is it that no Christian or Jew has seen this in this place? For all the interpreters do it differently. The Latin one thus: I have received a man through God. The other Ebrew thus: I got the man from the Lord. I do not ask now. I have often said above that I did not want to have a master this time, but to express my opinion in interpretation. If no one likes it, it is enough that I alone like it. The little word Eth means the or the, and is an article *Accusativi*, as all Grammatici must confess. So since Genesis Cap. 1, 1. speaks: In the beginning God created Eth heaven and Eth earth: that means German: den Himmel und die Erden, and always so in this and the following chapter. When, Adam recognized Eth Heva, his wife. Heva gave birth to Eth Cain. She gave birth to Eth Habet, his brother. Item Adam begat Eth Seth; Seth begat Eth Enos, and immediately. Just according to the way Heva speaks here, since she had born Cain: CanithiJsch, Eth Jehovah: I have gotten the man, the LORD. For she hoped, as she had said, that Cain would be the seed promised by God to crush the serpents' heads.

*) XX praecedente (uti h. 1.) verbo activo, a quo regitur, semper est nota Accusativi, nec datur dissimile exemplum. To Genesis 4, 1. Dub. vex. p. 36.

**) The Septuagint translates: *Ἐκτησάμην ἄνθρωπον διὰ τον κυρίον*, the Vulgate:

Possedi hominem per Deum.

j-) The English Bible: I have gotten a man from the Lord; the French: J'ai acquis un homme par l'Eternel; the Italian by G. Diodati: Jo ho acquis- tato un 'uomo col Signore; the Spanish: He adquirido un hombre por Dios; the Portuguese: Alcançai ao Virao de Jehovah; the Dutch: Ikheb eenen man von den HEEKE verkregen; the Swedish: Jag hafwer satt HERrans man (i.e. the man of the LORD). Correct only the Norwegian and Danish: Jeg eier en Mand, som er HERREN, i.e.: I have a man, who is the LORD.

"And I know for certain, if the most wicked Jews, who crucified Christ, or were even more wicked than those, who now would gladly crucify him much more abominably; as it is said of those, who in hunger at the furnace the other day, together with the Turks, crucified a cat and carried it about in mockery and derision of God, our Lord JESUS CHRIST, with many shameful blasphemous words; Such evil poisonous God- and cat-crucifiers, if they could believe, or had to confess (without faith) the truth of the languages otherwise, they would say thus: Yes, you cursed goyim, if it were true that the seed of the woman is God and man, then we ourselves would know that the text rhymes finely with it, since Heva says: I have got the man, the Jehovah, and freely confess that the language gladly and freely gives that this son, the man and God, is the LORD. But what one interprets differently here, as: I got the man through the LORD, or from the LORD, or with the LORD, is a compelled, forced, naughty thing, and not the right kind and nature of language, nor can anyone else prove it. Yes, in this way the wicked people would have to confess. But since they cannot accept that God was born of a woman's image, this text and the whole of Scripture must be wrong, or they must make a different nose.

"All other Ebrew scholars would have to confess that this woman's seed is Jehovah, that is, God and man, if they viewed the text correctly and held it to be true. For that this little word Eth is called den or die and is a *nota accusativi*, that is proven, convinced, known by all Ebraists, Jews and Christians in all grammars. But that it should also be ad, de vel cum, of or with or by, that is still unproven, and shall probably remain unproven, For on the examples they cite from Rabbi Kimchi or from Scripture, it can easily be said that the Ebrew language has never come up again, and the Jews cannot know *virtutem omnium vocabulorum, sicut res ostendit*; much less do they know *vim phrasis, figurarum et idiotismorum*, but they doubt, equivocir, grope and seek, as an unlearned organist seeks and asks the claves or organ pipes: Are you, are you?" Walch III, 2865-2866.

We therefore reject Hofmann's interpretation as a blatant falsification of the divine word, and take our stand with the blessed M. Walther, who, in explaining our passage, says: "Our theology is largely grammatical, and delights not only in the emphasis, but also in the context of the words, so that no stronger and more certain proofs can be demanded than those which are taken from grammar and the manner of speaking used by the Holy Spirit. .. Let us not, therefore, be deprived of the proper meaning of the letter, lest the divine word be rendered doubtful and uncertain to us, by which stratagem the devil made Eve in Paradise

miserably seduced." *) Moreover, Hofmann's interpretation is against the rule: "One must not regard the prophets' word, which was full of faith and spirit, as pagan as Aristotle or one other pagan", as our symbolic books aptly say, Müller 132. If, according to Hofmann, "no promise of restoration between God and man has preceded," Eve's joy is only a natural one, such as every pagan woman feels at the birth of a child, and it would be quite inexplicable why such self-evident trivial utterances of hers would have been handed down to us. Also, if Eve had only wanted to express her joy at the gift of a child, she would have expressed herself very absurdly: "I have got a husband with Jehovah," whereas according to Luther's interpretation this emphatic expression explains itself in the most glorious way.

We stay with Luther's interpretation of Genesis 4, 1. also because it is according to the analogy of faith. To mention only one, David, when the Messiah was promised to him, says almost with the same words as Eve: "This is a way of a man who is the LORD God XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXX, 2 Sam. 7, 19.

How comforting it is for us that already our first parents believed and confessed according to Gen. 4:1: Christ is Jehovah, and that this confession has been joyfully pronounced by all the enlightened children of God from the beginning of the world until this very hour. Pelargus rightly says of this confession Gen. 4, 1: "This is therefore for us a certain testimony to the deity of Christ, no matter how furiously the Jews and the Arians may chatter against it, and Calvin also calls this interpretation too sophistical." **) The Lutheran church therefore continues to sing happily:

Do you ask who he is? His name is Jesus Christ, the
LORD of hosts, and he is no other god; he must keep
the field.

*) Theologia nostra maximam partem Grammaticalis est, et non solum vocum *ἐμφάσει* gaudet, sed et conjunctione, ut argumenta firmiora et tutiora peti non possint, quam quae ex Grammatica et loquendi more a Spiritu Sancto usurpato arcessuntur. . . . Non igitur patidmur nos a proprietate literae abstrahi, ne dubium et incertum nobis reddatur Verbum Divinum, qua astutia Diabolus Evam in Paradiso misere circumvenit. Off. bibl. p. 686, 690.

**Est ergo nobis certissimum hoc Christi Divinitatis testimonium, quicquid contra furenter garriant Judaei et Ariani, sicut Calvinus quoque subtiliorem vocat hanc expositionem. Off. bibi. p. 691.

(Submitted.)

V on the transmission of the sacred ministry of preaching.

Within a year, the "Immanuel" has spoken out several times about the doctrine mentioned, partly in the synodal report, partly by members and friends of the Immanuel Synod. Let us see what they say there.

During last year's meeting of the Immanuel Synod, Fr. Meeske read his paper on the question: "Is there a doctrinal difference between us and the Missourians, and possibly which one?" We pass over what he says about the spiritual priesthood of all Christians, about the spiritual authority and about the public preaching office. It should only be mentioned that nothing new has been presented here; but that is precisely the beauty of it, that it is the old truth, and one may well rejoice that such testimonies have not yet been completely silenced in the circles of our opponents. Every orthodox son of the Lutheran Church speaks as these pieces have been spoken of here. Missouri also believes, teaches and confesses all this; for not only in the sense, but almost in the same words, we have spoken in this way in our journals and elsewhere. But that Pastor Meeske does not present this statement as his personal conviction, but rather as the confession of the Immanuel Synod: "The Missourians teach all this on the basis of the Word of God, and we also teach it" - that is, however, conspicuous; for as much as we have become aware of the matter here, members of the Immanuel Synod have indeed spoken in this way and similarly, while others have at times spoken quite differently. But let us leave that and come to the point.

In the synodal report "Immanuel" 1874, p. 237, it is further stated: "One point has still been disputed: namely, the establishment of the public preaching office in the congregation. We say: the congregation appoints the pastor to the office of preaching; the Missourians say: the congregation delegates the office of preaching to the pastor and explain it further in this way: all Christians actually have to exercise the public office of preaching, but they relinquish this right and delegate it to the pastor; the church has the keys, it gives them to the minister so that he may use them in its name and in its place according to God's will. Now it seems to some of us that in this view of the establishment of the preaching office by the church, the Lord Christ is set aside and the office itself is degraded; but in fact the keys remain Christ's keys and in truth it is therefore the same whether I say: the church entrusts the office to the pastor. Consequently, there is no doctrinal difference to be found between Missouri and us."

That the sacred office of preaching is conferred by God through the congregation by means of an ordinary profession, and that therefore those who are called have the rights of the spiritual and spiritual authority.

It is, however, our doctrine to exercise the priesthood in public office on behalf of the community, and it seems to me more than likely that the speaker wants to be understood in this way. The question is, however, whether the Immanuel Synod agrees with Pastor Meeske's lecture, recognizes the presented doctrine as its own and feels obliged to teach it accordingly. For up to now this has not only not happened, but it has also, as a synod, expressed itself in a downright negative way. In 1865 it positively rejected the following two sentences: "a. The office of preaching is given by God to the congregation; the congregation entrusts it to one of its members to administer it in its stead and in its name. b. Because the congregation has the office of the keys, it has the outflow of the same and thus also the external church authority". Pastor Meetzke's teaching has long since been publicly rejected by the synod, of which he is a member, and presented as false. Or has the synod ever taken back this statement? Let us take a look at the more recent reports on this doctrine.

In the "Immanuel" 1875 there is a short rebuttal of a part of the essay: "Two different judgments about the Missouri Synod", by K. Kühn (Consistorialrath?) from Bellstadt. He contradicts on p. 187 that the so-called Missouri doctrine of transmission "is found in the Orthodox fathers of our church", and says afterwards: "What do the Missourians gain with these citations? If these citations were really true in the way (which is not the case) that Pol. Leyser and Hülsemann used this word 'Uebertragene von Erwählen ins Pfarramt' and quite obviously connected the Missourian sense with it, what would be gained by it? would it be proved that it is a symbolic expression?" We find this statement in harmony with the condemnation verdict of the assembled Immanuel Synod. The latter rejects that the sacred office of preaching is conferred by God through the congregation by means of an ordinary profession, and Pastor Kühn supports this verdict of rejection by denying that this doctrine is found in the Orthodox Fathers and, moreover, that the symbolic expression is also lacking. Let us take the last piece first. The word itself is demanded here, but with as many letters as it is written. But in this case we are not arguing about words at all; after all, it is a shameful, childish, effeminate thing in the eyes of the world if one is otherwise one in the matter and yet quarrels about the words. We quarrel about the thing that is implied by that word; for as long as, among other things, it may be said without reproach: "the pastor is responsible for his actions only to Christ," so long are we not in agreement in the matter with those who may speak in this way. And the demand made is all the more a rotten support for our opponents. The word "transmission" is not in the symbols. With this it wants to be said: therefore it is also nothing with this Missouri doctrine. I should think, however, "if only they are correct."

If the doctrine were "deduced" from the holy scriptures and the confessions, then there would be something wrong with this doctrine. But consider the consequences of this demand. You and we know quite well that in our confessions the "symbolic expression" of the divine inspiration of the holy Scriptures is not found; so it follows, according to Pastor Kühn, that someone can nevertheless be a righteous Lutheran who rejects this doctrine. Do not tell me that this is something different, the "symbolic expression" is not present, therefore it must follow: so it is also nothing with this teaching. Whoever concludes otherwise here contradicts himself. In the same way, there are some things in the Confession that are not found in the Bible in the same words, e.g. the word original sin, Adam's plague, and the word sacrament is not used in Scripture. What is the point of this? Yes, there is now also nothing with the doctrine of original sin and the sacraments; for the words are not in the Bible. So there are also many articles of faith, many pieces of Christian doctrine, many chapters. What shall we say to these? These words: articles, pieces, chapters are not in the Bible; so now we are not allowed to speak of articles of faith, pieces of doctrine, chapters of the Bible; since the Bible is more than the symbol. But how will Past. Bold himself do, does he not sometimes refer to chapters of Scripture by name? - Will he say again: "much of what the Missourians do and write is so superficial and so tawdry"? We cannot prevent this; but neither will he be able to prevent what God intends to do, that nevertheless our doctrine is gaining "more and more influence in the minds" - add: and hearts - "of men now. With his reply, however, he has rebuked us so little that it has rather turned into a "rebuken" of "Immanuel", who claims that we have deduced the doctrine of transmission from the symbols. Pastor Kühn denies this by not admitting that it is in them. The word "transmission" is not there, so the doctrine of transmission cannot be deduced from it.

As we can see, the unity of the Immanuel Synod is not very good in this doctrine. But the inner contradiction is even more glaring.

In the next number of the "Immanuel" Pastor Hofmann says p. 196: "Between the Missourians and us it was and still is primarily a matter of the so-called transmission theory. And afterwards: "You see, dear readers, there is a difference; but it is not a fundamental one, not one concerning the basis of faith. That is how I see it, otherwise I could not have remained in the Immanuel Synod. The Missourians, however, see it differently, and have therefore annulled the communion of sacraments with us." We do not count this doctrine among the primary fundamental articles either. Dar-

By this we mean the teachings that a person must believe if he is to be a Christian and become blessed. We distinguish between primary and secondary fundamental articles. - If, however, Pastor Hofmann can base his remaining in a community that teaches differently on the fact that a certain doctrine, which we are dealing with here, does not belong to the fundamental articles, then one may reasonably ask: whether the doctrine of church government and the church ordinances are fundamental articles? which doctrines are nevertheless stated as the cause of the separation from Breslau. Admittedly, Pastor Hofmann's doctrine of transmission is a truth founded in God's Word and the confessional writings of our church, so I think that one should not take so lightly what others, belonging to the same community, teach contrary to it. One testifies against false doctrine within the community in which one stands, as long as such testimony is tolerated; but if public condemnatory judgments are pronounced about the truth which I have recognized and testified, then the path which I must take is marked out for me; either retraction of the condemnatory part, or pure divorce. Strangers may do what they cannot refrain from doing; but the community in which I live shall leave my faith unrejected and undamned. To still want to remain under such circumstances is a daring attempt to unite the recognized truth with error, or to keep both on an equal footing, which cannot take place with correct knowledge without violating conscience. - We are accused of having annulled the communion with the Immanuel Synod. However, the matter is much different. Namely like this. First, the assembled Immanuel Synod publicly rejects our doctrine, and then they demanded communion with ours. Since they could not accept it for that reason, it must have been us who made the water murky for them, although we stand at the bottom of the stream and our opponents at the top.

Pastor Hofmann admits a difference between Missouri and the Immanuel Synod, although Pastor Meeske cannot find one. But also Pastor Kühn experiences a "rebuke" by being reproached p. 198. from Hieronymus Kromayer's *Theologia pos.polem.* is reproached: "Some hold the church to be the principal and first holder of all church power, to which" (the church) "the same" (all church power) "adheres and from which it is transferred to the elected persons; not unlike how, at a time when there is no authority, civil power rests in the state, and is then actually transferred from the same, according to the opinion of most statesmen, to the elected authority." And then he goes on to say: "Isn't that quite Missourian? And this theory of transfer was held by some in the Lutheran Church in old Kromayer's time." Or perhaps Rev.

Boldly denying orthodoxy to the men who lived in Kromayer's time and spoke of the transmission in the way that has been communicated here, because the word is not in the symbols - he also denies it to Pastor Hofmann, who says in all seriousness: "Well, for my own part, I think that the Missourians are right after all with their doctrine of transmission - in spite of old Kromayer"; for he did not agree with the doctrine of transmission of those whom he introduces with the little word "some".

But Pastor v. Nolcken puts the crown on all this, who already in his writing recommended by "Immanuel": "Zur missourischen Uebertragungslehre", in the confessional sentences, of which he thinks to be able to make them "in unanimity with the whole" (?) "Immanuel-Synod", on p. 47. says: "I reject and condemn as false, confusing and misleading, if it is taught that the public office of preaching or its powers are in any way transferred from the congregation to the bearers of the office of preaching." Would that Pastors Meeske and Hofmann would also remember this second verdict of condemnation, which applies to their teaching no less than to ours. According to this, the toleration of their teaching within the Immanuel Synod is only a sham and nothing more. Then v. Nolken implores the brothers Ruhland, Brunn and Hein to desist "from the pernicious way"; also implores their congregations "through the love of Christ: to resist in love their erring shepherds, and if they persist in their ways, not to go with them, but to depart from them, lest they be made partakers of their sin." asks "all the brethren of the Missouri Synod" to "let themselves be awakened to new self-examination and purification, as they once purified themselves from Stephen, the more so since the man is still alive who led them these newer astray ways, and with his great gifts can himself best make good" "what he has failed to do." and also "all brethren and connections in America who are friends of the Missouri Synod" he implores "to resist their erring friends, and by indifferent watching not to make themselves partakers of the same sin with Missouri." And in the last number of the "Immanuel" p. 205, he calls upon Missouri, among other things, to revoke the doctrine of the transmission of the sacred office of preaching and to confess his new doctrine. - There the evil enemy has betrayed himself quite badly, he shows what he has in mind. Involuntarily one is reminded of the words: "Think well that they would like to draw young and old away from us, I understand it quite as they do it; only I see that it has not gone according to their wish. But why should we be expected to recant, and not first of all the members of the Immanuel Synod who agree with us in this doctrine, and who are much closer to the Synod members than we are? Does one think that this will then be found by itself? Possibly! Perhaps not.

Or does one really not notice the difference within one's own district? Or do they consider the difference to be so insignificant that it does not matter much whether one teaches one way or another about the transmission? How else could Pastor Hofmann, among others, write: "We pastors of the Immanuel Synod are completely united in faith and confession, so united that we would like to wish every synod and every church community a doctrinal state as united as ours." *Immanuel*, 1874, p. 117. But judge for yourself, does this not resemble the game that depicts unity in reverse? Always one chases the other, each with his own particularity. Even in one and the same number of the magazine *Yes and No* at the same time. Meeske: There is no doctrinal difference between Missouri and us; Kühn: Ueberübertragung is not a symbolic expression, nor do the orthodox fathers of our church know anything about this doctrine; Hofmann: There is a difference between Missouri and Immanuel. The Missourians are right with this doctrine of theirs, the Orthodox Fathers have the doctrine of Ueberübertragung as the Missourians lead it; v. Nolcken: The Missourian doctrine is rejected and condemned. Missouri recant! Now that rhymes, who can rhyme! By the way, as far as the recantation that is expected of us is concerned, we are in no hurry at all. The Immanuel Synod with its yes-no system is completely unable to convince us that it is right and we are wrong. And wouldn't we have to be real fools, punished by God, if we wanted to exchange discord for our unity - which God wants to preserve in and among us by grace?

But someone might want to say: What is this person putting on us! Does he not know that the persons named do not all belong to the Immanuel Synod? Yes, I do know that. But as long as the "Immanuel" opens its columns to such submissions without any contradictory remark, displays opposing writings, probably even recommends them in the best way, so long it is also responsible for everything that is presented to the readers in it; unless the "Immanuel" wanted to be a "speaking hall of the most diverse spirits", but then it has given up its character of being a "people's paper for Lutheran congregations". The "Immanuel" knows how to keep unpleasant things away from itself; why not here? For example, from the proceedings of the first meeting of the Synodal Conference, it gradually brings the 48-page discussion "on the doctrine of justification," with the exception, however, of what was said against the lowans on p. 45. If Pastor v. Nolcken in his "Illumination of Some Missourian Propositions" also speaks of the lowans and praises us that we resisted chiliasm and the theory of the open questions of the same - immediately it is said in a note of the

Editorial: "That strong Missourian calumnies had to serve as battering rams here, especially that Iowa rejects the imposed definition of open questions with indignation, is also to be heard about in the other part. That has become clear to us once again, nobody needs to "duck" there; everybody can bring his stuff to the market as he has it. "Immanuel is united, if not in doctrine, then in the fight against Missouri. If the blows of our opponents had struck us, they would have been received by those to whom they were actually intended; but "Immanuel" strikes blindly and hits his own children; for no doubt the Magdeburg parishioners read the Synod's magazine, and also probably the writings recommended therein, and must now see that the teaching of their pastor is condemned and the confessors of the same are urged to recant. In the meantime, we sit quietly and watch to see where this will lead. F. R. T.

(Submitted.)

The Hexaemeron in Relation to Geology.

The enormous arrogance of the modern sciences, especially of the vaunted natural sciences, is also manifested, among other things, in the fact that they dare to determine the process of formation of our earth body and to question the creation report contained in Genesis on the basis of these determinations or to interpret it according to their principles. The hermeneutic rule given in the divine revelation itself and always practiced by the orthodox church: "Scriptura scripturam interpretatur" is also in this point no longer to apply, but a hypothesis set up by a pompous science is to take its place. This hypothesis is accepted *a priori* and without any sufficient justification, as a foregone conclusion, and a blind faith in it is demanded, which finds an adequate parallel only in the papist belief in infallibility. Of course, materialism - this dragon's tail with all the vermin and scum of error it has produced - accepts these fantasies with jubilation. By dating back a primordial creation into a gray, immeasurable past, it thinks to gain space for its absurd theories of evolution and to find a new excuse for its unbelief and its hostility to the Bible and triumphantly celebrates its Bacchanalia. Then also with God's eternal word, which will remain when heaven and earth will have passed away, it is summarily cleared up and relegated to the grave of the Capulites. A stroke from the pen of these triumphant scientists is enough, which

They are not able to accept the whole divine revelation put into words. These modern titans really want to have known the mind of the Lord and also to have been his advisors in the work of creation; they presume to have seen when the Almighty founded the earth, when the morning stars praised him together and all the children of God rejoiced; they want to know on what their feet are lowered and who laid their cornerstone. Job 38, 5-7. Or rather, only a blind law of causality is supposed to underlie all this. All inorganic and organic beings on earth are supposed to have come into being through a process of development lasting billions of years, and a scriptural explanation fits excellently to this, which postpones an original creation into the distant eternity. So the materialists and "big-bread volcanists" exclaim all the more mightily: "Let us break their bands and throw their ropes from us! But he who dwells in heaven laughs at them, and the Lord mocks them. He will speak to them once in his wrath, and with his fury he will terrify them." Psalm 2:3-4.

But this cannot be particularly disconcerting. This enmity against the divine word, against this admonisher of conscience, when it has once completely broken with everything holy and moral, then only comes to light in that it passes through the self-imposed stages up to naturalism and atheism, to the extinction of reason and to the abrogation even of all logical thinking, and arrives at the "cowshed of Epicurus". But truly pathetic is the role that some believing and wanting to be believing theologians, preachers and Christians play in this. What this heaven-storming science octroyirts is received by them with deep bows and most obliging scratching feet as a great scientific achievement, and one asks at most for a short truce and declares oneself thoroughly satisfied with the meagerest compromise. One hopes to be able to draw even profit from these set up earth creation theories. They are supposed to give order and shape to the chaos which is in their opinion in the holy scripture. A great light goes up to them with it. They recognize that the whole church from the beginning, the whole Christianity, with some exceptions, up to the present day in this point and in many others went astray and was on the wrong track, because they did not know these scientific discoveries yet. Therefore, they have nothing more urgent to do than to bring their interpretation of the Scriptures and, in relation to it, their dogmatics into harmony with it.

Among our American neighbors, who are poor in faith and weak in belief, but who seek the glory of scientificity, the latter procedure has been elevated to the accepted self-evident principle. Their theology has been largely transformed into geology under their hands. The codex of natural scientific hypotheses forms for them the right, too

reliable axioms of the faithful exegesis. One will hardly find an American scientifically educated preacher or theologian who does not absolutely accept the so-called geological results and uses them to explain the holy scripture, especially the creation account. The holy Bible word must put up with being thrown on this Procrustean bed in order to give it the right measure. The explanation of Scripture must *volens volens* allow itself to be forced into these geognostic barriers. The whole English literature and daily press is soaked and filled with these geological dreams of primeval creation, and thus poisons the people and shakes their faith in the divinity and credibility of the holy Scriptures. Almost every thaumaturgical American "Lecturer" thus regales his auditorium, astonishes them and always reaps a hailstorm-like applause by this his marvelous knowledge. Taylor Lewis (Bible & Science, p. 20. ff.), professor at the Union-College, Schen., N. Y., speaks about it thus:

"In ancient times, the best way to understand the Bible was to read and study it. But now science has become the light of Scripture. Science and the Bible' is always a pleasant headline for an essay in a review, but the latter must always put up with accommodation for agreement. According to the popular opinion of the day, the holy scripture occupies a place like that of a Japanese Mikado or spiritual emperor, who has a court but no soldiers. It is held in high historical esteem, but science is the real monarch. . . . With these people it goes without saying that the Bible must be in harmony with their science. Must not all truth harmonize?" - they ask. On the basis of such a profound realization, the holy scripture is given a sermon, if it enters with its statements and teachings into the scientific terrain, which is cultivated with such great diligence, and if it disturbs its owners. To put "the two authorities" (the Bible and science) on one line, one could perhaps still put up with from that side, although in the parallelism science always comes first with them. But to assert that science is far inferior to Scripture, not only in some points, but in all things that the latter wants to teach us, and that the changing scientific language is quite incapable of communicating to us the eternal truths of the divine word; that its formulas and vaunted categories may prove obsolete and childish in future times; that the laws of gravitation may follow the laws of the *vortices* and *epicycles* into the rump chamber; that the Newtonian system is not only a small advance (?) beyond the Ptolemaic, and that the state of the present geology might be regarded in the future as we now regard the Aristotelian meteorology; that the enduring

The idea that the essentials are to be found in the Scriptures, while science can never get beyond the transient and the phenomenal, and that when the Lord speaks in his holy temple, all science and all philosophy must be silent before him - this is considered a crime.

"The representatives of this falsely famous art, these pompous scientists know the spirit of the times to which they pay homage. It becomes easy for them to write a eulogy to Hercules. The whole world wants to be scientific now. Hasn't science driven the idiots out of the world? - they ask. Has it not invented steam engines, the telegraph and the art of light biology? Has it not - to speak in the words of an Epicurean poet who boasts like a modern '*lecturer*' - drawn the terrible monster of superstition out of its dark dwelling into the light of day? Has it not freed us from the fear of comets and shooting stars, which all textbooks extol as the great benefit of science? Has she not put an end to the witchcraft processes, although she made a very thoughtful face to the phenomena of the newer spiritualism and did not know what to say about it? And has she not, as her greatest achievement, raised herself up as the advocate of the Holy Scriptures, although opinions about this are very divided and many consider that she should not bear this burden?

"While we respect and cherish all true science, we make no concessions to this disgustingly spreading one and ask no apology from it. Often she is very unbelieving and takes an outspoken hostile position against the holy scriptures. Then she does not seek agreement and does not want to know anything about reconciliation with it. Sometimes, however, with great condescension, it accepts the holy Scriptures as a concurrent revelation, but as a revelation that must first be harmonized with science. This science misses to reveal the highest truths and when it sits down on its tripod, such Bible believers have nothing more urgent to do than to buckle their travel bundle, get ready to travel and follow without even daring to look into their travel book where they actually want to go. So it goes with the highly famous Agassiz. We respect him as an excellent researcher in his field. He is said to be preparing a new movement, or rather he has already carried it out (he died the other day). And at the same time, many theologians and evangelists have already prepared to revise their dogmatics and doctrines of faith and are ready to set out. This last movement of science strikes at the heart of biblical faith. It applies to the question about the unity of the human race and the descent from a *primus homo*. The facts and doctrines in question are in living relation to divine truths, which can no more be separated from Christianity than blood can be separated from the heart.

And also about this one has dared - even in a school of prophets - to pronounce that one should not assert hastily what the Bible teaching is in this question, until one has heard the scientific oracle. Let the oracle speak first, and then there is still time to ask whether the doctrine of the Fall, of the first covenant of grace with mankind, of the head of the covenant, of redemption, and even of the mystery of the Incarnation cannot be modified in such a way that it comes into harmony with the oracle's statement. The church is advised to keep a philosophical calm in the meantime, even if science should claim that we, instead of being one in Adam, have a hundred thousand original ancestors." So far Tayler Lews.

As far as geology as a natural science is concerned, its oracles and inductions have already passed into the American schoolbooks. They are generally considered as made out. The only remaining question is how the Bible, "the second revelation", can be brought into agreement with the first one. Hitchcock in his "*Elements of Geology*" which has already gone through a myriad of editions and is used as a "text-book" in many American colleges, deals in the second part of his book with the apparent differences and discrepancies between geology and the Scriptures and seeks to lift and balance them, but always in such a way that the sacred Scriptures provide the escamotage. Scripture must give the escamotage. While he had concluded in the first part from the different mountain formations of the earth and their different paleontological findings and had asserted, it must already exist after its uranium beginning millions of years, he forces the Mosaic creation report in the following way to come into harmony with it. He remarks: The now most widespread explanation of the creation report is according to the geology to the effect that Moses reports only a creation in the beginning without including this beginning in the six-day work. After by God's almighty creator word heaven and earth had originated in a chaotic state, he passes over with silence an unlimited, almost infinite time period, in which the remains of the flora and fauna existing at that time, enclosed in the different mountain layers, originated and found their death. Only then he describes the present order of things, which began 6000 years ago. The great kingdom of death, which is to be found in the earth's crust, together with the traces of agonizing deaths of the animals, is supposed to come from the fact that God prospectively, in view of the coming Fall, introduced death into the world in advance. To this is remarked quite naively: "One needs to presuppose only this little, in order to bring the Bible in agreement with the requirements of the geology."

And the situation is not better in the old fatherland. Almost all newer Old Testament exegetes have capitulated to geology. Stallions-

Berg, Kurtz, v. Hofmann and many others sign this capitulation with the fact that they shift the *figmenta* of the geological deductions, the claimed millions of years for the coming into being of the alleged paleontological findings between Genesis 1, 1. and 1, 3. According to this opinion God should have created heaven and earth and the light in the primeval beginning, before an indeterminably long time. However, all this is supposed to have been only a *rudis indigestaque moles* in the beginning. In the course of the time then a kind of order is to have developed and a very elementary, primitive flora and fauna to have originated. Thereupon in very long intervals one world catastrophe or earth revolution is supposed to have followed the other, so that each time the plants and animals existing at the time largely perished. Only small remnants are said to have been always rescued from these world shipwrecks, with which each time a new order of things began, and to which then still higher new creations are said to have occurred. Also the spirit world, Satan with his demons, is supposed to have been created and fallen away already at that time and to have played a main role in the evocation of these events. Only after many incomplete and unsuccessful attempts it is said to have succeeded in banishing these demonic powers, so that the now existing or historical period could begin, the six-day work could start.

Professor Delitzsch, Regomont and others on the other hand, in order to be able to accommodate the common geological earth development systems, assume that the creation days reported in the Genesis were not ordinary days of 24 hours, but time periods of very long duration. These time periods should correspond then with the different mountain formations claimed by the geology together with their petrificirten plants and animals. Professor Delitzsch (Interpretation of the Genesis, p. 91.) remarks: "If the natural science claims that the present earth form and the present plant and animal world must have been preceded by thousands of years, then the short creation report is neither for nor against it. Nevertheless, he finds "significant reasons" to argue against the ordinary duration of the days of creation. By a *circulus in probando*, whereby he always tries to support a subjective Bible gloss by another one, without being able to produce even a single Bible passage, he leads a sham proof, which one notices only too clearly that geology played the dictatorship in it. This procedure reminds of a remark of Dr. v. Harleß in his self-biography (p. 181); when he writes: "Since that time I have always become attentive to the incomparable art with which many people read into the writings of others what they would like to have read out. . . . In the case of the Holy Scriptures in particular, the profession of a hundred so-called theologians rests on this noble art."

After all, what are the "significant reasons" that are against the ge-

living length of the days in the Mosaic creation account should speak? They are obviously weak, very weak. They are said to be: 1) The fact that the days of creation are called a *Jom* (day) behind the creation report; 2) that Ps. 91, 4. 3) that prophecy has its own measures of time, the ordinary names of which have an unusual meaning (like the weeks in Daniel), and that this can also be the case in cosmogony; 4) that the Sabbath following the days of creation is a rest of God extending over the whole world time; 5) that the last day is also called a day, although the final judgment will not take place in such a short period of time, and finally 6) that the mornings and evenings of the four first days were obviously not mediated by sunrise and sunset. (Interpretation of Genesis pp. 89-92.)

1) That the word "day" in the holy scripture (in Gen. 2, 4., where Luther remarks: *"In die accipiendum est pro tempore infinito*) often means a longer or shorter period of time, is undeniable, but it is just as undeniable that a day limited by morning and evening never denotes more than an ordinary day of 24 hours. Also Professor Delitzsch did not know how to give an example. This is also true ad 4. The divine Sabbath, which continues since creation, is not limited by evening. It is not said of it that the Sabbath became morning and became evening. Ad 2) When Ps. 91, 4. says of God that a thousand years are before him like a day, and a day like a thousand years, this is obviously meant to express the eternity, the immutability of God that is not subject to any time. For if before him a thousand years are equal to one day and *vice versa*, then the negation of all time sequence is predicated with it. But with the creation the time is set - with it it has taken its beginning, and the days of creation must therefore also be earth days. 3) To conclude that, because the divine prophecy indisputably has its own time measures, whose usual names hold an unusual sense, so this could or even must also fit to the cosmogony, is a false conclusion - *contradictio in adjecto*; for just because it has its own measures of time, they cannot also find their application to other objects, otherwise they would no longer be peculiar to prophecy, Ad 5) How does one know that the last day will be a day of longer duration than 24 hours? And how can one uncertain thing support and prove another uncertain thing? The biblical descriptions of the last day of judgment are certainly not such that it could be rightly concluded from them that the last execution of judgment will be a gradual one, taking place in a long sequence of time. Ad 6) It is true that on the first four days the sun was not yet created; but since the works of creation of these days are of a kind and

Since the two last days were markedly mediated by morning and evening, there is certainly no reason to assume that the four first days each denote a longer period of time than the one after the creation of the sun. But beyond all doubt this is raised, if we take Exod. 20, 11. and thus explain scripture with scripture. There it says: "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day." It is absolutely the view of the holy scripture to understand by "heaven and earth" the universe, the universe, all created things. So everything created has become by God's word of omnipotence in six days. The holy scripture knows only one creation in six days; of a former other it knows absolutely nothing and leaves also no space for such. It is great self-deception if one thinks to find the common geological world creation theories in the holy scripture again. And if the days of creation were long periods of time, how should the Israelites have understood the Sabbath commandment, which imposed on them the duty of six-day work, because God created heaven and earth in six days and. the rest on the seventh day commanded them, because God rested on the seventh day? How could they know that the days of creation were periods of time? A single day of creation is said to have lasted longer than all of Israelite history! Thus, the Sabbath would never have dawned on any Israelite!

But the above theory actually destroys itself. Because if at least the two last days of creation should have been mediated by rotation of the earth around its axis, as one assumes from that side, then also the nights should have been of the same duration. But one thinks of a nightly darkness lasting for thousands of years! Would not the just created plant and animal life have withered away and perished again in this long night time? So, while one wants to balance the scripture with a false science, one gets entangled in insoluble contradictions and palpable absurdities. Accordingly, it will have to remain with the simple wording of the creation account and the explanation given by Luther when he writes: *Statuimus, Moſen proprie locutum, non allegorice aut figurate, hoc eſt, mundum cum omnibus creaturis intra ſex dies, ut verba ſonant, creatum eſſe. Enarr. in Gen. pag. 9.*

And what is gained by the above concessions to geology? Is it thereby ſatisfied in its exorbitant demands? Is this ſcientific juggernaut ſatiated with theſe ſacrifices? By no means! Becauſe according to the geology the fauna ſhould appear before the flora, while, nevertheless, according to the creation report the latter was created firſt. The lower tranſitional mountain layers are ſuppoſed to contain only ſome very imperfect, little developed animal genera, to which in the higher ſtrata the flora is added.

The first time, new, more perfect and more developed of the same genera appear, which all does not fit to the creation report. In the Tertiary period then the present plant and animal world should appear quite completely, without a provable total extinction of the same would have followed. Thus, according to the interpretation of Hengstenberg and his followers, most animal and plant gaps would have already lived, when the six-day work began. Consequently, the work of six days would have been largely an *opus supererogativum* and was limited almost only to the creation of man. And what would become of the *finis creationis intermedius* - of the creation for the service of man? According to the geognostic systems the plant and animal world of that time already existed for hundreds of thousands of years and whole classes and orders had arisen and already disappeared forever when man stepped on the scene. With it, however, the divine teleology, at least for that time, is completely cancelled. A creation of the world at all in many thousand-year periods certainly does not correspond to the God of the holy scripture who has his intention on the human being, but only to a "pantheistic" primeval being which finds the same interest for tangents and molluscs as for the human being created after the image of God. One should not deceive oneself with the delusion as if one could reconcile and satisfy this science hostile to the Scriptures by concessions. By revealing to it the supposed external works of divine truth, one has already handed over to it the keys to the whole fortress of holy scripture and initiated the capitulation itself.

(To be continued.)

Ecclesiastical Contemporary History.

I. America.

Is this supposed to be Lutheran doctrine? In a sermon preached by Rev. J.

C. Barb in Tennessee and reported in "*Our Church Paper*" it says among other things: "These keys (of the kingdom of heaven) cannot be administered by every Christian; for no one should preach or administer sacraments without a profession. Somebody may perform the ceremonies, but what benefit will these ceremonies bring if they are administered by an unauthorized person? I can write a court order, put the words right and I can sign my name, but because I cannot do this officially, it is not worth a cent before the law. Or I can put myself in the place of a judge and investigate a case in court and acquit or convict by organizing a mock investigation, but it will be without effect because it is done without authority. So it is in spiritual things. God has placed apostles, prophets and teachers in the church. He has given them authority and power to make disciples in His name; for He says, "He who hears you hears Me." Should one think that

Within the congregations for which the *Church Paper* is published, such an abominable, papist doctrine can be preached with impunity and such language can be used that shows no understanding of the gospel at all? G.

About Professor Walther's pastoral theology we find the following verdict in the Reading "Pilgrim": "Walther's pastoral theology, a friend writes to us, is one of the most important books that have been published in the German language in America for pastors. I do not know of a better guide to the right administration of the sacred office. He who writes such a work for the church has not lived in vain, even if he would not have left a letter otherwise. I have now studied the delicious book for the second time and have been refreshed by the powerful testimonies of the dear old men of faith and have been told what they have recognized here and there as the right thing to do according to God's Word. Not only Lutheran ministers, but also Baptist and Methodist preachers could draw great blessings here. Here nothing floats in the air, -but everything is rooted in God's Word. May the time not be far distant when English brethren will also have access to this masterpiece in their own language." G.

How the only blessed church takes its unlearned children back into its fold. The "Kath. Glaubensbote" of April 5 gives information about the fate of the converts in a longer article. It says among other things: "The life of impecunious educated converts in the Catholic Church is already in and of itself a true martyrdom, a continuous struggle and fight for the most miserable earthly existence, a continuous suffering of lack, deprivation and starvation, a hidden beggar's life with constant hard, thankless and physically and mentally exhausting work, for which in most cases he is hardly offered a meager day laborer's wage, and not infrequently he is treated like a true day laborer. Shoemakers, tailors and other craftsmen have an easy time converting. After their conversion, they can continue their craft, and they remain in earthly terms what they were before their conversion. They do not have to sacrifice their once chosen profession to their better conviction and knowledge. Men, such as the Marquis of Ripon in England, or high-ranking women, such as Queen Mary of Bavaria, also convert very easily. They remain in earthly terms after their conversion what they were before and they take the millions they have in their pockets and the earthly wealth they possess and their personal independence in human society with them. Also a Cardinal Manning in London, an Archbishop Bayley of Baltimore or an Archbishop Wood of Philadelphia had in their time easy to convert, because they had to sacrifice relatively only very little or nothing to their conviction. But it is quite different with an educated Protestant preacher when he converts.... Let us assume that he becomes an editor of a Catholic newspaper, i.e. in other words... the publisher or owner of such a newspaper, who perhaps at the moment needs such an intellectual and capable force, hires him, i.e. he hires him and pays him for his services a certain, relatively mostly quite insignificant daily or weekly wage, usually too little to live and too much to die..... Quite naturally. For he certainly did not join the Catholic Church for the sake of earthly gain, and the latter did not call him at all. He obviously came quite voluntarily and only because his own innermost convictions drove him to it, and the mother church is of course not an institution of provision for him and owes nothing to her newborn child. The one who has returned to her must and should simply see how he can cope in the earthly world and in what way he can get by with his own. The church has neither a reptile-,

another Convertitenfond.. .. The convert must therefore be happy if, under these circumstances, he still finds a reasonably acceptable position as a 'newspaper writer' with some Catholic newspaper owner. But he is not allowed to work 'for the money' from the very beginning, so that he could not be accused of writing and defending his good catholic faith 'for the sake of money' and singing the song of the one whose bread he eats. In order to avoid this evil appearance, he must work very cheaply and as much as possible and in many different ways..... As a result, the enthusiasm of such a convert is soon dampened and depressed quite significantly. But he works. He works faithfully and honestly and as conscientiously as the oppressive circumstances only allow him. He works a lot, because a lot is demanded of him. The more he works, the higher the demands made on his strength. He works with the utmost effort of his mental and physical forces.... He has neither rest nor respite. He works 'for the church and in its interest' and the largest part of the fruit of his strenuous work, well - that is not seldom sacked by someone else in all peace of mind and the poor convert is often squeezed out like a bitter orange. When there is no more juice inside, it purrs together or one simply throws the skin away, if it lasts at all until it is thrown away, and, if possible, looks for another such bitter orange if and when it is available. It happens. One knows, fresh Pomeranzen are the juiciest and new brooms sweep better, like old. And such a convert must not complain. In the end, this could betray a weakness of faith and bring him into a very questionable discredit, both in and outside the church of his choice. And if, in the overflow of his tribulations and under the unaccustomed pressure of the burden that lies upon him, it should ever occur to him to complain to a trusted friend about his bitter distress and his and his family's external misery, then he will simply be told again, and rightly so, that all these sufferings are very good and very healthy for him and that he should only bear and tolerate these trials of his faith quite devotedly and humbly and calmly, - in heaven his reward would be great one day..... We turn our eyes with sadness away from this dark picture, on which no true Catholic can look without blushing and which will present a most satisfying sight especially to the enemies of the converts to the Catholic Church.

Honorific. From a lecture of Professor Wilker of the Methodist College in Berea, which is reported in the "Apologist", we learn the following: "A grievance existing in the American colleges, which cannot be too strongly rebuked, is the boundless carelessness with which they bestow honorary degrees. The degree Art. Mag. which was of importance in former years, but has now become almost worthless through the squandering of it in mass, *causa honoris*, is given away annually to hundreds of persons, for the only art consists in flattering a member of the faculty, or one of the trustees. A skilful craftsman who has invented a new machine is hastily stamped Master of Arts, although the only art of which he can boast is the art of invention. Or a man who has excellent natural endowments for mathematics, but is very ignorant in all other respects, is empowered to write the longed-for M. A. after his name. Among the many cases in which this title is squandered in such a disdainful way, it may, however, happen now and then that a name has, by iron diligence, brought it to something proper in the field of literature, science or art, so that it can with full right be placed at the side of thoroughly trained men. A title awarded to such a self-made man in recognition of his achievements then serves both the institution,

It is more to the honor of the person who grants it than of the person who receives it. Such cases, however, are extremely rare and can hardly be brought into consideration. - If an institution already loses respect in the eyes of all educated people by conferring the title of master on unworthy persons, how much more must it bring down contempt upon itself by squandering the higher degrees! In this country, doctoral degrees rain down en masse on men who understand as little of theology or jurisprudence as a peasant does of Sanskrit, and who are incapable of teaching either the divinity or any other science. Of the 300 doctors of theology who are annually fabricated in the United States, some even from certain girls' educational institutions, it may be safely assumed that at least two-thirds do not deserve the distinction. In Europe - with the exception of the Scottish universities, which are unfortunately also rather frivolous in this respect - the doctorate really means something. Either it is conferred inured, after years of study and rigorous examinations, as is the case in the universities of Germany and Holland, or when it is conferred *causa honoris*, it is always in recognition of great achievements in the scientific field, whether as a writer or as a teacher. How very different it is here in this country! How many of our doctors of theology understand Latin? How many are able to read the New Testament in the original text and do not even think of Hebrew? How many still understand a modern language besides English? How many have taken the trouble to learn the German language in order to be able to use the works of the scholars of Germany, although the most beautiful opportunity for this is presented to them everywhere in this country? We repeat emphatically: The throwing away of the doctoral diploma in such a frivolous manner brings disgrace to our colleges, degrades them in the eyes of all educated people, and weakens their influence." After further demonstrating how the degree of Doctor of Laws is abused in the same disdainful manner, he concludes: "We make ourselves ridiculous in the eyes of the European nations by our proverbial generosity with which we give away titles. Yes, indeed, we have given our neighbors across the ocean cause enough to call our whole educational system American humbug, and we will not regain their esteem until our colleagues either agree not to have *honorary degrees* at all, or agree to have *honorary degrees* at all.

or to award them only in very rare cases in recognition of great achievements in the field of science."

Women's Voting Rights. Of 232 Congregationalist congregations, 127 allow women members to vote in congregational matters; a large number of the remaining 105 congregations allow them to vote in appellate matters.

Illinois. The Supreme Court of Illinois has ruled that the bequest by Stephen Griffith of \$50,000 worth of land to the American Tract and Bible Society and the Church Building Society of the B. M. Church is invalid on the ground that no foreign corporation can own real property in the state. (Apol.)

II. Abroad.

The Mecklenburg. Kirchen- und Zeit-Blatt of February 23rd states that it is "to be regretted that the missionaries enter the battlefield without any profession and thereby possibly cause a division among the mission friends", but adds: "On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the reproaches of the missionaries are only too justified. Whoever knows the conditions to some extent, knows that Missouri in

fights first and foremost for pure doctrine. Whoever calls such an advocacy of the true confession of our church pharisaism or theology of the stars and calls it a disturbance of the peace, seems not to be serious about the confession himself and wants to bring his own little bundles to the market under the appearance of progress or the further development of the confessions. To have emphasized the full seriousness of the unchanged and undiminished confession in the face of such false coinage is Missouri's undeniable merit, which the five missionaries, however, have no profession to defend." - We think that where orthodox believers are attacked not only personally, but also in regard to their faith and confession, every comrade of the same faith has profession enough to step into the battlefield. Compare Ephes. 4, 1 Cor. 12, 26. 2 Tim . 1, 8. W.

A strange testimony is given in the February issue of the Erlanger Zeitschrift, p. 109 ff. There it says in an article "*Pia desideria* in regard to theological studies" among other things as follows: "It is claimed that those who have been educated in missionary institutions, American seminaries for preachers, are not infrequently equipped with richer treasures of knowledge, which are necessary for the leadership of the spiritual office, than many equally gifted and equally diligent theologians who receive their education at (German) universities. Should one not assume that the way of lecturing there is more adapted to the actual purpose of the theological lectures and the understanding of the students? Would that the doctors in their lectures, as in the books they write for students and pastors, would also use simple, clear language! If *nomina* were not *odiosa*, a long series of abstruse writing could be cited."

Luther literature. A not unimportant find for the history of the Reformation has been made at the University Library in Rostock. Professor Dr. Fr. Schirmacher has recently found there "*Epistolae Doctoris M. Lutheri et Acta colloquii Marburgensis in causa sacramentaria*", with the publication of which he is now busy. (General Evangelical Lutheran Cz.)

Leipzig theological faculty. In the previous volume of this journal, we reported (p. 344) how the pilgrim from Saxony had praised the Leipzig University to Pastor Ruhland as the "stronghold of orthodox theology. Greater blindness of an editor claiming strict Lutheranism can hardly be imagined. How it stands with this "hoard" and with the Saxon regional church, which relies on the same, Dr. Munkel reports in his *Neues Zeitblatte* of March 16 in the following: "The University of Leipzig was regarded in the second chamber of the Saxon Diet for its theological faculty, which has long attracted the largest number of theology students from all over Germany. Dr. Gensel did not like this influx at all, because Leipzig was fighting with Erlangen for the sad fame of being a planting place of rigid orthodoxy (!). He did not say that Leipzig should compete with Heidelberg and Giessen for the sad fame of the most empty lecture halls; but he demanded that professors of 'mediating direction' should be employed. Ludwig described this mediating direction in more detail to the effect that 'freethinkers' had to be employed, those who were free and free from the Christian faith in their own sense. This is called a mediating direction! He made the astute observation that the Leipzig orthodoxy was to blame for the decrease in the number of theology students in Saxony. The Minister v. Gerber answered that there were one or two of this free direction among the younger doctors. Incidentally, a good half of the professors belonged to the mediating theology, and the other orthodox half showed a great diversity of opinions, thus being nothing less than 'rigid'.

orthodox'. Then, however, v. Gerber declared that if he found a free-minded theologian who proved himself capable in terms of scholarship and character, he would have no hesitation at all in cooperating in his appointment in Leipzig. If this happens, there will be no hesitation in employing such men in the preaching ministry. For as the prospective clergymen are taught by the highest command, so they will also be allowed to teach as employed clergymen. There the wheat of the Protestant Association blossoms! The motion of Gensel and Ludwig for the early appointment of a decidedly liberal, historical-critical professor was approved by 46 votes to 23." Cultusminister Gerber is at the head of the church regiment. And it is on this church regiment that those who want to be strict believers place their hopes! O of the cane! Of him the Scripture says: "Which, when they fasted it in the hand, it broke, and pricked them in the sides; but when they leaned upon it, it broke, and pricked them in the loins." Ezek. 29, 6. 7. W.

Saxony. How blessed one was in Saxony, when more than a year ago the notorious rationalist Sydow was declared capable in the Prussian-United Church to administer an "evangelical" preaching ministry! And what does one do now, since a "Saxon Sydow" has also been found, as the Mecklenburg Church Gazette quite correctly calls Dr. Sülze? The Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kz. of February 11 reports the following: "Pastor Dr. E. Sulze in Chemnitz, despite the small majority (9 against 8 votes) with which he was elected pastor in Neustadt-Dresden, and despite the condition of his voters to let the 'Leuchte' published by him be received, has accepted the election that fell on him, even against the expectations of his friends. On the part of the church regiment, there seems to be no obstacle to the confirmation of the election. - It is indeed saddening when even those in Saxony who really want to be Lutherans still do not open their eyes about their national church. But this is the bitter fruit of denial, and it makes one ever more blind. W.

Injury proceedings against a punitive preacher. The behavior of the secular courts against a preacher when a member of his congregation brings an action against him for iniquity because the preacher has used epanorthosis (2 Tim. 3, 16.) against him, is very different in different states. Here in America, too, the judges on such occasions, often in the same state, render a completely different verdict. Interesting is what the "Pilgrim from Saxony" of March 19 reports in this regard. It is the following: "The following case from Saxony is embarrassing. A man comes to the clergyman of his parish and asks him, in order to obtain a scholarship for his upcoming golden jubilee, for a certificate in which, according to the statutes of the collature of the scholarship in question, the neediness and worthiness of the petitioner is to be attested. On the basis of very credible rumors about the man, the clergyman believes that he is not allowed to certify his worthiness, and he did not hold back from him in any way with what would determine him to such a refusal. The jubilee candidate denies everything that is held against him and demands the naming of the clergyman's guarantors. Understandably, the latter rejects this request outright, and now a complaint is filed. The result is that the clergyman is sentenced in all instances on the basis of § 186 of the penal code to a fine of 5 Thlr. and also to pay the costs. It is fair to ask, what is to become of pastoral care if the proceedings of a clergyman, such as the one in question, fall under the penal code? But since this is desired from certain sides, or at least the right to a "You are the man" is to be withdrawn from the clergy and transferred to the culture fighters a la Lasker in certain cases, perhaps another hint will be useful. The

The weekly viewer of the 'Pilgrim' is not a jurist, but, if I may say so, merely a clergyman. But he happens to be in the position to be able to refer to a decision which the Prussian Court of Justice gave for the decision of conflicts of competence in a case similar to the one narrated, on appeal of a Prussian consistory which had intervened on behalf of the sued clergyman. The High Court said: "Statements made to protect legitimate interests, judgments by officials in office, and similar cases do not fall under § 186. Rather, it has in mind only those cases in which disparaging or derogatory facts are asserted or disseminated voluntarily, without any justified cause, but not also cases in which an official interest provided the motivation for the statement. Therefore, even if the defendant made a reproach based on a mere rumor that seemed true to him or based on what he learned about the plaintiff's lifestyle, it must be assumed above all that he was pursuing a justified official interest..... If the form in which the defendant has spoken about the character of the plaintiff was too unsparing, the rebuke of the same belongs before his superior disciplinary authority, but there is no transgression of office to be left to judicial punishment, in that the intention to offend is absent." - In Prussia, then, the judiciary shows more insight into the difference between state and church than that in Saxony. W.

Prussian Provincial Church. The following report by Dr. Münkler shows how quickly the church is going downhill: "Pastor Werner has been elected pastor in the province of Brandenburg in Guben and confirmed by the Brandenburg consistory. The same man was previously elected in the city of Hanover, but because of his unbelief he did not pass the colloquium before the city ministry and was dismissed without the state consistory having to examine his orthodoxy. This same man is elected in Brandenburg, and what is very significant, confirmed by the same consistory which not long ago had recognized the dismissal of Sydow, Werner's comrade-in-arms. So times have changed."

Hanover. The following is written to the Allg. ev.-luth. Kztg. of February 25 from Hanover: "Finally the note that we can possibly experience another Klappiade in a short time, since the liberals succeeded after very great efforts on February 12 in pushing through the free-spirited Pastor Stephan from Chemnitz as the third pastor at St. Katharinen in Osnabrück. Stephan received 784 votes, his opposing candidate, Wendt from Hörter, 550. In the election of April 27, 1873, Pastor Klapp received 508 votes out of 559 cast. One sees from this that the positive members of the St. Katharinen congregation have finally roused themselves from their lethargy, even if this new victory of the liberals proves how deeply liberalism has taken hold in Osnabrück." - Accordingly, we learn that the Saxon regional church in Chemnitz not only carries a Sulze, but also a second unbelieving preacher in its bosom. W.

Preachers committing gross sins. On March 12, the Berlin Tribune wrote: "A sad sign of the spreading corruption of morals are the ever-increasing accusations against clergymen and teachers for performing lewd acts on their students. One of the most abominable cases of this kind can be registered from a place in the Mark, where the local pastor, an old man of seventy, has been guilty of the described offenses for years in the most aggravating manner, as has been confirmed by the investigation. He has now been remanded in custody. The conduct of the old sinner is all the more reprehensible because in his words he always formally speaks of piety.

He was also a man who was overflowing with joy and who, especially in the matter of the bridal wreath, was implacable toward the fallen of his army. - It is quite frightening! O how should preachers watch and pray before all, lest they fall into temptation.' How they should daily and hourly, especially in the hour of temptation, remember the word of the Lord: "But whosoever shall offend these least of these that believe on me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the sea, where it is deepest. W e h e the world for the sake of trouble! Trouble must come, but woe to the man by whom trouble comes! Matth. 18, 6. 7. Without doubt Polycarpus Leyser rightly says in the evangelical harmony that the first "woe" is the "*Vae dolentis*", the other the "*Vae poenam denuntiantis*"; the annoyed world complains to the Lord, he threatens the one who gives trouble. Therefore, woe to the preacher who sins in this way, heedless of the disgrace he thereby brings upon his God and Lord, upon the church and the gospel, and of the eternal ruin into which he thereby drags down whole multitudes of souls bought at great cost! In such a state one is reminded of that verse of the hymn: "O eternity, thou word of thunder": "O thou cursed child of man, mad of mind, blind of heart," etc. The slaves of sin in the priest's robe think, of course, that their crimes will remain hidden and thus no trouble will arise from them, but Satan, who knows well what damage is done to the kingdom of God and what increase the kingdom of darkness and death receives through this, already sees to it that the crime of the one who preaches God's word is revealed, and God also lets him succeed out of righteous judgment on the world that rejects divine truth and on the hypocrites among the Christians.

W.

As is well known, the **accusation of heresy** has become something almost unheard of in our days, at least a great rarity. It is indeed a dangerous thing for a theologian of modern faith even to recall that there is such a thing as heresy. That it nevertheless happens that even a theologian of modern faith raises the accusation of heresy, and does so with full justification, we will take the liberty of recording an example of this here. In the last December issue of the *Erlanger Zeitschrift*, Dr. v. Hofmann had reproached Clöter, a chiliast who had become truly mad, that the latter, by his predominant emphasis on the millennial kingdom, was distorting the central point of the truth of salvation, the doctrine of justification. In order to escape this reproach, Clöter, as is the way of all such spirits, made all sorts of nonsense in a reply sent in. Then Dr. v. Hofmann took hold of him and finally wrote: "I am addressing what is in his office and ask: what is to be emphasized in preaching and pastoral care as what is necessary for salvation? He (Clöter) answers 'the future kingdom of JEsu', the church answers 'reconciliation with God'. Which of the two is the apostolic way is to be read in 2 Cor. 5, 20. to 6, 2. Whoever does not want to learn it there, I will not teach him either, but do according to Tit. 3, 10." (*Erl. Ztschr. March-Heft. p. 166.*)

W.

A converted (?) former cenotist. L. Stählin writes in the *March-Hest* of the *Erlangen journal*: "On the theological side, the doctrine of God has been given a new version. It has been said: Christ, by becoming man, has given up everything that is not essential to God in order to be God, that is, everything in which he exercises his being God in the world.... . We confess that we ourselves used to share this new version of the doctrine of the state of Christ's abasement, but that we have been completely led away from it by the study of Schelling (!) and F. Böhme. Whoever admits even some truth to the way in which Schelling tries to put the meaning of Christ for the natural being, for the natural cosmos into the light, will not be able to go this way. For God probably remains God even without any be-

The world cannot exist without God, not only not without the Father but also not without the Son. But the world cannot exist without God, and not only not without the Father, but also not without the work of the Son..... The creation of the world is mediated by Him, but there is also no world preservation without the Son, as the Scripture expressly teaches: all things are confessed in Him (Col. 1, 17.), which can hardly be said of the Son of God in His present mode of being, i.e. of the transfigured Son of Man, as it could be meant in the previous verse that the world was once created by Christ in His present mode of being. If, according to this word of the apostle, the existence of the universe, which includes in itself the coherent order of its existence, has its ground in him, through whom and for whom it is, in whom it rests,' then the world would have to cease to exist if Christ ceased to be God in relation to the world and to act as such. In the striving for historical view, for historical truth and reality, this doctrine has dissolved and destroyed the conditional prerequisite of all history, the supporting ground of the whole cosmos and its history. It is a world-shattering thought that this doctrine expresses, and hardly anything is more surprising than the contrast between its world-destroying content and the guilelessness with which it is presented." But, Stählin immediately adds: "Not as if we were therefore compelled to return to the old dogmatic teaching!" - Lo and behold, modern theology! In order to reconcile itself with philosophy, it puts in the place of a particularly objectionable dogma a thought that comes to it, but behold! there philosophy again shows it how it thereby gets into contradictions! Quickly she turns back again; only she does not turn back to God's word. But this is the well-deserved disgrace of the newer theology, that it allows itself to be led on a fool's rope by philosophy before all the world.

W.

School compulsion. In Gladbach and Rheinberg, two district congresses of teachers, the latter on February 10, adopted resolutions on the confessional and interconfessional elementary school, which stated, among other things: "Any compulsory obligation of parents to send their children to interconfessional state schools (the prohibition of confessional private schools) would be such an encroachment on the religious freedom of the people, such an oppression and rape of consciences, that it could only be compared to a violent act of Asiatic despotism.

Freedom from usury. Otto Glagau wrote in his book "Der Börsen- und Gründerschwindel in Berlin": "The freedom from usury privileged the 'cutthroats', pawnbrokers and repurchase dealers, those vampires and leeches who fatten themselves at the expense of frivolity and need, and claim their victims from all strata of society.

Russia. The general government of the Baltic provinces is to be abolished and these basically German and Lutheran provinces are henceforth to be administered in Petersburg. The pilgrim from Saxony says in relation to this quite correctly: "That this autocratic act of government does not benefit our Lutheran co-religionists in the Baltic provinces, but on the contrary means a further Russification and only facilitates the old attempts to drive the Lutherans into the arms of the Greek Church, is only too certain.

Necrological. The associate professor of theology in Leipzig, Dr. Joh. Delitzsch, the eldest son of Professor Dr. Franz Delitzsch, has died.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 22.

June 1876.

No. 6.

What is it about the progress of modern Lutheran theology in doctrine-.

(Continued.)

VIII. Mas is biblical angel teaching?

Theses.

Hollaz: "The existence of angels is known with certainty from sacred Scripture and believed with a divine faith; from the principles of reason it is concluded with probability, not in an incontrovertible manner." *)

H. Kromayer: "Since this article (of the angels) is not a part of the definition of the" (justifying) "faith, nor does it serve as a basis for that which belongs to the concept and definition of faith, the knowledge of it, especially in those who find themselves converted at the threshold of death, is absolutely necessary for salvation. Therefore, in theological systems, especially in those that deal only with the fundamental articles of faith or especially with the controversial ones, as in the Augsburg Confession and its Apology, in the Schmalkaldic Articles and the Concordia Formula, the treatment of this article is omitted. But even though this article may be unknown, especially to those who pass away immediately after their conversion and thus have no further room for reflection, it may not be denied, since it is not only sufficiently founded in Scripture, but also the denial of it deprives God of the praise of omnipotence and providence.

*Existencia angelorum certo innotescit e Scriptura S. et creditur fide divina, ex principiis rationis topice et probabiliter, non apodictice et irrefragabili- liter colligitur. (Examen th. P. I, c. 4. q. 2. p. 374.)

*) If one divides the articles of faith into fundamental, circumfundamental, and prefundamental, one counts this article of creation and angels among the circumfundamental ones." **)

The same: "The angels were not brought forth from God's substance. For either they would have been brought forth from it by procreation or by some other impartation. Not by procreation, because the Son is the only begotten, Joh. 1, 14. 3, 16. 1 Joh. 4, 8. the own, i.e. actual, Rom. 8, 32. who has God as his own Father, Joh. 5, 18. Not by any other impartation, because God's essence is indivisible, completely something whole, incommunicable to everything else that is outside the bosom of the Godhead." †)

J. W. Baier: "The angels are by their nature spirits (so they are expressly called Ebr. 1, 14.) or spiritual or incorporeal beings, which do not consist of matter and form. For here the word spirit is not taken for a finer corporeal substance, as the wind is, Joh. 3, 8. or the breath of a living being is, Is. 2, 22. but in adequate contrast to the body; in the sense, namely, in which it is taken Jam. 2, 26. and in which it must be taken if it is ascribed to a nature that is not only living but also rational. Compare Luk 24, 39, where Christ, although he was 1. a spiritual being according to his divine nature, 2.

*If the article of the angels may not be denied, then it may still less be reversed and falsified and, to please a self-invented system, be transformed into a main article and thus a false reason may be foisted on the faith. Hereof in the antitheses an example.

**) "Cum nec ipsam fidei definitionem ingrediatur hic articulus (de angelis), nec immediate iis, quae ad conceptum et definitionem fidei pertinent, substet, ipsius cognitio praecise ad salutem necessaria non est, praesertim iis, qui convertendi sunt in limine mortis. Quare saepius in theologicis systematibus, praesertim iis, quae fundamentales tantum fidei articulos aut maxime controversos tradunt, ut Aug. Confess., ejusdemque Apol., Schmalcald. art. et Formula Cone., peculiaris ipsius tractatio intermittitur. Utut autem ignorari possit hic articulus ab iis imprimis, qui statim post conversionem suam fati concedunt et ita non amplius cogitandi spatium habent; negari tamen non debet, cum et in Scripturis satis sit fundatus et ipsius negatio Deo laudem omnipotentiae et providentiae subtrahat. Quodsi articuli dividantur in fundamentales, circumfundamentales et praeterfundamentales, hic ipse de creatione ac angelis articulus ad circumfundamentales refertur." (Th, posit.-pol. I, 259. s.)

†) „Angeli non ex Dei substantia fuerunt producti. Aut enim per generationem, aut per aliam quandam participationem inde producti fuissent. Non per generationem, quia Filius est μονογενής i. e. unigenitus, Joh. 1, 14. 3, 16. 1 Joh. 4, 8., est ἰδιος i. e. proprius, Rom. 8, 32, qui Deum habeat Ἰδιον πατέρα, Joh. 5, 18. Non per aliam quandam participationem, quia essentia divina est ἀμέρωτος i. e. indivisibilis, ὁλως ὁλον τι i. e. totaliter totum quid, aliis extra sinum deitatis positis incommunicabilis." (L. c. p. 290.)

3. had received a spiritual body after the resurrection, but denied that he was a spirit when he wanted to prove the truth of his body in his human nature. So also Ephes. 6, 12. the angels are opposed to the flesh and blood, i.e. the corruptible bodily nature."

*)

B. Antitheses.

v. Hofmann: "That there are spirits, the scripture does not teach, but presupposes it. Understood in this way, it may be true that the doctrine of angels has never been a dogma of Scripture; and if it is said that it belongs to the doctrines which are accepted only on the testimony of Holy Scripture, then this is correct only insofar as the view which serves as a prerequisite for the statements of Scripture about angels, this view, which is popular everywhere, has become foreign to us through the scientific observation of nature, so that of course we now come across it only in and with those statements. . . . Rather, we have to look back partly to a disorderly view,**) partly to experiences of the history attested by the Scriptures." †) (The Proof of Scripture. Noerdlingen.

*) "Sunt angeli sua natura spiritus (ita expresse vocantur Ehr. 1, 14.) seu substantiae spirituales aut incorporeae, ex materia et forma non constantes. Accipitur enim h. 1. vox spiritus non pro substantia corporea subtiliori, qualis est ventus, Job. 3, 8., aut halitus animantis, Es. 2, 22., sed in oppositione adaequata ad corpus; eo sci. sensu, quo accipitur Jac. 2, 26. et quo accipi debet, quando tribuitur naturae non solum viventi, sed et intelligenti. Confer Luc. 24, 39-, ubi Christus, licet 1. secundum divinam naturam spiritualis essentiae esset, 2. ex parte humanae naturae animam spiritualem haberet, 3. post resurrectionem corpus spirituale accepisset, tamen negavit, se esse spiritum, eum veritatem corporis in natura humana demonstrare vellet. Sic etiam Eph. 6, 12. carni et sanguini i. e. naturae corporeae corruptibili opponuntur angeli." Compend. th. posit. P. I. c. 3. § 5.)

**This "disorderly view" is said to have been formed from the first appearance of angels and to have made itself known already in Gen. 1, 26, where Elohim is used in such a way "that in the unity of its concept a multiplicity is summarized". (S. 275.)

†) As if therefore the angel doctrine could not be a Christian doctrine, no "scriptural dogma", because it corresponds to a "popular view"! Accordingly, one could also delete the doctrine of God and many other so-called *articuli mixti in the* class of scriptural doctrines, but v. Hofmann has his good reason to make this strange and dangerous list. He does it in the interest of his system, which does not recognize Scripture as its source, but only (allegedly) as its touchstone, "takes its starting point from the simplest and most general fact of Christianity and takes its content from it alone, and in which the doctrine of angels plays one of the most important roles". - Incidentally, according to Luthardt and Kahnis, the doctrine of angels "does not appear in Scripture as a revelation, but as a conviction based on facts of religious experience. (See the former's "Compendium," Third Edition, p. 108.) "The existence of angels in the Old Testament is taken from an ancient view." (S. 105.)

1852. I, 274. 275.) "The world of spirits is therefore, also in so far as in it the one essence of God unfolds into the diversity of his qualities to be active in the world, decided in the spirit of God and united in the self-diversifying unity of the same, and with the fact that the first closes in itself, and thus the divine seven-number touches the four-number of the world, the place is set where God is present to our world, and this world has its beginning. - If we have correctly grasped and rendered the testimony of Scripture concerning the angels" (which is by no means the case), "it must now be evident of itself how little the procedure of a dogmatist corresponds to it, who finds no other occasion to speak of the angels than in so far as he regards their existence as just as possible as that of man really is, or who even speaks of them only in passing. The angels have their scriptural place there, where the relationship of man and thus of the physical world to God is stated. While they are decided in God the spirit as in the effectively present life reason of the physical world, the human being is the image of God of the archetypal world goal. The angels are in the relationship of the spirit of God, the man is in that of the archetypal world goal to God the supramundane creator. In other words, the angels serve to accomplish the eternal will of God, but the object of this eternal will of God is man. "*) (p. 355. f.) "God does not appear to be enclosed in once and for all ordered, unchangeable laws of nature, but his will.

*) While other modern Lutheran theologians mutilate the doctrine of the angels, v. Hofmann, on the other hand, seizes the idea of angels to expand his air-building of the spirit of God, as the general world soul, or "as the effectively present life-ground of the physical world". He cuts the dress of the Scriptures in pieces and stitches it together from the pieces suitable for his system to a magnificent quilt before the eyes of reason. According to v. H. the angels are not called into existence by God's word and will out of nothing, but by the fact that the being of God "unfolded", the spirit of God "manifolded itself", while they, however, remain "decided in God the spirit". Let us now take v. Hofmann's doctrine of the creation of the world and of man in general, according to which "God is not merely the author of his (man's) life, but has set it forth from himself in such a way that he made his own life the basis of another, which is like his" (p. 127), and according to which "it is the power of the life originally belonging to God, which he sets apart from himself as the basis of the world life that becomes and has become (p. 189): so it is beyond doubt that v. Hofmann's angel doctrine is based on emanatist and pantheist views. Also Dr. Kliefoth, according to his criticism of v. Hofmann's scriptural evidence, could not judge differently. He finally writes about v. H.'s doctrine of the relationship of angels to God: "After all, the question will be allowed: whether such doctrinal statements correctly draw the line between theism and pantheism? and no unbiased person will dare to answer this question in the affirmative. (Kirchl. Zeitschr.

is accomplished through the free use of those living and personal forces. And it is not the case that God only works extraordinary things through angels instead of through the ordinary forces of nature: in the whole life of nature the Scriptures see the working of spirits. . . . Throughout Scripture, all phenomena of world life, even the conflicting ones, are traced back to the work of the spirits, without these ceasing to be united under God as the executors of his will. Through them also bad things come over men, and men are also destined to bad things.... . So we find that God uses His angels, good and bad, in a similar way as He uses good and bad men: the good serve Him with will, the bad without meaning what He wants. But what concerns us now is only this, that all good and bad phenomena of the world life are attributed equally to the rule and work of a spirit plurality. . . . But if this is the case with the angel doctrine of the Scriptures, then it also has a place in our doctrinal whole that is in accordance with the Scriptures. For then God in his relationship to the world will not want to be thought without the spirits, in that on the one hand he communicates himself through them to the world in the multiplicity of its individual appearances, as this is shown differently in the cherubs, differently in the "divine counsel" (the angels with God Ps. 89, 8.), "differently in the army of the angels, while on the other hand the corporeal world is not the object of the divine action by means of a once for all ordered natural connection, but by means of personally effective forces in it: a basic view, which then remains for all further contents of the theological doctrinal whole the indispensably always present background. *) . . . But we have already spoken of the spirit multiplicity.

1859. p. 312.) Dr. Philippi judges similarly. He first writes: "We will not be justified" (because of certain expressions used by von H.), "to think of the Hofmann angels as mere personifications of divine powers, for they are personal spirits, nor as a gnostic, from the divine BpthoS hypostatically emanirtrS aeon realm, for they are created spirits. Who Philippi immediately adds: "And yet, according to Hofmann's premises, *tertium non datur*, although such a *tertium* suspended between emanation and creation seems to be meant. In itself, of course, *tertium datur*, namely the simple and unambiguous doctrine of the church, commanded by the scriptural faith analogy, according to which the angels in time are at once, during the six-day work, personal spirits created out of nothing." (Kirchl. Glaubens!. 1857. II, 313.) But v. H. does not want to know anything about this, because this scriptural truth cannot be used for his gnostic system.

*Even Kahnis writes in relation to v. H.'s doctrine of angels: "One goes beyond the limits of Scripture if one sees in the angels the necessary medium of God's world relationship. God needs neither in creation, nor in providence, nor in the work of redemption these servants." (op. cit. I, 559.)

In the words of the first chapter, it is not only said that it is under God, but also that it is decided in the spirit of God, that the spirit of God works through it the multiplicity of the individual world phenomena. Yes, precisely the statement of the difference of the working of the Spirit of God, in so far as it has a determining influence on the world in its aiming at man, and in so far as it produces the multiplicity of its individual phenomena through the multiplicity of spirits, is the essential content of the doctrine set forth above" (pp. 275, 282, 308, 313, 351, 354).

