

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 many people can be found who are willing that the gospel should be preached, if only one does not cry out against the wolves and preach against the prelates. But though I preach rightly, and feed and teach the sheep well, yet it is not enough to keep the sheep, and to keep them, lest the wolves come and lead them away again. For what is it built, if I cast up stones, and I see another cast them in again? The wolf may well suffer the sheep to have good pasture; he loveth them the better that they find feist; but this he cannot suffer, that the dogs bark in hostility."

Twenty-fourth volume.
St. Louis, Mo.

Printing house of the "Lutheran Concordia Publishing House".

1878.

Content.

January.

Preface to volume 1878.	1
Historical introduction to the Augsburg Confession.	6
Compendium of the Theology of the Fathers.	14
Aphorisms.	18
Literature.	19
Ecclesiastical - Contemporary	23

February.

Was it about the progress of modern Lutheran theology in doctrine?	33
Compendium of the Theology of the Fathers.	45
Invitation to subscribe.	48
Miscellaneous.	51
Literary.	57
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history	58

March.

On the registration for confession and its pastoral use	65
Of the power and efficacy of absolution	76
Miscellaneous	82
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history	87

April.

What is it about the progress of modern Lutheran theology in doctrine.	97
Dr. Seiß and the Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper	104
On the miraculous powers of the first Christians	107
Compendium of the Theology of the Fathers.	110
Literary.	114
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history	117

May.

Did Christ humble Himself according to His divine nature?	129
The state of the present interpretation of the Revelation of John according to one of its latest boom	133
Romanism in England	146
Compendium of the Theology of the Fathers.	149
Martin Geyer. - Anecdote	152
Ecclesiastical. Contemporary	153

June.

What is the will of God in regard to the domestic government of the servants of the Church?	161
The state of the present interpretation of the Revelation of John according to one of its latest interpreters	168
Compendium of the Theology of the Fathers.	177
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history	181

July.

Page

What is it about the progress of modern Lutheran theology in doctrine?	193
The state of the present interpretation of the Revelation of John according to one of its latest interpretations	202
On the defense	209
From the Grand Duchy of Hesse	211
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history	217

August.

What is it about the progress of modern Lutheran theology in doctrine?	225
Church and ministry	230
Miscellaneous	236
New literature	237
Declaration	243
Ecclesiastical - Contemporary	244

September.

What is the doctrinal progress of modern Lutheran theology?	257
Church and ministry.	264
Dr. Seiß and his Chardon Thursday	274
Compendium of the Theology of the Fathers.	276
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history	279

October.

In what manner was the controversy existing in the New York ministry tried at its meeting this year at Utica?	289
Johann Salomo Semler, the Father of Rationalism	296
Compendium of the Theology of the Fathers	304
Miscellaneous	308
Literary	309
Ecclesiastical - Contemporary	310

November.

Disposition of Luther's Scripture de servo arbitrio	321
Compendium of the Theology of the Fathers	336
Miscellaneous	340
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history	343

December.

What is it about the progress of modern Lutheran theology in doctrine?	353
Mecklenburgisches Kirchen- und Zeitblatt	360
Compendium of the Theology of the Fathers.	367
Miscellaneous	369
Literary	371
Ecclesiastical - Contemporary	373

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 24.

January 1878.

No. 1.

Foreword to volume 1878.

There are not a few who are not averse to our doctrine, as advocated in "Lehre und Wehre," who applaud it in *thesi*, but who nevertheless believe that they cannot go along with us in everything, do not want to carry out the doctrine in *praxi*, describe our taking it seriously as hasty, impetuous, abrupt, and all too severe, and speak of a waiting position.

With a number of these procrastinators, in spite of their pious talk, the purse, the reputation with men, and the like, are the only motives. However, we do not have such common souls in mind just now. We have in mind, first of all, an undoubtedly not insignificant number of such who really think they are doing God a service and benefiting the Church. In Germany we have in mind those who believe that they must remain in the national church, and give as their reason that they must not abandon their office, that they must not leave the field to the enemy, that their departure is premature at the present time, that they must wait for clearer indications from God, and that in the meantime they must continue the struggle, and save what can be saved; that they could, if they remained, work more beneficially and more abundantly than if they left. Here in America, too, there are Lutheran preachers who recognize the truth, but do not want to take a firm stand in their congregation, e.g. Preachers who recognize and approve of the principle that there should be no pulpit and communion fellowship between orthodox and false believers, and yet either do not carry out this principle, or allow their fellow synod members to act against it, who remain in their synods, do not press them to a decision, but persevere in the hope of better conditions and in order not to cause separation.

What is it, then, that moves us not to allow ourselves to be distracted by such apparent speeches and to persevere in our course, but rather to remain with our

How can we persevere in the right course of action, which is the only one that is pleasing to God, and call the failure of so many to go along and stay behind displeasing and dangerous to God? It is nothing but the word of the Lord spoken by the mouth of Samuel the prophet, "Obedience is better than sacrifice." 1 Sam. 15:22.

That it is God's will that men should be in earnest about His word, that they should testify and be zealous against every falsification and denial of it, that they should break with false doctrine, that they should depart from those who will not depart from it, etc., cannot be doubted. "Pull not on the strange yoke with unbelievers: for what enjoyment hath righteousness with unrighteousness? What fellowship hath light with darkness? How does Christ agree with Belial? Or what part hath the believer with the unbeliever? What likeness hath the temple of God to the idol? But ye are the temple of the living God: as God saith, I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and will be their God, and they shall be my people. Therefore come out from among them, and separate yourselves, saith the LORD, and touch no unclean thing; and I will receive you, and be your Father, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the LORD Almighty." 2 Cor. 6:14-18. "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, that ye receive not any of her plagues." Revelation 18:4, "If any man come to you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house. Neither receive him at home, nor salute him: for he that saluteth him maketh himself partaker of his evil works." 2 John 10:11. "I exhort you, brethren, that ye take heed of them which cause divisions and vexations beside the doctrine which ye have learned, and depart from them." Rom. 16, 17. "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." Gal. 5, 9. "Avoid a heretical man, when he is admonished once and again." Tit. 3, 10. "Ye cannot at the same time drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot at the same time be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the devils' table." 1 Cor. 10, 21. "And now, thou son of man, I have set thee a watchman over the house of Israel, when thou shalt hear any thing out of my mouth, that thou shalt warn them from me." Ezek. 33:7. "A bishop shall be blameless . . . and hold fast the word that is sure and able to teach, that he may be mighty to exhort by sound doctrine, and to chasten the gainsayers." Tit. 1, 7. 9. "Ye shall not give the sanctuary to the dogs, neither shall ye cast your pearls before swine." Matth. 7, 6.

The will of the Lord is clear. Here it is now to be followed and obeyed. Here the Christian speaks, "I must be in that which is my Father's." When God speaks, we have only to hear and obey, to sit with Mary at the feet of JESU and listen to His speech, Luc. 10:39. and to say with Samuel, "Speak, O LORD, for

thy servant heareth." 1 Sam. 3, 9. There can be no question of obedience if one hears the word of the Lord with his ears, but also listens to the objections of his reason and gives them room. Reason must rather be taken captive, and the word of the Lord accepted with simplicity, humility, and unconditionality. Abraham, the father of the faithful, received the command from God: "Get thee out of thy father's country, and from thy friendship, and from thy father's house, unto a land which I will shew thee." Gen. 12, 1. He received the further command, "Take Isaac thy only son, whom thou lovest, and go into the land of Moriah, and offer him there for a burnt offering upon a mountain which I will tell thee." Gen. 22, 1. He could have objected to both commands in many ways, but he did not, he obeyed, his reason could say what it wanted. When the Lord speaks, one must immediately go along with Paul and not discuss it with flesh and blood, Gal. 1, 16; one must be ready for all good works, Tit. 3, 1. Obedience must be done willingly, cheerfully, and with air, and that in all things. How should he be an obedient child of the heavenly Father who first questions, hesitates, doubts, and then makes a choice among the commands of the Lord, accepting some and not others? No, we must submit to everything the Lord says. And as in all things, so also we are to be obedient to the Lord at all times, and in all places. It is God's business to speak and command, our business only to hear and obey, and not to worry about anything else. Therefore only obedience is right, which is done confidently and undauntedly, because we command the consequences of God, who has commanded us to do this.

Do we then have reason to be misled when so many call out to us? Your doctrine is well and good, but you go so straight through it, you take so little heed of the consequences of it, you proceed so quickly, you are so strict in everything! - Surely not; for is not all this essential to obedience? Must not God be obeyed in all things, simple, humble, unconditional, and quick?

It is true that the objections that are made against our unconditional, simple, and quick submission to the word of the Lord, the speeches with which so many want to excuse their procrastination, their failure to proceed, their evasion of the divine will, have a beautiful appearance. They complain, they say, that they are blaspheming the sad conditions, that they always have the goal of improvement before their eyes, that they want to testify at conferences and synods, that they are always discussing the sad conditions and want to submit resolutions and petitions, that they have the salvation of souls in view, etc. They say, "I am not a man, I am a man. Yes, indeed, carnal reason can also clothe itself in the garb of beautiful phrases. When Saul, in the war against the Amalekites, against the express commandment of the Lord, gave up the best sheep and oxen, he was not able to do so.

and was now punished by Samuel, his excuse was apparently very good. Saul answered Samuel, "I have hearkened unto the voice of the LORD, and have gone the way which the LORD sent me, and have brought Agag king of Amalek, and have destroyed the Amalekites. But the people (v. 9) have taken of the spoil, sheep and oxen, the best of the exiles, to sacrifice unto the LORD thy God at Gilgal." 1 Sam. 15, 20. 21.

But what does God say to such pious speech? It is of no account before God. In the name of God Samuel says to Saul, "Thinkest thou that the LORD delighteth in sacrifice and burnt offering, than in obedience to the voice of the LORD? Sift, obedience is better than sacrifice, and hearkening better than the hide of rams." In appearance, Saul does no evil, but since he bypasses and despises God's command, "God is moved to the highest wrath by this work, and this seeming work is a pure abomination, because it is done contrary to God's word." (Luther on Gen. 13, 14. 15. I, 1306.)

God is the highest majesty. He has the right and the power to command us. When he tells us to do something, he wants us to do it, not what seems good to us. "Why call ye me Sir, Sir, and do not what I say unto you?" saith the Lord unto such. What is this circumventing of the divine will, undertaken at one's own pleasure, with so beautiful an appearance, but an offence against the high divine majesty? The short-sighted man, earth and ashes, wants to master the divine wisdom and be wiser than God! You want to sacrifice with Saul to God, but sacrifice involves first of all complete surrender to the Lord. Their sacrifice without obedience in all that the LORD speaks is therefore only a sham sacrifice, their seeming service nothing but disobedience, nothing but rejection and contempt of God and his word. Hence the prophet Samuel saith to Saul, "Because therefore thou hast rejected the word of the LORD, he hath rejected thee also." 1 Sam. 15:23. By circumventing and setting aside his will, one cannot serve God. He thinks he is serving God, but he is not serving the true God, but an alien god, either himself or another creature. If he allows himself to be determined to disregard God's word and will through consideration of other men, he prefers these very men to the dear God. One's heart departs from the Lord. And yet we are to have him alone as our God. He saith, I the LORD, that is my name; and I will give my glory to no other, neither will I give my honor to idols." Isa. 42, 8. We are to fear him alone, to love him above all things, to cleave to him and his word alone, not to be turned away from his word by any consideration, but to look to him alone. We are to be pleased with his ways alone and not go our own ways.

These apparent sacrifices are therefore nothing less than idolatry,

Sorcery, contempt of the word of God-that is, in spite of the beautiful appearance-the most horrible, atrocious sins, more atrocious sins than murder, adultery, robbery, etc., sins against the first tablet of the holy ten commandments of God. Therefore Samuel saith unto Saul, "For disobedience is a sin of sorcery, and to resist is idolatry and idolatry." (v. 23) Just as sorcerers interfere with the majesty of God, just as idolaters and idolatrous people do not give the true God His due honor, but rob Him of it, so do those who, under a good pretense, disregard the will of God. In addition to this, while they bypass God's word and will, they still want to be right and adorn and boast about their deeds, just as sorcerers adorn their devilish work with the divine name.

For this is no jest; these are no small sins; these are the wrath and disgrace of God. A man deceives himself: he thinks that what he does is godly and good, and yet it is most displeasing to God. "For God," as Luther justly says, "is not so hostile to any thing as to one's own devotion." (E. A. 34, 12.) One may be willing to suffer for the sake of God and His Word, but one is restrained by the thought that the kingdom of God may be in danger. What is that but small faith, even manifest unbelief! Christ calls us first to ask for the sanctification of the name of God, for pure Word and Sacrament, and only then for the coming of his kingdom. We think we are with Christ and are against him; we think we are gathering with Christ and building his kingdom, and yet we only scatter and destroy. Because we do not go into God's Word, we have no comfort when suffering comes; we have no assurance that we are "suffering for righteousness' sake." And one day in that decisive day the Judge of all flesh will judge-not according to the discretion of men, but according to His Word. "He that despiseth me, and receiveth not my words, hath already he that judgeth him: the word which I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." Joh. 12, 48. "The servant that knoweth his master's will, and hath not prepared himself, neither done according to his will, he shall suffer many stripes. But he that knoweth not, and yet hath done that which is worthy of strokes, shall suffer few strokes. For unto whomsoever much is given, much shall be sought; and unto whomsoever much is commanded, much shall be required." Luc. 12, 47. 48.

All of this can only encourage us to continue on the path we have taken, to humbly submit to the whole Word of God, to take seriously not only one part of it, but the whole Word. May God grant us abundant grace to do so. The matter is not easy. Nothing is done with our power. We have to fight a hard battle against Satan and our flesh and blood. All too often we too are tempted and enticed to look at the possible consequences, human

6Historical introduction to the Augsburg Confession.

...and to show consideration... Then we must diligently remember the word of the Lord: "Obedience is better than sacrifice. God will be responsible for the consequences. The Lord rules His Church, not we. And "he hath never yet 'failed' in his reign; nay, what he doeth and letteth come to pass, there is a good end." "Therefore," says Luther, "we must not look at or follow what human wisdom or counsel suggests, but have God's will before our eyes, shown to us in his word, follow it, and stick to it, whether it concerns death or life, evil or good. If war or other calamities arise, speak to him who wills and teaches and believes. For it is not our own doing, nor is it of our own devising or doing; so we are not required to argue about his will, whether it is right or right to keep it. If he will let persecution and other things go, to the temptation and experience of those who are righteous Christians, and to the punishment of the unthankful, let it go; if not, he has so much marrow in his fists, that he can defend it and keep it, that it must not perish, that it may be seen that it is from him." 'Following the story of the prophet slain by a lion, 1 Kings 13:19, he says, "What then hath this prophet lacked? Not in wisdom, for he had the word of God; but in understanding he lacketh, in that he suffereth himself to be deceived, that another saith he also was a prophet, and that the angel of the Lord spake unto him: for he ought to have kept the word that was given him, and to have said unto the other, If thou be a prophet, then be thou a prophet: If thou be a prophet, let it be so; but this God hath commanded me, I know it, and will keep it, etc., and will not look upon angels, nor God's name. . . . Therefore let him" (man) "not follow himself, nor lead him on, nor conclude or do as he thinks, but hold all things in suspicion, and beware of the wiles of the devil, which would entice, provoke, terrify, or deceive man by his fair arguments." (E. A. 9, 372 f.)

May the faithful God therefore continue to preserve us from the "beautiful arguments" of the evil enemy and of our flesh, and keep us in the one thing that we fear his name, and thus keep a confident and calm conscience in all situations and circumstances. May he in grace continue to use our "doctrine and woe" as a means of nullifying the "fair arguments" of the enemy. G.

(Sent in by Rev. Fr. Zucker.)

Historical introduction to the Augsburg Confession.

(Edited for New York Localconference.)

If what has been said by Romans about the Reformation were true: Luther wanted to become a reformer; therefore he sat down with his friends and sought out this and that, on which

If the Reformation had been a matter of no profession, and therefore ungodly, it would have been judged as such. And if the confessions of our church had come into being because a particular opinion had been advocated in them, or a particular direction in the church had been represented in them, they would have no claim to validity at all. But as it is clear that the Reformation happened and had to happen for the sake of the Word of God and of conscience, so history also provides the clearest proof that the confessions were not invented and established according to a human plan, but that they arose out of necessity, and that in a twofold sense. For they were necessary, first, because strife had broken out, which made it impossible to avoid a statement of the truth; and secondly, because the consciences, bound by the word of God, could not help confessing what was in the confession.

To provide this historical evidence for the Augsburg Confession, however, would be almost nothing other than to present the history of the Reformation up to the year 1530. But if I am to give a historical introduction to the Augustana for our conference discussions on this confession, my task must be much narrower, and I believe that I have no more to do than to show how it came about that the Augsburg Confession was placed precisely in the form in which our church possesses it. And this is what I will try to do in the following.

The usual statement about the origin of the confession handed over in Augsburg is that it was written by Melanchthon with the Schwabach and Torgau articles as a basis. This is indeed not wrong, but it gives the impression that it was the intention of the Protestants from the beginning to present a revision of those articles in Augsburg. The matter, however, is quite different, and a closer examination of the actual course of events can only serve to show us all the more clearly God's rule over this confession and to make us all the more grateful for it, because this page of the history of the Augsburg Confession is also a clear proof that He rules in the midst of His enemies.

The history of the origin*) of the Augustana goes back to the discussion in Marburg. As is well known, the discussion concerned the doctrine of Holy Communion, and its purpose was to pave the way so that the warlike Swiss, who were accustomed to victory, could also be drawn into an alliance intended by the Protestant princes as a result of the impending conclusion of the Diet at Speyer. Luther, as well as Melanchthon, who did not expect a real agreement with the Swiss, were against the organization of the discussion; when it came to it, however, Luther - quite Missourian - insisted right at the beginning that the discussion should also include all other points of doctrine in which one could

*) After Plitt, Introduction to the Augustana. Erlangen 1867.

was not in agreement. A disputation on all of these points was rejected, but an agreement was reached on them without that, which, however, did not fully satisfy Luther. And when the discussion on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper did not result in a union, Luther came forward again with his other misgivings, which concerned the doctrines "of the inseparable union of divine and human nature in the one person of Christ, of original sin, of absolution, of the fruit and benefit of the ministry of preaching, of baptism, and of the supper of Christ our Savior. The Strasbourg theologians, in particular, gave an explanation of this, and in order that the whole discussion, which had caused a great stir, should not appear fruitless, and also that angry errors might be prevented, it was decided to draw up articles, both on the points on which agreement had been reached, and on those in which agreement had not yet been reached. Thus 15 articles came into being. Agreement had been reached on everything - unfortunately, as it soon turned out, only apparent agreement; only in the second half of the 15th article, which dealt with the Lord's Supper, was that expressed on which agreement had not been reached.

Although the alliance intended with the Swiss did not come to pass, the Protestant princes still thought of concluding an alliance, and Luther, as well as Melancthon and Jonas, received an order from the Elector, while still in Marburg, to come to Schleiz, in order to determine exactly those points in which the allies must be united. Thus were born the articles which, from the meeting held in Schwabach on October 16, 1529, are called the Schwabach Articles - a revision of those written in Marburg. These articles had to undergo some changes due to the changed circumstances, but in general they could serve as a basis, because the alliance concerned especially the Upper German cities, which had previously been inclined to Zwinglianism.

The covenant in the closing of which these articles were intended to serve did not come to pass either; but they were to render much more important service on another occasion.

Towards the end of 1529 and the beginning of 1530 the prospects for the Protestants were very bleak; the Romans, however, were already rejoicing as their saviour to the Emperor, who was then approaching the German Empire. Then suddenly a quite different prospect opened up. Charles V. summoned a Diet to Augsburg on April 8, and the summons was so friendly and seemed so impartial that the Protestants gained new hope, and even the thought of a possible amicable settlement of the whole controversy arose. This was based especially on the words of the letter, according to which the opinions of both sides were to be heard, and an attempt was to be made to bring all to a common understanding.

*) Cf. preface to the Augustana.

Christian religion. The emperor, as they say, seemed to be above the parties.

At the court of the Electorate of Saxony, which alone was concerned with the further preparations for the Augsburg Confession, all arrangements were made to appear at the Diet on time and well equipped. Public negotiations on the religious question were expected. For this reason the Elector was requested from various quarters to take with him especially Luther "as the one to whom God had given understanding of the Holy Scriptures before others, so that the Imperial Majesty might receive from him all the more thorough report in such action, which should be taken in love and kindness, what on the part of the Pope would not be rightly interpreted in the Holy Scriptures." This shows that after the reception of the imperial letter, there was at first no thought of making a confession at Augsburg. Soon, however, doubts arose as to whether it would be advisable to bring Luther, who was still in the Eight, with them to Augsburg, and as a result it was left undetermined whether Luther should travel with them. Then the Chancellor Brück made the suggestion that the opinion which, according to the invitation, was to be heard at the Diet should be "properly compiled in writing, with thorough proof from divine Scripture, so that it may be presented in writing," if the oral presentation by the preachers were not permitted, which was to be greatly feared. This proposal was accepted by the Elector, and as a result of it the Wittenberg theologians were instructed to put aside all other work, to deliberate on all articles about which they were in disagreement, both with respect to the faith and to the ceremonies, and to meet in Torgau with the result of their deliberation on March 20 - the invitation to the Diet had reached the Elector on that day. At the same time, Luther, Melancthon, and Jonas were instructed to prepare themselves for the journey to Augsburg. They were to go there, if a free escort could be obtained for them. If this did not happen, they and especially Dr. Martinus were to remain in Koburg until further notice. This letter arrived in Wittenberg on March 14, but it was followed by a reminder from the 2nd, which urged the theologians to hurry and called upon them to bring their books with them "as a matter of necessity. What they then presented to their sovereign in the first days of April were the newly revised Schwabach Articles, to which were added a few essays on the customs. This satisfied the Elector, and on April 4, he set out from Torgau on his journey to Augsburg, after having ordered that prayers be offered in the churches throughout the country for God's blessing on the upcoming Imperial Diet, which was expected to be held "in the place of a Concilii or National Assembly.

Immediately after arriving at Augsburg, Melanchthon wrote on May 4 to Luther, who had been left behind at Koburg: "I have made the entrance to our Apology somewhat more rhetorical than I had written it at Koburg." But when he sent his work, again improved and altered at Augsburg, to Luther on May 11, he wrote: "You receive our Apology, which, to be sure, is in truth more of a Confession." What Melanchthon here wishes to be called a Confession rather than an Apology, evidently leans in its first part on the articles delivered before the departure at Torgau. Why should this have been called an Apology in the meantime? and what did Melanchthon write at Koburg?

The matter appears to be thus. It has already been noted above that the articles demanded by the theologians on the proposal of Chancellor Brück and presented by them were not intended with certainty to be presented in Augsburg as a confession; one only wanted to keep oneself prepared for all cases. When the Elector arrived in Koburg on his journey to Augsburg, he received the news that the Emperor was still far away and that a long time would pass before the beginning of the Diet. Therefore, a stop was made in Koburg, and because on the way the Elector had received the advice *) to give the Emperor a thorough report on the religious matter in the presence of several Imperial Councillors before the beginning of the Imperial Diet, Melanchthon - it seems - was immediately instructed to **) write a defence treatise for this purpose. Why, however, the structure of this writing was changed again in Augsburg to such an extent that it became more of a confessional writing, is indicated by Melanchthon's letter †) of May 11. For, he says, the emperor had no time to listen to extensive discussions and Eck had published quite diabolical slander against them - the Protestants - which he wanted to counter with the writing thus composed.

The Elector had set out for the Diet with the best of hopes, for it was hoped that the Emperor would be an impartial judge. But immediately after his arrival in Augsburg, while the Emperor was still in Innsbruck, it was learned that the adversaries were making every effort to capture him against the Protestants.

*) The "electoral envoy" Hans v. Dolzig is named as the one who gave this advice.

**) For this hypothesis, Plitt's sources do not give any further clues.

†) Melanchthon wrote: *Mittitur tibi apologia nostra, quamquam verius confessio est. Neque enim vacat Caesari audire prolixas disputationes. Ego tamen ea dixi, quae arbitrabar maxime vel prodesse vel decere. Hoc consilio omnes fere articulos fidei complexus sum, quia Eccius edidit διαβολικωτατας διαβολάς contra nos. Adversus hos volui remedium opponere.*

understandable signs *) of the imperial ill-will. Therefore, one could no longer count on a friendly hearing, and had to keep the defense treatise, which naturally had to deal with the changed abuses and ceremonies - cf. the preface to the second part of the Augustana - as short as possible. Another circumstance had occurred, however, which made it necessary to make a confession of faith and doctrine before the Emperor. For Dr. Eck, as soon as the Diet was announced, issued a document in which he compiled 404 articles from the writings of those who "disturbed the peace of the Church. In it Luther and his followers were portrayed as false apostles, "who endeavored to tear the people away from the unity of the Roman Church and had so polluted all Germany with errors, ungodly speeches, and blasphemies that this country, once called the most Christian of all, had now become the home of all heresies. Eck sent this writing to the Emperor in good time, accompanied by a very provocative letter and (in the margin) with special notes, and offered to debate all these points at the Imperial Diet; for the people, however, he had them translated into German. This accusation could not remain unanswered, especially since it had reached the Emperor so directly, and the gross slander was most effectively refuted when the treatise to be presented to the Emperor contained a survey of the fundamental doctrines of the Protestants, thus proving their conformity with the old Church. For Melancthon, however, it was most appropriate to base his current work on the articles that had already been written, which were all the more suitable for a confession because they had already been recognized by many as the expression of the Protestant faith. Thus, the first 17 articles of the first part of the Augsburg Confession, which form an ordered whole, are unmistakably based on the Torgau (Schwabach) articles; the 4 following articles, however, are directly caused by Eck's slander, because Eck attributed to the Protestants a false doctrine of free will (Art. 18), accused Melancthon of teaching that God is the author of sin (19), presented the Lutheran doctrine of justification as if sanctification and good works were not at all compatible with it (20), and also claimed that the Protestants despise the saints (21). Eck's godless zeal and his slanders had thus become the means in God's hand to give the Lutheran Church an important part of the Augsburg Confession.

The draft of the thus reshaped work, consisting of the first confessing part added especially for the sake of Eck's calumnies and the second apologetic part shortened very much because of the imperial disfavor, has been published.

*Charles V withdrew the wish he had first expressed that the Elector should travel to meet them, and demanded that the Protestant theologians brought with him should be forbidden to preach.

The first part of the Theology was sent to Luther in Koburg on May 11 and, as is well known, was completely approved by Luther. Melanchthon, however, continued to work and improve on it, not alone, but in association with various other theologians who had gradually arrived in Augsburg: Brenz, U. Rhegius, E. Schnepf, J. Jonas, Spalatin and others. The preface and epilogue were written by Chancellor Brück. Everything, however, was still done in the opinion that the writing alone should be handed over to the Emperor by the Elector of Saxony in his and his own name.

That the Protestants present in Augsburg did not stand up for themselves in this religious matter, but represented their own, was well known to all, as, for example, the Chancellor of Ansbach writes: "Thus we are here not only for our own sake, but for the sake of all of ours." Such preparations, however, as had been made on the part of the Elector, had been made by very few; only the Nurembergers and the Reutlingers had brought with them a "Rathsschlag." But there was no lack of the consciousness that a common cause was being represented. Thus, for example, the Margrave of Brandenburg had written to his councilors that they should certainly go with the Saxons and the Nurembergers, "so that all of us who are of one faith and sacrament may be with one another and that we may not be alone. The opponents, however, did not regard the Protestant estates as anything other than a party. So the thought was obvious enough that the document drawn up by the Saxon theologians should be presented to the Emperor in the name of all the Protestant estates, and this wish was also expressed quite simultaneously by Margrave George and the Nurembergers. But while the Protestants were still negotiating over this proposal, the question was quickly brought to a conclusion without their assistance. For at the opening of the Diet, which took place on June 20, the Emperor demanded of each a written statement, in Latin and German, of his grievances and opinions. This was a clear call for joint action, which was soon undertaken. It was believed that there was still time to examine the confession carefully and to re-examine it, for, according to the declaration made at the opening of the Diet, the matter of the Turkish War was to be dealt with first. Therefore, on June 21, the Nuremberg envoys were instructed to call their preachers, and especially Osiander, to Augsburg to cooperate. But already on the next day, the Emperor was prepared, at Aller's request, to take up the religious matter first, and at the same time the Protestants were ordered to hand over their confession the very next Friday (June 24). Now, because a longer period, not even one day more, *) was not granted, the final touch had to be put quickly to the confessions to be submitted.