J. H. Kurtz: "The angels are spirits (Ebr. 1, 14.). Thereby a positive and a negative is stated about the nature of the angels. The positive is the concept of spirituality, of the free, self-conscious personality in contrast to the impersonal, unfree life of nature.... . The negative, which includes the general designation of the angels as spirits, is - to use the apt words of a respected theologian (J. T. Beck) - "the negation of the fleshy and bony nature of our earthly life, of the form of life of our earthly-spatial life-organism, thus also of the dependence on the earthly-spatial living conditions and laws of motion, without denying them a body-organ and an external life corresponding to it. For the Scriptures open up to us, apart from and above ours as it is now, a sphere of bodily life which, like the one on this side in its condensation of flesh and blood, corresponds in its earthy character to our earth system (1 Cor. 15, 45. ff.), so also as faithful deformation is homogeneous to the heavenly world system and likewise to the nature of a pure spirit (πνεῦμα), as our body on this side in its present reality is homogeneous to the nature of a mere (of the soul life)." . . . The bodies here (1 Cor. 15, 40.) designated as heavenly can, according to the whole context (!) and tendency of the

*That God works everything in the corporeal world through angels, v. H. believes to have proved by induction, but since the Scriptures certainly testify that the angels have worked these and those "individual phenomena of world life", v. H.'s reasoning is an illogical conclusion *a particulari ad universale*. But what does not a modern theologian do to have also his system and to give it a biblical coating! In order to bring the Bible into harmony with the system, he sometimes dares to make a bold leap not only beyond God's Word, but even beyond the barriers of logic, in which ordinary human children consider themselves banished. In addition, according to v. H.'s teaching, God's relationship to the world cannot be thought in any other way than through the angels. By the fact that God is supposed to do everything through the angels, as Dr. Kliefoth rightly remarks, "God and God's personal work and activity, separated from the world by the interposed angels, are pushed back into the supra-worldliness, on the other hand miracles and revelation are worked like the most everyday by personally living natural forces and consequently pulled down to this most everyday. But by the fact that God is not supposed to be able to do anything else, v. H. takes away from us the rationalistic so-called necessity of the laws of nature and gives us instead his angelic necessity.

Place can only be the bodies of the celestials or the angels*). . . . As the present human body bears the character and nature of the present earthly materiality, so we will have to think of the angels in a similar relation of their bodies to the heavenly materiality, since their body is called a heavenly one in the same sense as the human one is called an earthly one. If in the biblical view heaven is everywhere ascribed a higher purity, clarity, splendor and glory than the earth in its present state, we will have to think of the heavenly angels' bodies as finer, more ethereal, purer and more luminous than the earthly bodies of men. **) . . . Also the appearance of the angels on earth corresponds to this view. Thus Matthew says of the angel whom the disciples saw at the tomb of Christ: His form was like lightning and his garment white like snow, in which words not the only momentarily assumed human-like of his appearance is described, but rather just the extra- and superhuman, thus the *Specifisch-Angelische*; not his temporary appearance, but his actual nature. ... The older dogmatists have denied this and described the angels as absolute bodiless spirits; but there is a misunderstanding of the biblical designation of them as spirits, and the negation of a corporeality that somehow inhibits the spiritual life, which is to be determined, brought them to the complete negation of all corporeality, because they always thought of the coarse massiveness and clumsiness of earthly bodies. †) In fact, even apart from the positive biblical testimonies, the concept of an absolute bodilessness is in itself already completely incompatible with the concept of creatureliness,

*Dr. Delitzsch, following our old theologians, rightly says that the heavenly bodies of 1 Cor. 15:40 are sun, moon and stars (as this is taught by the "whole context and the tendency of the passage"); the doctrine of the bodies of the angels is "only a delusion brought to the Scriptures"; if one assumes that the bodies are essential and original to the angels: "then one brings the whole creation into confusion, for nothing is truer and more Scriptural" than that, .to speak with Bonaventure, the world creation is threefold: *scilicet corporalis tantum, ut elementa; spiritualis tantum, ut angelus; composita ex his, ut homo.*" (Bibl. Psychology. p. 48.)

**Also what J. P. Lange said about the law of the corporealization of all finite spirits from the material of their sphere of residence, where they are, will serve to put this subject in a bright light.
Kurtz.

†) Who knows "the older dogmatists", knows that this is not true. They referred, for example, to Christ's transfigured body, by the presence of which the Lord wanted to convince the disciples that he was not a spirit; Christ's transfigured body, however, did not have that "coarse massiness and sluggishness" which the older dogmatists thought of and for the sake of which they are said to have attributed corporeality to the angels.

168 What is it about the progress of modern Lutheran theology, etc.?

whose transfer to the angels has never been doubted from the biblical point of view. Physicality is the end of the ways of God. *) A creature without corporeality is not even conceivable, because everything created can live, work and exist only in space and time,**) and it is corporeality alone that binds the creature to space and time. Only God alone is an absolute spirit, only He alone stands above time and space. †) A created spirit without a corporeality, which holds it in space or in time, which gives it limitation and formation, would either have to be eternal, infinite and omnipresent like God, thus God himself, or, since this is incompatible with the concept of being created, it would rather dissolve into nothingness. Within the creature, therefore, corporeality is the condition of all existence, ††) the organ of all activity, the foil of the spirit; through it, the creature receives its limitation, its definiteness and its point of support, without it, it would blur and dissolve without attitude. ‡) The corporeality is a limitation for the created spirit, because it prevents it to be eternal, infinite and omnipresent."‡‡) (Bibel und Astronomie. Zweite Aufl. Berlin, 1849. S. 78-84.) .

Dr. A. F. C. Vilmar: "The older dogmatics took much trouble to describe the nature of the angels; mostly, however, they were guilty descriptions, which lacked even detailed scriptural research. ‡‡‡) Thus one of their descriptions was that they were par excellence incorporeal spirits (which had not even the finest corporeality about them), and therefore the angels were called *substantiae completae* (complete beings) in contrast to men, whose soul was called a *spiritus incompletus*; - it is the theory, drawn from empty spiritualism, and nowhere confirmed by Scripture; and in addition the comparison is

*The very opposite of this principle of the theosophist Oetinger is the truth: Spirituality is the end of the ways of God. Compare 1 Cor. 15, 46.

**) According to K. therefore also eternity will be time, heaven space!

† So the absoluteness of God consists in the fact that he is not bound to time and space?!

††) If corporeality is the "condition of all existence", then also the "spirit" must be something corporeal, what to assert is obvious materialism.

‡) If the spirit would "dissipate, blur and melt away" without the cover of a body, it must be a kind of gas!

If one refers now to some church fathers for the opinion that the angels have subtle bodies, so Löber has already remarked: "It originates from the Platonic philosophy that some assign a subtle matter to the angels, which they would have as body in themselves, of which opinion also formerly some old church teachers were taken. (Ev.-luth. Dogm. St. Louis, 1872. p. 261.)

‡‡‡) This is an obvious naked slander of the "older dogmatics". All regulations of the same about the nature of the angels are taken from the clear scripture.

with man, because the act of creation of man was overlooked or disdained to be appreciated at that time, a completely skewed one." (Dogmatik. Gütersloh, 1874. I, 306.)

J. H. Kurtz: "The sons of Elohim in Gen. 6. are not evil (Satan's) angels, but rather without doubt good angels, i.e. angels who remained good until this case "**) (The Marriages of the Sons of God with the Daughters of Men. Berlin, New York and Adelaide. 1857. S. 18.).

(To be continued.)

(Submitted.)

The Hexaemeron in Relation to Geology.

(Continued.)

But, one objects, what will geological natural science say to such an interpretation of the Scriptures? That would mean to ignore this wonderful science completely. Now, we are not geologists and in our argumentation we stick to the real facts brought to light by it and only dispute the consequences which it draws from these facts. But this does not require a great knowledge of facts and details, but only common sense and a little logical thinking. We claim then, as far and as far as the geology comes into conflict with the wording of the Mosaic creation report, it is not science, but dreamy speculation and adventurous hypothesis. In general, it contains much fiction and little truth. The building blocks, which are to be inserted into this construction, are not yet even after her

*Dr. Kurtz refers for his opinion besides some church fathers among others to Scheibel, Krabbe, v. Hofmann, Delitzsch, Baumgarten. Although we do not want to make him and these gentlemen heretics for the sake of their fantasy or, as Luther says, "foolish fable", that good angels mixed with the daughters of men and thereby gave life to a giant race, but thereby themselves fell together with men, we nevertheless believe to be able to apply Irenaeus' statement to them: "*Ad versus haereticos victoria est sententiae eorum manifestatio*". (Against the heretics the mere manifestation of their opinion is victory.) That Theodoret calls the advocates of the doctrine of those angelic fiefs (*Qq. in Gen. 47.*) "*stupidi et stolidi*," and Augustin does not speak more honorably of them, may only be mentioned. - By the way, Lic. Stroebel writes quite well: "Why should it be a crime to have not one of the demons (because these never bear the name 'sons of God'), but a heavenly angel for a son-in-law or brother-in-law? ... In Moses the 'sons of God' are dragged into ruin by their wives and their relatives; in Professor K. it is just the other way round: there the 'son of heaven', the 'angel' of light, seduces, contaminates, demonizes his wife, together with her parents and siblings!" (Guericke's Zeitschrift of 1861. p. 292. 293.)

The building's inner content, recognized according to its nature and value, is much less prepared for insertion. And the architect who is to erect the building has truly yet to be born. So far, only a heap of rubble lies before us. One does not know the individual data exactly and knows their far too few. And the law, according to which they can be combined to a truth system, is up to now an unknown secret. What would Baco of Verulam, the acknowledged founder of the modern empirical sciences, have said to this reckless, self-thrusting procedure? He writes in his *Novum Organum*: "The learned have tried to create a world from their ideas and to derive from their reason everything necessary for it, instead of building from experience and observation. If they had done the latter, they would have had facts and not opinions before them, by which means they could have finally recognized the governing laws of the material world. From these unproven presuppositions they then quickly deduce everything - a mode of proceeding that is obstructive to true science, but all the more conducive to vain disputation." (*Engl. Liter. Vol. I, 240.*) This applies in the highest degree to the newer geological systems.

The inclined reader shall allow us to briefly sketch the system put up by the geologists and put into the field against the Mosaic creation report here. It is said that the earth's crust consists of a series of superimposed rock layers, different in their compositions and formation series, which one has called primary mountains, transitional mountains, tertiary formations and quaternary mountains or diluvium, and which are then again composed of very different types of rocks and earth. From these mountain types only the Urgebirge should contain no Petrefacten, while all other should close a paleontological finding bordering on the unbelievable in itself. The lower stratified mountain types are supposed to contain the lowest animals and plants and from there upward a steady progress is supposed to lie through the other mountain formations up to the now existing flora and fauna. Also, no human remains are said to have been found until the Alluvium. These allegedly over each other layered mountain formations are supposed to put back a primeval creation into a fabulous sounding distant beginning time and are supposed to constatiren different, successive creation periods, which one calls primeval, secondary, tertiary and diluvial time, on which then only the present historical time period is supposed to have followed. These different time and creation periods are to be proved from the nature of the different mountain formations and from the fossil plant and animal species enclosed in them. Before all this, however, according to the now most widespread system of volcanism, our earth body, as a ball of gas, is supposed to have been in a space in which, by contraction of the atoms, by means of a chemical

In the second process, everything changed into a molten state, from which liquid mass, by cooling and compression, the primary mountains were formed, while after the neptunism the mass dissolved in the water precipitated as primary mountains.

But what is thus stated as fact and even more, the conclusion drawn from it is subject to strong and just doubt and is completely unproven conjecture. For:

1. Nobody can prove what belongs to the immediate creation in the earth's interior and what to the formed since then. The first miraculous becoming of things certainly did not take place according to the laws of nature known to us, according to which the created continues to exist. Who would like to conclude from the work known to us and the gradual development of a man that God must have created the first also as a child and that he had to go through the whole physical and psychic course of development which we perceive now in man, from the embryo state to manhood, would certainly be very wrong. The development of the protoplast happened suddenly, the present one, up to the complete development of maturity, happens gradually. And it is the same with the animal and plant world. The animals were brought to Adam immediately after the creation, so that he would give them names. And Adam found already on the seventh day the food necessary for his physical life in paradise. Even the tree of knowledge was already resplendent with fruit that was lovely to look at. And will it not have been the same with the other creation? Certainly, the other and thus probably most of what the interior of the earth contains, did not first develop from a primordial slime or from raw material and gradually took shape and form. That it is equal to that which has now come into being through indirect creation and according to the existing laws of nature, does not matter. The directly and indirectly created differs well by its mode of origin, but not according to its kind and nature. That is why no man is able to draw the borders between what was created in the beginning and what came into being afterwards. The creation of the world, the origin of our earth body with everything that fills and animates it, lies beyond the limits of all natural science and natural history. Only through faith do we recognize that the world was created by God's word, that everything that is seen came into being from nothing. Natural science is not able to reconstruct the creation. But already with this - as we are convinced - the ground under the feet of geology, as an exact science, is taken away.

2. Up to now, only an infinitesimal part of the earth has been geologically investigated and explored. From all of Asia, Africa, a large part of America and even Europe one knows in geognostic relation as good as nothing. That one at this and that place with the

The fact that a hammer has been tapping away at the exposed rock of the mountains does not mean that a part of the earth has been geologically investigated and explored. If a citizen of the Middle Kingdom came ashore in New York and wanted to determine the fauna and flora of our entire continent from the plant and animal species seen within a radius of three miles, this would be just as reasonable as the hasty conclusions of geologists from the few facts known to them. In general, only the mountains are the field for geological investigations. The geologists cannot penetrate into the interior of the earth. What fatal consequences the recognition of an area from a great distance and only according to general outlines can have, the military commanders of the United States often had to experience to their great disadvantage in the last war. The enemy often stood where their scouting sight had not reached to ambush them as they advanced. And it is more than probable that a geological exploration of the whole crust of the earth - if it were possible, as it is not - would lead to very different results from those now before us.

3. The borders of the so far explored mountain formations are by no means certain and determined, but flowing and merge with such gradation that almost every geologist has invented his own classification system, on which he bases his age calculation of the earth. What the one counts to one kind of mountains, the other assigns to another. What the one sets, the other overturns again, so that proposition and contrast always neutralize each other. Werner, Conybear, MacCulloch, Brongniart, Amatus de Halloy, de la Beche, Buckland, Mantell, Lyell, Phillip, Ansted, Rogers and many others have all set up different, conflicting systems. Everything is uncertain, uncertain and indeterminable according to the present knowledge.

4. The different mountain types do not always occur in the same order. Some limbs are completely dropped out in different places. Nowhere they appear all complete. In North and South America, one has not yet been able to discover the Cretaceous formation so powerfully developed in Europe. In all of Scandinavia and in a large part of Russia exist only the first members of the transitional mountains; all newer layers are missing. On the Pyrenees the granite, which belongs to the Urgebirge, comes into contact with the Cretaceous formation and in Tyrol it covers the limestone, which belongs to the Triassic of the Flötzgebirge. From Massachusetts to the Mississippi and from Canada to Alabama in the United States, the older layers of stone lie on the newer ones. Thus an inverse order takes place from that considered normal. (*Geol. of Moss. Vol. 2, p. 5(8.)* Schafhäütl, who examined the Bavarian Alps geognostically, expresses himself in his report about it to the effect: "1) that the chronological petrefacts of the Lias of the

The first is that the lower, middle and upper Jurassic often occur in one and the same stratum; and the second is that the individual systems of our strata repeat themselves several times, whereby the younger series of strata, in relation to their age, come to lie below the old ones. (Geogn. Unters. p. 26.) That means in other words, that after one of the older strata had formed, one of the newer ones was formed chronologically later. Whether this happened by repetition, does not matter. Accordingly, different layers would have formed at different places at the same time, to which also really otherwise so much points and which the geologists admit also in small scale. With it, however, the whole development theory and the long time calculation based on it and above all the ten miles thick, layered mountain formation, which is to cover the earth, is thrown over the heap and the latter sinks perhaps also so many hundred feet down. Admittedly, the geologists seek to explain these facts destroying their whole system of an immeasurably great age of the earth by the postulate that while these "many" miles thick mountain formations were still pliable, they were, often in a circumference of several thousand miles, pinched at the sides and lifted up in the middle by immensural internal natural forces, overturned and thrown on the newer stone formations. But *credat Judaeus Apella!* One thinks of the uplifting and overturning of a stone plate measuring several thousand miles in the square! What a height it must have reached when it stood upright! And then a layer of rock many miles thick from top to bottom bendable so that it could be bent and lifted up without breaking!!! Only in the land of milk and honey or in the homeland of the Brobdingnagians this could happen and be believed. And all this should have happened according to known and observed laws of nature! To the assumption of what impossibilities and to what desperation this hostility to the Bible drives those who are involved in it! What miracles, without one wanting to accept a divine miracle-worker!

5. According to the imagination of the geologists the stratified mountain formations should be about ten English miles thick or mighty. Since they are supposed to have formed in the sea, especially the transition mountains, a sea depth of ten miles would have been necessary for it, unless one wanted to assume a play of innumerable heaving and sinking, so that each time when a stone layer was finished, the sea bottom rose and sank again afterwards, so that a new one could form. If the herbs and trees were washed into the sea, as is claimed, then one asks reasonably: How did they come down into the deep sea bottom? What object would sink so deep according to the laws of gravity? And as is well known, wood floats until it is completely decayed and thus can no longer fossilize. So how do these remains of plants and trees get to the bottom of the sea?

Did they drag down their ancestors so deep into the sea that they could petrify there in their original form? Did they drag down those pre-mortal demons already dwelling at that time, of which the geological fable tells? But if these rock layers were formed by alluvial deposits on the seabed of parts of earth, animals and plants, as the geologists claim, then one does not understand why they should not all be of the same kind, since the parts supplied to the sea in one and the same region must always be of the same nature, until another earth catastrophe occurred. It could form therefore from one and the same material under same conditions also only one rock. And nevertheless not only the different mountain types, but also the layers of one and the same mountain type, deviate so much and so far from each other. (*Lord, Epochs of Creat.* p. 75. ff.).

6. About three-fourths of the earth's surface is now sea and only about one-fourth is land, and we have no reason to suppose that the relative proportion has ever been essentially different. Now, however, the thickness of the stratified mountain types is said to be ten miles. There the question arises as if by itself: Where did the earth masses come from, from which these mighty mountain formations could form? Even if the weathering of the primeval mountains proceeded still so slowly and was still so effective, this primeval rock volume was not sufficient by far to bring such a deposition to stand. There must have been valleys even on the primary rock formations between the mountains. And where there were plains, the humus, which was formed by weathering of the primary rocks, obviously remained and did not come into the sea. Only the soil particles washed away from the mountains had to settle partly in the valleys and partly be washed into the sea. But also from this only the smaller part was led into the sea, as the observation of the present alluvial process teaches it. And which mountains - mountains of more than thousand miles height - must have been necessary under such circumstances, from which, after weathering, such earth masses could be washed into the sea that from it the ten miles thick mountain formations could form. For this colossus therefore obviously the material is missing. Therefore, one has recently come away from this opinion and has assumed that these mountain layers have formed largely from fossilized infusoria, especially since the famous naturalist Ehrenberg discovered that the rock, as well as all humus of the earth's surface and even the lava of the volcanoes, often consists of fossil infusoria. This would have required then, one would like to think, an even longer time for the emergence of the earth's crust. But this shall not be so. Ehrenberg writes about it (*Mikrog.* p. 8) thus: "According to a law of development already presented in 1838, a single invisible pebble-shell-animal is able to divide itself by the act of self-division into eight

The first thing I would like to point out is that the forces of nature can develop in a few days to masses up to the volume of the entire earth and after an hour of rest, in a following single hour, to double this mass. In the face of such undeniable forces of nature, which may be called life force or otherwise, but which I will call by the name of life force, as before, in order to preserve a familiar expression for the enigma, the importance of an assumption of time for the development of them, indeed for the development of the earth, also disappears. All the mountains to be touched and explained here, exceeding 10,000 feet, as formations of the small life, can possibly have arisen in many thousands of years of often disturbed, but also in a few hours of undisturbed development." With it then, as with a blow, the bottom of the whole geological barrel would be completely expelled. Of course, it still remained questionable. For it could occur to such a small monster, of which each raindrop is said to contain several million, to divide itself quickly and to multiply rapidly, whereby we sublunarists would be hurled out into the airspace almost with lightning speed, by the rapid increase of the earth's volume. And if such a blow was repeated after an hour of rest! These beasts! Thus the natural scientists and representatives of the "exact sciences" are in the hair.

7. Then the volcanistic as well as neptunistic earth formation hypotheses are not only tasteless and adventurous, but also really impossible and set miracle upon miracle, while they were invented just to eliminate everything supernatural and to explain the whole earth formation according to the now known natural relations and natural laws. Thus, in the Tertiary period, great floods of water, called "Tertiary floods", are said to have raged, which completely shattered masses of layered rocks, carried away as debris and piled up walls of debris, sometimes very high, such as the Rigi, the Speer, the Roßberg, the Unkli. (Ebr. Apol. p. 386.) These naturalists find the biblical report of the flood extending over the whole earth and covering all mountains fabulous, unbelievable and impossible. They ask: Where should the necessary mass of water have come from? All sea waters shall not have sufficed. But they find the assumption of a tertiary flood at least as large, which piled up even the highest mountains, very understandable; for this the water quantity on our earth body was completely sufficient. In the report of the holy scripture the flood of sin is described as having come about by special intervention of divine omnipotence, as a judgment of God and thus rightly presented as a miracle. And certainly only as miracle the claimed tertiary floods would have been possible and only in this way they could be explained, but on natural way nevermore.

On these floods then, by evaporation of large water masses, a glaciation spreading over a large part of the earth's surface is to

have followed. *Hitchcock, Elem. of Geol.* p. 234. But one does not see how this should have been possible by natural means. As long as the evaporation proceeded, the glaciers obviously could not form and when the evaporation came to an end, the normal warmth must have re-entered and the glacier formation must have been nipped in the bud. Only by a colossal miracle, for example by softening of the earth from its position, it could be explained. And after this glaciation again a melting of the ice masses is supposed to have occurred, which broke off and tore loose large granite blocks from the northern mountains, which were carried away on the ice rafts to the south and settled on the European and North American lowlands, where they are supposed to figure as memorial stones of that miracle. According to this opinion our earth body, after it had come out of its track, by which that glaciation originated, would have to have slid in again finally. Even the otherwise unheard of, that water runs uphill, is said to have happened, whereby mountain blocks or boulders were carried from lower to higher mountains and these were ground and carved upward on their northern slopes. *Geol. of Mass. Vol. II*, p. 393. Thus we would have three natural wonders following each other, which would leave nothing to be desired in extent and colossality. The bible-hostile sore natural science finds no difficulty to believe these, and believing theologians, in order not to get into the disrepute of unscientificness, let themselves be impressed by it!

8. The way of origin of the primeval mountains postulated by the geology becomes now, however, the complete impossibility. From the witch's cauldron, in which the geologists brew and melt everything together, the different kinds of rocks, with the metals enclosed in them, could never have come out. Melt together the many minerals or also the 60 elements, approximately in the proportion in which they occur in the earth, and see whether the primary rocks, which differ so much from each other in their compositions, separate, precipitate and crystallize with the metals that they contain? Not at all. Only a *mixtum compositum*, a heap of rubble and slag results. And this is how the primary mountains would have to be, if the volcanists were right. Think of the fiery earth mass with its chemical elements in a process of cooling and solidification! Gold, platinum and other heavy metals would have to sink according to the law of gravity into the depth, after the earth center point, while the lighter rock types and metals on the surface, where the cooling took place, compress and crystallize. According to this assumption, not even a single granule or grain of the heavy metals could ever be found in the primary rock. They would have remained hidden from man forever in the earth's interior. (*Paine, Exam. Theor. Geol.* p. 105.) (Conclusion follows.)

Literary.

State and Future of the Saxon Regional Church. To be examined and taken to heart by all Lutheran-minded clergy and laity of the Saxon regional church. By *Lic. theol.* G. Stöckhardt, Diaconus. Zwickau 1876 (30 pages).

A most gratifying testimony from the scepter of the Saxon regional church, which, out of a loyal heart and with manly openness, holds it up as a sacred duty to the upcoming regional synod that, instead of continuing on the sloping path that has been trodden so far, it should rather seriously consider the "damage" to the regional church and at least immediately put an end to the grossest abuses. The author, as the preface (dated: Planitz, in the Passion Period, 1876) notes, "in the endangered situation of our (Saxon) church, considered it a duty to make a confession on his part and to substantiate the demands on the fulfillment of which, in his opinion, the existence of the Saxon regional church as a Lutheran church depends. - After recalling that the "princely episcopate" was only an emergency for the reformers, while the essential constitutional goals of the Lutheran Reformation had in mind the "participation and independence of the congregation, namely the congregation of believers," but that since the time of rationalism "the wholesome fence of discipline has been torn down and Word and Sacrament have been exposed to abuse," the damages now found in the regional church are discussed in turn. Under Harleß, Saxony had made a promising attempt some 20 years ago to restore the doctrinal and sacramental discipline that had fallen into disrepair, but "since then a setback has occurred. Since the 1868 publicized church council and synodal regulations, "the unchurched masses have become co-rulers of the church. The decision of the Ministry of May 24, 1869, in which the clergy were instructed not to refuse the guest admission of unchurched persons to the Lord's Supper, was "an attack on the Lutheran practice of the Lord's Supper," but this issue was happily resolved by the removal of the Prussian troops. Instead of the first synod of 1871 having "eradicated the bad remnants of rationalistic unbelief in the agendas, hymnals, etc., and having set out on its career with such an act of faith," it had rather "torn one more cornerstone out of the shaken foundation" through the new formula of obligation, had provided "doctrinal indiscipline with a fundamental right" and had "helped open the door to modern unbelief. This is proved by the Sulze case as "a divine judgment on that vote of the synod". A further conclusive step on this sloping path was then the expert opinion of the Consistory on the introduction of the Bible excerpt, since the same

inspiratio verbalis for untenable and the Bible for a "human monument of divine thoughts of salvation", by which "dogma of the modern, blurred mediation theology" obviously a "further overruling of the *publica doctrina*" was given. Finally, the introduction of civil marriage had put the knife to the throat of the regional church, and it was now the indispensable task of the regional synod to work toward "making the church independent" and to quickly regulate the exercise of discipline against the despisers of the church orders, especially to apply church discipline, especially communion discipline, to all obvious, unrepentant sinners. However, the true congregation must participate in the practice of church discipline, but the right of private suspension from the Lord's Supper must no longer be denied to pastors, but must be openly granted. In general, a wholesome care of souls demanded the reintroduction of "interrogation" (*exploratio*) or personal confession. However, communion discipline also requires doctrinal discipline; and if the synod does not insist on his revocation or dismissal in the case of Sulze, then "the regional church officially puts the Lutheran confession to rest. For "if Protestant unions are allowed to function freely in our pulpits and at our altars, it is hypocrisy and self-deception if one still speaks of a confessional state of our church. And "a right pastor will not be content to officiate properly in his place as long as he is stationed there. He must be concerned that his parishioners and their descendants, if he should die or be called to another place, should not fall prey to a wolf or, if they themselves move to another parish, should not fall into the hands of a hireling." "Repentance and conversion" is therefore "the condition of prosperous further work of the synod." Either the damage done so far will be thoroughly repaired, and orders in accordance with Scripture and the confession will not only be drafted on paper, but will also be introduced in practice. Or the synod refuses the reformation, or, what amounts to the same result, it takes half-measures: then only one possibility remains open for clergy and laity loyal to the confession to preserve pure Word and Sacrament: namely, Lutheran free church." - "This, too, must be admitted, that the recognition of the correct principle does not help over a prevailing practice contrary to principle, that the dead letter of the confession now and never makes a national church a Lutheran one." - The little book concludes with the faithful words: "Trusting in the grace of the Lord, he (the author) lives in the confident hope that if the appointed organs of church leadership, bishops and congregation, do not bring about a reformation and all the

If the Lutherans ignore the petitions, caveats and protests of serious Lutherans, God will again be pleased to carry out his work through a few small instruments, a few disreputable preachers and a handful of simple craftsmen and workers. Certainly, in the strength of the Lord, supported by the old fighters and witnesses, who, already outside the national church, have held high the banner of the Lutheran confession in our country, the latter will preserve the precious Word and Sacrament intact and unadulterated, at first in smaller circles, but through them to the present generation and the descendants. God's Word and Luther's teaching will never pass away. God bless the author for his brave confession of unpleasant truths and make his brave testimony a salutary tormenting worm in the conscience of all such state church Lutherans in whom the sense of loyalty for truly Lutheran church ethics has not yet completely died. The time of the state and regional churches is without question over. Lutheran consciences, however, who (to use the words of our Apology) "cry out for God's Word," will be able to endure it less and less in the rusty, ossified, and ossified state churches, if these, instead of at least correcting the grossest and most conscience-disturbing grievances, are striding wilfully and rapidly downward on their inclined plane. It is necessary to set up free church tents in between the ruins of the national churches, also as an alarm clock for the national churches themselves, whether they still want to repent. May God therefore strengthen both "old fighters" and new ones in the land of our fathers and establish justice and victory for them. S.

The Mechanism of the Vatican Religion. According to the Faculties Book of the Redemptorists presented by Dr. J. Friedrich, Professor of Theology in Munich. Second edition. Bonn, 1876, printed and published by P. Neusser. *)

This is a writing of 72 pages in large octavo by the old Catholic Munich professor Friedrich, who became famous by his interesting "Diary, during the Vatican Council". Whoever wants to get to know the essence of the papal monasticism and the papal religion will find what he is looking for in this writing. With astonishment he will convince himself that monasticism, like no other institute, supports pabstry, that the papal religion is the very antithesis of Christianity, a receptacle of all kinds of self-invented mechanical means against the sin-sickness of fallen man. No Protestant would perhaps have been able, as Professor Friedrich does in this paper

*) Sent to the editor by Heydenreich and Kühn in Oshkosh. Price: 45 cents postage paid.

The author of this book is not interested in the secrets of the laboratory in which the spiritual quack medicines are prepared, which the pope prescribes to the world, supposedly to help it from its sins, but in reality to help it from its money and to make itself its god. Reading this scripture, one feels as if one is in a subterranean chamber, where counterfeiters are minting their false money and are consulting with each other to bring it to the people. The text shows that the papacy is the greatest and most terrible institution that has ever existed, exists and will exist in the world to defraud the world of body and soul under Christian pretenses, and that today things are not better for the papacy than they were in Luther's time, but rather worse. It is true that the Roman and Arminian spirit in which the gifted Old Catholic author reports and criticizes in a strange mixture sometimes touches the Lutheran reader in a most unpleasant way; but it is gratifying that he finally feels impelled to declare: "But this is no longer the religion of Christ, it is rather a religion of the Antichrist. No reader will put this writing down without much instruction and without being strengthened in his abhorrence of the Roman Antichrist, his kingdom and the secret of wickedness working in it. W.

Johannis Gerhards Meditationes sacrae ejusdemque Exercitium pietatis. Ad veterum librorum fidem recensuit Hermannus Scholz, Gymnas. Guetersloh, magist. Guetersloh, sumptibus C. Bertelsmanni. MDCCCLXIII.

This is an unchanged reprint of the two known precious booklets of the great Gerhard. Five different editions have been compared and the variants are given below the text. The only change that has been made in this edition is that the now common spelling of the Latin words is followed. Paper and printing are excellent.

Available from our agent, M. C. Barthel, price: well bound, 75 cents; postage: 5 cents. G.

Sermon on Odd-Fellowship and other secret societies by Rev.

J. Sarver. Delivered in the Ev. Lutheran Church, Leechburg, Pa. - Ezra A. Cook & Co, Chicago, Ill.

The publication of a sermon against secret societies by a pastor belonging to the General Council is certainly an event to be welcomed with joy. The present sermon proves that the secret societies teach a false religion, and that association with them is forbidden because of their false teachings. The author pays special attention to the Society of Odd Fellows.

and shows I. that it teaches a religion, II. that it teaches a false religion, 1. because it denies the Lord Jesus Christ, 2. because it teaches salvation by works, 3. because it teaches that God gives eternal salvation to all men, 4. 4. because it puts the Christian religion on the same level with the false religions of the world and thus rejects it, 5. because it actually rejects the triune God and therefore worships a false god, 6. because it actually denies and rejects the supreme authority of the Bible. - May the faithful God bless and guide all witnesses of the truth within the General Council. G.

Miscellaneous.

SYMBOLZWANG. Last year, a book by a believing layman was published in Bremen by Müller, entitled: "Das Bekenntniß der Kirche, von einem Veteranen aus den Befreiungskriegen. In it the author says quite correctly: "Since no clergyman is compelled to accept an office in a church whose confession he considers erroneous, or to retain it after he later recognizes it as such; since he is not to give up his opinions, but only his office, if he cannot hold it on account of his conscience, there can be no talk at all of compulsory symbolism. Either the conscientious clergyman will not enter or he will leave."

Eau de Lourdes taxable. Some time ago, at the customs station of Basel, the highest federal duty was levied on a consignment of the water of Lourdes, allegedly endowed with miraculous healing power, by placing it in the category of medicines. On the other hand, a reclamation has been filed: the Eau de Lourdes is not a real remedy with inherent healing power, but only ordinary water, to which only faith gives healing power. Its healing power is therefore based on man's ability to think, but thoughts are duty-free. As one hears, the customs department has simply rejected the reclamation with the meaning that this water was sent to Switzerland as a remedy and must therefore also be cleared as a remedy; whether its value is imaginary or real is none of the customs department's business.

We preachers and teachers are reapers of the one wheat field of our God. Wherever you have to reap, do it with all diligence. If others are next to you in the places of the field that are more even, where the fruit is thicker, do not be envious of them. The dry hills and sandy patches of God's field must also be harvested. The individual stalks of wheat that are under thorns and thistles must also be cut and gathered. Prick you in this work

thorns, and if thou hast thy trouble with the burning thistles and evil weeds, let it not fail thee, nor make thee weary in such work as thou art called of God to do. If even a stalk of wheat, with much toil, cross and hardship, has been reaped by you and gathered into the heavenly barn of eternal life, your labor has been richly rewarded in the Lord. On that day, when your work has been done in faith, you too will hear from the mouth of Christ the words: "O thou devout and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will set thee over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Darwinism. The ape family tree, writes a teacher of natural science in the *Sächsisches Kirchen- und Schulblatt* of October 29, 1872, was a fantasy and has fallen through the discovery of a fossil Caucasian in southern France from the Stone Age by Dr. Riviere in 1872, as well as through the discovery of human culture objects near the Dardanelles by Frank Calvert in secondary layers of the earth.

Union. When recently a political party asked two others to go with it, it received in reply: "That would be walking in threes beside a precipice, while each of the travelers has the fixed and well-known thought of hurling his traveling companions down the slope at the first favorable opportunity." *Fiat applicatio!*

Ecclesiastical Contemporary History.

I. America.

Columbus, Ohio. The Ohio Synod's new institutional building was occupied on 2 b. m.

General Synod. Rev. Wedekind had made the statement in the *New York Sun* that the Lutheran Church has very little sympathy with the way Moody and Sankey are extending the kingdom of Christ. About this, the "*American Lutheran*" is very displeased. He would not have objected if Pastor W. had expressed this as his private opinion, but that Pastor W. should present this as the opinion of the Lutheran Church is a grave error; as a member of the General Synod he (Pastor W.) must know that the great majority of pastors and congregations are in favor of *revivals* and operate them almost as Moody and Sankey do; he has therefore placed the Lutheran Church in a false light before the Christian public. That, therefore, the "*American Lutheran*" should make a counter-statement, which the un-Lutheran, but

Lutheran Pastor Burrell (see "Lutheran" No. 7, p. 53.) published in the *New York Sun*, is quite natural. The "*American Lutheran*" forgets, however, that the General Synod, by its letter sent to Germany in 1845, in which it declares itself in favor of Zwingli and Union, has deposed itself from the Lutheran Church, and that nothing in all the world entitles him, as defender of the General Synod, to speak in the name of the Lutheran Church.

G.

Confirmation. The question whether it is proper to admit to the Lord's Supper those who have been baptized in infancy, but have not yet been received into the full communion of a Protestant church, is answered in the negative by the *Observer*, giving as one of the reasons: "because Confirmation is the completion of infant baptism, which without it remains unfinished, and therefore cannot confer all the privileges of church membership upon those who have received it." - This is an atrocious blasphemy of Holy Baptism and wicked Papism, which makes human institutions divine. G.

On the Sunday Question. The *Lutheran Observer* seeks to prove that Luther's doctrine of Sunday was that "the Christian Sabbath as a moral institution was substituted for the Jewish one by divine decree, and that everything that originally belonged to the Sabbath, as it is based on nature, and that everything that was contained in the third commandment as a moral statute, was placed by the apostles under divine inspiration, on the day of the Lord, as the Christian Sabbath". He therefore brings in some sayings of Luther taken out of context and quite naively claims that the sayings of Luther, according to which Sunday is not commanded by God, are taken out of context. The passages of Luther which he brings, he gives as Dr. Krauth collected and translated them, and also adds his remarks, according to which such passages of Luther, which express a "laxer view", are supposed to be taken out of context. But even the authority of Dr. Krauth will not be able to overturn the fact that Luther did not teach a divine institution of Sunday. G.

Consequences of Pulpit Fellowship, Dr. G. Diehl of the General Synod complains in the "*Lutheran Observer*" as follows: "Bor recently it happened that in one of our vacant congregations the Kirchenrath put a preacher of a small sect on duty to hold an extended meeting in the Lutheran (?) congregation and to serve the Lord's Supper. I had to preach in the congregation on the same Sunday afternoon on which the latter had preached in the morning and administered Holy Communion. In the name of the conference (!) I objected to the action of the church council and insisted that the preacher should not be kept longer than the evening. - In another Lutheran church, which is preacherless, the church council invited a local Methodist preacher, a man without education and teaching ability, to preach in their church. Can't our synods and conferences, through their officials, prevent such irregularities?" - These congregations, however, only did what the preachers of the General Synod regularly do.

Methodism. The voices in the Methodist Church protesting against the hierarchical church regime and demanding greater freedom for the congregations are increasing. Recently, the New England Conference decided to ask the General Conference to allow each district to elect its own presiding elder. Until now, this was a matter for the bishop. G.

The Methodist Bishop Simpson, at the opening of the World's Fair in Philadelphia, offered a prayer, i.e., a *speech* to "God," such as any heathen might have offered. We share some of it: "We praise You for Your wonderful grace in the past, for the land which You gave to our fathers, a land unknown to many centuries, discovered in the course of time by Your chosen people, whom You led through the waves of the sea with Your own right hand, a land of immense extent, mighty mountains, vast plains, innumerable products and never imagined treasures. We thank You for the fathers of our country, men of spirit and power, who suffered many hardships and sacrifices, who preferred to expose themselves to many dangers rather than stain their conscience or become unfaithful to their God, men who were on the

broad foundations of faith and justice built the great edifice of civil liberty. We praise Thee for the hundred years of the Republic, for its founder, the immortal Washington, and his contemporaries; for the wisdom with which they acted; for the firmness and valor which, under Thy protection, enabled them to reach their goal. May we sons follow in their footsteps and imitate their virtues. We thank Thee for social and national welfare, for valuable discoveries and numerous inventions, for labor-saving machines, for schools, free as the morning light, for the growing generation; for books and periodicals, for art and science, for free worship, for a church unrestrained by any state laws. . . . We also ask Your blessing on the President and members of the World's Fair Commission and on all those associated with them in the various departments who have worked long and earnestly amidst tribulations and complaints for the favorable success of this enterprise. We welcome them (our national guests) to our shores and rejoice in their presence among us, may they represent thrones or science or agriculture, or may they have come to exhibit the triumphs which genius and art have won in the development of industry and the progress of civilization.... May the new century be better than the past, more radiant in the light of true wisdom, more glorious in true charity and purity of morals, and may money, genius and labor be freed from all antagonism by the introduction and application of such principles of justice and equality as are capable of balancing conflicting interests and binding all parts of society to each other by imperishable bonds. May Your special blessing, O God, be bestowed upon the women of the Americas, who for the first time in the history of the human race occupy such a prominent place in a national celebration. May the light of their prudence, purity and diligence cast its rays into distant lands, so that there too their sisters may understand the beauty and glory of Christian freedom and strive to attain it. We beseech Thee, Almighty Father, that our beloved Republic may be strengthened in every need of our greatness.... And as Thou hast caused a son of this people (Franklin) to foresee how Thy lightning can be drawn from the clouds, which now flies as an electric force around the globe, and serves the word: Glory to God in the highest, peace on earth, and welfare to men, may America's mission consist to the last in sympathy, brotherhood, and love toward all our fellow men. - And may the coming centuries shine in the glory of Christian civilization." - Again a sad proof of where it leads, if the Americans think they have to open any celebration, in which Gentiles, Turks and Jews take part, with a so-called prayer. G.

Methodism. At the last New York Methodist Conference, a lady also appeared with her credentials. Bishop Andrews, questioned as to whether she was eligible, ruled that she was a *layman* within the meaning of the provision of the Methodist Church Order ordering the election of delegates. G.

"What a preacher should eat", i.e. also what should be presented to him, is described by a Methodist preacher in the "Christian Messenger". He first cites the word of the Lord: "Eat what is presented to you", Luc. 10, 8, but then restricts this significantly by listing his kitchen list. He first proceeds negatively and shows what one should not eat. The first and most important is: "1. leave the pig off the table. God did not create it for food and did not forbid it to his people without a reason; it contains very little nourishing power for anyone, especially not for the intellectual worker, but it contains

The pig has the power of stupefaction and is very detrimental to human activity. Is it possible to find an animal that is less enlightened and less active, that is more impure and more rotten than the pig? It is a lump of rotten bacon that is neither good for the muscles, nor for the bones, and even less for the brain and nerves. The tendency of assimilation of the pig by digestion is also not mindward, but necessarily pigward." Furthermore, pickled and preserved fruit things, fatty baked things, sugar things, paste-like pies, especially *mince pies* are rejected. "Such things," it is said, "are not to be presented to a servant of God, and he is to beware of eating them.".... 4. it would be much better for preachers if the '*turkeys*' had never arisen." As for the positive side, it says, "It requires a great measure of phosphorus, nerve fluids, iron substance, electricity, both as muscle and bone substance." Therefore, not only beef (*beefsteaks*), mutton, Kleienbrod, Latwerge and others, but also soup bones are recommended. This kitchen note explains why the Methodist preachers always shout "Spirit! In the latest issue, a "sister" sheds light on the same. She says among other things: "Hereupon (in reference to the pig) I would like the writer.... know that we here... feel grateful when we get a piece of a pig every time. I am of the opinion that the described characteristics can also be found in other animals.... They" (the Methodist preachers) "can have bran bread if they want it, because the bran is cheap. I also believe that they would rather eat soup than soup bones. "

G.

The "United Brethren" argue about the establishment of a German professorship in the Lebanon Valley College. How necessary this is, everyone can already see from the exhortation of a supporter of it in the "Fröhlichen". In an article entitled "The German Professor's Chair," he says, among other things: "In our church there are only a few conferences which do not act more or less in favor of a college or seminary; and it seems to me that it is too late for such theories, which I recently read in the 'Ambassador,' to find favor."-And it seems to us that most of the gentlemen writers in the "Fröhlichen" need above all a school in which primers and first reading books are proficiently practiced.

G.

The Mennonites deny original sin. A correspondent of the "Mennonite Messenger of Peace" writes: "In the New Testament we find no trace of original sin, but throughout the holy scriptures we find much about the inherited desire and inclination to sin, and about the corrupted sinful human nature, Gen. 8, 20, Ps. 51, 7, Jn. 3, 6, Rom. 7, 18-23, and so on. This is not yet sin and worthy of punishment, but only becomes so through the indulgence of the lust and the execution of the sin, through the deed, Jac. 1, 14, 15. The tenth commandment makes the lust for our neighbor's property sinful, but this is only the case when he cannot or will not give away the object of our lust, and we still have an evil desire for it, but as soon as he is inclined to give it away or sell it, the lust ceases to be sin.

II. Abroad.

The East Indian Missionaries. Under the heading: "Betrübende Mittheilung aus Indien," the Leipziger Allgem. Kirchenzeitung of March 31 writes the following: As a result of news just received, writes the "Evang.-Luth. Missionsblatt", we are compelled to inform the friends of our mission of the extremely painful fact that of the five missionaries mentioned in the "Verwahrung" of the Mission College in No. 2 of the "Evang.-Luth. Missionsblatt", unfortunately no less than four have definitely separated from us. They are the missionaries Zucker, Zorn, Grubert and

Willkomm. Only in the last months of the previous year the five brothers - without having tried to find a remedy for what was bothering them in the order prescribed by our mission constitution - suddenly and unexpectedly came forward with one proposal after another, demanding such an implementation of the principles and basic provisions of our mission concerning the church confession, which finally amounted to a complete reorganization of our mission in the sense of the Missourian Free Church. In view of the great importance and urgency of the matter, in which one also tried to involve other brothers and members of our mission, and in view of the profound changes which the departure of these brothers entrusted with important posts would necessarily have to entail, our Director Hardeland, at the request of the Mission College, decided to travel to India himself without delay. This sacrifice was by no means in vain. Not only has one of the five, Missionary Schäffer, been preserved for our joy, but we also have reason to hope that the difficult events will not be followed by further shocks, and that our work will continue without new disturbances. With God's help, this extraordinary visitation trip of our director will also be of great use for the strengthening and promotion of our work, for the elimination of grievances and the like. In the case of the four missionaries already mentioned, however, even the most faithful and heartfelt efforts of our director have been in vain. They refused from the start to disapprove of the attack on our mission that Pastor Brunn made in his preface to their "Declaration" without their order, and finally declared that they could only remain in our mission if the members of the college would break with such Lutheran state churches as the Saxon and Bavarian ones are at present, and consequently with the present Lutheran state church system in general by open resignation. Of course, our director then had to tell them that we could not stay together under such circumstances and that he would have to put the consequences of their irresponsible actions on their consciences. Probably the four present missionaries will leave India with their families already in these days.

We do not believe we may withhold from our readers a **testimony for Missouri which is** found in the "Mecklenburgische Kirchen und Zeitblatt" (edited by Dr. Philippi, Jr.) of April 5. After the same paper, in the number of February 23, the dear editor of our synod had spoken (see our May issue p.155. f.), a Mr. E. in S.... f felt urged to send in a rather bitter article against it. Although the editor has now included this article in the designated number of April 5, he has added the following "editor's epilogue" to it: "Justice requires that the Missouri Synod, so often and much reviled, should be defended against the charges and suspicions of the above article. Let us endeavor to avoid all personal insinuations, and confine ourselves to the matter in hand. In our opinion, the matter is twofold, the doctrine and the practice of the Missouri Synod. - In the first respect, on the one hand, the doctrine of transmission and, on the other hand, the proposition that the pope is the antichrist are reproached, but in the struggles of the Missouri Synod with the Iowa Synod and against the German regional churches, it is not at all a matter of these propositions, but partly about the un-Lutheran concept of Löhle's church, partly about the chiliasm defended by the opponents of the Missouri Synod, and partly finally and primarily about a lax position on the confessions on the part of Missouri's opponents. Those doctrines reproached to the Missourians can only be considered as consequences of the Lutheran doctrine so vigorously advocated by this synod. It belongs to the dishonest tactics of Missouri's opponents that

one singles out only these sentences in order to brand the Missourians as the most insane and overstretched literalists possible. - As far as these doctrines themselves are concerned, one cannot deny that the Missouri doctrine of transmission, even if one should not approve of it, is much closer to the Lutheran doctrine of the spiritual office, as it is found in the symbolic books, than the more or less catholic doctrines fought against by Missouri. The proposition that the pope is the antichrist has in any case far greater justification than the chiliasm defended by the deniers of it. This proposition can only be called a "strange Missourian quirk" by those who forget that it is already found in the symbols and is defended by all old dogmatists. The assertion, however, that this doctrine has been made by the Missourians into an article of faith 'on which salvation depends', 'which no one who wants to be a true Lutheran and become blessed may reject', is again one of the many suspicions of the opponents, invented only for the purpose stated above; at least we have nowhere found such expressions in Missourian sheets and writings; we are convinced that the Missourians, who are firmly grounded on the symbols and the old dogmatists, stand by the doctrine in question as well as the latter. Quenstedt, in reference to the doctrine of the Antichrist, expressly states: *non est quaestio de fundamentali aliquo fidei, articulo, cujus ignoratio vel negatio damnat, sed de articulo fidei non - fundamentali* - Uebrigens handelt es, wie schon gesagt, in dem Kampf Missouris gegen Iowa und gegen die deutschen Landeskirchen, zunächst nicht um die beiden eben besprochenen Lehren, und darum haben die Vorwürfe der Missionare gegen den Wochenschauer der Luthardt'schen Kirchenzeitung allerdings volle Berechtigung. - But as far as the practice of the Missouri Synod is concerned, which, according to the opponents, consists in tearing apart and dividing the unity of the Lutheran Church and taking incomprehensible pleasure in causing division and schism everywhere, we must pay close attention to who it is that is confusing Israel. The unity of the Lutheran Church consists in the unity of doctrine; but if all kinds of special doctrines are tolerated in the Lutheran Church as equally valid directions, if e.g. If, for example, Hofmann's doctrine of reconciliation is again recently described in the Luthardt'sche Kirchenzeitung*) as a mere theological justification of the doctrine of reconciliation, if the Saxon regional church, under Dr. Luthardt's precedence, has substantially weakened the commitment to the confessional writings, etc., etc., etc., etc., etc, one cannot reproach the Missourians for not wanting to have fellowship with such a yes-and-no theology and for accepting those who feel urged in their conscience to separate themselves outwardly from those from whom they are inwardly divorced. Even the appearance of the missionaries, deplorable and unjustified as it may be, was not prompted by a desire for separation and division, but by the provocation in No. 35. of Luthardt'sche Kirchenzeitung." - In the number of May 3, the editor closes his report on the outcome of Director Hardeland's efforts to persuade the missionaries in the East Indies to recant with the words: "But God forbid that we should sit in judgment on those who, not for the joy of separation, but for the sake of conscience" (emphasized by the editor himself in the print) "are not able to continue to work together with those who do not stand firmly on the Lutheran confession

*)Note. In No. 6 of the Allgemeine Lutherische Kirchenzeitung (General Lutheran Church Newspaper), it is literally written: 'The disputes which were initiated two decades ago about the doctrine of reconciliation by v. Hofmann's "new way of teaching old truth" have shown clearly enough that if the church were to depend with its preaching on the agreement of its scholarly representatives about the theological reasoning, it would be in a bad way.'"

The concessions that must now be made to unbelief in Saxony, after the new Gelöbnißssormel has come into effect, are sadly documented in an essay in the Sächs. Kirchen- und Schulblatt of April 6 provides sad proof. In the "Leuchte" of the notorious Sulze, a deacon from Chemnitz (who has just been promoted to archdeacon for the sake of his "merits") by the name of Schmiedet had tried to prove that Protestant unions can now claim their good rights in the Saxon state church. To him, the aforementioned paper now refers to the interpretation which the uürte Dr. Bauer, the father of the vow, had given to it himself, and remarks on this, among other things: Dr. Bauer does not distinguish the Scripture from the Confession in such a way that the latter contains the facts, while the latter contains only doctrine, or doctrinal formulation, but in the Confession itself two things are to be distinguished: the testimony to the "healing fact" - to which we are bound - and the scientific demonstration, substantiation, combination of the facts. The latter is doctrinal formulation, teaching. We are not bound to this; it is a matter of science. Here, everyone only vows to formulate and therefore to teach to the best of his knowledge and belief. *Exempla illustrant.* Christ is the Son of God, in the ontological metaphysical sense; this is testified by the Scriptures, and with them by the Confessions. This Son of God was also man according to the testimony of Scripture, in agreement with the Confession. (Compare also Meyer, Römerbrief, 4th ed., Preface, and p. 355; further Dörner, Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie, p. 840.) As such a personality, we say God-human, he was sent by God. Thereby the fact is testified. But how in Christ divinity and humanity were united, how this union is possible, that is a matter for doctrinal formulation." - In the face of such concessions, to claim that the Lutheran confessions still rightly exist in the Saxon regional church is downright evidence of a darkening for which there can hardly be any hope of help. **W.**

Kahnis. In a review of the new edition of Kahnis's Dogmatik, which is found in Luthardt's Kirchenzeitung of March 24, it says: "The character of the book" appears "to be essentially ecclesiastical Lutheran in intention and execution", Kahnis legitimizes himself in it "as a true son of Luther", he is "infinitely more Lutheran than individual statements of his sound. Probably Kahnis himself will smile about this as about a *sancta simplicitas*. But we must be heartily appalled at such judgments in a church newspaper that wants to be Lutheran.

W.

It is a false conclusion that the "Pilgrim from Saxony" of April 30 draws from the fact that the unbelieving candidate Bernde, who was appointed pastor in Siebenlehn, renounced the office for the sake of the existing vow formula, that "the present vow formula has proven to be a sufficient protection for the pure doctrine. Sufficient protection is granted only by such a commitment to the symbols, which not only no naturally honest unbeliever, but also no conscientious false believer can enter into.

W.

Free Churches. In the "Kirchenblatt für die ev. - luth. Gemeinen in Preußen" there is an essay by Pastor Rudel in Triglaff, which does little honor to his logic and Lutherthum alike. In order to prove how foolish it is to "rave for free churchism" (which, as these words read, hardly occurs elsewhere than in utopias), he points to the picture of disunity which the so-called free churches present at present. As if the free church were preferable to the state church because the free-church constitution brought about unity of faith, and as if the great advantage of the free church did not consist above all in the fact that in it conscience is free, while in the state church it is subjugated and violated in a thousand ways.

will! Whoever does not leave the state church for the sake of conscience and seeks the Free Church, but because he thinks that with the Free Church the prelude to a thousand-year peace rift is already beginning, as Mr. Breslau seems to have meant, at least at an early stage, is certainly a dreamer; but if Mr. Pastor Rudx ascribes this foolishness to us, then he either does not know us and speaks of us easily according to hearsay, or his polemic against us is something even worse. Pastor Rudel expresses his satisfaction that "the Iowa synod has declared itself to be in favor of a lapse of open questions" by accusing our synod of having "not the Lutheran doctrine of the catechism, but Lutheran theology as the basis of the doctrine of peace.

symbol." Why then does the broad-minded Lutheran not rather say "the doctrine of the Lutheran Catechism" instead of "the doctrine of the Lutheran Concordia Book"? There is a very simple reason for this. For he knows quite well that where nothing, absolutely nothing, but to assert this latter doctrine "as a symbol.

But what would it help him if he reproached us for this? The whole Christian

The whole world knows that this is what our entire orthodox church has been doing since 1580. With the

He would give us the best testimony that a human being could give us.

But he would betray himself, or rather his synod in Breslau, if he were to do so.

The Lutheran synod is nothing less than a Lutheran synod faithful to the confession. Thus x for, in order to achieve its purpose, resort to the means of false insinuations with ob ligate equivocation. As long as our opponents have to resort to such means in order to be able to attack us, we truly have no reason to be afraid of them.

Their attacks only make us all the more cheerful and certain. And that the liberal "Lutherans" of Germany and the "Lutherans" on the broadest basis here mutually becomplimentiren, is quite of the order: *ὁμοιον ὁμοίῳ φίλον*. W.

Hanover. In Dr. Münkels Neuem Zeitbl. of February 17, we read in a report on the meetings of the state synod held on February 5: "Of considerable importance were the negotiations about the so-called Holdermann'sche Case. Holdermann, the Baden Union at an originally reformed Gemeint twice in Hanover and Osnabrück with the election record. although not elected in both cases. In response to complaints from the municipalities, the state Constistorium both times the election, because the right of the congregations to vote was violated and a non-Lutheran was brought to the election. The regional consistory then the principle of "objective church membership," i.e., that any person who belonged to a non-Lutheran church community was excluded from the application process. and election must be rejected, even without his orthodoxy being tested. would. The emperor, however, decided otherwise. Holdermann was rightfully entitled to the whale In such cases, if a man like him is elected, the regional consistory is only to examine his orthodoxy and accept or reject him according to the results of the examination. This is the fact. - The Committee of Fourteen had brought a motion to the Synod in which it knew that the decision of the Emperor was formally justified. In the matter, however, it sided with the Landes-Consistorium and adopted its legal principle, "according to which objective membership in the Lutheran confessional community is the precondition for eligibility for employment in the Lutheran Landes-Kirche. If a clergyman from Baden is committed to a non-Lutheran confession and therefore does not belong to the Lutheran confessional community, he possesses the necessary qualifications. ability is not. Lastly, the confidence is expressed that the landing The proposal was as gentle against the imperial decree as it was firm in its demand. - The motion was as gentle against the imperial decree as it was firm in its demand. On the other hand, it

showed a certain breadth in the fact that it did not

The state consistory hires clergy from congregations that have a Lutheran confession, even if these congregations do not form a church under church law, as is the case within the Prussian Union. For the Landes-Consistorium hires clergy from congregations that have a Lutheran confession, even if they do not form a church under church law, as within the Prussian Union. For in Prussia, one speaks of Lutheran congregations and a Lutheran regional church, which at the same time includes Uniate and Reformed congregations, but not of a Lutheran church. On the other hand, Dr. Uhlhorn assured that the Consistory had not employed clergymen from the Baden Union for more than 30 years, and ConsistorialRath Grisebach proved this in a "longer" speech with evidence, at the same time with the remark that in East Frisia reformed preachers had converted to the Lutheran Church in order to be able to apply for a Lutheran pastorate. - A minority motion was made by Röscher and Guden, which essentially agreed with the imperial decision and rejected the committee's motion. At Roscher's request, a roll call vote was taken. The vote resulted in 47 votes in favor of the committee's motion and 17 against it, which meant that the minority motion of Roescher and Guden was rejected. - In and of itself the matter is very simple, as Superintendent Münchmeyer pointed out. Whoever wants to have a Lutheran clergyman will turn to where Lutheran congregations are, but not to un-Lutheran areas. Or, to put it crudely, whoever wants wine will not turn to any brewery, and whoever wants pure wine will not go where the wine is mixed or manted. It would be astonishing how this can still be argued about, if the ecclesiastical conditions in Germany were not in bad confusion. Formerly, everyone was required to adhere to the church of pure doctrine, because he owed this confession of truth. This was demanded of a clergyman above all things. Now, little value is placed on it, and that is where the mishmash in the churches comes from.

Hanover. In the Braunschweig-Hannover'schen Kirchenblatt of March 25 we read: "We don't need a mirror paragraph." Thus Oberkirchenrath Uhlhorn in Hanover told the regional synod when it reported on the Protestant Association, pronounced the incompatibility of the membership of the same with the clerical office - and yet in fact did not really want to touch the Protestant Association members in the clerical office, as in the church councils and in the synod itself.... ""But we do need a mirror paragraph."" This is the content of a leaflet, which a Hanoverian pastor, who signs himself - † -, had printed in Saxony, because a church paper in Hanover did not want to take up the article. In his opinion, leaving Spiegel in office proves that the Hanoverian church needs a reformation of its head and members. And he is right in this. For Spiegel is a notorious false teacher, who, for example, instead of preaching the story of the resurrection at Easter, simply declares it to be poetry; and if one lets him and his kind, wants to let them, then one can only let everything else. Nor does this apply to the church regiment and the synod alone; if they do not act, then the pastors must act and the congregation members. Such damages can go on as long as they do not become notorious; now it is no longer possible. But we do not need a mirror paragraph for that. We have the ordinances and confessions of the church, and only need that they be handled. - So much for the church bulletin. The brave editor makes the remark: "The author, who is also unknown to us, does not seem to have known our paper; we would have been happy to serve him. Would that the dear man would realize more and more that not only the state but also the members of the church themselves are to blame for the church misery in Germany, that the state, after most of its citizens have fallen away,

that the church cannot be governed in any other way than it is governed, and that there is nothing left for the church, if it does not want to be suffocated by the embraces of the state and finally destroyed, but to let the state go, even if it has to leave the state hostel as poor as Hagar. It almost seems, by the way, as if this truth is already imposing itself more and more on the church newspaper; in the same number it says, "what must be won" is "freedom from the state"; to which the editors remark: "We add here what the Hessische Blätter already said once last year: 'The church free from the state! This is the serious exhortation that resounds loudly and audibly to every friend of the church from the events in Hanover. Outside of this constitutional struggle, even with the best will in the world of confessionalism, all and every pure doctrine will finally be lost without hope."

W.

Pastor Ueltzen of Hehlen, editor of the church bulletin for the affairs of the Lutheran Church in Brunswick and Hanover, has been sentenced by the Criminal High Court of Wolfenbüttel to two months' imprisonment "for lèse majesté" for having called it a flagrant violation of the law in his bulletin that the King of Prussia had authorized the Berlin Oberkirchenrath to issue a decree, which limits the church wedding to a mere blessing, - was sentenced by the Criminal Senate of the Ducal High Court in Wolfenbüttel to two months' imprisonment "for insulting the majesty" and found guilty of paying the costs of the proceedings.

Bremen. We read the following in Dr. Münkels Neues Zeitblatt of March 9: "In a small writing about an intended church representation, Pastor Victor says: There is no city in our fatherland where the antithesis of Christianity is taught and proclaimed in public under the Christian name as unashamedly as it is here.' The Senate, which holds the church government firmly in its hands, does not want to know anything about valid confessions, and leaves each community free to decide how it wants its faith to be held. As a result, unbelief is taught in the majority of congregations, even in the most blatant manner. Bremen is the hostel of the Protestant Association."

Münkels writes **about the so-called Simultanschulen, which are** currently planned to be established everywhere in Germany: By a confessionally mixed elementary school or simultaneous school one understands a school in which children of different confessions, Catholics, Lutherans, Reformed, possibly also Jews are taught together by the same teachers. Because this is not possible in religion, each denomination has its own teachers for religious instruction, a Catholic teacher for Catholic instruction, and so on. What is the point of all this? In a few cases, necessity may dictate it. In most cases, however, there are other intentions. One wants to force religion into a corner of the school, where the confessions may still sit separately. In the school itself, there are no longer any confessions; everyone sits together and learns the same thing in the same way. In this way, it is hoped to unite them, as it were, and to educate a people that no longer asks about confessions, but learns to get along and respect each other, works unanimously on the construction of the German fatherland and its greatness, and is warmed up to the aspirations of modern education. Everyone can see where this is going. If religion used to be the soul of the school, now it is to be patriotic education, and Christianity is to become a corner religion. It is therefore a question of the great main thing, and hence comes the excitement with which the simultaneous school is pursued back and forth in German lands. As far as the hoped-for gain is concerned, the schools will only increase the confessional discord, especially when the parents realize that the faith of the children is being taken away.

wants. Then, history cannot be taught at all without dealing with the Pabbacy, the Reformation and the churches. The same difficulty recurs with a reading book as well as with singing lessons, if one does not want to remove the spiritual song and the chorale. Finally, one has no non-denominational teachers; those who have no ecclesiastical confession pay homage to their own confession of rationalism or unbelief, and will consider it wrong to put their light under a bushel, at least in all kinds of ways let their particular opinions flow in. Or one must produce a mechanical instruction according to prescribed books, where only training and cramming is done, one must instruct but not teach, and also not educate.

Ultramontaniam, Dr. Munkel writes in his paper of March 16: A turnaround has taken place simultaneously in France and Spain and has thus caused an unpleasant downfall for the ultramontane airshipmen. Don Carlos has left the field and Spain before King Alfonso and fled abroad. He was the hope of the ultramontanes of all countries, who supported him with money and crews so that he would restore the rightful throne of the Bourbons and the Pope in Spain. After much bloodshed, he took with him nothing but the blessings of the pope and the curses of a badly broken country. This does not mean, however, that a time of refreshment will now come, which the poor country so urgently needs. However, Alfonso has so far shown himself inclined to freedom of faith. If this has not happened out of opposition to Don Carlos, he is nevertheless the son of his mother, who sacrificed her throne to her misrule. Alfonso is still young, and Alfonso must first show himself. - In France, the elections for the National Assembly have taken place since February 20, and have resulted not only in a respectable majority for the Republic, but also against ultramontaniam. If the elections are an indicator of the mood, then the country is tired of the previous activity, which wanted to make everything subservient to the pope and his church, and dealt with the suppression of Protestants and the establishment of the rule of faith. This activity had almost degenerated into a frenzy, which believed that it could take the empire with a mere wave of its hand, and preached its exorbitant designs from the rooftops as if it had only the sparrows as listeners. How is that so suddenly transformed! He who was staggering a moment ago is now trembling before the losses he can and will suffer. He is already threatened that it will go to the freedom of teaching and the free Catholic universities, which are barely in the making, and it will not stop there.

The Moabite antiquities, whose discovery 4 years ago caused such a great sensation, which promised to establish a completely new branch of Semitic philology and were therefore purchased by the Prussian Ministry of Culture for 20,000 Thaler, The decipherment of which the ingenuity of several learned men, as it was thought, had already attempted with astonishing success, turned out to be articles fabricated shortly before their alleged discovery by a potter still alive in Jerusalem, and the inscriptions proved to be meaningless scribbles. The German antiquarians ask the public not to make much fuss about it. W.

Is absolutism to be spoken of categorically or hypothetically?

In our time, the presupposition that the newer a writing is, the better it is, is especially dangerous; but also the presupposition that a writing is to be regarded as absolutely pure in doctrine simply because it is old and comes from the "time of the rule of orthodoxy" is not without danger. Already in 1542 Luther wrote: "They are not all pure who now write." (XIV, 378.) And there Luther is not speaking of the Papists or of the Zwinglians, but precisely of those who professed to be Evangelicals or Lutherans. But if we go back to the seventeenth century, in which the pure doctrine of the Word of God was worked through and methodically presented with a diligence and acumen as in no other age of the Christian Church, we unfortunately see that even in this so richly blessed time, in this so-called age of orthodoxy, one still had to confess with Luther: "They are not all pure who now write." Even in the best (otherwise quite inestimable) doctrinal expositions of this time, there are nevertheless already deviations from the pure and honest Protestant doctrine, which God has again given to the Church through the great miraculous and gracious work of the Reformation. Among other things, in those doctrinal presentations not only is the emphasis on the doctrine of justification no longer found, as it is in Luther's writings *and* in our church confessions, but even indirect deviations from this doctrine *stantis et cadentis ecclesiae* appear here and there in them. Unfortunately, many otherwise faithful theologians have not applied the diligence to the study of Luther's writings that they should have applied primarily to the study of these writings after the study of the Scriptures, which is undoubtedly one of the main reasons for the deficiencies inherent even in the writings of our otherwise undeniably orthodox dogmatists. Among others

Doctrine and Defense.

In 1636, the great theologian Michael Walther, in his classic "*Officina biblica*", already complained bitterly about this neglect of the study of Luther's writings on the part of even some of the best theologians of his time. He writes: "For this time nothing to be said of other distresses of our so dear mother, so I cannot but be filled and tormented by the highest affliction of mind, when I reflect, as I often do, upon how innumerable many, even those not excepted, who wish to be regarded as confessors of our religion, inside and outside Germany, the so exceedingly useful writings of our common father in God, the great hero, Luther, the courageous conqueror of the Antichrist and so successful reformer of Pabstism, blessed and immortal memory, become contemptible and worthless. . . . How few are there in our time who consider those writings worthy of being read? Here one hears from many whimsical excuses or pretexts when one takes them to task for it. Many complain that they are deterred by the severity of the polemic. Even more, those who are in limited financial circumstances say that they are hindered by the rarity and costliness of these works. The vastness of so many Jena, Wittenberg and Eisleben tomes, which in themselves constitute a small library, fills most of them with distaste. As a result, not only the authority of this truly apostolic man is in danger of being carelessly despised, but also the truth of the heavenly doctrine, which is sleepily disregarded, and the gift of scriptural interpretation, which is unhesitatingly disregarded. So that it is to be feared that out of God's just judgment and as a severe punishment for the contempt of his gifts, together with Luther's writings, the Lutheran religion will lose its way and disappear sooner than one would think. May Jesus Christ avert this omen!" (*Officina biblica*. Ed. 3. Wittenbergae, 1703. Praef. 2. b. 3. a.) So there is no doubt that we, too, in our time, if we do not want to lose what God once gave to the church through the work of the Reformation, must first of all study Luther's writings and those of his faithful co-workers most diligently, according to the holy Scriptures, and in addition to the pure and orthodox creeds and doctrines of our church, Secondly, although we possess exceedingly rich treasures of divine teaching in the "many" glorious writings of later godly teachers, especially from the seventeenth century, we are by no means exempt from the effort of our own research and the most serious examination.

How true all this is, may be shown here by the famous theologian Paul Tarnov and specifically by his doctrine of the power of absolution. Born in 1562 and died in 1633 as a

Professor of theology at Rostock, he has published many valuable writings, among which his book: *De sacrosancto ministerio libri tres* (Rost. 1623), occupies an excellent place. We are far from wanting to elevate ourselves above this great theologian or to diminish his fame of having been a meritorious teacher of our church; nevertheless, we do not consider it a violation of our duty of reverence toward such a divine scholar if we also show in him how we never lose sight of Ap. Gesch. 17,11. out of sight. By the way, we do not want to give our own critique here, but the critique of the Jena theologian Christian Chemnitz, who, as is known, was not only related to the great Martin Chemnitz by blood, but also in a high degree by spirit.

Christian Chemnitz writes the following: "With regard to the form of absolution, it is to be known whether it must be categorical or conditional and hypothetical. For so writes Tarnov b. 2. cap. 23. S. 829.: The form and manner must always be conditional. For since absolution can and should be imparted only to the truly penitent, but only those who are truly penitent are known to God, the heart's annunciator, which the ecclesiastic only concludes with probability from the words and actions, so also the private and special absolution can only be given and understood in a conditional form, just as in the common and public sermon the forgiveness of sins is not proclaimed and communicated to anyone except the truly faithful/ These words speak either of the salutary fruit and bestowal of absolution on the part of the confessor; and so it is true that the forgiveness of sins is bestowed only on the truly penitent through absolution. Or they speak of the form of absolution in terms of God offering it, who, as much as there is in him, offers grace and forgiveness of sins to all men. In either way, however, they do not prove that the form of absolution is a conditional one, as in the following way: If you repent of your sins and believe in Jesus Christ, I absolve you. Rather, the form must be categorical, or so worded as to indicate the cause of one's speech: "And I absolve you," etc., or: Because you repent of your sins and believe that your Savior has done enough for them, I absolve you in God's stead and by virtue of my office. For the ministers of the church are commanded to administer the sacraments and proclaim absolution according to the outward appearance (which is indicated by mouth and gestures), if it is of the right nature, but to present the inward appearance to God. For as Augustine writes in 1. B. of Baptism against the Donatists Cap. 12. of the one who has received baptism in error: "To him who has received baptism by false pretenses

If a person has been baptized after he has come here in the wrong way, it happens that he is not baptized again, but is cleansed by righteous repentance and sincere confession, which could not happen without baptism, but what was given to him before then begins to be strong in him for blessedness, since that deception has disappeared through the sincere confession', - this is also to be said here. For just as no one will say that baptism is to be granted to adults only conditionally, because only those who are truly penitent and believing are known with certainty to God, the heart's annunciator, so absolution is by no means to be granted conditionally for the sake of this cause. But just as baptism and the Lord's Supper are given categorically to everyone after the outward confession of the mouth and offerings, and no one says conditionally to the adult: 'If you have true repentance and truly believe, I baptize you, or, accept, this is Christ's body': so also no one who outwardly confesses true repentance with mouth and offerings is to be granted absolution conditionally, but categorically. For even if one were a hypocrite, as can happen from time to time, and pretended to repent, nevertheless absolution on God's part remains valid and begins to be powerful for salvation when that pretense has given way to a true confession. For "God's gifts and calling may not repent of him," Rom. 11:29, "so that God is true and all men are false," Rom. 3:4. Thus it is evident that Tarnov's opinion, according to which he teaches that the form and manner of absolution must always be conditional, cannot be approved, but that it must be a categorical one or at least one that only states the reason and cause. For otherwise, 1. baptism and the Lord's Supper would also be granted conditionally to adults; 2. the certainty of absolution and forgiveness of sins would be endangered to some extent, which does not depend both on the contrition and faith of the recipient or confessor and on the promising and offering God. For whether the confessor and outwardly truly penitent is a hypocrite or not, absolution is always valid, firm and certain on God's part. And since the confessor sits in God's stead, not as an omniscient heart-annunciator, but as a servant who is bound to the outward words and gestures and to the judgment of love, and since he is also not commanded to absolve conditionally, he must absolve categorically, not conditionally. (3) Here, too, the question is not about the fruit and efficacy, but about the form and essence of absolution, which even the hypocrites receive un mutilated; as well as all hear the same word, the same gospel, although the same fruits do not follow in all from the guilt of the field, Luk 8, 5-7. Therefore, Tarnov himself subsequently distinguishes between the question: whether absolution can be secretly stolen from the confessor by a hypocrite and impenitent (according to that well-known expression: He

The words "I have rejected absolution" are taken together between the act of absolution and the act and the fruit. Not to mention here that this could very easily give the confessor reason to doubt the truth of absolution and forgiveness. For if either his contrition is not very strong, or his faith is somewhat weak, or if he has been offended by the words of confession, he will very easily begin to doubt, frightened, whether his sins have been truly forgiven by absolution. 6. (6) If, of course, the confessor knows that the confessor does not sincerely confess or believe, or that he does not want to amend his life, then he must rather invite him to return at another time with a truly penitent heart than absolve him conditionally. For we, too, demand a diligent attendance, but we reject conditional absolution with most others." (*Brevis instructio futuri ministri ecclesiae. Jenae, 1660, 1660. pp. 286-292.*)

W.

(Submitted.)

The Hexaemeron in Relation to Geology.

(Conclusion.)

A similar difficulty arises from the different fusibility of the various minerals. Gold, for example, condenses at about 1300 G. Eh.; lead at 612, antimony bet 810, tin at 700, bismuth at 476, and platina compacted is more than 1000 G. Ch. higher than some other minerals. So how could they be found compacted next to each other? How could they all be enclosed in the same primary rock? It would be absolutely impossible. So the volcanists are not able to lay even the first stone of their scientific building, as also a young-neptunistic school rejects that whole theory. But also it is not able to solve the above problems, because water, as is known, does not dissolve many minerals. And even if they were not in a dissolved state, they could not, for reasons given above, precipitate in the way we find them in the Urgebtrgen. (*Lord, Ep. of Creat. p. 30. ff.*).

And the situation is no better with respect to the uncertainty with which the paleontological heroes determine the discovered petrefacts. Most of it is mere conjecture, as their innumerable gross violations constatarir this. Thus, Dr. Schleuchzer once gloried in the lucky discovery of a *homo diluvii testis*, until Cuvier declared this *homo to be* a large salamander. The Darwinists were already happy to have found the petrificirte primordial cell, from which all organic life is supposed to have developed, but King and bird-catching made the joy water again for them, in that they

The first two authors proved that this mineral was not a petrification, but a very simple separation. (Ebr. Apol. p. 396.)

How exceedingly ridiculous the expert geologists and adepts made themselves a few years ago with their learned investigations about the age and the mode of origin of the "fossilized" so-called "*Cardiff Giant*", which a clever Jankee, with a sharp business eye, had made by a common stonecutter in Chicago and secretly had laid in a swamp in the state of New Aork. With clever cunning he had it discovered afterwards, exhibited it for show and made a great profit from it. The Niese was brought from town to town in great numbers as a full-bodied Antediluvian who had once walked lustily on the glacial fields of the Tertiary period and had now risen as if from the dead. In Albany, N. N., his arrival was greeted with great festivities. The geological grand sultans decided with exact expertise that he had lived at the time of the gigantic megatherms and mammoths and once looked down on us from that gray past in spirit. Only on historical way mau came behind the fraud and the shares suddenly fell on zero. And so in a thousand other cases. One would have to write a book, bigger than the Magdeburg Centuries, if one wanted to collect all the blunders and ridicule of the paleontologists, of which they have been guilty in the determination of the petrefacts found in the earth. Many petrifications are figments of their imagination. If one also considers, in which various, but certain forms the different minerals crystallize, in which wonderful shapes water freezes, which peculiar forms soft clay often assumes, and that most of the older so-called petrefacts only empty, imprinted on the rock forms and shapes, The great difficulty and relative impossibility of the demarcation between genuine fossils and mere forms of crystallization must be obvious, as in this, admittedly, one has been mistaken innumerable times and is still mistaken daily.

Therefore also the assertion is of no great importance that the flora and fauna appearing in the transition mountains should have disappeared now almost completely from the earth. Because who vouches us for the fact that the found petrefacts have been recognized correctly? In addition it comes still into consideration that those first animal species should have been mostly salt water animals, which lived therefore in the sea. But who has explored the great world sea up to the present day? Who has dived down into its depths and looked around at everything that lives and weaves there - at all the wonders of the sea that have their being there? We know only the surface and the outermost edge of the sea. But all seas would have to be explored before something could be determined with certainty about the extinct or still living marine animal species. Has Agassiz

Some years ago, during his South American journey in the service of natural science, he discovered and subsequently described many species of plants and animals that were previously completely unknown. Not even the animal and plant world on the earth's surface is completely known. Thus one could not find up to now the plants, from which *Sagapenum* and *Albumen* are won, (*Paine, Ex. Theor. Geol. P. 30.*) How can one therefore assert from above reasons that the plant and animal classes preserved in the earth interior must have lived in one of the historical time period preceding. Who knows whether they do not live today still in the depths of the seas. And if it turned out with certainty that some of the petrificierten animal genera are not to be accommodated under the now living, so the geological hypotheses would not be proved with it, because we do not know also the changes which have occurred in the plant and animal world by the curse of the sin, with which God the Lord once occupied the earth. The creature was thereby subjected to vanity, so that it now fears and longs for redemption (Rom., 8, 19-20.). The divine sentence to Adam was: "Cursed be the field for your sake; you shall feed on it all your life with sorrow; it shall bear you thorns and thistles, and you shall eat the herb of the field. Luther remarks on this passage in his commentary: "I do not know what offense it has because of the air and thunderstorms, of which there are innumerable; item, harmful animals and the like, all of which increase this grief and sorrow. Before sin, however, not only was there none of these mischiefs, but also the earth would have been unplowed and unseeded, before one would have known it, if Adam had not sinned. Nevertheless, this damage and misery, which sin has introduced, has been much less severe and more bearable than this, which followed the flood. For here only the thorns, thistles and work are thought of; but we learn and now find that other innumerable things have come in addition. For how many things do we find that harm the seed, grain, trees and all plants? How many accidents do the herbs suffer from harmful worms? After that, frosts, thunderstorms, damaging thaws, winds, waters, landslides, earthquakes, etc. also cause damage. But as I have said about the damage of the plants, so I think it is also completely true that the people would have been healthier than they are now; as also shows the incredible long life of the people before the flood. For here God Adam has nothing to do with the stroke, the leprosy, the holy disease and other terrible and dangerous ills.

After speaking of the three classes of animals that Noah was to take into the ark, he continues: "This is the difference of these words or names; although, as has been said, in some places it is not the same.

is held. But all this should not be referred to any other time than to the time after the flood, otherwise it would follow that such wild and cruel animals would also have been in paradise. However, let no one doubt that before the sin, because man was commanded to rule over all animals on earth, there was unity, not only among men, but also among the wild animals, with man. Although it can be clearly proved from the first chapter that the wild animals were created together with the others, their kind and nature were changed because of man's sin; so that what should have been tame and harmless animals are now wild and harmful after sin. This is my opinion; although we cannot indicate or conclude anything certain about the life before sin, because we have lost it; we can, however, make up stories and make assumptions about it.

So far Luther. But this teaching is certainly of great importance for the refutation of the geological dreams of primeval creation, with which the biblical creation report is reinterpreted and questioned. For if such changes in the animal and plant world and in the natural and climatic conditions of the earth really occurred through the curse of sin and the judgment of the flood, as Luther assumes, and to which certainly the long life span of the pre-flood human generations, as well as also the plant and animal genera enclosed in the ice sea, point with certainty, then all comparison of the then and now living plant and animal world is thereby made completely impossible. For this comparison is based on the fact that everything on earth, since the beginning of the historical period, has always remained the same. In addition, however, some animal species of the same orders may really have perished, such as the megatheria, the mammoth and the like, as obviously the species are not constant, even if certainly the classes and orders do not vary, without that a prehistoric primordial creation would be constatirt.

From the judgment of God of the Flood and its devastations caused on earth perhaps also the coal formations explain themselves, which the earth holds now, if differently the anthracites and other coal types are of vegetal origin. Let us consider that the then still almost virgin earth was certainly covered with a very luxuriant and powerful vegetation and that the present sand deserts, swamps and treeless steppes were probably only caused, as Luther assumes, by the flood, and that the incoming diluvial floods quickly uprooted whole forests and washed away all the vegetation, and where they broke into valleys and encountered mountain ranges, they had to undermine them, so that they fell on the washed-up vegetation masses, buried them and covered them with rocks and earth, this seems to agree admirably with the perceived fact that the coal and lava flows were caused by the floods.

The exceptions would be probably only those, where the floods completely washed away and leveled the mountains. This may explain the fact that coal deposits are found directly on almost all types of rock. If G. Bischof would be right, who calculated even to small fractions, that the plants necessary for the formation of the Saarbrücken coalfield have needed alone one million 4177 years for their growth (!), then the thing would have to stand differently. But why must have grown those charred plants all at that place? Also with the longest time assumption it was not possible. Because after some feet of coal material had been deposited, no vegetation could thrive there and also millions of years could not increase the coal material under such condition. So it has obviously been washed together from far and wide. And one has p.ostulirt for the formation of hard coal an almost just as long period of time. On the other hand, Goeppert in Breslau, by using water vapors, has already in the course of 2 to 6 years transformed vegetables into brown coal and even into shiny black hard coal. Similar experiments with the same results were made by Ehrenberg in Berlin and the French geologist Dambrie, whereby the common geological age calculations of the earth are thrown over the heap. (Prof. Zöckler in Rud. und Guer. Zeitschr. Jahrg. 28. p. 214.)

Likewise the claimed immeasurably long past of the historical period existing now lacks all proof. The traces of civilization discovered in the Nile delta 30 feet under the earth are said to date back 7000 years before our era. The age of the rock, in which one wants to have found human bones, calculated Agassiz on ten thousand years. A fishing hut excavated at the Gulf of Bothnia is said to have been built ten thousand years ago. The Mississippi delta is supposed to have served the people already 57,000 years ago to residences according to its alluvial findings and the like. But the proof for these assertions is missing or is based on completely erroneous premises. The extent and the depth of these delta and other alluvial deposits seem to give at first sight a rather safe standard for the time calculation, since the speed of these alluvial deposits is subject to our observation. But it is nevertheless only appearance. For how does one know that the circumstances and conditions of the delta formations have always been and remained the same? How does one know that the currents were never larger than they are now? On the contrary, it is quite certain that the flattening of the mountains and hills and the filling of the valleys caused the alluvial deposits at the river mouths to decrease in the same proportion and to proceed more slowly. Also, especially after the Sündflut, before the earth again with

This delta formation made very rapid progress in the time when the earth was covered by mighty forests. Thus also Fr. Pfaff (the newest Forsch. und Theor. auf dem Gebiet der Schöpfungsg. p. 85. ff.) by careful experimental investigations over the degree of the weathering, which different stone types suffer in certain time, under the usual atmospheric influences, dargethan, that if the stone cuts and stone grooves placed by the geologists in a prehistoric Tertiary period really originated from so many thousand years, as is assumed, from the same also long ago every trace must have disappeared. Already after a period of 6 to 8 thousand years, according to these investigations and experiments, that smoothness would be completely weathered, which is certainly very plausible. Who has ever seen a geological cabinet, will never be able to believe - if the enmity against God's word has not made him completely blind - that these stone cuts and cracks (which according to our conviction originate from the time of the flood) can be older than some thousand years. So then by these simple experiments of the geologist Fr. Pfaff the whole speculation concerning the immeasurably long past of our earth body and the human race would be completely refuted by real facts.

We believe to have proved that geology now cannot be considered as a science at all and that it can also never become a science, for the simple reason that it is absolutely not able to draw the border between the directly and indirectly created. It lacks the starting point. And this no human acumen can ever determine. And truly, to place the oracular sayings of such a hypothesis science above the holy scripture and to want to explain the latter according to its principles must be regarded as an assassination of its divinity and absolute credibility. The divine truth expressed in God's word and the divine truth revealed in God's works are, of course, in perfect agreement and do not contradict each other, but our knowledge of this truth, of the truth revealed by God's works, is different. In this, too, our knowledge is piecemeal. The whole nature around us, as well as our own body and soul life, is often a *terra incognita* for us and is full of wonders and secrets. Where physiologists and natural scientists think they know something, they often only have to give the secret a scientific name in order to hide their ignorance. This is even more true of the earth's interior, because it rather eludes our perception and experience. If, however, natural research brought to light real, established facts which we would not be able to unite with the "clear wording and meaning" of the Holy Scriptures, this would not yet give any reason to deviate from them or to reconcile them with those facts by forceful interpretation. "*There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than your philosophy.*"

ever dreamt", we say with Shakespeare. Then it would not be due to the scripture itself, nor to those facts, but only to our inability to find the coincidence in which they coincide. The doctrines of the divine Trinity, of the Incarnation, etc. do not agree with our logical concepts and mathematical theorems, but they agree perfectly with all other truths of salvation. Even mathematics establishes and proves propositions, such as the one about two lines that always approach but never intersect and the one already known to the ancients about Achilles and the tortoise, which contradict our logical understanding. In such a state of things, it certainly behooves human reason to admit its immense limitation and to humble itself and not to set itself above the divine word, which judges everything, but is judged by no one and nothing.

Albany, N. J.

P. Eirich.

(Translated by Prof. A. Crämer.)

Compendium of the Theology of the Bavarians

from

M. Heinrich Eckhardt.

(Continued.)

6. heresies.

Explain this article of faith to me by refuting the heresies:

Rabanus: "In the Trinity nothing created nor serving must be believed, as Dionysius wills, from which Arius drew; nothing unequal, as Eunomius; nothing resembling a mere gift of grace, as Aetius; nothing earlier nor later or lesser, as Arius; nothing foreign or serving another, like Macedonius; nothing brought in by trickery or delusion, like Manichaeus; nothing corporeal, like Melito and Tertullian; nothing physically formed or humanly shaped, like Vadianus; nothing invisible to itself, like Origen; nothing visible to creatures, like Fortunatus; nothing different in motion or will, like Marcion; nothing drawn from the nature of the Trinity to the nature of creatures, like Plato and Tertullian; Nothing that is special according to the office, not common to the other, like Origen; nothing that is mixed up, like Säbellius, but a whole, perfect, because the whole is of one and one; not, however, a single thing, like Silianus and Praxetes, but one that is of the same essence,

i.e. in the Godhead the Son is of the same essence with the Father and the Holy Spirit of the same essence with the Father and the Son." 1)

But you know that the word "same essence" is not found in the Scriptures with as many letters, and is therefore derided by the Arians?

Athanasius: "It does no good if someone uses words that are not found in Scripture, if he only associates the pious sense with them. A heretic, on the other hand, even if he borrows his words from sacred Scripture, will hear from the Holy Spirit, because he is nothing less than suspicious and corrupt of heart: 'What do you proclaim my rights.'" 2)

So much for the first chapter of the first book and the first part of the subject of theology. The second part of the first book deals with the effects or works of God, which every human being has in common with the other creatures, such as creation, preservation and completion.

Chapter II.

1. of creation in general.

I. The Causing Cause.

Did the world come into being by chance?

Basil: "Not by an accidental event has the building of heaven and earth ever come into being, as some have thought, but from God himself it has its origin and its cause. 3) Lactantius: "Accordingly, those who say that everything came into being either by free will or from small seeds clustered together are in error, since a

Nihil creatum aut serviens in Trinitate credendum, ut vult Dionysius, fons Arianus; nihil inaequale, ut Eunomius; nihil gratia aequale, ut Aetius; nihil anterius posteriusve aut minus, ut Arius; nihil extraneum aut officiale alteri, ut Macedonius; nihil surreptione aut persuasione insertum, ut Manichaeus; nihil corporeum, ut Melito et Tertullianus, nihil corporaliter effigiatum aut anthropoforme, ut Vadianus; nihil sibi invisibile, ut Origen; nihil creaturis visibile, ut Fortunatus; nihil motibus vel voluntate diversum, ut Marcion; nihil Trinitatis essentia ad creaturarum naturam deductum, ut Plato et Tertullianus; nihil officio singulare, nec alteri communibile, ut Origen; nihil confusum, ut Sabellius; sed totum perfectum, quia totum ex uno et unum, non tamen solitarium, sicut Silianus et Praxetes, *ὁμοούσιος* ergo, i. e. in divinitate Patri filius *ὁμοούσιος*, Patri et Filio Spiritus sanctus. Raban. 1. 4. de serm. propr. c. 10.

Nihil id refert, si quis voces in scriptura non repertas usurpet, quamdiu pias sententias complectitur. Contra, Haereticus tametsi voces suas e sacris literis mutuatur, nihilominus suspectus animoque corruptus audiet a Spiritu sancto: Quare enarras justificationes meas? Athanasius, de Syn. Arimin. et Seleuc.

Non eventu fortuito usquam extructio coeli et terrae orta est, perinde ut quidam opinati sunt, sed ab ipso Deo originem atque causam sumsit. Basilius, in Hexaem.

The fact that such a great, such a glorious thing could neither be made nor ordered without a most worthy originator. And the very reason by which we feel that everything exists and is governed, shows the most skillful master of the spirit.)

Is the Father alone the author of creation?

Basil: "In creation you must consider the Father as the main cause of what happens,*) then the Son as the builder, the Holy Spirit as the finisher." 2) Arnobius: "By the speaking of the Father, by the creating of the Son, by the quickening of the Holy Spirit, all creation came into being. "3)

*) Understand this in the right sense.

Prove this:

Chrysostom: "That the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are the Creator of all things is clearly shown in the saying: The heavens were made by the word of the Lord, and all his host by the spirit of his mouth. "4) Likewise Eucherius: "It is to be noted that at the very beginning of heaven and earth the whole Trinity is indicated as the Creator, for the Father is meant by the word 'God,' the Son by 'in the beginning,' and the Holy Spirit as 'floating on the water. "5)

How is this Mosaic 'floating' to be understood?

Eucherius: "It is said: the Spirit of the Lord hovered on the waters, not by a sweep, but by power; not locally; but by effect; not by spaciousness, as the sun hovers over the earth, but by the power of his majesty." 6)

Errant igitur, qui omnia vel sua sponte nata esse dixerunt, vel ex minutis seminibus conglobatis. Quoniam tanta res, tam ornata, neque fieri neque disponi sine aliquo prudentissimo autore potuit. Et ea ipsa ratio, qua constare ac regi omnia sentiuntur, solertissimum mentis artificem confitetur. Lactant. 1. 7. c. 7.

In creatione cogita mihi*) principalem causam eorum, quae fiunt, Patrem; deinde conditricem- Filium ; perfectricem Spiritum sanctum. Basii. c. 16. de Spiritu.

*) Sobrie intellige.

Patre loquente, Filio creante et Spiritu sancto animante facta est omnis creatura. Arnob. in ps. 147.

Quod Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus sint creatores omnium, manifeste in isto versiculo demonstratur: Verbo Domini firmati sunt coeli et spiritu oris ejus omnis exercitus feorum. Chrysost. homil. de Joanne Bapt.

Notandum, quod in ipso exordio coeli et terrae tota Trinitas insinuatur creatrix. Nam Pater in Dei intelligitur nomine, Filius in Principii, Spiritus vero sanctus, qui superferebatur aquis. Eucher. 1 in Genesi.

Superferri Spiritus Domini dicitur aquis non pervagatione, sed potestate; non localiter, sed potentialiter; non per spatia locorum, sicut terrae Sol superfertur, sed per potentiam sublimitatis suae. Eucher. in 1. c. Gen.

Furthermore, when it says in the creation story, "God spoke and it came to be," is this to be understood from the bodily voice of the mouth?

Junilius: "That God said: Let there be light, or other things that are called there, one must believe that he did it not in our way, by the bodily voice of the mouth, but it is to be understood more deeply: God spoke that the creature should become, because he made all things by his word, that is, by his only begotten Son." 1)

Did God bring forth the created things out of some need?

Theodoret: "God the Lord has no need of praisers, as He has no need of any by nature, but has given existence to angels, archangels, and all creatures, moved only by His goodness. "2) Eucherius: "God did not perform works out of a need, but out of His benevolence and His omnipotence; not to be magnified by our praise, but to reveal Himself through His works. "3)

Explain this by refuting the heresies:

Theodoret: "The master of the creation is not the one who, as the fable of Valentinus wants, was formed from the suffering of Achamod and came into being after the production of the 35 Aeons through transformation and suffering; nor do we say with Basilides, Cerinth and others that the angels, whose highest place Jechaboth occupies, are the masters of the work; or, as the accursed Marcion wants, any other besides the Good." 4)

II. Matter.

What kind of matter did God make the universe out of?

Theodoret: "He has by no means, as the other master craftsmen do, made all this out of an already prepared material, but has, what was earlier

Quod dixerit Deus sive ut lux fleret, sive alia, quae perhibentur, non nostro more per sonum vocis corporeum fecisse credendus est, sed altius intelligendum, dixisse Deum, ut fleret creatura, quia per verbum suum, hoc est, per Filium suum unigenitum, omnia fecit. Junii, in Genes.

Non indiget Dominus Deus laudatoribus, quippe qui natura nullius indiget, sed sola bonitate ductus, Angelis, Archangelis et universae creaturae largitus est, ut essent. Theod. qu. 3. in Genesi.

Deus non ex indigentia fecit opera, sed ex beneficentia et omnipotentia; non nostris ampliandus laudibus, sed suis manifestandus operibus. Euch. l. i. in Genes.

Creationis opifex est, non qui, ut vult Valentini fabula, ex passione Achamolh formatus est, et post 35 aeonum productiones ex conversione et passione factus; neque Angeli quidem, ut vult Basilides, Cerinthus et alii, quorum principatum dicunt Jechaboth; nec, ut execrandus Marcion, aliquem alium, praeter Bonum, opificem esse dicimus. Theodore, in Epitom.

was not, led into existence." 1) Lactantius: "No one therefore asks of what substances God made these so great, so wonderful works, for he made everything out of nothing." 2)

But one reads Genes. 1. that some creatures were brought forth from water, that is, not from nothing?

Eucherius: "But matter is made of nothing; but the particular kinds of created things are formed of that formless substance which was called heaven and earth, not because it already was this, but because it already could be this." 3)

III. The way.

Say now also the "how"?

Nazianzenus: "By his word and by his will he founded the universe. For he spoke, so it happened; he commanded, so it stood." 4)

IV. The object for whom?

For whom did God create this world?

Nyssenus: "Not for himself, since he has no need of them, but for us." 5)

V. The purpose.

For what purpose?

Leo: "That they may be useful to those who use them and pleasing to those who behold them; that thanks may be offered over them to the Creator, and God worshipped who made them, not the creature who serves." 6)

Nequaquam, quod caeteri faciunt artifices, ex jam comparata materia omnia haec effecit, sed quae prius non erant, in ipsum esse protulit. Theod. 1. 4. de materia et mundo.

Nemo igitur quaerat, ex quibus ista materiis tam magna, tam mirifica Deus opera fecerit: omnia enim fecit ex nihilo. Lact. 1. 2. c. 9.

Materia tamen facta est ex nihilo; mundi autem species de informi materia, quae coeli et terrae nomine appellata est, non quia jam hoc erat, sed quia jam hoc esse poterat. Euch. 1. I. in Gen.

Verbo universum constitit et proposito. Ipse enim dixit et facta sunt; ipse mandavit et creata sunt. Nazianz. in orat, de statu Episc.

Non sibi, cum nullius horum indigeat, sed nobis. Nyss. orat. I. de paup.

Ut sint commoda utentibus et speciosa cernentibus; ut de illis gratiae referantur auctori, et adoretur Deus, qui condidit, non creatura, quae servit. Leo serm. 2. in Natal. Dom.

VI. Time.

When.

Theodoret: "On the first day of the first month God ordered the hut to be erected, because at the same time God created the creatures, which is indicated by the sprouting of the trees. Let the earth, he says, bring forth grass and herbage, and fruitful trees, every one bearing fruit after his kind. For with the beginning of spring the meadows begin to green, the seed fields take up seed, and the trees bear fruit. For the same reason, at that very time, God delivered his people Israel from the bondage of the Egyptians." 1)

(To be continued.)

Miscellaneous.

Papacy. We read the following in the "Kirchenblatt für die ev.-luth. Gemeinen in Preußen" of October 1: The whole papal secular power is based on a lie. The lie was recognized long ago, but the rule remained. We want to tell this lie once as an example beside many others, how one has falsified still afterwards in Rome already since old time. In the 8th century a document was written in Rome, which was called *donatio Constantini*, i.e. donation Constantin. It was based on the healing of Constantius from leprosy and his baptism by Pope Sylvester, which had already been conceived there in the 5th century. This is already told in that document, whereupon the emperor out of gratitude gives Rome, Italy and the occidental provinces to the pope, also reports how he, in order to honor the pope, performed groom services for him and led his horse a distance. Moreover, according to this poetry, the pope was to be lord and master of all the bishops, and the See of Peter was to have power over the noble thrones: Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople and Jerusalem.*) The king of the Franks, Pipin, and his advisors did not have the knowledge of the language,

1) Prima die primi mensis Deus jussit erigi tabernaculum, propterea quod eodem fere tempore creaturas Deus condidit, cujus rei fidem facit germinatio arborum. Germinet, inquit, terra herbam virentem, ferentem semen secundum genus et similitudinem suam, et lignum fructiferum faciens fructum. Incipiente enim vere prata florere incipiunt, segetes semina concipiunt et arbores fructum emittunt. Eaque de causa Deus etiam sub idem tempus liberavit populum Israel a servitute Aegptiorum. Theod. qu. 72. in Exod.

*At the coronation of the pope it has been called to him for a long time: Take the tiara adorned with 3 crowns and know that you are the ruler of the earth, the father of the princes and on earth the representative of Jesus Christ.

that they would have recognized by the language itself that this document was a completely new work of art, and so he recognized it as his sacred duty to grant the Roman provinces to the pope. In particular, however, this case of the secular pope's power is a judgment on the presumption of infallibility. When Boniface VIII raised the claims of the papacy to the highest level in relation to secular power and in the bull *Unam sanctam* declared the obedience of all men in all things to be a necessary condition of beatitude, the opposition of the new spirit against the Roman bishop arose for the first time in a fatal way; the disgrace of the Babylonian Exile at Avignon was the consequence. When the papacy thought to have celebrated its highest triumph at the 5th Lateran Council, and Pope Leo X had repeatedly put up with blasphemous acclamations, *) that great wound was inflicted on him by the Reformation, which was just beginning to scar. And now, after Pius IX, by his Marian dogma and the declaration of his own infallibility, has sanctioned the earlier exaggerations and has quite publicly placed himself in the temple of God and pretends that he is God, this papal power is collapsing like a rotten building. The finger of God is unmistakable in all this. ... When it became probable that the Vatican Council would recognize the Syllabus and the doctrine of Infallibility, even those Catholics who had hitherto been regarded in Germany as leaders of the Catholic cause, but who inwardly recognized the wrong and disastrous nature of this dogma, sought to They tried to defend themselves against this sinister dogma by reminding the Roman Curia in advance that this would put an end to the previous peaceful relationship with the governments and expose the Church to even greater restrictions. Catholic legal scholars in Bavaria gave their opinion on the political significance of this doctrine to the effect that the government had to withhold its placet (consent) because the old *modus vivendi* (the previous legal relationship) was thereby abolished in its fundamentals; the Catholic government in Austria also denounced the Concordat to the pope, i.e. the contract between it and the Catholic church regime that had been valid until then. This happened especially because the Vatican Council accepted the Syllabus issued by the Pope on December 8, 1864 (a compilation of sentences, which actually, as the latest symbol of the Catholic Church, names and condemns all errors of this time) in the form of certain sayings and doctrines. According to it, the church can, as in the Middle Ages, use external means of coercion in the application of the law.

*) In the ninth session Antonius Pucctus shouted the words of the 72nd Psalm: "all kings will worship you and serve you" to the pope, in the sixth he was called the lion (*leo*) of the tribe of Judah; in a speech delivered on December 10, 1512 Marcellus called the pope: "You, the other God on earth."

The Catholic Church, too, is granted the divine right to depose kings and give away kingdoms and nations as he sees fit; indeed, constitutions and constitutional principles are condemned which, like the constitutional one, form the foundations of our state life. Admittedly, Catholic leaders in our fatherland have wanted to deny that there is any danger to the state in this, and in this respect they also have a pretense that in a position of power such as Prussia now has, the pope does not at first think of making those cruel sentences practical, but it is a thousand times confirmed experience that the pontifical power has always proceeded according to that principle of government which Richelieu recommended with the words: When times are unfavorable, let the reins loose, only that you do not let them out of your hand, so that when times are favorable, you can tighten them again. In the Middle Ages, individual popes not only pronounced such sentences, which refer to the pope as the ruler of the world, as the sun from whom kings and emperors receive their power, as the moon receives its light from the sun, but also acted accordingly, installed and deposed kings, released subjects from their oaths. Since the dogma of Infallibility also has retroactive force, in that it declares the bishops of Rome infallible in general, thus also those who have long since died,*) it is obvious that with this dogma, depending on the circumstances, practically all claims are possible, which make everything possible because of their binding force for the conscience. Just consider the procedure that the state has taken and is still taking towards other religious communities. As soon as the application for state recognition and free practice of religion is made by such communities, the government demands from them their confession of faith and whatever else applies to them as a constitutional or life law. After this, the state examines whether recognition can be granted to them, and in these written statutes the state has forever a firm document by which it can convict them in the case of transgression that they have not kept their contract. But this is no longer possible with respect to the Catholic Church, since, in addition to and above all other statutes, that law of faith and life applies to it which the pope, as it has been called, carries in his bosom, just as the high priest once carried in his breastplate spiritual light and law. Hence it comes that the same thing that the Catholics have put up with in Baden and Württemberg, for example, they will not put up with in Prussia, that which did not go against conscience there in former times, here they will not put up with.

*Among them are popes whose doctrinal decisions have been condemned as heresies by other popes; Innocent IV himself declared obedience to a heretical decision of the pope to be a sin (see Maret: "The General Council and Religious Peace" 1870).

Now it goes against the conscience, because the pope disapproves of it, who herewith has divinely judged a so-called middle thing and thus made it a sin. Thus, in sum, it must be said: The papacy has the appearance of the highest conservatism, it is presented as the refuge of all legitimacy and preservation of divine order, as the refuge of all salvation even for the external prosperity of princes and states, and yet it is only a distorted image of conservatism; in fact, it is the most profound revolution from above, as the power that sits down in the temple of God, as a god and pretends that he is God. (2 Thess. 2, 4.)*)

*The Catholic Church has so much the appearance of conservatism that in this magic the key is to be recognized to explain the conversions (conversions) to the Catholic Church, which have been carried out since the French Revolution especially by members of the aristocracy (the nobility); there is authority yes according to human reason and for human desire for convenience most perfectly carried out with the establishment of infallibility; there is a contentious obedience, to the most blind degree in the Jesuit order, but obligatory also for the Church, so that its members submit with the day when the dogma of faith, which they fought only yesterday, is proclaimed as dogma by the pope; there is a millenarian adherence to just and unjust claims; There is a power over the masses, a richly structured activity of associations, against which even the social-democratic agitation experiences an effective resistance; above all, there is a representation of a unity of faith, against which the increasing ecclesiastical fragmentation of the Protestants looks like a process of self-dissolution. It is an enchantment, it is caricature, it is flesh and not spirit, but since the world deceives and is deceived, it is a "power that is great" and it is not at all obvious that, even if today the secular power has entered into a life-and-death struggle against the papal power, at some turn of events, If there is a turn of events that the triumphant liberalism will bring about by revealing its political impotence by its fruits, such a reversal can happen that the natural bearers of conservatism, above all the kings, will throw themselves into its arms again, or at least try to save their thrones by making false concessions to it. It is said that the first Napoleon summoned Pope Pius VII, whom he had imprisoned, to his house one day and proposed a covenant of world domination, to which the latter at first only replied: "*comediante*". Then, after Napoleon had let out serious threats and bitter anger, he had left with the word "*tragediante*". The revelation of John shows that it can come even well still to such tragicomic. At the end of this note I cannot refrain from adding a remark for confirmation, which I found only yesterday in the just published book of a good Lutheran (?), the bishop Martensen: Catholicism and Protestantism. He writes on p. 5: "If we consider the conversions from the Protestant to the Catholic Church that have taken place during our century, and inquire into the motives for them, insofar as they are of a religious nature, it will become apparent that they are mainly due to a need for authority, to a "hunger for firm authority," which hunger has sought its satisfaction precisely in the Roman Church. "Everything in me," it says in a self-biography, "sighs, calls and cries out for authority." From all the numerous writings of those converts it is clear that they were either in the Roman

What is an Evangelical Lutheran Church? It was once said that it is hardly possible to give a short description of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. For if one wanted to do so, one would have to go into great detail about all the special doctrines it has that are not found in other churches. From this it is clear that the Lutheran church is not the one true visible church on earth, but only a special party, if not a sect. - Valentin Ernst Löscher, Saxon high court preacher in Dresden, who died in 1741, once answered this reproach briefly and well as follows: "The name of the Evangelical Lutherans can be used partly in its essence and the main work, partly according to the historical circumstances. According to the first type, the Evangelical Lutheran congregation (or church) is that which accepts, confesses, and teaches in conformity with the true, pure Gospel and Word of God according to its wording in the sharpest sense in all articles of faith. In the other way, however, that congregation (or church) is called Evangelical Lutheran which exactly and completely agrees with the church re-established by the personal ministry of the blessed Luther, his true disciples and unsuspected constant assistants in the fundamental articles, also truly retains Luther's fundamental doctrines, which he defended to the death and never changed (not his earlier human errors, which he himself later recognized), and accepts the unchanged Augsburg Confession in its original sense. - But what is written of the whole Evangelical Lutheran Church can easily be applied to every member of it. And so we have a double idea or definition of an Evangelical Lutheran Christian, the first of which is theological, the other historical." (Detailed *historia motuum* between the Evangelical-Lutherans and Reformed. 1707. preliminary report p. 19.) W.

It is not surprising that the poor have preferably sought an infallible doctrinal authority in order to obtain a reliable answer to the great question: What is truth? or that they have especially looked for an authority of reconciliation which would stand them in good stead for a sure and complete forgiveness of sins. Such religious motives (for it is a recognized fact of experience that the poor are mostly motivated by external motives) are found more in aristocratic circles, and in such a way that not infrequently the religious need for authority is intimately connected with the political. This fusion is especially evident in the forerunner and noblest representative of all aristocratic converts, Count F. L. Stolberg, who combined with his belief in the Roman Church the most peculiar view, sufficiently disproved by history, that all the evil that arose from the French Revolution, especially that political and social activity which had become so dangerous for the prerogatives of the nobility, could only be stopped by uniting the nations again under the obedience of the Catholic Church.

K irchlich -Zeitgeschichtliche.

I. America.

The General Council and the Synod of Pennsylvania. In this year's preface of his "Zeitschrift", of which he has also published a separate print, Pastor Brobst has given an overview of the history of the Council and its prehistory, especially concerning the Pennsylvanian Synod, in order to assess the controversial issues. We emphasize some of the following: "The Synods of Pennsylvania and New York, as well as the General Council in general, are facing a crisis - an important turning point; this became apparent on various occasions during the past year..... We freely and openly confess that we were mistaken in our expectations; we believed there was greater unity among us than is now really to be found, and we hoped that everything could and would soon develop in a peaceful manner. ... A few months ago an influential member of our synod said: 'Our fathers also believed in the doctrines of our church, but they did not lay so much stress on them as is laid on them today.' That is correct, and there lay the error, and there it still lies. For example, one accepts the true doctrine of baptism and the Lord's Supper, of the person of Christ, etc., but does not firmly reject the contrary doctrine, the false teaching about these and other points. Error is tolerated alongside truth, and this greatly weakens pure doctrine and consumes its strength. This has been the weak point of our synod since the beginning of this century, and it still is to some extent today. That is why they began to build communal churches, to introduce the communal hymnal, and thus, of course, the difference between Lutheran and Reformed was blurred or covered up, and the union was introduced, if not theoretically, at least practically. Hence it came about that although the synod a hundred years ago, as today, professed all symbolic books as a doctrinal basis, it nevertheless tolerated openly rationalists in its midst 40 and 50 years ago, and although there were often fierce battles between these and the orthodox, the latter, precisely because of the unionism that had set in and because of the disdain for the Lutheran doctrines of distinction, were nevertheless too weak in their position to practice doctrinal discipline on the former. The same weakness became apparent later in the struggle against the New Measure system. Although the outward form of it was rejected, the false doctrines on which it was based were not decisively attacked, because they were not properly recognized. Thus, as a result of Unionism, Methodism, under the name of 'New Measures', or Neo-Lutheranism on the one hand, and Rationalism, introduced from Germany through theological writings on the other, came to great power in the old synods of our country. ... In the forties a change occurred. To this contributed the 'Lutherische Kirchenzeitung' of Pastor F. Schmidt, the *Lutheran Standard*, the Writings of Dr. Nevin (Honor to whom honor is due), the 'Lutheran' and other writings of the Missouri - Synod . . . much with. ... In 1853 there was a serious struggle at Reading over affiliation with the General Synod. . . . With the decision taken by a committee of the General Synod . . . and sent to Germany, in which this body declared itself decidedly unteachable and un-Lutheran, we stood up, asked for the floor and for permission to read this writing, when from various sides, influenced by external urges, the call to vote became so loud and powerful that we had to sit down before we could calmly complete our protest speech.

could.... The main error of the Synod of Pennsylvania at Reading in 1853 consisted in the lack of a public testimony for the distinctive doctrines of the Lutheran Church and against the Uniate Church in fact and truth - it was, without being aware of it, basically a denial of the faith for which our forefathers were ready to sacrifice property and blood; For, in spite of the 'reservation', one put oneself factually on a par with the unrighteous false teachers by passing over their rejection of the Lutheran doctrine with silence, and by an organic connection with them, put oneself on a par with them in the eyes of the world. This was a grave sin, and such a beginning could only lead to a sad end, as it did at York and Fort Wayne.... If, however, the Synod of Pennsylvania had firmly and immovably maintained its position in the beginning, it would have resisted the unruly nature in the General Synod with word and deed, instead of making itself part of it by uniting with it, if not indirectly then directly...; or if she had united with her brethren in the West, who stood with her on the same ground of faith; or if she had only remained true to herself and had properly cultivated her own field of labor and developed her own gifts, she would stand much better today and would now occupy the same place in the East which the Synod of Missouri occupies in the West." In reference to pulpit fellowship already cultivated in Mühlenberg's time, it is said toward the end of the preface, "One says: 'Mühlenberg and his associates did have preachers from other churches, e.g. Episcopal, preach in their pulpits here and there.' This is unfortunately true - although it happened only rarely - and there the dear fathers, in good opinion, certainly committed a mistake which caused much loss to our church in this country right at its foundation. Through their pulpit fellowship with the Episcopalians, practiced as it were only exceptionally, the false view was spread almost everywhere that the Episcopal Church was the English branch of the Lutheran Church, and this contributed immensely to the fact that especially in Philadelphia and New York so many of our young people who had become English converted without hesitation to the Episcopal Church, which after all belongs to the 'most distinguished' church communities. This historical fact has not been duly recognized and emphasized by our historians for a long time." G.

The General Assembly of Presbyterians. The Synod of the State of Missouri had agreed that Catholics who convert to Presbyterianism must be rebaptized; but submitted the matter to the General Assembly. The General Assembly, however, gave no decisive answer, but referred the question to a committee to report next year. Resolutions were also passed concerning the conversion of Gentiles to Christianity and Germans to Presbyterianism. A certain Dr. Knox, however, let it be seen from his speech on this occasion that it was especially a question of the Americanization of the Germans. G.

At its May meeting, **the Moravian Synod** rescinded previous synodal resolutions prohibiting women from speaking or praying in church or in prayer meetings.

About the dispute between the Northern and Southern Methodists, the Southern Methodist paper, the "Family Friend" says: "Fraternity between our and the Northern Methodist Church is now a fait accompli. What does this fraternity actually entail? Nothing more than mutual recognition. - For a long time the northern church did not want to recognize our church. In 1848 our ambassador, commissioned to initiate fraternal intercourse, was rejected by the General Conference of that church. Since that time, the relationship between the two churches has sometimes not been at all fraternal. Two years ago, however, during our

At the Fourth General Convention in Louisville, Doctors Hunt and Fowler and General Fisk presented themselves as ambassadors of the Northern Church to extend to us the hand of brotherhood and to initiate fraternity in the name of their church. These ambassadors were kindly received and discharged their duty in a dignified manner. - Thereupon our General Conference decided that we would gladly consent to the proposed fraternity, but conditionally; there were difficulties which, if not first removed, would prevent the fraternity from being effective and beneficial. It was thus ordered that a commission be appointed, consisting of three preachers and two laymen, to confer with a commission to be appointed by the Northern Church, for the correction of existing wrongs. Our ambassadors, Doctors L. Pierce and Duncan, and President Garland, were instructed, after official reception, to notify the General Conference of that church that we had appointed a commission like the one designated, and that we desired, indeed deemed it necessary, that they likewise appoint a similar commission. Our ambassadors did as instructed, and that General Conference also declared itself willing to do so and appointed a commission. We confidently believe that the commissioners of these two churches will put an end to all the injustice between them. - What injustice? Because of mine and yours. During the Civil War, many preachers of the Northern Church came to the South and, equipped with authority from the Secretary of War, took possession of much of our church property. However, said authority did not give them legal title; but as it often goes in life: force before right! or, as a well-known maxim goes: possession is half the right! so the Northern Church owns to this day church property to the amount of many thousands of dollars, which rightfully belongs to our church community. In New Orleans alone, that church owns property in the amount of \$55,000 (so highly appraised that it was snatched from us) - property of our church, legally certified. These are the houses of worship of the Negro communities. The Negro congregations had left our church association; they then took the church property with them to the northern church. But the property titles for all these Negro churches are in the hands of the Trustee Boards of our American churches. The secular court would have to return our property to us if we were suable; but our church authorities thought it more advisable to wait until an amicable settlement could be effected. This case in New Orleans mentioned here is only one of the many inconveniences that stood in the way of true fraternity. Of course, the northern church also has its complaints against our church. Our church, too, owns property in some places, which is judicially certified to the northern church. Let us hope, then, that said two commissions will bring about an amicable settlement!" According to another article in the paper, however, the "Fraternity" still seems to be in the wide field; for in spite of the fact that the Southern Methodist Church already has a church paper with 13,000 subscribers in New Orleans, the Northern Conference has ordered the publication of its own paper and has employed the Negro preacher Revels from Mississippi as editor.

G.

In the South American republic of Venezuela, the president, in his message to the congress, has spoken out in favor of the disestablishment of the national church from the Roman court and for the eligibility of bishops and priests by the congress. "We do not want," he says, "to see our state destroyed by enemies who masquerade as defenders of religion. It is necessary to return to the original organization of the Church as Christ intended .

II. Abroad.

We believe that we cannot withhold from our readers a **testimony for the Missouri Synod** which appeared under the code B. in D. in the "Mecklenburgische Kirchen- und Zeitblatt" of May 17 of this year. It is as follows: The Missouri Synod is once again vehemently attacked in No. 7 of the Gazette; it is accused of "unedifying extravagance, brusqueness and self-appreciating arrogance. Although these frivolous accusations are immediately and duly rejected by the editor, the event would like to offer a suitable opportunity to express a general, probably not unjustified wish with regard to the behavior against the Missouri Synod. It is evident that the writer of the article in question speaks only from hearsay about the Missouri Synod. For his so sure judgment he refers only to the reports of the General Evangelical Lutheran Church Gazette. Not even the easily available writing of the Missourian pastor Ruhland "Der getrostete Pilger" etc., whose content he calls "hateful" without further ado, he has seen himself, since he says that the article "Aus Sachsen" in the Luthardtsche Kirchenzeitung has exposed this content. Therefore, the words with which he thinks he can dismiss the writer of the article "For the Missouri Synod" must be doubly returned to this author: "He has truly made it too easy for himself. - I would like to ask in general, however, not only not to take the public attack against the Missourians too lightly, but also not to take one's own judgment of them too lightly. Without the *audiatur et altera pars*, who would immediately finish his judgment on even the slightest dispute, let alone on such a deep, serious, long struggle as Missouri has waged for the sake of the most sacred cause? - There is already a great bias against this synod thanks to the many oppositional newspaper reports and especially Professor Fritschel's tour through Germany. So far this has made little difference on the whole, as long as the matter did not come closer to us. However, since we are now inevitably affected by the formation of separate Missouri congregations in our national churches and especially by the events in the Leipzig Mission, it will now be our serious duty to read not only against and about Missouri, but also Missouri itself. And in that case I may say with all confidence that for everyone, even the opponents, the gain will be great, and for those to whom disguised unionism and drunken progress theology are an abomination, the joy will also be great, as well as, with the missionaries who have left, the thanksgiving to the merciful God who has built such a solid tower as the Missouri Synod into the walls of our church, which are undermined from without and within. It does not seem impossible to me that God may have transferred the leadership of the Lutheran Church to America, however smilingly disdainful the looks from here to there may still be in general. In any case, if the Lutheran Church in our country still has the strength to become a confessional and disciplinary church again, we will have to go through the same struggles that the Missouri Synod fought victoriously. - To this I will add a complaint about the General Evangelical Lutheran Church. Missouri's opponent in No. 7 of the Gazette criticizes the fact that this newspaper is called "so-called. Yes, should that really be so wrong? Is it not true that it is becoming more and more a representative not of the Lutheran Church, but of the so-called Lutheran university theology? One should read, to emphasize only one thing, the announcement and review of the new edition of Kahn's Dogmatik. What a yes and no is mixed together there with beautifully flowing verbiage. Yes, even a rambling necrology of the famous Zurich Protestant associationist Lang could not be missing. In it, all of us in the

The religious position of the "tireless and energetic champion of liberal theology" is described as "Christianity without miracles" and as "decidedly opposed to positive Christianity. The religious standpoint of the "tireless and energetic champion of liberal theology" is described as that of "Christianity without miracles", as "decidedly opposed to positive Christianity", but at the same time it is attributed with "a love of truth that expresses itself without reserve". For according to modern Lutheran theology, one can deny some, much, even all miraculous things about Christianity with untiring energy and try to tear them away from all hearts and still have a love of truth, so that truth itself is obviously to blame when it is branded as a lie by the love of truth. - Professor Walther's sermons are also cited by the writer of the article in No. 7. But he does not seem to have read them either, otherwise he would not have put "American" after the title of the Postille. But what one does not know, one does not understand. Perhaps I will make him and others want to read the sermons if I include a few words from Dr. Brömel's evaluation of them. - In the following, the sender then communicates the verdict of the aforementioned, which was already communicated earlier in these pages. W.

Saxony. About the ecclesiastical movement in the Saxon regional church, in whose interest Deacon Stöckhardt in Planitz publishes the "Flugblatt", the "Pilgrim from Saxony" writes, among other things: "It is (see Lutheran No. 11.p.87) a proof of courage and bravery to burn the bridges behind him and thus cut off the retreat for himself and his people, as Stöckhardt does; But by doing so, he at the same time gives proof that he rather disregards the possibility of an understanding with the regional church organs, and has separation in mind not as an unavoidable evil, but as the actual desired goal of his efforts, and thus his writing gains more the character of a defense of the already decided departure from the regional church, than that of an attempt to really help it to a thorough and beneficial reformation." - The request for support for the resigned East Indian missionaries contained in the "pamphlet" finds least favor with the "pilgrim." He writes: "Most distressing to us in the 'pamphlet' has been the 'urgent plea' for the four missionaries from India dismissed from the service of our missionary society." "They are called 'courageous confessors', 'who served our mission faithfully and were dismissed precisely for the sake of their faithfulness, which they had shown as Lutheran missionaries'. And yet it is basically only the tactlessness of Brunn, which has immediately exposed the young men's uncalled interference in a matter that did not in the least concern their serious profession over there, to the public and capitalized on it for the Missourians whom he serves. To glorify this Missourian conquest-church policy, too, requires a degree of ecclesiastical self-consciousness which we have hitherto found only among the Missourians themselves."

Saxony. The General Evangelical Lutheran Church Newspaper of May 12 describes the ecclesiastical conditions of the Saxon regional church, among other things, in the following: One had hoped in many cases that the Consistory would put an end to the outrageous exhibitions of Dr. Sulze as an Evangelical Lutheran clergyman. The delegates' conference of the Association of Saxon Clergymen had put a motion to this effect on the Consistory's agenda; however, upon the assurance that the authorities had taken action against Dr. Sulze, it was dropped. Since then, the latter has proceeded rather more ruthlessly, and now he is in the immediate vicinity of the Consistory. It is reported that he has now been seriously admonished by the Consistory to adhere to the teachings of the Lutheran Church, but it would have been gratifying if the authorities themselves had spoken out in this matter..... No less saddening for the ecclesiastically minded was the confirmation of

of the liberal pastor Landmann and Rendel in the Grand Duchy of Hesse, who, as is known, even before the Reichstag thought of it, applied for the introduction of civil marriage in the Hessian Chamber of Estates, as superintendent in plans that must be all the more conspicuous because the person in question caused quite a stir by his colloquium before the Landesconsistorium at Dresden. This confirmation appears to be merely a concession to the liberal church boards and patrons, which could have been avoided all the more easily, as the Consistory could simply decide, certainly with almost unqualified approval: that the attitude (!) alone, without scientific ability, does not entitle to such an office in the Saxon regional church..... Will the Church of Saxony, in order to preserve and maintain its reputation, which has been "lost in many cases through its own fault", get its act together and take seriously not only the old, but also the good, rational and appropriate orders concerning discipline? After the vindication of the Mecklenburg church regime in the Diet, will it have the courage to think of its own dignity for once? Or will it also let the present moment pass by, and for fear of unpleasant appearances, or more correctly, for fear of mankind, spurn all and any real discipline and thereby rightly become everyone's "footcloth"? This seems to us to be the true crisis in Saxony. - So far the church newspaper. In such conditions, can a true Lutheran still ask whether he may remain in the union of such a church of union with the enemies of Christianity?

W.

The Saxon chambers also discussed and passed resolutions on the royal decree concerning the compensation of the clergy for the omission of fees. The "Pilgrim from Saxony" writes about it: "The number of baptisms, banns, presentation letters and marriages is determined for the last four calendar years. The number of baptisms, baptismal calls, presentations and marriages is determined for the last four calendar years, calculated according to the conventional or matriculated lowest fee rates and compensated according to the average annual amount from the state treasury. This compensation shall be paid from 1. January 1876, in half-yearly installments to the parishes, on condition that: a) baptisms, baptismal services and marriages shall be performed free of charge in a form prescribed by the higher ecclesiastical authority, and b) a fixed salary corresponding to the average amount of the same during the last four years shall be granted to each clergyman and church servant in lieu of any and all income from accidentia and stolon fees, and c) the obligation is imposed upon him, from the time of the fixation, not to accept any consideration for any individual act or effort incumbent upon him in his office, for which compensation has been received through the fixation. Services of the clergy (e.g. funeral, baptismal and marriage services) or church servants which go beyond the form envisaged under a) and do not belong to the essence of the ecclesiastical act and are claimed in a permissible manner shall be specially remunerated, but these remunerations shall be paid to the church treasury. Failure to comply with the above provisions by January 1, 1878, will result in the loss of the state compensation. - There was a heated dispute about whether a clergyman was allowed to accept gifts, especially on the occasion of certain services. Some considered this unworthy of a clergyman and therefore wanted it to be forbidden in tender respect of the dignity of the clergy, without, however, finding the acceptance of gifts on the part of physicians and teachers degrading; others declared the prohibition to be unnatural, a restriction of personal freedom, Others declared the prohibition to be unnatural, a restriction of personal freedom, especially of the giver, even a tyranny, and in the form in which the majority of the second chamber actually wanted it, an undeserved vote of no confidence in the clergy, a new cut in the bond that united clergy and congregations, and not exactly suitable to spur the zeal of the clergy. Nevertheless, the

The second chamber upheld the prohibition with a large majority, while the first chamber lifted it again. After repeated negotiations the first chamber gave way and it was agreed that not the gifts at all, but only the gifts for a certain act performed by the clergyman should be forbidden." - "From the Diet the royal decree goes to the Synod, while rather, as Oberhofprediger vr. Kohlschütter and Professor Fricke emphasized with reference to the synodal and church council regulations, the opposite way would have been the correct one."

"Inclination toward the sect. In our "Schulblatt" of April, p. 112 ff. it is reported that a teacher of the city of Fürth in Bavaria, J. Th. Mayer, has given a serious testimony against the abolition of the confessional schools in this city. Even the Leipziger Allgemeine ev.-luth. Kz. must praise this testimony in its number of April 7. But since the dear man, urged by his conscience, has left the Bavarian regional church and joined Pastor HLrger's congregation, the aforementioned church newspaper quickly throws a stone at him, and uses Mr. Mayrr's testimony for the fact that, when he stands up for the Lutheran church, he is not zealous for a sect, for by Lutheran church he understands nothing other than the old apostolic Catholic church. From this the correspondent already wants to have noticed that Mr. Mayer is a member of the "sect"! So we read: "However, here already the direction shines through, which he also took soon after, by declaring that Luther did not want a Lutheran confession (?), but only the return to the original Bible Christianity, to the Apostolic-Catholic Church. And when he then went on to say: The school should be a place where the children are taught a Christianity as it is known and wanted by the Holy Scriptures, not such a Christianity as is demanded by the various catechisms or private views of the teachers of religion," some people sensed an inclination towards the sect. Unfortunately, this inclination soon became a real resignation from the national church. The man could not find himself in the behavior of the clergy of the city, he saw in their behavior to this transformation of the school lukewarmness, couragelessness, weakness of faith. Thus, on February 10 of this year, he resigned from the national church. In a printed leaflet entitled "Zur Aufklärung" (On Enlightenment), he announced that he had declared his resignation to the city pastor Lehmus, and then visited his confessor, Pastor Götz, to ask him whether he had done something bad by joining the free Lutheran congregation in Bavaria, whose name was "Hörgianer" after the Memmingen clergyman Hörger. The latter had answered him: You must and will have agreed with God in your conscience. You will find weeds and wheat over there and over there, but the confession is more faithful with them." - So if one does not want to let the Lutheran church become a sect, then one reveals "leaning toward the sect"! If one did not know that error cannot be justified in any other way than by the most nonsensical assertions and resolutions, it would be purely inexplicable how learned people can make assertions and draw conclusions, as is done here.

W.

The Neuendettelsau Standpoint. It is most curious to see from a Neuendettelsau correspondence in the Allgemeine evang.-luth. Kirchenztg. of May 5, that Neuendettelsau stands at the present time in the same way as Iowa originally stood with regard to the open questions and the position on the confessions, although the latter later sought to deny this and has now probably returned to its original position. We now leave the relevant section of that correspondence without any criticism, since we consider the equally indifferentist-syncretist and papist theory expressed therein to be in contradiction to God's Word and dangerous both for the individual Christian and for the Church.

Church have already revealed themselves sufficiently in this journal. - Thus one writes to the Leipziger Kirchenzeitung from Neuendettelsau: "That representatives of the two opposing Lutheran Free Churches of Prussia could find a place in the institution is an unsought illustration of the so-called Neuendettelsau standpoint and the ecclesiastical direction represented there. How could one have offered one's hand for the theological education of both for the service in both separated churches, if one would not be willing to take one's stand in the ecclesiastical conduct against both synods on the basis of the confession common to them, and if one would not seriously find in both two directions within the one confession? The conviction that there are "open questions" which separate the Iowa Synod from the Missouri Synod and also distinguish us from the German Missourians among our brethren, it is this conviction which, while faithfully standing on the thetical-antithetical basis of the confession, gives the Neuendettelsau direction the possibility of uniting where others must divide, until finally the Lutheran Church has fallen under the spell of a legal entity or into the fragmentation of individual congregations which exclude themselves. The conviction of the right of open questions in the church gives so much breadth that one can also carry the others and does not have to tear apart the church fellowship with them. Open questions, however, can exist for the individual and for the church. An open question, however, is not that which is not stated in Scripture or is stated only obscurely. These are idle questions. Open questions are those which are clearly answered in Scripture, but for which the individual or the church has not yet recognized this answer from Scripture and raised it in a conscience-binding way. The whole process of dogma and symbol formation is based on this sentence. What the conscience of the individual has bindingly recognized as the scriptural answer to a question is not an open question for him, but your answered question. What the whole personality of the church has recognized from the Scriptures through the mediation of a chosen church body and therefore has known: that is not an open question for the church. However, the history of dogma proves that there have always been questions, questions of salvation, which have not yet found a sufficient answer from Scripture for the church. These were open questions. But as soon as, by means of a spiritually anointed central church personality, the scriptural statement on the question in question was raised in a conscience-binding way and from there became the common property of the church conscience, the question ceased to be an open one for the church. For this reason, however, such questions, as long as they have not yet been appropriated by the church conscience in its scriptural answer, are also not suitable to be church-dividing. Only that which already binds the conscience of the church can the church confessionally assert as divisive truth against those who seek to obscure this truth and thus extinguish the light newly given to the church. Only then is the abolition of church fellowship a reaction of the church's conscience bound in God's Word, an act of self-preservation and therefore accompanied by salvation and blessing. Moreover, it only serves fanaticism. Now, to the extent that the individual stands higher than the respective state of knowledge of his church, that can be a decisive question for him personally, what must still be considered an 'open question' for him as a member of the church in his ecclesiastical behavior, as an open church question. And to the extent that he has a reformatory vocation, his knowledge will become church knowledge, and by means of it the open question will also cease to exist for the church. But the more the individual or the church is led to manhood in Christian knowledge, to the apostolic fullness, the more the 'open questions' will become symbolically decided ones. One could only ask whether, especially in the beginning of the dogma-historical movement, so many ecclesiastical 'open' questions could be without endangering the salvation of the soul. The answer to this is that all these symbolic determinations are conceptually mediated.

It is not a question of the 'open questions', but of the 'what' and 'how' of the truth of the Scriptures, which are precisely determined conceptually, while the simple, unmediated knowledge of the truth of salvation is sufficient for salvation, as we find it, for example, in the apostolic fathers, in the Apostolicum, and in every dogma before it passed through the struggle and the symbolic establishment. The 'open questions' are definitely the conceptually precisely determined 'what' and 'how' of the truth of Scripture, in which determination it appears lifted out of its biblical immediacy and set apart from the false concepts that threaten it and come from worldly wisdom. This introduction of the church by the spirit into the whole truth of the divine word is promised to it and takes place step by step according to the spirit power of the world threatening it in each case. This dogma-historical process, led by the Holy Spirit, who reduces the open questions for the church more and more, until they have all come to 'one faith and knowledge of the Son of God', is the most central struggle of the contending church with the darkness of the world. In it, the church must carry out and prove the central truth of Scripture, Christ, which is grasped directly in faith, also in the knowledge of all the aberrations of a false gnosis. Only in this way can she, as a teacher of the peoples, maintain the divine truth given to her at all levels of culture. Therefore, we only state "open questions" for the church, because it has not yet penetrated from the dispute to the victory and cannot yet claim the apostolic full measure. And such open questions, which for this very reason have not yet entered into the experience of conscience of the church, but are answered by one person in one way and by another in another way from Scripture", about which no unanimous understanding of Scripture has yet been formed, do indeed exist at the present time. So in the doctrine of the church, its present and its future. The Missouri sword stroke, however, cannot untie this Gordian knot for us as long as we cannot adopt their view of Scripture and confession in the relevant points for the sake of conscience. So we must simply want to take away the right of independent research in Scripture against Luther's spirit, or admit that in fact at the present time in the church among its members, and certainly not the worst, in these points there is still no unanimous understanding of Scripture by the Spirit of God, so that there are (!) still open questions for the church, as well as before Luther (!!) in the question of the way of salvation and the means of salvation (!!). And as certainly as before Luther the dissent in these questions was not church-dividing (!!), so certainly not now in the church question of the ministry and of the last things. What is already thetically established in the confession, we can also subscribe to, it does not affect us, admittedly the confessions are not considered purely as doctrinal laws, but in their historical antithesis. - These remarks are only intended to clarify to some extent what Neuendettelsau understands by open questions, and why its position is therefore one of reconciliation between the opposing Lutheran churches. And this reconciling position, which is so necessary in our time, is also expressed in the effectiveness of the institution. May therefore the reconciling position of Neuendettelsau awaken an interest in its cause in all those who have not once and for all thrown themselves into the arms of a closed-mindedness which is, as it seems, inaccessible to any controversy, who do not consider that open questions in the above sense were in the church at all times, that they have in fact led the life movement of the church further and brought it the blessing of a thorough unanimous understanding of a truth; which finally wants to be more Lutheran, i.e. less Lutheran. The Epitome to the Concordia Formula expressly states that the Confessions wanted to be no more, but also no less than testimonies of how the Scriptures were understood at all times in disputed articles by the living at that time, i.e., not a "truth" that is similar to the Scriptures.

content congruent confessional content, but a piece of scriptural truth that was raised from Scripture in the questions brought to the agenda by the Spirit of God at that time."

Eastern Austria. The Districtualconvent (the Synod of the Augsburg Confession) of the eight seniorates on this side of the Danube (Hungary) in Tirnau (September 15 and 16) has decided: no one may be accepted from a foreign district as a pastor, professor or teacher in this district if he does not commit himself before entering this district to observe the symbolic books and if he is a member of the Protestant Association. (Prot. Kz. p. 931.)

Switzerland. 83 pastors have resigned from the Swiss Preachers' Society (which met Aug. 17-18 in St. Gallen) because they cannot sit with clergymen (the Thurgauers) who are forcing out of office and church their fellow ministers who hold to the Apostolicum. - In German-speaking Switzerland, too, the ecclesiastical conditions became more unbearable, and the free formation of congregations increased. In order to meet this need and that of the city missions, a committee has come together to found its theological institute, which is to train faithful preachers; the new college is to be about halfway between university and seminary. Pastor Arnold in Heiden (Appenzell) is named as the director. - A pastor (in Zurich) who declared that he did not want to leave the Apostolicum was dismissed without further ado; 151 fathers of families of his congregation alone immediately formed a free congregation and elected him as their pastor.

Parish Principle. Even the pilgrim from Saxony of May 7 writes: "It is also our conviction that, after the previous form of territorial church constitution, which has its apex in the sumpiscopate of the sovereign, has outlived its usefulness, it is only the congregational principle on which a healthy church constitution can be established. But the necessary prerequisite for such a constitution is that it is not the congregation, as it emerged from the former compulsory state church, mixed from believers and unbelievers, intermingled with a large number of merely nominal Christians, but the professing congregation that gives itself its constitution, in other words, that all representatives of it are bound to the confession of the same and that sufficient guarantees are given for the maintenance of this cornerstone of truth." - Such and similar statements, which are now repeated in many German newspapers, to which not long ago the word "congregational principle" was an abomination, prove what a mighty change has taken place in the convictions of German pastors. Let us hope that in time many other things, which are also perhorescised as Missourian special doctrine, will gain acceptance even among our present opponents. The hated truth only freshly known: the right confession is never without fruit. **W.**

Prussia. At its session of May 5, the House of Representatives adopted Virchow's motion, according to which in the future the organs of the national church would no longer be entitled to participate in the appointment of theological professors and seminary directors. Thus, if in a few years, which is quite possible, the Jew Lasker will be Prussian Minister of Justice and the atheist Professor Virchow Minister of Culture, these gentlemen will have to determine from which professors the Protestant clergy of Prussia would have to obtain their official preliminary training, and if the gentlemen ministers would like to make a Hartmann a dogmatist and a Hanne Jr. a university preacher, the organs of the church would have no formal right to object to this. (Pilgrim from Saxony.)

For a number of years now, **theological literature** has experienced a strange decline in relation to the literature of other subjects. In a German newspaper we read: 25 years ago, in 1851, the category "theology and devotional writings" still accounted for 17.8 percent of the total, and from 1865 on, the ratio was as follows:

1865 1866 1867 1868 1869 1870 1871 1872 1873 1874 1875

14, 614, 413 913, 614, 214, 512, 811, 110, 89, 68,6

Since 25 years a relative decrease of more than 100 percent has occurred, but this is not only relative, also the absolute figures show a considerable decrease (if they are accurate?!).

Bohemia. The number of "evangelicals" in Bohemia is increasing rapidly; they already number 108,000 souls (72,000 Helvetic, 46,000 Augsburg confession); evangelical congregations are formed in almost all larger cities.

(Kreuztg. 295, Suppl.)

Russia. The Governor General of Warsaw, Count Kotzebue, has just issued three rescripts remarkable for the relationship of the Russian government to the Roman Catholic Church. The first rescript forbids the Roman Catholic clergy, in case of grave responsibility, to baptize children of mixed marriages between Catholics and converts to the Orthodox (Greek-Russian) faith and, in general, to perform all ecclesiastical acts with respect to converts, whether or not they have converted to the Orthodox faith. The second rescript also forbids the organization of pilgrimages with flags and pictures to neighboring indulgences in case of grave responsibility. The third rescript makes it a strict duty of the clergy, in case of extraordinary events in the Imperial Family, as soon as they are notified of such an event by the state authority, to hold the appropriate service without first waiting for the instruction of the Consistory. The administrator of the Archdiocese of Warsaw, Prelate Zwolenski, has announced the rescripts to his subordinate clergy by circular order for the strictest observance.

(Ev. Chronicle.)

Spain's sky is clouding for the pope in a very alarming way. The pope had demanded that religious freedom be completely revoked. Now the Diet has met, and the Committee of the same has passed the following resolution on April 7: "The Government and the Committee have agreed that the buildings of worship and the churchyards must be granted complete inviolability, to the extent that no Spaniard or foreigner may be troubled on account of his religious faith, so long as he does not offend Christian morals, and that all citizens, whatever their faith, may be admitted to all offices and services of the State. Undoubtedly, the law must equally respect the religious acts of believers who, by word and writing, defend their faith within the existing laws." It is said that the pope will withdraw his nuncio from Spain, thus making the break with the government an open one.

(Münkel's N. Ztbl.)

Social Democracy in Germany. We read the following in the General Evangelical Lutheran Gazette of May 5: The Social Democrats, who reorganized themselves at the Gotha Congress in May of last year into the "Socialist Workers' Party of Germany," see their organization threatened by the campaign which the Berlin public prosecutor Tessendorf has again opened against them. In the "Preuß. Staatsanzeiger" (Prussian State Gazette) that, at his request, the City Council of the Berlin City Court had decided to close the membership of the Socialist Workers' Party domiciled in Hamburg, as well as this association itself, for the entire extent of the Prussian monarchy.

The socialist machinery within Prussia has thus been brought to a standstill for the time being. Whether it will help anything is more than doubtful to us. The form can be broken, but to grasp and restrain the spirit is beyond the power of a prosecutor. As long as the socialist spirit continues to grow unweakened and is fertilized from day to day by the current of the times, it will know how to create a new form for itself, and if it can no longer do so publicly in conformity with the laws, then it will proceed secretly against the laws. We do not underestimate the importance of organization for any party. But the power of Social Democracy to influence and dominate the masses lies not so much in its organization as in its press. In the first quarter of this year, the press has grown considerably. During this period, local socialist papers were founded in the cities of Apolda, Barmen, Berlin, Bremen, Breslau, Duisburg, Frankfurt a. M. and Hanau. Where the funds for the maintenance of all these papers come from - the German Social Democracy currently has 38 newspapers, namely 2 official main organs, 21 local papers, 11 trade union organs, 3 'joke papers and an illustrated weekly - remains shrouded in darkness for the time being. The destructive effect of the socialist press, especially of the local papers, can be observed very clearly in some places. Thus, for example, Stuttgart has to show the most surprising and saddening fact for the conditions there, that 50 percent of the newly concluded marriages in the first quarter of the year remained without a church wedding. The local socialist newspaper, the "Süddeutsche Volkszeitung", has 1237 subscribers in Stuttgart alone. One is fully justified in relating these figures as cause and effect when one sees how in the socialist press the church with its servants and institutions is virtually outlawed.

German Darwinism for the People. The Ackerbauzeitung describes the present man according to his advantages over the quadrupeds and the mammals. These advantages consist in the fact "that he 1) walks upright, does not, like the quadrupeds close to him, use the hands for walking, - an arrangement, by which division of the work between hand and foot, thus a greater skill of both is achieved together with perfect development of the thumb, the calf and the foot span; 2) that the frontal parts of the brain are more developed in man, in which, according to the experience of physicians and physiologists, lies the higher faculty of thought, but above all the faculty of speech; 3) that man develops very slowly in childhood, that in particular his skull ossifies more slowly, as a result of which the development of the brain takes a longer time, whereby his capacity for education is considerably increased. These three characteristics have so far become more and more perfect in the human race during the millennia and have thus caused the transformation of the so-called wild or natural man into the civilized one of today. But still man, precisely as the beginning of a new series of beings, is a very imperfect creature and afflicted with a multitude of anatomical, physiological and spiritual deficiencies, whose gradual elimination we may hope for in the course of future millennia."

Misprint in the previous issue.

Page 163 line 15. 16. from above and 16. from below read instead of: - untidy - unthinking.

A good testimony concerning the mission to the Jews with some remarks.

Such a testimony is found in the "Saat auf Hoffnung" (1st issue 1876. p. 58.), and it is directed against the false ally of the mission to the Jews, chiliasm. Professor Delitzsch asks a pastor if he still devotes his attention to this magazine. He answered in the negative, "because it (the journal) unfortunately does not live up to the beautiful preface in which it promises to keep away all tendencies contrary to pure Lutheran doctrine; it has by no means definitely renounced all chiliastic efforts; Even if it does not explicitly teach chiliasticism itself, I am deeply saddened by the fact that it gladly welcomes as collaborators everything that promises to pull along the net of the mission to the Jews, be it even the grossest chiliastic omissions, without accompanying the report on such endeavors with a serious protest against the leaven of false doctrine, as is befitting. Then, in spite of the initial promise to the contrary, the endeavor to make the doctrine of the mass conversion of Israel a fundamental tenet of faith, the acceptance of which weighs even more than much else that the Lutheran Church has and teaches, becomes more and more evident. In this sense, I can no longer participate in the mission to the Jews, as much as I have always wished that it would one day be carried out in conscious opposition to chiliasm; then many more pious hearts would certainly fall to it, which are thus repulsed." Professor Delitzsch then declares that he too rejects the chiliasm condemned by the Augustana (in Article XVII), that he believes in the conversion of the Jews, but that he rejects any idea which contradicts the fact that in Christ both the Mosaic law and the national prerogative of Israel have found their end. With this, however, the learned commentator of the

Doctrine and Defense.

Old Testament on the one hand too much; on the other hand he might also be in contradiction with his exegetical omissions. For as far as chiliasm is concerned, a chiliasm that teaches that one day "the temple of Yahweh, now visible, will exert (a new unheard-of) magnetic attraction" (on the nations), that one day "Jerusalem will be the place where the river of the nations flows and is renewed again", is, however, one that runs counter to Lutheran doctrine and is also included in the verdict of condemnation of the 17th article. Although Professor Delitzsch wants the Mosaic law to find its end in Christ, he teaches on the other hand: "Neomenia and Sabbaths are still celebrated, and the difference is only that, as once all Israel gathered in the high feasts at Jerusalem, so now all flesh wallet allneumondlich and allsa-bathlich to Jerusalem. Even if he is reluctant to grant the Jews external prerogatives in this miraculous kingdom, he grants them spiritual prerogatives all the more unreservedly. It is only because of the great spiritual advantages of the Jews that those multitudes are there to celebrate their Sabbaths in Jerusalem. "A holy seed grows up (from the Jews), which fills the earth with its fruits, which becomes πλοῦτος ἐθνῶν (wealth of the Gentiles)" (Rom. 11.). The Israel of the future has "a prominent position in the universal church; the scattered sons and daughters bring with them the Gentiles who rush to her; both build Jerusalem's walls." For since the Old Testament does not yet "know a heaven with blessed people," *) so there is also no heavenly Jerusalem whose Hera-fahrt could be hoped for on earth." Thus "the eschatological idea of the new cosmos (Is. 65, 25.) always flows together with the millennium" (since only this is true, that in the Old Testament often, but not always, the New Testament time flows together with eternity, the kingdom of grace with the kingdom of honor). **) No refutation of this interpretation of the prophet shall be attempted here. Such a one would coincide, nevertheless, essentially with the reasons against the Chiliasmus in general, as they have been repeated already often. These exegetical results are also of such an astonishing and obviously erroneous nature that just here it is sufficient to recall a word of a church father brought also earlier in these sheets: It is enough for their refutation to report them. Perhaps Professor Delitzsch's interpretation differs in this from that of the

*An assertion, which only includes the truth, that the revelation of the blessedness of the believers in the Old Testament is not yet as bright as in the New Testament, as far as the nature of the blessedness is concerned. For wherever God reveals Himself to man in graces, man recognizes Him as the Blessed One. Abraham hopes that God will be his reward, Moses that he will see God's glory; and that is more than hoping for a heavenly Jerusalem.

**) S. Delitzsch on Isaiah Cap. 2.; 66.; 65.; 61.

chiliastic school of pietism, that it tries to get its results from a literal understanding of the prophet's words and thus tries to preserve a semblance of scriptural conformity, while the latter put its once preconceived opinions into the text quite clumsily and ruthlessly. For example, one can hardly believe his eyes when J. Lange explains the conflict of Michael with the dragon (Revelation 12:7) as Satan trying to hinder the conversion of the Jews, but Michael destroying his attempts and strongly promoting them. But this doctrine of a church triumphant on earth bears a different signature than that of the church. The latter says: "The time of his judgment has come" (Revelation 14). As the paradise remained as a sign of judgment until the flood of sin - so Luther remarks -, as the dead sea stood before the eyes of the second world as a sign of judgment, so also Jerusalem stands before the eyes of the world, which has the gospel, as such a sign. Why does not the chiasm also resurrect Sodom? Yes, of course there is no chiliastic apparatus of temples, walls, sabbaths; that does not fit to the tendency. However, Sodom is not worse than Jerusalem (Matth. 10, 15.). But if Chiasm wants to make possible what divine justice once did not allow under Julian, namely, the rebuilding of the temple, it proves that it itself fights against the idea of the unchanging judgment and justice of God, as the apocatastasis completely abolishes it. According to church history, both are well united, as in Petersen's wife, a native of Merlau and others. As kindred spirits, they are also in the 17th article with each other and under the same judgment. Furthermore, the desire of the church is not a Palestinian Jerusalem - whatever God may have intended for it in terms of the cross on earth, or even in terms of days of outward peace and increase - but it says: "Come. Therefore Luther rightly wants us to ask for the last day. And when we encounter such prayer in the church of our day, *) we heartily agree, and welcome it as a mark of the right, true church. The desire of believers for Christ's future also, as Gerhard puts it, **) hastens Christ's future, although they always submit to His will. We do not know to what extent chiasm has the courage to pray for his things; but this is evident, that the prayer of the church and its desire is thoroughly directed against him and his hopes. Since the above and similar views do not deny the mission to the Jews and its organs, they should first serve only to confirm how justified the testimony of that Lutheran pastor seems.