*) Cyprian p. 66.

The documents had to be laid down. On Thursday morning, a meeting was held in which the entire confession was read out, finalized, and signed, so that it could still be put into a fair copy and handed over to the Emperor the next day.

The faithful confessors were almost cheated of the opportunity to make their confession publicly. For after the greater part of the Friday session had been taken up with other matters, which, it is claimed, were deliberately protracted, the Emperor demanded toward the end of the session that the two documents be presented to him now only because it was too late to read them out. The Protestant estates, however, objected to this, and especially the Elector demanded most urgently of the Emperor that he would graciously hear them in this highly important matter, which concerned their souls and oaths. After repeated refusals, the Emperor yielded, and so on the next day, Saturday, June 25, the Confession was read out in a special assembly, if not in a public session of the Imperial Diet, then at least before all the Electors, Princes, and Estates, to which, as is known, even fierce opponents could not refuse the testimony that it contained nothing unlawful, but the truth and the Word of God.

The Protestants had come to Augsburg trusting in God and their good cause, and had not even previously taken joint measures*) to ensure that the matter would be properly represented at the Diet. In large part through the actions of the enemies, the confession of which we rejoice came into being under God's direction and was made together as the confession of the Protestant Church and not as that of Melanchthon. This is proved not only by its content and history, but also by Melanchthon himself when he writes: "I have compiled the articles contained in the Confession and have given almost an epitome of the doctrine of our Church, on the one hand to give account to the Emperor, on the other hand to reject false accusations. And in doing so I have done nothing on my own hand. For in the presence of the princes and other chiefs, and of the preachers, the several propositions were spoken of in turn."-The adversaries and enemies of the gospel had power in their hands, and worked with great exertion against the cause of truth before the Diet and in the same. But all their cunning and shrewd calculation, their cunning and guile, and even arbitrary violence, could not hinder the progress of the gospel, and they had to come to shame. For the whole Diet, opened with great pomp, had no significant consequences. Only for the Protestant Church, which was to be destroyed there, did it become an Ebenezer through the Augsburg Confession. The resolution of the Diet was, of course, that the Protestants should follow the Papal Confutation. But from

*) Cyprian p. 53.

Nothing came of this decision and advice. The Confession, on the other hand, is a monument, and a living monument at that, of God's glorious help. For at that time it delighted the confessors greatly and strengthened them mightily; in the time that followed, the church always drew new strength and fresh courage from it, and it will also go back to it with ever renewed joy until the time of confession on earth reaches its end at all.

(Translated by Prof. A. Crämer.)

Compendium of the Theology of the Father

From

Heinrich Eckhardt.

(Continued.)

VII. Their works and aspirations.

Now describe to me, as above, the works and endeavours of the good angels, so here those of the evil angels.

Nazianzenus: "The devil is a murderer of men, a hater of good, who in darkness aims at the body of the church, a Sptzfündler and Uebelthäter." 1)

Ambrose. "The old enemy, the liar from the beginning, the enemy of truth, the envier of man, whom he deceived himself before, the enemy of shame, the teacher of lust; - By endeavoring to ruin the human race with innumerable harmful arts, by sowing discord, by inciting to anger, by stirring up desires, by counseling the shameful, by recommending the false, and by multiplying the snares of error by the deceit of opinions, he is more annoyed at the bravery of those who stand than he rejoices in the weakness of those who fall." 2)

Nyssen: "The corrupter of human nature, who always works that we may not lift up our eyes to heaven, but continue to-

1) Diabolus homicida est, osor boni, in tenebris sagittans corpus Ecclesiae, sophista ac maleficus. Nazianz. orat. 1. de Reconc. Monach.

Hostis antiquus, mendax ab initio, inimicus veritatis, aemulus hominis, quem ut deciperet, se ante decepit, adversarius pudicitiae, magister luxuriae. - Innumeris nocendi artibus hominum genus nitens evertere, serens discordias, incitans iras, acuens cupiditates, suadens turpia, commendans falsa et errorum laqueos per opinionum commenta multiplicans: plus uritur de virtute stantium, quam laetatur de fragilitate labentium. Ambr. 1. 10. Ep. 80. et 84.

While stooping to the earth, thereon to paint brick out of dung, i. e. to lust after filthy pleasures." 1)

Tertullian: "The devil's work is man's destruction." 2)

VIII. The spiritual armor against the same.

But with what weapons are the wiles, endeavors, and schemes of the devil resisted?

1. With the word of God. Chrysostom, "This is our salvation, this is our safety, if we daily arm ourselves by reading, by hearing the Word, by the Word in the Spirit. Thus we shall remain unconquered, and be able to escape the wiles of the evil spirit." 3)

2. u. 3. through true piety and prayer. Augustine: "By true piety the men of God drive out the hostile power in the air. For they neither conquer nor subdue any, except in the company of sin. But they overcome all their temptations and hostilities by worshipping, not those, but their God against those." 4)

IX. The Science of Devils.

Finally, I ask you: Does the devil know the inner thoughts of men?

Augustine: "We are certain that the devil does not see the inner thoughts of the soul; but that they are revealed to him by the movements of the body and the manifestations of the affections, we have learned from experience. But the secret of the heart is known only to him to whom it is said: Thou alone knowest the hearts of the children of men." 5)

So how far and how much of the future can they predict?

Augustin: "We do not see the eternal and principal origin-

Depravator naturae humanae, semper studens, ne ad coelum oculos elevare possimus, sed in terram continuo inclinati, lateres in ea ex luto faciamus, i. e. ad lutas voluptates inhiemus. Nyss. 1. de vita Mos.

Operatio Diabolorum est hominis eversio. Tert. in Apol.

Haec nostra salus est, haec securitas, si nos ipsos quotidie munimus per lectionem, per auditum, per spirituale verbum. Sic poterimus invicti fieri, et maligni daemonis technas eludere. Chrys. in 2. c. Genes.

Vera pietate homines Dei aeream potestatem inimicam ejiciunt. Non enim aliquem vincit aut subjugat nisi societate peccati: omnesque ejus tentationes et adversitates vincunt orando, non ipsam, sed suum Deum adversus ipsam. Aug. de util. cred. c. 12.

Internas animae cogitationes Diabolum non videre, certi sumus: sed motibus corporis et affectionum indicia ab eo colligi experimento didicimus. Secreta autem cordis solus ille novit, ad quem dicitur: Tu solus nosti corda filiorum hominum. Aug. de Eccles. dogm. s. autor defin. ap. Tertull. c. 81.

seek the times in the wisdom of God: but by the knowledge of certain signs which are hidden from us, they know much more beforehand than men. At times also they foretell their own estimates." 1)

5. Uom people.

1. The merit of man.

You have spoken of the angels as the most excellent of God's creatures in heaven; tell me now which is the most excellent of the creatures on earth!

1. Of the dominion over the other creatures. Epiphanius: "On earth the most excellent creature above all is man, created by God with ineffable wisdom to be chief, to whom God has given dominion over the things created by him." 2)

2. Of the image of God. Basil: "For what else is made on earth in the image of the Creator? To what other is authority given and dominion given over all animals on the land, in the water, and in the air? Only a little is he lowered among the angels for the sake of union with an earthly body." 3)

3. Of the Incarnation of the Son of God. Chrysostom: "Yea, he is better than the angels, and greater than the archangels, than he that is honored above them all. For as he says who writes to the Hebrews: God took not the angels, but the seed of Abraham, and set them on high." 4)

4. Of the structure of the human body. Ambrose: "If one would even look at the structure of the human body, he could not consider anything on earth more delicious.)

5. Of his whole nature. Nyssen: "Also wears the

Non causas temporum aeternas et cardinales in Dei sapientia contemplamur: sed quorundam signorum nobis occultorum experientia multo plura, quam homines, prospiciunt. Dispositiones quoque suas aliquando praenunciant. Aug. 1. 9. de Civit. c. 20.

Eminentissima super omnia in terra creatura est Homo, qui ad principatum creatus est a Deo, inenarrabili sapientia, cui tradidit Deus dominium ab ipso creatorum. Epiph. 1. 2. tom. 2.

Quid enim aliud in terra ad Creatoris imaginem est conditum? Cuinam alii potestas data est et imperium super omnia terrestria, aquatilia, aereaque animalia concessum? paulo minus ab Angelis diminutus est propter terreni corporis conjunctionem. Basil. in ps. 48-

Imo Angelis melior et Archangelis major, utpote prae illis omnibus honoratus. Non Angelos Deus, sicut Hebraeis scribens dicit, sed semen Abrahae assumpsit et in sublimi sedere fecit. Chrys. in 1. c. Eph. serm. 3.

Ipsam etiam humani corporis fabricam considerare si quis velit, nihil poterit in terra preciosius judicare. Ambr. in ps. 118.

Man by his nature an image of the whole creation, wherefore he hath been called a little world. "1)

(6) Finally, of his creation. Theophilus: "While God created all the rest by his mere word, and made it, as it were, by the way, without the application of any special diligence, he held man worthy to be an eternal work alone, worthy of his hands." 2) And Nyssenus: "The heavens, whose like is not found among visible creatures, were made by the mere word. So also all the individual creatures, the Aether, the stars, etc., are brought forth only by the word, that they may be; but only to the creation of man did the Creator of the universe, as it were, proceed with counsel. "3)

II. His name and description.

From whence is he called man?

Lactantius: "The man-shark God formed from a lump of earth; therefore he is called man (Adam), because he is made of earth (Adamah)." 4)

So what is man?

Basil: "Man is a privy of God, endowed with reason, made in the image of his Creator." 5)

III. The matter and form of his creation.

What was man made of and how was he made?

Damascenus: " God formed man with his own hands into his image and likeness, forming him indeed a body out of the earth, but giving him a rational and understanding soul by his own blowing into it." 6)

Et in sui ipsius natura totius creationis simulacrum fert homo, quibus de causis et parvus mundus dictus est. Nyss. 1. de creat. hom. c. 5.

Cum caetera omnia sermone nudo constitueret Deus et ea quasi obiter, nulla peculiari adhibita diligentia, conderet: hominem existimavit solum esse opus sempiternum suisque manibus dignum. Theophil. 1. contra Autol.

Coelum, cui nihil in creaturis visibilibus simile reperitur, Verbo solo perficitur. Sic et singula quaeque creaturarum, aether, stellae etc., Verbo tantummodo producuntur, ut sint: ad hominis autem solius conditionem cum consilio quodammodo conditor universitatis accedit. Nyss. 1. de creat. hom. c. 3.

Hominem Deus figuravit ex limo terrae: unde homo nuncupatus est, quod sit factus ex humo. Lact. 1. 2. c. 11.

Homo est factura Dei, rationalis, ad imaginem creatoris sui facta. Basii, hom. 10. in Hex.

Propriis manibus plasmavit hominem Deus ad suam imaginem et similitudinem. Ex terra quidem corpus fingens, animam vero rationalem ac intellectivam propria insufflatione illi elargiens. Dam. 1. 2. Orth. c. 12.

Of the manner of its formation Lactantius says, "If we should know how he did it, he would have taught us, as he taught us the rest." 1)

(To be continued.)

Aphorisms.

Any new constitution that does not begin by requiring those who do not want to submit to God's Word to get out only makes things worse.

Altar fellowship. Thus Pastor Lohmann writes in the Pastoral-Correspondenz of October 6, which he edited: "If the church must keep back from the communion table those who, because of a lack of knowledge, are not able to examine themselves properly, then this also applies to those who do not acknowledge the communion of his body and blood promised by Christ. And how shall the minister of Christ give the sacrament to him who testifies his unbelief in it, affirming that here he receives Christ's body and blood? If this is not internal untruth in the Holy of Holies, I do not know what one would call it. Against Rotermund's sentences referring to this I simply place Luther's pronouncement in his letter to those at Frankfurt am Main in 1533: And in sum, that I come from this piece, it is frightening to me to hear that in one and the same church or at one and the same altar both parts should fetch and receive one and the same sacrament; and one part should believe that it receives the same bread and wine; but the other part should believe that it receives the true body and blood of Christ. And often I doubt whether it is to be believed, that a preacher or pastor could be so obdurate and wicked, and keep silence, and let both parts go thus, each in his delusion, that they received the same sacrament, each according to his faith.' But how, if the Reformed and Unreformed, who seek admission to our communion table, profess for themselves the communion faith of the Lutheran Church? Then, of course, the last emphasized reason against their admission does not apply: but they must then be made aware of the contradiction between their personal confession and their membership in a false church fellowship; they must be admonished to affirm the confession of their mouth by leaving the false fellowship and joining the true one. But if they do not wish to do this, we would do wrong to encourage them in their wrong state by premature admission to the Lutheran Lord's Supper. Thus it was seen

1) Quomodo id fecerit, si nos oporteret scire, docuisset, sicut docuit caetera. Lact. 1. 2. c. 12.

also our fathers, who have always treated the access of one hitherto belonging to a foreign confession to the Lutheran Lord's Supper as a change of confession; and I think I have proved in brief that we have no cause to depart from it."

Literature.

Dr. Martin Luther's first and oldest lectures on the Psalms from the years 1513 -1516. Edited by Die. th. Joh. K. Seidemann. Dresden. R. von Zahn's Verlag. 1876.