*) Compare "Lutherans" 1875, p. 177.

**) Loci, de extr. judicio § 20.

His testimony is also connected with a warm recognition of the personal worthiness of the editor of the "Seed of Hope". And this reminds how, however, in order to remain just, one should not expose the reprehensible in the mission to the Jews without also remembering its work and its blessings. If Kalkar, the historian of the Jewish mission, says that the idea of a general conversion, which is to take place at the end of the present world epoch (with the return of the Jews to Palestine and other accessories), gave the efforts of England for the conversion of Israel their real force and emphasis, *) this cannot be true of the mission which Professor Delitzsch represents. Without doubt, the love of Christ as the first impulse urged those men to their work. It cannot be denied that their love, zeal and sacrifice were crowned with many successes and blessings from God. From time to time baptisms of Israelites are reported from the Curonian church, which appointed a missionary for the numerous often very poor and degenerate Jews there and at the same time gave him the office of a pastor-adjunct in Mitau. The mission in Germany itself is probably less successful. The benefits with which the Jews are showered in Germany are on the whole - even if the principles of humanity may here and there have a small share in their granting - the product of apostasy from God and His word, of contempt for the church and its goods. The Jews will only flourish in a proud worldly sense and become more inaccessible to the Gospel than ever. The Jews do not see in the Christians a boasting of the mercy that was done in Christ, but that all this is no longer respected; so this is not the way and the time for them to receive mercy (Rom. 11, 31.).

But just now, where the bright sides of the Jewish mission unfold, it becomes apparent what a harmful leaven the chiliasm adhering to it is. The Jewish mission itself, contrary to knowledge and will, gives insights into the character of these teachings, which promote fanaticism, and whose bearers, above all, consider it necessary to declare that they are far from fanaticism; as we also see from the counter-declaration of Professor Delitzsch, and as one has heard such assurances quite often in America. It is indisputable that this ever-ready assurance arises from the same trait of human nature, according to which the miser, for example, strives above all to show that he is not stingy, but a philanthropist. But in spite of these assurances, a chiliastic

*Kalkar, Geschichtlicher Ueberblick der Bekehrungen der Juden, p. 193. ff. Unfortunately, Kalkar also does not unambiguously state that he considers the Pietist interpretation of Scripture with regard to eschatology to be a kind of progress and development.

The leavened mission of the Jews, however, has neither an eradicating gardener's hand against the germinating enthusiasm, nor does it have other than blunt weapons against the rampant one. As proof of this, let us recall an incident from Pastor Gurland's effectiveness in Curland. A rabbi, E. Moische, who was not unfamiliar with the gospel, but who only believed in the future glory of the Jews, and who had been completely confirmed in his principles by a trip to England, soon gathered people around him who wanted to use the gospel to become the first fruits of the church of the future. A part of these enthusiasts is said to have turned to America. They claimed to Pastor Gurland that "the church of the present time from the Gentile world is only a preparatory, temporary appearance of the actual Messianic kingdom, which will soon be revealed as a kingdom of perfect glory through the restoration of the kingdom of Israel as the shining center for all mankind.) What can Pastor Gurland (the man "after apostolic example", as the "Seed of Hope" calls him, which example he admittedly does not have before him, no matter how excellent his qualities appear otherwise) hold against these enthusiasts? Nothing but that he endeavors to prove from the Bible "that the triumphant church of the future is not an essentially new one, but only the reverse side and last manifestation of the church fighting under the cross and for the cross". We see that the dogmatics of this mission to the Jews has already established its own terminology. That of the millennium is no longer sufficient for them; this is now called the "triumphant church of the future". Thus they distinguish between the triumphant church on earth and the one in heaven, since up to now Christianity knew only of the one in heaven. The one on earth is the reverse side of the one we only experience and - in the best case - form ourselves. This means nothing else than that it is the opposite of the cross. What wonder, then, if people who have tasted nothing of true suffering over sin and the wrath of God like this very reverse side? It also appealed to more worthy people, Jacobo and Johanni, who wanted to sit at Christ's right hand. But Christ cuts off such thoughts and gives them the cup of suffering. And the apostolic model itself, does it ever promise Christians a triumphant church on earth? It comforts them with nothing else than the divine judgment and their final rest (2 Thess. 1, 4. ff.). Following this apostolic example, Luther also says: "Therefore it finally comes to pass - that God sees (namely, how men pervert their way), and hears the cry of the saints, who can indeed judge the world (for a spiritual man judges everything), but cannot make it better." **)

*) Compare "Saat auf Hoffnung," 3rd ed. 1875, S. 142.

**Luther on Gen. 6, 11.

If now that pastor expresses the desire that the mission to the Jews "should be carried on in conscious opposition to chiliasm," then this mission will hardly comply with this just demand, according to all experiences, but will continue its way - at least for the time being. If he wants to see the demanded realized, he will find that he and like-minded people must do it themselves. Why rely on others and wait for others? But the Lutheran church of this country is almost in the same position as our witness. It does not have a mission; it only gives money for it. But the German Mission does not lack money; we often encounter surpluses in the income. The mission does not need our contingent for its expenses as well as for its work! All that is lacking is that our young people (for, of course, the mission requires youthful forces, even because of the acquisition of the heathen languages) no longer want to let other people do the mission, but consider that they are sent to that work with a right knowledge of the pure doctrine, in true faith and in the love of Christ. For although a missionary's ability in all respects, including natural ability, may be greatly desired here, a living faith and pure, even theological, knowledge of the doctrine of salvation are the first of all abilities. How obvious, for example, would be - next to the resumption of the Indian mission - an American-Lutheran mission in Japan, the country where even this name might be outwardly conducive to it at present. At present we are still far away from it, and the writer of this article will gladly concede that others are in a better and more thorough position to judge the difficulties or the possibility of the matter; however, it is permissible to point out in view of the fact that God can and has allowed something to come about in his time, of which, as it was said today, one saw nothing. We also see an example of this in the testimony of this Lutheran pastor. It also belongs to those who stand up in Germany for the unreserved confession (called the Missouriian confession). And what a difference in times we see there! Decennia ago, America in Germany was only noted in church history. It was, as it were, only included in the statistics of the Lutheran Church, even if more or less friendly. Now the "unreserved confessional standpoint" has already become a power that approaches one's own conscience and ecclesiastical consciousness. And if we have a manifestation of this in those who faithfully represent this standpoint and profess it, no less do those who reject it bear witness to it.

*) A just demand it is. For if the mission to the Jews claims - and quite correctly in the evangelical sense - "that in some respect every minister of the Christian Church and every Christian who associates with Jews should be a missionary to the Jews," it must not advocate doctrines which are equally foreign to the ecumenical confession of the Church and to the individual consciousness of true Christians.

They try to resist him with all their might, they suspect him and blaspheme him. But basically, one cannot complain about this; it is only a sign of the approaching divine victory. So may God also let his church see something in the mission that it does not see today. - D.

(Sent in by C. A. Frank.)

About the conscience.

(Submitted for review.)

Is there really a conscience in the sense in which the Christian church urges it? No, says the materialist of today; what you call conscience is basically nothing but the sum, the result of education and habit. With the greatest pleasure the South Sea Islander slaughters his prisoner and eats him as a delicacy, while the spirit of the eaten would haunt the Westerner to the grave. With a calm face, the king of Dahomey sees the victims taken from his own people fall to reconcile him with the deity and to serve him in that world: the civilized world, on the other hand, clenches its fist and stamps its feet as against an abomination that cries out to heaven. The fanatical Muslim considers it his duty to thrust a dagger into the chest of the "Christian dog" whom he calls by that name: the Christian would like nothing better than to see the crescent moon perish forever in the ocean of time precisely because of its cruelty. The bigoted Roman Catholic curses the Protestant; it is a matter of conscience to him to rob the Protestant of all that nature and civil community concede to him: the Protestant protests against this as an outrage degrading God and man. Tyre and Carthage laid their own children on the glowing iron arms of Moloch; Sparta exposed her womb to wild beasts or otherwise let it perish miserably: the Christian mother would rather give up her life than allow such a thing. The widow of the Hindu mounts the funeral pyre with a jubilant heart in order to burn herself; she grieves her heart away if she is not allowed to carry this out: the Englishman and the missionaries of the church zeal against it as madness with all means at their command. But enough, they say, of the examples from the life of nations to have proved that what one likes to call conscience is really only the result of education. One person is educated in these customs and traditions, and therefore considers everything in conflict with them to be wrong; another is educated in the opposite views, and therefore rejects everything that is wrong with them. What is taught to a man by his parents, by his educators, by the prevailing

Habit has been imprinted, that is the standard he uses to judge the truth and morality of what comes under his eyes. - What can we say about this? First, we admit that education and habit do much to determine the conscience of fallen man in his sense of right and wrong, in his judgment of truth and error. Secondly: If, however, it is asserted that conscience is not immanent in man, i.e., that there is not inherent in his soul a potency or power which, if properly guided and developed, is capable of feeling and giving voice to real right or wrong, to real truth and error, we oppose this with a decisive "No! But with what can you maintain your resolute No? To you with experience. If conscience were nothing but the result of education and habit, it would be absolutely impossible for a man to come to recognize as wrong and in conflict with truth that very thing which he has been trained and accustomed to.

If the soul of man does not have the ability to examine two opposing principles, actions and phenomena and to decide, especially under divine guidance, for right against wrong, for truth against error, for good against evil, then we will encounter riddles in the actions of whole peoples as well as of individuals, which we will find as little capable of solving as the ordinary Thebanians found the riddle of the Sphinx. How can one explain, without conceding the existence of conscience, that whole peoples and individuals of every sex and age, especially through the ministry of the Gospel, have come to trample down as wrong and error precisely what they imbibed with their mother's milk, what was considered right and truth before and in their time, and to go to their deaths rather than return to the "fatherly way"? Coercion of circumstances, new masters, earthly advantage do much to bring people to other so-called convictions. Think of the times of Constantine the Great, of Carl the Great and the Saxons, of the English in India. Yes, the change of mind and conscience in some people can be explained by the compulsion of circumstances, new rulers, earthly advantages; but how then, if the opposite was the case? If compulsion of circumstances, custom and habit, physical and so-called spiritual masters, reverence for the traditional, all the advantages of earthly gain commanded to remain with the acquired and learned? and yet we find whole peoples who have voluntarily broken with their past in order to turn to something better? When, in order to select the luminaries out of millions, we find in St. Paul, Augustine and Luther that the very thing they had clung to from their youth and in which they had lived with all their soul, they afterwards, convinced of a better, regarded as sin.

What is the key to this than to admit that there is something called conscience in man that is capable of enlightenment and can be changed by the weight of reasons? There is no other key to this than to admit that there is something in man called conscience, which is capable of enlightenment and can be changed by the weight of reasons. Add to this the following: In the history of mankind we come across quite undeniable cases where what we call conscience, the feeling of truth and lie, has tortured people to death. Remember Franco Spiera, who, when he reverted from what he had recognized as truth to what he had been taught, felt such pains of conscience that he gave up his spirit over it. Where is the sum of education and habit here? From this everyone will see that if the instances given in the introduction demand of us not to admit both the capacity for error and the depravity of the human conscience, but rather its non-existence, we may and must, with the seal of thousands of years and millions of years of experience, press on it a very legible No! -

The second question that must be answered in this investigation would be: Does not the assertion of conscience contradict the doctrine of the total ruin of man through the Fall?

On the one hand, we teach that through the loss of the divine image, man is so blinded that he hears nothing of the spirit of God, and on the other hand, we again open the judgment seat of God with the conscience in man? In reply to this, we are allowed to draw on the wisdom of Dr. Joh. Gerhard. "To the question: whether the image of God in man was lost through the Fall? I answer: 1. If one takes the divine image for the essence of the soul itself, for the intellect, will and the other powers, then one must not say that it was lost through the Fall, since according to its essence the soul of Adam remained the same after the Fall as it was before the Fall. 2. If we take the divine image for the general harmony and similarity by means of which the human soul illustrates to us that which is peculiar to the Godhead, e.g. that it shadows the holy Trinity, that it is incorporeal, spiritual, endowed with understanding and free will in the things that are in its sphere, then again we must not say that it was lost through the Fall, since all this is perceived in the soul of man even after the Fall. If one takes the divine image for the dominion over the other creatures, especially over those endowed with life, in which, in the second order, the divine image consists, then one must not say again that, in this, the divine image is lost.

In the sense and in this respect the image of God has completely disappeared; even if the dignity of that dominion has been diminished and shaken in many ways, some traces of it still remain. (4) If the divine image is taken for the principles innate to us, which are still to be found as the remaining fibers of the divine image in the mind and will of man and as the fragments of the former supreme edifice, then we again confess that the divine image has not been completely lost with respect to these admittedly small remnants, since the work of the law is still described in the hearts of those who have not been born again. (5) If, however, according to the interpretation and delimitation of Scripture, the divine image is taken for that righteous justice and holiness for which man was created, for the integrity and righteousness of all virtues as they existed in man before the Fall, then it must be said that the divine image was lost through the Fall. (*Loc. de imag. Dei* § 129.) According to this, it is clear: by the assertion of the loss of the divine image, the loss of conscience as such is to be asserted as little as the loss of the understanding or will per se. But what the conscience has lost through the fall, we will have the opportunity to talk about below.

(To be continued.)

The Galesburg Rule.

Distressing and joyful.

The Pennsylvania Synod held its sessions this year in May at Reading, Pa. Many must have looked forward to this meeting with anticipation. And those who hoped that the Pennsylvanian Synod, the "venerable mother synod," would at last take a decisive stand, that the unimportant elements, which have become quite widespread since last fall, would leave, that the witnesses to Lutheran practice who have appeared so far will be steadfast and unyielding, - will find themselves deceived. Everything remains the same.

On the first day of the meeting, towards the evening, three of the theses presented by Pastor Brobst, which Dr. Krauth had written in 1868, "concerning the registration and admission to Holy Communion" were discussed. The first thesis reads, "This Synod confesses without reserve the 10th Article of the Augsburg Confession according to its original meaning, and believes that the further declarations concerning Holy Communion, as found in the other symbolical books, are in harmony with the Augsburg Confession and with sacred Scripture." After Rev. Brobst gave explanations, "Rev.

Dr. Spangenberg with great bitterness about the miserable condition of the English churches and especially the English Lutheran churches of this country." "Vr. C. W. Schösser expressed the hope that the brethren would not take offense at what Dr. Spangenberg spoke; they should bear in mind that the brother was still quite a stranger among us and could not understand us, that this was the first Synodal meeting he had attended, and that when he had become better acquainted with us he would find his impressions considerably modified." Rev. Brobst wished the English brethren to speak. Vr. Fry explained that the English brethren were silent because they heartily approved of the thesis. Rev. Brobst, on the other hand, doubted this. Some speakers thought that the thesis should be voted on. Dr. Krotel, Dr. Späth and Pastor Rath spoke against it. The latter said it was "against the custom of Synod" to vote on theses. The second thesis read: "No erroneous believer or openly ungodly person should be admitted to Holy Communion until he repents of his error and sin and refrains from it." According to the report of "*Lutheran and Missionary*", only the meaning of the words: Errgläubiger and ksretio, which latter word is used in the English version of the thesis. No result seems to have been reached. The third thesis reads: "Every pastor has the right and the duty to make the necessary examination to decide among the persons who want to go to Holy Communion whether they possess in doctrine and life the qualities required by the Holy Scriptures. This is absolutely necessary when they are admitted for the first time and as often as may be required later, so that in our church now, as once in the days of the Reformation, the assurance applies: 'It is not granted to those who have not been interrogated beforehand' (Augsburg Conf. Art. *Abus.* 3, 6.)." Dr. Krauth gave a long discourse on this and remarked, among other things: "For me, the author, this declaration is of special interest, because in the expression of the true principle which it expresses, I still see traces of a lack of complete understanding of the questions conceived in it. I see in it the traces of the difficulties that have disappeared. But connected with it is an underlying principle of which it is the true, but not fully corresponding expression. . . . Who does not tremble when he sees the new life that has awakened in this country through the testimony to the truth. Brethren, this confession can spare us; God will raise up others to defend it if we leave it; but we cannot spare it. Forsaking it involves destruction." -

In spite of such fine testimonies, the earlier indecisive nature has again won the day. Proof of this is the synod's deplorable position on the so-called Galesburg Rule: "Lutheran pulpits only for Lutheran pastors and Lutheran altars only for

Lutheran Communicants." This rule had been accepted by the General Council at its last autumn meeting as agreeing with the Word of God. The main representatives of the unirite movement had not been present, and soon thereafter they began to fight the rule most vehemently and to set everything in motion for pulpit and communion with other believers as well. On the other hand, many fine testimonies in favor of the Rule came from the army camp of the other direction. From this battle one hoped for a glorious victory. But how the heroes fell! On the second day of the meeting, the delegates submitted to the General Council their report, written by Dr. Schmucker and signed by them and Dr. Krauth. The report reads: "With regard to the decision of the General Church Assembly concerning this point, a great deal of ambiguity and erroneous opinion has come to light. Your delegates would like to give a correct account of this decision, so that this ministry and the congregations belonging to it know exactly how it stands. The proposal was made that the rule, which was established in Lancaster in 1870 and fixed in writing in Akron in 1872 and raised to a formal resolution, should be improved so that it should read (the rule): as it agrees with the word of God, is, etc., etc. The question was expressly raised as to whether or not it is in accordance with the word of God. The question was expressly raised whether the adoption of this amendment would annul the other parts of the resolution, whereupon the President gave the official declaration that this was not the case, but that the second and third points of the Akron Declaration still stood *intact* and remained the declaration of the General Church Assembly. This proposal to improve the declaration made at Akron was, after lengthy discussion, combined with a resolution concerning the negotiations of the Augustana Synod on this point, and the resolution of the General Church Assembly, as it was finally adopted, again lays to the heart of our pastors and congregations the principle which includes the declaration at Akron, without, however, abandoning any part of that declaration. After the resolution had been passed, the President made the official declaration that the only change made by it was this, that it was here declared whence we take this rule, namely: from the word of God and the confession of our church. - It states (*explicite*) what was already understood by it (*implicite*). - The President further said that if there was any doubt about the correctness of his statement, an appeal was free. But nobody appealed against this declaration of the President. In voting for that resolution, your delegates did so with the clear understanding of the facts as they have been stated here. Besides this short report on the facts,

However, we would also like to express our personal conviction that it was obviously not the intention of this resolution to exert a violent coercion on the practice of our communities, but to express the true principle in this whole matter. The resolution adopted is not intended to command, but to educate. We could hardly expect that people everywhere would soon be ready to recognize the legitimacy of this rule, nor did anyone think of forcing an outwardly legal obedience to it, but the general church assembly wanted to pronounce what it believed to be the truth and the right in this matter, in the confident expectation that sooner or later the congregations would mature to accept it." Who would have expected such a pathetic report, a report which one senses is intended to satisfy the discontented unconverted! No wonder that protests against the Galesburg rule were withdrawn and the most vehement opponents of it, e.g. Pastor Kunkelmann and Dr. Seiß, declared that they were now quite satisfied; after all, they can now quietly continue their old Unirt practice. And those who up to now had testified against the Uniate direction, where were they? They were silent, they were also satisfied. The report was unanimously accepted and peace was concluded between the two directions, but not a peace pleasing to God, but a peace about which God and all the angels and all those who concede dominion to the pure teaching of the divine word alone are heartily grieved. A declaration that satisfies such different parties, both those who defend pulpit and altar union with false believers and decry the rejection of these as rigid exclusivism, and those who have testified against such unionism, - such a declaration that satisfies such fundamentally different parties without the hostile party declaring that it has become of a different mind, - it condemns itself, it is unworthy of a faithful Lutheran. Such a rotten peace cannot please God and benefit the church. Honest struggle is better.

The unbounded joy of Dr. Seiß over the report of the delegates adopted by the Synod, which he also expresses especially in the "*Lutheran and Missionary*" of June 29, must show even to the dumbest eye that things are not right with the Pennsylvanian Synod, Dr. Seiss, that fierce fighter against a Lutheran practice, writes: "We are glad that even after so long a time of pernicious uncertainty and misunderstanding such a distinct and definite non-recognition of the adverse extravagances has come about." He expressly declares that the testimonies of Dr. Krauth, which contain so many excellent things, should not be regarded as an interpretation and defense of the Council's statements, but only as an explanation of the change that has taken place in his conviction and the reasons for such a change.

Those who had previously spoken so many fine words in favor of Lutheran practice and against Dr. Seiß's raging fight against it, and who now, when it came to the meeting, remained silent and gave in, - they have spoken the verdict on themselves, e.g. Rev. Brobst, who in this year's preface to his journal spoke thus: "Out of love for peace and fear of the quarrel that hinders so many good works, we kept silent, with good intentions, although we should have been more resolute at times. But now we see that a hard struggle is absolutely necessary for the sake of peace and that it would be a sin, as things now stand, to want to avoid or evade it." (p. 3.) Out of love for peace, one has now kept silent again and avoided the struggle. According to Pastor Brobst's own testimony, this was a "sin. - It should also be noted that this time a delegate to the reformed synod was appointed. We do not read that anything was witnessed against this evil. How the heroes have fallen!

We can report more pleasant news from the "oldest daughter" of the Pennsylvanian Synod, the New York Synod (Ministry). The president of the same, Dr. Krotel, who was present at the Pennsylvant Synod, had requested a copy of the delegate's report adopted by that Synod, no doubt hoping that he would be able to persuade his Synod likewise to make such an ignominious mum-mum-saying. But in this the Doctor miscalculated, as we see from his own letter reported in the "*Lutheran and Missionary*". In his report, which he had to make as a delegate to the Pennsylvanian Synod, he had also mentioned "the satisfactory report" of the delegates of the Pennsylvanian Synod and expressed the wish, if the Synod desired it, to read it out. But this was immediately refused, because such a document might easily influence the synodals. "One of the speakers said that they did not want to hear anything of Pennsylvanian wisdom." Synod refused to hear the Pennsylvanian delegate's report now. Also, consideration of the New York delegates' report to the Council was postponed until the committee in question would have reported on the negotiations of the district conferences. And this committee then called the attention of Synod to the proceedings of the first District Conference, at which 23 members had signed a petition to Synod. In it they express their joy at the Galesburg Rule and ask Synod to make their resolution their own and thus to profess this Rule. "Now began one of the most interesting, warm and important debates." The point at issue was: what did the Council decide at Galesburg? Some claimed that the Galesburg resolutions were a very decisive step forward, and that da-

by the exceptions allowed at the Acron meeting. The others thought that the only change made at Galesburg was the insertion that the rule was "in harmony with the word of God and with the confessions of the church," that the President of the Council, Dr. Krauth, had officially declared at Galesburg that the decisions made at Acron were in no way annulled, and that this declaration of the President, Dr. Krauth, since no one had appealed against it, had become the declaration of the Council. Instead of the present motion of conference, President Krotel proposed that Synod approve the resolution of the Galesburg Convention, in the sense in which the President of that Convention had then declared the resolution, and in which it had been adopted by the Convention. In doing so, he read the Pennsylvanian delegate's report and a report from a New York delegate and referred to the testimony of other delegates. Pastor Frey, on the other hand, stated that the President of the Council, Dr. Krauth, had testified in a letter to Dr. Ruperti that the account of the Galesburg negotiations given by him (Pastor Frey) in the Herald had been "correct";*) he further pointed out that the Galesburg Rule had been associated "with the strong theses of the Augustana Synod". He and others showed that the whole negotiation was a decisive step forward, that the very insertion of the words that the rule was in harmony with the word of God necessarily cut off all exceptions, and that the ensuing excitement and the long and able articles of Dr. Krauth showed that the Galesburg rule had dropped the exceptions adopted at Acron. Despite this controversy, President Krotel's proposal was adopted by 31 votes to 29. A great commotion arose, and some delegates, indignant in the highest degree, declared their intention of leaving the Synod with their congregations. President Krotel tried to calm them down, since the decision could be reconsidered in a later session. This was done. After a closed debate, only 22 voted in favor of Dr. Krotel's proposal, and 46 against. The original motion of the first conference was now accepted with 66 votes against two. The majority of the Synod thus declared that they accepted the Galesburg Rule, not in the sense of the delegates of the Pennsylvanian Synod, nor in the sense of the majority of their own delegates, but in a "strict and exclusive sense". Hereupon President Krotel declared that he could no longer remain President, as the President as such had to represent the New York Ministry at the next meeting of the Council, and that he could not, nor would he wish to, represent a body which occupied such a position. He was admittedly asked to withdraw his resignation,

*In particular, it was stated that Dr. Krauth, the President of the Council, contradicted himself in the clearest terms by letter. Luth. Herald, No. 11.

but in vain. Pastor W. Hoppe was now first provisionally, later definitely elected as his successor. The delegates to the Council were instructed to vote only in the sense of the Synod, i.e. for the abolition of all exceptions. Towards the end of his report, former President Dr. Krotel says: "We have not yet reached the end. The opposing! elements which made themselves heard and felt in the journals and at conferences and came out so decisively in the New York Ministry have not been reconciled and it will be more difficult to reconcile them than some good-hearted people believe. It needs no prophet to foretell what is coming." - If Dr. Krotel, as he himself writes, does not now appear as a New York delegate at the meeting of the Council and the Pennsylvanian Synod, it probably does no harm to the good cause.

So the "daughter" has overtaken the "mother" in the run to the right goal very much. G.

(Translated by Prof. A. Crämer.)

Compendium of the Theology of the Fathers

from

M. Heinrich Eckhardt.

(Continued.)

VII. The order.*)

In what order?

Athanasius: "The whole nature was created in six days, first of all the light, which period he called a day; secondly the firmament; thirdly he gathered the waters and made the dry things appear; fourthly he made the sun, the moon and the host of the other stars; fifthly he brought forth the animals in the water and the host of the birds under the sky; sixthly the four-footed animals on the earth; lastly he made man." 1)

*Continuation of chapter II, 1. of the creation in general.

1) Tota rerum natura intra sex dies condita est, et primo quidem Lux, quod spatium diem appellavit; secundo Firmamentum; tertio in unum congregans aquas, aridam exhibuit; quarto Solem et lunam fecit caeterarum-que stellarum chorum; quinto animalia in aquis et volucrum in coelo nationem produxit; sexto quadrupedia in terris; deinde hominem fecit. Athan., serm. 3. contra Arian.

VIII. The nature of created things.

How were created things made in the beginning?

Nyssenensius: "I hold that all rational creatures were made very good in the beginning. If they would have remained afterwards in such a way, as they were created in the beginning, then they would be without all evil "1).

But what do you think of the unreasonable creatures, among which are many animals?
are harmful?

Eucherius: "They were created good, but given to scourge those who used them evil." 2) Theophilus: "Nothing harmful was created by God in the beginning, but the sin of men has worsened the nature of the creatures.)

IX. The end.

Will this world building remain forever?

Salonius: "Nothing under the sun will remain that will not perish, since everything is vain." 4)

But the most perceptive among the philosophers hold differently?

Lactantius: "Plato, who knew nothing of the divine mystery, said that the world was made for eternal times, which is far different. For whatever is of a heavy and solid body must, as it once had a beginning, so also necessarily have an end." 5)

Is that general end of the world still far away?

Gregorius: "In the earlier years the world flourished equally than in its youth; now it is pressed down by age and by the more frequent complaints as it were htn pushed to its near end "6).

Arbitror creaturas rationales omnes initio optimas fuisse conditas. Quod si deinde ita permansissent, ut a principio creatae sunt, extra omnem utique malitiam essent. Nyssen. 1. de arb. c. 3.

Bona condita sunt, sed male utentibus data sunt in flagellum. Eucher, 1. 1. in Genes. Nihil noxium ab initio a Deo est conditum, sed hominis delictum conditionem creaturarum reddidit deteriore. Theoph. ad Autol.

Nihil permanebit sub Sole, quod non transeat, quoniam omnia vana sunt. Salon, in Eccles.

Ignorans Plato coeleste mysterium, mundum dixit in perpetuum esse fabricatum, quod longe secus est. Quoniam quicquid est solido et gravi corpore, ut initium coepit aliquando, ita finem capiat necesse est. Lactant. 1. 7. c. 1.

Mundus in annis prioribus velut in juventute viguit, nunc ipsa sua senectute deprimitur, et quasi ad vicinam mortem molestiis crebrescentibus urgetur. Gregory. homil. 1. in Evang.

But how many ages of the world are there?

Gregory: "In six days the world was made, in six ages it will be brought to an end." 1)

So much of creation in general; now of created things in particular.

How many times are the created things?

Olympiodorus: "Of the things created, some remain without succession, existing at the same time with the present world time, as: the sky, the earth, the stars and the sun; but the others perish and pass away, but are preserved by succession of the generations." 2) Or differently. Albinus: "Some of the created things are spiritual, others visible." 3) Bernard: "Because the Creator of the universe created only two creatures for his knowledge, the angels and man." 4) - I will deal with these two in particular.

(To be continued.)

Miscellaneous.

The joy of confession with which Luther once appeared before the emperor and the empire in Worms has always been an object of great astonishment, has strengthened many a weak person in the faith, and will undoubtedly have this effect until the end of time. Luther himself, however, regretted all his life not to have acted differently at that time and to have let well-meaning friends dampen his spirit on that occasion. Already in 1521 he wrote to his friend Spalatin: "Erasmus thinks that everything must be done politely and with a friendly benevolence. But after that the Behemoth asks nothing, and does not get a hair better of it. . . . Therefore, their writings, which refrain from scolding, biting and angering, do nothing at all. For popes, who are politely reminded, think that their fox-tails are being stroked; and as if they were

Sex diebus mundus conditus est, sex aetatibus consummatur. Greg. 1. 4. in 1 Reg. 9.

Eorum, quae creata sunt, alia quidem durant absque successione, cum praesenti seculo simul extantia, veluti coelum, terra, astra et Sol; alia vero corrumpuntur et pereunt, sed generis successione servantur. Olympiod. in Eccles, c. 1.

Quaedam ex creatis sunt Spiritualia, quaedam visibilia. Albin. 1. 2. de Trinit. c. 9-

Quoniam autem duas tantum ad intelligendum se condidit universitatis autor creaturas, Angelum et Hominem. Bernh. in sent, moral.

They are satisfied that they should be feared and that no one should dare to punish them. Your Plutarchus reproves them in the booklet "Of Flattery"; but Jeremiah is much more terrible and fierce, when he says: "Cursed be he who does the work of the Lord carelessly"; but he speaks of the work of the sword against the enemies of God. Therefore I fear and am very much afraid in my conscience, that I have departed from your counsel and that of other friends in Worms, and have kept some of my spirit, and have not presented a right Eliam to the idols. They should hear it differently if I were placed before them again." (Walch's Ausg. XV. Appendix. p. 158. f.) In the year after Luther goes so far in his "Missive to Hartmuth von Cronberg" that he declares the misery Carlstadt had caused him in Wittenberg to be a punishment because of his behavior in Worms. He writes: "Well, I think, whether such a thing will not also happen as a punishment of some of my most distinguished patrons and me. My patrons because, although they believe that Christ has risen, they are still groping with Magdalene in the garden after him, and he has not yet ascended to the Father, John 20:17. But for my sake, that I may serve good friends at Worms, lest I be seen to be too stiff-necked, and subdue my spirit, and not make my confession harder and stricter before the tyrants; because of which after a time I have often had to endure evil reproaches from the faithless and ungodly. They judge as pagans (as they are) should judge, who have never felt either spirit or faith. My humility and reverence for them has caused me much regret. But let it be as it may, whether it be a sin or a good deed, therefore undaunted and undaunted! For just as we do not despair of our good deeds, so we do not despair of our sins. But we thank God that our faith is higher than our good deeds and sins. For the Father of all mercies has given us to believe not in a wooden Christ, but in a living Christ, who is Lord over sin and innocence, and who is able to raise us up and keep us, though we fall into a thousand and a thousand sins every hour; there is no doubt in my mind." (XV, 1985.) That same year, in his "Answer to King Henry VIII's Book of England," Luther finally wrote the following: Still further I say: I am sorry that I allowed myself to be so far under before the emperor at Worms that I wanted to suffer judgement over my teachings, and to hear where someone showed me to be in error. For I should not have shown such foolish humility, because I was sure of it, and before the tyrants nothing helped. One must be sure of things, so that even if all the world were against it, everyone would still remain on it." (XIX, 303.) O spirit of faith and confession of a Luther, where are you? W.

"The Darwinian Moral Principle and its Consequences. Under this heading, the Allgemeine evang.-luth. Kirchenzeitung contains an article in which we read, among other things, the following: Numerous advocates of Darwinism recommend the neglect of incurably or infectiously ill persons in the interest of expedient influence on the process of natural breeding. Not only Herbert Spencer's "Sociology" recommends the elimination of such troublesome, or because of the infectious character or the hereditary nature of their sufferings, even harmful subjects by means of fundamental neglect: in Hckel's "Natural History of Creation" (p. 154. f.) it is lamented "that the perfected medicine of modern times possesses and practices more than before the art of dragging out insidious, chronic diseases for long years". "The longer the sick parents prolong their stubborn existence with the help of medical art, the more numerous offspring can inherit from them the incurable diseases (consumption, scrophie disease, syphilis, etc.), and the greater the number of individuals will be infected by the insidious hereditary disease in the following generation, thanks to this artificial medical breeding. From the point of view of a moral philosophy essentially determined by zoological points of view, above all by the great fundamental law of the struggle for existence, such considerations seem only too well justified. Whether the ethical principle of Darwinism may be developed mechanically (grossly materialistic), or whether it may be given the form of militarism or perfect-tonism: in none of these cases will an affirmative answer to the question whether hospitals should be founded for hopelessly ill people be obtained from it. Only 'Christian humanity', instead of the hesitant "Perhaps" or the shrugging "It does not seem to me", will answer that half or completely Darwinian moral position with a fresh and joyful "Yes" to this question. - But the consistent representatives of this breeding morality do not only judge the sick in this way; their relentless judgment is also occasionally directed against superfluous, i.e. sickly and weak children, or against children who lack the necessary means of existence. The Spartan abandonment of infirm children is praised by the historian of culture F. v. Hellwald (in "Ausland", Jahrg. 1873, No. 34; also "Culturgeschichte", p. 276) and the natural historian of creation Hckel. The latter thinks (p. 152. 155.): the people of Sparta owes to this artificial selection "to a large extent the rare degree of masculine strength and rough heroic virtue by which it stands out in ancient history", and talks half and half mockingly about our "so-called humane civilization", which would condemn any attempt to renew such a procedure with a cry of indignation, while it submits without grumbling to the sacrifice of thousands of the best youthful men through a war. The

The idea of letting the superfluous children of the proletarian population of poor factory districts die a painless death by suffocation in carbon dioxide had already been proposed earlier by individual social politicians from Malchus' school (Martensen, "Socialismus und Christenthum", German by A. Michelsen [Gotha 1875] p. 30.). - Occasional attempts to justify certain unnatural sins of the sexual sphere, namely self-abuse and the abortion of the foetus, may not cause too much surprise next to manifestations such as those listed here. Compare, among other things, what was written in this journal (Jahrg. 1874, Nr. 27.) about the work of the Austrian Staatsrath Dr. L. H. v. Guttzeit: "Dreißig Jahre Praxis, Erfahrungen am Krankenbette und im ärztlichen Cabinet" (Vienna 1873) and about the question raised therein: why our enlightened times still consider sins, such as those listed in Rom. 1 are still considered crimes?; likewise what is reported in this paper (Year 1873, No. 13) about L. Büchner's and the Berlin "Socialdemokrat's" defense of the crime of abortion. - Even the bloodthirsty, cruel principles of revolutionary terrorism, the measures of the Commune, are occasionally spoken in the interest of selectionism. "Iron is everywhere the plow, and blood the fertilizer of culture", says F. v. Hellwald ("Culturgeschichte", p. 676.); and so that one does not misunderstand him in this, he further declares with explicit reference to the great and glorious principles of the first French Revolution: "Probably no head has fallen too much under the axe of the guillotine; for the field of human culture wants to have its abundant manure, and this manure is blood". As is well known, the philosopher Ueberweg from Königsberg, who died as a decided materialist and a fierce enemy of Christianity, also once (in a letter to F. A. Lange, communicated by the latter in his "History of Materialism", II, 525. He does not believe that communities which have materialism as their theoretical premise will find secure recognition sooner "than until fanatics of materialism have arisen who, like the old Puritans, are ready to lay down their lives and with gusto mow down the Catholic and Protestant Christians together with the old rationalists, for thirty years if need be. Only after that, when the victory, the bloody victory, has been won, will it then be a pleasant and beautiful task to once again bring in the principles of mildness and humanity". So far the church newspaper. Here you can see what it means when the atheists of our time say that they do not want to know anything about religion, but that they think all the more highly of morality!

W.

The Holy Scriptures. Thus Dr. Münkelt writes in his Neues Zeitblatt of October 23 of last year: "If it is only important that the truth of salvation is faithfully and completely preserved in the holy scriptures, then we leave the part of the holy scriptures in respect and validity in which this truth of salvation is taught. But there are many other things in Scripture, such as wars and agriculture, travels, genealogies, the lives and deaths of strange men, in which there is nothing to be read of the truth of salvation; should all this enjoy the same prestige as the truth of salvation, should it be reported just as faithfully and completely? That is not necessary for our salvation, and God does not do anything unnecessary. - As reasonable as this sounds, it is strange for the faith. Just listen! In the Bible the truth is infallibly and completely laid down. Such a book exists only once in the whole world and cannot exist a second time, because all other books of the people are judged after the word: To err is human. That such a book exists is something quite extraordinary, and could be called a divine miracle work, even if only for faith. Because without direct effect of God it is not possible at all. All other books are books of men, but this is God's own book, which he has made an instrument of salvation. - Now we are to make distinctions in this same book. We read some verses in which God's gracious love is discussed, which belong to the divine miraculous work. Soon after come some verses in which Paul's mantle and manuscripts are spoken of, or David's princes and captains, as in the holy scriptures divine and human are interwoven. This does not belong to the miraculous work, it is man's work. And so we travel through the Scriptures as through a strange maze. Here it blossoms and greens as in the garden of God, and close beside it stunted little plants or made flowers; soon we have solid ground under our feet, and a step further we have swaying boggy ground. - The faith will never be satisfied with the fact that God lent to the writers of the Bible in one and the same book in colorful alternation one after the other, now his spirit without error, then his spirit with sight, and that in one go. There the scripture is chopped up, and what is the worst, one does not know anymore how to deal with it, where the word of God ends and the word of man begins, as already the dispute about important pieces of the holy scripture shows, whether they are legends or divinely authenticated history. - Starting from these premises, Pastor Ramsauer in Osternburg has treated the much-discussed subject in a small writing for those who want to penetrate it with more understanding. The title is "Göttliche Eingebung der heiligen Schrift" (Oldenburg, Schulze). He stands on the point of view that the holy scripture is God's word, but not that God's word is "in" the holy scripture. The difficulties which, on the other hand, arise from

He does not deny that the riddles of the sacred books are raised in large numbers and with easy effort; just as a sincere theologian would rather admit that he cannot solve the riddles than try to explain them away with artificial explanations. If we were allowed to believe in Christ only when we have solved all the mysteries of his person and speech, we would have to wait with faith until the time when all faith ceases. We let science examine the word of God carefully and present all its doubts and objections. But as soon as it wants to trap the word of God with it, we go the opposite way, which faith leads, by showing us holy land everywhere. Ramsauer tries the difficulties, as many have done before him, and that is good and instructive, because one wants to think of inspiration more closely. If this is only approximately achieved, and if some of it is of doubtful value, then others may do it better. The inspiration does not stand or fall with it.

Ecclesiastical Contemporary History.

I. America.

There are many English translations of **Luther's Small Catechism**. Pastor Wetzel now offers in the columns of the "*Lutheran Standard*" a revision of the English text and invites criticism of it, so that, if accepted, it could be published by the Synodal Conference and thus there would at least be a uniform good text within it. G.

Voices on the recent decisions of the Pennsylvania and. New York Synod. In the Lutheran Herald it says: "The Pennsylvania delegation to the General Council presented a unanimous report to their Synod, which, after a long discussion, made it known to all concerned that there is really no "Galesburg Rule" at all, and that if anything is certain, it is that the "exceptions" have not been abolished, but rather reaffirmed. So Dr. Krauth had said, so the Pennsylvanian Synod wished to hear. The addition: "in accordance with God's word and the confessional writings" has no further meaning; the same was already "meant" in Akron. - The opponents of the Rule listened with joyful astonishment, withdrew their protests already in their pockets with emotion, and the friends of the Rule - were completely satisfied. The delegation had accomplished a masterpiece, it had the miracle hat in its hands, under which the whole synod, head by head, immediately took a seat in joy, and the most undecided, as well as the most undecided in the confession, felt at once one and happy, and could not understand how they could have quarrelled so! For now it may be enough to pretend: Peace, peace, there is no danger! But soon other sounds will awaken the Lutheran Church of the East from its slumber, and other resolutions and above all other deeds will become necessary, like those which have been accomplished so far. Oh, that one may not misjudge and miss the time of the visitation of grace, and that the judgment of God, which has already begun so seriously at the house of God, may come to ruin. Much can still be done well,

much can still be saved; but no promise is given to ecclesiastical diplomacy and powerless indifferentism; they will be judged in their own time!... The New York Synod is fully aware of its position and task, and will remain resolutely faithful to its decision; and in this the Lord help it by grace." The "Church Friend" (General Synod) writes: "The New York Ministry at its last meeting declared itself in favor of the extreme direction of the General Council, and thus took the first step toward union with Missouri. Rev. Dr. Krotel could stand it no longer and has resigned his office as President of the Synod. If the reporters of the Pennsylvanian Synod knew how to calm the agitated minds, the New Yorkers approved the Galesburg resolutions in all their repulsive brusqueness.... So there is more upheaval to come. A friend who brought the above facts to our attention remarks: "There seems to be nothing left but a gathering of all German Lutherans in the Synodal Conference; the German Lutherans will all want to become 'Miffourish' in time, and the more leisurely we let them go, the better it is for us."

According to the "Herald", the **New Yort Synod** adopted the following resolutions at its last meeting: "1. the district conferences are instructed to invite the teachers in their districts to participate in their meetings, to give them the opportunity to communicate with each other, and then to agree with the teachers on their wishes, or rather to make a decision about them, but especially to establish teachers' conferences in their districts. The teachers of the parish schools are to be invited to synodal meetings and given the opportunity to hold a conference and express their wishes, so that the synod can then deliberate on them and the teachers can be brought into an organic connection with it, or be accepted as advisory members. "The committee on secret societies proposed: 1. to urge all pastors belonging to the synod to instruct their congregations about secret societies and to warn against them; 2. to commission a committee to briefly and concisely illuminate the nature and reason of secret societies according to Scripture and to submit such work to the individual district conferences, possibly to the next synod. The Synod accepted the proposals.

The Swedish Augustana Synod has instructed its delegates to the next meeting of the General Council to firmly defend its position on the question of pulpit and communion with those of other faiths, and if the Council should pass resolutions that conflict with its well-considered and unanimous testimony, to protest seriously against them and report to the Synod. This Synod has also decided to organize an edition of the Concordia Book, since the one published in Sweden is out of print. G.

General Synod. Pastor Wedekind recently gave a lecture on the eleventh article of the Augsburg Confession, the so-called *Holman lecture*, at the end of the academic year in the Gettysburg Seminary of the General Synod. According to an endowment of Father Holman, a lecture on an article of the Augsburg Confession is given annually by a person designated the year before. From the notes in the papers it seems that the lecture was not in the prevailing spirit of the General Synod; for in opposition to the new Methodist measures flourishing in the General Synod, Pastor W. gave his word to the old venerable use of private confession. The "*American Lutheran*" is naturally quite incensed about this and fears for the "good reputation" of Gettysburg if such teachings can be presented there with impunity. G.

The Roman Catholic Press. The "Katholischer Glaubensbote" writes: Evils in the Catholic press are many and varied. Some of them are pointed out by the Reverend Father Joseph Jessing of Pomeroy, Ohio, in No. 150 of the "Ohio Orphan Friend" published by him. First of all, he condemns the disunity that exists in many parts of the Catholic newspaper press in this country and calls attention to the sad spectacle that Catholic newspapers so often get into quarrels with each other and then throw the most bitter invectives at each other..... Another evil in the Catholic citation system of our country is reprimanded by the Reverend Father Jessing in the following manner: "There are and were Catholic papers which drag along their existence coldly and sleepily, which are first of all anxious to use the newspaper business as a means of making money, and which avoid attacking an evil if they might thereby presumably lose some subscribers." ... We agree with the Reverend Father Jessing However, we consider one of the most important problems with which the Catholic press of this country has to struggle continuously to be the poor or rather the little and indifferent support it receives from the Catholics of this country.

Roman Knights. The "Katholischer Glaubensbote" writes: "We now have four companies of 'Roman Knights' here in Louisville, whose members are all Germans or at least of German descent. These societies, by their tasteful uniforms, by their firm and dignified bearing, and by their perfect exercise, do much to make our public processions and processions attractive..... As long as there are such associations here, so long is the future of the Catholic Church assured for America.... Surely the importance of these associations will be appreciated by them (Americans and Irishmen) and the time will not be far off when the Catholics of Louisville will be able to boast of at least a dozen of these associations in the field. We have Catholic associations here in abundance, both ecclesiastical and supportive, but we have no associations which, like the associations of the 'Roman Knights', are able to so captivate the youth and inspire them for the (Roman) religion."

II. abroad.

Missourians on Madagascar. Recently, Missouri's enemies were filled with righteous anger when they saw the latter advance to the East Indies on its course of world conquest; and in order that their zeal may cool the less, let it also be revealed to them what seems to have remained quite unnoticed so far. The way from America to India leads past Africa. Should Missouri have completely circumnavigated this, nowhere touching the coast, before it came to India? How could the conquerors be expected to do that! And indeed: What was to be expected has happened! If nowhere else, then on the African island of Madagascar, Missourian weed seed has been spread and sprouted secretly, as if by the enemy, "while the people slept. In the eleventh tract published by the Bavarian Missionary Association, which is certainly not friendly to the Missourians, the following can be read about the Christians from Madagascar: "Wonderful! For 25 years without a teacher, they had remained free of false doctrine, firmly grounded in the evangelical way of salvation; scattered and without church order, they had cultivated brotherly love and fellowship, appointed preachers and **entrusted** them with sacrament and pastoral care. The spirit of counsel, wisdom and discipline had assisted them." Wasn't that real Miffourian without Missouri's name? And isn't there the "desert-island case," as

Professor Vilmar expressed in one of his last lectures, in order to ridicule the Lutheran official doctrine, become reality? Vilmar said, for example, that the case set by the Lutherans, that Christians could be forced to move to a "desert island" - compare the second appendix to the Schmalkaldic Articles "Von der Bischöfe Gewalt und Jurisdiction", The idea that Christians could be forced to ordain one of their number to the office of preacher is only a fantasy and does not justify any objection to his neo-papal doctrine of ministry, according to which only ordained priests can powerfully administer the means of grace and the laity are bound with their blessedness to the self-perpetuating priesthood. H.

Open questions. This is the title of an article in the "Mecklenburgische Kirchen- und Zeitblatt" of June 28 by B. in D. (see "Lehre und Wehre" July issue p. 216). (see "Lehre und Wehre" July issue, p. 216), prompted by the Neuendettelsauer Correspondenz also published in this journal. The article begins: "In No. 18 of the 'Allgem. evang.-luth. K.-Z.' the point of contention between Neudettelsau and thus the Iowa Synod, which is ecclesiastically equal to it, on the one hand, and the Missouri Synod on the other hand, is attempted to be presented in an article entitled 'Aus Neudettelsau' (From Neudettelsau). The Luthardt'sche K.-Z. itself seems to share the position of Neudettelsau, since it has brought the article in question without comment. The so-called open questions are given as the point of contention. It might be expedient and welcome to some, if the Neudettel-Sau-Jowaian and the Missourian views on open questions are briefly contrasted with each other in their own words". This he does in the following. First, he shares some sentences from the aforementioned correspondence. He introduces one of the sentences with the question: "And what does Neudettelsau now particularly count among the open questions, which are indeed clearly taught in Scripture, but whose answer has not yet been raised by means of a spiritually anointed central church personality - I beg your pardon, I almost wrote: by the pope - in a conscience-binding way and made common property of the church conscience? Then he contrasts what is written from Neuendettelsau with a long passage from the preface to "Lehre und Wehre" of 1868. To another article in the "Mecklenburgische Kirchen- und Zeitblatt," entitled "die Missourisynode," a reply by Mr. E. in S. (see "Lehre und Wehre" June issue p. 186.), the editor, Dr. Philippi, adds the remark: "Although the above article does not add anything new to the matter, we do not believe we should reject it in order to avoid the appearance that we are not giving our opponent a chance to speak. The author's view of Missouri's position on the open questions is sufficiently refuted by the above article .open questions." The words of Mr. E. in S.: "Yet even in the symbolic books the Pabst is nowhere exactly called the Antichrist," prompt another remark: "But is it not said art. smalc. II, 4 (Mueller 308): haec doctrina praeclare ostendit, papam esse ipsum verum antichristum? " G.

Neuendettelsau's present position on Iowa can be seen in the last report on the Mission Institute, which states: "We accept the present position of the Iowa Synod because it leaves room for the direction we represent to assert itself, and because we hope that the power of truth (!), if only given the freedom to testify to it, will itself break through and thus gradually lead the Synod to the desirable goal of unanimity even in those matters which go beyond the common ground of confession and which characterize the particular direction."

The editor of the Braunschweig "Kirchenblatt" was **delighted with the** report on the missionary institute in Neuendettelsau. He is particularly pleased

"The voice of peace, which can be heard in the report". "The fact alone," it says, "is a voice of peace, that two pupils, one from the community and for the church service of the Oberkirchenkollegium in Breslau, and one from the Immanuel Synod and for it, have sought and found admission in the institution. Then, however, the report shows in an excellent presentation the ground on which the peace can rest and also, according to God's will, as we are firmly convinced, should rest, by discussing the open questions." In the following he shares from the report "with heartfelt agreement" some things concerning open questions, doctrinal decisions etc.

- Sad! G.

Saxony. Here, licentiate G. Stöckhardt in Planitz near Zwickau, pastor G. Baumfelder in Ortmanndorf near Mülsen and pastor K. H. Schneider in Röhrsdorf near Wilsdruff submitted a petition to the state consistory with the following content: "the evang. Lutheran Landesconsistorium should not further deny the appointed ministers of the divine word the right to object to the admission to Holy Communion of obviously impenitent sinners, at least until receipt of a consistorial decision". The Landesconsistorium, however, roundly rejected even this minimum of the demands to be made by a conscientious steward over God's mysteries, in an official "Bescheidung" of March 24. "The individual clergyman," wrote the Landesconsistorium, "should not set himself up as a judge as to whether the case of real impenitence exists...since he is not a heart-denouncer." One should hardly think that such a decision would be possible. According to this, the consistory presupposes such a crass blindness in its pastors that they can never decide whether a person is really impenitent; in order to know this, a person must be a "heart-denouncer"; only the "spiritual authority" can and may decide on this, from which it follows that the latter, on the other hand, understands heart-denouncing! Of course, those brave men could not calm down with this decision, and therefore lodged a complaint with the Consistory and appealed to the "ministers of state commissioned in evangelicis", who administer the alleged rights of the Catholic king as sumpiskopus in Saxony. The three excellently motivated recursive writings are printed in the "leaflet" published by Lic theol. Stöckhardt for the confessionally faithful Lutherans of the Saxon regional church of May and June and are worth reading. They are the expression of a conscience caught up in God's Word and of a lively conviction that the confession of our church is one that corresponds perfectly to the Scriptures. We therefore take the liberty of referring to the "leaflet" itself. The answer of the Ministry was not long in coming. As was to be expected, the recurrences were also rejected. After a lengthy discussion, in which the high authority attempts to refute the reasons given by the petitioner for his demand, it is finally explained that if a member of the congregation is unexpectedly and suddenly convicted of gross transgressions against God's word, which exclude a penitent state of heart, and nevertheless persistently desires the Lord's Supper, in cases of such an extraordinary nature, the clergyman is authorized and obligated to refuse communion, and afterwards to report to the superior authority, but the consideration of such extraordinary cases is no reason to change the existing provision that the clergymen are not entitled to provisional exclusion from communion as a rule. Of course, Lic. Stöckhardt declares in the number of his "pamphlet" that he is not satisfied even with this illusory concession, and remarks: "Not only in such extraordinary cases, which perhaps do not occur in a decade, when a member of the congregation suddenly and unexpectedly

If a sinner is convicted of a gross misdemeanor and still desires the Lord's Supper, but in general in all cases in which a manifest and impenitent sinner comes forward for confession (and this is what we asked for), the clergyman, by virtue of the key office entrusted to him by Christ, is entitled and obligated to refuse the Lord's Supper to the person concerned independently, without asking the consistory, regardless of whether he has only recently or long since learned of his sin. According to the confessional writings, all parish priests have the right to banish, i.e. to exclude from the sacrament, only that this be done in an "orderly manner". The clergyman has to examine the communicants carefully before he admits or rejects them (AugSb. Conf. 15.), and if it is a matter of public chastisement and formal exclusion, he should involve the congregation (Matth. 18,15-17. Schmalk. Article). Later, against the intentions of the Reformers, the consistory, instead of the congregation and its shepherd, was entrusted with the right to publicly banish stiff-necked sinners. This is acceptable, if only the consistory always judges and decides according to God's Word, which has not happened in several recent cases. But one right no pastor may be deprived of is the so-called right of private suspension, i.e. the authority to privately deny communion to unworthy persons who want to communicate. This right belongs to pastoral care and is unanimously granted to all pastors by the Lutheran fathers. Only when pastoral care and private suspension from the Lord's Supper prove fruitless, is the matter to be brought before the Superintendent and the Consistory, and the latter must then, if all further admonitions have proved futile, finally exclude the sinner from the Lord's Supper and all other ecclesiastical rights. Amsdorf, a well-known Saxon theologian, wrote in 1561: "If the consistory wanted to prevent or forbid the servants of the church the binding key or the secret (or private) suspension from the Lord's Supper, then one cannot and should not consent to it/ So the editor, bound by God's Word and the Lutheran confession in conscience, must persist in this standpoint and sees himself compelled to uphold the declaration already made in his appeal (at the end) to the church regiment by leaving the consequences to the one who judges rightly. In community with a larger number of fellow ministers he will, among other wishes, bring this request for recognition of the right of suspension to the Synod, as he has already joined the Wildenfels resolution, which makes the same demand in the second thesis. In the meantime, he will continue to act according to God's word and confession." - At the end, the "leaflet" finally contains the wording of a petition with which Lic. Stöckhardt, together with one of his teachers in Planitz by the name of Dalmer and a Mr. Jähn in Hartenstein, now addresses the state synod on behalf of a conference of (about 150) preachers and laymen from various regions of Saxony that took place in Wildenfels on April 16. It is not difficult to speculate what the synod will do. A synod that has already made concessions to the spirit of the times in the first temptation and whose best members, who had voted against the concession in the meetings of the synod, have eagerly sought to justify it afterwards, has already delivered the proof that no help may be hoped for from it. And even if she repentantly admitted her apostasy and wanted to turn back, she would only learn with horror how irretrievable the opportunity was that God offered her years ago and that she did not seize. Even the Saxon regional church now says: "Gone is gone!"

Saxony. "Two pieces of news," writes the Allgemeine eo. luth. Kirchenztg., "which came to our ears at the same time in these days, have moved the minds not a little, especially in those circles in which one has open eyes for the signs of the times, and

a warm heart for the Lutheran Church in the country. Dr. E. Sulze, since Easter pastor at Neustadt-Dresden, has passed the supplementary elections to the synod in two constituencies on June 12, even if with a very small majority. And against Lic. G. Stöckhardt, deacon in Planitz near Zwickau, the Landesconsistorium has initiated proceedings for the removal from office through provisional suspension. Characteristic enough for our state church conditions! A denier of the deity of Christ, who calls the ecclesiastical doctrine of the Trinity a "shrunk paganism", the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper "materialistic superstition", the effect of baptism attested in the catechism "sorcery", who resolutely denies the necessity of reconciliation through Christ's blood, and in general has the forehead, to openly declare it as the goal of his effectiveness in Saxony that the old Christian faith be cleared up here and that room be made for a 'new form of Christianity, although he once took the oath to stick to the pure doctrine of the Protestant Church.-Lutheran Church according to Scripture and confession, and was not only obliged anew when he was employed in Chemnitz for the sake of this oath of office already taken earlier: such a denier of biblical and Protestant fundamental truths is in office and dignities, is transferred to the residence without objection, and now even receives a double mandate to the Lutheran State Synod. Lutheran state synod, without there being any formal right to dispute his seat in the same, after one had once omitted to deny him the seat in an Evangelical Lutheran parish office, which could and should have been done with justification! And another clergyman, who has made his Lutheran Christian faith known in word and writing, especially through an excellent catechism ('Die heilsame Lehre' (Zwickau 1875)) and has developed a richly blessed effectiveness in his congregation, is affected by serious disciplinary measures, because in his zeal for the pure doctrine and the Lutheran character of the Saxon regional church he has recently let himself be carried away too far (!). Doesn't it seem as if unbelief and infidelity have more validity in this country than faith and fidelity?" - Who would not expect a Lutheran newspaper to answer: Alas, God be lamented! But not so the church newspaper; it thinks that people who are far away might well get the idea, but the conclusion would not be correct and it would be necessary to dispel the evil appearance. "Unfortunately," she says, "as far as the Sulze case is concerned, we are not in a position to excuse and mitigate the annoyance caused by it, which has become quite blatant again through his election to the Synod. On the contrary, it cannot be denied that this very serious trouble and the great leniency with which our ecclesiastical superiors have hitherto allowed it, has given the greatest encouragement to separation and will continue to provide the most obvious pretext, unless, as we hope, the Synod brings about change and takes precautions that Lutheran congregations do not appoint as pastors men who have manifestly broken with Lutheran church doctrine and virtually make a mockery of it. But as far as Stöckhardt's suspension is concerned, we are in a position to be able to clear the Landesconsistorium of the suspicion of a hasty and unjust reprimand, since it certainly complains with us that it was virtually challenged and forced by itself to this disciplinary procedure against the hitherto so capable and faithful servant of our church, without having given it any well-founded reason to do so." In the following, the church newspaper now tries to justify the Consistory. Towards the end it says: "Two of the potentates *) have then also, as we hear, thereby (the

*) As we can see from No. 26 of the church newspaper, one of these two declares in a letter to the same, as far as it concerns his person, "for an incorrectness". He "by no means considers the matter closed, but must reserve the full freedom of action" according to his conscience.

Response of the ministers) Reassurance grasped. Not so Stöckhardt. He did not consider the deal to be over at all, but continued the discussion even now. He even did not want to wait for the reception and effect of his writing. Instead, he unequivocally showed his disdain for the authorities of the regional church, published a second and third "pamphlet" with the documents that had been exchanged between him and his superiors, and finally, tired of the "fruitless exchange of notes," addressed a petition to the regional consistory, in which he flatly declared that he could no longer recognize it as an evangelical Lutheran church. Lutheran, but rather had to apply to it the words of the Schmalkaldic Articles originally meant against the bishops entangled in Roman error: *episcopi defendentes impiam doctrinam et impios cultus habeantur tanquam anathema*, declare the further intercourse with it to be unfairness on his part, and therefore consider the relationship of subordination to be completely resolved. The answer of the Landesconsistorium was, as it could not be otherwise, the initiation of the trial of removal against Stöckhardt by his provisional suspension from all official service, after he had already been placed under special supervision for some time before.... Sulze and Stöckhardt: we come back to this unsought parallel at the end. If we only had the choice between the two extreme positions which these names still represent within our national church, we could not be in doubt for a moment which of the two we would prefer. But there is a defect in each of them.... In any case, these events have considerably clarified the ecclesiastical situation in Saxony..... Saxony seems to be getting a bad reputation for keeping the most influential offices open for people who, for the sake of their heterodoxy, cannot get anywhere else, e.g. in Hanover, and that not even notorious ignorance prevents the appointment of a Protestant unionist, prescribed by some liberal city council, as head pastor to so many clergy and congregations.

Shortage of theologians. An old parish priest in Bavaria, whose eyesight is so poor that he cannot perform his duties, has always had vicars for years. His last vicar was taken from him and neighboring pastors, who have their own branches, were assigned to fill in. They held out for half a year, then they could no longer do so, especially since one of them was suffering from a neck ache himself. Then an old priest, who had retired because of complete deafness, moved to the neighboring town. The blind priest gave the deaf one the sign when he should step on the altar or the pulpit, when the organ fell silent and he could begin. Thus the blind man had to be the deaf man's ear and the deaf man the blind man's mouth. Now there is a vicar again; how long he will be allowed to stay remains to be seen; probably not for long. Thus the evangelical people's newspaper.

(Neues Zeitblatt.)

Count Baudissin of Leipzig was appointed professor at the **theological faculty of Strasbourg**. The "Messenger of Peace from Alsace-Lorraine" describes him as faithful to the confession.

Prussia. The bill concerning the Protestant church constitution in the eight older provinces has, as was to be expected, now also been adopted by the House of Lords essentially in accordance with the resolutions of the House of Representatives. The law does not grant the Protestant Church the desired freedom and independence on the basis of the confession. The Protestant Church does not receive an endowment that permanently secures it the external means to fulfill its tasks, although the state previously confiscated considerable church property. The funds that the state wishes to allocate to the church are subject to the annual approval of the House of Representatives.

The state's own right of taxation, which is preserved for the church, is substantially limited by the provision that a new approval by state law is required if the church exceeds a small percentage. Even the church's own right of taxation is substantially limited by the provision that, if a small percentage is exceeded, new approval by state law is required. The members of the Oberkirchenrath and the Consistories, the General Superintendents and the Superintendents "are employed only under the countersignature of the Minister of Culture. Before a church law passed by the Provincial or General Synod is submitted to the King for sanction, it must be established by a declaration of the State Ministry that there is nothing to be recalled against the law on the part of the State. (N. Pr. Ztg.)

The German Old Catholics held their third synod in Bonn at the beginning of June. Thirty-one clergymen and 76 parish delegates attended the meeting. According to a report given there, the total number of German Old Catholics now amounts to about 50,000 souls, which means that it has doubled since June 1873. There are currently 60 Old Catholic clergy in Germany; their bishop is the former Professor Reinkens. From the negotiations it is to be mentioned that several motions concerning the elaboration of a biblical history and the introduction of the German language at mass were rejected. However, the parish council was asked to consider the latter point further. On the question of celibacy, it was business as usual. - The Swiss Old Catholic National Synod also met almost simultaneously. Prof. Herzog was proclaimed Old Catholic Bishop of Switzerland. Reform motions concerning the abolition of celibacy and the obligation to confess were accepted. Döllinger in Munich had declared himself in favor of celibacy even for Old Catholic priests. (Pilger a. S.)

The Virgin of Orleans. After the ardent bishop of Orleans, Dupanloup, had so zealously pursued the canonization of the Virgin in Rome to the honor of his diocese and of France, the papal Congregation of Rites has now ruled that the bishop Dupanloup cannot be granted the sainthood for two important reasons. It is condemned by a court composed of priests under the presidency of a bishop, and is also convicted of heresy. The *advocatus diaboli* (devil's advocate) has thus inflicted a painful defeat on Bishop Dupanloup in this trial. (N. Ztbl.)

Great Britain. In England and Wales, not counting many Jesuits temporarily staying there, there are 1762 Roman priests in activity (1231 secular, 531 regular). There are 50 Catholics in the House of Commons, 35 in the House of Lords, and 7 in the Privy Council. (Kreuzztg. 303.)

Heidelberg. The first chamber of Baden also reported on the plight of Heidelberg, whose theological professors would soon have to hold lectures among themselves for lack of students. It is proposed to buy students by offering scholarships for those who want to study in Heidelberg. However, the second chamber must have expected little from the deal, because it went down from the government's demand to 6000 marks. Thus the matter came before the first chamber. Freiherr von Gemmingen said that money could not solve the problem; at present, faithful teachers were needed to attract students. As is well known, the Protestant Association rejected this insight. Nevertheless, even the very liberal Dr. Holtzmann admitted that a faithful professor had to be hired, because nothing could be done with money alone. This appointment had already been approved by Kiefer in the second chamber. Among the 6 members who voted against the purchase of the students were two grand ducal princes. Where the desolation of the church comes from was made clear by the proceedings in the chamber. How, then, if one were to continue and offer bonuses for listeners of liberal preachers?

Hanover. What gross insults and suspicions the Landeskonsistorium has been subjected to in the printed papers of the Protestant Association Actions Committee because of Klapp's rejection will be remembered. The State Consistory, as Minister Lichtenberg stated at the Synod, patiently endured this with the intention of responding at the Synod. However, the crown attorney finally had to see reason. For the purpose of Stephen's election in Osnabrück, the retired school director Volkmar, together with two others, had circulated an election appeal, in which the following passages appeared: "We are most seriously damaged and offended by the Orthodox Consistory, which exercises an intolerable tyranny; you would insult yourselves if you voted in its sense. The defendant was defended by O.-G.-A. Grass. The Superior Court sentenced them to costs, as well as each of them to a fine of 150 marks. (Neues Zeitblatt.)

Bible Excerpt Question. Although the Saxon teachers had been rejected several times with their demand for a Bible excerpt for the schools, they nevertheless continue to agitate for it, several times with the participation of royal district school inspectors. The pilgrim from Saxony writes: "The opponents seem to have been threatened with a kind of eight. The fact is at least that at the Schneeberg general teachers' meeting the friends of the whole Bible for the school did not vote against the withdrawal, but left the pastor, who was present as a guest and who spoke out manfully against the withdrawal, alone and, when questioned about it, shrugged his shoulders apprehensively. Thus the matter came before the chambers anew as a petition of the "General Saxon Teachers' Association". And in fact, the second chamber, with reference to the district school presidents who had been introduced since the synodal decision and were therefore "not yet heard", decided against only 7 votes to discuss the question of exodus again, possibly to bring about agreement with the Consistory! The first chamber was different. The matter had been decided; and, said the former Minister of Culture, v. Falkenstein, if our youth were not threatened by any other dangers than those arising from the reading of the Bible, then one could very calmly look on. It was striking, Professor Fricke added, probably in view of the tolerated agitations of the teachers, that the latter returned to this question again and again. He was "astonished at the fleeting motives of the petition compared to the discussions that had taken place so far. Most of the other members of the first chamber seemed to share this view. For the teachers' petitions and the motion of the second chamber were rejected here against 3 votes and are now hopefully laid to rest forever."

Non-denominational schools. With the repeal of a decree of the former Minister of Education v. Mühler, the current Minister of Education Falk has determined that Jews may be members of the board of directors of a Christian school, with reference to the Reich Law and the School Supervision Law of March 11, 1872. In individual cases, this has already been permitted. In and of itself, therefore, only Jews can form the board. If in this way more and more of the confessional and Christian school crumbles away, the non-denominational school will be there by itself. (N. Ztbl.)

Necrological. Recently died Dr. th. Bruno Lindner in Leipzig, known among other things for his work on church history.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 22.

September 1876.

No. 9.

(Sent in by C. A. Frank.)

About the conscience.

(Submitted for review.)

(Continued.)

But what is conscience? Is it not the crown of man, in which his cognition and sensibility come to the highest and most beautiful appearance? - Is it not the criterion that makes man especially that being as which he differs from all other visible creatures endowed with life? - Is it not, as much as it still expresses itself, the real bearer of the moral world order? - Is it not the innate principle that never lets man be a Platonic *tabula rasa* (see its Philebus) nor an Aristotelian *tabula pura* (see its *de anima* L. III. c. IV.)? *) Yes; but this still does not say what conscience actually is. Let us let Paulo tell us this. Rom. 2, 14-15, we read the following: "For if the Gentiles, who have not the law, yet by nature do the work of the law, the same, because they have not the law, are themselves a law unto themselves, that they may prove that the work of the law is written in their hearts, since their conscience testifieth them, as also their thoughts, which accuse or excuse one another. - .

*For since Plato claimed that the ideas were co-created in the human souls, which they subsequently forgot, and consequently compared the human soul to a rubbed tablet, Aristotle, on the other hand, denied these co-created ideas and taught that the soul was an empty tablet, which, through abstraction, represented and imprinted the ideas on itself from the particular and individual things. Walch's philosophical lexicon under "idea".

The first thing we have to point out from this and from the context is that Paul puts Jews and Gentiles together as equally condemned before God. The Jews are condemned because they did not keep the law of God, which was revealed to them from the beginning and was especially given to them. The Gentiles, however, do not have this law proclaimed at Sinai, but because of this they are not excused before God, but are still lost, because they are not completely without divine law, they have (like the Jews also) the natural law and according to this they must be lost, because they have not kept it. Now where Paul puts Jews and Gentiles together or contrasts them with each other, he is speaking in general terms. So also here. What he says about Gentiles, concerning law, conscience, etc., he does not speak of individual persons or individual peoples among the Gentiles, but of the Gentiles as they stood in relation to the Jewish people. In addition to this, Paul 2 Cor. 4, 2. speaks par excellence of a conscience of men: "We prove ourselves well against all men's consciences" (πάσαν συνειδῆσιν ἀνθρώπων). To every Gentile Paul ascribes the law, conscience, etc., and that as something innate. For when he speaks, the Gentiles "do by nature τὰ τοῦ νόμου," i.e., they do as they are naturally born into this world (Ephes. 2, 3.), things, works, which agree with the revealed law, he admittedly does not say that the Gentiles do all works, or only such as the revealed law requires; but yet he says this much: the Gentiles do without revealed law things pertaining to the law. The truth of our apostolic dictum concerning the generality of conscience finds its confirmation in the Gentiles themselves. That there is one God, that one must not blaspheme the Godhead but honor it, that one must keep oaths and contracts made in God's name, obey one's superiors, not murder, not break marriage, not defile one's neighbor's good name, that one should do good and flee vice: these are such obvious things that one need not go into their further execution. The laws, history, books, and songs of the heathen are full of them, and to our knowledge no nation has yet been found which, as it did not acknowledge a divine being, so also did not have some concept of right and wrong, which had not done τὰ τοῦ νόμου in this or that piece. -

It is a pleasure for us to be able to share something about this from our great reformer. He lets himself be heard in Erlang. Vol. 36, pp. 40 and 56: "That the Gentiles have a law is taught us by our own conscience and reason; just as Paul speaks first to the Romans that the Gentiles also have a knowledge of God, for God has revealed this to them, that they see God's invisible being, that is, his eternal power and divinity, as it is perceived in the works from creation onward; but they have not praised him as one God, etc.; with which words St. Paul indicates that all Gentiles have knowledge of God. With which words St. Paul indicates that all the Gentiles believe in God.

They have knowledge of God, namely, that he created all things, gives all things, nourishes and sustains all things; therefore their own conscience urges them to give glory to God and thank him for all his benefits. Therefore, even though Moses never wrote the law, all men have the law written in their hearts by nature. But God also gave the Jews a written law, that is, the ten commandments, for abundance; which are also nothing else than the law of nature, which is naturally written in our hearts. What Moses wrote in the ten commandments, we naturally feel in our conscience, Rom. 2: For so the Gentiles etc." Vol. 46, 83: "There are two kinds of knowledge of God. One is called the knowledge of the law, the other the knowledge of the gospel. For God gave the two doctrines, the law and the gospel, that he might be known by them. The knowledge of the law is known to reason, and reason has almost grasped and smelled God. For it has seen from the law what is right and what is wrong, and the law is written in our hearts, as St. Paul also testifies to the Romans, even though it was given more clearly by Moses: but it is nevertheless true that by nature all rational people come to such a point that they know it is wrong to disobey father and mother or the authorities, and likewise to murder, commit adultery, steal, curse and blaspheme. Therefore they have punished the transgressors of the law, as fornicators, murderers, thieves, with severe punishment, as the Romans and other pagans, have also written many books about it, and have had to confess these murderers, thieves and peelers, and such bad boys (when they have been taken by the neck and done to them as they have done to others) for the court, that their abuse is unjust. For their own conscience says: it is not right for one to strangle another. For they have this account of the law of God and ten commandments written in their hearts by nature, and they see it both in themselves and in others, without punishing it in other men, as St. Paul Rom. 1:2 says, and in themselves they do not punish it; but if they can do it secretly, they do it as well as others." -

The second point that presents itself for our attention is that the same apostle who says Epbes. 2, 12. says of the Gentiles: "You would be without God in the world", here speaks: "The Gentiles are a law unto themselves" - ("because the right reason is the more excellent part - *pars principalior* - in the Gentiles, so one says, when they follow this in all actions of life, they follow the law of nature", Balduin to this passage) - "so that they prove the work of the law is written in their hearts." From this we learn that the law of nature is inscribed in the heart, in the soul of man, it is engraved there, it is created for the soul by Him who created it in righteous justice and holiness. Man may or may not want that the forces of his soul

Even if man is not in contact with his Creator, he still feels something of this "work of the law". Therefore we cannot understand how Vr. Harleß in his "Christian Ethics" 4th ed. p. 29: "Conscience is not only the human spirit organized for constant spiritual intercourse with God, but at the same time the constant spiritual intercourse of God with the creaturely spirit. Thus conscience is not substance, but actual interrelationship of God with the human spirit and vice versa. And this is the reason why we cannot merely say that conscience is the spirit, but must distinguish 'the thoughts of our heart' (Rom. 2:15) from what conscience is in its essence. For by its nature it is not the effect produced in the heart, or the 'work of the law written in our hearts' (Rom. 2:15.), but by its nature it is an ever-active operation of God upon our spirits, an operation which from the beginning is connected with the eternal Son, the 'Word.'" We cannot subscribe to this definition, but consider any determination of conscience that goes beyond the creaturely as not corresponding to the apostolic concept. Luther 36, 56.: "Nu, wiewohl beide, Jüden und Gentile, ein Gesetz haben, dennoch haben sie gleichwohl Gottes fehlet. For the law cannot be sufficient without God's Spirit and faith, because God has decreed all things under unbelief, that he might have mercy on all, and that all the world might sin in Adam. . . . Although the commandments of God are written in the hearts of all men, yet the hearts are so darkened by the devil that they cannot be seen nor known. But God now reminds the Jews of the commandments that are imprinted in their hearts, gives them a written law above the natural light, and even gives it to them orally, so that they may see it as it is written in their hearts. But if the natural law were not written and given by God in the heart, one would have to preach for a long time before the consciences would be struck. One would have to preach to a donkey, horse, ox or cow a hundred thousand years before they would accept the law, even though they have ears, eyes and heart like a man; they can also hear it, but it does not fall into the heart. Why? What is the fault? The soul is not formed and created for such things to fall into it. But a man, when the law is held up to him, soon says, "Yes, it is so," and cannot deny it. He could not be persuaded so soon, unless it were first written in his heart." -

The third moment, which Paul inculcates, he gives in the words: "because their conscience testifies to them", by which he can say nothing else than this: the law written in the heart does not stand there as a dead letter, but asserts itself as living by appearing in man as a co-knowing witness and giving its voice as God's voice,

to affirm or deny the state of a thing. When we humans experience the work of the natural law in this way and in the same way, this is the *conscience*, the *syneidesis*, as Paul calls it here, the *conscientia*, the co-science, which is also called heart in the Scriptures, as 2 Sam. 24, 10.: "And the heart smote David after the people were numbered"; 1 Kings 2, 44.: "Thou knowest all the wickedness of which thine heart is conscious"; 1 John 3, 20.: "So our heart condemneth us not." Of the conscience, as the co-knowing witness, Paul also speaks 2 Cor. 1:12: "For our glory is this, that is, the testimony of our conscience."

The fourth point which we must consider in order to come to terms with the determination of conscience according to apostolic guidance is found in these words: "In addition also the thoughts which accuse or excuse one another. It is true that, according to some commentators, this passage should be understood in this way: "The heathen who do the requirement of the law show that the same is written in their hearts, and this is supported at the same time, as far as the doers themselves are concerned, by their (subsequent) conscience, and as far as their relationship to other heathen is concerned, by the accusations or also the defenses which they mutually exercise in their moral thoughts, so that one of them makes condemnatory or also justifying reflections on the other" (Meyer); "Conscience teaches them to judge the quality of their own and others' actions" (Weiß, *ibid.*). This, however, does not help our purpose; for what the heathen have accused or excused in others, they must first have judged themselves accusingly or excusingly. And this is the further moment that Paul wants to bring into play: the work of the law has made itself known in the Gentiles not only as a witness, but also as a judging judge, in that it either excuses a man, or acquits him, or accuses him, or condemns him. Scripture also speaks of this power of conscience. Of the acquitting one: Job 27, 6.: "My conscience does not bite me for the sake of my whole life; Ap. Hist. 23, 1.: "Ye men, brethren (his enemies accusing him), I have walked in all good conscience before God unto this day." Of the condemning: Joseph's brothers, Gen. 42, 21: "We are guilty of this against our brother"; Judas, Matth. 27, 4: "I have done evil in betraying innocent blood" and the already mentioned passage: "If our heart does not condemn us, we have joy in God", 1 John 3, 21. "If they went out convinced by their conscience", John 8, 9.

If we now want to establish a definition of conscience in accordance with the four points discussed, it would read as follows: conscience is the work of the law inscribed by nature in the heart of all men, which in the

The first is that man appears not only as a law, but also as a co-conscious witness and delivers his accusatory or excusing judgment in the things that he recognizes as belonging to his forum. Buddeus and Rambach give the following double definition in the latter's Moral Theology, pp. 530 and 546:

"Conscience is a faculty of the human soul by means of which man can examine and judge his actions, of which he is conscious, according to the guidance of divine law, whether they are in accordance with it or not, and consequently right or wrong. - The actual form and nature of conscience consists in this, that it partly prescribes what is right or wrong, to do or not to do, partly bears witness to our actions, partly passes its judgment on whether they are in accordance with the law or not, and absolves or condemns man according to the nature of the actions". J. G. Carpzov: "The conscience is an inner judgment, so the all-wise Creator implanted in the soul of man, by virtue of which he judges from the divine rights inscribed in his heart, of his own life, thoughts, words and works, whether they are right or wrong, to punish or to reward" (Lessons from the Uninjured Conscience, p. 7.). Others describe conscience as 'a practical syllogism, in which the guiding principle takes the place of the upper clause, the witness the place of the lower clause, and man's own judgment the place of the final clause. - To confirm what Paul teaches of the conscience of the pagans, let us cite two more pagans. Cicero in his speech *pro Roscio*: "Do not think, as you often see in the fables of the poets, that the wicked, who commit something ungodly and evil, are tormented and frightened by the burning torches of the Furies. Every evil-doer is frightened by his iniquity and his terror, his wickedness troubles him, his foolishness torments him, his evil thoughts and consciences terrify him: these are the perpetual and native furies of the mind of the wicked." Seneca *L. III. de ira c. 36.*: "I take liberty and am daily judge of myself. When the light is extinguished, and my wife, who already knows my habit, is silent, I reflect on the whole day that has passed and what I have said and done during it. I give myself nothing and hide nothing. For why should I be afraid of some mistakes I have made, since I can say: see to it that you do not do it again, this time it will be a gift to you. (Both passages in the translation by J. G. Carpzov, loc. cit.)

(Conclusion follows.)

The Weimar Regional Church.

Decision of the Breslau Oberkirchenkollegium on the request of Pastor Lochte in Erfurt.

On June 22, 1875, Your Reverence submitted to us for a decision by the Church Order the question arising from a practical need, namely from a request addressed to you by several fellow believers in Weimar for admission to our church fellowship,

whether or not the Lutheran regional church in the Grand Duchy of Saxony-Weimar should still be recognized as a Lutheran church.

Now that you have submitted to us the document indispensable for the decision of this question, namely the synodal order of the said church of March 29, 18/3, at our request under March 15, we have subjected the present confessional character of the Lutheran Regional Church of Saxony-Weimar to a conscientious examination, and have thereby come to the conclusion,

that the qu. Landeskirche can no longer be recognized as a Lutheran church, since in it the Lutheran confession has ceased to be *publica doctrina* (publicly valid doctrine) and as such (according to Article 7 of the Augustana) exclusively authoritative for the entire ecclesiastical organism.

Of course, this judgment is not meant to deny that the qu. Church became Lutheran at the time of the Reformation and remained Lutheran for centuries. This is beyond all doubt and results as clear as daylight from the church order of November 6, 1664, which professes the Concordienbuch of 1580 and expressly commands that all and every church and school ministers in the entire Saxon principalities and lands are to be guided in all articles by the Scriptures of the prophets and apostles, then by the above-mentioned *libris symbolicis*, and are not to bring and teach anything contrary to the same in the pulpit and in the schools.

But this confessional basis, by virtue of which the entire doctrine of the Book of Concord had been proclaimed as the exclusively authoritative *publica doctrina of the church* and, moreover, to be recognized by the church servants as binding for them when they assumed office by taking the religious oath, has unfortunately been changed in the course of time. The Grand Duke Carl August sanctioned by the Rescript of March 11, 1817 "in the exercise of his episcopal rights and thus as the supreme bishop of the entire Lutheran churches of his lands" on the proposal of the chief consistories in Weimar and Eisenach a modification of the previous religious oath, to the effect that the words should be added to the obligation to the symbolic books:

"insofar as they are consistent with sacred Scripture."

With this addition, however, the previous religious oath, as well as the meaning and scope of the Lutheran confession as a hitherto exclusively authoritative *publica doctrina* for the national church, binding in all articles and not permitting any exception. Not the entire Lutheran Confession, because it was scriptural in all its articles, was still the authoritative *publica doctrina* of the church, but only as much of it as was still considered scriptural by the clergy who committed themselves. The clergymen bound by this addition were therefore no longer required to be guided in all articles only by the symbolic books, as well as by the sacred Scriptures, and not to teach anything contrary to them, as the church order of 1664 had commanded, but only insofar as the teaching of the symbolic books agreed with the sacred Scriptures. This addition, as a modification of the previous religious oath, only makes sense if it was intended to question the hitherto assumed universal agreement of the doctrine of the Book of Concord with sacred Scripture and to authorize the clergy to correct the doctrine of the symbolic books in their lectures to the extent that it would be necessary, above all, to maintain agreement with Scripture. Least of all, however, does the addition permit the interpretation that nothing has been changed in the previous authoritative meaning of the symbolic books, but that in this respect everything should remain so completely as it was before, that the clergy should still be required, in all articles of doctrine, to be guided not only by the sacred Scriptures, but also by the symbolic books, and not to teach anything contradictory to them. Such an interpretation is already made impossible by the fact that the Oberconsistorium in Weimar explicitly motivated its proposal by the fact that the symbolic books themselves did not want to be unchangeable norms of faith for all times. It was therefore very well known that this modification of the religious oath was not a matter of an indifferent different formulation that did not affect the doctrine itself, but of a change in the previous authority of the symbolic books, that the Supreme Consistory proposed in the first place only the obligation to the sacred Scriptures (omitting any mention of the symbolic books), and only in the event that this omission should not be popular on the part of the supreme bishop, that addition, by which, of course, essentially as much was achieved as if the symbolic books had not been mentioned at all. For since the addition itself did not determine anything about the extent to which the symbolic books actually corresponded to the sacred Scriptures and to what extent they did not, but rather left this to be determined at the discretion of the individual clergymen, there was - as far as the new

The fact that the oath of religion came into being - nothing would have stood in the way if individuals, or even all clergymen, had wanted to correct all symbolic doctrinal articles - supposedly for the sake of the conformity with Scripture that was to be established - which would actually be tantamount to abolishing the previous authority of all symbols, and would actually make any further mention of them in the oath of religion superfluous. This, however, suited the rationalism flourishing and ruling in Weimar at that time, which was looking for a legal basis for its unbridled doctrinal willfulness and unfortunately found it in this rescript of the highest bishop of the state.

It is not unknown to us that this view has been disputed and that it has been said that the authority of the formulated confession for a church is to be distinguished from the obligation of its ministers to this formulated confession. The latter is only an application of that otherwise established authority, which would still exist even if there were no obligation at all. We admit this, but only in the case where no obligation at all takes place, but not in the case where one does take place, namely such an obligation as does not respect the otherwise established authority of the confessions, but more or less destroys it. For although the authority of a confession and the obligation of the ministers to the same can and must be conceptually distinguished, it is impossible to separate the two in such a way that the former remains intact if the latter is substantially changed. If the teaching of the confessional writings is no longer to be committed to in the old sense and scope, then *eo ipso* the authority of the same no longer exists in the old sense and scope, and it is accidental, and a matter of subjective discretion, if individual clergymen, because they still consider the ecclesiastical confession to be scriptural in its entire scope, nevertheless follow it. The church no longer compels them to do so, but rather tries them to the contrary.

This judgment cannot be changed by the fact that the Rescript of March 11, 1817, regards the modification of the religious oath, which it orders, as something in accordance with the spirit of the Lutheran confession and actually demanded by it, and thus at least does not want to set anything that would contradict it. This can be admitted, and yet one will have to assert that this rule, whether one wanted it or not, is nevertheless contrary to both the spirit and the letter of the Confessions. To be sure, the Confessions recognize only the sacred Scriptures as a rule and guideline of doctrine, and subordinate the ecclesiastical confessions to this rule. But they do not mean this in such a way as if they themselves wanted to somehow question their consistent conformity to Scripture. Rather, they assert it most decisively both in the preface to the Concordia Book and in the entrances to the *Solida declaratio*, and therefore also claim "because (not insofar as) they are taken from God's Word,

to be equally authoritative for the doctrine going on in the church. The implementation of this in the Rescript therefore contradicts the spirit as well as the letter of the Confessions, and this error on the part of the authors of this addition can never be considered proof that the previous state of confession has not been legally changed.

The only thing that could be cited for this would be the circumstance that this modification of the confessional status was ordered unilaterally by the church regime without consultation and consent of the congregations, and thus could not have legally annulled the Lutheran confessional character of the Weimar church, which, by the way, rightly existed. But even if we were to admit this, we would still demand that the Lutherans of Saxony-Weimar should have protested by word and deed against the unjustly introduced confessional modification and should have demanded and fought for the restitution of the former religious oath before we could acknowledge that their church is not only by right, that their church should not only be Lutheran by right, but that it is in fact Lutheran, on which everything ultimately depends, just as we do not declare a sinner repentant because he should be so by right by virtue of his Christian status, but because and when he really is, as far as we can judge. However, not only has nothing become known of such a protest, of such a struggle of the Weimar congregations, respective of their clergy against the addition to the religious oath introduced by the church regime 59 years ago and applied up to this time, but on the contrary, there is another fact, that in the agreement reached with the congregations for the establishment of the new synodal order, the previous confessional status, i.e. the one existing at the time of the agreement, was also preserved for the future, by which one can certainly understand no other than the confessional status modified in 1817, but not the one standardized by the church order of 1664. If one had wanted to return to the latter, the addition to the religious oath, which contradicts it, would have had to be removed, which was not done then or later. In our opinion, however, this fact amounts to a subsequent approval of that disastrous innovation on the part of the congregations, so that the formal legal validity of it, because it was originally ordered unilaterally by the church regime, can now no longer be doubted.

But even if we were to drop this whole instance borrowed from the 1817 innovation and admit that the Church of Saxony-Weimar had undoubtedly been an Evangelical Lutheran one until the enactment of the new synodal order, we would not be able to make this clear from the church constitution which had come to public recognition through the synodal order itself.

The first is that the synod can in no way be admitted as a community of the entire Protestant state church of the Grand Duchy of Saxony-Weimar. For this no longer consists solely of the original Lutheran congregations of the state, but, as is clear from § 1 of the synodal order, of all the Protestant congregations of the Grand Duchy, as they are described in more detail in § 1 of the church congregation order of June 24, 1851, thus also of the reformed, formerly unconformed, which are likewise guaranteed their previous confessional status for the future. Even if it is conceded that the confessional status, despite the addition made in 1817 for the Lutheran church and extended in 1843 to the reformed congregations, which had hitherto only been connected with the latter by ecclesiastical regulations, to the obligation to the Lutheran, respective reformed symbols, still remained to the full extent a Lutheran, respective reformed one, it was nevertheless made at least of its exclusive confessional status by the combination of the confessional relatives of both sides into one and the same church. The principle expressed in the seventh article of the Augustana, that church fellowship must be based on united doctrine and must coincide with it, was thus abandoned, so that the simultaneously guaranteed continuation of the validity of the previous confessional status for the Lutheran part can at least no longer refer to this article without coming into contradiction with itself. All attempts that have been made to understand the "state of confession in the Protestant regional church of the Grand Duchy" guaranteed in § 1 of the synodal order in such a way that the regional church, which the synodal order refers to, should retain its Lutheran confession as the exclusively authoritative *publica doctrina*, fail because of the wording and context of the passage. It cannot be denied that this Lutheran regional church, composed of Lutheran and reformed, respectively united congregations, as such and in its entirety, according to its confessional character, can neither be called a Lutheran nor a reformed one, but must only be called a united one, even if it has not expressly adopted this name, which is irrelevant. Or if one wanted to say that in its entirety it is both Lutheran and Reformed, then, if one did not want to impute to it a confessional state that contradicts itself and thus cancels itself out, one would have to dispense with the so-called distinctive doctrines of both confessions and limit this assertion to the other consensus of both in doctrine. In this way, however, no other result would be gained than that this church in its totality is a united one, in which the distinctive doctrines of both confessions, because they are insignificant, have lost their character as church-dividing.

One will not be able to object to the fact that the expression "Protestant regional church" may not be pressed here, but must be understood in such a way that any reference to the confession is to be excluded. The so-called Landeskirche of Saxony-Weimar does not want to be a confessional church at all, but only an association for purposes of external administration, first of all for a cooperation in the Landessynode regarding such matters that do not concern doctrine and what is connected with doctrine. Only for this purpose had the unification of all Protestant congregations of the country taken place without distinction and with preservation of the different confessional status, and if the general designation "Protestant Regional Church" had been chosen for it, then this did not exclude the fact that - with regard to the confession - two, or rather three independent church congregations distinguished from one another still rightfully existed, one Lutheran and one Reformed, respective Uniate, - at least according to the matter, even if not according to the name, which we ourselves declared to be irrelevant.

We admit that this argumentation - apart from our first serious misgivings about the addition to the religious oath - would have some merit if it were confirmed to some extent by the other contents of the synodal order. But this is by no means the case. The regional synod, in whose establishment, just as in the establishment of the church regime common to both confessions, the nature and the actual essence of the Protestant regional church as such becomes particularly clear, is by no means out of all relation to the confession and by no means has to deal only with matters that do not affect the doctrine. For

1. According to § 14, it has to begin its entire activity with a communal service, which alone proves that in this regional church, as such, there is also teaching, admittedly not in unity, since this service can be held by Lutheran as well as Reformed clergy.

2. According to § 26. of the synodal regulations, all members of the synod must, at the opening of the synod, make the solemn vow, which is the same for all, that in their work at the synod they will cooperate, in obedience to the divine word, so that the church may grow in all things in him who is the head, Christ. In this context, the words "obedient to the divine word" must necessarily also have a reference to the teaching of the divine word, in accordance with which the synod members vow to work, since through this work, as it is said later, the church is to grow in all things, thus also in teaching. In this version of the obligation, it obviously coincides with the modified religious oath, which basically only serves to bring the doctrine into conformity with the

The same is true for the Lutheran and Reformed synods, which differ in their interpretation of the sacred Scriptures. Since now both the Reformed and the Lutheran synods have to take this vow, which nevertheless diverge with respect to the doctrines of distinction in the interpretation of the sacred Scriptures, respectively contradict each other, the vow must necessarily either be ambiguous, that the same words for the different confessions should admit a different meaning, or, if the same words are to have and express the same sense, the doctrines of distinction must be dispensed with, for instance, because they are regarded as merely human opinions either contradictory to Scripture or transcending Scripture, so that the vow would have to be limited in sense to the consensus of both confessions, as far as it extends. But in the one case, as in the other, the union character of the synodal vow cannot be denied.

3. But as in the common worship of the regional synod, as well as in the identical obligation of all its members to the obedience of faith to the divine word, the Protestant regional church of the Grand Duchy of Saxony-Weimar presents itself not only as a constitution, but also as a community in faith and doctrine, so also in the common work, to which all synod members, without distinction of confession, are called not only for the so-called externals, but expressly also in relation to questions of doctrine and confession.

According to § 19, the introduction of new church-legal norms with regard to worship, doctrinal order, catechisms, hymnals and agendas is made dependent on the approval of the regional synod, which approval naturally presupposes prior consultation and decision-making by the synod on the relevant bills of the church regiment. Since the above-mentioned matters concern doctrine and the confession both directly (such as the doctrinal order and the catechisms) and indirectly, it is impossible to maintain with any justification that the Protestant regional church as such has no relationship to the confession, but is only an association for the joint management of external church matters, insofar as these do not affect the area of doctrine in any way. This is now believed to be proven by the same § 19, since the relevant participation assigned to the synod there is only granted under the explicit condition,

that the confession cannot be a subject either of the synod's decision-making or of ecclesiastical legislation in general.

However, anyone who wanted to conclude from this provision limiting the participation of the synod that the synod was not allowed to deliberate and decide on doctrinal and confessional issues would be contradicting the rest of the Constitution.

This is because the agreement, and thus also the deliberation and decision-making of the synod with regard to doctrinal rules, catechisms, etc., is just as expressly demanded. If one does not want to bring § 19 into contradiction with itself, then it only remains to understand by the confession, on which the synod is not to pass a resolution, the symbolic books themselves, which are not to form the subject either of a synodal resolution or of ecclesiastical legislation in general. Assuming now that (similar to § 1.) with this provision the continuation of the previous authority of the symbolic books, both Lutheran and Reformed, which is also to be respected by the regional synod, is to be preserved, it would follow for the synod members that in the deliberation of Lutheran doctrinal codes, catechisms, etc., they must respect the Lutheran doctrinal code. On the other hand, when discussing reformed doctrinal codes, catechisms, etc., they would have to base their deliberations on the reformed confession as the authoritative and decisive norm. Since it is one and the same assembly, however, which is to judge doctrine and thereby measure with double standards, since, due to the confessionally mixed composition of the synod, without an *itio in partes* being provided for, Lutherans have to decide on the reformed and reformed on Lutheran doctrinal rules, catechisms, etc. with equal authority, it is impossible to describe the confessional character of a church organized in such a way, respective synod, as anything other than unconfessional. Yes, one must further say that the synod and its members, especially since they have been obligated to exercise their activity in obedience to the divine word, would be expected to do something that they could not do without sinning, if the doctrines of distinction of both confessions were not to be counted among the indifferent middle doctrines, which, measured by the divine word, could be called neither truths nor errors, and thus could be conceded to each other as harmless special opinions without their own denial of divine truth. Exactly the same, however, applies

4. of § 35, according to which the members of the committee to be elected by each synod before its conclusion without any consideration of confession, consisting of the president of the synod and 4 synod members, which thus may be composed of persons of different confessions, even possibly once of all Lutherans or of all Reformed, shall be elected for the interim period until the beginning of the next synod.

in filling clerical positions, in dismissing clergy, in investigating clergy for doctrine, in deciding on a congregation's objections to the doctrine of the clergy designated for it, or on the existence of a clergyman's canonical attributes, etc.

shall take part in the deliberations and decision-making of the Church Council as extraordinary members with voting rights. According to the foregoing, we can dispense with further proof of how this institution both decisively denies the view that this regional church as such and in its entirety has nothing to do with matters concerning doctrine, and also clearly imprints the unchurched confessional character on a church organized in this way.

Another objection, borrowed from this, that the various attempts to bring about a ritual union have so far been in vain, as well as that the new Protestant church book, which contains only Lutheran forms for baptism and the Lord's Supper, is not used in the Reformed congregations, cannot overturn the above verdict. The fact that the uniformity of the form of worship for the congregations of both confessions has not yet been achieved does not prove that the attempts directed toward it will not be continued and that they can achieve their purpose sooner or later. And they can not only be continued according to the introduced and undoubtedly rightly existing synodal order with ecclesiastical law authorization, they will also be continued, as must be concluded at least from the report submitted to the first regional synod by the Grand Ducal Church Government, since according to the same the clergy have been instructed,

Where the older agendas are no longer available, or where they have been in use for a long time and are not in a condition that corresponds to the dignity of the service, the "Evangelische Kirchenbuch" (Protestant Church Book) is to be immediately adopted and put into use. Nothing is mentioned in the report about any restriction of this measure to the Lutheran congregations. On the contrary, since in the same section, which deals with worship under V., the introduction of a new order of pericopes in all churches of the country, which already took place in 1855, is motivated by this,

that the necessary agreement on this side of church life should also have been established everywhere,

The conclusion to be drawn from this is that with the aforementioned agendas, the church regime also intended to establish uniformity in the cultus in all churches of the country. Be that as it may, however, and even if this is not - or at least no longer - the aim, but the previous diversity of the forms of worship in the country should be left as it is for the time being, this can nevertheless by itself not affect the other facts and orders. In itself, this cannot overturn the other facts and orders in which the united confessional character of the Protestant state church is clearly expressed, but at most can be regarded as a sign that the Union Principle has not yet permeated and homogeneously formed all expressions of life in the church of Saxony-Weimar, even if many of them do. But it does not follow from this that

this church is still an evang. Lutheran, which would only be the case if the Lutheran confession - at least in principle - had to regulate exclusively all ecclesiastical expressions of life, which, in view of the new synodal order, cannot be said of the Lutheran regional church of the Grand Duchy, but least of all can be proven by it, that it is said to have been expressly assured even on the part of the government (no doubt *bona fide*, although erroneously) on occasion, as well as confirmed by tacit acceptance of a declaration drafted and submitted in this sense by a number of clergymen, which we only want to mention, without, by the way, considering a refutation of the conclusions drawn from it to be necessary.

We hereby believe that we have sufficiently substantiated and justified the decision on your question given at the beginning of this letter. The Lord knows how difficult it has become for us to make the same decision, and to make it in the way that has been done here. It is indeed no small thing to have to deny the Lutheran confessional character of a regional church, which for centuries has been a shining example to the other German Lutheran churches through its proven confessional fidelity, through outstanding achievements in theological science, through wholesome orders in churches and schools, and whose memory will remain a blessing as long as there is an Evangelical Lutheran church, after the changes made with it in the spirit and in favor of the modern union, in principle and in accordance with the law! Thus, it is also difficult for us that we must worry that this decision will reduce rather than increase the already small number of friends of our church outside Prussia. Nevertheless, we have not been able to avoid it without neglecting to carry out the mandate given to us by the last General Synod for such cases, and without incurring the reproach of having denied our brotherly counsel and help to our faithful from Weimar, who are severely challenged in this matter, despite their pleas. How happy we would have been if we could have decided differently with a clear conscience! But we cannot do anything against the recognized truth; we cannot apply double standards and judge the Saxe-Weimar Regional Church differently than we judged the Protestant Regional Church in Prussia, which is organized in the same way in all essentials, almost 50 years ago and therefore avoided it in obedience to God's Word. May those who come after us have the better fate of experiencing the restoration of a Lutheran regional church in Saxony-Weimar and of being able to reverse the decision we have made.

. Breslau, March 30, 1876.

The Ober-Kirchen-Collegium of the Lutheran Church in Prussia. E. Huschke.

(From the Wroclaw Church Gazette.)

(Translated "by Prof. A. Crämer.)

Compendium of the Theology of the Fathers

from

M. Heinrich Eckhardt.

(Continued.)

2. of the angels in general.

I. The name.

What does the name Angel mean?

Augustin: "Angel is a name of office, not of nature. For what in Greek is angel, in Latin is nuncio (German: Bote)." 1)

II. The description.

Augustine: "An angel is a spirit, a bodiless, invisible, rational, intelligible, immortal being; the good ones are light and sufferingless, the bad ones ugly and subject to suffering." 2) Connect with Damascenus: "An angel is a rational being, always mobile, his, powerful, free-will, bodiless, serving God, by grace, not by nature, partaking of immortality." 3)

III. The freedom of the will.

So that the individual parts of this description would become more obvious, I ask first: Were the angels created powerful?

Augustine: "The angels were created in such a way that, if they wanted, they could stand in the light of bliss, but also, if they wanted, they could fall "4).

Prove this:

Theodoret: "God created the whole nature of the incorporeal beings in such a way that he endowed them with reason and immortality. But it is a peculiarity of the rational to possess free will." 5)

Angelus officii nomen est, non naturae. Nam Angelus Graece, qui latine Nuntius appellatur. August. in Explic. Ego sum, qui sum.

Angelus Spiritus est, substantia incorporea, invisibilis, rationalis, intellectualis, immortalis, bonorum lucida et impassibilis, malorum tetra et passibilis. Aug. de cognit. v. vitae c. 6-.

Angelus est substantia intellectualis, semper mobilis, suae potestatis, arbitrioque libera, incorporealis, Dei ministra, per gratiam, non naturam immortalitatem consecuta. Damasc. 1. 2. de Fide c. 3.

Tales creati sunt angeli, ut si vellent, in beatitudinis luce persisterent; si autem vellent, etiam labi possent. Aug. de Eccles. dogm. c. 62.

Deus universam naturam incorporeorum creavit, rationalem eam et immortalem efficiens. Rationalis autem proprium est libero arbitrio potiri. Theod. qu. 36. in Genes.

Augustin: "If the angels were naturally unchangeable, the devil and his angels would never have fallen out of the comradeship of the same "1).

Augustine: "Even the angels, who existed, if they had not been free, how would they have been crowned? "2) Prosper: "For it was their will that, while the wicked fell away of their own free will, they themselves remained in their dignity. And therefore, because of their constancy, they are made eternally happy, certain of their perseverance, and so perfectly blessed that they neither desire nor are able to become more blessed. "3)

IV. The incorporeality.

Further it is said in the description that the angels are incorporeal; but now the angel's bread is mentioned; but by bread only bodies are nourished?

Augustine: "The manna is called angel bread, not because angels satiate themselves with it, who have no need of food, but because, like the law, it was given to the people through the ministry of angels." 4)

But also some of the fathers call them physically?

Augustin: "Therefore we say that the rational beings are corporeal, because they are circumscribed by space, as also the human soul, which is enclosed by the flesh "5).

V. The performance and the purpose.

For what ultimate purpose are the angels created?

Epiphanius: "The angels are created by God for the guard of that which was formed by Him "6).

Et si angeli naturaliter incommutabiles essent, nunquam de eorum consortio Diabolus et angeli ejus cecidissent. Aug. de Fide ad Petr. c. 23-.

Angeli quoque, qui perstiterunt, si liberi non fuissent, unde coronarentur? Aug. de vera et falsa poenit. c. 16.

Voluntatis enim eorum fuit, quod, malis sponte cadentibus, ipsi in sua dignitate permanserunt; ideoque merito suae stabilitatis in aeternum felices effecti, de sua permansione securi sunt et ita perfecte beati, ut nec cupiant beatiores fieri ultra, nec valeant. Prosp. de con tempi, c. 3.

Panis Angelorum Manna dicitur, non quod illo Angeli, qui cibo non egent, saturentur; sed quod per Angelorum ministerium, sicut lex, populo praeberetur. Aug. de Mirab. Script, c. 23.

Ex eo intellectuales naturas corporeas esse dicimus, quia loco circumscribuntur, sicut et anima humana, quae carne clauditur. Aug. de Spir. et anima c. 18.

Angeli facti sunt a Deo ad providentiam eorum, quae ab ipso constructa sunt. Epiph. ex Proclo 1. 2. tom. 1.

It says in the description: they serve God, does this part of the description also apply to the fallen angels?

Augustin: "God also needs the evil spirits as servants, namely for the punishment of the godless or for the probation of the pious, in another way to this, in another way to that. For though every one of these spirits is evil in that he seeks to harm with an evil will, yet he receives the power to harm only from Him under whom all things are. For as the evil will is not from God, so no power is without from God." 1) Gregory: "Not only do the good angels who help serve God, but also the evil ones who tempt; not only those who make the steps easy for those who repent, but also those who make them difficult for those who do not want to repent." 2)

VI. the time of their creation.

When were the angels created?

Origen: "The ecclesiastical proclamation contains that there are angels of God and good powers that serve him in carrying out the salvation of men; but when they were created and what they are like is not clear enough." 3)

But if you at least ask about probability, what will you answer?

Augustin: "The first day is of the angelic nature, as which was first named with the word 'heaven'. From which it is evident that on the first day the spiritual, i.e. angelic nature was created" 4).

Utitur Deus ministris etiam Spiritibus malis, ad vindictam malorum vel probationem bonorum, alio modo ac illam rem, alio ad istam. Quamvis enim inde sit quisque malignus Spiritus, quia mala voluntate nocere appetit tamen nocendi potestatem non accipit, nisi ab illo, sub quo sunt omnia. Quia sicut non est mala voluntas a Deo, sicut non est potestas, nisi a Deo. Aug. 1. 2. ad Simpl. q. 1.

Non ministrant Deo solummodo Angeli boni, qui adjuvent, sed etiam mali, qui probent. Non solum qui a culpa redeuntes sublevant, sed etiam, qui redire nolentes gravent. Gregory. 1. 2. in Job. c. 16.

Est illud in Ecclesiastica praedicatione, esse Angelos Dei quosdam et virtutes bonas, quae ei ministrent ad salutem hominum consummandam; sed quando isti creati sint et quomodo sint, non satis manifeste distinguitur. Orig. 1. 1. περί αρχόν.

Primus this ipsa est angelica natura, quae primo coeli nomine nuncupata est. Unde ostenditur, primo die factam spiritalem i. c. angelicam naturam. August, ad Oros. qu. 21.

Can you cite something to testify to this?

Epiphanius: "If not at the same time with heaven and earth also the angels had been created, he would ever not have said to Job: 'When the stars became, all the angels praised me.'" 1)

But do you think that the Mosaic creation story includes the creation of the angels?

Augustine: "Where the sacred Scripture speaks of the creation of the world, it does not clearly say whether or in what order the angels were created; but, if they are not transitions, they are designated either by the word heaven (since it says: 'In the beginning God created heaven and earth'), or rather by the word light." 2)

So, can we doubt their creation because the Mosaic history does not explicitly mention it?

Augustine: "Elsewhere, however, Scripture testifies to this in the clearest terms."

3)

VII. Their orders.

Are the angels the same in rank and degree, or different?

Augustin: "How it is with that most blessed and heavenly society, and what the differences of the persons are, so that while all are called by the common name angel, there are archangels, and how those four names differ from each other, in which the apostle seems to have summarized the whole heavenly society, since he speaks: 'Both the thrones and dominions and principalities and authorities,' let those say who can, provided, however, they can prove what they say; I confess that I do not know." 4) But does one not reluctantly admit that there is such a difference of their orders and degrees?

Basil: "Some of the angels preside over nations, others guide individual believers. But as much more excellent is a whole people than

Nisi una cum coelo et terra Angeli quoque creati essent, non utique dixisset ad Job: Quomodo genita fuerant sidera, laudaverunt me omnes Angeli. Epiph. 1. 2. tom. 2.

Ubi de mundi constitutione sacrae literae loquuntur, non evidenter dicitur, utrum vel quo ordine creati sint Angeli: sed, si praetermissi non sunt, vel coeli nomine (ubi dictum est: In principio creavit Deus coelum et terram), vel potius lucis, significati sunt. August, de civit. 1. II. c. 9.

Alibi autem hoc sancta scriptura voce clarissima testatur. August, ibid.

Quomodo se habeat beatissima illa et superna societas, quae ibi sint differentiae personarum, ut, cum omnes generali nomine Angeli vocentur, sint tamen illic Archangeli: et quid inter se distent quatuor illa vocabula, quibus universam istam coelestem societatem videtur Apostolus esse complexus, dicendo: Sive Sedes, sive Dominationes, sive Principatus, sive Potestates, dicant, qui possunt: si tamen possunt probare, quae dicunt; Ego me ista ignorare confiteor. Aug. in Ench. ad Laur.

a single man, so much greater, of course, must be the dignity of an angel who presides over nations, before that in whom the guard of individuals is entrusted. 1) Gregory: "Those who proclaim lesser things are called angels, but those who proclaim the highest things are called archangels. " 2) Isidorus: "Among the angels there is a distinction of powers, and according to the dignity of their degrees, offices are assigned to them, and some are preferred to others, both in height of power and in knowledge of strength. " 3)

If there are different orders of angels, how many are there? .

Salonius: "There were ten orders of angels, but one fell through pride, and therefore the good angels always work to have the number supplemented out of men, and brought back to the perfect, i.e. to the ten number. " 4)

So there are nine left now?

Gregory: "There are nine orders of angels: angels, archangels, powers, authorities, principalities, dominions, thrones, cherubim and seraphim. " 5)

VIII. Their species.

How many times are the angels?

Theodoret: "Some have preserved their goodwill towards the Creator, but others have turned to wickedness. Accordingly, the Almighty God, distinguishing between the merits of the angels, has set some of them to remain in the eternal light without apostasy, but the others, who have voluntarily fallen from the state of their majesty, he has cast down to the punishment of eternal damnation. " 6) (To be continued.)

Alii Angelorum gentibus praesident, alii singulos credentes consequuntur. Quanto vero praestantior est gens tota uno viro, tanto nimirum majorem necesse est esse Angeli gentibus praesidentis dignitatem supra eum, cui singulorum praefectura commissa est. Basil. 1. 3. contra Apol. Eunom.

Hi qui minima nunciant, Angeli: qui vero summa annunciant, Archangel i dicuntur. Gregory, in Evang. homil. 34-.

Inter Angelos distantia potestatum est, et pro graduum dignitate ministeria iisdem sunt attributa, aliisque alii praeferuntur, tam culmine potestatis, quam scientia virtutis. Isid. 1. 1. de summo Bono c. 10.

Decem fuerunt ordines angelorum, sed unius cecidit per superbiam: et idcirco boni angeli semper ad hoc laborant, ut de hominibus numerus adimpleatur et perveniat ad perfectum numerum, i. e. denarium. Salon in Eccles.

Novem sunt ordines Angelorum: Angeli, Archangeli, virtutes, potestates, principatus, dominationes, Throni, Cherubin et Seraphin. Gregory. in Evang. homil. 34.

Alii benevolentiam erga Creatorem conservarunt: alii vero in malitiam declinaverunt. Theod. q. 36. in Genes. Et consequenter: Omnipotens Deus Angelorum merita discernens alios in aeterna luce sine lapsu permanere constituit: alios sponte lapsos a statu celsitudinis suae, in aeternae damnationis ultione prostravit. Greg, in 21. c. Job.

Literary.

Lectures of the Gospels. For the Sundays and Chief Festivals of the church year. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D. Complete in two volumes. Philadelphia. Lutheran Bookstore. Smith, English & Co. 1876.

As the author says in the preface, "a complete series of lectures on our pericopes, whether on the Gospels or on the Epistles, has not yet been presented in the English language". It would certainly be most gratifying that the first work of this kind in English should come from a Lutheran, if only the author were a faithful Lutheran. As much as it must be acknowledged that there is much that is excellent in these sermons, that the language is beautiful, fluent and attractive, and that the external decoration is also excellent, it is to be deplored that not only inaccurate, unchurch-like expressions, but also false doctrines are found in them.

The "*Lutheran and Missionary*" praises these sermons for saying much about Christ. But what kind of conception of Christ do the readers get when they find, among other things, the following offensive teaching in the sermon on the first Sunday in Lent: "We must not assume, however, that Christ was so sinless and spotlessly pure out of natural necessity and that his fame concerning perfect purity and righteousness was a possession that cost him nothing. It was the same thing that he ... under hot and difficult battles . . with the powers of darkness and their princes. . . Although the infallible and unchangeable God, He *emptied* Himself through the Incarnation in such a way that, taking on our nature, He thereby took on all its weaknesses, dangers and sorrows. As he thus exposed himself to hunger, pain, tears, and death, so he also exposed himself to the temptation of the danger of sinning and being eternally lost." (p. 362 f.) Synergism is openly preached. In the sermon on the young man at Nain it is said that the word of the Lord brings even the dead soul to life, but of this word it is then said: "When Christ's word of command met the consciousness of this dead man, it now came to him to obey the same. It was through this word that such consciousness was reawakened. He could neither hear from himself inwardly nor obey outwardly. That he could do both came entirely from the power of God as it was brought to him through the spoken word. But when this power came, ... it became the young man's business to use this power and obey the word. After hearing it, he had to stand up and sit down. Human activity and will must, after all, go hand in hand with divine grace.

(p. 933. f.) See also p. 212. 457. 666. (p. 933. f.) See also pp. 212, 457, 666. In the sermon on the Sunday of Septuagint, it says of beatific grace: "Divine grace wants to make active servants and workers out of people. It does not make blessed without a corresponding activity on our part. We must surrender to become co-workers with God. Human activity, under God's guidance, is a part of the economy of salvation. A man may go idly to his doom, but he cannot go to heaven without doing." (p. 306.) In the Maundy Thursday sermon it is said "that Christ gives the manna and bread of heaven to all the faithful partakers of this holy sacrament". (p. 481.) As then the author, who is also editor of the "*Lutheran and Missionary*," declares in this paper (of April 13) it to be arrogance to make it an article of faith that the unbeliever, like the true believer, receives the true body and blood at the table of the Lord.

Many other things could be mentioned. Let us only point out the falsehoods concerning the last things, the teaching that the church is not yet the bride of Christ (p. 992), the assertion that the Reformation was not perfect (p. 1067), the view that John the Baptist became impatient in prison because Christ delayed the beginning of his kingdom and left him, John, his kinsman and faithful witness, languishing in chains and not freed. How unfortunate that an otherwise beautifully appointed English gospel postilion cannot be consistently recommended, and can only be used by those who are grounded in pure doctrine. - G.

Protest.

The General Conference of Preachers of the Eastern District of the Synod of Missouri, Ohio, &c., which, following the meetings of the said District, met at Baltimore on the 23d day of August I. J., hereby gives notice that it regards the participation of some of its members in the orphanage festival at Mount Vernon, N. Y., as described in the "*Lutheran Magazine*" No. 23. I. J., as a kind of pulpit fellowship contrary to sound Lutheran practice, that it has admonished the brethren in question, and is by no means disposed, as it might appear without the publication of this protest, to approve of such a thing.

Baltimore, August 24, 1876.

On behalf of the above conference
H. Hanser.

Ecclesiastical Contemporary History.

I. America.

Two free conferences were held in the month of July among Southern Lutherans who accept the Augsburg Confession without reserve, one in Catawba County, N. C., the other in New Market, Va. Professor Schmidt has been present and active at both. At the former, the theses adopted by the English Lutheran Conference in Missouri in 1872 were the basis of the discussion; at the latter, the fourth, fifth, and sixth articles of the Augsburg Confession were discussed. G.

Voices on the recent decisions of the Pennsylvania and New York

Synods. Rev. Brobst reports in his journal that at the last meeting of the Pennsylvania Synod he proposed "that we do not appoint a delegate to the Reformed Synod this year, but send a committee to them to formulate a plan whereby we might work together to end the communal churches in our county"; but that the proposal was not adopted. Concerning the acceptance of the report of the Council delegates on the Galesburg Rule, he says: "When the Galesburg report was read at the Synod in Reading, I and others were so surprised that we did not know what to say. There was a peculiar mood in the synod which I cannot describe to you. And before we could recover from our surprise, the report was adopted. We were not entirely satisfied with the report, but we were not prepared at that moment and at that hour to propose an improvement in the proper form. The adoption of it was a little too rapid in general, under the influence of the well-meaning, but, we believe, mistaken friends of peace." - The "Pilgrim" from Reading, who before the meeting of the Pennsylvania Synod spoke many an excellent word against the Unionist direction in that Synod, but afterwards brought a favorable report of the meeting, now, therefore attacked, thus speaks out: "During the night to-morrow, and after the close of the reading of the delegate's report, the opponents of the 'Galesburg Rule,' as is well known, made a total change of front. We were, admittedly, too much surprised by this highly unexpected sudden turn of events, so much so that it took us people of ordinary stature, with somewhat slow-moving orientation, quite some time to clearly recognize our own and the opponents' situation. But we can testify that much in truth, that we were not able to meet the changed terrain position, the reversed change of mind, which was expressed so enthusiastically by the opponents of the rule, perhaps just for that reason, with unreserved confidence; but we let ourselves be put off by trustworthy 'insightful ones' with an achievement, which, however, did not really want to become tangible for us. - The over-favorable correspondence crept into our columns at this time of lack of insight and understanding of the situations, out of abundance of tropical heat and through the overwhelming influence of a unanimous delegate's report. - We now realize, after prolonged consideration, that by the delegate's report, which completely satisfies our opponents, the decision is delayed, but certainly cannot be omitted. A 'rule' that stands on God's Word and the confessional writings of the Church (so recognized by the friends of the rule and admitted by the opponents) cannot possibly be left to the arbitrary discretion of the individual for acceptance or non-acceptance.... The execution, the observance of the mentioned rule, is again left to the discretion of the individual conscience. It is precisely

The hope expressed in the report of the delegates that **sooner** or **later one would** be convinced of the nullity of the rule - allows such a wide margin for the most vehement opponents of the rule (which stands on God's word and confessions) that they have been touched in the most "pleasant" way. The simple rule received such an eloquent modification that those who were fiercely opposed with their own weapons and spirit were "gladly" approved: The rule, hard-fought with peculiar weapons and spirit, has been approved with "joy". We are sincerely pleased that the German Synod of New York understood the "Galesburg Rule" differently from the Pennsylvanian, that it accepted it **without exception**, thereby acting less diplomatically than honestly. Her cause sir has done well." - A correspondent of the "Pilgrim" also lets himself be heard in No. 34: "Dear Pilgrim! For so long we have jointly raised our lance against all kinds of unionist and syncretist spooks that seek to do their mischief in our dear Lutheran Church, that even now we cannot let go of each other in this holy struggle, in spite of the fact that people outside think that we, along with so many other faithful comrades, were either beaten to death by mice or led away as prisoners in your hometown the other day, or that we even defected to the enemy as faithless traitors. For a long time I could no longer dip a pen in ink because of my displeasure and sadness, so pained was I by the misfortune that had befallen our holy cause in your immediate vicinity. Now that I see you again cheerful and in good spirits, my spirits return and I realize that I owe it to ourselves, as well as to our brothers who condemn us so mercilessly, to speak an explanatory word about the justly condemned course of events at the Synod in Reading." The Correspondent concludes the following defense with the following words: "The representatives of the Rule went to the meeting that morning full of eager expectation and hope of victory; they left it deceived and displeased. They were generally comforted: Soon the Synod of New York will speak, then at the General Council it will be either - or! and God willing, we too will see each other again in the course of the year! - Summa Summarum: We have by no means submitted to the mum-mum rule, as is hastily claimed, since the rule itself was not even negotiated; and - postponed is not canceled!" - If this defense is not entirely sufficient for us, since it would have been the duty of resolute Lutherans to protest, or, if the Galesburg Rule were offered to them as a second edition Acron rule, to renounce it, - this much is certain, that at the "Pennsylvanian" Synod a real *Yankee trick* was played, and that it was so finely laid out that even some hitherto brave witnesses allowed themselves to be taken by surprise. Well, they are picking themselves up again and the Lord will make the sincere ones succeed. May God lead them to victory. - The "Church Gazette" of Canada, now edited by Pastor Spring, takes note of the report of a New York correspondent of the Wisconsin Parish Journal, and then continues: "This correspondent claims in the same article that a certain Doctor of Theology has quite naively declared publicly that he considers it wise and prudent to allow sectarian preachers into his pulpits because members of his congregation are living in mixed marriages. If this is so, we declare that we do not speak the word of such "assumptions", and that in the entire Canadasynod there is not a single pastor who would let sect preachers into his pulpit to members of his congregation who are too dear to a sectarian spouse. No, if one wanted to mix such a mixture of common brotherhood on Lutheran pulpits and altars into the "exceptions", then we would also ten times rather accept the rule without clause. Thus we can clearly see that in the wording of the decision of the Synod in Reading, the abuse of the rule is not to be avoided.

The rule is much broader than the New York Ministry's version. And if, notwithstanding this, we are of opinion that there may be exceptions to the rule, we at the same time declare on the other hand that a man ceases to be a decided Lutheran who considers it 'wise and understanding' to allow sectarian preachers into his pulpit because members of his congregations live in mixed marriages. We can see neither 'wisdom' nor 'understanding' in such a unionist practice, but the opposite, because thereby the congregations of the said Lord suffer great damage, at least the faithful, resolute confession of the Lutheran Church. It would be 'wisdom' and 'understanding' if a pastor would declare in such cases that his members should remain firm in their doctrine and not let themselves be turned away from the false-believing part of the marriage, and if the latter do not want to hear his Lutheran sermon, they know where their respective churches are. Especially here the word of Jesus applies: 'No one can serve two masters. But it is called serving two masters, if once the Lutheran pastor teaches the justification of the sinner before God only by true faith in the Savior JESUS Christ, and perhaps on the same day in the same pulpit the sanctimoniousness and the 'feeling good' is raised up to the third heaven; or when the Lutheran pastor speaks of the benefit, blessing and necessity of infant baptism, and at another time the Baptist brother tries to prove in the same pulpit that infant baptism is no baptism at all. No! No! The Canada Synod does not want to know anything about such exceptions, because it is a Lutheran Synod and not a syncretistic one; for if pulpit fellowship has been imputed to it here and there (!), then in the case in question it was precisely not such" (?). - The "Reformirte Kirchenzeitung" expresses itself as follows: "It seems unreasonable to us if one gets excited about the Lutherans, who only want to give their pulpits and altars for Lutherans for preaching and sacraments. According to their principles, they cannot act otherwise if they want to be conscientious. The Lutheran believes that all those who do not teach Lutheran doctrine are mistaken in the basic truths of Scripture, therefore he cannot allow such false teachers to enter a Lutheran pulpit or the followers of such false doctrine to go to communion with them. One must respect the conscientiousness of those who act according to their principles; they deserve higher respect than those who have the same principles but do not want to act according to them, partly out of fear of man, partly out of soft accommodation to prevailing prejudices."

Chiliasm in the General Council. Dr. Seiß, editor of the "*Lutheran and Missionary*", writes in regard to the Serbian-Turkish war: "While the great powers of the world are keenly watching the outcome and watching each other with jealous eyes, the Church, with the role of prophecy in her hand, is waiting in patience for the beginning of the end, when Jerusalem shall no longer be trodden down by the heathen and the holy land shall be freed from the curse of desolation which has rested upon it for nearly 2000 years."- How often has the Lord Doctor prophesied! This prophecy, like that of the Antichrist Napoleon, will also come to pass. - Item, who is silent on the matter, seems inclined to it! G.

"Our Church Paper praises the *Lecturer*, who agitates for the Granger Order in the state of Virginia, for his manners, his talent as an orator, his zeal. Since no word of warning is included, this cannot be considered other than a recommendation. This is not right. G.

Methodist scholarship. The editor of the "Familienfreund", a Dr. phil, writes about himself and his paper: "It is the brothers' paper - your paper. As 'E pluribus unum' - as one among many, among you, I personally do what is in

my powers. Personally, I have no more to get in from the leaves than any other member of our conference."

Methodism. The Philadelphia *Inquirer* reports that a Methodist preacher there "exchanged pulpits" with a Universalist preacher, noting that this had been happening elsewhere for years.

Methodists find Synergists. In the "Haus und Herd," a Methodist journal supposedly devoted to instruction and entertainment, etc., there is an article with the heading: "How are we to think of the relationship of divine grace to human freedom? In this article it is stated that the Methodists profess synergism. It says among other things: By the term monergism is meant the exclusive operation of divine grace in the human heart; by the term synergism, the cooperation of divine grace and human freedom.... . Our church order in the 7th article correctly says that man, through the fall, has departed far from original righteousness; how far, is not said; but obviously it is meant that in man the image of God has not been completely destroyed.... Monergism, then, has no play in our view, but the means of grace is thoroughly synergistic. The two active factors are the divine grace on the one hand, and to you we put above - (really!) -, and the human freedom on the other hand, of which however none excludes the other, but both work in most beautiful harmony with each other. (Cf. "Lutherans" of August 16.) G.

Methodism. A strange confession is made by the *Northern Christian Advocate*, the official organ of the Methodist Episcopalians. It says: "In the last 14 years the whole church reported 2,072,686 probationary members; but of these only 509,316 remained, about 22 per cent! That is, out of 2,072,686, only 509,316 were left in the church at the end of the first year, and 1,587,370 had fallen away again, or far more than the total number of our church members. That is, in 14 years the Methodist Episcopal Church has lost as many members as would be necessary to form another community as numerous as it, with a surplus of several hundred thousand." (L. Ztschr.)

The papists in America are indeed quite poor people: they still have no saints of their own. The Roman "Freeman's Journal" hopes for improvement only "when the Catholics begin to sanctify themselves. "Only when we have some real saints in this country," says the same, "will we perform a work of which the builders will not be ashamed. The Holy Father expressed the poverty of this country in the words he spoke to the Reverend Dr. Paw of the Diocese of Ogdensburg: 'The United States is a wonderful country in material energy and flourishing, but it has no saints!'"

II. Abroad.

Saxony. Lic. Stöckhardt has broken away from the regional church and has joined Pastor Ruhland with a significant part of his congregation and now officiates together with him. A free Lutheran congregation has also formed in Crimmitzschau and has appointed the dismissed missionary Willkomm as its pastor.

W.

President Dr. v. Harleß is close to going blind, according to a message received by the Leipziger Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung!

Oldenburg. Dr. Just. Ruperti has been appointed by the Grand Duke as church councilor and superintendent of the Principality of Lübeck and first pastor in Eutin. At the same time, the Allgemeine Leipziger Kirchenzeitung reports from Oldenburg: The

The shortage of theologians is increasing; already smaller positions have to be combined with larger ones, as has already happened several times in Jeverlande, and foreign theologians are drawn into the country every year. The free election of pastors and the insufficient income of a large number of pastorates has led to the fact that at present not a single pastor's son in the whole country is studying theology. Of the 85 pastorates in the duchy, according to the latest estimate, twenty-two still earn less than 2000 marks and seventeen do not earn more than 1800 marks.

Hanover. Dr. Münkler writes in his *Neue Zeitblatte* of July 6: "The resistance to the new form of marriage, which, by the way, still awaits the highest confirmation, seems to be limited to Hermannsburg and specifically to the person of Pastor Th. Harms, who is, however, determined to sacrifice his office if his old way of marriage is not left unchanged. At a conference of clergymen, which was assembled at the annual mission festival in Hermannsburg as usual, the matter was discussed in detail and seriously. What reasons Pastor Harms gives for his refusal, he will publish himself. What is learned about it will have to be left until then, since it is very insufficient and amounts to saying that Harms could not allow the state to interfere in the church in this way." - It would indeed be very regrettable if Past. Harms left the state church because of the institution of civil marriage.

W.

Three petitions to the synod are now circulating in **Saxony**. The first concerns church discipline. "Our first request," it says, "to the reverend regional synod is therefore generally to 1. work toward the revival of Protestant church discipline in the Lutheran regional church of Saxony with the high church regime. ... Our second request, the fulfillment of which we consider urgently necessary not only for educational reasons, but also for the preservation of the dignity of the church, indeed for its continued existence, is therefore directed to 2. that the application of church discipline be ordered against the persistent refusers of church marriage and the baptism of their children..... We request the Synod to offer its hand to this end, 3. that church discipline be restored against all who live in public sins and persist unrepentantly. . . . We submit to the reverend Synod the urgent request to decide 4. that in the cases of manifest sin against God and His church mentioned under 2 and 3, until actual proof of the change of heart, communion discipline, i.e. after exhaustion of all admonitions, denial of absolution, exclusion from Holy Communion, and deprivation of all ecclesiastical rights of honor, such as the right to vote, the right of patronage, and ecclesiastical burial, must take place. We ask - in order to exclude all doubts that have arisen in recent times, 5. for express recognition of the right, respectively obligation, due to the clergy to object to the absolution and administration of the sacrament in the cases mentioned under 2 and 3 until the decision of the Consistorii. ... We add the request, 6. that the Reverend Synod make it the duty of the clergy and church councils, as far as this is at all possible, to be concerned about the restoration of the timely personal confession of the communicants. And because finally the participation of the church council in all ecclesiastical matters of discipline is by no means to be excluded, but rather to be considered very desirable,.... the Synod is hereby urgently requested 7. to authentically declare the... 7. for an authentic explanation of the provisions concerning the eligibility of churchwardens in the sense and interest of the church." The second petition concerns doctrinal discipline and takes into consideration the notorious Pastor Sulze. His abominable teachings are set forth and it is pointed out that "by the in the above mentioned manner torn down

The report says, among other things, that "doctrinal arbitrariness and irresponsible denial of the most important confessions of our beatific faith in the widest circles of our Lutheran regional church, which is completely incompatible with the vows of office we have taken, have given rise to deep, painful and, in its consequences, perhaps very disastrous distress. There it is also said, among other things, that distress has been given to "many faithful members of the regional church who have been distressed in their conscience as to whether, under the present circumstances, the Lutheran regional church can still be regarded as an intact one, and whether it is possible to remain in it for conscience' sake. "Of what consequence", it then continues, "this latter moment is, the undersigned do not need to elaborate, in the present time, where the spread of sectarianism also in our church, and especially the Lutheran separation in Saxony knocks in the most serious way on the doors of the national church and a neglect of the most necessary church doctrinal discipline or an even too lax handling of it must be recognized as the straightest way to work into the hands of those separated communities and to dig the grave of the national church. The undersigned have neither been able nor willing to remain silent about the aforementioned grievances, so as not to become complicit in the least part in the woe that the Lord pronounces on those 'who offend the least of these who believe in Him'. In the confident and trusting expectation that the Reverend Synod will be concerned about the preservation of the unaltered confessional state of the Lutheran Regional Church of Saxony and thus about its unified and blessed further development, the undersigned unite in the twofold petition: The Reverend Synod wishes to petition the Lutheran Regional Consistory for the following Lutheran Landesconsistorium that the annoyances caused by Sulze's doctrine, which is contrary to Scripture and the confession, be lifted by church order, and that similar annoyances be prevented for the future.

Free Church. In a critique of Wyneken's theses on the Free Church, which were discussed by our Synod of the Middle District in 1874, the "Pilgrim from Saxony" of October 3, 1875, remarks among other things: "As Lutherans we protest against the imposition of recognizing an ecclesiastical constitutional form, may it have its head in an elected synod or in the pope, as a law of the church binding for all times." We note here that it does not occur to us or to any true Lutheran to demand any constitution of the church as the only valid one. What we claim is only that not every one, e.g. one according to which the state rules in the church, is one that agrees with God's Word or is an adiaphoron. W.

Leipzig. About a new church institution in this city, the "Sächsische Kirchen- und Schulblatt" of the L. Z. takes the following. The following: "The experiences made elsewhere, especially in our neighboring state, before the introduction of the law on the certification of civil status in Saxony, according to which an unusually large number of bridal couples did not seek church blessing and many parents did not seek baptism for their children, led to a number of new institutions when the above-mentioned law came into force, in order to make the ecclesiastical consecration of these important moments of family life more desirable also for those who should not be willing to seek the ecclesiastical marriage and baptism, which are no longer prescribed by law. Thus, the wedding ceremony, with organ accompaniment, singing and decorated altar, is currently granted free of charge to each individual couple who requests it for the days from Monday to Friday; the baptismal ceremonies are usually moved from the sacristy to the church, in order to make them more solemn with organ and singing; for this, too, costs are no longer charged. These facilities alone have done much to keep alive and revive the ecclesiastical spirit in our community, and only a small number of those who have been blessed by the church are still in attendance.

of their marriage covenant before the altar of the Lord, or do not seek baptism for their children."

Württemberg. The Leipziger Allgem. Kirchenzeitung of July 28 reports: A number of seminarians from Schönthal Monastery appeared in Ems on occasion of an excursion undertaken under the direction of a repentant and asked the emperor for the honor of being allowed to introduce themselves to him, a favor which was granted. "Do they all remain theologians?" the emperor asked the repentant. "Yes, most of them," was his answer. After an enthusiastic hymn of praise to His Majesty by the young men, the Emperor concluded, "visibly moved": "It must be a joy to be allowed to lay the foundation with such young people, but not to unbelief, as is unfortunately almost the order of the day. I hope that you will become capable theologians. Farewell, gentlemen!"

Prussia. The Prussian Church Gazette of July 15 writes: "Regarding the obligation of our parishioners in the Mark to contribute to church buildings, I have already drawn attention to a decree of the Royal Government of Frankfurt a. O. of October 14, 1875, which declared the old legal provisions of the Mark, according to which every inhabitant of the province, without distinction of confession, had to contribute to Protestant church buildings, to be repealed by the new law of May 14, 1873. Likewise, in 1875 and 1876, the Potsdam government, in three decrees, exempted the so-called Reformierten or French in the Uckermark from such contributions. Recently, the Fredersdorf congregation was to be forced to contribute to parish building repairs and the relocation of an uninformed pastor, and since the government initially decided in the same sense, the congregation was forced to file suit. Before the case reached a court decision, the government acquitted our people in a decree of April 3, 1876. The course of the trial could not be stopped by this, and on May 12 of this year the District Court at Angermünde decided in the same sense. Although, as one hears, the Lutheran congregation wants to appeal, both the government decree and the court decision already have value for all Lutheran congregations in the Mark.

From the history of civil marriage in Germany, Dr. Münkler reports the following: In a village in Bavaria, where there is an old priest with a vicar, the vicar was not at home when the registrar, i.e. the mayor, sent to the rectory and demanded the agendas. Strangely enough, the vicar's relatives delivered the same. In the meantime, when the vicar returned to perform the church wedding, he searched in vain for the agenda, and now it turned out that the registrar, in the best opinion, had thought to fulfill his duty by performing the wedding according to the agenda. Of this tragi-comic occurrence, understandably, nowhere to be read, but nevertheless it is completely vouched for. In contrast, it is of course only a trifle and not worth mentioning if, who knows how often, such language errors occur, as I heard with my own ears that the registrar, a very brave village mayor, thus addressed the bridal couple: Since, according to the law of etc., a legally valid marriage cannot be contracted before the registrar, I ask you, etc., what is your opinion? Thus the Ev. V.-Krchztg.

Schleswig-Holstein. The Freimund of June 1 writes: "In 1866, Schleswig-Holstein was incorporated into the Prussian state. The inhabitants of these two duchies almost all profess the Evangelical Lutheran Church, but the Prussian government also wants to establish the "separating union work" in the new provinces. The experiences of the saddest kind, which were made in the old provinces

does not discourage further attempts. In Kurheffen, the Prussian church policy has already initiated a free church, and now Pastor Paulsen in Kropp (near Schleswig) brings the following news in No. 2 of his "kirchlicher Anzeiger": "The near future will probably already decide which course the church development in our country will take. We consider it very likely that a Lutheran Free Church will be formed in Schleswig-Holstein before the end of this year, and not impossible that a not inconsiderable number of young theologians will make themselves available to it. The future will teach us which way God will go with his church. But we will do our best to be prepared for everything, so that such a movement does not catch us unprepared. In No. 4. of this sheet it is further stated: "It is the first duty of all church-minded people to strive for: 1) that the church can organize itself freely according to ecclesiastical laws and orders, free of all state paternalism; 2) that the church authorities are elected by the clergy and congregations and not appointed by the state; 3) that without the consultation or consent of the clergy and congregations no changes are made. 3) that without the consultation or consent of the clergy and congregations no changes in the church regulations may be made and no church laws may be suspended, but that the "church authorities" who do not carry them out will be held strictly accountable. This alone secures Evangelical Lutheran provincial churches against union and enables them to remain in the faith of the fathers. The present state, on the other hand, is a de facto union, tantamount to the slow death of the Lutheran Church of Germany. As long as there is a prospect of reaching this goal, everyone should remain calmly in the national church and work on its further development. If this is impossible, we are forced to enter the path of separation; but then it is the God-willed path for us, and it will not be too difficult for us to walk it and join the Lutheran Free Church of Prussia with its 61 congregations, 44,000 souls and 79 churches. (Pastor Paulsen thinks in the last sentence at first only of those Lutheran congregations of Prussia, which are under the Oberkirchenkollegium in Breslau; however, as is known, there is also a Lutheran Immanuel Synod in Prussia). - The final thesis seems to want to lure the Schleswig-Holsteiners into the Immanuel Synod preferred by Freimund. Hardly with success, since so far no one has been able to unravel on which doctrinal basis this synod actually stands.

W.

Hanover. After the decision of the state synod that the position of a Lutheran clergyman is incompatible with membership in the Protestant Association, the first attempt was made at the district synod at Gr.-Berkel to proceed seriously, since an active member of the association, Pastor Grütter (Hameln), was present. Rittmeister v. Hake wished that Grütter's participation in the meeting would not cause a precedent. Pastor Meyer-Hemeringen, however, took an even firmer grip and made a motion to request the Consistory to relieve the Synod from the sad situation of having to discuss church matters with a Protestant. He did not seem to remember what Oberconsistorialrath Uhlhorn had declared at the state synod, that the state consistory was not thinking of removing a Protestant Unionist clergyman as a result of the state synod's decision, but would rather "proceed extremely mildly," that is, would not do anything to him. This is what happened. At the behest of Consistorialrath Grisebach, Meyer's motion was changed into a request to Grütter to resign from the Protestant Association, which must have made him somewhat cheerful. A strong approach with a weak retreat, which teaches that one should first consider "whether one should also lead it out" or stay away from the matter. For the testimony of Grütter on the

In the evening, Hamelin citizens congratulated Pastor Grütter with a torchlight procession on the occasion of the first synod and the beautiful victory that Pastor Meyer had prepared for him. - (N. Ztbl.)

E. v. Hartmann, author of the *Philosophy of the Unconscious*, experienced some time ago an unexpected success of his doctrine of the unworthiness of existence. The lithographer Blume had attacked and beaten to death his friend and colleague Diehle in his room without any cause, and reported his deed to the police himself. The reason he gave was that he had only given Diehle the pleasures of blissful nothingness described by Hartmann, and had himself sought the opportunity to think about blissful nothingness for a few years in pleasant seclusion (in prison). If he had wanted to apply Hartmann's teaching completely, he would have had to give himself death at the same time. Robert Davidsohn took this as an occasion to write a harsh article against Hartmann in the *Berliner Börsen-Courier*, that he had converted Schopenhauer's gold (!) into copper, the strong wine of Schopenhauer into intoxicating booze. But he also attacked the person of Hartmann harshly. Hartmann, it is reported, was not able to find a publisher for his writing, and thus spent large sums not only on the publication, but also on the promotion in public newspapers, and thus achieved his great success. This and other things led Davidson to sharp attacks against Hartmann's character. Hartmann filed a criminal complaint for this reason. The court, however, left all attacks aside, except for the personal insult in one passage, for which it imposed a fine of 30 marks. As this result is already very minor, Hartmann's prosecution does not taste very much like the calm grandeur of his philosophy. He appears irritated in concern for his hard-bought fame, and may feel that it will disappear after a short existence into "blissful" nothingness. For the Wonnemonat is already behind him, and no money will secure him a place of honor in the hall of fame of German thinkers. If he has written a proud pamphlet about the self-decomposition of Christianity, he may now occupy himself with his own self-decomposition. (N. Zeitbl.)

Pope and Turk. According to a Roman correspondence of the "*Dziennik Polski*" (Polish Daily News) published in Lviv, the Roman Curie invested about 42 million francs in Turkish government securities.

The ranks of the Prussian episcopate are thinning more and more. After the Archbishop of Cologne has now been removed from office, only five bishops, namely those of Culm, Ermland, Hildesheim, Osnabrück and Limburg, will soon be legally officiating in the twelve Prussian episcopal sees. Five bishops, those of Münster and Paderborn, the two archbishops of Cologne and Posen-Gnesen, as well as the prince-bishop of Breslau, have been deprived of their episcopal functions by decision of the spiritual court. Two bishoprics, those of Fulda and Trier, are vacant due to the death of their chief shepherds and have not yet been filled, since no agreement could be reached between the government and the cathedral chapter regarding possible candidates. Negotiations for the restoration of the Trier bishopric have not yet been concluded; the chapter in question has sent a deputation to Rome to demand the pope's consent to the election of a moderate bishop.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 22.

October 1876.

No. 10.

(Submitted.)

Dr. Philippi's Doctrine of the Church.

Many readers of the ecclesiastical doctrine of faith of Dr. F. A. Philippi will have eagerly awaited the appearance of the third section of volume V of this work. It contains the doctrine of the church, and the important position that Philippi occupies among the dogmatists of the present day gives alone a reason to present his doctrine of the church clearly.

Dr. Philippi does not belong to those who are doubtful on the question: what is the church? or bring a series of open questions instead of the answer. He confesses already on the first page of his writing: The Church is the congregation of believers generated by Word and Sacrament and thereby sustained. Christ is her head, the community of believers is his body. - Its means of generation are also its distinguishing marks, namely Word and Sacrament. - However, since the Word does not exercise any compelling power over the hearer, and the church is built into this world of sin and lies, there are not only obvious deniers and false teachers whom the church excludes from its midst, but there are also always unregenerate confessors in the heart who outwardly consider themselves part of the congregation of believers, and yet do not share its faith. The church cannot avoid their fellowship, since there is no unmistakable criterion for faith, which is something purely internal, known only to God in truth. Although the church presupposes true faith in love for all active professors, it must remain aware that it has no divine certainty for it. Therefore, in this earthly world of appearance, the church never appears in pure separation; the believing confessors called by the word are indistinguishably mixed with the faithless confessors called by the word. This fact necessitates the twofold use of language, according to which of the church

in the broader, non-actual sense and again of the church in the narrower, actual sense of the word. Thus, the One Church of the Lord is considered in a double sense. The relationship of the identifying marks of the church is therefore also such that the proclamation, acceptance and use of Word and Sacrament are not identifying marks of the individual believer as such, but only identifying marks of the place and circle in which the congregation of believers is found. Since the word of the Lord, according to his promise, is to accomplish what it is sent to do, there is always a congregation of believers within the congregation of the called, but since their existence rests on the promise of the Lord, the essential church of the Lord as a congregation of believers is an article of faith. -

It is one of the advantages of this doctrine that Philippi does not fail to demonstrate the practical consequences of the opposing false doctrine. Already on p. 11 we find that Philippi rejects the description of the church as the wiped congregation of the called, which is now also common outside the Roman church, because even if the unbelieving mouth confessors are listed as dead members next to the living ones, even if faith alone is held as the means of justification and salvation, a faithless mouth confession could not possibly have been intended by God and instituted in the church. Nor could it fail that, if outward membership already brought about true membership in the church, in view of the already existing aversion of human nature to sincere repentance and living faith, many would be all the more inclined to be satisfied with this outward appearance, and to their soul's ruin would reassure themselves that a true member of God's church could not be lost after all; which was then not only the fault of their wrong conduct, but at the same time the fault of the misguided doctrine.

For the sake of the believers contained in it, the name of the church of Jesus Christ is therefore transferred in a broader, inauthentic sense to the entire congregation of the called. Only by virtue of the synecdochic use of language is the transfer of the glorifying qualities to the mixed congregation; for it is understood that the distinguishing designations, according to which the church is the bride, the woman, the body of Christ, the royal priesthood, etc., can be attached only to the believers. - In the following it will be proved that neither the necessary effects of faith, as love sacrifice, martyrdom, which can also be spurious martyrdom, nor the accidental and temporary companions of faith, as miracles and prophecies, are absolutely certain: Miracles and prophecies are not necessarily sure signs of faith, but the experiential perception, through which the church reveals itself, is only the edification on the basis of the pure and unadulterated word. There, where Word and Sacrament are found pure and genuine,

the visible church fellowship also has the characteristics that in a special sense belong to the church as the community of called believers. Since the various church communities have historically deviated from one another in essential points of doctrine, the doctrine of the individual church communities must be examined according to God's Word and from this it must be finally determined which community is truly and really in possession of the pure Word and Sacrament. Philippi claims for the Lutheran church the right to those glorious church predicates and remarks that the task of his doctrine of faith is to prove the right of the Lutheran church as the bearer of truth. That is why the Lutheran church is rightly called the true church. At the same time, however, the Lutheran church recognizes that the other churches, insofar as they share in the truth, also deserve to be called "churches"; for the sake of their heretical error, however, these are counterfeit churches. The Lutheran church, as the true church, is, according to p. 18, not the church of the Lord par excellence, for this is the spiritual body of Jesus Christ; for which reason also the expression: true church, is understood in double usage. Although the one, holy, apostolic church passes through all church communities, it is by no means indifferent to which church community someone belongs, which of them proclaims the gospel more loudly, because the called believer should also become a believing confessor with all confessors of truth.