This is the diplomatically exact reprint of a handwritten manuscript of Luther in the Royal Public Library in Dresden and comprises two strong volumes of 470 and 407 pages in large octavo. The work is splendidly equipped in every respect, which was only made possible for the publisher by the most liberal support of the Saxon Ministry of Culture and the General Directorate of the Royal Collections for Art and Science. This early work of Luther's appears here for the first time in print; although one knew that it must be available somewhere, the place which held this treasure was unknown until now. Even Seckendorf writes: "I confess that I have not seen Luther's first lectures on the Psalms, which he himself mentions and which he gave shortly after he became a doctor, and that I do not know whether they exist." (*Commentar. de Luth. I*, 316.) Seckendorf had already remarked before at the same time: "It would be desirable that more of what Luther wrote before 1517 had been preserved. From the little that still exists, the man's great gifts shine forth even then." (*P. 22.*) And he is right. Not only is it in itself most interesting and instructive to see from the products of Luther's mind in the time before his public Reformation appearance, how Luther's light of evangelical knowledge once went out around him in dark night, and how he was enlightened from step to step, not as with one blow, but under the heaviest inner struggles; In spite of all the errors in which he was still caught at that time, and in spite of the whimsical allegories in which he still indulged himself at that time, taking into account the taste of his time, his interpretations of Scripture at that time already contain, let us say, a treasure of theological thoughts that cannot be weighed in gold and silver. Since Mr. Seidemann has added a photolithographic facsimile of a page of Luther's manuscript, on which the print is based, to the work, one can see from it not only that the decipherment of the manuscript, although "very clean", but "fine, narrow, sharp, pointed, very small and with many, many abbreviations" written.

with difficulties that only such an excellent connoisseur of manuscripts as Seivemann could overcome; one can also convince oneself from this that the Licentiate has reproduced the valuable document with the most pietistic accuracy and made it the desired common property of all those who, with Beza, say of Luther from experience: "*In quo qui Spiritum Dei non sentit, nihil, sentit.*" These lectures of Luther's on the Psalms from so early a time, however, serve but little for the study of the 86N8U8 everywhere; in them alone, as has been said, are already found many precious grains of gold of profound theological thought. We do not mean by this all kinds of learned remarks or results of a perceptive speculation, but rather those Petrine thoughts which "not flesh and blood" but only the "Father in heaven" can reveal, expressions of that only true theology which is not a human science which even an unregenerate can have, but a *habitus mentis practicus* ὁρθόδοξος.

The present lectures or "*dictata*," as Luther calls them, he held, so Seidemann reports, presumably at that time according to the monastery rules early from 6 to 7 o'clock, and they were probably attended primarily by Augustinian monks. Johannes Oldenkop, a former listener, says in his annals for the year 1513: "Tho düßer sülven Tidt hoff ann (hob an) M. Luther den Psalter Davidt tho lesende, und was dar flittich by vnd hadde vele thohörers. "

Luther begins his opening address with the following words, among others: "I sincerely confess that I still do not understand most of the Psalms, and that unless God enlightens me through your merits, as I confidently hope, I will not be able to interpret them. To be sure, Greeks, Latins, and Hebrews have worked many times on the interpretation of the Psalter, and I believe more than on that of any other book of the divine Scriptures. But as yet no work has been done on it, so much so, that in not a few places the interpretations are more in need of interpretation than the text itself." (I, 1.) "The other prophets say of themselves, -The word of the Lord has come to me,' but this one (David) makes use of a new mode of speech. He does not speak: 'The word of the LORD is come unto me,' but, -His speech is come by me.' (2 Sam. 23. 2.) I know not what deeper and more confidential inspiration lies implied in this word. For though the Spirit has spoken through all the prophets, as we sing in that song, yet none is so spoken of. (I, 3.)

Let a few quotations from Luther's Commentary on the First Psalm of 1513 serve to prove that already from Luther's lectures of that time shine forth those flashes of truly theological thought in which every Christian reader of Luther's later writings delights on every page of them.

To the words of Ps. 1:2 after the Vulgate: "*In lege Domini voluntas ejus*," "in the law of the Lord is his will," Luther makes the remark: "The Jews are in the law with unwillingness and only with the hand. For although the law could restrain the hand by fear of punishment, and move it to works by hope of good, yet it could neither loosen nor bind the will inwardly; namely, it could not loosen it to freedom, nor bind its desires. For this happens solely through the bonds of love, which were not given by the law, but by Christ in his spirit.... Christ does not want his kingdom to exist through force and compulsion, because then it would not exist, but that one should serve him with will, from the heart, and with affection (*affectu*). For in this way his kingdom is eternal and indestructible, because it is not based on force. He loves a cheerful giver. For this purpose he has given his Spirit, and therefore he who does not have this Spirit of Christ is not his. For those whom the Spirit of God impels are the children of God; but these are they whose will is in the law of the Lord, because this is not of us without the Spirit of God. But there are also those today who seek to pervert the mouth of this prophet and to pervert the tongue of him, who with their puffed-up senses and forced works want the law of the Lord to be in their will, and not that their will be in the law of the Lord. For this also the Jews desired (besides that their will was not in the law of the Lord, as was said), in that they desired that what they pleased, what they ordained, what they established, should be acceptable to God. And so they rather "set their law before God, as if he were rather bound to accept what they will and choose, than that they should accept his law from him to do what he has chosen and wills. Of this kind, especially, are many religious now." (1:5, 6, 7.) - Concerning the words of the same verse, "He speaks of his law day and night," or, according to the Vulgate, "He contemplates his law," etc., Luther makes the following remark: "Here also there are perverse men (as in the first part of the verse) who likewise pervert and pervert this speech of the saint (David). Their contemplation is not by the law of the Lord, but, on the contrary, the law of the Lord is (what is frightening) in their contemplation. These are they who reinterpret the Scriptures according to their mind, and compel the Scriptures to receive into themselves what they establish by their contemplation, and to agree with it; whereas the contrary ought to be done.... They do not desire to be holy with the holy, but they desire that the holy should be profane with them. Such were the heretics." (I, 10.) - Further on Luther comes again to the will, and adds, "It may be that even in the law a man may forcibly awaken in himself the act of willing, and yet his will is not in the same. Many, therefore, may deceive themselves who think that they already have a good will when they awaken the act of willing.

But they do not consider that it is a forcibly enforced and imperiously awakened act; which appears from this, that when the act is over, the will falls back upon the accustomed." (1:22. f.) - Concerning the words of the 5th verse, "Therefore the ungodly abide not in judgment," or, as the Vulgate has, "Therefore the ungodly rise not in judgment," Luther makes the following remark, "In us neither is nor ariseth God's righteousness, unless first our righteousness fall away and wholly perish. Nor do we rise unless we have fallen first, standing evil. So God's being, holiness, truth, goodness, life, etc., is not in us at all, unless we first become nothing, unholy, liars, wicked, dead before God. Otherwise the righteousness of God would be mocked, and Christ would have died in vain. And this is the disputation of the deepest theologian, the Apostle Paul, which is quite unknown to our theologians nowadays, whether speculatively, I know not, but no doubt practically. For Paul, for instance, desires to be found in Christ, that he has not his righteousness, and calls himself the chiefest of all sinners, which is a great and blessed pride. For the more abundant God's grace and righteousness is in us, the more powerful our sin is to us; and the less (our own) righteousness we have according to our judgment, and the more we judge, curse, and abhor ourselves, the more abundantly does the grace of God pour itself out upon us. Many have misunderstood this word of the apostle ("Where sin has become mighty, grace has become much mightier," Rom. 5:20.), and have said, "Let us do evil, that good may come of it" (Rom. 3:8.).), when the apostle rather intends to teach how God's righteousness is made great, namely, by making our unrighteousness great, and by the excess of our sin, because sin is so much powerful by so much as it is known to be powerful. For in itself it is an evil which is infinite and incalculable, as is also the grace of God. Therefore, the power of it is the knowledge of it by more or less. And this is the judgment which the Lord loveth. But the ungodly "stand not up in the same," because they magnify not their sin, but their righteousness; for they stand and excuse themselves." (I, 24.)

Licentiate Seidemann rightly says: "The main thought on which Luther bases this whole explanation of the Psalms is briefly expressed by him in 2001, for example, on Ps. 102:6: "And what do you seek? I see nowhere in Scripture anything but Christ crucified.'" (Vorr.XVI.)

Through the few notes above, based solely on the interpretation of the first Psalm, we hope to have convinced our readers that these early lectures of Luther's not only have historical value, but also contain a magnificent treasure of true theology. Happy are those who lift it up!

W.

Ecclesiastical - Contemporary.

I. America.

The New York Ministry held an extraordinary meeting in the city of New York on December 4 and 5 of last year, about which the "Witness to Truth" reports the following in No. 6: "The President announced the reason for calling the extraordinary meeting and explained that, according to the Synodal Constitution, the "Herald matter" was the only subject of discussion, with which, however, some did not seem to be satisfied. After the presentation of the mutual complaints, the so-called "protest party" (i.e. those who publicly protested against the procedure of the Herald Redaction) was allowed to advance its cause, which it did, but not without many and unseemly interruptions from the other side. The debate was a very heated one, and it was made only too plain that the opponents of Matthew's propositions were bent, if only they could, in one fell swoop and in a few hours, "in short order," to condemn the protesters, to force them out of the Synodal Union, and to bury the "Witness of Truth" (whose paying subscribers already amount to about 1,000). We readily admit that a large part of the brethren on the other side were not willing, and never will be willing, to go so far, but the determining elements of the same had this intention, and also sought, to the best of their ability, to carry it out. Each of the four sessions brought such a storming, but in vain.... We refrain from entering into the details of the negotiations; the mere recollection of the wild performances repeated several times is distressing enough. We are not fighting for or against persons, but for truth and against error, and therefore we leave personal attacks and remarks to those who find pleasure in them. It was pointed out on our part that it was precisely the now protesting congregations (about half of the Herald readers) who had taken up the Herald in the past, that the conduct of the present editorial staff was unbrotherly toward them and contrary to the actual purpose of the Synodal Gazette, and that the protesters felt compelled to publicly represent the rights of their congregations, as well as the sacred truth of the Word of God, on account of their conscience. On the other hand, the other side was represented by the president of the first district conference; also from there the proposal was brought forward that the synod approve the conduct of the editor. Later, however, it was thought wise to withdraw this proposal. The protesting party tried in vain to make use of the right granted to it to justify its protest; it could only speak out on the first point of the same. On the other hand, other proposals kept coming from the other side, which were so often modified, amended, and substituted that time soon passed without any result. An extremely bitter and spiteful attack on the Missouri Synod, emanating from the other side, was earnestly rejected, and in general we simply remained on the defensive in the debate. It was enough for us that with the shield of truth we could repudiate all suspicions and accusations. An attempt to bring the debate to a close on Tuesday was disposed of by 39 votes to 21. The next morning, our proposal to continue the justification of the protest was not accepted; on the other hand, a long resolution consisting of four points was introduced by Kühn, which was intended to crush the protesters quite violently. On closer inspection, there were already such strange things in the first paragraph that there was nothing more urgent to do than to delete two sentences from it. Then the

Proposal something like this: "Synod censures the conduct of the protest party as unbrotherly, hasty, and contrary to the order of Synod." This proposal was adopted by 41 votes to 18. In order to judge of the proportion of votes, it may be noted that our side had already declared at the beginning of the debate on the first day that it conceded to have deserved a censure because of a formal defect, and for this reason some brethren agreed to the said proposal who would not be prepared to go further, - nevertheless we believed ourselves obliged to protest against this decision and to appeal to the regular Synodal Assembly for the following reasons: 1) because the debate was cut off before we had finished our defence; 2) because we were not referred to by any clause of the Constitution (resp. the resolution in question was not justified by the Constitution). The time for adjournment had long since passed, and after it had been briefly decided to pay the \$200.00 "deposited" by the former Business Committee with the Treasurer of the Synod to the present Business Committee of the "Herald," the Synod adjourned." The "Witness to Truth" will continue to appear.

Of Dr. Krauth's theses on the Galesburg Rule of the General Council, the "Kirchliche Mittheilungen" in No. 9 of this year, edited by Missions-Inspector Deinzer in Neuendettelsau, say that they are "not yet completely sufficient for the strictly confessional point of view," i.e. for the truly confessional point of view; in the following number it is said that "it is difficult to expect that the more strictly confessional direction will win the day.

General Synod. At a Sunday School meeting held in September of last year in the South Bend Church in Armstrong Co., Pa., mostly by Reformed Christians, a Lutheran (?) pastor of the General Synod took part, along with some Presbyterians and a Methodist, who, as the "Zeitschrift" reports, claimed in his paper that "nowhere in the Holy Scriptures is there a command to baptize".

The Kirchenfreund calendar, published by Pastor Severinghaus on behalf of the German Publication Authority of the General Synod, contains general Christian content as well as a number of bad jokes. What the "German Christian people", for whom the calendar is supposedly published, are supposed to do with it, is not foreseeable. The calendar contains only the list of preachers belonging to the General Synod. G.

A Puritan institution, Amherst College, has conferred the doctorate on a Roman priest.

Tunker. A new division of the Tunker community has recently been formed under the name of "Community Anabaptist Brethren," who hold that each community should keep house for itself with its preacher, and that no one else has a right to rule it. The new community has increased significantly in number of members. (Kundsch.)

"The body of believers" is the name of a new sect that has arisen in Pittsburg. It has no creed but the Bible, rejects the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, but regards the Lord Jesus as divine and baptizes only in his name.

Secret societies are known to exist in almost all American institutions of learning. From Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., hostilities have recently arisen between the members of the secret societies and their opponents. Two of the latter were relegated to prevent further sedition among the students. The classes held assemblies, in which, since the secret society members had the majority, all class officials who belonged to the opposing party were deposed. The faculties had to do their best to prevent outbreaks of violence. Now, where God's word does not rule, there

it cannot be otherwise than that truth and justice are defeated. Hardly anything shows more how sad the situation is in the sects than the fact that so many of them, especially preachers, belong to the shameful humanistic secret societies.

Roman Daughters' Schools. It is calculated that there are 30,000 Protestant girls in Roman Catholic schools, and Catholics claim that one out of every ten of these girls is converted to Catholicism, and that three out of every ten learn to abhor Protestantism. We ourselves have no doubt that two-thirds of all who are educated in Catholic schools are lost to Protestantism.

(Apol.)

A Roman priest in Elmira, N. I., was sent to prison by the court because he refused to testify in a case of bigamy. The Methodist "Happy Messenger" comments: "We live in America, where even Catholic priests must bow to the law of the land if they do not want to be punished. Confessional secrets don't count in court here." - If the priest in question really did not want to testify to something because he only knew it on the basis of what had been confessed to him, we can only call it tyranny if one wanted to force him to break the *sigillum confessionis*.

II. Abroad.

Saxony. After the Sachs. Kirchen- und Schulblatt of November 22 of last year reported that a member of a congregation in Saxony had refused to have his newborn child baptized, it added: "We are seized by only one feeling, that of the deepest pain over the fact that our regional church must remain silent at this time about such insolent mockery of its sacraments, and does not tolerate those who trample on the holiest things in it. Every such story reminds us of the misery of the lack of serious church discipline. For what we have of it now is truly like a scarecrow in a cabbage field, which threatens and always threatens, but does not shoot. There, of course, the loose birds must gain courage, and generations must grow up which no longer have respect for anything, not for the church, not for the king." And yet the Redacteur remains calm in a Church whose efficacy consists, on the whole, in educating a generation alienated from God. W.