Whereas other theologians today believe themselves entitled to present a so-called biblical theology in opposition to our symbols, or even within the Lutheran church to interpret the symbols according to Scripture, Philippi, on the other hand, takes pains to prove the established doctrines in the symbols and recognized orthodox teachers. This happens in regard to the doctrine of the church from p. 20 on. - Starting from the sentence of the Apostolicum: I believe in a holy, Christian church, the congregation of the saints, he first proves that the latter confessional word: the congregation of the saints, stands in an explanatory appositional relationship to the former; the same is clearly and unmistakably demonstrated in the Large Catechism with the third article of faith; the congregation of the saints is therefore not in the church, like the kernel in the shell; rather, the word of the poet finds its application here: Nature is neither core nor shell, it is all at once. Already the large catechism contains all the *stamina of the doctrine of the church*. She, the congregation of the saints or true believers, as she is begotten by God's Word, is also continually built up inwardly and increased outwardly, is therefore recognizable by the administration of God's Word and Sacrament as the Church of Jesus Christ. There is no salvation apart from its fellowship. From all this it follows that the Larger Catechism describes the Church according to its God-ordained idea, and that what the Larger Catechism states-

The small catechism summarizes this briefly and strikingly in the third article. From the Apology it is especially emphasized that there it is said of the "new Roman definition of the church" that this does not rhyme at all with the true church, but certainly with the Roman papacy! - In regard to the private doctrinal writings of Melanchthon and the following teachers, it is beautifully demonstrated that the latter is wrongly reproached as having gone back in his *Locis* from the definition of the church which he gives in the Apology. Rather, in the *Locis* he only had to make the frontal change towards Anabaptism, according to which he teaches of one and the same church that it is not only the congregation of the saints, but also the assembly of the called, because Anabaptism so "remembers" the evangelical concept of church that to him the church would also no longer be the congregation of believers called by the Word, but only a sum of those directly (without Word) inspired! In contrast to this, Melanchthon had to do with the church in the broader sense, the *corpus mixtum*. Philippi then lets M, Chemnitz, Joh. Gerhard and Hutter follow; among the refutation which Bellarmin, in particular, receives from these teachers, it is also emphasized that this arch-Catholic opponent of his time also reproaches the Lutherans for doubling the church; whoever, therefore, in more recent times again wants to reject the distinction between the visible and the invisible (actual) church as spiritualistic and fantastic, and portray it as a doubling of the church, is walking directly in Bellarmin's footsteps with this criticism of the doctrine of the invisible church. In order to summarize what all faithful Lutherans who read Philippi's writings will be pleased about, two more things should be noted here in advance. After Philippi has presented the old Lutheran dogmatists up to Quenstedt and Hollaz in regard to their doctrine of the church, he first comes to the important result, p. 126 and 127, that on this point there is only one unanimous doctrine in our church, a complete agreement between Luther, the symbols and all the older orthodox dogmatists who rest on the symbols. Therefore, one would have to give up the assertion as if there were a dissent among these witnesses in the conception of the church. Even Melanchthon and Chemnitz must not be placed on the opposite side. Therefore, Musaeus could rightly say: "There is only one voice and one understanding among us, namely, that the catholic or general church is actually the congregation of all believers and saints who are fighting on earth," and so on. Here, too, the Lutheran doctrine stands in the middle of truth between the Roman Catholic on the one hand and the Anabaptist-enthusiastic extreme of error on the other. On the other hand, Philippi warns the newer Lutheran theology, if it is inclined to the first error. Un Lutheran is not

The Lutheran doctrine is not only that doctrine which conceives the true church of Jesus Christ as the indiscriminate congregation of the baptized, but also that doctrine which regards the true church of Jesus Christ exclusively as the congregation of unbelievers and believers alike, gathered around the means of grace, if it correctly defines the relationship between Word and Sacrament and recognizes faith as the only means of salvation. The tendency of this polemic against the true Lutheran concept of the true church of Jesus Christ, as the *ecclesia invisibilis*, is indeed directed against today's atomism or individualism, also against subjectivism and unionism, but this goal is also achieved by keeping the true Lutheran concept of the church! We would like to say, certainly much sooner; because Philippi points out that the Lutheran church in the times of its secure existence, while it held on to its doctrine of the invisible church, led the fight against those church-dissolving directions much more successfully and energetically than it happens today with the so-called more objective (?) church concept. Finally, Philippi teaches: If one does not return to the doctrine of the invisible church, then one would have to recognize the indiscriminate congregation of the called as Christ's body, as if one were already a member of Christ's body through the mere external use of the means of grace! This must lead to the dangerous misunderstanding of the soul, as if outward membership alone, quite apart from living faith, secures salvation! Faith, therefore, would not be so necessary for salvation! May this testimony, which does not come from America, but is the voice of a German university teacher, be heeded all the more in Germany!

Regarding the doctrine of the ministry, which, as Philippi states on p. 48, is already given indirectly by the symbolically established concept of the church, Philippi again seeks to strike the middle, and already in the citation of the Large Catechism he teaches that the church, as the congregation of the saints, is obviously granted the office of the keys. Since, however, the same Larger Catechism describes the church 'as a holy company and congregation on earth of vain saints, under one head, Christ, called together in one faith by the Holy Spirit, we find no justification in the symbols for the fact that Philippi, as soon as he grants the church the office of the trumpet, each time adds the restriction: however, this only belongs to the entire church as the unified body of JEsu Christ *), which, in this unity of its entirety, continues to be represented by the Holy Spirit.

*) If the teaching that the church is essentially invisible is based on the ministry, then the body of Christ can only be understood as the mystical and spiritual community by virtue of which all believers are directly attached to Christ and receive spirit and life from him. Philippi therefore erroneously finds in this designation of the church such a division and subdivision of the individual congregations, by which these are supposed to be connected to the head Christ only by means of a total congregation.

The ministry of Word and Sacrament is not the responsibility of the individual believer as such. Since Philippi understands by the ministry the public congregational service of the Word, we agree that this ministry is appointed by the separation of certain persons whom the church entrusts with the preaching of the Word, and that the bearers of the ministry appointed by the church stand as servants of Jesus Christ in his place as well as servants of the church in the place of the church, as long as they remain subject to the Word of their Lord. But when Philippi continues on the following page: the ministry is so instituted in the congregation as a whole that only the whole congregation as a spiritual priesthood is the bearer of the ministry, so that even the individual congregation, if it appoints certain persons for the de facto execution of the ministry, performs this act only as a member of the body of JESUS CHRIST in the context, name and commission of the congregation as a whole or of the church of the LORD; for here there is a separation of the whole into its parts, not a summation of the whole from the mass of individuals who are independent in themselves: Individuals, we find in this derivation of the ministry a deviation from the genuine Lutheran teaching of the symbols, especially from the teaching of the Schmalkaldic Articles. We teach with the symbols that the church has the command from God to appoint preachers, and because, according to the Apology, "such is very comforting, if we know that God wants to preach and work through men and those who are elected by men, it is good that such election be highly praised and honored, especially against the devilish Anabaptists, who despise and blaspheme such election together with the office of preaching and the bodily word." Since it is already said here in a bad way that God preaches through those elected by men, the Apology does not yet know anything about a collective congregation organized in three estates, through whose connection, name and commission each individual congregation could only proceed to the appointment of the ministry. Since the believers are all under one head, Christ, as the Large Catechism says, and constitute a spiritual assembly scattered throughout the whole world, it is a dangerous error to insert between these believers and their one head, under whom they are all united in the same way by faith, a so-called common church, i.e., as Philippi writes, a church consisting of congregation, office and regiment. It might seem as if the mediatorship established by this common church were a harmless idea, because such a common church can never be gathered together, as if it could in no way be compared to the papacy in the Roman church, where the pope wants to make himself the mediator and original dispenser of all graces and gifts, from whose power even the subordinate church offices are derived, that according to him the church is not only divided into teacher-

The Church is not to be divided into a congregation and an audience, but into a well-functioning organism of three hierarchical ranks, called congregation, office and regiment! If we further ask what kind of regiment the faithful, who are bound only to the voice of Christ, should carry in the church, we read that the regiment with all its orders and measures should serve the purification and spreading of the divine word, and that state in the Church which has the means to do so is the most suitable bearer of the ecclesiastical regimental office. The transfer of the sumptuary episcopate to the orthodox sovereigns is therefore no mere emergency, but the normal relationship. As long as the bearers of the magisterial office were members of the church, a Caesareopapist degeneration in the handling of this office was not to be feared; only when the persons in authority were no longer Lutheran would the ecclesiastical government have to be reshaped and given a different form. Philippi thus teaches, in the manner of the Breslau Oberkirchenräthe, that an ecclesiastical office, distinct from the office of preaching, is endowed to the church as a whole; according to the principle of divine right, the particular shaping of history is left to the church. Where the proof of Scripture is lacking, history today must give the appearance of being right. If only Philippi would adopt the cited principle that history is a teacher; for one has experienced enough that the Lutheran Church was almost suffocated in Germany precisely because it was supposed to exist only as a state church, under the embrace of the prince-bishops and their councils. Once the inalienable right of every Christian to watch over the preservation of pure doctrine himself has been surrendered to these prince-bishops and similar ecclesiastical authorities, it is bound to happen that these authorities will regard the church as a kingdom of this world and will take their measures accordingly. Should the Word of God, which carries its power in itself and will also make its way in the hearts of the faithful, need such supports? In view of the ecclesiastical conditions in Germany, one question may be worth asking: If the church could act factually only in the union of these three estates, and a time would come when the word of God would be dear, and the members of the magisterial estate would also have departed from the truth,*) it would thus be as it was in the time of Elijah, when there were only 7000 scattered believers, where should then the believing laity turn, if they, meeting in smaller or larger assemblies, want to establish the ministry of preaching among themselves? According to Philippi's teaching, they would first have to be commissioned by the church as a whole, which is organized in three estates, and yet this state-church organism, which, like everything that is only historical, has its time, could be rightly called the "church of the state."

*) When once the blessed A. Bengel was asked by a noble lady whether there are also barred seats in heaven for the status persons, he answered: Yes, but they are said to be very dusty. - 1 Cor. 1, 26.

soon disappear from the earth! If this case should occur, then according to Philippi's doctrine of the key power, it would not be possible to deduce from where such an assembly, which consisted of e.g. only lay Christians, would have the power to choose a pastor. Philippi goes so far as to say that the classical passage 1 Peter 2:9, insofar as it makes the proclamation of the word the duty of the spiritual priesthood, is to be understood only by the congregation as a whole; for only this congregation is the bearer of the ministry, which is why, as it is particular in various individual congregations, it must also command its one ministry to a plurality of persons for the purpose of directing their service to these special congregations. The minister of the word for this individual congregation is not a minister of this individual congregation, but a minister of the church to this individual congregation! Although Philippi must admit that not only prayer and sanctification of life, but also the proclamation of the Word is in itself a sacrifice to be offered by the spiritual priest, he nevertheless admits that the spiritual priest, as such, has no public share in that which belongs to the chosen race, the royal priesthood, the holy people. With the offering of these sacrifices, the spiritual priest must confine himself to his private relations, but in no way does he possess the office of public proclamation of the word! It is therefore surprising that Philippi nevertheless allows lay Christians a share in the calling of the pastor, and that on p. 257 he again allows the public handling and proclamation of the word to a Christian in the manner of a case of necessity, for example, if he is a prisoner among a heathen people. - If the ministry comes to the local congregation only by means of a higher church authority above the individual congregation (according to Philippi, from the authority of the universal church), then the Roman Catholic doctrine, which has the pope as the only master of the keys, who ordains the mass priests from his power, is much more consistent in that it prohibits the layman from exercising the key ministry even in cases of emergency, and e.g. on a ship, if no ordained priest is available, it prefers to let hundreds of Catholics die miserably before it permits what our symbols teach in the appendix to the Schmalkaldic Articles: "Therefore, where there is a true church, it follows that there is also the power to elect and ordain church servants, just as in an emergency even a bad layman can absolve another and become his pastor, as St. Augustine writes in a history," and so on. Philippi also admits these exceptions in cases of emergency, and writes: "The rule is confirmed by the acceptance, and in such a case even the tacit consent of the church to this exceptional action can be presupposed, even without a preceding ordinary appointment. Everyone can see that Philippi has quite a different justification for the exceptional administration of office which he permits to the layman than the Schmalkaldic Articles. Philippi places the seat of the preaching office in his common church, and because

Without whose consent and discharge the priest would in no way have an interest in the office, then in this case of an exceptional act he must resort to the plea of tacit consent of the church. With the same right, however, any thief, if he stole a skirt in an emergency, could justify himself by saying that he had the tacit consent of the owner. - When, on the other hand, the Schmalkaldic Articles teach that in times of need even a poor layman can become the pastor of another, they prove that the ministry of preaching is original and direct (i.e., without the mediation of a common body) among the faithful, just as the gospel is, for if there were only two or three of them among one another, the true church would already be among them! Thus our symbols go back to the last reasons and the original seat of the ministry of preaching, which is placed in the royal priesthood of all who are born again through baptism. Nowhere in the Schmalkaldic Articles are these two or three laymen said to represent the whole church; rather, according to Matth. 18, 20, they already have sufficient spiritual power because they represent the Lord Christ; for the Schmalkaldic Articles continue: "Here belong the sayings of Matth. 18, 20.", and add: "Lastly, this is also confirmed by the saying of Peter: You are the royal priesthood 1 Peter 2, 9. These words actually concern the true church, which, because it alone has the priesthood, must also have power to elect and ordain church ministers." The original right to proclaim the Word, whether publicly or privately, thus rests in the spiritual priesthood of Christians. The public exercise of this right is indeed so limited by Christ himself for the sake of order that the office within the congregation is to be exercised only in a special calling, for "where there is a community of those who have the same right, one (or some, as the congregation pleases) is to be chosen and accepted, who instead of and in the name of all the others shall publicly exercise these offices, for in such a case it is not fitting that one should distinguish himself from the others, and appropriate to him alone that which is ours alone; But in case of emergency, that is, as Luther writes there (to the council and congregation of the city of Prague), if there is no one else who has also received such an office, then do away with this right and also put it into practice! Therefore, only because Luther bases this general Christian right, which he also proves with Matth. 23, 8: One is your master, but you are all brothers! - that is why Luther can write of the lay Christian's official function as Philippi p. 258 from Luther states: "Here you shall place the Christian in two places" and so on. In his writing to the nobility of the German nation, Luther expressly teaches: "Hence it comes that in time of need any one can baptize and absolve; which would not be possible if we were not all priests!" Against the above doctrine of the office of preaching, which in Luther's

Philippi argues that this Christian right, which all spiritual priests had, was immediately restricted again by Christ's institution; he could also find no scriptural reason for Christians to refrain from their right (i.e. from the public exercise of their right) for the sake of order. This duty of the individual is in the nature of things. But with what right can Philippi write that it is in the nature of things that the one universal church should refrain from one person and immediately entrust a plurality of persons with the office to the individuals? He has no scriptural evidence for this! The Gallican church, which once wanted to place the pope under the conciliar, concluded precisely from the idea of a catholic universal church the necessity of a chief shepherd who should rule in the name of the universal church. Philippi, of course, wants to avoid this conclusion! When, on the other hand, the Schmalkaldic Articles teach that wherever there is a true church, there is also the right of the office of the keys, and use Matt. 18:20 and 1 Peter 2:9 as proving sayings, they want to prevent anyone from taking away the Christian's inalienable right, for "no special person" should interpose himself between Christ, the one and only Lord of the keys, and the Christians who are partakers of Christ through faith. The whole church, so it is said in the Schmalkaldic Articles, possesses the office *immediately* and *principaliter*, directly and originally, i.e. without the need of an intermediary to whom the keys were first given by Christ, and from whom (by whose commission, as Philippians teaches) the use of the office should first reach the individual Christians or the individual congregation. In this sense it says there: the keys do not belong to one person alone, but to the whole church! Philippi is in error if he wants to understand the words of the Schmalkaldic Articles: the keys do not belong to some special persons, but to the whole church, as if the keys belonged only to the church as a whole, but not to the spiritual priest as such! Philippi thus makes the "church as a whole," which he calls the church as a whole divided into three estates, a mediator between Christ and the believers, while the Schmalkaldic Articles reject any such mediation and teach: where there are only two or three, there is the true church according to Matth. 18, 20. If the keys were not given to the believers directly and originally, then it could not be proved from emergency baptism and emergency absolution that the whole church, i.e. every believing Christian, originally has the right to administer the means of grace; if he did not already have this right in himself, then mere necessity could not give it to him. *) Philippi has already p. 51-57 an over-

*Although Philippi has undoubtedly read C. F. W. Walther's book on church and ministry, he nevertheless does not agree to discuss the statements made under Thesis VII.

He also states that the congregations nevertheless retain their right even if the bishops follow the gospel (the sentence: the congregations retain their right! does not want to agree with the idea of a single "common church" either); however, he finally only points out that the fact that the *tractatus* grants the congregation of believers as the spiritual priest does not in any way mean that the modern "common principle contrary to Scripture" is being advocated. However, in the end he only points out that the fact that the *tractatus* grants the key power to the congregation of believers, as the spiritual priesthood, in no way gives the word to the modern "common principle," which is contrary to Scripture and the confession. Nor is it our opinion to do the latter, for precisely because we find in the symbols, especially in the *tractatus*, the doctrine that the office is conferred on believers originally and directly by Christ, we can most decidedly object to the voice of the church being represented by the mass of unbelievers, i.e. by the well-known Lord *Omnes*, as Philippi writes. Believers will know how to distinguish the voice of the world from the voice of the church. That is why the same Schmalkaldic articles teach Art. IX: the church is the holy believers and the sheep that hear their shepherd's voice. Although Christ gives the church the last and highest judgment, and Christ's bride or mistress is certainly more than the steward, she is nevertheless placed together with the latter under the word of her heavenly bridegroom. Where this position is held, there is no reason to fear a transition from "the so-called pastorate into pastorate bondage. Nevertheless, this fear seems to be at the bottom when Philippi continues that the church, which has the key power, is not a lay congregation, but that the *Tractatus* deals with an organized congregation of believers. Although we find it proper and respectable that a congregation, where it can make it possible, e.g. in the election of a pastor, should be advised by pastors who are close to it, we must nevertheless not bring a congregation under the law of a collective church consisting of "congregation, office and regiment," and must be very sorry that Philippi teaches that only the latter (the collective church) is the acting subject. Just as he has remarked of those who have the Roman concept of the church that they are influenced by the tendency, as if one had to steer in their way toward ecclesiastical atomism and individualism, so it seems to us here that Philippi from

way to refute. Apart from what is quoted there from Luther and Heshusius, Polyc. Leyser's testimony is the most convincing; he teaches: In case of emergency, the authority that ordinarily belongs to the person called by the church reverts to the first best Christian (*recidit ad proximum*). The Church may ordinarily confer this power on the rightfully called; but extraordinarily and in case of necessity, every true member of the Church has the same right and may use it for the glory of God and the service of his neighbor.

In this way, he clings to the idea of an ecclesiastical regiment, which is to have its bearer in the Lutheran authorities, for fear of ecclesiastical anarchy. Since he wants to make a representation of his overall church out of the three estates, the following should finally be noted: Already from Joh. Gerhard's writings, Philippi emphasizes that Gerhard gives everyone his due share in the church government, because the church consists of presbytery, magistrate, and people; this division is also found in the following dogmatists, although these teachers were urged to it by the papist doctrine of the Church, which sees only the spiritual state in the church; In contrast to the papists, Luther also proclaimed the Christian nobility of the German nation, because a Christian, in whatever state and profession he may be (thus also in the magistracy), does not cease to be a member of the church, i.e. a spiritual priest. i.e. a spiritual priest. That is why Luther emphasizes the glory of the Christian state to this papal priestly rule and rejects the establishment of separate classes in Christianity; "if you want to look at the Christians, you must not look at any difference, and not say, this is a man or woman, servant or master, old or young, as Paul says, Gal. 3, 28. It is all one thing and one spiritual people!" If Philippi nevertheless finds in Luther a distinction of the church into three estates, Luther nevertheless does not have the opinion to make an organic division of the church, or even to initiate a blending of state and church, as the newer ones want. Rather, Luther teaches in the Disputation of 1540: "God has ordered three regiments in this world against the devil, namely the home and world regiments and the church! He does not transfer the one regiment into the other. In the confessional writings there is also no such division and specialization of the church into three ranks, but rather a warning to keep the spiritual and the worldly regiment distinct! It is also known how deeply Luther lamented it in the last years of his life, when he foresaw that a political and herile regime, especially by the jurists, would be practiced more and more also in the church! He does not only want to prevent abuse, when he writes: "we must tear up the consistory, because we want neither the lawyers nor the pope in it.

It is true that God the Lord has left the congregation of the elect under the rule of the ecclesiastical rulers, but he has also done so under the papacy, although this is certainly displeasing to God. Through the Word, God's work on the souls of men still continues, for the Holy Spirit is not bound to any constitutional form, and works in those who hear the Word when and where He wills. But if ever the national ecclesiasticism has become rotten, this is now the case. While the state is devoid of religion, and often even hostile to it, the Anabaptist sects in Germany are rising up alongside it.

and make more and more a mockery of the national churches, because they consider the flesh to be their arm. In view of these conditions, the German theologians should prepare themselves much more for the time when the ropes are loosened by which the church can be pulled in the tow of the present state. - It is to be wondered at that time, while the territorial system was still much more flourishing than now, nevertheless the right of the congregations was much better preserved in the writings of the teachers of that time than happens today in Germany. At that time, Hartmann, for example, wrote in his Pastoral: "In our time, too, the excellent godliness of our princes is to be praised, according to which they set before their subjects skilful and capable teachers, not so that the congregations would be deprived of their right, but because the people neither understood nor used their right, and the right judgment of the same was hindered by old errors, they took it under their guardianship and represented the place of the church." But now that we are at the beginning of the end, as Philippi also indicates (especially at the end of the national churches), not only the Unirte dream of a German national church, but Philippi also wants to bring the congregations under an organized collective church regiment. Doesn't any church authority today have to become a worldly regiment, not much better than the dreaded majority government of the well-known Mr. *Omnes*, which Philippi wants to avoid? If the congregation of believers still wants to keep the spiritual field in this time, it must necessarily move in greater freedom than is possible under a worldly constitution. One now hears it said in Germany that the Missourians are Independents and want to speak the word of ecclesiastical democracy! It is true that we assert the freedom of the individual Christian man from all human statutes, and thus also the freedom of the Christian congregations. This is the independentism that inspired the Lutheran Reformation. But we also know that the true dependence of the members of Christ, who all stand under One Head, Christ, requires such loyalty to God's Word and such a serving love among one another, which can never be enforced by external constitutional forms; for the Lord who governs the church is the Spirit. But where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom! 2 Cor. 3, 17. Chr. Hochstetter.

There is no letter so small in their (the papists') doctrine, and no work so small, it denies and blasphemes Christ and defiles faith in him and leads the poor hearts to impossible things and to despair. Luther.

It is not an art (the article of justification) that can be learned or boasted of; it is an art that wants us to remain disciples and masters. Luther.

(Sent in by C. A. Frank.)

About the conscience.

(Submitted for review.)

(Conclusion.)

Now, can man rely on his conscience as an infallible standard in judging all his moral actions and those of others, and is it sufficient before God to have judged himself merely according to his conscience? It is not difficult to see that this is the banner under which the whole element of those seeks to fraternize mankind and to justify itself, who certainly still claim a God and responsibility before him, but not the necessity of revelation. It is true that we see from Genesis 18:24-28 and Romans 1 that God has punished the Gentiles temporally and eternally because they have suppressed the voice of their conscience in the grossest parts, and that man is therefore required to hear and follow the natural law in the face of God's wrath and punishment, but this does not mean that God's word gives his yes to the above question. Rather it teaches us that since the "*principium morale et naturale humani generis*", i.e. Adam acted against his conscience against the express commandment of God, all the created powers of the soul are devoid of original justice and perfection. Of the very Gentiles to whom Paul vindicates conscience, the same apostle says Ephes. 4, 17. 18.: "That ye walk no more, as the rest of the Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind, whose understanding is darkened, and are estranged from the life that is of God, through the ignorance that is in them, through the blindness (hardening) of their heart." Here we hear of darkness and ignorance that have entered the soul and conscience, and Rom. 1, 18. we read that men endure in unrighteousness even what is left of light in the conscience; and Ephes. 4, 18, that the old man corrupts himself in error through lusts. Therefore, in our definition of conscience, we have also said at the end: in the things that it recognizes as belonging to its forum. The man left to himself recognizes the very least of the things about which he should form a conscience. But also here we leave the execution to Luther. We have already heard from him: "Although the commandments of God are written in the hearts of all men, yet the hearts are so darkened by the devil that they cannot be seen nor recognized." Furthermore, he writes in 36:56: "Because it is now in the heart, even though it is dark and completely faded, it is awakened again with the word that the heart must confess that it is like the commandments, that one honors, loves, and serves God, because he alone is good and does good."

not only to the pious, but also to the wicked; though the devil strongly warreth that man should neither feel, nor know, nor accomplish; neither can man do any thing without the work and light of the Holy Ghost."

As a maximum of what man can know from his conscience, Luther gives the following 34:283: "For this is also true, which St. Paul says to the Romans, that God has revealed to all the world that they must know that one God is, has been unconcealed from the beginning of the world to the end; which one also notices that, if the Gentiles had not had knowledge of God, they would not have called their idols God. That there had to be a God, they knew, and it was right; but when they said, This is God, then they immediately celebrated." 35, 68: "The Gentiles did not celebrate that God was something that helps. This light is still in the nature, otherwise the people did not say: Help me" (Jonah 1, 6.). "But there it is celebrated, and here reason is blind, and causes idolatry, that it ascribes the Godhead to other things, and does not recognize the true God. 58, 265: "The first three commandments of God are quite unknown to reason; the other table has a little reputation with it, so that transgressors and wrongdoers are sometimes punished. But those who do against the last two commandments, the world does not consider them to be sinning and abusing." 58, 264: "The other table teaches how one should behave toward one's neighbor in this life according to outward conduct; which the philosophers, who wrote about good works, have taught and explained very well and best. As the *Academici*, *Peripatetici*, and *Stoici*, who all held virtue and an honorable life to be the highest good, and though they may be somewhat divided in words, yet they were united in the main things; from the other table they were able to speak, write, and teach finely, actually, and correctly, concerning this temporal life; for they alone know the *definitions*, and can define virtue rightly." How little it is sufficient before God to have judged only according to one's conscience, he puts so right by continuing after the already above mentioned passage 40, 83: "Reason comes so far in God's knowledge, that it has *cognitionem legalem*, that

They know God's commandment and what is right and wrong, and the philosophers also had this knowledge of God; but it is not the right knowledge of God that comes through the law, whether it be Mosaic or that which is planted in our nature. For men do not follow him; especially when they see in the world and perceive that the worse the evil, the better the happiness, they think there is no God to punish sin, and therefore follow the multitude that lives in sins. . . (86. 87.) The other knowledge comes from the gospel, that all the world by nature is an abomination to God, and is eternally condemned under God's wrath and the devil's power, from which it could not be saved.

For the Son of God, who is in the Father's arms, became man, died, and rose again from the dead, having put away sin, death, and the devil. This is the right and thorough knowledge, way and thought of God, which is called the knowledge of grace and truth, the evangelical knowledge of God. But it does not grow in our garden; reason does not know a drop of it. On the left hand it can know God according to the law of nature and according to Moses, for the law is written in our hearts. But that it should otherwise know the abyss of divine truth and will and the depths of his grace and mercy, how it will be in eternal life, reason does not know a drop of it, and is even hidden from it, it talks about it as the blind talk about the color." - From this it may be seen at the same time how little Paul in our basic passage overturns the *truncus* and *lapis* of the Concordia formula, which are soon enough deplored and ridiculed. For because Paul grants to the Gentiles the natural law, works of the law, the voice and judgment of the natural conscience, he is supposed to contradict the Concordia formula when it writes: "But in spiritual and divine things, concerning the salvation of souls, there man is like a block and stone . . . because man neither sees nor recognizes the cruel and fierce wrath of God against sin and death, but continues in his own safety, even knowingly and willingly, and thereby comes into a thousand dangers, finally into eternal death and condemnation, and no pleading, no beseeching, no admonishing, no scolding; Indeed, all teaching and preaching is lost on him before he is enlightened by the Holy Spirit, converted and born again, for which no stone or block but man alone was created.... And in this case (that man despises the instrument of the Holy Spirit) it may well be said that man is not a stone or a block. For a stone does not resist the one who moves it, nor does it understand or feel what is done to it, as a man resists God the Lord with his will until he is converted. And yet it is true that before conversion man is still a rational creature, having understanding and will, but not understanding in divine matters, or a will to will something good and wholesome. . . . However, the Lord God trains the man whom he wants to convert and trains him in such a way that a darkened mind becomes an enlightened mind, and a stubborn will becomes an obedient will. And this is what the Scriptures call creating a new heart." (p. 593. and 602. Müller's edition.) We do not understand how this teaching, which rests so completely on Paul's and the rest of Scripture's sayings and Christian experience, should contradict Rom. 2, 14. 15. unless one lets Paul contradict himself.

or absolutely cannot and will not understand that conversion and the divine things of which the Concordia formula speaks are far above the sphere of the natural conscience.

But if one speaks, for what purpose is the natural law? Luther's answer 58:271: "The law is used in two ways. First, for this worldly life, for God has ordained all worldly rights and laws to ward off sins with them. From this it is to be supposed, and must follow, that all laws and rights are given for the purpose of increasing sins and preventing them." (How far one may come in this with his natural conscience, we have heard above.) "Secondly, the law is needed spiritually. Which is so, that it increases the transgression, as St. Paul saith; that is, it reveals and makes known to man his sin, blindness, wretchedness, ungodly nature, wherein he was conceived and born; namely, that he knoweth not God, but is an enemy to him, despiseth him, and therefore justly deserveth death, hell, the judgment of God, eternal wrath and calamity.... . But of this know nothing at all all men who think that they are to be justified by the law and their own works." That the natural conscience does not show man this service, and that God's word must intervene, is evident, although the conscience is that in man to which alone God's word can be attached. To return, therefore, to the first question, we answer that he who relies on his conscience as an infallible guide, and thinks that by this means he can stand in God's judgment, is, as the Scripture says, Proverbs 28:26, "He that relies on his heart is a fool."

Now if one may not rely on his conscience without God's word, because it can and does err, is it not then indifferent whether he acts in accordance with or against his conscience? Or is not man bound to respect even his erring conscience, provided he does not know or cannot recognize that he errs? To this Rambach Moraltheologie, pp. 564 and 565, answers as follows: "But one objects, and says: a) If conscience could err, man could have no certain knowledge of some thing. Answer: This follows no more than if one should say: If the understanding of man could err, man could have no certain knowledge of any thing. The erring conscience must be reproved and better informed by God's word, and so it can attain to certainty. - It is said (b) that conscience presents its sayings and judgments as the sayings of God, who has appointed it to be its governor in the soul; how then should it be possible for it to err? Answer: The conscience

Knowledge is indeed God's governor in the soul; but after such corruption has entered the soul, it does not always perform its office as it should, and must be rebuked in it. But because it speaks in the name of God, he who does not obey the dictates of conscience is an enemy of God, unless he is convinced that conscience is wrongly interceding in the name of God. And this is the reason why even the erring conscience must be respected." - In conclusion, we have Rambach's classification of the different kinds of conscience. (p. 551) "But conscience can also be divided in different ways for different purposes. With respect to the guiding principle, it is sometimes called the right, sometimes the wrong, sometimes the certain, sometimes the doubtful. With respect to the actions that are to be judged by the standard, it is either good or bad, or fearful, either preceding or following or succeeding. With respect to the state of man, it is either the sleeping or the awakened, the tender or the broad conscience." ("Good conscience" Ap. Gesch. 23, 1. 1 Pet. 3, 16. 1 Tim. 1, 5. Heb. 13, 18.; "evil conscience" Heb. 10, 22.; "clean conscience" 2 Tim. 1, 3.; "unclean conscience" Tit. 1, 15.; "uninjured conscience" Ap. Gesch. 24, 16.; "weak conscience" 1 Cor. 8, 7.; "brand in the conscience" 1 Tim. 4, 2.; "who condemned himself" Tit. 3, 11.)

Thus, then, we have commanded the reader what we have been able to collect from our treasure-house on this subject, and to set it up in order; should he wish to add from his treasure-house any silver, gold, and precious stones, no one would be more pleased than the writer of this verse. -

(Submitted.)

Explanation.

The undersigned finds himself moved in his mind to revoke and withdraw herewith, for the glory of God, His Word, and Reformation truth, a little writing published in 1869 against the Reformation doctrine of usury, especially in consideration and acknowledgment:

that the prohibition of usury in Scripture is not only found among the regulations of the ceremonial law, but is repeated by the prophets and in the Psalter; that therefore Luther and the Reformation teachers, even in and with the adherence to the ecclesiastical doctrine of usury, remained faithful to the principle of the Reformation: subordination to Scripture, as then also from the ecclesiastical confession this doctrine, though not excluded, is not only to be found in the Bible, but also in the Bible.

The Reformation's doctrine of usury is therefore (as little as in other matters) in no need of improvement, since it corresponds both to the conservative spirit of the Reformation and to the humble self-restraint of its theology. Therefore, it behooves us not to resist a path that, in right recognition and appreciation of the great divine deed of the Reformation, finds and attains unity in spirit with the fathers also in regard to the doctrine of usury, as we see it in the church of this country through God's grace, but to walk along with it in God; especially as we may certainly look forward the more joyfully to eternity, to receive the same blessedness with those who have been our fathers in faith, our models in faithfulness and constancy unto death, the more we also on earth have become one with them in faith and sanctification, "without which no man shall see the Lord." God help us to do this!

Forestville, Door Co, Wis. Aug. G. Doehler, Rev.
in Sept. 1876.

Literary.

Institutiones theologiae exegeticae in usum academicarum praelectionum adornatae a Dr. C. G. Hofmanno. Editio nova. In urbe Sancti Ludovici ex officina Synodi Missouriensis Lutheranae. 1876. 8.

We had long felt the lack of a manual that we could use as a basis for our lectures on hermeneutics in the seminar here. Not only were we sorry that because of this lack so much noble time had to be spent on dictation, but also that the so necessary repetition from a hastily written college booklet could not be as successful as from a present printed compendium. Thus, we have attempted to remedy our deficiency by reprinting an older hermeneutic textbook, which appeared in 1754 under the above title, and which was specifically intended by the author to be used as a basis for academic lectures. The author is Dr. Carl Gottlob Hofmann. He was born on October 1, 1703 in Schneeberg in the Saxon Erzgebirge, where his father was a high school principal, studied under Börner, Rechenberg and others at the University of Leipzig, held academic lectures here soon after completing his studies, and finally worked since 1739 as the general superintendent of the entire Saxon district and as the first theological professor in Wittenberg until his death, which occurred on September 19, 1774. He was without doubt the

greatest adornment of the "*Cathedra Lutheri*" in the 18th century. Sincere godliness, thorough scholarship, holy zeal for the preservation of the "good supplement" were united in him. He is one of the few "Uebrigen" who still in the second half of the last century held fast to the teachings of the Reformation in living faith. We have chosen Hofmann's hermeneutical compendium above others, partly because it is the closest to the orthodox hermeneutics of our time, with its increased demands in many respects, and partly because it is more complete than others, partly because it is so complete in all its brevity and so free of heterogeneous additions in all its completeness,*) partly because it is so clear in all its thoroughness and so clearly arranged in all its artful, strict order,**) and finally because, although intended as a basis for academic lectures, it is nevertheless also excellently suited for private study. Admittedly, we would have preferred a hermeneutic from our time and one calculated especially for our present needs. But an orthodox hermeneutic of the present time unfortunately does not and cannot exist, since, as is well known, all the more recent, even the so-called faithful and "confessional" learned "theologians" have abandoned the doctrine of the inspiration of all the writings of the apostles and prophets, this foundation of every *hermeneutica sacra*, as an "untenable" one. It is true that Professor Dr. Delitzsch has uttered the bold assertion, "The Church is maturing into the *aetas virilis ac regia* of Scripture interpretation" (Die Genesis. Leipzig 1852. p. 39.), but not long ago even the Erlanger Zeitschrift had to admit: "By the way, our opinion is not at all that we have made such wonderful progress in the scientific understanding of Scripture that there is not still much to learn from 'old Starke' even for the well-trained theologian". (September issue of 1865.)

Our Hermeneutical Institutions, in the Prolegomena on page 1-11, deals with the concept of exegetical theology, prefacing it with the following definition, which characterizes the whole book: "Exegetical theology (or hermeneutics) is the God-given (θεόδοτος) practical habitus by which a theologian is equipped by certain means to find and prove to others the meaning of sacred Scripture, so that, firmly convinced of the meaning of the Holy Spirit, he may promote the instruction of men to blessedness and God's glory." Hereupon

*) Hofmann's *Institutiones theologiae exegeticae* give the invaluable hermeneutical works of a Flacius, Dannhauer, Franz, Pfeiffer and other excellent hermeneuten in nues.

**Also Joh. Georg Walch says in his *Bibliotheca theologica* of our Compendium that it is "*ob virtutes perspicuitatis justique ordinis commendandum*". (*Bibi. th. Jenae* 1765. IV, 214.)

In the first book, pp. 12-62, the purpose of exegetical theology, i.e., the meaning of sacred Scripture, is dealt with according to the analytical method; in the second book, pp. 63-86, the subject of the same, i.e., the personal, theologian, and the factual, sacred Scripture; and finally, in the third book, the main part of the whole, pp. 87-249, the principles and aids of the same. An important addition is the detailed biblical and factual index that follows on pages 250-297.

We cannot but conclude our announcement with the words with which the announcement of our writing in the *Novis Actis Eruditorum* of 1755 was once closed. There it says: "We invite all those who tend to pervert the doctrines of the Protestant Church and to accuse it of who knows what kind of opinions, especially in the doctrine of the divine Scriptures, to be taught better by reading this booklet, and we ask them to finally be ashamed of themselves. We believe that this book provides splendidly both for the public academic teachers and for the studying youth, since the author, in his treatment of a subject that is as rich as it is difficult, has shown such rounded brevity and a truly 'painstaking accuracy and definiteness,' which two things have always been considered highly praiseworthy and exceedingly recommendable." (S. 436.)

Since the book can of course not find such a large distribution as German written, so the same can also not be sold as cheaply as would be desirable. However, the price for the really excellently equipped book has not been set higher than had to be done in order to protect the publishers from greater losses. The book is well bound with a leather spine and gilt inscription and can be purchased from our agent for K1.50, shot through with writing paper, for K2.00. W.

Dr. Conrad Dieterichs, Weiland Superintendent and Rector of the Gymnasium at Ulm, **Institutiones catecheticae**, that is, thorough interpretation of the catechism of D. Martin Luther in question and answer and provided with notes. Translated from the Latin by D. Friedrich Wilhelm August Notz, Professor of the Northwestern University at Watertown, Wisconsin. St. Louis, Mo. and Leipzig. Published by Br. Dette. 1876. price: hardback \$2.00. postage: 10 cts.

Among all the detailed expositions of the Catechism in the Lutheran Church, one of the most famous is that of Dr. C. Dietrich, since it so admirably combines doctrine and defense. The many editions of his *Institutiones catecheticae*, the introduction of the same in many schools, high and low, the use of the same for theological lectures on the part of be-

The works of famous theologians, the explanatory writings written by them, - testify to the high esteem in which they were held in our church. Hence our Synod has published the extract made by Dietrich himself from his larger work intended for Latin schools, with additions from the larger work, etc. The Ohio Synod has also published an English translation. The Ohio Synod has also organized an English translation. Now, if our children have an exceedingly delicious book in this one, according to which they can be taught by their teachers, it must be desirable for those who give catechetical instruction to be able to consult the larger work as preparation. For those who know the Latin language, a new edition of the Latin work was published in 1864 by Dr. Dieckhoff. For those who do not know the Latin language, a German translation was a *desiderium*. An old translation, done in 1618 by N. Ludw. Seltzer, was urgently recommended to all teachers in the "Schulblatt," Vol. 3, p. 273, with the following words: "The book is a true spiritual treasure, and no one who can obtain it should let the opportunity pass. Better a new skirt than to be without this book! - Is scarcely to be had at all. The publisher wanted to reissue it at first. But since the language is too much outdated, he decided to publish the work in a new, literal translation. By the grace of God, he succeeded in doing so. The translator he found is Professor Notz of Watertown, who is well known as a competent philologist. He speaks of his work, for which the Church is certainly indebted to him, in the preface as follows: "What he wanted to achieve was a rendering of the original in good German that was as literal as possible, understandable to the reader, and that took into account the use of theological language. He refrained from adding his own additions, with the exception of a few notes below the text - mostly citations from Dieterich's own textbook of logic, namely, where peculiar logical and rhetorical terms made a brief explanation seem appropriate for the majority of readers. For the greatest difficulty in translation was posed by precisely these artificial expressions of the logic of our fathers. But following the example of his predecessor, the . . . M. Ludw. Seltzer, who not infrequently simply omits the relevant expressions or sentences, the undersigned was all the less able to decide to do so, since Dieterich himself places such great emphasis on the presentation of the logical method of proof, and especially our time still has much to learn from the sober logic of the fathers. Incidentally, Seltzer's translation has been compared step by step in the most exact manner, as well as the excerpt of the *Institutiones* published by the German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, etc.". That the Herr Uebersetzer has reproduced the artificial expressions mentioned, and not,

as happened in the old translation, will certainly find general approval. If Dietrich's work now contains some things that not everyone who has to teach catechetical instruction can use, since these otherwise extremely useful terms used by Dietrich require other knowledge, there is still enough rich material left for him to collect a treasure of wholesome teaching and to be able to communicate this treasure to others. - The preface of the translator contains interesting notes concerning Dietrich's life, literary works and especially his *instituttones*. The picture of Dietrich is added to the book, which is also otherwise beautifully equipped and contains XII and 505 pages. G.

Ecclesiastical - Contemporary.

I. America.

A young German Presbyterian preacher has renounced his sect and sent the editorial staff a letter of rejection written to H. S.. In the same it says among other things: "Now, after much study and prayer, I have found that this doctrine is not according to God's Word, that it is, in other words, false, and more dangerous than anyone thinks. I thank the Lord that he has opened my eyes, that I now see this. O how blessed! I am certain of my cause according to God's word.... The truth is but One and this One truth is certain according to God's Word.... In studying the theology of various churches and viewing it in the light of the divine Word, I have found that our dear, old, Lutheran church is the only orthodox one. It is not the only one that saves, nor does it claim to be, but it does not allow itself to be deprived of the glory of being the only one that believes. That there are believers also in the false churches is because they still have pieces of the truth which the Lutheran church has entirely.... While the Presbyterians, with their reason as a lamp, want to illuminate, explain, and make clear God's counsels, the Lutherans let God's Word be their lamp, let God's Word stand as it stands, and 'take reason captive under the obedience of Christ'.... I know the arguments of the Presbyterian Church almost as well as you do, Mr. S.s were you so acquainted with the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, you would not have been a Presbyterian a day more, provided you meant sincerely for your salvation. Reason plays the chief part in all things in the Presbyterian Church, under which God's Word must bow.... And do you think then that the people here believe so false a doctrine as the Presbyterian? No; with the exception of three persons, they have all told me they know the Presbyterian doctrine is false.... God forgive me for helping to build this straw building here in M., for I know such a work will burn according to God's word. Nor does it excuse me that I did it 'in good opinion', for it is by this good opinion that Satan sometimes has his power. I am turning back to my orthodox Lutheran church, and I am doing it now; I have built long enough on this straw building. Would

God forgive me! And may he also one day enlighten you by his Word and Spirit in such a way that you will one day want to return from your false teaching to the biblical truth which the Lutheran church has.... We are often enough very exact with our own treasures, why not more exact with the treasures that are the Lord's? We generally do not give away much of what is ours, why give away so much of what belongs to the HEART? Why not hold fast to the salutary word of the LORD? Why give away so much of the truth of God, merely to gain our own end? May God teach you that His way is only one, that it is to be found in His Word and not in reason, that furthermore God's Word is certain and definite even in things which we call 'secondary matters', and finally that the church to which this truth is entrusted is the Lutheran church which God has blessed above all others. Hoping that you too may one day realize this truth, I sign, etc."

The Holston Synod. According to an account of the last session of this synod in Tennessee, found in the "*Lutheran and Missionary*," the "famous (?) Galesburg Rule" was discussed at the same. "In regard to these much debated and involved questions," says the report, "the Synod is almost or quite unanimous. All hold that it is the sacred duty of the Church to preserve and defend the purity of the pulpit and altar with anxious care and constant vigilance. All are against indiscriminate pulpit and altar communion. But not a single one is in favor of an absolute exclusion from our pulpits and altars - of all who are not entirely one with us in name and doctrine. The Synod approved the Galesburg rule, declared and applied in the spirit and spirit of the Akron resolutions, Others as Lutherans in name and in all respects wholly Lutheran in doctrine. may, under wise restrictions to be determined by the conscientious judgment of the pastor and church council, be admitted to our pulpits and altars, but only on the ground of privilege and not of right." - This is most sad. Faithful Lutherans have no privilege to dispense where God's Word clearly reveals to them the will of God. Conscientious Lutherans at the present time cannot even allow all who are called Lutherans to stand in their pulpits and at their altars.

G.

The Pittsburgh Synod also declared that the Galesburg Declaration did not abrogate the Akron decisions, that is, that everything remained the same. G.

The German Synod of Maryland, formed some years ago from the Maryland Synod, which was part of the General Synod, has broken away from the General Synod.

It is not unknown **that in the General Synod**, despite its Lutheran name, reformed doctrine is in vogue. Especially the reformed doctrine of the sacraments is popular. But also the reformed doctrine of the Gospel, as a mere narrative, is spread. Thus an article in the "*Lutheran Observer*" of Sept. 1 says: "Nature reveals nothing to us of the love, truth and power of Jesus. Hence the necessity of the gospel to bring us this good news. And when the gospel has done this, it has done all it can do. It can only reveal and lead us to the Saviour. ... He is the real gospel, not the printed book. John says that he saw in his vision One clothed in a garment sprinkled with blood, whose name is called the Word of God. Love the printed word,... but do not confuse it with the purpose God has in mind, when

he puts it into your hands.... He saith, Come unto me;' not unto the written word, but unto him who is the word itself." - Is not this abominable raving, a reviling of Christ and his gospel! Through the gospel he comes to us, that we may come to him; in the word of the gospel he is taken hold of us. The beginning of the article entitled "Come to me" is blasphemous. It reads, "The accounts we find of JEsu in the Gospel do not present Him fairly and perfectly according, for He is infinitely greater than all His words and works." One can hardly believe his eyes! G.'

Dr. W. M. Reynolds, formerly professor in Pennsylvania college, then president of Capital University at Columbus, and later of Illinois State University at Springfield, Ill," died Sept. 5, Episcopal preacher at Oak Park, Ill.

The Methodists. In order to put an end to the thirty years' war waged between the Northern and Southern Methodist Episcopal Churches, and to make peace, committees, each consisting of five men, were elected by both bodies, which met at Cape May, N. J., in August. They say in their address, "We unanimously united upon the following declaration and basis of fraternity: that each of the two churches is a legitimate branch of Episcopal Methodism in the United States, having their common origin in the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1784," etc. The suits for stolen church property (S. "Lehre und Wehre," July issue p. 214.) were investigated by them; but in most cases they could only lay down general rules, according to which the disputes should be settled. - The Fraternity, however, seems to be still in the wide field. The editor of the "Apologist," Nast, is still not well disposed toward the editor of the Southern Methodist paper, the "Family Friend," And still seeks to incite against him. The latter therefore writes, among other things, in his paper of September 23: "We would beg the dear Doctor to be reconciled to us.... Doctor, scold us no longer! Harm us and our church no longer!" G.

II. Abroad.

Saxony. In Saxony things are moving forward happily. Lic. G. Stöckhardt, "in connection with some of his fellow ministers", has founded an organ which, under the title "Die Ev.-Luth. Freikirche" (The Lutheran Free Church), finally strikes the right note to awaken the sleepers in the apostate German regional churches and to promote the reconstruction of the church of the Reformation. Since we have already reported in detail on the contents of the first two issues of the book in the "Lutheraner" of September 15 of this year, or rather, have included the excellent "Preface" in extenso, we will only report the following here. Under the heading: "Ecclesiastical Chronicle" and "Ecclesiastical News" it is reported: "Within the Saxon regional church the different directions have separated themselves more and more clearly from each other. Each of the three parties has recently drawn up its program. But in this all parties and programs are alike, that nowhere is the whole truth taken in full earnest. Su lze's programme, to which 13 clergymen and a larger number of educated laymen have now expressly subscribed, contains the usual phrases and slogans of the Protestant Association, which have already been sufficiently illuminated and judged. The middle party met this year in the first days of July at Zwickau instead of at Meissen. The first day was spent in discussing the sects and how to combat them. The speaker opened his paper with the successful assertion that sects, among which our Separation was also recently counted, tended to form when new

Life is awakening in the church. Until now, all church historians have believed and said that sectarianism is proof that things are rotten in the church. But it must be progress. Equally new, and striking to all who have studied only a little church history, was and is the other proposition, defended even by a professor, that the previous narrow-mindedness of doctrine had produced sectarianism. On the second day, the same professor advocated a broad-minded position on sacred Scripture. Criticism, i.e. human reason and science, must decide what and how much may be considered truth and revelation in the Bible. The entire conference agreed. A more evident apostasy from the fundamental principle of the Reformation, the Holy Scriptures as the infallible Word of God, is inconceivable. But that the Bible-believing, confessionally faithful Lutherans of the national church should speak and act so timidly and tamely in the face of such powerful errors is the saddest phenomenon. This so-called 'confessional action party' (i.e. 'party of action' - because it has not yet acted) has given expression to its position in three petitions to the Synod, which relate to communion discipline, doctrinal discipline, and marriage ordinances. What is demanded is certainly in accordance with Scripture and the confession. But too little is demanded, and the main damage to the national church is not even touched upon. One is silent about the religious oath, although one generally deplores its abolition. Other demands, e.g. those concerning the restoration of the confession, the basic condition of all church discipline, are made too maternalistically, limited with an 'as far as possible', which immediately gives the Synod the 'transition to the agenda'. Still other petitions are wrapped up in a dark form that is surely not entirely without intention. Why does one ask that the annoyance given by Dr. Sulze be lifted out of the way of church order, and does not demand in German and clearly the dismissal of Sulze and associates? But the main error, which explains the blunders just criticized, lies elsewhere. All the petitions of the same wording in 1875, as well as the one of January 15, 1876, were asserted as demands of conscience. The 181 clergymen, the Dresden Pastoral Conference and several diocesan assemblies signed the third of the so-called Zwickau Theses ('We feel urged by conscience') without complaint. Now all at once the -conscience' is deleted. Thus these last three petitions lack all force, all emphasis.... One wants to pull one's head out of the noose at times. For if one demands something on account of conscience, one cannot then calmly see that such a demand is not fulfilled, but rather that the opposite is and remains practice. The 'Pilgrim from Saxony' and, agreeing with him, the 'Luthardt'sche Kirchenzeitung' justify this interpretation of ours. Both papers have openly declared: 'That is not how we stand - that we would separate if all our demands were not met.' All demands are, and quite properly, proved from God's Word. And whether one tolerates synodal decisions that are more or less contrary to Scripture makes no difference. Summa: God's word and Luther's doctrine no longer necessarily bind the conscience. One has no desire to use one's person and office for the truth and every title of truth; it is so difficult to suffer and sacrifice anything for the sake of Christ and his kingdom. That is the sad thing. - In addition to the three separate Lutheran congregations in Saxony (Dresden, Chemnitz, Planitz), a fourth has recently been added in Crimmitschau. This one has appointed the former missionary Willkomm as its pastor. On the 5th Sunday after Trinity, Rev. Schneider in Röhrsdors, who likewise had not been able to calm himself at the last church regiment, resigned his regional church office and preached his farewell sermon on the prescribed text, Joh. 8, 31. 32. In Planitz teacher Dalmer, after he had been suspended immediately after his resignation (according to which paragraph of the law?), resigned from his school office.

definitely laid down. To the readers who are not yet familiar with our circumstances, we note that our Free Church is not limited to Saxony, that we know ourselves to be completely one in faith and doctrine with the free Lutheran congregations in Nassau, Bavaria, one in Baden, and one in Hesse (with the exception of America). An external ecclesiastical association, whether synodal or conference, among these like-minded congregations of Germany and their pastors has also been contemplated for some time. We entrust this matter of the Kingdom of God to the intercession of our congregations. In other German lands and provinces, likewise, earnest and faithful Lutherans are beginning to stir. God bless their departure from the decayed national church building and their entrance into the Lutheran Free Church, and help that they may possibly choose such a Free Church, which takes the Lutheran confession and all its provisions fully seriously." - How it finally came to the separation of the editor from the national church, he relates as follows: "After the recourse addressed by me and my two fellow ministers to the ministers of state commissioned *in evangelicis* and handed over by them to a Collegium appointed according to the law, was rejected and the so-called right of suspension, i. e. the right of provisional Holy Communion, was definitively revoked. I sent a three-sheet letter to the Saxon State Consistory on May 27, in which I upheld my earlier declaration that I could not obey and again gave detailed reasons. The latter reserved further resolution in case I refrained from a complaint to the Protestant ministers of state. Hereby the final result of my petitions and protests, which I was already prepared for after the first rejection, i.e. suspension and dismissal, was announced to me clearly enough. After I had appealed five times to the proper church authorities and had not even achieved so much that my reasons, taken from the Holy Scriptures and the Confession, were duly considered, appreciated, or rather refuted to me, it seemed to me like a gimmick unworthy of this serious, holy matter to speak the same thing for the sixth time and presumably again to the wind. I had also recognized it as a tactic of the evil enemy, that he wanted to tire the conscience by delaying and stalling, and as dangerous to the soul to enter into this tactic and to play, as it were, with the devil. Therefore I gave up the way of complaint. In the meantime, God had opened my eyes further, so that I became aware of all the deep damage to the nature of the national church and of what was contrary to God in my previous administration, and at the same time he had sharpened my conscience about my participation in other people's sins and the continuation of a false, sinful practice in grace. In particular, the intercourse with my present brother Pastor Ruhland had been the means in the hands of the Lord to lead me further in the knowledge of the truth. Already in my little book "Zustand und Zukunft der sächsischen Landeskirche" ("State and Future of the Saxon Regional Church"), which appeared at Easter, I had expressed the conviction and provided the proof that the Saxon Regional Church had already ceased to be a Lutheran church years ago. There I had revoked my previous practice of confession, according to which I had given absolution Sunday after Sunday to the unrepentant and unrepentant, whose state of soul I could have convinced myself of by a brief confessional interrogation, and had administered the Lord's Supper, and had confessed that I was guilty of infidelity. Since then, for months, I had continued to administer my church office, especially the sacrament, with great pain in my conscience. The position I had taken in the last-mentioned pamphlet, i.e. the position of waiting until the Synod, had become more and more doubtful and untenable to me, especially since the Synod was adjourned once again. I had to tell myself that what one has recognized as right should be done at that time, and what one has recognized as sin should be done just at that time.

I have to give it time, since God gives knowledge of the truth, and that it is evil and displeasing to God to suspend obedience until a certain date. My scruples of conscience in the whole struggle so far have had as their object and cause my long hesitation, not any quick, rash action. All attempts on my part to put a stop to the lax administration of the Lord's Supper at my place had remained unsuccessful. So I could no longer resist the Spirit of Truth, especially at the time of Pentecost. It seemed to me to be the most obvious thing to do at this point to take the fight to the Saxon Landesconsistorium, as the representative of the Landeskirche, and to state openly how I stood by him. Indeed, I would have been guilty of dishonesty if I had repeatedly emphasized only the right of suspension and thus created the impression that I otherwise considered the Consistory to be a normal Lutheran church authority. Just from the last decisions of the Consistory I had seen that it thought and spoke about sin, repentance, faith, grace, absolution quite differently than Scripture and the Confession, and it had become clear to me that it no longer stood on the foundation of the Lutheran faith. Then I saw myself compelled to apply the passages of the Schmalkaldic Articles, in which it is made the duty of the churches, pastors and congregations to consider such bishops, who defend ungodly doctrine and worship, as criminal people and no longer to recognize them as head pastors, to my relationship to the Consistory. Only recently the Saxon Consistory had confirmed Dr. Sulze as the main preacher of Neustadt-Dresden and thus tolerated and defended his ungodly, soul-destroying teachings and encouraged the degenerate administration of the Lord's Supper in the Saxon regional church by neither excluding nor suspending even the most obvious despisers of the sacred, the despisers of baptism. If I were to continue to obey such an authority, I would make myself guilty of defending and promoting falsehood and lack of discipline. Overwhelmed by Scripture and confession, I obeyed the commandment of God pronounced and justified in the Schmalkaldic Articles, and resigned my obedience to the Saxon State Consistory, not only in the case at hand, but in general, because I did not want to resist God. On June 6, Paul Gerhard's Day, I wrote this last, decisive petition, certain, in spite of all opposition, to follow in the footsteps of that witness of truth. On June 10 I was suspended from office, and at the same time I was given the prospect of being removed from office. On June 14, I declared my resignation from office and my resignation from the national church. My writings and steps, especially the last step, have recently been reviewed several times, especially in the 'Allgemeine ev.-luth. Kirchenzeitung' ('Eine Renitenz in Sachsen') and in the 'Pilger aus Sachsen'. I have only one thing to say in reply to the attacks I have received in these articles. In these articles I lack any consideration of the reasons given by me not only for my position in general, but also for my actions and proceedings in the individual, specific cases from Scripture and confession. Nor do the opponents appear to justify their policy of waiting, of acquiescence, and indeed of acquiescence in lies and sin, not in injustice, with clear statements from Scripture. The reader who conscientiously examines my writings and submissions, in which I have attempted to prove all my assertions by Bible and symbols, and compares them with the above-mentioned replies, will have to admit to me that the authors of the latter did not even attempt a thorough refutation of my reasons and counter-reasons - and in such serious matters I recognize only Scriptural reasons as valid - and apparently had no desire to do so. If this is so, then I do not do injustice to my opponents when I make such a criticism without reasons in sacred

matters of conscience, a dismissal with tangible expressions 'imprudence,' 'unrestrained obstinacy,' and the like, without proof, a frivolous, conscienceless *raisonnement*."

Saxony. In the "Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung" of August 25, a report is given on the petitions that are to be sent to the state synod meeting at the end of September. These petitions primarily concern church discipline, doctrinal discipline, and the marriage and wedding ordinances. As far as the punctum on church discipline is concerned, the church newspaper declares that it is "not beyond all doubt whether the petition will be accepted in its entirety, indeed in its principle. As to the punct of doctrinal discipline, it bites, among others: "Separation knocks earnestly admonishingly at the gates of the national church; but the chief cause of it is the want of doctrinal discipline. 'A neglect of the most necessary ecclesiastical doctrinal discipline or an even too lax handling of it,' we therefore say with the petition, 'must be recognized as the straightest way to work into the hands of the separated communities and to dig the grave of the national church.'" Strange is the remark of the church newspaper (Luthardt's?): "Sulze is not a professor, but a clergyman of the regional church, who should teach in accordance with the confession wherever he teaches." Should not the professor of a Lutheran regional church do the same? How can the regional church hope for pastors who are faithful to the confession, if the professors who are to train and educate them are unfaithful to the confession?
W.

The "Allgemeine ev. - luth. Kirchenzeitung", after receiving a warning from the East Indies, still continues to have "lies" fed to it by its correspondents and to readily copy them. Thus, for example, a correspondent from Hanover writes again in the number of August 4: "Can any believing Lutheran feel enthusiasm, or even respect, for conditions where here an attempt at understanding between the German Free Churches, undertaken with warm love, is shattered, where there Missourians in doctrinaire delusion declare that Pastor Harms in Hermannsburg is no longer a Lutheran?" What Missourians have declared that? Are the Missourians in Germany so misguided that one thinks, in good Jesuitical fashion, that the commandment no longer applies to them: "Put away lies and speak the truth"? - It is true, of course, that we do not approve of everything, but have to reprove some things, both what the blessed Harms wrote and what his brother and successor in office wrote. We cannot approve, for example, when he said in his last mission festival sermon, according to his missionary bulletin (of June): "The terrible battle has long since broken out, and here and there a small group has shown the courage to leave the Union and that church fellowship which, in their opinion, has departed from the Lord Jesus and His Word. Here a congregation arises, and there a congregation. But how little love is there even among those who have thus departed? The one congregation heresies the other and hates the other, and they exclude each other from the Sacrament, and yet all want to be members of the body of Christ, and all want to be a Lutheran church fellowship!" According to Pastor Harms, then, all strife among the "separated" comes from lack of love, and the rejection of false doctrine to the opponents among the same he declares to be "heresy"! It is equally wrong when Harms said on that occasion: "If we ask further: How will it become with our Lutheran mission? we will likewise receive the answer from God's Word: It must become good with it, as it will only become good with the Lutheran church itself. And in addition to this, she has a very special promise of her own: the Lord has promised her that He will do it in haste in the last times, that in the last times the gospel will be preached to all creatures, that in the last times the mission will have an extraordinary uplifting effect."

For the gospel, the word of the cross, is to be brought to all nations, peoples, and tongues, so that no Gentile will be able to excuse himself at the last day as if he had not been able to convert. Here is interpreted to our time in particular, what the Scripture proclaims in advance of the whole New Testament time, and falsely asserts, at least according to the wording, that for the sake of the mission all Gentiles could be converted. But if we have reproved and will reprove this and the like, it is not yet declared that "Pastor Harms is no longer a Lutheran." Unfortunately, it is now becoming the fashion that, in order to be able to reject a fraternal punishment with a good appearance, one immediately proclaims it to be a proclamation of excommunication. But what is that but to shut the mouth of the Holy Spirit? It is true, we Missourians have no claim to high esteem, and like to be the least, but if we punish with God's word, it is not to be jested with for the sake of our personal wretchedness. Luk 10, 16.

W.

Bremerhafen. Of the Lutheran congregation at Bremerhasen, the "Bremer Kirchenblatt" itself confesses: "Much injustice has been done to it, its church rightly bears the name of the Kreuzkirche." She wants to build a larger place of worship because she has no more room. "Only a year ago a new place" (even against payment) "was refused to it, while one had been given to the Catholic congregation there," and in addition the Lutheran congregation still has to bear the costs of the unirritated church.

Hesse. We read the following in Brunn's journal: "Ev.-luth. Kirche und Mission", No. 6: "As much as we like to acknowledge and honor everything that can be found in the cause of the Hessian Renitents of right faith, we can certainly not see any suffering for the sake of faith in their suffering. The Renitents quarrel and argue with the Hessian state government about the concept of separation, and to this quarrel they make such heavy sacrifices, indeed, they possibly risk the continuance of their entire cause of faith. We separated Lutherans in Nassau, and so also the Lutheran congregation in Hesse, which is associated with us, know very well that we have not made a new church; we truly only want to be members of the old Lutheran church, which was long before us. But we distinguish between spiritual and secular-civil, between legal and ecclesiastical. According to legal and civil concepts, as they are used by the state government, the formation of separate Lutheran congregations is, of course, a new ecclesiastical formation, the creation of a new religious community that did not exist before. The latter is also permitted by law in Hesse. Why is it that the Renitents there do not want to find and send themselves into this juridical-bourgeois. Use of language find and send? Why do they insist on dealing with the secular State and its jurists only according to spiritual and ecclesiastical terms, and not according to those as the civil law has them? Spiritual things, to be sure, are to be judged spiritually, says St. Paul, but in civil life a Christian judges himself according to civil conditions. If, therefore, the State declares us to be a religious community now only newly formed, we ought not, therefore, to quarrel with it, much less to desire to become martyrs, for the sake of this purely State speech; No, we may admit that we are, to be sure, something entirely new, newly constituted religious communities for the state and for our external human-civic side, which the state alone regards, which did not exist before in this external form, only that we thereby confess and testify that our faith is not new, but that of the old true Christian and Lutheran church. But to confess the latter freely and to one's heart's content is not forbidden by any law, even in Hesse, and is not hindered by any police. That, however, is precisely what is deeply deplorable, that the renitents in Hesse, according to their false Vilmar doctrine, do not know how to properly separate the purely spiritual realm of the church from the human exterior.

Hanover. On the occasion of a report on the confirmation by the royal government of a marriage law drafted by the synod, Dr. Münkler remarks in his paper of July 27: "In the country itself, dissatisfaction has not yet disappeared in places, and here and there one hears isolated voices announcing resistance. Since the concerns lie in another area than that of conscience and the divine word, there is no reason for separation and nothing more is heard of it. At most, in very few cases, there will be resistance, the consequences of which will perhaps be regrettable but temporary, without disturbing the peace of the national church as a whole."

Lauenburg. The Allg. Kz. writes: With the annexation of Lauenburg into Prussia and its connection to the province of Schleswig-Holstein, the special administrative authorities of Lauenburg are now dissolved. This also includes the Lauenburg Consistory, which administered the church and school system. The 27 churches with 31 clergymen will now be subordinated to the Consistory in Kiel, and the Lauenburg Superintendency will thus join the ranks of the Schleswig-Holstein provostries. At the same time, the right to fill a large part of the Lauenburg parishes will pass to the Kiel Consistory, since only the smaller number, especially in the cities, is filled by election.

A new Union congregation was recently formed in Langenberg (Elberfeld District Synod). The two existing congregations there, a larger Reformed congregation and a smaller Lutheran congregation, have united to form a congregation which, in addition to the old general confessions, confesses the common confessions of both sides and expressly recognizes the Augsburg Confession of 1540 as the expression of this common confession and as the binding doctrinal standard. The Catechism of the Rhenish Provincial Synod is adopted as the catechism. The congregation retains two churches, in which the order of worship remains unchanged. The remark with which the Neue Evangelische Kirchenzeitung accompanies this announcement is naïve: "The opponents of the Union, who are pleased with the statement that Union and Confession are two irreconcilable opposites, can see from this example that even united congregations can and want to bind themselves to a confession (but what a confession!!)" (Meckl. Kirchen- und Zeitblatt.).

The Saxon Chambers have recently adopted a law containing the following provisions concerning the Roman Catholic Church of Saxony: No ecclesiastical ordinance may contradict the laws of the state. Ordinances of general content require the sovereign's approval in order to be promulgated and must therefore be submitted to the King by the Minister of Culture. The approval is to be stated in the ordinance. The Church's means of discipline and coercion directed against body, property, civil honor, etc., are inadmissible. Clergymen to be employed must have a certain education obtained in Germany. If they offend against the laws of the state, they are to be dismissed as required. The pope may not exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the country. Orders and brotherhoods similar to orders are forbidden, etc.

Bavaria. Thus we read in Luthardt's Kirchenzeitung of June 9: A sample of the religious worldview of the Bavarian teachers was recently also published by the "Bayer. Lehrertztg." gave a sample of the religious worldview of the Bavarian teachers. It says: "I have accompanied the world citizen from the perspective into the Jammerthal of the goddess Hertha. You, mother, are the first berusene factor to bring peace to humanity, unity and freedom, to build up the strong pillars of the peace temple of the peoples in quiet hours far from the noise, the sense-listening vortex of pleasure of the people forgetting their dignity in the divine halls of the child's soul." How divine these halls are, and what formative power this poetic world-view of modern teachers exercises on the hearts of children, there-

of which we have just read a proof. Before the district court in Kaiserslautern the case came to trial that a fifteen-year-old Sunday school pupil had his teacher told by another teacher that he would beat his brains to water if he reported his school absences. If we add to this excellent school education the educational methods of modern parents, we can hope for an excellent generation in the future.

Germany. Dr. Münkler writes: "The formation of a German conservative party out of several former half, mild and wholly conservative parties is a small event, of which one must wait and see whether it will become a great event. If this were to happen, we would be at the end of many a turmoil. The new party aims at the preservation and reinvigoration of Christian and ecclesiastical institutions, especially the Christian, confessional elementary school. It regards the church controversy, 'which is being exploited by the liberals as a cultural struggle against Christianity, as a misfortune for the empire and the people, and is prepared to cooperate in ending it'. It recognizes the right of the state, by virtue of its sovereignty, to regulate its relationship to the church contrary to the claims of Rome, but in such a way that no encroachments of the state on the area of internal church life take place. From such encroachments, as it seems, it does not absolve the State, and therefore wants to help to eliminate overlapping laws, and to give more independence to the Protestant Church in particular."

Holland. One consequence of the Dutch school law, which has taken away the Christian character of the elementary school, is the reduction of the municipal elementary schools to purely poor schools. In the countryside this consequence was less pronounced; but in all the larger towns of the country, as a result of that school law, the private school system took an unimagined upswing. The children of the rich were not to be found in the elementary schools, but the children of the very numerous and capable middle classes in the Dutch cities were. Now one would look for them in vain. Many confessional schools have been founded from private funds by both Protestants and Catholics. The boards of directors of Protestant schools, which have no access to a general budget, usually have to charge somewhat higher school fees than the schools that are maintained on municipal funds. Thus it is self-evident that only those parents who really care about the proper education of their children take on these additional costs and entrust their children to the Christian schools. Nevertheless, these schools are overcrowded and have such a great demand, especially from the small bourgeoisie and the more solid working-class families, that they cannot accept all those who have enrolled. And so any citizen who thinks anything of himself, whatever his religious views, may not leave his children to the cheapest schools. That already goes against decency. The consequence is that only the children of the poorest, and of such parents as care little for the matter, are left for the communal schools. Hence it is quite true when the public elementary schools, e. g. in Amsterdam, bear above their doors the inscription "*openlyke Armentschool*". (Ref. Kz.)

Necrological. We have just read that Prof. Rudolf v. Raumer in Erlangen, the well-known author of the valuable work: "The Influence of Christianity on the High German Language", has recently died. He was born in Breslau in 1815.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 22. N November 1876.

No. 11.

The "carrying" of Melanchthon from the "side" of Luther.

After Luther's death, it was often pointed out to those Lutherans who did not want to keep brotherly, altar and church fellowship with obvious false teachers within our church, that Luther himself had cultivated such fellowship with Melanchthon, even after the latter had no longer been in agreement with Luther on several important points of doctrine.) Such Lutherans, one claimed, obviously wanted to be more strictly Lutheran than Luther himself. A Lutheran according to Luther's sense must not break off fellowship with erring persons who still professed our church, but must rather bear and tolerate them, as Luther once did a Melanchthon. This has also been reproached in recent times to those dismissed East Indian missionaries who declared that they could no longer remain in the service of the Leipzig Missionary Society if it did not break away from the fellowship with notorious false teachers in which it is known to stand. Missionary Zorn wrote us from the East Indies that Director Hardeland had said to them, the missionaries who were troubled in their conscience: "They want to be more orthodox than Luther. - One must take a man for Lutheran, that is, not divorce him, as long as he confesses to be Lutheran. Here," it continues, "Luther's carrying Melanchthon's from 42-46 was cited (and cited again and again) as a resounding example of sound church practice from the foundational period of the Reformation."

*) This was done, among others, by the crypto-Calvinist Dr. EaSpar Peucer, Melanchthon's son-in-law, in his *Tractatus historicus de Melanchthonis sententia de controversia Coenae Domini*, 1576. The Philippists at the Altenburg Colloquium in 1568 went further, and claimed that Luther had agreed with Melanchthon's deviations from the earlier teaching.

Now, if Melanchthon had really been revealed as a stiff-necked false teacher already in Luther's time, and if Luther had really not let Melanchthon go on quietly during that time, one would have to admit, however, that those Lutherans who do not want to cultivate fellowship with false teachers who have left our Church do not act in Luther's sense, at any rate not according to Luther's example.

But the case, thank God, is quite different; and this is the purpose of the present article to prove.

First of all, far from it that Melanchthon, during Luther's lifetime, either already consciously deviated from Luther's teaching in any article, or that he, if this was the case, should have gone out freely with his errors and placed himself in opposition to Luther, he rather either meant that only his doctrinal form was different and that he only softened certain, as he thought, misunderstandable, paradoxical, harsh expressions, or should he really have been clearly aware of his deviation from Luther's doctrine, and should he also have secretly spoken out against his comrades, then he always tried to conceal his deviations as much as possible, by expressing himself ambiguously and at the same time publicly confessing Luther's doctrine in all points, so that just the unsuspecting Luther had less of an idea of Melanchthon's doctrinal deviations than others. *) First of all, everyone who has taken a more than superficial insight into Melanchthon's behavior in the last ten years before Luther's death is confronted with this alternative.

Slight doubts about Luther's teaching on Holy Communion seem to have arisen in Melanchthon's heart already in 1535, not during his study of Scripture, but during his reading of the Church Fathers, especially the Greek ones. On January 12 of that year he wrote to Brenz: "I see that there are many testimonies of the ancient writers (Church Fathers) which unambiguously interpret the Sacrament in a typical and tropical way; but the counter-sacred testimonies are either of later origin or spurious. But not only did he write these words of his otherwise Latin letter in Greek (no doubt from apprehension that the letter might fall into indiscreet hands), but he also adds: "I beseech thee that thou mayest interpret this letter to the best advantage, and, when thou hast read the same, tear it up at once, and show it to no man." (*Corpus Reformatorum*. I. II, 824.) But none the less did Melanchthon confess, at any rate because he had his

*) We will deal later with those cases in which Luther noticed that Melanchthon was really deviating, and for that reason too, however, took him to task, but Melanchthon gave way or gave reassuring explanations.

**Löschner, who also reports this, says: "To which, among other things, this brought him, that he had an almost divine respect for the writings of the fathers. (Hist. mot. II, 31.)

Doubts had not yet been overcome, then still publicly and solemnly also in this point to Luther's doctrine. In 1536, as is known, he also signed with Luther the so-called Wittenberg Concord, which he himself, in accordance with the order he had received, drafted between the Wittenbergers and the theologians of the upper countries. (See Luther's Werke. Hall. Ausg. XVII, 2529. ff.) It is true that for his own part he had been in favor of the establishment of the Convention. Among other things, he writes to his trusted friend Camerarius that he "could not have prevented the meeting as he wished" (Corp. R. III., 89.), and confesses to his friend Veit Dietrich: "Since I tried in vain to prevent the meeting, I have finally come to the conclusion that we (at least) should not enter into a final settlement. (p. 97.) Without doubt, however, Melanchthon had been against the meeting only because he had feared that it would only result in trouble. Even before that, he had written to the Landgrave Philip in regard to the planned meeting: "Now I am worried for many reasons that this will cause more disunity and greater division, hatred, anger and public scolding. (A. a. O. p. 56.) He expressed the same concern in letters to Veit Dietrich. (p. 65. 70.) Suspicious as all this may be, however, Melanchthon cannot be trusted to have signed the "Concordie" in contradiction to his convictions at that time. In 1537 we find Melanchthon among the signers of the Schmalkaldic Articles, which, as is well known, express Luther's teaching in such clear terms that an opponent of it can only sign it as an autocatacrist. In 1538 we read in a responsum of Melanchthon to one of the nobility: "There is no reason to tear Christ apart in this way, that he is with us according to the divinity, and is not with us according to the humanity, especially because he has said that he gives us his body and blood. So also Paul saith, that the supper is a communion of the body and blood of Christ. But if Christ were not bodily present, it would be communion of the Spirit only, and not of the body or blood. And this I judge to be sufficient for a simple lesson. For we ought not to depart from words, because they are contrary to other scriptures. Now these words of the supper are not contrary to other scriptures, though they be strange to reason." (p. 620.) We find a particularly splendid confession of Melanchthon in the testament which he wrote in 1539 in a premonition of death. In it he writes, among other things: "Of the Lord's Supper I hold the Concordia made here. *) I have therefore attached myself to these churches, and hold

*) A proof that Melanchthon had the Wittenberg Concord with full over-
...that he had signed a testimony.

that they confess the doctrine of the common church of Christ, and that they be true churches of Christ. And I command my children to remain in our churches, and to flee the churches of the papists, and their connection with them. For the papists profess in many articles an entirely corrupt doctrine: they know nothing at all of the doctrine of the righteousness of faith and of the forgiveness of sins; they teach nothing of the distinction of the law and the gospel; about the invocation of God they have heathen or Pharisaic opinions; to these errors they add both many others and manifest idolatry in their masses and their worship of dead men. I therefore demand of my children that they obey me in this, for the sake of God's command, and not join the papists. ... There will also perhaps arise new sophistical comparisons of the doctrines of faith, by which the old errors, somewhat colored, will be restored, and these comparisons will corrupt the purity of the doctrine which is now taught. Of these also I warn mine own, that they do not approve of sophistical comparisons." . . . My intention has not been to sow any new opinion, but to declare clearly and actually the Catholic doctrine taught in our churches, which I believe to have been revealed by a special act of God's grace in these last times through the Lord Dr. Martin Luther, so that the church might be purified and restored, which otherwise would have completely perished. ... But I give thanks to the venerable Dr. M. Luther, first, because I have learned the gospel from him. Secondly, for the special benevolence towards me, which he has shown by many good deeds, and I want him to be honored by my own not unlike a father." (*Corp. Ref.* III, 826. f.) On February 13, 1538, he wrote to Dietrich: "Concerning the quarrel of that man who disputes with you that one may not raise the symbols (the consecrated elements) on high, I have spoken with I)r. Luther, who is only angry that the unnecessary matter is being agitated. My advice, however, is that if he confesses that the body is really present, he must necessarily permit the elevation. If he defends Zwingli's dogma, I believe you will not tolerate the man." (p. 488.) To the Goldberg pastor, J. Resting, Melanchthon writes, in 1541, concerning elevation at Holy Communion, "Many of ours have abolished the same; we here retain it according to the old custom, and I hold that you should not suddenly change that custom. Although many questions would be avoided by the abolition of that custom, yet, because with the signs Christ's body is given, that outward reverence cannot be condemned, if one has the right understanding, and does not worship the sign, but recognizes that there is something else given besides the signs. At all times of the church

the congregation falls on its knees at the act of the mystery, as it is called. Therefore I do not see how you could abolish that custom; only that the people are to be instructed rightly." (*Corp. Reform.* IV, 735.) Not to mention other definite avowals of Melanchthon to Luther's doctrine from this and the following years, Melanchthon writes, as late as 1543, in the preface to his *Locis*: "I accept the doctrine of the Wittenberg and associated churches, which, beyond all doubt, is the consensus of the Catholic Church, i. e., of all those instructed within the Church of Christ. But it is Paul's will that there should be judgments in the church concerning doctrine, that the truth may be preserved unaltered, and that unity may not be rashly disturbed. I myself also acknowledge the leanness and lack of spotlessness of my writings. Therefore, although I strive to speak actually and simply, it may happen, especially with the great mass of things and with such great brevity, that at times something is expressed too obscurely or not comfortably enough. I do not, therefore, withdraw myself from the judgments of our churches; for I respect them for God's church, and reverence them with sincere reverence, nor will I separate myself from them, and submit my speeches, writings, and actions to their judgment." (*Locis praecip. th. Lips. 1552. Praef. A. 2. s.*) Finally, the following is highly important. When, in 1545, the Swiss desired to be admitted to the Schmalkaldic League, the Elector of Saxony asked the Wittenberg theologians for their opinion. They issued such an objection, which was not only signed by Melanchthon, but also written by Melanchthon himself. In it, however, after mention has been made of the political reasons which oppose the acceptance of the Zwinglian Swiss, it says, among other things, as follows: "We leave this to the gentlemen themselves, who by the grace of God are gifted with a high intellect, to consider for themselves. But it is public that the preachers of Zurich write against our church, and have some articles which are reprehensible. Now we cannot suppose, if we were to contend on both sides with writings against each other, that hearts would be inclined to equal protection. On the other hand, they would understand and need this acceptance as for strengthening and spreading their opinions." (*Corp. Ref. V, 723.*.)*) What could and could not Luther

*Bretschneider, the editor of the *Corpus Reformatorum*, says for easily understandable reasons:

"I consider neither Luther nor Melanchthon to be the author of this objection, but either Bugenhagen or Cruciger." But supposing Bretschneider to be in the right, it remains certain that Melanchthon signed the objection with his own hand, and thus testified that he wished to be regarded with Luther as an opponent of the doctrine of the Zwinglians, as an erroneous and dangerous one. But to this must be added that the Wittenberg theologians in 1597, in their *Refutatio historiae Peucerianae*, expressly testify: "That to the Elector

What other conclusion can be drawn from this than that Melanchthon was also in agreement with the Swiss on doctrine? It might not remain completely hidden from Luther that Melanchthon was tormented by scruples and was already inclined, by virtue of his nature, which shunned disagreement and struggle, to achieve unification through less distinctive formulas, yes, to make compromises with the opponents, so all this was sufficient for Luther, however, and rightly so, to consider his dear Philip, in view of those beautiful confessions of the pure and orthodox doctrine of the Word of God, as a man who was a conscious opponent of some article of the pure doctrine and attached to some dangerous false doctrine. We do not deny that if the same symptoms that appeared in Melanchthon had appeared in another personage, Luther would not only have been filled with grave distrust of the same, but would also have intervened with greater seriousness. But the situation was not that Luther overlooked a false doctrine in Melanchthon, which he would have punished and condemned in another, but that Luther's guileless, faithful heart could not trust such unfaithfulness to God and man in his so often tried and tested honorable Melanchthon. Thus Luther was able to write to the preachers at Eperies in Hungary on April 21, 1544 (before the publication of his "short confession" of the same year): "What you write of Matthia Devai" (who had been in Wittenberg) "surprises me greatly, since he is so well rumored among us that I myself can hardly believe it, whether you write it or not" (that he had joined the Sacramentarians). "But be it as it may, he has certainly not learned the doctrine of the Sacramentans from us. We are constantly fighting against this in public and in particular, and not the least bit of the abomination is to be noticed or seen among us, unless the devil is mumbling about it in some secret corner. Stand firm, therefore, and be assured that, if God does not take away all my wit" (Latin: "*Nisi me Deus furiosum fieri permittat*"), "I will never have the same opinion with the enemies of the Sacrament, or that such an abomination will be heard in the church entrusted to me. Or if I, since God is for, do otherwise, you may confidently say that I am mad or damned. It is the devil, who, knowing that I am publicly invincible, as so many of my books testify, seeks to defile me by secret serpent-whispering, as much as he can, in corners, and to insult the word of truth under my name. So after so many of my confessions, I must issue a new one, if I want to do it as soon as possible. I think nothing bad of Mr. Philippen" ("*De M. Philippus mihi nulla est omnino suspicio*"), "nor of any of ours.

about this question given Responsum is from Philippus itself, which is to be noticed well, in writing set up and is still now present at this time in the Saxon archives." (*Consil. Witebergens. Tom. I. f. 307.*)

For, as I have said, Satan must not make a noise about it publicly." (XXI, 1334. f.) Luther bears similar testimony in a letter of November 12 of the same year against Alterius in Italy. He writes to the same: "I pray in the Lord that you may not be deceived and defrauded that it is the Zurichers, as Bullingerus and Pellicanus, or even Bucerus himself, who in the beginning of the clamor wrote much in Latin (as they say, for I have not seen it) of it; but I hold that he has now long since become of a different and better mind. Yea, if ye should hear at once that **Philip**, or Luther himself, had been united with their, the Swiss, flock, **I beseech you for God's sake, believe it not.**" (XVII, 2633.) To the same Alterius Luther had written before, June 13: "Bucer stands by Melanchthon in the Cologne Church, which would not be suffered and **Philip would not tolerate** if he (Bucer) were thought not pure (in doctrine)." (Luther's Brr. of de Wette. V, 567.)

It is a fact that Melanchthon himself thought that he was not departing from Luther's teachings in reality, but was only softening his, as he thought, harsh and abrupt expressions in order to protect them from misunderstanding. So he wrote among other things on June 22, 1537, to Veit Dietrich: "However, I try with all diligence to preserve the unity of our academy, and you know that I use some art in this. Luther does not seem to have any hostile attitude towards us. Only yesterday he discussed with me in an extremely friendly manner the points of contention which Quadratus (Cordatus) had aroused, when I explained what a tragic spectacle it would be if we were to fight with each other like the Cadmean brothers themselves. . . . Otherwise, I wish very much that the articles, in respect of which there seems to be some difference, were clearly and usefully explained. You know that I speak of some things less repulsively (*minus horride*), of predestination, of the consent of the will, of the necessity of our obedience, of mortal sin. That of all this Luther believes the same, I know, but unlearned men love certain somewhat exaggerated (φορτικώτερα) sayings of his, since they do not see where they belong, too much. Nor will I dispute with them. Let them rejoice in their judgment. However, allow me, the peripatetic and lover of the middle road (*mediocritatis*), to speak less stoically at times." (*Corp. Reform.* III, 383.) On October 13, 1537, when a day had already been fixed on which Melanchthon was to be reproached for suspicion that he was harboring false doctrine, he wrote to the same Dietrich: "I have today gathered a small stock for my defense. I will say why I thought I had to explain some things in the dogmas more precisely, in order to avoid ambiguities and inauthentic ways of speaking (*ἀχυρολογίας*), which have many dangers. I will show what disadvantages

I will also say why I thought I had to mitigate some things. I will add what goals I have set for myself, not to be the originator of a new sect or to appear as if I wanted to play mirror fencer against Luther, but to achieve these two things: so that for the benefit of the youth a real and simply presented Christian doctrine would be available, as well as so that I would promote the studies of the other sciences. I will also apologize for the fact that my views have been more moderate in public deliberations. For I have never advocated my opinion tyrannically; I have rather followed what the princes have decided in common council, as should be done in an aristocracy. Know, then, that I face the reproach with full equanimity. For perhaps a frank parley will lift the whole offence." (A. a. O. p. 429.) When, in the year before, Cordatus attacked Melanchthon because the latter had called good works the *causa sine qua non*, Melanchthon declared, in a letter addressed from Nuremberg to Luther, Jonas, and Cruciger together: "I have never, especially in regard to this point of controversy, wanted to teach anything else, nor have I taught anything else than you teach together. ... My writings are available. I do not flee your judgment either, not even Amsdorf's. Nor have I ever been anxious for anything else than to explain as truly as possible what you teach, because I knew that many hold erroneous opinions about such important things. The young also need a way suitable for teaching, sometimes also with dialectical words. ... I ask you also, for Christ's sake, to believe that I have taught what I have taught in good zeal and not in the consciousness (*animo*) of disagreeing with you .. I have never wished to separate my opinion from yours; rather, when I am burdened by the suspicions and calumnies of certain men, and alienation of minds is to be feared, I prefer to go somewhere away from it. I do not presume to do anything, and I do not want to publish anything new but my opinion. The Yours I have collected and explained as simply as I could." (A. a. O. p. 180.) He also wrote to Camerarius in regard to this controversy in the same year: "Letters" (of Cordatus) "have been circulated, in which it was written that I would not return, because I do not agree with Luther and the others. This empty talk of men is ridiculous to me; but there are those here who have stirred up these fables, who thus sufficiently show their foolishness or the weakness of their will. I am not accused of anything except that I am said to praise good works too much. This happens because, in explaining and methodically presenting these points of contention actually and accurately, I speak of some things less objectionably (*minus horride*) than they do." (p. 193.) Still on October 21, 1545, he writes

to Buchholzer: "I do not know whence comes so great a hatred against me in some old friends, since they themselves know that no new dogma has been produced by me, and that in some pieces the true and proper explanation has been sought with a fair amount of diligence." (S. 872.)

In addition to these repeated assertions by Melanchthon that he was in agreement with Luther in doctrine, there is the fact that many questionable things that Melanchthon spoke, wrote and did remained completely unknown to Luther. That Melanchthon, for example, had written an "*Apologia de conciliatione*," defense of a compromise, Luther learned with astonishment only through a letter from Venice. (Luther's Briefe von de Wette. V, 568.) Ratzeberger also writes: "After this Colloquio (1536) and departures from Wittenberg, not only Bucerus, but also the other theologians of the Upper Netherlands, Switzerland and Zurich, wrote much to Philippo, and likewise Philippus now and then to the Zurich theologians, since Heinricus Bullingerus had only recently succeeded *Zwinglio caeso*. From Lutherus did not know anything about this secret writing back and forth, and it remained hidden for a long time that Lutherus did not know about it. (Ratzeberger's Handwritten History of Luther and His Time, edited by Neudecker. Jena 1850. p. 85.) "So now," Ratzeberger relates below, "Philippus, as reported, was able to conceal his *a doctrina Lutheri de sacrosancta coena*, that he did not let himself be heard nor noted with the least, and sheer no one could notice it even among the *studiosis*, for only his secret and trusted friends, as Vitus Winshemius, Mag. Marcellus *et pauci alii*, and thus his secret *affectus Luthero adhuc vivsnts* or *mehrentheils* remained concealed and covered up." (S. 95.)

That this portrayal does not do too much to Melanchthon is proven by many of his private letters that still exist, both to certain persons among the Lutherans, of whom he knew or believed that he did not need to mislead himself before them, as well as to the Oberlanders and Swiss, to whom he thought he could open up his inner life without any danger of betraying himself. If one reads these letters, one must be amazed at how completely different Melanchthon's position appears in them than in his public appearance and in his intercourse with Luther. These letters are full of the most bitter reproaches against Luther, while, on the other hand, in what the faithful Luther wrote, there is not a single line in which he secretly disparaged Melanchthon in any way against others. Even Meurer, in his biography of Melanchthon (p. 82), must admit the latter, although, according to the now popular historical "impartiality" and "objectivity," he distributes the blame for the disproportion between Luther and Melanchthon fairly equally among both "theure Gottesmänner. As for Melanchthon's bitter outbursts against Luther, he wrote, to share only a few things here,

In 1544, when Luther had preached a serious sermon against secret marriages, he gave the following to his Camerarius: "On the day I arrived, ours" (by which he always means Luther) "preached a sermon here, in which he did not pore over the jurists with the dignity of a Pericles, but with the frankness of a Kleon. (*Corp. Ref. V*, 293.) Otherwise Melanchthon repeatedly calls Luther "our Pericles" in his letters to intimate friends, in order thereby to characterize Luther's supposedly impetuous nature, (cf. p. 292. 464. 495., where he calls Luther the Xanthippides.) Calvin also gives Luther this nickname (*Epp.* 13, 5.), but whether the latter borrowed it from Melanchthon, or Melanchthon from Calvin, is uncertain, the former being the most probable. After Camerarius had answered Melanchthon's letter, the latter wrote again: "That you think that these harsh sermons against the jurists cause me pain, you are not mistaken. What is this before the people? How untimely it is now! ... Yes, one (!) thinks that he does not even have cause for it, and that he lets himself be ruled by temper, as otherwise also against others." (p. 310.) This unjust rebuke, by the way, was soon to serve Melanchthon to great shame. Not long afterward, Luther, among others, released Melanchthon's son from a secret engagement, as an unholy one, the fulfillment of which would have been a misfortune for the family. (See Luther's Letters from de Wette, V, 676.) Even to Bullinger, of Zurich, he wrote secretly, as early as March 25, 1541: "If rougher letters are written by some in these parts, we others still want to cultivate consensus and friendly relations among ourselves, and not allow our churches to be torn asunder any more." (p. 342.) But when he had learned that Luther would once more send forth a serious writing against the Zwinglians, he wrote to the same Bullinger on August 30: "Perhaps before this letter of mine reaches you, you will receive an exceedingly dreadful writing of Luther's, in which he renews the controversy about the Holy Supper. Never has he treated this matter with greater impetuosity. I therefore no longer hope for the peace of the church. Our enemies will swell the comb who defend the idolatries of the monks, and our churches will be more torn asunder." (p. 475.) To Bucer he writes on the same occasion, August 28: "I have written to you through Milichius of our Pericles, who has again begun to thunder most vehemently about the Holy Supper, and has written an *atrocious* (*atrocem*) book, which is not yet published, in which we, I and you, are taken through (*sugillamur*) to the utmost." (p. 474.) In the same year he wrote to Veit Dietrich: "Concerning the other question, how in the Lord's Supper there are ten categories, I do not wish you to say much; nor did I wish to ask the teacher (*τῷ διδάσκαλον* - Luther), for he who asks him hears him

with anger (*ὀργίλως*), and answers him indefinitely (*οὐ σαφώς*)."

(p. 728.) After the appearance of the "Short Confession," he wrote to the Zwinglian-minded Augsburg Musculus: "It is truly to be regretted that the churches in our day are more invited, as the Homeric warriors say: 'Let us now go to supper, that we may propitiate the god of war,' than as Christ invites us, who wills that at this rite the covenant of a true and unfeigned goodwill be made. ... I wish that the Swiss would not answer to Luther's latest book, nor carry fire to fire." (S. 525.)

Even Melanchthon's most intimate friends repeatedly complained about his ambiguous behavior, that he never really spoke out decisively, but continued to dissimulate, and that it was important for opposing parties to take him for their own. Thus, for example, Calvin, angry at Melanchthon's silence on Luther's attacks on the Swiss, wrote to Melanchthon: "We are indeed leaving an atrocious (*foedum*) example to our descendants, in that we would rather surrender all liberty unceremoniously than touch the mind of a single person unpleasantly by a small annoyance. . . . If this example of tyranny appears at the very beginning of the reviving church, what will happen in a short time, when things have grown worse? ... I confess that what you teach is, of course, perfectly true, and that you have hitherto endeavored to keep minds from quarreling by a mild way of teaching; I praise your prudence and moderation. But by avoiding this point as a cliff, so that you do not cause offence to certain persons, you leave many in uncertainty and darkness who demand something more certain from you on which they can rely. But it does us little honor, as I once remember telling you, not even to sign in ink the doctrine which many saints do not stand to leave sealed with their blood." (*J. Calvini epp. Lausannae*, 1576. p. 135. 8.) In 1551 Calvin reproaches Melanchthon, "With a few points thou only hast awakened more lamentations and sighs than a hundred insignificant persons with their manifest apostasy." (L. c. p. 213.) In 1554 the same wrote to Melanchthon, "The other day I wrote to you of that doctrinal piece in which you dissimulate your opinion more than you depart from us. . . . Nothing is of so great importance that your dissimulation should be allowed to loosen the reins of the angry people" (Westphal and others) "for the confusion and dispersion of the church. To say nothing of how delicious a sincere confession of sound doctrine should be to us. You know that for more than thirty years the eyes of an innumerable multitude have been fixed on you, who desired nothing more than to learn from you. Yes, is it unknown to you today that so many, because of that ambiguous doctrinal form which

Thou too fearfully dost pause, hovering in doubt?" (A. a. O. p. 298. f.) In the following year he wrote to him: "Concerning artolatri" (bread worship, by which Calvin understands the Lutheran belief in Holy Communion) "the inner opinion of your heart has long been known to me, which you also do not conceal in your letters. But I dislike that indecision (*tarditas*) of yours." (p. 339.) To Sleidan Calvin wrote in the same year: "How much I should congratulate myself on Philippi's agreement in a matter, I do not know, since in the most important main pieces, he either openly denies sound doctrine by selling himself to the philosophers, or, in order not to incur the hatred of certain people, cunningly, at least not quite sincerely, conceals his opinion." (*Historia motuum* of Löscher. II, 37.) The same exhibition, that Melanchthon speaks dissimulatre, with intent to equivocate, was made also by Calvin's friends. Blaurer writes to Calvin in 1558: "From Melanchthon I expected better things, and I am very much surprised that this great man is not of equally great courage (*animo*), but always, when it has come to the point, assumes the old weakness. . . . May he" (Melanchthon) "at least dissimulate, he will by no means be able to deny himself. To many he has written many things exceedingly modestly, by which he testifies not indistinctly how far he is from the opinion of those who think and speak superstitiously of the Lord's Supper of Christ." (*Calvini epp.* p. 431.) Even Sturm, the great admirer of Melanchthon, is forced to confess, "Philip would have done right if he had stated his opinion simply and without equivocation." (*Antipappus* sec. p. 139.) Zanchi writes to Bullinger, "Philip is timid, so that he often does what he himself does not approve." (Innocence. Nachrr. 1730. p. 385.) To the Elector John. Friedrich was so aware of Melanchthon's inclination to make a false peace, that in 1535, although Luther himself was in favor of sending Melanchthon to France, the former wrote to Brück: "We are not a little concerned that if Philip travels in France, he will, with his great wisdom and diligence in bringing the king to an opinion, leave much to be desired, which Dr. Martinus and the other theologians will not be able to concede." (*Corp. Reform.* II, p. 909.) *) How necessary it was, therefore, for Melanchthon, as early as the year 1530, in Augsburg, that Luther should strengthen him continually, may be seen from the drastic account which the brave deputy of the city of Nuremberg, Hier. Baumgärtner, who was present at the private negotiations with the papists, makes of Melanchthon's conduct. He writes from Augsburg on September 13, 1530, to the Nuremberg

*Melanchthon himself complained of this to Calvin, who therefore wrote to Farell about it: "Either he himself does not know his mind, or he conceals it (*dissimulat*)". (*Epp. Calv.* p. 30.)

Lazarus Spengler, the clerk of the town council of Berg, among other things, the following: "God has decreed by His grace that the confession be given out and handed over once, otherwise our theologians would have long since confessed something else: as they would gladly do, if they were followed, even though they are unequal to one another. Philip has become more childish than a child, ... The Elector has no one of understanding in this matter except Dr. Brück, but he has been brought to the point that he is now also dealing with worries, since he has no support from anyone. For the other Saxon theologians are not allowed to speak publicly against Philippum; for he stretched out his head in such a way that he recently said against the Chancellor of Lüneburg: "Whoever may say that the next means given are not Christian, is lying as a villain. To which he was answered: He that saith the contradiction, etc. And besides this, one does not cease to disparage in many ways those who show themselves Christian and brave in this; as then the Hessians, who have kept themselves quite well and honestly in this, are publicly accused before us; fear that it will also be kept with us in such a way. In sum, if we do not soon receive a harsh, ungracious farewell from Kais. Majesty, we would not be let go until we are brought into the fish traps, so that we forfeit God's grace and do not gain the emperor's. For the nature has hitherto steadily granted: as often the princes with each other, then one comes to the Elector ridden, tells him how he means the thing faithfully and well etc.; he has understood this or that from the Emperor, and if one alone escaped in this or that piece etc., the thing could still be helped: immediately Philip is there, puts articles, glosses them etc.... . In the meantime, this is carried by" (the Brandenburg Chancellor) "Heller and Brenz also to the Margrave; if we are then required to do so, and we therefore do not allow ourselves to enjoy the pre-cooked porridge, then it is of an unpleasantness, and the theologians run around, saying that we may not suffer peace; as if peace could certainly be obtained by our yielding; (we) only wanted to hit with the Landgrave, whom they then in this truly miserably denigrate. Therefore it is necessary to call upon God diligently to help the matter Himself, for it has truly come over human reason. *Periit lex a prophetis et sapientia a sapientibus*. Some Schnepf still has a beak to sing Christianly and constantly, for which reason he was often *scurrilously* mocked by others; outside of him, for the sake of all theologians, we already wanted to be one with the Widertheil." (Unschuld. Nachrr. 1730. p. 392. ff.) On September 15 of the same year, the same Baumgärtner wrote again to the Genanüten: "Therefore, I ask you for the sake of God and his word, you should also do your part and write to Doctori Martins Luthers, that he, as the one through whom God first opens his word to the world again, should run in to Philippo by force and yet keep the devout

(For no man to this day has done more harm to the gospel than Philip.) For at this Diet no man has done more harm to the gospel to this day than Philip. He has also fallen into such presumption that he not only does not want to hear anyone else speak and advise about it, but also comes out with clumsy cursing and scolding, so that he frightens everyone and dampens them with his authority.

*) The dear Baumgärtner probably did not know that Luther had already written the following to Spalatin in Augsburg on August 26: "I hear that you have undertaken, though not gladly, a wonderful work, namely, to unite the Pope and Luther with each other. But the Pope will not want it, and Luther refuses; see to it that you do not spend your efforts in vain. When you have accomplished the thing contrary to the will of both, then I will immediately, following your example, reconcile Christ and Belial with each other. I know, however, that it was not of your own free will, but by chance, or rather by the ghosts of Speier, that you were led to this vain effort. Christ, who has hitherto been your strength, will now also be your wisdom, so that those Italian cunning plots against you will be of no avail. For evil counsel is most evil to the counselor. Greetings M. Eisleben, Dr. Brenz, Schnepf, and all ours." (Br. L.'s von de Wette. IV, 144.) By the way, Luther, however, also received later news from Nuremberg of the dangerous acts of settlement of which Baumgärtner complains against Spengler, and wrote the most earnest letters to Melanchthon, Jonas, and Link on that account. (A. a. O. p. 168. ff.)

**That he was irascible, Melanchthon himself admits. He writes to Veit Dietrich in 1540: "I am often deeply indignant, for you know that I am irascible (δ'οXox)." (6. R. III, 1172.) Further, to the same in 1541: "Meo more, hoc est, iracundius." (Corp. R. IV, 435.) In the same year, in the preface to the History of the Regensburg Colloquium, he confesses, "I am by nature less pugnacious (pugnax) than is necessary." (p. 671.) Those who know Luther and Melanchthon only superficially usually form the idea of these two persons that the former was of an angry, the latter of a meek disposition. The opposite, however, is the truth. Ratzeberger relates: "It was also Mr. Philippi's habit by nature, in disputationibus publicis and privatis, that he soon became indignant if anyone opposed him with a weak or slight argument; for he was a sharp dialectician and was accustomed to sharp arguments, more than to slight ones; Therefore, if he heard a weak or low argument put forward in disputatione, he rejected such a weak argument so that he often did not want to hear the opponent out ex impatientia, but ordered him to be silent and to give room to another. In contrast, Lutherus had a much more magis sedatum morem disputandi in disputationibus vel publicis vel privatis, as he was otherwise serious in his Scriptis. For if someone brought forward a weak, lazy, or low argument, Dr. Lutherus did not so soon forget it. Lutherus did not reject it as soon as Philip did, but always reassumed it himself, and often gave it a better adornment, form, and reputation, which the opponent himself had often not thought of; when this happened, he asked, on top of everything else, whether this was not Mr. Opponent's real opinion; if the opponent said yes, then he first of all solved the argument, so that everyone was amazed at it and had to learn a great deal from it. So Philip was not minded; for as moderate and placidus as he usually was in his

of him, because he had been so great up to now, and I had let it remain so, and had nevertheless often admitted much to him against my conscience". (A. a. O. p. 396.) Löscher says of these letters: "They depict Philippi's inconstancy and great timidity at the Diet of Augsburg, and, though they may be somewhat harsh, they are nevertheless the truth." (p. 390.) How inclined Melanchthon was to yield to enemies and friends, and indeed against the latter often with inner displeasure up to dogged anger, how inclined to use ambiguous words and confessional formulas to produce outward unity, may be proved by the following communications. How he stood in his inner being in this respect, about it he poured out his heart even after Luther's death, in the year 1548, in that well-known letter to the Electoral Council Christoph v. Carlowitz completely without concealment.*) The Augsburg Interim, drawn up by order of the Emperor, had appeared. Melanchthon had written against it immediately and thereby incurred the wrath of the emperor." After Carlowitz (a main opponent of the old expelled Elector) had urged Melanchthon to greater compliance, the latter replied, among other things, as follows: "I will open up to you completely. ... First of all, I assure you that the most noble Prince (Moritz) may decide according to his and his council's opinion what may be beneficial to him as well as to the state. If the prince has decided, then I will, even if I cannot approve it, not act rebelliously in any way, but either remain silent, or bear whatever may happen.**) I have also previously borne an almost shameful servitude, since Luther often served his nature, in which there was no small quarrelsomeness, more than either his position (*personae*), or the general good. And I know that at all times, as the inconveniences of bad weather, so any errors in government are modestly corrected with the expenditure of *Scriptis* was, so easily he let himself be commoviren and indignant in *disputationibus publicis* and *privatis*; thereby some, so stupid by nature, *per illam vehementiam Philippi* deterred, had to keep silent." (Ratzeberger's handwritten history of Luther and his time. Edited by Neudecker. Jena 1850. p. 100.)

*) It is true that in this article of ours we have to do neither with Melanchthon of the first time, nor of the time after Luther's death, which the honored reader must not overlook, but with Melanchthon, who became suspicious, up to Luther's death; his Brie to Carlowitz alone, though of 1548, gives information about Melanchthon's position towards Luther in that middle period, may therefore be listed as a witness for what we have to prove.

**On this Löscher makes the remark: "This smacks of indifferentism and skepticism, which is little befitting the confessors of the truth. One must not say, 'I will either be silent'; one must rather say, 'I will not be silent of Christ and His Gospel.'" (Innocence. Nachrr. 1730. p. 383.)

of some art (*modeste et arte*) must bear and overlook. But you say that not only silence, but also recommendation (of the interim) is required of me. I do not doubt that you, as a wise man, are able both to see through the characters of men and to judge deeply about their dispositions and inclinations. I am not by nature quarrelsome (γιλόνειχος), and love, if any one, the socialization of men. Nor did I arouse these disputes which have broken up the state, but got into those already aroused,*) and as they were many and intricate, I began to consider them, from a certain simple urge to investigate the truth, especially as many learned and wise men at first applauded them. And although the author (Luther) had added some harsh matters at the beginning, I still thought that I should not reject the other true and necessary things. By taking this out and holding it, I have gradually either removed or softened some tasteless (*absurdas*) opinions. **) ... I believe that the Emperor's will is good, and see that insignificant (mediocres) conditions are presented. I wish, however, that a few (!) would be mitigated. I freely and gladly concede many things about which others have argued so vehemently." (*Corpus Reform.* VI, 880-82.) Thus, as early as 1535, when he had returned from a meeting with Bucer in Cassel, where he had advocated Luther's doctrine of Holy Communion, he was able to write to Camerarius: "To tell you my opinion, do not demand of me now, for I was the messenger of a foreign one, though I shall not, however, conceal what I believe, when I shall have heard 'what ours answer.'" (II, 822.) As early as 1530, Melanchthon, as we have already seen, was guilty of making peace by ambiguities. Among other things, he even wrote about this himself to Luther on August 22: "Eck ridiculed the word 'alone' when we say that men are justified by faith alone; yet he did not condemn the thing, but said it was offensive to the ignorant. For I compelled him to confess that righteousness is rightly imputed by us to faith. He

*Melanchthon, therefore, hereby absolves himself of having caused, with Luther, by the work of the Reformation, the fire of discord between the friends and enemies of the truth, which is now blazing high and ever higher! In his fearfulness and false love of peace he did not think of what John writes 2 John 8.

**Here Löscher remarks: "How Philip here, and elsewhere in this letter, has endeavored to place Luther in a hateful light and to ascribe 'tasteless' opinions, and how he has so often spoken so coldly of the work of the Reformation, contrary to his own and public testimony, which is otherwise given in all his writings, is shown by the Wittenberg theologians with great seriousness in the refutation of Peucer's history, p. 252. ff." (Op. cit. p. 384.)

wanted us, however, to write thus: that we are justified by grace and faith; I was not against it; but that foolish man does not understand the word 'grace.'" (II, 299. f.) To this news of the rotten peace Luther answered him, "You write that Eck was compelled by you to confess that we are justified by faith; would to God you had compelled him not to lie!" (L.'s Br. of de Wette. IV, 145.) *) In 1539 Calvin writes to Farell: "I sent him (Melanchthon) a few articles, in which I had briefly summed up the summa of the matter. These he himself agrees with without contradiction, but he confesses that there are some in that part who demanded something more crass, and with such rigidity that I do not say tyranny, that for a long time it was to be feared that they saw him alienated from their opinion. But though he does not think that there is a thorough agreement, yet he desires that this agreement, however it may be, shall be cultivated until the Lord shall have brought us both to unity in his truth. As for himself, have no doubt that he believes altogether as we do. (Calvin, epp. p. 24.) The consequence, then, of his dissimulating to his opponents, was, that they took him altogether for their own, betwixt him, as he doubtless intended, at least at that time, to have brought them nearer to the truth by the same.

Thus we have seen, on the one hand, that Melanchthon, already from 1535 until Luther's death, was occasionally tormented by doubts and wavered in his former convictions, but on the other hand, that he, nevertheless, until Luther's death, publicly professed Luther's doctrine without reservation on the most diverse occasions, and that therefore Luther, until his death (with short interruptions), was on his best behavior towards Melanchthon with regard to his faith and doctrine. Luther therefore, until his death (with short interruptions), stood by Melanchthon in regard to his faith and doctrine, and that Melanchthon himself continuously expressed the conviction that he was not at all interested in bringing up new dogmas and in

*Quenstedt writes: "When, after the delivery of the Augsburg Confession from the Imperial Diet of 1530, a settlement of the points of contention between the princes and theologians of both parts was negotiated from August 16 to 22, Melanchthon was pleased to leave the word 'grace' in its ambiguity. When, after the meeting of August 16-22, Melanchthon negotiated, it pleased him to leave that word 'grace' in its ambiguity, that he and his comrades could take and interpret it for the mere effect of divine benevolence, but Eck and his comrades, as usual with them, for virtuous qualities, which were poured into men by the benevolence of God, as the principal cause; Which signification did not prevent man from obtaining blessedness from merit, as the secondary cause, which was infused into him by God from his benevolence, as the primary cause. In such ambiguities Philip delighted exceedingly, as may be seen from his letter of August 22. Luther, however, disliked this 'mischievousness' (Ephes. 4:14.) from the first; hence he rescribed Melanchthon on August 25." (*Theol. did.-pol.* II, 770.)

We have, of course, also seen that Melanchthon, behind Luther's back, was no less secretly concerned about Luther, especially about Luther's ardor against all false doctrine and against false sacramental doctrine. Of course, we have also seen that Melanchthon complained bitterly behind Luther's back about Luther, especially about Luther's fiery zeal against all false doctrine, especially against the false teaching of the sacraments, even to the sacramentarians; indeed, in order to establish an external peace, he not infrequently resorted to ambiguous words and formulas and sometimes showed himself willing to make the most dangerous concessions to his opponents; but never until Luther's death did he publicly declare himself either against Luther's teaching or for the teaching of his opponents. Taken together, this casts a very bad light on Melanchthon and his conduct during the time from which the first scruples concerning Luther's teaching may have arisen in him until Luther's death. But far from it appearing that Luther had carried Melanchthon as a false teacher who had been seen through by him, the appearance falls on Melanchthon that, if he had really inwardly fallen away from the truth, he had understood to maintain in Luther the good opinion that he was still in full doctrinal agreement with him. We must not forget two things here, first, which, now that all the documents have been brought to light, are as clear as day, were mostly hidden from Luther and hardly suspected by him; second, that Melanchthon, in consequence of his unmeasured love of peace, accommodated himself not only to the Swiss, but also to Luther, in every possible way; hence Luther did not bear him as a false teacher, but acknowledged him *bona fide* as a weak, slightly wavering and wavering, but nevertheless pure teacher. Therefore, Löscher rightly calls Hospinian's and other reformers' portrayal of the matter, as if Luther had known of Melanchthon's apostasy but had forgiven him for it, a "novel".

(Hist. mot. II, 34.)

Our opponents will of course now say that it is inconceivable that Luther should not have noticed the deviations of which Melanchthon was notoriously guilty already during Luther's lifetime. But as little as this can be denied by anyone familiar with the history of the Reformation, it is also an undeniable fact that Luther, as often as he noticed something about it, far from simply overlooking it and taking it to Melanchthon, rather immediately intervened against it.

(Conclusion follows.)

Open Declaration and Protest.

In the "*Lutheran & Missionary*" of October 12, there is an exceedingly bitter, scornful and mocking article about the protest of the Pastoral Conference of the Eastern District of our Synod in the September number of "Doctrine and Order" and about the spirit of our Synod, which is revealed in it and the like. To this article the editor of the "*Lutheran & Missionary*" calls special attention as coming from a pastor of the Missouri Synod, who says, "that for obvious reasons he does not wish his name to be mentioned, but that facts are facts, and that truth has an edge which cuts to more than one side.

Since it has been repeatedly either hinted at or even stated in the papers of our opponents, especially those of Iowa, that there is a not small party within our Synod which is more liberal in its views and in some respects, perhaps even in the main, does not agree with Professor Walther and the majority of the Synod which follows him, and since I have reason to believe that this alleged party includes especially younger members of our Synod, and among them very probably also myself: I feel compelled in my conscience, without the slightest direct or indirect request from any quarter, to publicly express my vigorous protest against that article in the "*Lutheran & Missionary*".

In my opinion, one can quite honestly and conscientiously have different opinions about the necessity, expediency, and even the legitimacy of that protest, and just as honestly and conscientiously not agree with Professor Walther on all points, and still be a true and honest Missourian. For that is what one is. for that is what one is, according to my conviction: For that is what one is, according to my conviction, if, in addition to the unreserved acceptance of the confessional writings of our Lutheran Church with regard to all its doctrinal regulations, one also possesses the characteristic quality of a true Lutheran, which has become very rare in our slack times, by God's grace, and if one seeks to acquire it more and more and to practice it in all one's life and deeds, namely, the rock-solid conviction that doctrine or faith is not ours but God's, that we are consequently not free masters of doctrine, who may, at their discretion, refrain from it or declare it not so important and necessary, but that we are obligated to be faithful to it as stewards, even in the least; That, further, pure doctrine, and nothing else, is the fountain from which all else in Christianity flows, and that in this respect also the Word is truth: "A little leaven

sours the whole dough." that, finally, a true and sincere adherence "to Christ's speech," or, what is the same thing, to a genuine Christian and Lutheran, also includes this, that one in no way, neither by words nor works, gives oneself the appearance of believing that, in the end, those may be right who, in this or that doctrinal question, have a view that does not agree with our conviction - not merely opinion - drawn from God's Word, or as if, after all, it did not much matter how one stood on this point. All this may be found in a man; he may therefore, according to our conviction, be a true, sincere Missourian, without feeling compelled in his conscience to agree everywhere with Prof. W. in the application of these principles. For as firmly as we are convinced of the sole correctness of these principles, we do not consider Professor Walther, or even the Synod, infallible. But according to my firm conviction, and I should think also according to the judgment of any honest-minded person, one cannot be a real and sincere Missourian, indeed hardly an honest Christian man, if one so bitterly, scornfully and mockingly judges and comments on his own Synod and its whole tendency, and that in the paper of one of the bitterest opponents of it, as that "Missourian" (?) does about the Missouri Synod. Has he already raised his voice in due place against that protest and against the inclusion of it in "Lehre und Wehre" and declared that, in the event that the proceedings of that conference and the editorial staff of "Lehre und Wehre" are publicly approved by the Synod and presented as a model to be followed by a faithful Missourian, he can no longer remain a member of the Synod for reasons of conscience? Did he go through all the instances with his complaint, and when all was of no avail, forced by conscience, declared his resignation? But does not the natural sense of justice tell every man, even the respectable man of the world, that all these steps must first be taken before such a bitter, hostile attack can even be formally justified?

We know well that it is not easy and pleasant, nor is it exactly the way to gain honor and reputation in the midst of the ecclesiastical body of which one is a member, if one speaks out openly in any respect against the expressed convictions or the convincing actions of the leading persons or the majority of this body. Therefore, we are not inclined to judge anyone as insincere and hypocritical who, for a similar reason or for the much more honorable one, namely, in order not to hurt a man to whom he owes a great deal by contradicting him in a way that is not absolutely necessary, does not openly express every dissent that he would not allow to remain unspoken to others and that he might well express in occasional cases.

and confidential conversation. But we must and will herewith most earnestly protest against the fact that a member of our Synod speaks out in such a bitter, scornful and mocking, and at the same time so pathetically cowardly manner about the whole tendency and direction of our Synod in an opposing paper. And we must protest just as earnestly against the proceedings of the "*Lutheran & Missionary*," which declares the conduct of the cowardly, deceitful traitor "for obvious reasons" to be right in spirit and in fact, and supports and encourages him in it. A cause that resorts to such means as desirable weapons against the hated adversary must seem suspicious even to an honest and honest-minded man of the world.

F. W. Stellhorn.

Explanation.

Since I am convinced that I am acting in the spirit of the venerable Pastoral Conference of the Eastern District of the Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio and other states when I correct a misunderstanding which has arisen through their protest published in the September issue of "*Lehre und Wehre*", I hereby declare that this protest does not refer to those preachers and congregations of the New York Ministry who bear witness by word and deed against the false, un-Lutheran doctrine and practice advocated by the General Council.

Boston, October 8, 1876.

H. Fick,
per temp. chair.

Miscellany.

Strange contradiction. To whom did the Lord give the Lord's Prayer? Answer: To his disciples. But in what capacity? As believers or as ministers? Answer: As believers, of course. Otherwise only ministers would be allowed to pray the Lord's Prayer. If they pray it officially and publicly as ministers, this does not change the fact that it was originally and directly given to all believers. 2 To whom did the Lord give the Great Commission, "Go ye into all the world," etc.? Answer: His disciples. But in what capacity? As believers or ministers? Answer: As believers, of course. Otherwise only the ministers would be responsible for the mission. To whom did the Lord give Holy Communion? Answer: His

Jüngetn. But in what capacity? As a believer or as a minister"? As a believer, of course. For otherwise Rome would be right in referring to and using the words "drink ye all of it" only for ministers. To whom has the Lord given the whole Word of God? To whom does the Bible belong? Answer: To all believers. Otherwise the papists would be right when they forbid the laity to read the Bible. But now 5: To whom did the Lord originally and directly give the keys? And strangely enough the usual answer is: The apostles, his disciples as - ministers!

Luther literature. In the Erlanger Zeitschrift of July of this year, there is a review of the writing of A. Baur's writing on Luther's *libertate Christiana* by Professor Plitt, which begins as follows: "It is gratifying that also in recent years Luther literature has again experienced a not inconsiderable increase. I call this pleasing, because in the whole field of post-apostolic literature there is hardly a writer who is so worthy of serious and devoted study as Luther. The very fact that Luther is always being studied is very understandable; indeed, one could justifiably be surprised that this is not done by many more. Luther was once the spiritual 'father of the Protestant Church of Germany, the twelve messengers of the German land,' as his approving contemporaries called him soon after his appearance. If nowadays some are annoyed that such a thing happened, and even reproach Melancthon because he called after his divorced friend: *pater mi, pater mi, currus Israel et auriga ejus!* and thus called him a new Elias, this does not change the fact. Luther is still held in the highest esteem by our German Protestant people; they place something on his word and feel distrust for everything that is punished by this word, that is not compatible and rhymes with Luther. Therefore it is very understandable that theologians of the present day who want to offer something new to the congregation seek to come to terms with Luther and themselves raise the question whether and to what extent they build on the foundation laid by him. But then there is also the danger that, in the desire to agree with Luther, one will interpret him on one's own initiative and introduce views foreign to him into his writings. For this reason all such attempts must be received with caution and carefully examined with respect to their justification." How necessary this examination is also with regard to Baur's writing, Plitt points out. W.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The Tennessee Synod abolished the licensing system.

The General Council has postponed the decision concerning the Galesburg Rule for one year. Pastor Brobst reports in his paper: Monday morning. The established order determined the deliberation of the decisions of Galesburg, concerning altar and pulpit fellowship, as well as such negotiations of the synods in association with the general church meeting, which refer to this subject. Dr. Schmucker, chairman of the committee concerned, reported. The report was taken up for consideration. The delegation of the Ministry of New York, through Pastor Halfmann, submitted a petition relating to this subject. This was received by the Council and reads: "The Lutheran Ministry of New York, at its last meeting, held at Lyons, N. Y., from the 22nd to the 27th June, 1876, passed the following resolution: 'The resolution passed by the General Assembly of the Church at its Convention last year at Galesburg, under which the rules previously established, viz: 'Lutheran pulpits for Lutheran preachers alone, Lutheran altars for Lutheran communicants alone, are in accordance with the Word of God and the Confessions of our Church', is recognized by our Synod as correct and the same hereby expresses its approval of the same and instructs its pastors to work with all wisdom and faithfulness so that this rule may be more and more effective in practice.'" After various synods connected with the general church assembly have understood this rule in this way and have decided that the rules established in Akron only need to be changed by explaining where this rule was taken from, the delegation of the Lutheran Ministry of New York, etc., takes the liberty of submitting to the honorable general church assembly a statement of its approval, 1) to declare that any exceptions to the rule, namely: the rule, which agrees with the Word of God and the Confessions of our Church, is: "Lutheran pulpits for Lutheran preachers alone, Lutheran altars for Lutheran communicants alone", can neither be claimed nor regarded as special privileges. 2) to earnestly urge the district synods that the above rule be enforced and increasingly carried out in their congregations. - The Assembly then proceeded to consider the report of the Committee. Upon Dr. Seiss' motion, it was resolved that that part of the committee's report which relates to the proceedings of the various synods on this subject be included in the minutes; likewise the official report of the resolutions of the Augustana and Holston synods; further, that that part of the proceedings of the synod of New York which relates to the instruction of its delegates be included in the proper place, namely: Resolved, That our delegates to the General Council, at the next meeting of the same, be required to vote in the sense of the resolution passed at this Synod concerning the Galesburg Rule. It was proposed that the paragraphs which follow the historical account of the Synods in the Committee Report be added to the Minutes. A detailed discussion of this proposal followed. - Monday afternoon. The discussion continued and the first item in the Committee Report was adopted, as follows: "It appears from the above proceedings (the extracts previously given from the Synodal Protocoll) that some

Uncertainty is found with respect to the resolutions of the General Convention at Galesburg concerning the Declaration at Akron. The concurring testimony of a large proportion of the delegates and of the President of the General Convention establishes that the true intent and effect of the resolutions at Galesburg is that these resolutions add to those at Akron the indication of where the source of this rule is to be found, and that this Declaration stands unchanged in all its parts." - Tuesday morning. The New York delegation brought in the following substitute for Professor Späth's proposition. As it is evident that there is no small difference of opinion as to the position which the General Council, by its declaration made at Galesburg last year, has taken with respect to communion and pulpit communion, as compared with former declarations relating thereto, especially that of Akron, Ohio, be it hereby resolved and expressly declared: That exceptions to the rule: "Lutheran pulpits for Lutheran preachers alone; Lutheran altars for Lutheran communicants alone," can neither be claimed nor regarded as a special privilege, and that the District Synods are earnestly requested to see that this rule is carried into effect and more and more carried out in the congregations. - Prof. Späth's proposal is: Resolved, That the true meaning and intent of the Galesburg Declaration on Altar and Pulpit Communion, as well as all previous declarations on this point, is that the General Church Assembly intended thereby to express its conviction of what is truth and right in this matter and to set forth the principle of our Lutheran Church in this matter, as contained in her confession and founded on the word of God, in the firm conviction and hope that this principle, if presented by our pastors and teachers with all fidelity, wisdom and patience, will bring all our congregations to a full understanding and adoption of a true Lutheran practice in this matter. After a serious discussion lasting several hours, it was decided to lay on the table all the proposals concerning this question, to which Mr. Hauff of New York had added a new one, in agreement with Professor Späth's. The meeting was then adjourned. Thereupon it was proposed, in accordance with the understanding at the adoption of the above resolution, that the President of the General Council (Dr. Krauth) be requested to prepare a set of theses on the decision at Galesburg, concerning pulpit and communion, and to present them for discussion at the next meeting of that body. These should be published at least three months before the meeting in the various languages of the Council - German, English and Swedish. This proposal was finally unanimously adopted, and the long debate ended in peace (?).

Unirt - Evangelical. In the "Immanuel" we read: A pastor of the Unirte Synod Illinois (America) writes: It is sad that our Lutheran (unirt) brethren in Germany show so little interest in America. The handful of separated Lutherans provide the Lutheran Synods here so abundantly with preachers that they are never (?) in short supply. In the large Lutheran mother church, only the Langenbrgrr and Berlin Association is to our aid. Shall it not be able to do as much as the Old Lutherans? We must, for lack of forces, leave the real missionary work to the Methodists and Lutherans.

II. Abroad.

The Allgemeine evang.-luth. Kirchenzeitung of September 1 reports on the contents of the first number of Lic. Stöckhardt's paper "die ev.-luth. Freikirche". It says at the beginning: "Since in them (the first two sheets) continual war is announced to the Landeskirchentum, they may at least claim our attention." The conclusion of the report is strangely conciliatory: "We do not at all believe that the national church will last forever. On the contrary, if the practice continues of wanting to preserve at all costs all members, even the lazy ones, of the church, and of not supporting the clergy in the exercise of their pastoral duty in relation to the "commanded" means of discipline, separation will assume ever greater proportions. The word spoken at the Synod in 1871, that too great broad-mindedness would lead to separation, seems already to have been forgotten: broad-mindedness has become maternal-mindedness. It also seems to us to belong to the cross shape of the national church that the clergy and congregations have no contact with above. We envy the national churches that receive pithy speeches from their pastors to strengthen and comfort them. We hear nothing! Or would not the movements in Saxony, especially the efforts toward separation, be worthy of being thoroughly examined by the church government? Would not the faithful clergy be worthy of being shown that one also takes part in their doings and their struggles above? Will none of those who must be considered called to do so/ break a lance for the "valuable maid", for whom our national church also wants to be regarded? Well, a 'maid' she seems to remain. But we are not ashamed to be in her service, which is still the service of the Lord. To the Free Lutheran congregations, however, we wish that Christian life may flourish in them, and hope that they will not forget that we are all chasing after one goal, even if the means separate us here."

"The Saxon regional synod," writes the Braunschweiger Kirchenblatt, "has been called for October 2. It will have an outstanding, perhaps decisive significance for the Lutheran Church of the Kingdom of Saxony. For at this meeting it must be a question of whether the church government, which up to now has endangered the regional church through more than questionable weakness against unchurchly and brusqueness against church endeavors, wants to steer onto a different course, and whether the latter will take the increasingly threatening Lutheran separation seriously. This Separation, consisting of four congregations, leans, as is well known, on the American. Missouri Synod."

"The Lutheran Free Church." This sheet indicates Pastor Schenkel in the Sachs. Kirchen- und Schulblatt of September 7, as follows: "Under this title a new ecclesiastical periodical has been appearing for about a fortnight, which probably deserves notice more than many other publications of the kind. The very fact that it appears and can appear is apt to make us clergymen of the national church, even those who are the greatest optimists in regard to the ecclesiastical situation, and of whom Gen. 49, 15: 'And he saw the rest that it is good,' are more than justified, to be set in motion a little; for it reminds us by its existence of the still small but easily widening breach which has been made in the walls of the Saxon Regional Church. But also the contents and the whole manner of writing show that here is something about which to shrug one's shoulders nobly would truly be folly." - In the "Lutheraner" of October 1, we reported how the editor of the Sachs. Kirchen- und Schulblatt was acting so very wrongly against Lic. Stöckhardt. Pastor Schenkel also reminded us of this in the number of this newspaper cited above. He writes: "It seems to me that the honoured

Author to err in some of his sayings. This, that Stöckhardt develops a richly blessed effectiveness, he tries to refute by the report of a great confusion of the minds. Well, St. Stöckhardt caused a lot of confusion, especially in the end, but we do not want to claim this as proof against his blessed efficacy. What a hullabaloo the apostles caused (Acts 17:6: "These who stir up the whole world"), what a hullabaloo Luther caused, what confusion of the minds, what hostility of the household through them! And yet no one will be able to deny them a rich effectiveness. - The accusation that St. was completely faithless, because as a servant of the national church he did his mistress the disservice of belittling her before her members, is also not true. Then perhaps a very large part of the Saxon clergy is faithless at the present time, because he does not hesitate to declare publicly in his sermons that there is much wrong with us, to call for repentance and to call for a reformation of the national church. Luther, too, testified quite differently from St. Paul against the damage to his church as a servant of it, and for that reason did not resign his office in it. One can only leave when he has done everything and when, after a hard struggle, his conscience compels him. But that St. fought a hard battle within himself is proven by his above-mentioned words in the history of the latest separation; all those who were close to him can also testify to this. That St. went too far in this, that he let the eventuality of a separation show through more than was reasonable, this alone is to be reproached to him in this point. I say this only because I believed that this way of fighting against separation would not achieve anything. I, at least, would try in vain to ward off the desire for separation in my neighboring community."

Saxony. From a letter from Pastor K. H. Schneider, who, as we have already informed you, has left the Saxon regional church together with Lic. Stöckhardt, we see that he has now also accepted a call to a separate Lutheran congregation in Saxony, namely in Frankenberg and Mitweida. As sorry as we are that the hope we had that the aforementioned would enter the service of our church in America has not been fulfilled, we are nevertheless pleased to see how the reconstruction of the orthodox Lutheran church in the land of the Reformation, our dear fatherland, is proceeding so splendidly. W.

"The Lutheran Free Church." Under this heading there is an article in the Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung of September 29, in which the writer makes the polemic against the Lutherans who have left the national church rather easy and comfortable. He writes: "If one calls for the Free Church now, it is different than in the thirties. Then it was the Union which compelled to go this narrow and afflicted way. Now the Free Church has become the principle. We have first in mind the Missourian circles in Germany. For it is from these circles that the agitation for the Free Church is at present proceeding. They declare it to be the right form of the Lutheran Church at the present time. The individual reasons which they assert for their separation or demand for a free-church form of the ecclesiastical being are not the actual reason, at most an occasion. They do not fight this or that national church; they fight 'national churchism' itself as the source of all evil. That is the turn which the course of ecclesiastical polemics has taken with us." - Much as the writer of this alleged finding may rejoice, since he thinks to find in it perfect rest for all the injuries to his conscience in the State Church, his premises are untrue. We so-called Missourians, and all Lutherans who are clear in the matter, may well consider the Free Church constitution as the original one, and the one most conformable to the nature of the Church, but we are far from regarding it as the only one under which the Church can exist. Not the national church per se

We are not attacking the churches of the land, but the national churches, as they have gradually become and as they are at present, at least for the most part. - Further on in that article it says: "What we have hitherto been accustomed to hear only from sectarians, that the national churches are 'Babel,' and their own communities, on the other hand, are 'Canaan,' where the sole rule of Christ and His Word is at home, and the like, we now hear this language here also. It has not hitherto been in use in Lutheran circles." This assertion is also untrue. It was not the so-called Missourians who opened the fight against the national churches, or rather state churches, of our time and first called them a "Babel." Blessed Dr. Rudelbach did both 23 years ago. For example, in an article published in his journal of 1853, "Das Parochialsystem und die Ordination" ("The Parochial System and Ordination"), he writes, among other things, as follows: "With the present investigation we intend a critique which would be suitable to show us the path we shall have to take when the Church of Jesus Christ, delivered from the Babylonian state-church prison, will have regained its natural, innate, rightful freedom." (A. a. O. p. 6.) Was Rudelbach also a Missourian fanatic, or their forerunner?!

W.

Schleswig-Holstein. We read the following in the "Freimund" of August 24: "Four years ago Pastor Paulsen founded a "church association" in Kropp, which initially had only 24 members in the four parishes of Kropp, Haddebye, Hollingstedt and Treya, but is now already expanding throughout Schleswig-Holstein. There are already no less than 50 branch associations. The organ of this association is the "Kropper kirchliche Anzeiger" (Kropper Church Gazette), which has appeared every month in one sheet for 4 years. Above the title of this sheet is a cross, above and beside which are the words, "In this sign thou shalt conquer," but below it, "God's word and Luther's doctrine pass away now and nevermore." Pure doctrine and pure Sacrament are presented as the highest treasures of grace of the Church, but it is also declared: "It is a great self-deception to always refer to the fact that the proclamation of Lutheran doctrine and the Lutheran administration of the Sacraments are not hindered and therefore everything is in the best condition. You can have both, even if there is no longer a church; for you cannot put a castle in front of the mouth and you cannot occupy the open field with soldiers. The church must have walls; its walls are discipline. What use is it if the pastor preaches a sermon on Holy Thursday about Holy Communion according to Lutheran doctrine, and then he has to let all who despise the sacraments, who do not have their children baptized, for example, and who despise marriage, join in quietly? Without discipline, the pure administration of the sacraments, the pure teaching of the Church, is no longer possible. In discipline lies the Church's decisiveness. But in discipline on all sides also against the state. We want no foreign fire on the altars, no consideration of the times, no other guide than the Bible. Decisiveness is the Christian's adornment, not fear of man."

Pastor Diedrich's judgment on the Saxon separation and on the present polemic of the lowans, as found in his "Dorfkirchenzeitung" of the month of October, is as follows: In No. 25 of Luthardt's newspaper it is reported from Saxony that the light-friendly Pastor Sulze at Neustadt-Dresden has been elected to the Synod, and besides that, that the faithful Lutheran Pastor Stöckhardt at Planitz near Zwickau, having renounced the service to the Consistory, has been deposed from his office. The newspaper also finds it terrible that the denier rises from honors to honors in the regional church and that the confessor is deposed; nevertheless, it thinks that Pastor Stöckhardt has demanded too much Christianity from his church regiment, and that therefore one cannot give him

are with us. We do not wish to dwell at length here on a description of the Saxon regional church; it is sufficient to state that the church regime lets the deniers and impugnors of the truth freely rumble and tear down in its district. If it does not want to or cannot defend itself against the enemies, it seems to us at least right that Christians and especially clergymen who have risen from their sleep should simply say to such church regiments: You cannot be our patrons any longer, we would rather shield ourselves under the guard of the Lord and shake the dust from our feet. Pastor Stoeckhardt, with his faithful church members, has joined with the Missourian Pastor Ruhland, which was perhaps the closest thing to him. If more and more Saxon and German theologians join this party, we can hope that their circle of vision will be changed somewhat and that even more good will come of it. - The Fritschel brothers of the Iowa Synod have kindly sent us their new "kirchliche Zeitschrift" (church magazine) and thus obliged us to thank them. The first three issues are filled with polemics against Missouri. But methinks the two Synods might just as well know how they stand to each other, and have spoken out enough. What is the use of compiling over and over again from old and new maculature, "This we said and that we did not; that ye said and that ye did not?" Would it not be better to say, "Such we are, and such we remain?"-and to report briefly only on new things, when such things occur, than to keep on grumbling about the past! I cannot imagine that such tapeworm polemics are a blessing. The Missourians imagine themselves to be really true Lutherans, and the Iowans do not think so, but consider themselves perpetrators of the old Lutheran doctrine. In so far as they claim this, I consider them to be in error. Löhe's work is finished, and though he may otherwise deserve much praise, I cannot see that he has continued the Lutheran doctrine. One should grow in knowledge; but it is only important to experience the old one truth in new contrasts ever more deeply, but to remain steadfast in the apostle's teaching, to let Christ's voice sound ever more simply, and to carefully guard against anything new.

Iowa and Neuendettelsau. In a lecture given by the missionary inspector Deinzer in Aha on July 25, 1876. July 1876, in which he expresses his satisfaction that "the Missourian-minded elements" have left the Synod of Iowa (for in Germany one may only say that this or that person is "Missourian-minded", so there is no need for further investigation, the baton is then broken over him, "*hic niger est*"), Mr. Deinzer, as Neuendettelsau's representative, says further: "It is true that our views are no longer shared by the Synod in individual points. In the controversial questions of church, ministry, and last things, we hold firmly to the convictions handed down by our spiritual fathers and recognized by us as scriptural truths. We profess the doctrinal views with respect to which Iowa takes the position of waiting neutrality. But on account of the existing unity in the main matters, we can easily bear such differences." We cannot be surprised at this. Neuendettelsau and Iowa, as they are now, already understand each other. Neuendettelsau knows quite well why Iowa stands as it does in America, and Iowa knows quite well why Neuendettelsau must stand as it does in Germany. The spirit is the same. And Löhe is dead, who was already close to letting Iowa go, and the honest farmer is also dead, who had punished Iowa's notorious dishonesty with great seriousness and admonished it to repentance. And the terrible storm that was unleashed upon Iowa, in which his dishonesty was publicly exposed on all sides, by friend and foe, by stranger and housemate, has passed. All it takes is a little waiting. In time, after all, grass grows over everything.

W.

German "Confessionals". The present state of the doctrine of the so-called "Confessionals" in Germany can be seen, among other things, from a statement in the *Sächsisches Kirchen- und Schulblatt* (Saxon Church and School Gazette) of August 24, in the article "Zu den Planitzer Wirren. There it says: "One should help our regional church, this outward visible organization as a church, more to its rights. If one had been more aware of this right in his time, then we would probably not have the congregational election of the clergy and many other things that are now painful. According to our homespun way of thinking, the congregation elects the congregational minister, but the ecclesiastical minister is not elected by the object of his activity: the individual congregation, but by the subject who gives him the commission: the congregation as a whole, his mistress, the church." It is evident from this that, on the basis of the Word of God, according to the dear confessions, first, the church and the congregation are one and the same, that is, the church is already a group of two or three believers, and, secondly, the choice of preacher is made by the "congregation" or the "people"; a German confessional does not care about this. In this he follows his own "homespun way of thinking," but of course without prejudice to his claim to be confessionally faithful. W.

Eisenach Assembly. Church publications also again bring the invitation to the meeting in Eisenach, which was originally suggested by the Immanuel Synod in Prussia and is to have the purpose of bringing about a unification among the unfortunately so scattered, divided and torn Lutherans of Germany. A splendid purpose, but it depends on the way in which one intends to achieve it, and in the way it was begun in Eisenach, one will never reach the goal. The renewed call for unification in Eisenach also expresses anew how faithful and serious one is with the truth, with the Lutheran confession, and we do not doubt that the latter is the real heartfelt opinion of the honorable men involved. But the leaven which, according to Gal. 5:9, corrupts the whole dough, is in the Eisenach enterprise the extension which one wants to give to the limits of confessional fidelity: only soul-corrupting, foundation-violating false doctrine is to exclude from Lutheran church and Lord's Supper fellowship and thus also from the Eisenach agreement (the same ecclesiastical position which the Immanuel Synod has publicly declared to be its own). So the question remains, where is the boundary at which the danger to the soul begins in the case of false doctrine? Is not every false teaching, in so far as it concerns faith at all, a noxious leaven? And is not the whole of Christian doctrine the beautiful golden chain, on which not One Ring may be broken? - Thus the position of the Eisenach Conference blurs into the vague indifferentism of modern Lutheranism: we want to be Christians, Lutherans, true, faithful Lutherans, only not to be so strict and exact with pure Lutheran doctrine, so that one can still keep the people together to some extent. A sign of how impossible it is for truly faithful Lutherans to carry out this position is shown by the "Pilgrim from Saxony," who in his columns completely represents the lax, modern Lutheranism and the blurred, newer theology, and who gives his full approval to the call for the Eisenach Conference, saying that it was spoken "from his soul. Yes, the "Pilgrim" at the same time advises Pastor Vollert in Greiz, who co-signed that appeal, to return to the Greizer Landeskirche, from which, as is well known, he resigned and joined the Immanuel Synod; the "Pilgrim," however, seems to argue this out of the feeling that if one does not take it so strictly with Lutheranism on one side, but goes along with an Eisenach Conference, one must not want to take it so strictly on the other side, and can also go along with a Greizer Landeskirche. Oh, that one would want to see! (Brunn's Blatt.)

Prussian State Church. The Hannoversche Pastoral-Correspondenz of July 29 reported that the Bielefeld so-called Lutheran Conference had discussed the question: "May the need of the church urge us to leave the Landeskirche?" Pastor Greve of Guetersloh had the paper. The assembly adopted the following theses: 1. The Landeskirche is not a public foundation, but a historical entity in which the divine foundation is contained. (2) Separation from the national church is therefore not necessarily reprehensible. (3) It must not, however, be done for theoretical, but for practical reasons of conscience. (4) It must be done not only for feared, but for real necessity. (5) These are present, not only when the unlawful is boldly demanded, but also under circumstances when, by silence and by standing by, we make ourselves accessories to other men's sins. The following were recognized as occasions for conflict: 1. the question of honor, 2. the question of Christ (Sydow), 3. church discipline, 4. the question of the intervention of the state in internal church matters. The congregation then asked its executive committee, which, by the way, can expand *ad hoc* through co-optation, to be a council of conscience, which is to examine whether a member has come into conflict with the law or only out of subjective opinion. But if the same has acted rightly, so that all must be of his conviction according to the teaching of Scripture, all want to be in solidarity. - After the experiences made so far, it will probably remain with these resolutions; for if the gentlemen did not see the wood for the trees, they would not have made these resolutions in the first place, but would have carried them out long ago. W.

Bavaria. The Leipziger Allgem. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung of September 15 writes: "In general, death has so significantly affected the already thin ranks of the clergy this year (23 pastors have already died this year) that the greatest distress has already arisen in the parishes, and in one region, where four neighboring parishes are without pastors and administrators, it could already be reported that no such orphaning of the parishes had taken place since the Thirty Years' War.

Bremerhaven. The local Lutheran congregation is in the process of building a new church. In relation to this, the Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung of September 1 stated: "The construction has already begun some months ago, is to contain 600 seats and cost 60,000 Marks; but the congregation, consisting for the most part of non-wealthy families, cannot raise the costs from its own funds and already has to bear a church burden of about 7,000 Marks. In addition to this, it suffers from a severe disadvantage in comparison with the other existing parishes in Bremerhaven. The Lutheran congregation, on the other hand, has repeatedly been refused a request to that effect; indeed, in connection with its recognition by the authorities, it has been forced to enter into a contractual obligation, according to which the Lutheran members of the congregation still have to bear the church building debt of the Lutheran congregation. In accordance with this procedure, which has been observed so far against the Lutheran congregation, a collection requested for the new building in the Bremen state has been rejected by the responsible side. These facts are not mentioned in order to accuse the authorities (that is not necessary, they already speak loudly enough), but in order to prove by them, in accordance with the truth, that the Lutheran congregation sees itself dependent on the help of its fellow believers. It is the spirit of moderation and leniency which the church government of the Bremen Senate allows to prevail; this can be seen in the Lutheran congregation of Bremerhaven, since what is granted to it is only moderate, while on the other hand the Catholics and the Uniate have received leniency. Perhaps

the Senate also fears the congealing effect of Lutheran orthodoxy, and finally receives an address of thanks from the Protestant Association, which also sees its task in the fight against this congealing.

Hanover. We read the following in the Hannoversche Pastoralcorrespondenz of September 9: "At the Protestant Day in Heidelberg, where, by the way, an empty church is now provisionally given to the Jews as a place of worship, while the ecclesiastics did not receive this place of worship, but had to build a prayer hall for themselves - that is, at the Protestant Day in Heidelberg, a count of the available forces was made, and it is announced with a certain sense of victory that there are now 140 local associations, as opposed to 125 in the previous year. Of these newly founded associations, by far the most come from Hanover; there are no less than 10, namely Sulingen, Harburg, Lüneburg, Salzdetfurt, Hameln, Alfeld, Geestendorf-Lehe, Münden, Bevensen, Stade, Buxtehude. That the local associations have grown up so rapidly in Hanover is partly explained by the firmness with which the church regiment and the synod have opposed the Protestant association; the association is in a state of war, its agitation is resisted, therefore it is rallying for battle. The 'wanderers of the association', Klapp and Baumgarten, have sought to rally everywhere. The fact that so many local associations have come into being points in any case to a serious illness in our communities, especially in the urban ones. And after all, it is very inadvisable to walk coolly by the hundreds who have fallen among the robbers. We pastors in particular may ask ourselves how we are to seek opportunities, not only in preaching, but in Bible studies and lectures, to reach above all the despisers of religion among the "educated" and semi-educated, the latter becoming especially easy prey to the Protestant Association, because their views are roughly on the level of the Protestant Association's religious semi-education. - In addition, however, the growth of the Protestant Association within our national church calls for ever more serious confession and for decisive opposition to preachers or other church officials who join the Association. It is clear that he is throwing down the gauntlet to our church; we must not be afraid to show him that he has no right in the church. Moreover, the crisis in the kingdom of Saxony shows what turmoil arises when a Lutheran national church opens its doors to arbitrary doctrine." - The same paper also says: "The fears that the introduction of the new marriage law will cause a separation in our regional church have not yet completely disappeared, since some of the outstanding clergymen of our country have not yet come to an end with their deeper and well understandable struggles. However, several have already decided to proceed according to the marriage law. Two church councils, on the other hand, have petitioned the Landesconsistorium to allow marriage to continue according to the old formula. One of the church councils mentioned is Hermannsburg. It would be of infinite value if the Minister of Culture could be persuaded not to refuse his permission. For a separation in Hermannsburg, which would be unavoidable, would put more in question than one might think today. We can only heartily wish that this misfortune be averted from our regional church." - The Braunschweiger Kirchenblatt of September 9 adds to the latter note: "Münkel's Zeitblatt supplements this with the statement that among the petitioners for release of the old marriage form were S. Dankwerts in Ebstorf, P. Drewes in Wrindel, P. Raven in Sivershausen; P Harms in Hermannsburg "is said to have asked for permanent release of the old form; 8. Rocholl allegedly refuses the new form at all. We know of at least one pastor, moreover, who has definitely indicated to his superintendent that he will not use the new form.

could and will. As you can see, everything is still uncertain. The decision will lie in Hermannsburg. And for the time being, we decidedly do not believe that Pastor Harms should have entered the path of petition, which we do not consider to be treadable under the present circumstances. For it is perhaps the worst thing about the new law that it places the decision in the hands of the Prussian Minister of Eultus. We consider it quite impossible to acknowledge the request in this way. For the rest, sad as a schism is, it is the lesser evil in the situation created by the TrauungSgrsetz. For through this legislation, the ship of the national church has got into a waterway from which, according to our firm conviction, it can only be pulled out from the shore. The matter is not yet at an end, and we must not yet fear that the church in Hanover will have the nail hammered into its coffin without action. But to see such a nail in the new marriage law, all the embellishments of the same cannot prevent us." The Allgemeine Leipziger Kirchenzeitung of September 15 also reports, "In Hanover the Protestant Association continues to subvert the 'Hanoverian castles' by appointing foreign pastors. In the towns of Northeim and Münden two liberal clergymen have again been elected, one from Arolsen, i.e. from the absorptive Union, the other from Zerbst. The congregation of St. Nicholas in Zerbst was reformed until 1829, since then it has belonged to the regional church of Anhalt, in which the doctrinal union rules, the type of which is reformed, but whose confessional writings were once adopted as a result of political circumstances, the Augustana and its defense. The burning question of objective church membership, the requirement of which was denied by the Sumpiskopus but affirmed by the Landessynode, is thus once again put to the Landesconsistorium for decision. A very serious decision!"

Baden. So we read in the "Allgem. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung" of 25. August 1 The only fact is that the Israelites in Heidelberg, who at the moment do not have a synagogue because they have undertaken to build a new one, have been assigned a Catholic church for use as a synagogue, and that the Israelites do not even take the slightest hesitation in refusing their seat in this former monastery church, which has since become a school church, while the faithful Protestants have for many years made do with a private room, and finally had to build a special church hall, which, as is well known, was consecrated on July 2. And at the same time there is a surplus Protestant church, which is not used at all for most of the year!

Bremen. The Senate of the free imperial city of Bremen, following the example of the Swiss Synod of Aargau, has issued the regulation that the presentation of a birth certificate (instead of a baptismal certificate) is sufficient for confirmation. Henceforth, an unbaptized person can just as well be confirmed and receive Holy Communion in Bremen. Pastor Viktor there complains: "There is no city in our fatherland where the opposite of Christianity is proclaimed under the Christian name as unabashedly as it is here. (Immanuel.)

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 22.

December 1876.

No. 12.

The "carrying" of Melanchthon on Luther's part.

(Conclusion.)

An indirect proof that Luther, as often as Melanchthon's deviations became known to him, did not overlook or "bear" them, but then immediately intervened against them, are Melanchthon's repeated complaints, always and always, especially in the last years of Luther's life, that he felt pressed to the utmost at Luther's side and was thinking of exile. We have already reported above Melanchthon's complaint in his letter to Carlowitz: "I have also formerly borne an almost ignominious servitude, since Luther often served his nature, in which there was no small quarrelsomeness, more than either his position or the general welfare." What does Melanchthon say here other than that Luther did not support him, did not credit him with any deviation, but, when he noticed such, immediately intervened against him, and that Melanchthon, as often as he deviated, had to carefully conceal this and be constantly concerned that Luther would confront him for it? Or would Melanchthon have been able to complain so bitterly in 1548 about an "almost ignominious servitude" he had formerly borne to Luther, if Luther had given him, as his most important assistant and as a man of great merit before others, the liberty to deviate here and there from the truth that he, Luther, had recognized? Does this complaint not clearly prove that Melanchthon, out of fear of Luther's wrath, often agreed to Luther's statements with inner reluctance?