Freedom of conscience still does not seem to be recognized as a precious good by some "believing" pastors of the Saxon regional church. According to the "Sächsisches Kirchen- und Schulblatt" of October 25 of last year, the notorious rationalist Dr. Graue in Chemnitz wrote to an unbeliever who had refused the participation of a pastor at the funeral of his child and had refused to pay the burial fees demanded of him, among other things, the following: "As little as someone is forced to have his children baptized, as little as a bridegroom may be urged to have his marriage blessed in church, just as little is someone forced to request the services of the church at the funeral of a relative. Since you have now refused these services at the funeral of your child from the outset, as the orderer has informed me on my questioning, you are of course free from any ecclesiastical charge." On the other hand, a state ecclesiastic appears in the said paper and declares, among other things: "That Dr. Graue is heartily glad that every compulsion to do ecclesiastical acts has been removed, that is his affair; we do not envy him this joy of his." Would to God the national ecclesiastics not only envied the rationalist this joy, but followed him in it! The suffering of the "faithful" over the deliverance from the previous compulsion of conscience can have no other effect on a rationalist than that it is

only makes him more obdurate. In addition to this, he is quietly allowed to misuse his office to preach his religion of reason instead of the Gospel, but if he does something that reduces the income of the parish, he immediately intervenes against him. For thus it is further stated in that article: "According to information, the city council of Chemnitz has already reprimanded Dr. Graue in the interest of the parochial treasury, and also the church inspection, by means of a decree to the church boards, has made known its decided disapproval of the, to say the least, clumsy action of the first city clergyman"

Free Church. After the reviewer of a paper by Pastor Schöler on the Prussian regional church in the *Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung* of November 9 of last year had reported on his description of the deplorable state of the regional church, he continued, among other things, as follows: "So there would be nothing left but resignation? separation? the Free Church? Yes, if there were now one, well-ordered, in unity of spirit: how many anguished souls would take refuge in the arms of such a one! But into fragmentation many a theologian may go, congregations do not follow, and to many for whom the Free Church is a longed-for ideal, doubts have arisen from the course of events as to whether it is already time. All respect for the conscientious conviction of those concerned! But when such a small fellowship of a few dozen people, having scarcely come into existence, after a few months, is again dispersed under flashing rays of banishment (cf. the events in Saxony, Klein Linden-Allendorf, etc.), then many a one, who truly does not shrink from the cross, believes that he still misses something of the blessing of God, which expresses to such fellowships the seal that was expressed to the apostolic church (Acts 2:44, 46, 47; 4:32). And many a one does not therefore go out of the old church, though in view of its damage he may say, "It is harder for me to stay than to go." - We, too, believe that if the Free Church had quickly achieved great success, many would certainly join it who are now turning their backs on it. But it is not remembered that the Christian is not to be governed by probable great successes, but only by God's command. How? if this were the very test of the believers' absolute obedience to God, that the orthodox Free Church, so soon after its appearance, should have to fight such hard battles within itself, and stand in such an angry shape? And would not the Free Church not be in this shape if all who are serious about the pure confession were to come to its aid? Are not, then, just those to blame that the Free Church is in such a miserable condition, who for its sake remain aloof from it? - How those only deceive themselves who say, "It is more difficult for me to stay than to go," is indicated by the reviewer himself when he continues, "Not to go, but to be forced out: that was the watchword in former times, and rightly understood, it will also be the right thing. But how many have chosen as their watchword not to go, but to let themselves be pushed out, without ever being pushed out, at least for the sake of it, because they pushed their limits further and further out near the edge! The whole development of the national churches in the last twenty-five years has taught us sufficiently how much has been neglected in the *principiis obsta!* in timely, unanimous advocacy, in common passive resistance. Exactly the point can often be found where the yielding began, which afterwards led to continued retreat, exactly also the point where a halt could still have been successfully made." - So one recognizes this, and yet one wants to stay out of this course backwards? Where will one finally arrive? - There, where rescue is no longer possible, because the conscience, dulled by continued denial, no longer desires rescue. W.

State Church and Sovereign Church Regiment. In No. 42 of last year, the *Leipziger Allgem. Kirchenzeitung* had written: "We would also like to hear this from the Roman Church.

We can learn from the Catholic Church that we expect nothing from the state and the political powers, but everything from our work, our zeal, our faithfulness, in order that Christianity and the church may once again become a power among the people and gain more influence over the life of the people. But that is the sad thing, that in spite of the many blows which the modern State has dealt us, we still expect too much the final help from a reversal of the State or from a direct influence of the princes. This may be due to the fact that the state church, the state ecclesiastical system, has almost become a matter of faith with us, and the sovereign regiment of the church is almost regarded as a characteristic of the church." - The "Kirchen-Blatt" of the Breslauers of November 15 of last year calls this "a golden word." If this is too much to say, we can nevertheless adopt what the "Kirchen-Blatt" adds: "To this we say Amen, and can only wish that this complaint, often expressed by us, but of course unheeded, may now be heard from the Allg. luth. K.-Zeitung, and be taken to heart by those whom it concerns. As long as the lamentation that the state no longer inculcates Christianity as it used to and helps to make its subjects Christian by means of state funds does not cease, the church forces will remain tied up. And it is a contradiction for the churches to desire and demand greater 'independence' so long as the churches are not able to lead their members without police assistance." - So far, however, the faithful of the national churches have revealed that they cling to no dogma more firmly than that the new obedience or correction is not a piece of the atonement. W.

Bavaria. At the last General Synod held in Ansbach, it was decided to send out a written address to the members of the regional church in the name of this assembly. The address was also written. Its general publication, however, was finally opposed by certain unspecified reasons, so that it was omitted. From the (Neuendettelsauer) "Freimund" of November 8th of last year, which has printed the speech, we communicate the following passage of it: "Our national church enjoys the inestimable, in so many other German countries painfully missed benefit, that the confession according to the Scriptures of the salutary truth, brought to light again by God's grace by Dr. Martin Luther, is the foundation of its existence and the guideline of its life-movement, which is still in legal force. If this good does not come to its full development in her, if the holy beauty of a church born of God's Word alone does not attain its corresponding appearance, then human weakness and sinfulness is to blame for this, from which all human beings, and thus also the congregation of the Lord, suffer as long as she still lives in the flesh and awaits his transfiguring return. If, therefore, our Lutheran church is afflicted with weaknesses and deficiencies, we deplore them no less than those who want to alienate you from it through the illusion of a supposedly purer Christian community, and it is not our opinion that we should be content to see the holy confession of our fathers as an outward inscription on it. But, thank God, the truthful proclamation of the holy truth and the scriptural administration of the holy sacraments are not only unobstructed in it, but can also be found in abundance ... May only the church not be deprived of any right which it needs in order to be and to do what it is called to do; for if the church of Jesus were to be forced into a corner in which it would be cut off from the siting influence on the life of the people which can only proceed from it, then our people would have to be led towards its downfall by the deplorably increasing savagery " A sad document. The lack of pure doctrine is attributed to "human weakness and sinfulness, from which all human beings suffer," and warned against it as against the main danger,

to be "alienated" from the national church "by the mirage of a supposedly purer Christian community"; for, the General Synod apparently wants to say, to claim that there can be a "purer Christian community" is nothing but a lie and a deception. It is true that these words occur in the address, that "all members of the Synod, secular and ecclesiastical, stand and hold by the confession of our church and want to live and die by it," but this may well have been the main reason that nothing came of the publication of the address, even if not explicitly (at least the "Freimund" reports that the reasons are said to have had nothing to do with the content). On the other hand, knowing the Bavarian Ministry as we do, one may forgive us or not, we cannot say anything else than with Horace: *Credat Judaeus Apella*W

Province of Posen. The Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung of November 23rd wrote: "The lack of candidates in Posen is even greater than elsewhere. Whoever enters the spiritual ministry here must be prepared in advance to bear the Lord's poverty abundantly, and only the greatest willingness to sacrifice and a truly apostolic patience and love for the kingdom of God can endure it here. The dwellings which are made available to the clergy are often such that the last worker would spurn them. Churches are seldom there, but only poor, low prayer houses. Usually there is no opportunity to associate with people of the same level of education, apart from the fact that it is often almost impossible for the clergyman to marry, and that the circumstances are not such that he could keep a proper household. In addition, because of the great expansion of the parishes, the clergyman must be prepared to spend day after day on open country roads, or even to travel from one place to another on the worst roads, a circumstance that only the fewest can cope with, both physically and mentally. - So hardships, such as our American pioneer preachers have to endure, are also found elsewhere.

At a Pomeranian pastoral conference, senior teacher Dr. Erich Haupt presented theses on Sunday, the sixth and seventh of which read as follows: "6. Therefore, the church must expressly teach that the Sabbath commandment is dissolved, in that it finds its fulfillment in the sanctification not of a particular day, but of the whole life. 7. (7) The church is to teach expressly that the observance of Sunday is based neither on divine nor apostolic commandment, but is an ecclesiastical ordinance necessary for the common worship."

As if possessed by the devil, not physically, but spiritually, a boy seems to be, of whom the General Evangelical Lutheran Church Newspaper of Oct. 26 of last year reports the following: "An eleven-year-old boy in the rescue house at Schladen in Hanover opens every lock, no matter how strong, with a tiny nail; no window is too high for him not to come here. J. reports the following: "An eleven-year-old boy in the rescue house at Schladen in Hanover opens every lock, no matter how strong, with a small nail; no window is too high for him that he does not lower himself; hardly a hole is too small for him that he does not nestle through it; no cold is too hard for him that he would even for a moment consider spending the night outdoors, even if he were only dressed in a shirt. A hundred times in one year he escaped to do the most horrible and unspeakable mischief, and they always feared arson. Only the pleas of the father of the house induced the administrator to leave him in the asylum. His whole conduct was designed from the beginning, as he himself openly stated everywhere, to do so much evil to the house parents that he would have to be chased away. His goal was the penitentiary, where one of his relatives would be housed for the rest of his life, and where he would be quite comfortable. When he thought he was safe in his hiding-place, he would light a fire to bake himself eggs, break in to steal food, dirty the beds of his comrades, and so on. Once they searched for him in vain for half an hour in a parlor, until at last they found him quite

nestled between the stove and the sopha under the carpet. The usual punishments of the house were completely ineffective on him, as was the kindest treatment. He made a repulsive impression on the other pupils. Finally the boy's health began to waver. In particular, sores appeared on his feet, which he probably had from an old frostbite, but which he aggravated by constant scratching and plucking, all to annoy the houseparents. Once, for the same reason, he leaned his shoulder against the red-hot stove that the smell of burning drifted through the house. After some time he also claimed that he could not stand on his legs, so he was taken to the sickroom and to bed. The doctor, however, who examined him several times, declared the illness to be a fabrication. Since he had also escaped from here, they put leg irons on him, which did not prevent him from walking, but they did prevent him from running, climbing, and jumping. If they were taken off him, he escaped, and they had to be put on again. This was repeated several times. We could," says the annual report, "cite many more traits of unbelievable, almost satanic malice, for which we do not know an explanation; incidentally, many of his deeds are such that they cannot well be told in public. An inquiry to the doctor, whether the boy was to be considered insane, was decisively denied by him. Some will perhaps seek an explanation in the following course. One morning the father of the house had occasion to observe the boy unseen, while he was busy washing out the soiled bedclothes. The boy, thinking himself unnoticed, kept muttering something to himself; when the father of the house listened more closely, he heard the words: 'Come, dear devil! Dear devil help me.' Even after the Verwaltungsath had now decided to dismiss the boy as incorrigible, the indefatigable house-father again asked for a respite. Then the following happened. The boy is in bed in the sickroom; the fetters have been removed from him, because the door is well locked and secured, the window about fifteen feet above the ground and, what is more, boarded up from the outside. The boy leaves the bed, climbs up the window, breaks the panes above the sash, clamps himself through them, and jumps fifteen feet down to the ground. Then he runs through the garden and across the dirty yard, dressed only in a shirt; he succeeds in getting back into the house through the back door unnoticed; he creeps up the stairs into the stranger's chamber, lies down with his dirty feet first in one bed, and then, to increase the mischief as much as he can, in the other, and is discovered here quite unmolested. But now the patience of the house-father, and still more of the house-mother, was exhausted, and they resolve to keep the boy no longer."

Wuerttemberg. In the Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung of November 9 of this year, it is written, among other things: "That is the special thing about our situation in Wuerttemberg, that while the masses, as everywhere, are indifferent to the church, if not even hostile to it, the thought of the worthlessness of the (national?) church and even a certain opposition to it is making more and more progress among our believers. The chiliastic worldview is endemic in Wuerttemberg."

Missionaries in Madagascar complain that the union of church and state is beginning to become troublesome in that country. The Queen entertained many native preachers on State revenues, and in some provinces compels the people to go to church. A. B.

Spain. We read the following in Dr. Munkel's Neues Zeitblatt of November 8 of last year: "Pastor Fliedner from Madrid, the son of the founder of the blessed Kaiserswerth Institutions, recently reported on Spain in Berlin in order to awaken helpful love. The obstacles to evangelical activity have partly diminished, partly been alleviated. In the whole country there are now 10 -12000 evangelicals."

in 31 parishes. In the Protestant schools, of which Madrid has 6, 7000 children are taught. In addition, there is a hospital and 2 orphanages in Madrid. A special effort is made to distribute books. Annually about 4000 whole Bibles or parts of them are distributed. Since 60 out of 100 men can neither read nor write, the readers help out in this case. - Who are the evangelical missionaries? They are Englishmen, Americans, Swiss and Germans, according to their confession High Church Englishmen, Free Church Presbyterians, Reformed, Baptists, Darbists and Lutherans. We become apprehensive at this enumeration.... Shall we begin with half a dozen confessions? Fliedner assures us: they work 'in full unity'. As proof he cites: All services are based on a uniform agendas and a hymnal; a common correspondence paper is kept by all, which is read by all, and for which each of them can write. There is a monthly general mission conference. Even Catholics are enraptured by the unity of spirit, so that they must exclaim in amazement: 'Behold, how they love one another so!' This must be a union on the broadest basis, perhaps along the lines of the Evangelical Alliance, although it is impossible to see how the Darbists, with their rejection of the preaching ministry, fit in, not to speak of the Lutherans and High Churchmen."

The Book of Tobias. We read the following in a local political paper: "About the discovery of the original text of the apocryphal Book of Tobias in the Bodleian Library in Orford by Neubauer, the 'Univers' is informed that Neubauer found the original Chaldean text of Tobias in a manuscript that was recently acquired. When St. Jerome wrote in the preface to his translation of the Book of Tobias to the bishops Chromatius and Heliodorus: *Exigitis enim ut librum chaldaeo sermone conscriptum ad latinum styllum traham, librum utique Tobiae* -, one may assume that the text discovered by Neubauer is, with the exception of a few variants, the same as that translated by St. Jerome. The Tobias of the Vulgate differs from that of the Septuagint in several points, and especially in that the Greek Tobias speaks in the first, the Latin in the third person; in the Chaldean he speaks likewise in the third person. In other respects the Chaldee original is closer to the Septuagint than to the Vulgate. A number of disputed words in the translation of Tobias are healed by the Chaldean original. In the latter the dog does not occur, the end of the book of chapter 11, 20. is missing, the conclusion is shorter and different from the translations." To the Papists the most fatal thing about this (alleged) finding of the Book of Tobias in the original Chaldean text will be that the verse chapter 11, 9. is missing; for, as is well known, the Jesuit Tanner, on the occasion of the Regensburg Colloquium in 1601, answered Aegidius Hunnius' question, "Is it, then, an article of faith that Tobias carried a dog with him?" three times with great zeal: "Of course!" ("*Maxime, maxime, maxime!*") S. *Colloq. de norma doct. etc. Lavingae, 1602. p. 353.*) With that finding, therefore, the Papists lose one of their articles of faith, unless the Pope substitutes it from the shrine of his heart.

W.

Consequences of the Celibate. From Paris it is written in a newspaper on December 2 of this year: The trials of French clergymen for crimes against morality are a standing item in the jury courts. Thus, in the past week alone, the Abbe Saunois, pastor of Blancey, was sentenced by the jury of the Cote d'Or to ten years' hard labor for such an atrocity committed against underage girls, and the Abbe FlosselleS, pastor of Bpissy-Mauvoisin, was sentenced by the jury of Seine-et-Oise (Versailles) to ten years' hard labor for even more heinous and repugnant crimes.

natural offence was sentenced to twenty years' hard labour and the same length of time under police supervision.

Pope and Sultan. It is written to a newspaper from Rome on Nov. 30 of this year: Bloody tears are still being wept for the Turks in the Vatican. A high personage in the Vatican expressed himself in these days in this sense: "The last supports of our hope are gone: Turkey and France, where shall we look now?"

Why the Pope lives so long. A Parisian paper, *Journal des Debats*, has the following curiosity from a book by the Marquis de Segur, a good Catholic: "In 1866, a holy girl of Marseilles, Mademoiselle Amelie Leautard, had an intuition to crown her life with a supreme and heroic sacrifice. Pius IX was seriously ill. Mademoiselle Leautard resolved to offer herself to God as a sacrifice for his Vicar. But fearing that this might be an act of presumption, she wished first to obtain the permission of the Pope himself. When she had presented to him her supreme desire, Pius IX remained motionless and silent for a time, and finally, as if obeying a voice that had spoken to him in secret, he laid his hand on the head of the Christian heroine and said to her: 'Go, my daughter, go, my daughter, and do what the Spirit of God has inspired you to do?' The next morning, according to her custom, Mademoiselle Leautard attended the first Mass in St. Peter's; she received the Communion, and having the sacrifice of love in her heart, she offered her life for the Pope to Him who had offered his for the human race. Her vows were scarcely pronounced when, seized with a terrible and sudden pain, she fell to the earth with a cry. The physician was summoned, who declared that his art could do nothing against this strange malady. Three days later she died. The news of this miraculous death was brought to the Vatican. Pius IX received it without showing any surprise, he only murmured, raising his eyes to heaven, in an agitated voice: '*Così tosto accettata!*' (So soon accepted!)" *La Chronique*, from which we take this, puts as a heading: "The Pope a vampire."

G.

Apologetics. In the report on the proceedings of the 30th Assembly of German Philologists and Schoolmen in Rostock, third session, the speech of Prof. Dr. Oppert of the *College de France* from Paris is also included. From it we learn the following: "While, on the whole, the discovery of the cuneiform writings has considerably increased the historical importance of the Books of Kings and Chronicles (just as the reputation of the venerable Herodotus has been raised beyond all doubt by the discovery and explanation of the ancient Persian texts), there are also points where, according to the opinion of some scholars, absolutely no agreement can be established, and where, according to these scholars, the Assyrian monuments should be given credit and not the Bible. The speaker opposes this view. According to the biblical chronology, there is an intervening period of 257 years between the death of Solomon and the removal of the ten tribes; it is known that the Books of Kings and Chronicles draw from the Imperial Annals. According to the Assyrian lists of eponyms, however, this time is limited to 210 years. These lists of eponyms are lists (tablets) of names according to which the Assyrians, like the Athenians, designated the year after their archons. Now those scholars want to create agreement between both reports by not only taking 47 years out of the history of Judah and Israel, but also by presenting a king as apocryphal, as invented by the Bible, who is thought to be the king of Assyria in two places of the Books of Kings and Chronicles, namely the king Phul. Redner, on the other hand, brings about the agreement by the fact that he, without touching the biblical chronology in the least,

rather assumes gaps in the Assyrian reports. Such gaps are very conceivable from the outset. For since only the Assyrians reckoned according to eponyms, while in Babylon and in southern Chaldea the years were determined according to the years of the reigning kings, so naturally, when a Babylonian king had reigned over Assyria, the eponyms were missing in the lists and even in the tables made for Nineveh also the names of the kings, since tradition knew that after the eponym so or so many years had fallen out. If therefore an interruption of the list of eponyms seems conceivable and explicable from the beginning, Redner now proves in the following by a calculation that it must really have taken place. He arrives at this result, under emphasis of the fact that the name Phul is really a Babylonian one, by combination of different facts and especially by drawing on the two fixed solar eclipses of June 15, 763, and of June 13, 809. It is therefore groundless to doubt the existence of King Phul. - Still another apparent contradiction between the Bible and the Assyrian cuneiform writings, which attaches to the name Asriah, is lifted by the lecturer by a correct explanation of the cuneiform writings. It is to be regretted that excellent books, which until now have been in a respectful reserve with respect to the cuneiform writings and which are by no means flattering to the researchers alone, as well as, for example, the otherwise excellent work of Max Duncker, accept such immature ideas as historically justified and thereby give them an emphasis which only facts may have.

Darwinism. On the occasion of the 50th Assembly of German Natural Scientists and Physicians in Munich, Prof. Virchow himself unexpectedly spoke out against Prof. Jäckel's Darwinian ape theory after the latter had given a lecture. Among other things, he declared: Natural science, like everything in the world, is also composed of three pieces, of objective and subjective knowledge, to which faith is added as the middle piece. The latter exists in natural science just as it does in religion. It has never been proved as an objective truth that a development from ape to man is possible through intermediate links; indeed, positive research in the field of anthropology has increasingly led away from the proof of a connection between the two. This has been proved by all investigations of skulls; no skull has ever been found where one could be in doubt as to whether it belonged to an ape or a man.

Spiritualism. It is astonishing how silly the unbelievers try to prove that Spiritualism is nothing but a common hoax. If it were so, if demonic powers were not at work in it, it would not have spread as rapidly and as widely as Muhammadanism and Mormonism, and would not have survived so long. Dr. Münkel writes quite correctly in his "Neues Zeitblatt" of Nov. 15 of last year: "Even if it (Spiritualism) did not gain its presentable form until 1848, it is in fact as old as the sorceress at Endor, who conjured up Samuel's spirit for Saul. If he is to be a religion, we shall be able to put him together with the Chinese ancestor-worship which is the essence of that religion. Although it has not yet been formed, it is already recognizably turning into a modern paganism, and is struck by the frequently recurring words of Scripture, that it forsakes the living God and consults the dead. According to the law of Moses, the mortal conjurors were to be cut off from the people, and even if we no longer have such a law, we have no doubt that the spirits are a bad deception of the evil spirit, which satisfies the deeper needs of man in a false way by dulling them with intoxicating and anesthetizing means. After disillusionment, nothing but materialism remains."

W.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 24.

February 1878.

No. 2.

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

(Continued.)

IX. Concerning the Doctrine of the Creation of Man. **)

Thetic No. 1.

Hollaz: "Everyone who is emanated from the divine essence is God in essence. But the soul of man is not in essence God. So etc. The first proposition is clear, because no one can emanate from the essence of God without being God. The Logos (the personal Word) or Son of God is God in essence, because he emanates from the essence of God the Father through eternal generation. The second proposition is obvious, because if the human soul were God in essence, it would be omnipotent, etc., which is ungodly to think, and blasphemous to say. . . . From the essence of God the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Godhead, is breathed forth and proceeds from the same; the finite spirits, namely, the angels and the human soul, are produced from nothing. . . . God's generation we are called

1) This is an article begun in the June issue of the 21st volume of this journal and continued until the June issue of the 22nd volume, in which the answer of modern Lutheran theology has already been given to the following questions: 1. What is theology? 2. what is the principle of theology? 3. what is inspiration? 4. what are the properties of sacred Scripture? 5. Do Christian dogmas arise by degrees? 6. what is the right Christian belief of the true God? 7. what is creation? 8. what is the biblical doctrine of angels? Unfortunately, these are not the only articles of the Christian faith which modern Lutheran theology has "advanced," or rather remodeled, falsified, perverted, and destroyed. Not even one of them has been spared by the seawater of our progressors. The result of their work is an entirely new religion, but with the Christian name retained.

2)) For a supplement, compare Year XXII, No. 4, concerning the question: "What is Creation? What is Creation?"

(Act. 17, 28.) Not because of our participation in the divine essence, but because we were created in the likeness of it, as the original cause. Thus Adam Luk 3, 38. is called the Son of God, because he was created in the image of God. . . . If the human soul had flowed from the substance of God, not only the born-again but also the unborn soul would be of God, which is unbiblical and anti-biblical, for 'he that committeth sin is of the devil,' John 3:8. "*)

Calov: "God did not breathe into the soul from His essence, as the Stoics, Epictetus, Seneca, Cicero called the soul a part of the divine breath, and the Manichaeans and Priscillianists claimed that human souls originated from the substance of God. They were therefore condemned by the Bracerenian Council, Chapter 5, because God's substance cannot be communicated (Is. 42:6) and is indivisible. "**))

Buddeus: "If souls are emanated from God's essence, then either a certain begetting of souls from God must be established, or one must assert that the divine essence can be divided into infinite parts. But how absurd this is, Cicero already saw. ... It is well that Pet. Poiret does not want expansion to be said of God, but whether, when one says that the soul is a particle of the divine being, this can be understood without expansion, I doubt very much. . . . And this is at the same time to be noted against Boehme, Weigel, and the others, who must therefore derive the soul from the divine essence, because they think that all created things exist from it by emanation. For either they do not know at all what

*) Quicunque ex essentia divina emanavit, is essentialiter Deus est. At animus humanus non est essentialiter Deus. Ergo. Major liquet, quia nemo ex essentia Dei emanare potest, quin sit Deus. 'Ο λόγος s. filius Dei ideo essentialiter Deus est, quia ex essentia Dei Patris per aeternam generationem emanat. Minor patet, quia, si animus humanus essentialiter Deus esset, foret omnipotens etc.; quod cogitatu impium et dictu blasphemum est. . . . Ex substantia Dei spiratur et procedit Spiritus S., tertia divinitatis persona; ex nihilo producti sunt spiritus finiti, sel. angeli et anima humana. Dicimur genus Dei (Act. 17, 28.) non propter essentiae divinae participationem, sed propter similem ad illam, tanquam causam exemplarem, productionem. Sic Adamus dicitur Filius Dei Luc. 3, 38-, quia in imagine Dei creatus est. ... Si anima humana fluxisset e substantia Dei, non tantum renata, sed et irrogenita anima ex Deo esset; quod est ἀγαφον et ἀντίγραφον, nam qui peccat, ex diabolo est. 1 John 3, 8-" (Examen theologic. P. I. c. 5. q. 10. p. 418. s.)

**) „Animam non de sua substantia inspiravit Deus, uti Stoici, Epictetus, Seneca, Cicero animam divinae particulam auae dixere et Manichaei ac Priscillianistae animas humanas ex Dei substantia extitisse asseruere. Concilio Bracarense e. 5. ideo damnati, quia Dei substantia communicari nequit (Es 42, 6.) et indivisibilis est." (System, locc. th. Tom. III, p. 972.)

they want, or they must affirm something that is incompatible with the concept of a spirit. Not to mention how close this opinion touches on (pantheistic) Spinozism." *)

Gerhard: "The living breath came from God, not out of God." **)

B. Antithetical. No. 1.

Dr. v. Hofmann: "In virtue of the fact that the eternal Spirit of God indwells man, man is a living being, he has his own independent breath of life, which is both his spirit and his soul. ... The term "indwelling of the Spirit of God in man" will now have to apply to the doctrine of Scripture. But we have taught it more closely in such a way that we at the same time made the distinction that to man as I the spirit of God is the effective present ground of his self-consciousness and self-determinableness, while to human nature in its connection with the physical world aiming at it it is determinatively indwelling. ... Since God pours out this spirit (deep sleep Isa. 29, 10.) as well as he promises to pour out a spirit of grace on the citizens of Jerusalem (Zech. 12, 10.), the one as well as the other effect must in the last analysis be traced back to God, and the former" (of the sleep of sin) "not to an admission, but to an effect of God (Ezech. 14, 9.), who wills that there the evil, here the good, should just so appear, to an effect, therefore, which God, because inwardly in man, exercises by his Spirit." ††) (Proof of Scripture, I, 260. 261. f. 265. f.)