*This has always been the manner of those who cherished false doctrine, but dared not come out into the open with it, because they were afraid of the still living, decided representatives of the pure doctrine, to complain secretly, and after their death also publicly, about experienced "bondage," tyranny of conscience, pressure, imperiousness, bossiness, and the like.

Another indirect proof that Luther did not support Melanchthon's deviations, if they came to his knowledge, are Luther's many declarations that he could not deviate from any man, any angel, in short, any creature, in the doctrine, and especially in the doctrine, in which Melanchthon is strongly suspected to have deviated already during Luther's lifetime. To cite only a few such explanations here, Luther wrote in October of 1544 in his "Short Confession of the Holy Sacrament Against the Enthusiasts," and, as history proves, also to Melanchthon as a warning: "I count them all in one pie,*) as they are who do not want to believe that the Lord's bread in the Lord's Supper is his true, natural body, which the ungodly or Judas receives orally just as well as St. Peter and all the saints. He who, I say, will not believe this, let me be satisfied only with letters, writings, or words, and hope for no communion with me; nothing else will come of it." (XX, 2212.) Only a few weeks before his death, on January 17, 1546, Luther wrote to the preacher Jakob Probst: "I, the most miserable of all men, have had enough of this blessedness of the psalm: 'Blessed is the man who walks not in the council of the Sacramentians, nor treads in the path of the Zwinglians, nor sits where the Zurichers sit.'" There you have it, which is my opinion." (XVII, 2634.) Now, if Luther had known that Melanchthon was also a stiff-necked Zwinglian, and yet had borne him, nay, cultivated the most intimate communion with him, it would have been proved that Luther was the greatest hypocrite whom the sun ever shone upon, and that his whole struggle against the Swiss had its ground not in the fear of God's Word, but in personal hatred, or in envy and pride. But who will assert this but a blind Papist?

But there is also direct evidence that Luther did not bear and tolerate any error in Melanchthon with regard to divine doctrine.

When Caspar Cruciger was to give lectures on the Gospel of John in 1536, he requested the material from Melanchthon. The latter also granted Cruciger his request and gave him, among other things, the remark: "Only Christ is the *causa propter quem*; however, it is true that people must do something, that we must repent and raise our conscience through the Word, so that we may have faith. Thus our repentance and our effort are the *causae sine quibus* of justification." At this lecture, by God's providence, Luther's faithful disciple Cordatus, then pastor at Niemegek, was present. The latter was frightened by such a lecture, which had hitherto been

*) Immediately before, Luther had said, "His name is Stenkefeld, Zwingel, or whatever he likes."

Lutherans unheard doctrine, and reproached Cruciger about it, who now told him, among other things, that he had only presented what he had received from Melanchthon. Thereupon Cordatus turned to Melanchthon, and when the latter did not satisfy him, he communicated the matter to Luther. (Corp. Refor. III., 159. ff.) It is true that Melanchthon now reports: "Yesterday he (Luther) discussed these disputes, which Cordatus had aroused, with me in an exceedingly amiable manner," but he also confesses, not only in the immediately preceding: "I strive with all fidelity to preserve the harmony of our Academy, and you know that I am also in the habit of using some art in this mode of proceeding" (pp. 383.); Melanchthon had also previously, for his vindication in this matter, addressed from Nuremberg (for he had just been away at the time of Cordatus' accusation) a lengthy letter to Luther, Bugenhagen, and Cruciger, and explained himself very well as to the sense in which he had used those expressions. "I beg, therefore," he writes, "for Christ's sake, to believe that I have taught what I have taught in good zeal, and not with the consciousness of being at variance with you." (p. 179. f.) Ratzeberger writes of this transaction, among other things, as follows: "When Dr. Cruciger *ex praescripto Philippi* dictated to his auditors the entire *Lectionem de verbo ad verbum publice in schola*, a pious God-fearing pastor, Conradus Cordatus, an Austrian, who had recently come to Wittenberg to study *verae religionis christianae*, became suspicious of this Formula *causa sine qua non*, which was excited by the studiosis. For he had heard the same before from Philippo in *privata lectione* besides the foreigners, and let himself be suspected of *bona opera requiri ad salutem tanquam causam sine qua non*, conferring therefore with etzlichen studiosis thereof, until such was finally brought for Dr. Luther. Hereupon Dr. Luther was moved hard, and for this reason he advised Dr. Cruciger with hard words. Dr. Cruciger apologized, because these *Dictata in schola* were not his, but Mr. Philippi's, as he proved such with the right *autographo Philippi*. Thereupon Lutherus resorted to trade and set up a *publicam disputationem* and exploded and condemnirt the Opinion *tanquam erroneam et falsam* with public *Testimoniis scripturae*. This hurt Philippo secretly very much and drew a secret suspicion on Lutherum, as he did not want to press him and suffer next to him, but let himself be incited against him, therefore became also hostile to Cordato beyond measure; all out of this delusion, as if Cordatus had caused him such diminishment with Luther, therefore he called him *pro Cordato Quadratum*, but secretly, and did not let himself notice his displeasure against Lutherum in the least, but could hide the same artfully with himself." (Manuscript History, etc. pp. 82-84.) Löscher shares from a writing available to him in manuscript: "Schütz- und Verantwortung der

Formula Concordiae" of 1585 the news: "Lutherus had publicly said that the '*causa*' had to be removed from the doses. (Unschuld. Nachrr. 1706. p. 367.)*") With this it is quite true that Melanchthon in the year. 1538 to Veit Dietrich: "You have caused me greater distress by your edition of a Psalm, where you intersperse some things about the *causa sine qua non* and about the (as you say) *causa secunda*. What will our critics, or rather sycophants, say? - You have "corrupted in my favor Luther's interpretation" (of the 51st Psalm). You will be accused of the crime of forgery. He himself, may he have said so(!) or not, will issue vehement sentences and will want to erase and exterminate those designations of causes. I am indeed looking forward to a new tragedy. Nor is the matter explained according to the theological language of art (τέχνη & ζ), when you say: although the whole thing depends on mercy, yet the confession of sin is the second (subordinate) cause of forgiveness. ... It is a linguistic error, which, though insignificant, will yet produce new tumults for us. What a bondage it was (!) when you were here, you remember. And yet you should know that it has now become much harder. And therefore, with certain intent, I have observed this Pythagorean taciturnity for a time, in order to give no occasion for tumults." (C. R., III, 593. f.) It is evident from this, although Luther, as Melanchthon himself reports, had conversed with him "exceedingly sweetly" about the matter, yet Melanchthon had well perceived that Luther was very much in earnest, here, where the purity of the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae* was concerned. **)

*) Dr. Carl Schmidt also reports in his writing: "Ph. Melanchthon. Elberfeld. 1861": "He gave up the formula, good works are the *conditio sine qua non* of justification; the sentence contained in the *Loci* of 1535, works are necessary to eternal life, inasmuch as they must necessarily follow reconciliation, he replaced in the edition of 1538 by this: 'the new spiritual life is necessary'; later he was even content to say: obedience, that is, righteousness of conscience is necessary." (A. a. O. p- 333.) Thomasius, too, writes: "By his (Melanchthon's) prudent explanation and retraction the storm, which was already rising, had still been pacified. Melanchthon relinquished those expressions,' about which Luther also expressed his disapproval." (The Confession, etc. Nuremberg. 1848. p. 100.)

**Later, in 1555, Melanchthon wrote: "Although this proposition is to be held fast: *Nova obedientia est necessaria*, we nevertheless do not want to attach the words '*ad salutem*' to it, because this appendix is interpreted to mean *meritum*, and would obscure the doctrine of grace." (C. R. VIII, 410.) By the way, the Ducal Saxon theologians Wigand, Kirchner, and others, at the Altenburg Colloquium, certainly rightly remarked to the Electors, Paul Eber, Caspar Cruciger, and others: "If, however, the same author afterwards secretly incorporated into his books those seeds of his old error, Luther,

Another occasion on which it appeared that Luther was not disposed to bear and overlook false doctrine, even when it concerned his Melanchthon, who was so dear to him, was the following. The court preacher of Duke Heinrtch in Freiberg, Jakob Schenk, asked in a letter addressed to Melanchthon and Jonas, whether one could take Holy Communion under one form among tyrants. Melanchthon affirmed this in his answer, and sought to substantiate this opinion of his. Schenk, who not only expected a completely different answer, but also seems to have desired it for certain reasons, immediately sent Melanchthon's answer to the Elector as proof that Melanchthon's teaching could not be right. This matter alone would not have kindled a great fire. But at the same time the Elector had heard several other rumors about Melanchthon's and Cruciger's position to Luther and his teachings. As a result of this, the Elector instructed his faithful Chancellor Brück, in a letter of May 5, 1537 (l. c. 365.), to consult first with Luther about this matter. Brück was astonished to learn that Luther was already prepared for such an opening. Among other things, Brück reports the following about his conversation with Luther to Prince John Frederick: "Dr. Martinus says and confesses that he would never have thought that Philip was still so stiff in his fantasies. (Melanchthon must therefore have tried to make Luthern forget his suspicious remarks again and again by good explanations). "From this I understood that Philippus had given him the letter of Ew. Churfürstl. Grace to Dr. Jakob (Schenk) had been hidden from him. He also indicated that he had all kinds of precautions and could not know how Philip was at the Sacrament. For he did not call it anything else, considered it only a bad ceremony, and had not seen him receive Holy Communion for a long time. He would also have brought argumenta, after the time when he was in Cassel, from which he heard how he was almost of Zwinglian opinion. But how it stood in his heart, he did not yet know." (Even after Melanchthon had presented his Zwinglian "arguments" and thereby betrayed himself, he must therefore have quickly retreated toward Luther). "But the secret letters and counsels, 'that among the tyrants one may receive the Sacrament in one form,' would give him strange who was withdrawn from so much business and writing, and buried in it, could not, as it were, be such a hundred-eyed Argus, that he saw and noticed all the editions, diversities, and alterations of those books." (*Acta etc.* f 138.) It is positively absurd to suppose that Luther must have read through each of the many editions of Melanchthon's *Loci*, and thus must have learned it, as often as Melanchthon again, according to his custom, made alterations in them.

Thoughts. But he wanted to share his heart with Philip, and wanted very much that Philip, as a high man, would not distance himself from them and from the school here; for he would ever do great work. But if he would persist in his opinion, as he notes from Dr. Jacob's letter, the truth of God would have to prevail. He would pray for him. For if for the sake of the tyrants' prohibition, and for the preservation of peace, One Gestalt might be taken, their commandment would have to be justified, and for the same cause it would have to be taught that works did to justification.*) He said, "In short, there is no more weakness," and besides this he introduced many good things to me against writing too long about it. I told him what Your Lordship's Grace considered Philippi's opinion to be, and considered it, as I had noted from Your Lordship's Grace next to Lochau, that he would press until he saw his time and comfort, and especially if he would experience the doctor's death. ... Dr. Martinus cried that if he did so, he would become a wretched man and have no peace for the sake of his conscience." (*Corp. Ref.* III, 427. f.) At what time this conversation of Brück with Luther, which should be kept secret according to the express will of the Elector (p. 365.), took place, is not stated in the relevant documents deposited in the Weimar archives. Under August 4, however, Cruciger writes to B. Dietrich, after he had thought of Schenk's affair with bitter words: "The Doctor (Luther) has written that he has heard that an exceedingly poisonous plague is developing in this school . . . and speaks of Erasmian mediators, by which he undoubtedly aims at me, above all at Philip." (p. 397.) But Melanchthon himself writes under September 18 also to Dietrich in regard to the same matter: "Now we are called to answer for ourselves, I and Jonas. For he (Schenk) had also asked Jonas for advice. But the former was more cautious, and gave no answer in the matter; he is, however, demanded in court; as I believe, so that the opportunity to corner me (*me urgendi*) has a greater appearance. .. I will go from thence with the greatest equanimity, if they will banish me (*ἱξοστραχίσουσι*). ... I hope that Luther will step into the remedy with his authority." (P. 410. f.) In this hope Melanchthon was not mistaken. But why? He had then really the consciousness that, though he could not appropriate, nay, approve of Luther's polemical manner, yet agreeing with him in doctrine, he preferred only a milder *τρόπος παιδείας*. He therefore also immediately made an excellent detailed confession concerning his doctrine of justification.

*) Here, then, Luther's suspicion, which he had already expressed, that Melanchthon's expression that good works are the *causa sine qua non* of justification, had its basis in syncretistic sympathies, reawakened.

(p. 430. ff.), in order to show that he, as he himself writes of it under the 13th of October, in no way intends to become the originator of a new sect or to fight against Luther behind his back.*) Of a conversation because of the suspicion which Luther had at that time entertained concerning Melanchthon's faith in the matter of the Holy Supper, we find certain details neither in Melanchthon's, nor in Luther's letters of that time. But not only does Melanchthon report on November 25: "Although, after those recent deliberations about me, the day (of my interrogation) had already been announced to me, Luther's illness prevented anything from being negotiated, whereupon an armistice occurred" (p. 452.); but Melanchthon undoubtedly also gave Luther reassuring explanations about this point. It is a fact that Melanchthon also about this time, as we have already proved above with Melanchthon's own words, rejected Zwinglianism and professed the right doctrine of Holy Communion. Thus Luther's anger subsided, and even the strong suspicion against Melanchthon vanished from his faithful heart, which was so easily calmed by good words.**) Even Amsdorf, whom Luther held in extremely high esteem, could not, therefore, in the long run tear his Melanchthon from Luther's heart, although he wrote to Luther, pointing to Melanchthon, that he was "nursing a snake in his bosom". (S. 503.) -

It is true that one wanted to claim that Melanchthon had changed the Augsburg Confession with Luther's knowledge and approval in 1540; but this was contrary to historical truth. In the "Wiedermalige Haupt-Vertheidigung des Augapfels" (Leipzig 1673) we read rather: "Dr. Wigandus writes in the History of the Augsburg Confession p. 31 that Melanchthon *solus*, alone, without other counsel, changed the Confession; which is displeasing to good people. Thus also the Jenische theologians" (on the occasion of the Altenburg Colloquium) "have answered sufficiently to the intercession of the Phrlippists and thus said: The gentlemen may do well, and not speak so presumptuously against the eighth commandment, that they may presume to persuade the simple, as if it were so, as they pretend. But some of our own have heard more than once that the man of God Luther, of holy memory, has complained many times that the Augsburg Confession is so often changed, and has said to Philippe: "Dear Philippe, the book is not yours, but that of the whole confessing church.

*) See above p. 328 the relevant passage from Melanchthon's letter to Dietrich already reported there.

**) How fast Luther, if an even badly erring one recanted, let himself be satisfied, is shown by the example of the wretched Agricola. Read Cruciger's letter to Dietrich, *Corp. Ref.* III, 482. Even to Cruciger, Luther's procedure here seemed too mild, because he hated Agricola.

For this reason, it is not your place to change such a book so often and in so many different ways. Likewise, in the history of the Augsburg Confession against the disguised Ambros. Wolfium, p. 365, that Luther himself often addressed Philippum and asked him to refrain from changing and increasing the Augsburg Confession; at times he even expostulated with him and said: "Who has commanded you?" (p. 343.) That Luther did not intervene more seriously against Melanchthon on account of his alteration of the Augsburg Confession, without inquiring into a discord arising therefrom, was doubtless chiefly for two reasons. First, the first changes were not direct blackening of false doctrine, but merely weakenings of the Confession.**) Melanchthon himself replied, when in 1541 at the Worms Colloquium Eck rejected as a basis the altered Augsburg Confession presented to him, to Melanchthon's great embarrassment: in it "nothing was changed in fact and substance, although in these last copies more lenient and clearer words were used." (Schmidt's Melanchthon. S. 381. f. Cf. Luther's Werke. Tom. Hal. XVII, 625. f. 631.)**) On the other hand, it may have seemed less dangerous to Luther that Melanchthon allowed himself changes only in the Latin text, the German, once given to the

*Dr. C. Schmidt, in his biography of Melanchthon, p. 423, claims that the word "*exhibentur*," which Melanchthon used in the 10th article of the modified Augsburg Confession, means that (body and blood) are "offered", "which presupposes faith on the part of the recipient"; however, this is obviously false. *Exhibere* means more than *offerre*, to offer, namely, "to present, to answer." Now, since Melanchthon's altered text reads: *Quod cum pane et vino exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus*" (not *credentibus*!) "*in Coena Domini*," only he can sign these words without a *reservatio* who believes in a real presence and in an enjoyment of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, of which all who partake of the Supper become partakers. Therefore also Melanchthon in the following year, as Schmidt himself reports p. 398. f., at the Colloquium in Regensburg "declared: The Protestants hold the common doctrine of the Catholic Church, that in the supper, when the bread and wine are consecrated, the body and blood of Christ are essentially present and taken," and they reject the opinion of those who deny the presence of Christ, since it comes 'from human reason alone, without God's Word.'" Melanchthon, by the way, here referred to the words of the unamended Augsburg Confession, "*Testati sumus etiam in A. C., nos 'improbare' eos, qui negant, adesse et sumi verum corpus Christi.*" (*Corp. Ref.* IV, 276)

**Therefore, when Melanchthon finally had himself duplicated in Regensburg, Luther wrote to the Elector: "We ask that Your Lordship not write too harshly to M. Philipp and ours, so that he does not grieve himself to death again. For they have reserved the dear Confession for them and still remained pure and firm in it, even if everything is lacking." (XVII, 842.)

Emperor, however, left the Confession unchanged. The "Hauptvertheidigung des Augapfels" also draws attention to this. It says: "Moreover, it appears that the German (copy), which was handed over to Emperor Carl the Fifth, did not undergo as many changes as the Latin one; as, by God's special providence, the tenth article remained intact (Apol. F. C. f. 163.), so that Mr. Luther himself was content with it, and did not care so much for the Latin. (p. 344. f.) When, therefore, Hugo Grotius once asserted that the *Belgic* Confession might well be changed, since this had also happened to the Augsburg Confession, the reformed Joh. Gerh. Vossius answered him (*Tom. IV. opp. in epp. selectis p. 4.*): "You say that the Augsburg Confession has been changed. I do not know whether this serves much to the point, because it was indeed changed by Melanchthon on his own hand, but, if I am not mistaken, never under public authority. I know at least this much, that Melanchthon was reproached by Luther for having done this without asking anyone for advice." (Citirt in the Introduction to the symb. BB. by J. T. Müller. p. LXIX.)

Only one more example may give proof that Luther did not carry Melanchthon, but punished and threatened him himself, if it once became apparent to him, in spite of Melanchthon's continual game of hide-and-seek, or if even an urgent suspicion arose in him that Melanchthon was falsifying doctrine.

Since the Wittenberg Concord in 1536, the Lord's Supper controversy had been almost completely quiescent until 1543. In that year, several things came together that made Luther realize how necessary it was to once again give a serious public testimony against the Sacramentarians. Toward the end of 1542, Luther received Baldaffare Altieri's letter from Venice, which he had addressed to Luther on behalf of the Protestant congregations in Venice, Vicenza, and Treviso, but also the opinion that even in Germany there is disagreement about the doctrine of Holy Communion, and asks for the sending of an "*Apologia de conciliatione*", which Melanchthon is supposed to have published. *) Luther was not misled by this about Melanchthon's orthodoxy; rather, we read that Luther, for example, in a letter to Wolferinus of July 20, 1543, decidedly confesses Melanchthon's doctrine of Holy Communion (*Tom.*

*The magnificent letter (dated November 26, 1542) is reported by Seckendorf in his *Commentarius histor. et apologet. de Lutherismo* 1. III. s. 25. § 97. P. II, f. 401. f. Our dear college, Professor Günther, communicated the same in German in the "Lutheraner" of November 1 of this year.

Hal. XX, 2012. f.)* and, as we have already seen, in his answer to the Italian Protestants on November 12, 1544, gives him the testimony that he is also seriously committed to the pure biblical doctrine in the matter of Holy Communion. In this reply, however, Luther had not only expressed his deep indignation over the mischief which the Swiss were causing in Italy, but at the same time had promised to issue a new document against them. Melanchthon read the letter with horror and wrote about it to V. Dietrich on October 25, 1543: "As far as Italian affairs are concerned, 'what I feared has happened. I knew well that Luther would write more harshly than he thinks (!). For what was it necessary to admit also transubstantiation?**) ... But since Luther's answers are widely circulated, that opinion, when brought to the Swiss, will excite new controversies.'" (C. R. III, 208.)

In addition to the news coming to Luther from Italy, there was also the fact that at the beginning of the following year the Zurichers published Zwingli's works anew and "professed all his opinions anew" (Guericke), and that the rumor was spread that Luther had given way in the doctrine of the sacraments, which, as Luther was told in Eperies, had reached as far as Hungary.***) So Luther decided to raise his voice once again against the Zurichers. Melanchthon was shocked to learn of this, not only because his hope of complete unification with the Swiss vanished, but also because he heard at the same time that he, too, would be attacked by name in the projected writing. The latter was indeed a mistake, for when Luther declared against the Italians and Hungarians that he would write again against the Sacramentarians, Luther, reassured by Melanchthon's beautiful speeches, gave him the testimony that he was right, even in the matter of the Sacrament. But Melanchthon

(*) Punished by Luther, that he had treated the remaining consecrated elements disrespectfully, Wolferinus had appealed to Melanchthon. Luther, however, answered him, "It is true that M. Philippus has rightly written that the Sacrament is nothing but the sacramental act ... so that he rejects the enclosing and carrying about of the Sacrament." At the conclusion of his argument, Luther finally writes: "Thus I mean, and M. Philip also means it thus, as I do not know otherwise." (Op. cit.)

**Luther had only written: "We reject the useless and sophistical disputation of transubstantiation, giving nothing if anyone else believes it or not. (de Wette V, 568.) It is much to be apprehended that Melanchthon, for the sake of his dear Swiss friends, took more offence at the so distinct disputation of the true doctrine of the presence of Christ in the Holy Supper, which is found in Luther's Briefs, than at Luther's putting so little weight in it, whether one believed transubstantiation or not. Melanchthon knew how dismissively and mockingly Luther otherwise spoke of this superstition.

***) See Luther's Briefs to the Brethren in Eperies. V, 643.

obviously had an evil conscience; for things were indeed worse for his faith now than Luther suspected. Already on September 6, 1543, he had written to V. Dietrich: "You know that in Italy and France a quarrel has broken out about the Lord's Supper, and that this discord, as in Germany, stops the course of the Gospel. And in France the chiefs invoke the authority of Luther to excuse their cruelty. I wish that this were not confirmed by you. For antiquity undoubtedly spoke much differently about this matter than modern times. Nazianzenus speaks simply of images (αντιτυποις) of the body and blood of Christ. And I could adduce more similar testimonies. Or do you think that I hear without much pain that ours sometimes speak of the Rhenish no more lightly than of the Turks? I am sorry that you too sometimes speak somewhat harshly. I would therefore like you to speak of the whole matter as a scientifically educated man (*ut hominem doctum*). I have touched on this matter in the little book written in Bonn against the Cologne Sycophants, and I ask you to read it in our friendship. For I wanted to say something about the use of the sacraments and to rebuke the ideas of the common people, who invent almost magical inclusions of Christ. However, I do not make the Lord's Supper a profane thing. I say that in its use Christ makes us members of it, and is effectual." (C. R. V, 176.) Melanchthon also wrote to the opponent of Luther's doctrine of the Holy Supper, Eutychius Musculus, at Augsburg, August 12, 1544: "Now our Pericles excites new internal wars. He thunders against those who speak differently about the symbols of the body and blood of Christ than he himself speaks, and at times he also attacks me. I do not know, therefore, how it will turn out with me. Perhaps at this age of mine I shall have to emigrate." (C. R. V, 464.) One sees from this that even if Melanchthon had calmed Luther by glosses that could be heard, he himself was not calm; as often as Luther "thundered" against the Sacramentarians, he feared none the less that it would be to him. So it was no wonder that Melanchthon, when he heard that Luther would again write against the Sacramentarians, and when it was rumored that Luther would on this occasion also call him an opponent, was frightened. He now feared, without a doubt, to have become manifest to Luther. Thus, as already noted, he wrote to Bucer on August 28, 1544: "Of our Pericles I have written to you through Milichius that he has begun to thunder again about the Lord's Supper and has written an *atrocious* (*atrocem*) book, which has not yet been published, in which I and you are attacked. He has been with Amsdorf these days for the sake of this cause, whom alone he draws into the fellowship of this commerce, and who alone approves of these outbursts. I hear that he will take me and

Cruciger to him tomorrow. ... I am a quiet bird, and will not go out of this prison unwillingly, if I should be pressed hostilely. In a little while you will know the further course." (P. 474.) How Melanchthon wrote to Bullinger on August 30, concerning the writing which he had expected with great anxiety, has already been stated above. About the same time he also wrote to Jonas: "I have written this to you with a heart weighed down with sorrow about that of which I gave you notice the other day. For now it is expected that it will come to a meeting. A formula is presented concerning the Lord's Supper, of which I know not what it will be." (p. 476.) Cruciger also reports the same thing to his friend V. Dietrich, under the 7th of September, with the following words: "For the sake of the Cologne Church Order, Philip has come under suspicion; in the same, however, he himself has written nothing about the Eucharist, nor did he seem to disapprove of Bucer's opinion, as far as the doctrine is concerned. But our Zeizer (Amsdorf), stiff as he is, has also inflamed our master (Luther). And, as I hear, he contends that not even a synecdoche is to be allowed in the words of the Lord's Supper;*) and ours (Luther), when he was with that one (Amsdorf) the other day, is said to have written a little book, which no one has yet seen, and now, as I hear, he is making a formula; which he wants all of us to sign, perhaps with the intention of publishing what he has written. At least he has been heard to say, that if any of us believe otherwise than he does, he will not stay here. You see, therefore, what might happen if he should present too strict a formula, especially with anathematisms, with which also those are to be condemned who, out of weakness or out of mere error, believe differently in other churches, or who also do not want to approve of this, which he once stiffly asserted in N.: that bread is God, etc. **) Therefore the other (Melanchthon) resolved that he should rather go straight out of town than agree or dispute with the master." (P. 477.) Now all these were admittedly empty fears of an evil conscience. When Luther's so dreaded "Short Confession" had finally appeared at the beginning of October 1544, the same Cruciger wrote to Dietrich on October 7: "Ours has given no hint of any disfavor against us, although one noticed before from his speeches that he had harbored, I do not know, what suspicions. The booklet that has appeared is also written in a much more moderate manner,

*) Cruciger is mistaken here. Luther had not yet learned the Cologne Reformation formula.

Also, as is well known, Luther rejected the rhetorical, but not the grammatical synecdoche in the sacramental words.

**) Cruciger also says this against all truth, that Luther could be expected to want to condemn those who err out of weakness; and in any case it was an empty rumor that Luther (or Amsdorf?) ever claimed that bread is God.

than one had hoped, although there is no doubt that some have also been annoyed by it for the sake of certain all too harsh words, such as that he almost without distinction calls those 'devilish' who believe the opposite.*)" ... By the way, I think that our man thinks much more appropriately than he sometimes speaks when he is in a state of agitation." (S. 497.) But as groundless as these fears proved to be, they show, first, how well Melanchthon and his friend Cruciger knew that Luther himself would not spare them, even publicly, if it should become evident to him that they were attached to false doctrine; and on the other hand, that both, if they did not merely take offence at Luther's strong expressions, but fell in with the contrary doctrine in their hearts and towards their confidants, had so far only reassured Luther by ambiguous speeches; which latter unfortunately seems to be more likely to be assumed than the former. By the way, Melanchthon, in a letter of October 10, mentions a conversation he had with Luther on the matter in the following words: "I have told Luther that I have always defended the synecdoche, that when bread and wine are taken, Christ is truly present and makes us his members, and that outside of the use, no outward acts (rite) have the nature of a sacrament. I deem that he has been thus satisfied." (P.498. f.) God alone knows whether this has been all that Melanchthon then conceded to Luther. This much, however, is certain, that Luther did not object to the expression synecdoche, as a grammatical figure,**) and that he appropriated the important axiom first laid down by Melanchthon: *Nihil habet rationem sacramenti extra usum a Christo Institutum*, is known.***)

Thus the unsuspecting Luther wrote in his second letter to the Italians, November 12, 1544: "If you should have heard that Mr. Philip or Luther consented to their (the Sacramentans') frenzy, for God's sake do not believe it." (Luther's Brr. of de Wette. V, 697.) But Luther only too soon received occasion for fresh suspicion. In 1543, Melanchthon had worked out the draft of the Cologne Reformation with Bucer in Bonn, on behalf of the Elector Hermann von Wied. On that part which dealt with the Holy Communion, Melanchthon had not worked, as already noted, but he had presented it to Luther, even before the latter had published it.

*Luther does not say directly of his opponents that they have a "devilish," etc. heart. Luther does not say directly of his opponents that they have a "deviled heart," etc., but says conditionally that if the opponents had called his God a "baked God, a baked God," etc., he could have paid them with similar coin.

**S. Luther's Great Confession. *Torn. Hal.* XX, 1296. writing Wider die himmlischen Propheten. S. 341. f.

***) S. *Torn. Hal.* XX, 2012. f. XXI, 1561.1588. ff. As is well known, the Melanchthonian axiom is also referred to in the Concordia formula. S. Müller p. 665.

Luther wrote about it to Amsdorf on June 1544: "I have neither seen nor read the Cologne Reformation. Luther wrote about it to Amsdorf on June 23, 1544: "I have neither seen nor read the Cologne Reformation, although I hear that it is praised. I have asked M. Philipp, who says it is of such a nature that the right understanding and use of the Word and Sacraments are taught in all churches, with the elimination of all superstition." (P. 670.) But the matter was, alas, very different. About the end of the month of November Luther at last received the draft. And now he wrote to the Chancellor Brück: "The Bishop's (Amsdorf's) articles please me well, especially that of the Lord's Supper; for there lies power; and send them again herewith. *)... But I am moved by the articles to fall quickly into the book (the draft of the Reformation), and of the sacraments; for there the shoe presses hard against me, and I find that nothing pleases me everywhere. For a long time there has been much talk about the use, fruit, and honor of the sacrament; but it mumbles about the substance, so that one should not hear what he thinks of it, in all measure, as the enthusiasts do, and, as the bishop (Amsdorf) indicates, does not say a word against the enthusiasts, in which it is nevertheless necessary to act; the other would be found with less effort and talk. But nowhere does it come out whether he received the right body and blood verbally, nor does he report anything about it when he tells the Anabaptists about their deeds, even though the Anabaptists have as many evil articles as the Anabaptists. All in all, the book is not only helpful to the enthusiasts, but also comforting; rather for their doctrine than for ours. Therefore I am sick of it, and exceedingly displeased with it. If I am to read it in its entirety, my gracious lord must give me room to do so until my unwillingness subsides; otherwise I cannot look at it well. And even without that, as the bishop shows, all and everything is too long and great a wash, that I may well feel the rattle-mouth, Bucer, here." (de Wette. V, 708. f.) Prof. C. Schmidt, in his "Melanchthon," says, of the Lord's Supper, it was said in the Cologne Reformation, that it is "the communion of the body and blood of our Lord JEsu Christ, at which communion we are to keep His memorial, that we may abide and live more fully in him by faith, and he in us; and because this giving and receiving of the body and blood of Christ our Lord is a heavenly work and commerce of faith, men ought to put away all carnal thoughts in this mystery." Schmidt himself adds, "The essential presence was transitions, and the enjoyment of the body and blood represented as a matter of faith; evidently this must have displeased Luther in the highest degree." (P. 437.) True, Luther, in spite of this discovery, must still have thought the best of Melanchthon and alone

*) Amsdorf had sent the draft with his criticism to the Elector of Saxony, and he had sent both to Luther.

Bucer for the culprit, since he still on March 5, 1545, in his preface to the first tome of his Latin writings, judged Melanchthon in terms of the highest esteem (cf. *Tom. Hal.* XIV, 427. f. 453.);*) but soon thereafter, perhaps made aware by Amsdorf, it seemed to Luther to be undeniable that Melanchthon here, as the collaborator of that draft of the Reformation, had betrayed his erroneous belief. So Luther decided to finally write publicly 'against Melanchthon. With great shock this came to the ears of the Elector, and he now sent a written instruction to his Chancellor Brück, how he should negotiate with Luther, so that the open break, if possible, could still be averted. In this instruction of April 26, 1545, it says, among other things: "We therefore deem it good that you, as for yourselves or by our command, as you will judge to be the best and most unobjectionable, should do the following with Dr. Martino without danger, and, since it would be done by our command, after avoiding our gracious greeting and overruling the enclosed letter of our credence. We would be reported as if he were now at work to write a book against the Sacramentarians,**) which we would quite happily put up with, and would also see it graciously and gladly. But besides this, it also seems to us as if he should want to name M. Philippum Melanchthon in such a book on account of some stated suspicion, which, if this were the case, we would truly be in great distress. ... Therefore it would be our gracious request that he would not note this from us in any other way than graciously and in the best of intentions, and that he would spare Philippum from being named in his book, but (since he had reasons for doubting that he was with the Zurichers or others in the matter of the doctrine of the Sacrament), require him to come to him and alone, in a Christian and fatherly manner, admonish him; so we would be sure that he would be found and instructed in a Christian way and in all fairness.***) ... If he will not be helped by an admonition, which we do not want to provide for ourselves, then we could

*) Melanchthon, too, had advised against admitting the Swiss into the Schmalkaldic League as late as March, and had advised against permitting the sale of their books in Saxony! (*C. R.* V, 723. 741.)

**) This was first of all a writing against Bullinger, who had published an extremely vehement reply to Luther's "Kurzes Bekenntniss" (Short Confession) at the beginning of this year, which even Calvin and Melanchthon disapproved of.

***) The Elector could well cherish this hope, since Brück had written to him shortly before, on April 24, that he "could not refrain from telling him that Philip was once again grieved and distressed beyond measure" (was) "and may he take it for granted that because Martinus wants to place the article of the Most Holy Sacrament, he will reach further than the Wittenberg Concord with the Upper Lands gives and is also able to do in principle, and that from this a great disruption of this time will come about.

the proposals to this and other things, so he would think to be good, also come well." (C. R. V, 746. f.) However, as soon as Amsdorf had sent him his "Censure" of the Cologne Reformation, Luther had already testified against it privately and publicly, and Melanchthon, since the latter felt guilty in the matter, also drew Luther's sharp judgment upon himself. He wrote to Dietrich already on August 11, 1544: "About the Amsdorf censorship I wrote to you the other day. And now Luther begins to stir up war in sermons. He is also said to want to issue, I know not what." On the same day he also wrote to Camerarius: "Your Leokrates (Amsdorf), once a friend of yours, has sent here a sharp and malicious censure of the Cologne Reformation. But to him to whom he sent it (Luther) it appears as a mild one. Leaving its object, he now thunders and flashes against certain other things, attacking at times me also." (p. 461. f.) That Luther obeyed the Elector's counsel, Seckendorf reports in the following words: "Luther received Melanchthon's excuse, in that the latter said that he had neither exposed the passage on the Holy Supper, nor concealed from Bucerne what he missed in it, but the latter had taken no notice of his recollection. Thus Luther's anger turned all the more against Bucer; but the latter also calmed him down by publishing a little book in which he set forth his opinion of the Sacrament somewhat more clearly." (*Commentar, de Lutheranism.* L. III, 8. 27. § 108. P. II, fol. 448.) Although, apart from this message from Seckendorf, which is undoubtedly based on documents contained in the Saxon archives at his disposal, we ourselves have no further authentic document about a reproach made by Luther to Melanchthon in private, at the request of the Elector, and about the success of such a reproach, it would, however, be foolish to doubt on that account that it was made. For as far as Luther is concerned, first of all, faithful as he was, he is known never to have written any unfavorable word about his relationship to Melanchthon, either to a friend or to an opponent of his; and secondly, how could Luther have thought of speaking out about Melanchthon in a matter in which the Elector had evidently placed the seal of secrecy upon him? As far as Melanchthon is concerned, he, too, mentioned that reproach against no one; but since he knew that it had been done by order of the Elector and was to be a secret one according to his express wish, this is very explicable. Was it for Melanchthon towards the Elector a

between them and the Oberlanders, and not only between the Swiss preachers. (p. 743.) Accordingly, Melanchthon had declared that he wished to adhere to the doctrine as it had been formulated in the Wittenberg Concord in 1536.

dangerous thing to divulge these secret negotiations, so it was certainly also otherwise in his interest to keep his mouth shut about it. There is therefore no doubt, not only that the reproach happened, but also that Melanchthon thereby declared himself against Luther, as he had always done, in such a way that the latter was now completely reassured.

Thus we also perceive, not only that Melanchthon, from the time in which this reproach must have fallen, until Luther's death, never again complained to his confidants that Luther was also aiming at him in his polemics, but also that from then on both again conversed with each other in unadulterated cordiality and intimacy. Already on May 7, 1545, Melanchthon wrote to Wolfg. Musculus: "It pains me that the Zurichers have not only answered improperly" (to Luther's "Short Confession") "but also that they have adopted the absurd opinion of the heathen. The church is not in that multitude in which there is no knowledge at all of the promise of Christ, no voice of the gospel, no preaching ministry." (C. R. V, 755.)*) That Luther, in his writing "against the 32 articles of the theologians at Louvain," of that year, in the 28th thesis, had declared "the Zwinglians and all Sacramentians" to be heretics (Opp. Hal. T. XIX, 2256.), Melanchthon mentions this, but without, as he was wont to do on such occasions, expressing any censure of it. He writes only to Menius on September 9 of the year named: "I send you the propositions that have appeared against the articles of the Louvian sophists, which will be followed by a whole book. Adam may only not think that Luther has stretched out his arms (*abjecisse hastam*) in the Punct vom Abendmahl des HErrn. You see here again him giving the signal." (C. R. V, 848.) To his V. Dietrich he declares, without a sidelong glance at Luiher, as usual, on September 13: "If I could shed as many tears as our Elbe carries water with it when the river is full, my pain, which has arisen from this discord, could not be satisfied." (p. 852.) **) Even with Amsdorf, whom he had hitherto considered Luther's Anreizer, Melanchthon seems now to have been reconciled. At least he writes to him on July 24 of the aforementioned year, among other assurances of his love and veneration for him, the following: "Although I very much desired to accompany Dr. Luther on his journey to you, for I see nothing to be desired by you.

*) Previously, Melanchthon had not dared to hand over a letter from Calvin to Luther that had been sent to him. "Your letter," he wrote to Calvin on April 17, 1545, "I have not given to Martina, for he takes much with suspicion." (From the Zurich manuscript reprinted in Henry II. Suppl. 12. p. 107. Compare Innocence. Nachrr. 1722, p. 626. ff., where Calvin's letter is included).

**) That Luther repeatedly made similar statements concerning the sacramental controversy is well known.

I would rather not leave here without your permission than to discuss the most important things with you in all sincerity of heart. (p. 798.) When Luther traveled to Mansfeld in October of the same year to recuperate, and in December to settle a dispute, he compelled Melanchthon to accompany him. (p. 864. 910.) On November 11, Melanchthon reports to Medler: "Dr. Martinus read the story (written by you) yesterday at the supper, to which he had invited our pastor (Bugenhagen), Cruciger, G. Major, and me; as he is in the habit of inviting his friends to himself on this day. For on the day before Martinmas Luther was born, and is now entering his 62nd year (?)." (p. 887.) On January 20, 1546, he again reports that he had been invited by Luther to supper, and had therefore declined another invitation. (C. R. VI, 17.) On February 8, he dubbed Luther "his dearest father and restorer of the pure doctrine of the Gospel." (p. 33.) When the ailing Melanchthon was to be sent again to Regensburg for the Colloquium in January, 1546, Luther revoked it and wrote to the Elector about it on January 9: "How would one do, if M. Philippus were dead or ill, as he is truly ill, that I am glad that I have brought him home from Mansfeld. ... He will gladly go, if one wants it, and dares his life; but who wants to advise or tell him in such danger, in which one would like to tempt God and in the end cause ourselves a vain rebuke. The young doctors must also go up and lead the word after us." (de Wette. V, 775.) Brück, who had talked about this with Luther, reported the same to the Elector: "The Doctor never wanted to advise that Philippum should be sacrificed for the journey and the futile, unnecessary effort. ... If Philippus had been a faithful man who neither shuns nor avoids anyone, he would have been weak and ill; it would have cost him no small effort to bring him home alive again, for he would neither have wanted to eat nor drink," etc. (C. R. VI, 10.) Therefore, Luther still wrote to Melanchthon from Eisleben in the most cordial and friendly manner. He begins his third last letter of February 1, 1546, with the words: "Grace and peace in the Lord! I also thank Thee, my Philippe, that Thou prayest for me, and I beseech Thee to continue to pray." (de Wette. V, 782.) In his penultimate letter of February 6, he hails him as "the faithful servant of God, his dearest brother," (p. 785.) and in the last of February 14, as his "worthiest brother in Christ." (p. 974.) By the way, a note of Ratzenberger, to which also Seckendorf (L. III., 1.693.) refers to, is most strange: "One wants to say and insist for a constant truth, since Dr. Luther noted his weakness and worried, that he would have trouble with his life, he had before his end a good friend, who at that time had been around him at Eisleben and who had been with him at the time of his death."

after that he became pastor of St. Nikolaus and was called M. Johannes Rothe, he gave the order that as soon as he would come to Wittenberg after his death, (he) wanted to seriously admonish Philippum that he wanted to do away with some points in his *Locis communibus*, so Lutherus (contested) and Philippum therein, and leave them outside, **because of the most recent conversation, which he, Lutherus, held with him**". (Ratzenberger's handwritten history of Luther, etc., edited* by Neudecker. Jena, 1850. p. 139.)

Finally, we share here a story that Luther's works from Kirchner's, Selnecker's and Mart. Chemnitzens "Gründlicher, wahrhafter Historie von der Augsbургischen Confession" (or "Historie des Sacramentsstreites") of 1584. It reads as follows:

"Since Major wanted to leave for Regensburg, he first came to Dr. Luther to bless him, and found these words written in Dr. Luther's hand in the entrance to his study: *"Nostrī Professores examinandi sunt de Coena Domini,"* i.e., our Professores are to be examined by the Lord's Supper. For this reason he began and said: "Reverend Father, what do these words mean? To which the great doctor answered him: "What you read, and what they say, that is the opinion; and when you come home again, and I also, an examination will have to be set up, for which you, as well as others, shall be required. But when Dr. Major wanted to rid himself of the suspicion with great prayer and clear confession, he finally received the answer: You make yourselves suspicious by silence and palliation; but if you believe as you speak before me, speak this also in the church, in *lectionibus, concionibus et privatis colloquiis*, and strengthen your brethren, and help the erring back to the right way, and contradict the wanton spirits; otherwise your confession is only a larval work and of no use. He that holdeth his doctrine, faith, and creed to be true, right, and certain, cannot stand in the same stall with others that lead false doctrine, or are of the same mind, nor ever give good words to the devil and his scales. A teacher who is silent about error, and yet wants to be a true teacher, is worse than a public fanatic, and does greater harm with his hypocrisy than a heretic, and is not to be trusted; he is a wolf and a fox, a hireling and a belly servant, etc., and is not allowed to teach, word, faith, and religion. and may despise and hand over doctrine, word, faith, sacrament, churches, and schools; he is either secretly in cahoots with the enemy, or is a doubter and wind-farer, and wants to see where it will end, whether Christ or the devil will prevail; or is altogether uncertain of himself, and not worthy to be called a disciple, let alone a teacher, and wants to anger no one, nor to speak his word to Christ, nor to hurt the devil and the world, etc.' etc. This is what Dr. Major considered,

Luther, who faithfully promised to follow it and thus blessed Luther, has often himself recounted and told of such earnest words that the great man of God spoke to him. (*Tom. Hal. XVII, 1476. f.*)

Whether Luther wrote the words: "*Nostri Professores examinandi sunt de Coena Domini*," also for Melanchthon's sake, above the entrance to his study, we do not want to decide; in any case, had Luther returned alive to Wittenberg, he would not have been dispensed from passing such an examination.

But be that as it may, we now finally ask: can those who maintain ecclesiastical fellowship with notorious heretics, if they on the whole profess the doctrine of our church, rightly refer to the fact that Luther also carried a Melanchthon? - We answer: Impossible! It is true, if one goes a little deeper into the history of Melanchthon's conduct during the last ten years of Luther's life, one sees such a dull picture of the former that one must ask oneself with astonishment how it was possible that there was not a decisive break between the two men. And we confess that it cost us not a little overcoming and only the duty not to let our Luther still in the grave without contradiction desecrate and soul-destroying: To prevent the soul-destroying abuse of his name, has moved us to collect and add one feature after the other to the design of that picture. How much we would have preferred to be able to help that only the memory of Melanchthon in the time of his faithfulness and blessed effectiveness be kept alive, but that the memory of him in the time of his fading and falling be extinguished and buried forever! May those who, instead of seeking comfort for their syncretism in Melanchthon, who once stood faithfully by his teacher Luther, seek comfort in Melanchthon, who secretly machinates against Luther, but publicly professes his faith in him and his doctrine, be responsible for compelling Luther's faithful disciples to bring to light what they would so gladly see covered up. It is true that Luther "bore" Melanchthon with a love that turned everything to the best and hoped for everything, such as is seldom found among Christians. But to say that Luther carried Melanchthon as a false teacher who had been revealed before him is contrary to all historical, factual truth, and is an atrocious blasphemy of Luther, who until his death was a faithful confessor of the pure truth and an unbending fighter against any falsification of it. From a man like Melanchthon, who continued to do everything in his power to make Luther believe that he agreed with him on doctrine, from a man who was seriously reproached by Luther as often as his deviations became apparent to him, from a man who refrained as often as he was reproached, from a man who himself continued to complain at that time, next to Luther, as if under a cloud that gathered over his head, that he was not a man of the truth.

He was always afraid of having betrayed himself, of being called to account by Luther and, when Luther polemicized from the cathedra and pulpit, of being meant by a man who, even after Luther's death, told a Carlowitz, what an unbearable "almost ignominious servitude" he had endured under Luther - to say of such a man that Luther had carried him as a false teacher who had become obvious, to us a role model "from the fundamental time of the Reformation", this would be downright ridiculous, if it were not so sad. But to ascribe it to Luther, the reformer awakened and sealed by God, that he boldly condemned all others who cherished Melanchthon's errors as false prophets and therefore as ravening wolves, but that he "carried" and overlooked these same errors in Melanchthon out of special friendship, God preserve every Lutheran from this in grace, but to him who does such, God grant sincere repentance.

W.

Missouri and Hermannsburg. *)

On page 107 of these sheets it says: "The Missourians take up a hostile position against Hermannsburg"; on page 200: "Young people sent from Hermannsburg to Missouri, after they have received American *rectius* Missourian-Lutheran instruction there, immediately brand Blessed Harms, this faithful Lutheran soul, as a false teacher who has fallen away from the Confession." Much the same is now heard and read about Missouri's relationship to Hermannsburg. This must help to keep the mood of indignation against Missouri in the necessary sharpness and tension and to increase it as much as possible. And the main point (- source?) of such - I can really not say milder - nasty lies and slander about a sister church is the Luthardt'sche Allgem. evang.luth. Kirchenzeitung, from which so many, especially younger theologians, who are still in the naive stage of respect before the modern Lutheran professorial theology, often take the material and direction of their judgment.

This paper, in some respects the main organ of all Lutheran national churches, can certainly never be at peace with Missouri. This is already evident from one sentence of its prospectus, when it says: "Considering that a church is not a school, and therefore must allow diversity of directions within itself, it has to allow the various directions, as far as they move on the common ground of the Lutheran confession and submit to the standard of this confession,

*) From the "Mecklenburgische Kirchen- und Zeitblatt" of September 20.

to do justice." For Missouri will never admit, however, that the church must allow different directions in herself, must gladly do justice to the same. Missouri will not in the least follow such modern Lutheran professors' wishes in this matter, but will keep as faithfully as possible to the opposite urgent exhortation of the Apostle Paul, who writes: "I exhort you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye at all times speak one thing, and hold fast one to another in one mind and in one opinion." But should one complain: yes! but where then, if the words of Scripture are to be taken so strictly in the Church, is free research, free German scholarship? So the worry is vain; free science will very well remain, even if the "justified" directions of Luthard's chiliasm and synergism, of Kahnis's Arianism, of Hofmann's pantheism, etc., do not remain, but are swept out of the church into the great weed-heap of other heresies.

Now, however, in the dull shadow of the national churches, which no longer permit the purifying draught of serious doctrinal discipline, and indeed close themselves off more and more hermetically, these "directions" can not only nest peacefully and, according to their proliferating nature - for "their word eats away at itself, like the cancer" - cover all the walls; but one can also proclaim it downright as the right order: "Considering that the church is not a school, it must allow diversity of directions within itself."

It is well worth looking at this beautiful sentence a little more closely. So "the church is not a school," well, that is true enough; but when it goes on to say, "therefore it must allow diversity of direction," that is a very strange modern church-logic! Consider, the school, because it has to do with a human system of truth, with a truth on which no salvation of soul hangs, with a truth which is first sought: therefore the school must not tolerate different directions. For it is true that a *sic et non* cannot be united with any truth, even if it were the most subordinate. But the church, which is not a school for the very reason that it has to do with the truth revealed from heaven by the living God, with a truth on the preservation of which depends life and salvation, with a truth which it is not yet seeking, but has, has entirely, for it is written: I have not behaved unto you, that I have not declared the whole counsel of God;" and wholly hath, not germinal, not progressive, for it is written, "ye have the anointing, and know all things;" "ye are made rich in all doctrine, and in all knowledge." (It is pernicious deceit of progress, chiliastic flesh-dreaming, to think that the Church, "the pillar and foundation of truth," of all truth of all time, develops like the

The church, then, because it has a divine, blessed, perfect truth in contrast to the school:) So the church, because it has, in opposition to the school, a divine, blessedly working, perfect truth, must therefore, in opposition to the school, "allow diversity of directions." It must allow that even as to the most important truths of salvation, one teaches yes and the other no; that one teaches that all Scripture is inspired by God, and the other that a great part of Scripture is not inspired by God; that one teaches: That one teaches that God is triune, and the other that he is not; that one teaches that there is yet to come an outwardly glorious, victorious triumph of the church in the millennial kingdom, and the other that this is a false doctrine confusing the hearts, denying the present full glory of the church, and so on. The church, because it is a church and not a school, must allow this to happen; this is the logic of the General Lutheran Church Newspaper.

Equally strange and important is the practical logic concerning personal fellowship, which one is accustomed to draw from the sentence: "the church is not a school. For since the school has to do only with human truth, which is to be won more and more, the contenders for and against are not otherwise to annul the personal community; one is to bear the other in patience. But the church, precisely because it is not a human school, but a divine community resting on revealed truth, must and ought, for the preservation of this community, according to express divine command, to suspend personal communion with the obstinate disputants against its truth. If any man come to her, and bring not her doctrine, she shall not receive him, nor greet him; if any man be not obedient to her word, she shall have nothing to do with him; she shall avoid a heretical man, if he be admonished once and again; she shall curse him that preacheth another gospel. But how has the fight against the most obstinate false teachers, even where they outline the ground, turned out with us? It has really become a true student dispute. They shout at each other as if they were really serious, but then they sit down together for a beer in peace and quiet. The struggles in the church for divine truth against the deadly lies of darkness have become friendly school quarrels, have entirely ceased to be church struggles, which, after all, have as their basic rule the word: "He who says to his father and mother, I do not see him, and to his brother, I do not know him, and to his son: I know not; they keep Thy speech, and keep Thy covenant."

But if Missouri does not want to school the holy fight for the truth of God, but wants to conduct it in a church-like manner, then it is the unpleasant disturber of the peace who exalts himself in uncharitable, unbrotherly brusqueness.

Now, this disturber of the peace is supposed to have a bad time

The young people sent by him are said to have "branded the blessed Harms as a false teacher who had fallen away from the confession of the Lutheran doctrine. I have called this above a wicked lie and slander,*) and will now prove it.

Some of the pastors of the Missouri Synod, who had gone out from Hermannsburg, had privately given the Rev. Theodor Harms ideas about some erroneous teachings in his blessed brother's writings, which were also widely circulated in America. How? this has nowhere become known. I do not doubt that it was done in a reverent manner, for the position of those sent out from Hermannsburg is generally one of great reverence for their "father" Harms. Harms himself does not say the opposite either, where he reports about the incident. The assertion, then, that the "young people" had branded the blessed Harms as an apostate false teacher is merely fabricated. Harms, in his public statement, says only: "If Hermannsburg missionaries, who were sent to America, were able, after a short time, to send me a whole list of heresies from my brother's writings, I attribute it to their stupidity, which, of course, does Hermannsburg no honor, but neither does America." To this article, which harshly rebuked Missouri pastors in a paper much read in their own congregations, Missouri has now issued a single public counter-statement in the "Lutheran". This is probably a little too long to be reproduced here in its entirety. It is an excellent piece of writing by the recently deceased former president of the Missouri Synod, Wyneken, from which the "Missouri spirit" shines forth very clearly: heartfelt love and breadth in the evaluation of the person, with the most conscientious loyalty in preservation and undaunted, reckless courage in the confession of divine truth. How does Missouri officially brand the immortalized Harms as a false teacher who has fallen away from the confession of Lutheran doctrine? All passages relating to his person may follow here: The headline of the reply reads: "All respect to the blessed Louis Harms. Only no idolatry of men and no cultus of living or deceased saints in the Lutheran Church." "Is it an injustice to represent as wrong and dangerous in the writings of the excellent man that which is wrong and dangerous? Th. Harms himself says: 'In my description of the life of the blessed brother I have pointed out that in some points of doctrine he was not correct?'"

"Who then condemns Augustine's or Luther's writings, when with these great men themselves one rejects what is not in accordance with God's word, especially as they call upon their readers, even in what they erred, themselves publicly

*) Of course I do not want to say that about brother E. in S. personally, who himself indicates that he only repeats what he has read elsewhere.

state.

How this should be done in practice in the church, St. Paul has long since taught us with his own example. Hopefully, the high apostle will not be denied Christian modesty and humility; and what does this great apostle do? He was still a blasphemer, persecutor, and reviler, when Peter had already preached mighty sermons and done great deeds, and was considered a pillar in the church. Nevertheless, since Peter hypocritically pretended in matters of faith in Antioch, thereby promoting false doctrine and causing confusion in the church, Paul publicly resisted him before the church. Yes, he was not satisfied with this, but thought it his duty also to tell the story to his Galatians, who had allowed themselves to be seduced by the reputation of -great men*, and to teach them, as well as all Christendom, the important doctrine that God does not respect the reputation of men, and to exhort them, where it is a matter of doctrine, also in practice to be guided by him, who, with all Christian modesty and humility, for och spoke concerning the high and great men': But of those who had the reputation of what they were then, I care nothing." -

"The Mr. Director should not be tempted by his false sensibility to apply to the person of his blessed brother that which is censured in his writings, to whom certainly no Christian denies his merits here on earth and his glory in heaven." - "Some heresies, however, have crept into the otherwise blessed writings of the dear servant. These are not merely slight errors in doctrine or even quirks, but errors contrary to Scripture, which are always dangerous to the soul, and they should not be glossed over, all the less so when they are found in the writings of a truly great and very influential man. At the same time, however, I will gladly confess that, according to my firm conviction, the heart, the faith, and the state of grace of the blessed Harms have not been touched in the least by any of these things. On the other hand, his otherwise truly evangelical sermons testify to this, in which he pours out full consolation over the despondent hearts of sinners, in which he points with true evangelical earnestness to the sole reason for justification and salvation, Christ and his vicarious satisfaction in faith, as in his open confessions of himself and all Christians, that sin always clings to them, and in spite of the best will and intention makes them sluggish to walk the path of the holy commandments in full fidelity, the whole man shows how he lives and lives."

This is how Missouri speaks of Harms, and in Germany this is called "branding him as a false teacher who has fallen away from the confession of Lutheran doctrine".

And now, as to "the hostile position which Missouri is supposed to take against Hermannsburg," it was Hermannsburg first who, through his missionary paper, publicly called out to the Missourian congregations, "It is a rude thing for some Christians to teach that it is a doctrine that the pope is the antichrist, when a doctrine can only be gathered from plain words of Scripture; that it is a doctrine that any lending of money on interest is mortal sin."

What did Missouri say in reply? This: "Like a spokesman among the right true Lutherans in Germany, who still expresses himself in the January issue: One may call us reformed or Catholic, we remain Lutheran in the true sense of the word and want to hold fast to the confession of Concordia, which every independent Lutheran Christian should own in good faith, just as such a man in the February issue can call it a quirk when some Christians teach that it is a doctrine that the Pope is the Antichrist, since a doctrine can only be taken from clear words of Scripture'; that will be inexplicable to every Lutheran, at least here in this country. For my own part, at least, it is not only inexplicable, but it strikes me with horror when a man who claims to be a Lutheran, i.e., a man in whose heart Christ and his Gospel live, and who also knows the Pabst (and at least the Lutheran pastor should), has even a doubt that the Pabst of Rome is the real Antichrist. I ask: Was it a doctrine in Christ's time that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christian? Every Christian will answer: that is a childish question; it was and is and remains such a doctrine, on which hangs the whole salvation and damnation of a man, for the Lord himself says to the Jews, if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins. But where in the Scriptures of the Old Testament - for the Jews could only gather it from them - are the clear words that this Jesus of Nazareth and no other is the promised Christ or Saviour of the world? Nowhere. But this is how it is: Throughout the Old Testament Scriptures there are prophecies concerning the person, the office, the individual circumstances of his life, from the conception to the ascension of the future Messiah or Christ, so that everyone, through the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit, could not be mistaken, but had to recognize him as he appeared, unless he wilfully closed his eyes. When God sent his Son in the fullness of time, when Jesus appeared in public, he testified of himself as the light of the world, and also claimed to be the light of the world. In addition to this, the prophecies of the Scriptures came from Moses, which were only fulfilled in Him and in no one else; therefore He Himself, as well as the holy apostles, always referred to the Scriptures, calling upon all to search the Scriptures, for it was they that testified of Him as the Saviour of the world, and even today He insists on this.

until the last day the belief of every Christian that this Jesus is the Christ and no other. Similar, of course with the difference that lies in the nature of things, is the case with the Antichrist. It is not, of course, written in as many words: The Pope of Rome is the true Antichrist, but the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments testify to this, that the Antichrist is to come; they also describe him so exactly, and NB. as one who is to sit and reign in the temple of God, and not in the pigsty of the ungodly, atheists, and materialists, that when he is to be revealed in his time, every one who looks at spiritual things in the divine light, and lives in the one right light of JESUS, can and should recognize him. He too, born as a will-o'-the-wisp out of the lake of hellish darkness, bears witness to himself, as does every light, but in the light of the prophecy of Scripture he is so clearly marked that he cannot be misjudged in this light. Our fathers knew this. Their struggle at the time of the Reformation, they were divinely convinced, was a struggle with Antichrist, and with the very right Antichrist. Knowing this, they gladly gave away everything, even their lives. This they laid down as a precious legacy for their children in the Confessions. This confession lived in the whole church; even the little children sang it into the world in the song: 'Keep us, O Lord, by thy word, and prevent the pope and the Turk's murder,' and became martyrs over it, as they did at the storming of Magdeburg. And now this battle, this hot divine battle, is fought for a 'quirk,' the dear martyr's blood is shed only for a 'quirk,' the dear confession itself is a 'quirk' of which one must be ashamed, although in some backward countries one still lets oneself be sworn to it if one wants to become a pastor. Oh, how far it has come with our dear Lutheran Church that not openly unbelieving professors and pastors, but people who are regarded as champions in the ranks of the Lutherans, who refer to Concordia and demand that 'every independent Lutheran Christian should possess it cheaply,' can dare to strike the confessing Church in the face in this way without even feeling it, but as if it were a thing settled long ago, which, however, no longer has anything to do with it. And this at a time when the Lord Himself is in the process, with great bitter earnestness, of instilling again into the leaders in office, as well as into the whole people, who have been neglected and seduced by them, like careless schoolboys, the lesson which they have so dissolutely forgotten."

"As for the other 'quirk,' the question of usury, Mr. Director finds 'clear words of Scripture' enough about it, and any good German lexicon can tell him what 'usury' means. Let it be said, however, for the comfort of all those who take interest, that if charity, as it is described in Scripture, urges them to lend at interest, they not only commit no mortal sin, but do a good deed, for charity is a good thing.

is the fulfillment of the law. But in an honest examination it would be hard enough for them."

This is how Missouri responded to the controversy of antichrist and usury brought on by Hermannsburg. And this is now called "Missouri takes a hostile position against Hermannsburg".

So distorting and slanderous are all the phrases which the modern Lutheran enthusiasts for the national church *a tout prix*, as well as the learned continuators of Christianity have circulated about Missouri. - D. B.

(Submitted.)

Also an explanation.

After an inner struggle, I take up the pen on this. To gain or lose "honor and reputation" cannot come into consideration for me. Therefore, even if my words do not count for much, they may still be spoken in honor of truth and love, urged on by conscience.

As for Professor Stelhorn's "protest" in the November issue of "Lehre und Wehre," I heartily agree with it. Perhaps I would have said with the "*Lutheran Standard*": That "Missourian" leaves Missouri where he does not belong. But I stand differently by the "Declaration."

I ask: How do things go in our synod? How do the "leading persons" and the "majority of this body" behave in it, or more particularly: "Professor Walther and the majority of the Synod following him"? That not "Herr Prof. W., or even the Synod, is infallible," is true, and, thank God! that not only the former knows and believes, but also the latter. From the moment this knowledge and belief ceased, we would cease to be right Missourians, and become base idolaters, robbing the glory of the only infallible God. But to keep us from this, and many outside our Synod, is truly not one of the least pieces of the struggle which Professor Walther has waged for nearly 40 years, and our Synod then with him. Here, too, to God alone be the glory! Even Luther was not infallible, as Missourians have often testified, but have also challenged enemies to prove him false. But how is it done in our Synod? When Prof. Walther comes to us with "statements and applications," he quite naturally believes that both are right. If he did not, it would be most strange, to say no more. But is it then equally natural that the "majority following him" should accept it so readily, and very dishonorably follow blindly? Is it not Professor Walther's own sacred duty and pleasure, every time

- or where would the opposite be? - to bring the compelling scriptural proof, as well as the confirmation from the symbolic books and the writings of the orthodox fathers? Has he not testified in hundreds of sermons, articles, and sayings before God and all the world how serious he is about it? And does not the Synod demand, every time and everywhere, like a man, for his "setting forth and applying" that proof in a peremptory manner, until it testifies its applause? Thank God, the "majority of the Synod following him" is not yet slavishly imprisoned in the ignominious fetters of a blind charcoal-burner's faith. Yes, if Prof. Walther came with doctrinal statements and wanted to connect them in conscience, without being able or wanting to lead that proof, and he could not be dissuaded from it, but rather wanted to stubbornly persist in it, then the Synod would still depose him from all his offices today, to God's glory and to the man who has now become a deceiver to deserved and salutary punishment. Thus, and not otherwise, is it written in the Missouri Synod as such, and God keep it in this sense by grace! This in testimony against interpretations likely to come upon Stelhorn's "explanation." -A . Wagner.

Explanation.

For the sake of my conscience I must herewith publicly declare that, while I wholeheartedly agree with the "Protest" published by Professor F. W. Stelhorn in the November number of this paper, the "Declaration" connected with the same does not have my applause, because it expresses principles which are not in agreement with either truth or love. J. C. W. Lindemann.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The General Council. The expectation expressed in the ecclesiastical papers of Germany, that at the October meeting of the General Council the Lutheran confession would celebrate a brilliant victory, has not been fulfilled. We do not deny that delegates from the New York Ministry, in particular, held their ground in a manly manner; but on the whole the Unionist sentiment won the day. A companion of the lax Councilmen, a correspondent of the "*Lutheran Observer*," writes: "It is heartening to find that in the Council, which has been struggling with this iron rule for some years, the exclusivists are in the minority." The declaration made that the matter was not yet ripe, that there was still learning to be done, the resolution that next year the matter of the pulpit and altar fellowship should be discussed on the basis of theses to be written by Dr. Krauth, is probably nothing but blue haze among the Unionist-minded. Just as love is often deceived, so, we believe, have the sincere be-

The Lutheran Church, however, is not the only church in the world that has a mixed pulpit and communion, and they would be deceived into accepting this as cash coin. It does not occur to men like Dr. Seiß and Dr. Krotel to learn from them; such a thought is ridiculous to them, Dr. Krotel, for instance, scoffs at it in the "*Lutheran*." He writes: "So New Yorkers wait until next year to see what has been learned on this question in the course of a year." These people do not want to learn, but to dominate with their unionism. They have no objection to a discussion of the theses. They will put up with it if one speaks out in a completely Lutheran way, if only the Council does not make any further statement and does not disturb them in their unirite practice. Who knows how long the discussion of the theses will take? Dr. Krotel writes in the "*Lutheran & Missionary*": "It is evident that you, my dear *Lutheran*, are well satisfied with the conclusion reached at the convention in B. You tell us that the General Council has not yet made a statement, and that it will not be possible for the Council to continue its discussion of the theses. You tell us that the General Council has now clearly and officially declared that the Galesburg proposition did not abrogate the Akron proposition, and that the exceptions stand today as they did before the Council met and passed its resolution at Galesburg. You also make it clear that the General Council at B. refused to make any new declarations. You also tell us very clearly that the theses on the Akron-Galesburg statement are intended for the doctrinal hearings to which the General Council usually devotes parts of several days. If I understand this point correctly, the Council has decided to discuss these theses, **like those on justification by faith**" (and with these, as is well known, they have been carried about for a very long time), "in order to come to a better understanding of these points and of each other. It is nowhere said that this discussion must come to an end at the next meeting, but it is presupposed that the discussion will be **detailed, thoughtful, and exhaustive, and that not the slightest attempt will be made to hurry the matter.**" Dr. Seiss openly states in the "*Lutheran & Missionary*" that the Council, in adopting the resolution concerning the theses, "declared that the general opinion and condition of the congregations was such that further declarations on the subject were inadmissible, and that the matter should henceforth be discoursed upon in the form of theses . . . without legislative action." And at the meeting the same said that, after 20 years' experience in Philadelphia, he could not keep an English congregation together in that city under such a rule. They have, after all, now gained time again. After all, they had first wanted the presentation of theses to be postponed for 2 years. They complied when the New Yorkers insisted that the theses be made next year. After all, there is no "Declaration" in sight so soon. Dr. Seiß is therefore quite satisfied with the way things are going, he is cheerful and in good spirits. This alone makes the matter suspicious. More. For nine years the Council has been supposed to declare itself a decidedly Lutheran practice. At its last meeting it devoted only 1½ days to the discussion of the question which has caused many a fierce struggle in the last year by name. Is there any hope that it will now come to a decision next year? The New York delegates had to withdraw their petition on a technicality. What is to be expected from a body to which, in its majority, parliamentary rules take precedence over the truth of the divine word? At the request of Dr. Seiss, resolutions of New York lay delegates, and afterwards of the Rev. Frey, were laid on the table, and Dr. Späth moved that his resolution also be laid on the table; and amid laughter the motion was carried. Where serious matters are thus treated, is there any prospect that the matter will at last be seriously attacked? Summa: To want to make the Council, as such, a Lutheran body, is a vain enterprise. As one has done from the beginning without true inward unity...

If the people had gathered together in order to oppose the General Synod with only one large, respectable body, they are now trying to hold it together with all their might. Some time ago the leaders were afraid that their work would fall into ruin. They have now manoeuvred again and worked so that the lazy peace and the preservation of the body is assured again for at least a year. In his sermon Dr. Krauth promised them the dawn of a golden time of peace, when there will be no more fighting, but full harmony. - The fighters for true Lutheranism in the Council are in a difficult position. God grant them holy courage, good counsel, and right works. G.

II. Abroad.

"The Sifting of the Leipzig Mission." Under the above heading Dr. Münkel ("Neues Zeitblatt" No. 37) has pronounced his verdict of condemnation on the dear confessors in the Leipzig Mission. For years, of course, one has had to become accustomed to seeing Dr. For years, of course, one has had to get used to seeing Dr. Münkel fighting in the ranks of those who do not refuse the Lutheran name in order to cloak themselves with the nimbus of alleged orthodoxy, but who are so averse to the true Lutheran spirit and courage of faith that, in order to save old institutions and church forms, no matter how perverse and contrary to Scripture they may be, they happily swim along with the broad current of syncretism and indifferentism of our day, pay homage to the policy of waiting and hesitating, so popular here and there, but in the meantime abandon one position after another to the enemy, and in all this look down with noble disdain on those who are serious about the noble confession of their church, and who therefore profess the pure doctrine not merely with words but with cheerful deed. Dr. Münkel, too, seems to have long since inscribed on his banner the verdict of condemnation on all true Lutheran confessors on this side and the other side of the ocean. However, we confess that we did not expect him to take his aversion to true confessional loyalty as far as he does in the above-mentioned article in his journal. - Even if Dr. Münkel lacks understanding for the recent events in the Leipzig mission, even if he has no sympathy for the missionaries who have left the mission, one may still expect a Christian who wants to be a Lutheran to judge according to right and fairness. Without even a word of proof for his assertions, Münkel attributes the conduct of the missionaries to their desire for "theology of strife," denies them with thin words "that their missionary profession was a need of their hearts and that their departure from it was a pain," asserts that they were "strifeful men" and that they were "the ones who had no desire for the mission, that they, as "strugglers," "with a few scanty school formulas, set themselves up to be reformers and masters of the contested mission," and that they had "no doubt" intended, after having made a "purge among the East Indian missionaries," to place "the mission thus purged in the service of the Missouri Synod." In the latter absurd assertion, however, lies the key of understanding Münkel's wrath against the missionaries who had left. This is so: because, as is well known, it is the Missouri Synod that leads the fight against the rotten, thoroughly rotten state church system and rejects and punishes with unrelenting severity every deviation from the model of sound doctrine, because it is it through whose publications the dear brethren in India confess with thanksgiving to God that they have penetrated to full clarity and truth: that is why the "Lutheran" Münkel is not afraid to throw all sense of justice overboard in his hatred of everything that is called Missourian, to throw sand in the eyes of inexperienced readers with unproven assertions that even bear the stamp of untruth on their foreheads, and to give himself the appearance as if he were only concerned with protecting the doctrine that was taught by

the "misguided" missionaries allegedly caused. Or is it not so? How would it be possible for Münkcl to make the truly terrible charge: "One doubts entirely" "that those (who have left) should have had their heart in their profession"; how would it be possible that he could call the letters of the missionaries, which, after all, our readers know from the "Lutheran," "not only clumsy, zutappende," but "arid letters"; how, finally, would it be possible that he should "not credit that" to those who have left, that they have acted according to their conscience, and sneeringly exclaim: "What will they answer, if they are reproached with having grown sick of missionary service in the feeling of their incapacity, and have sought to get out with husks of contentious theology?" -: how would all this be possible, in view of the facts which are after all openly apparent, if he had not become blind in his antipathy to Missouri? This is truly sad enough. While a tone of deepest pain, earnest wrestling with God, sincere love for their profession, unfeigned humility and deepest distress of conscience runs through the letters of the dear missionaries, a man who wants to play the champion of pure doctrine behind the studious dares to pass a judgment on fellow believers that breaks the baton on them as Christians and Lutherans - a harsh, terrible, merciless judgment. It is plain to see that Dr. Münkcl knows nothing of certainty of faith, of a loyalty to the Lord and His Word that is not afraid to confront even the most respected and learned men boldly and undaunted, who would rather have all the world as his enemies than deviate from God's Word just a hair's breadth, who would rather go to his death a thousand times than act against his conscience. He is not afraid of God's word, which will judge him as it judges us. Otherwise he would not have dared to call the doctrines of the congregation's transmission of the ministry of preaching and of the Antichrist, which were, however, emphasized by the former missionaries in their letters, "formulas of controversy." Otherwise he could not possibly say, "Let it be left to those who have a desire to enter into doctrinal controversy." He would not otherwise have had the heart to speak of the missionaries who were

zealous for pure doctrine as "theological fighting cocks." He would otherwise have shied away from writing the bitter, judgmental, scornful words about the latter: "In their dealings with the missionary college, with the missionary director, and with their brothers, the missionaries, they disregard the most ordinary duties and considerations which their conscience should have commanded them, if it were really so tender and sensitive. We ask any fair-minded reader who has followed with attention the steps of the missionaries who have gone out, whether these thoroughly spiteful, untrue, and slanderous phrases do not entitle him to the wondering question: Is it possible that a man who dares to write thus should be afraid of God's word? - We have written down the above remarks only to show our readers where the miserable, enervating, conscience-dulling state churchism has finally led men who, like Dr. Münkcl, were considered pillars of the Lutheran Church. We do not consider Münkcl's vituperative article worthy of a detailed refutation. He refutes and judges himself. -E

. W. K.

Misprint in previous issue.

Page 326 line 8 from bottom read: snake whisper.

Page 326 line 4 from bottom read: *Philippo*.

Page 335 line 5 from bottom read: end of evidence.

Page 338 line 19 from bottom read: first, that which is now.

Page 342 line 9 from above read: Amtsträgern! (Mecklenb. Kirchen- u. Zeitblatt.)