*) „Si animae ex essentia Dei emanarunt, aut generatio quaedam animarum ex Deo statuenda, aut asserendum, essentiam divinam in partes infinitas posse dividi. Quod quam absonum sit, jam ipse Cicero intellexit. . . . Bene quidem, quod Petrus Poiretus extensionem a Deo removet, sed an sine extensione intelligi queat, quod dicitur, animam divinae essentiae particulam esse, valde dubito. . . . Atque hoc simul contra Boehmium, Weigelium ceterosque notandum, qui ideo Animam ex essentia divina non derivare nequeunt, quod, res creatas omnes ex eadem per emanationem esse, existimant. Aut enim nesciunt revera, quid sibi velint, aut ejusmodi quid admittendum, quod cum notione spiritus nequit consistere. Ne dicam, quam prope haec sententia a Spinozismo absit." (Institutiones th. dogmat. p. 376. s.)

**) „Spiraculum vitae a Deo factum, non ex Deo." (Loc. de imagine D. § 12.)

(†) He deliberately says: "in man", not: "in the Christian". - If he rightly rejects the threefold division into body, soul, and spirit, then this rejection loses its value for him, since it only has the purpose of serving his pantheistic ideas.

††) We see that H. is serious about his teaching that the spirit of man is the spirit of God; even sinning, though not sin, he attributes to the latter.

Delitzsch: "It is not said that God created a breath outside of himself and introduced it into man, as our ancients, in order to hold fast the creatureliness of the human spirit, believe they must assume. ... God the Creator draws from Himself that which man is to have in common with Him in spirit, He combines into self-life, and thus creates (?) the spirit of man. "**) (System of Biblical Psychology. p. 58.)

Thetic No. 2.

Hollaz: "God (Father, Son and Holy Spirit) said to Himself: 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness,' Gen. 1:26. Thus the first man was made in the image of God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Augustine urges the force of this conclusion when he writes: "God the Father, addressing the Son, does not say, 'Let us make man in your image,' or 'in my image,' but speaks in the plural, 'in our image and likeness,' and who would separate the Holy Spirit from this majority? . . The Son of God is not, nor is he anywhere in Scripture called, the image of the holy Trinity, for then he would be an image of himself and of the Holy Ghost, which is inconsistent; but he is the image of the person of the Father, Ebr. 1:3, because of his eternal begetting from the Father. Therefore Moses by the image of God understandeth not particularly the Son of God." **)

*) To be sure, Delitzsch adds: "This (spirit of man) is as little God as a breath of man is a man. *Nec tu enim* - says Tertullian adv. Marc. II, 8. -, si in tibiam flaveris, hominem tibiam feceris, quamquam de anima (?) tua flaveris, sicut et Deus de spiritu suo. And creaturely is the spirit of man nevertheless, for it came into being (?) at the beginning of time, and conditioned, because it came into being by a free effect of God, but by one not, like the coming into being of other beings, mediated by his, but by an immediate personal effect of God. The spirit of man is a breath that has passed directly from God the Personal into the body, and for that very reason it is a person-forming breath. It is not emanated by God, if one associates with emanation the characteristics of natural necessity and passivity that conflict with the pure concept of creation, but it can be called emanated if one deletes these characteristics. So teaches Scripture." (?!). To be sure, D. remarks below against v. Hofmann's theory also this: "I do not find taught in Scripture any indwelling of the absolute Spirit of God in man, which differs from the world-presence of the Godhead in general, which bears all created things in its particularity." (p. 67.) But if, according to D., man's spirit is "created out of himself" by God, then it necessarily follows either that he cannot be a creature, or that God also contains creatures in himself. D. evidently speaks of the "origin" and creatureliness of man's spirit only insofar as it, though emanated from God, only became spirit through man's divine inspiration.

**Dixit apud se Deus (Pater, Filius et Spiritus Sanctus): Faciamus hominem in imagine nostra, secundum similitudinem nostram*, Gen. 1, 26.

Quenstedt: "God indeed says Gen. 1:26, "Let us make man in our image, that he may be like us," but v. 27 is added, "And God made man in his image. Thus what he had before said in the plural, he immediately repeats in the singular; whence we justly conclude, that though the image be an image of several, that is, of all the three Persons of the Godhead, yet in relation to that which is one in those three Persons, that is, in relation to the perfection of the essence which belongs to all Persons alike." *)

Quenstedt: "It is not revealed in Scripture that the first man was formed in the image of one who was to come, or of one who was yet to come in his time. ... The image after which the first man was formed is not the Son of God in the flesh, but true righteousness and holiness, Eph. 4, 23. or created righteousness, Eccl. 7, 30. But that the Son of God is called "the image of the invisible God," Col. 1, 15. and "the brightness of his glory, and the image of his being," Ebr. 1, 3. is to be understood of the essential image; but here is spoken of our accidental likeness to God. . . . That Adam was made in the image of Christ is a dogma of Osiander, not of Scripture, which teaches simply that man is made in the image of God. . . . Osiander's opinion does not agree with Christ's designation, 1 Cor. 15:45, 47, that he is "the other Adam. For if the creation of man had been preceded in order by the form of human nature presented in the divine mind, Christ ought rather to be called the first, than the other, Avam. ***) "Nowhere is it said that man was made after

Ergo primus homo ad exemplar Dei, Patris, Filii et Spiritus Sancti, conditus est. Vim hujus consequentiae urget Augustinus ad lit. operis imperfecti: 'Non ait Deus Pater, Filio loquens: Faciamus hominem ad imaginem tuam, aut: ad imaginem meam, sed pluraliter ait: ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram, a qua pluralitate Spiritum Sanctum separare quis audeat?' . . . Filius Dei nec est, nec ullibi in scripturis dicitur imago SS. Trinitatis; sic enim foret imago sui ipsius et Spiritus Sancti, quod est *σπογγ*; sed est imago personae Patris, Ebr. 1, 3., ob aeternam a Patre generationem. Proinde Moses per imaginem Dei non praecise intelligit Filium Dei." (Examen th. P. II. e. 1. q. 9. p. 467.)

„Dicit quidem Elohim Gen. 1, 26.: 'Faciamus hominem ad imaginem nostram'; at in v. 27. subjicitur: 'Et creavit Deus hominem *bezalmo*, in imagine sua.' Quod itaque prius in plurali dixerat, mox in singulari repetit; unde recte concludimus: imaginem quidem esse plurium h. e. omnium trium Deitatis personarum imaginem, sed juxta id, quod in tribus istis personis unum est, essentialis nimirum perfectionem, quae aequaliter omnibus personis competit." (L. e. P. II. e. 1. s. 2. q. 4. f. 858.)

) In scriptura non revelatum, hominem primum ad alicujus futuri vel suo tempore venturi imaginem fuisse formatum. . . . Imago, ad quam primus homo fuit formatus, non est Filius Dei in carne, sed justitia et sanctitas vera,

He is said, on the contrary, to have been the Son 'in the likeness of sinful flesh,' Rom. 8:3, and to have assumed the form of a servant, Phil. 2:7." *)

B. Antithetical. No. 2.

Dr. Philippi: "The Son of God is the image of God; man is created in the image of God, that is, in the likeness of the Son." (Ecclesiastical Doctrine of the Faith. II, 361.)

Dr. Thomasius: "Man was the creaturely image of the Son, beholding, willing, loving, willed," seen, and loved by the Father-and for this very reason the good pleasure of the Father in the Son rested upon him." (Christ's Person and Work. I, 202. ed. 2.)

Vilmar: "The archetype of this likeness is God the Son, and so the sacred Scriptures of the New Testament complete the doctrine of creation as the same is given in the Old Testament." (Dogmatics. I, 237.)

Dr. v. Hofmann: "The second thing we have said about the beginning of the self-realization of God's eternal will is this, that the relationship to God, into which man was created on the one hand as a consciously free I, and on the other hand as nature serving itself as the means of itself, is the image of the unequal inner-divine relationship, that is, man is the image of God of the archetypal goal of the world". (Scripture Proof I, 248.)

Thetic. No. 3.

Quenstedt: "The image of God is taken either inauthentically, and so either for the being of the soul itself endowed with the ability to recognize and to will, as some of the ancients took the image of God; or for a certain general uniformity and likeness, by virtue of which the soul of man expresses something divine or is a certain image of the Godhead;

Eph. 4, 23, sive rectitudo concreata, Eccl. 7, 30. Quod autem Filius Dei dicitur 'imago Dei invisibilis,' Col. 1, 15, et 'splendor gloriae et character substantiae ejus,' Ebr. 1, 3, illud de substantiali imagine intelligendum; hic vero agitur de accidentali nostra similitudine cum Deo. . . . Adamum factum esse in imagine Christi, est dogma Osiandri, non scripturae, quae simpliciter docet, hominem ad imaginem Dei esse factum. . . . Sententia Osiandri, non convenit appellationi Christi 1 Cor. 15, 45., quod sit secundus Adam. Nam si creationem hominis ordine praecessit forma humanae Christi naturae in mente divina praeconcepata, ad cujus similitudinem Adam creatus fuerit, Christus primus potius Adam dicendus erat, quam secundus." (L. e. P. III, e. 2. s. 2. q. 1. f. 166. f.)

*) „Nullibi dicitur, hominem creatum esse κατά του νλον, sed κατά τον ὕεόν, indefinite sumtum; e contrario Filius Dei dicitur fuisse ἰν ὁμοιώματι σαρκος αμαρτίας, Rom. 8, 3., et accepisse μορφήν άουλον, Phil. 2, 7." (L. e. P. II. e. 1. s. 2. q. 4.)

Or for the dominion over animals, which the image of God only accidentally pertains to. Or it is actually taken, for that inward integrity and righteousness of his powers created to the first man." *)

The same: "First and foremost, the image and likeness of God, in relation to the intellect, consisted in an excellent knowledge of God and divine things, as well as in an exact knowledge of creatures and natural things; in relation to the spiritual faculty of desire or will, in a complete inclination to the highest good known, and in a voluntary obedience to pot, and therefore in a righteousness and holiness which was perfectly conformable to the law, and excluded all sin; in relation to the sensual faculty of desire and affections, in an undisturbed harmony (of the same) with the higher faculties of the soul." **)

Apology of the Augsburg Confession: "The old Scholastici . . . say that original sin is a defect of the first purity and righteousness in paradise. But what is *justitia originalis*, or the first righteousness in paradise? Righteousness and holiness in Scripture do not mean merely keeping the first table, doing good works, and serving the neighbor; but Scripture calls him righteous, holy, and just who keeps the first table, who keeps the first commandment, that is, who fears God with all his heart, loves him, and relies on God. Therefore, Adam's purity and integrity were not only perfect health, pure blood and undefiled body, as they say, but the greatest thing in such a noble creature was a bright light in his heart to recognize God and his work, a right fear of God, a right heartfelt trust in God, and a righteous mind, a good and cheerful heart toward God and all things divine. And this is also attested by the Holy Scriptures, when they say that man is made in God's image and likeness.

*) „Imago Dei accipitur vel improprie; atque sic quidem vel pro ipsa essentia animae, intelligendi et volendi facultate praeditae, quomodo nonnulli veterum imaginem Dei acceperunt; vel pro generali quadam congruentia et analogia, qua anima hominis quaedam *ὁμοίωσις* exprimit seu exemplar quoddam divinitatis; vel pro dominio in animantia, quod accidentaliter saltem imaginem Dei respicit. Vel sumitur proprie pro interiori illa virium integritate et rectitudine primo homini concreata." (L. c. P. II, c. 1. s. 1. th. 7. f. 837.)

**) Imago et similitudo Dei primario ac principaliter posita fuit respectu mentis seu intellectus in eccellente Dei rerumque divinarum cognitione, nec non exacta creaturarum rerumque naturalium scientia; respectu appetitus rationalis sive voluntatis in plena ad summum bonum cognitum inclinatione et propensione atque spontanea erga Deum obedientia, adeoque in iustitia et sanctitate lege Dei perfecte conformi ac excludente omne peccatum; respectu appetitus sensitivi et affectuum in amica cum superioribus animae facultatibus conspiratione." (L. c. s. 2. q. 5. f. 867.)

For what is this but that divine wisdom and righteousness, which are of God, are formed in man? For what is this but that divine wisdom and righteousness, which are of God, are formed in man, by which we know God, by which God's clearness is reflected in us, that is, that these gifts were first given to man when he was created, right clear knowledge of God, right fear, right confidence, and the like? For thus also Irenaeus and Ambrose, speaking of the image and likeness of God, say, among other things, that the soul is not in the image and likeness of God: The soul is not made in the image of God, in whom God is not at all times. And St. Paul to the Ephesians and Colossians shows that the image of God in Scripture means nothing else than the knowledge of God and righteousness and justice to God. And Longobardus says freely that the first-created righteousness in Adam is the image and likeness of God, which is formed in man by God." (Art. 2. p. 80. f.)

B. Antithetical. No. 3.

Dr. v. Hofmann: "God created man in His image, created him in such a way that he resembles Him: this is what the words say, and the only question is what the image of God should consist of.... The context does not allow for the likeness of a morally holy being to God.... In relation to the animal world the human being is godlike.... Accordingly, the very thing that enables him to control the world around him is also that in which his image of God consists: he was created to be a consciously free I, a personal being. Accordingly, it is not a moral conduct that signifies God-imagehood, but a moral relation." (Proof of Scripture, I, 251. f.)

A. Thetic N. 4.

Quenstedt: "The image of God has not only been obscured and distorted by the fall of the first-fallen in them and in all their descendants, but has been completely lost, so that in the corrupted nature there are hardly any fragments of it left. - A distinction must be made between what is improperly and improperly called likeness, when it is taken either for the substance of the rational soul and the essential qualities of it, the intellect and will, or for a certain conformity and likeness by virtue of which the human soul expresses something divine. And so we admit that the image of God still remains in Adam's offspring. And between that which is taken in the proper sense, namely, for the perfections and excellencies of the soul or its faculties, as well as for the integrity and righteousness of all powers. And so it has been wholly destroyed.- A distinction must also be made between the image of God, when taken in the biblical style, and when taken according to ecclesiastical usage. That in that sense it is wholly and completely

We believe that the image of God is lost; that in this sense some fragments of the divine image remain, we admit. - To the sayings of Scripture Gen. 9, 6. Ps. 39, 7. Weish. 2, 23. 1 Cor. 11, 7. u. Jak. 3, 9. To the statements in Scripture, Genesis 9:39, Psalm 39:2, Wisdom 2:11, 7, and James 3:9, in which it seems to be taught that the image of God still remains, it must be answered that they do not say that fallen and unregenerate man still has the divine image (the word image of God is taken according to the biblical, not the ecclesiastical style), but that man was originally made in the image of God, but that man was originally created in the same image, that all men received it in Adam, as in their head and source, that they are still capable of attaining it, and that it belongs to them in itself, although it is accidentally lost. And therefore man is not to be put to death, nor is he to be cursed, as one whom God hath worthily made in his own image; not as though he had it still, but because it is inherent in him." *)

B. Antithetical. No. 4.

Dr. v. Hofmann: "Therefore it (the image of God) is also propagated by the sinful first created, and not by the holy man, but by man; because he is man, it is said later that he bears God's image. Gen. 9, 5. Jam. 3, 9. . . The Scriptures, therefore, do not understand the image of God in man to mean a moral conduct on the part of man, so that with the entrance of sin the image of God would be lost." (Proof of Scripture, I, 252. f.)

*) *Imago Dei per protoplastorum lapsum in ipsis totaque posteritate non solum obscurata et deformata, sed plane deperdita et amissa est, ut vix rudera quaedam ejus amplius supersint in natura corrupta. - Distinguendum inter imaginem Dei improprie et abusive sumtam, vel pro ipsa substantia animae rationalis, ejusque facultatibus essentialibus, intellectu et voluntate, vel pro generali quadam congruentia et ἀναλογία, qua anima humana quaedam divina exprimit. Et sic concedimus, imaginem Dei in posteris Adae adhuc superesse. Et acceptam proprie, pro animae seu facultatum animae perfectionibus et virtutibus, i. e., pro concreata justitia et sanctitate, omniumque virium integritate et rectitudine. Et sic penitus fuit deleta. . . Dist. inter imaginem Dei acceptam stilo bibli co et sumtam in usu ecclesiastico. In illa acceptione totaliter amissam esse, statuimus; in hac sumtione aliqua rudera imaginis divinae remansisse, concedimus. . . Ad dicta Scripturae, videl. Gen. 9, 6. Ps. 39, 7. Sap. 2, 23. 1 Cor. 11, 7. et Jac. 3, 9-, in quibus imago Dei adhuc superstes statui videtur, respondendum, in illis non dici, hominem lapsum et irrogenitum adhuc habere divinam imaginem (sumto imaginis vocabulo juxta stilum biblicum, non ecclesiasticum), sed hominem primitus ad eam esse creatum, omnesque homines eam in Adamo, tanquam in capite et fonte, accepisse, ejus adhuc esse capaces, ipsisque illam per se competere, quamvis ex accidente sit amissa. . . Adeo- que non est homo occidendus, non est ei maledicendum, quippe quem Deus dignatus fuit ad suam imaginem condere; non quasi adhuc habeat, sed quod per se ei competat." (L. c. q. 9- f- 898- 901. s.)*

Thetic No. 5.

Quenstedt: "A distinction must be made between the divine image itself and that which was necessarily connected with it. Of the image it is said that it was natural to man, because it was created, adhered to him wholly, and could pass on to posterity; but not of that which was connected with the divine image, which was the indwelling of the most holy Trinity; for wherever the divine image is, there is the most holy Trinity. But this indwelling is supernatural, partly because it is not of the kind of created quality that the image is, partly because it presupposes a man already created in his perfection and standing in it (for, according to order, the house is earlier than its inhabitants), and partly because that indwelling of the divine image is supernatural; partly because that indwelling of the Trinity was not one so wholly inherent, or of such a nature, that it would also have passed to the offspring by virtue of begetting, or by means of it, as in the state of innocence the likeness would have passed by means of begetting."*)

B. Antithetical. No. 5.

Kahnis: "The question is whether this harmony (with God) is the product of man's created nature, as the Lutheran Church teaches, or supernatural gift of grace, as the Roman Church teaches, †) A mediation of this contrast lies in the one in the Fathers,

*) Distinguendum inter imaginem divinam, et quae eidem necessario connexa sunt. Imago divina dicitur homini naturalis, quia est concreata, penitus infixa et transire potuit ad posteritatem, non autem connexa cum imagine divina, qualis v. g. fuit inhabitatio SS. Trinitatis; nam ubi est imago divina, ibi est SS. Trinitas. Sed inhabitatio SS. Trinitatis est supernaturalis: tum quia se non habet per modum qualitatis concreatae, ut imago; tum quia praesupponit hominem jam creatum et constitutum in sua perfectione (prior enim est domus ordine, quam illius incola); tum quia illa inhabitatio Trinitatis non fuit ita penitus infixa aut sic comparata, ut etiam vi generationis vel mediante illa transiisset ad posteros, uti mediante generatione in statu integritatis transiisset imago. " (L. c. q. 6, f. 891.)

The Pelagian Roman Church, in teaching that the image of God is a supernatural gift of grace and an addition to the image of God, is interested in being able to assert that man's nature remains in his created goodness even after the loss of the image. Hence it is said in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession: "It has ever come to light that the sophists and the school-disputers have not understood what the Fathers meant by the word 'lack of the first righteousness'. But to teach this thing actually and correctly, and what original sin is or is not, is of great need, and no one can heartily long for Christ, for the unspeakable treasure of divine grace and mercy, which the gospel bears, or have any desire for it, who does not know his sorrow and pestilence, as Christ says, Matt. 9, 12. 2, 17.: 'The healthy have no need of the physician.'" (Art. 2. p. 83.)

The first man, who was born of the spirit of God as the spirit of life, had the bond of fellowship with God in the indwelling spirit of God. If, as John says in the Gospel (1:9), the Logos enlightens every man (!), the light of the Logos, i. e., the Holy Spirit, will also have indwelt the first men. And if it is the Spirit of God who renews the sinner into the image of God (Ephes. 4, 24. Col. 3, 10.), which implies an eternal indwelling of the Holy Spirit, the condition of this renewal by the Spirit into the Spirit seems to be an original indwelling of the Spirit of God. But this one will be justified in calling grace." (The Lutheran Dogmatics. Leipzig. 1868. III, 290.)

A. Thetic. No. 6.

Calov: "By the word (rib) the Jews understand the side, and fable that God created man as an androgyne (hermaphrodite), so that the man and the woman had sexually different bodies, which, however, were connected at one side, but that God separated them afterwards; to which opinion also Eugubinus (Steuchus † 1550) is not opposed. But as Gen. 1:27 apparently says that God created 'them' (the first human beings, but not that one human being) 'a male and a female,' so in the following chapter the creation of each of the two is described differently, namely, that Adam was made of earth, Eve was formed from Adam's rib. The word, therefore, is not to be understood of a side, but of a rib, which, as is intimated, was taken from a side." *)

*) Per vocem XXX Judaei latus intelligunt, et fabulantur, Deum primum hominem androgynum condidisse, ut mas et femina esset corporibus sexu quidem distinctis, at lateribus conjunctis, postea vero separasse; quibus non abnuat Eugubinus. Sed uti Gen. 1,27. „masculum et feminam illos" (homines primos, non vero illum quasi unum hominem) aperte condidisse Deus dicitur: ita cap. seq. distincte utriusque creatio exponitur, quod Adam ex terra productus, Eva ex Adami costa formata sit. Vox ergo XXX non de latere, sed costa accipienda, quae latere exemta innuitur." (System, locc. th. Tom. IV, p. 453. s.) It is true that this thesis is not directly opposed to v. Hofmann's antithesis, since the latter contains, in fact, an entirely new hypothesis; but from Calov's thesis, we think, it can be seen clearly enough how that hypothesis would have been judged by our pure theologians, if it had been presented to them. - By the way, we are far from thinking that Calov's account, which is undoubtedly correct, is a fundamental article of faith, or that v. Hofmann's hypothesis is a heresy. We communicate the latter only to show, first, what almost ridiculous and disgusting peculiarities an otherwise serious man can come to love his system, and, second, because the hypothesis is regarded by v. Hofmann as a, if not necessary, then not unimportant component of his system.

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

B. Antithetical. No. 6.

Dr. v. Hofmann: "Man is created One. . . He was man before he became the man of woman. . . . Man, we say further, became man of woman, and so woman of man; by which it is said that sexual difference is not originally proper to man, either so that man was at first man without woman, or so that he was man-woman. . . If the narrative of the creation of woman is based on the tradition of an experience, then this experience must necessarily be thought of in such a way that the first-created man, when he awoke from his sleep, not only recognized woman for his equal, but also found himself changed, so that he became aware of the connection between the change in his body and the creation of woman. . . But the change that took place in him at the end is not to be thought of in such a way that he was formed for sexual union with the woman beforehand just as he was afterward, and thus, only without the woman, would have been man just as he was afterward. Otherwise, those would not be so wrong who compare the biblical account of the part of the man's body taken to form the woman with the legend of the Greenlanders, according to which the woman came into being from the man's thumb.... . *) The story tells us that man, when God willed him to desire his equal, was granted the fulfillment of this desire by the creation of a woman who was like him but sexually different from him, so that he himself, in that the woman was created from a part of his body, became another, that is, a man formed for union with the woman. . . . If this is the opinion of the narrator, then it will not contradict his meaning that I have undertaken to determine the place from which the part of the body was taken for the formation of the woman, in connection with the fact that the first-created was thereby changed into the man of the woman; and whether thereby the proof that, strictly speaking, neither rib nor side, but a detachable part of the whole signifies, has succeeded so badly" (as Winer in his bibl. Realw. p. 356), "can be left undecided here." (Scripture Proof, I. p. 357. ff.) †)

(To be continued.)

*v. H. refers to "Tuch, Komm, über die Gen." ("Cloth, Come, on the Gen.") for the purpose of making this comparison, p. 44. It is difficult to say why the biblical account of the formation of a woman from a rib should appeal more to unbelieving reason than to v. H.'s imagination.

†) Dr. Kliefoth remarks on this: "Most characteristically and to no small degree confirming our just expressed judgement, v. H.'s Theosophy is based on an

(Translated by Prof. A. Crämer.)

Compendium of the Theology of the Fathers

From

M. Heinrich Eckhardt.

(Continued.)

IV. The parts of man.

How many parts does the human being consist of?

Augustine: "Man consists of two substances, soul and body: the soul with its reason, the body with its senses. 1) Eusebius: "To these God has added a third part, namely, the Spirit of life, which is a power by which the earthly body and the soul made in the image of God are joined and united." 2)

What is the body?

Chrysostom: "As an earthen vessel is nothing but baked clay, so also our body is nothing but clay, strengthened by the warmth of the soul." 3)

The first point is the one that regularly becomes a cliff for all theosophists. At the conclusion of his second Lehrstück, von Hofmann gives a discussion of the course of the creation of man. According to 'Prophecy and Fulfillment' (a writing by H.), to which reference is made, this means: God took away from the sexlessly created man, after he had let him fall asleep, (not a rib, but) that which sat in the place of his abdomen, made of it the woman, and closed the place to man again with flesh and with that which from then on made him a man.... If we disregard the lack of scriptural ground, this theosopheme also fits the system quite well.... As the second person of the Trinity is accomplished in the creation of the sexless man himself, so the sexless man now further opens up into man and woman, and so into humanity. On the other hand, this anthropogony serves not a little to make the Fall of Man, and what is attached to it, fit for the system. For this reason, H. concludes the second doctrinal piece with the remark: 'But as in the biblical narrative the creation of woman stands on the borderline between the creation and the sin of man, so also in our doctrinal whole.'" (Kirchliche Zeitschrift von Dr. Kliefoth etc. Sechster Jahrg. S. 319. f.) Whoever does not consider this, may easily get the idea of regarding such theosophies as innocent gimmicks, which, though lacking all scriptural foundation, do not disturb the coherence of the doctrine of salvation, and therefore should not be reckoned among the doctrinal falsifications, which under certain circumstances may become dangerous, but should at most be smiled at.

Duabus substantiis constat homo, anima et corpore: Anima cum ratione sua, et corpore cum sensibus suis. Aug. de Eccl. dogm. e. 19.

Quibus tertiam partem addidit Deus Spiritum scilicet vitae, qui virtus quaedam est, qua terrenum corpus et quae ad imaginem Dei creata est anima conjunguntur atque uniuntur. Eus. 1. 7. de praep. e. 4.

Sicut vas fictile nihil est aliud, quam coctum lutum: ita et corpus nostrum nihil est aliud, quam lutum animae calore solidatum. Chrys. in 2 Tim. 2.

What is the soul?

DamascenuS: "The soul is a living, simple, incorporeal, immortal substance, not apparent to bodily eyes according to its proper nature, endowed with reason and the faculty of cognition, and not capable of being reproduced, which makes use of an organic body, which communicates to it life, growth, sensation, and procreative power." 1)

. Are souls of God's substance, or a part of it?

Concil. Bracat. "If any man believe that human souls are of the substance of God, as Manichaeus and Priscillian have said, let him be accursed." 2)

How do you prove that?

Augustine: "For it follows that God's nature would be captive, seduced, deceived, disturbed, defiled, condemned, and crucified." 3) The same: "Although the soul is immortal according to its nature, yet it follows that it can fall away for the worse and advance for the better, that it is changeable, and by this it is quite clear that it is not of the substance of God." 4)

Are they blown into individuals directly by God, or given by procreation?

Gregory: "The Fathers made no small inquiry into the origin of the soul. But whether it descended from Adam or was ever communicated to the individual remained uncertain, and they confessed that this question was insoluble in this life. It is a difficult question, and cannot be understood by man. For if the soul is born of Adam's substance with the flesh, why does it not also die with the flesh? But if it does not come into being with the flesh, why is it attached to sins in the flesh that comes from Adam?" 5) Augustine: "We cannot, without danger.

Anima est substantia vivens, simplex, incorporea et corporeis oculis secundum propriam sui naturam invisibilis, immortalis, rationalis, intellectualis, infigurabilis, organico utens corpore, illi vitam, augmentationem, sensum et generationem tribuens. Dam. 1. 2. de Orth. e. 12.

Si quis animas humanas ex Dei credit substantia extitisse, sicut Manichaeus et Priscillianus dixerunt, anathema sit. Concil. Bracat. cap. 5.

Sequitur enim, ut Dei natura captivetur, decipiatur, fallatur, conturbetur, turpetur, damnetur atque crucietur. Aug. contra mend. ad Constant.

Anima tametsi secundum quendam modum suum sit immortalis, tamen in deterius deficiendo et melius proficiendo, mutabilis esse convincitur, et per hoc non esse de substantia Dei, dilucidissime ostenditur. Aug. contra Prisc. et Orig. c. 1.

De origine animae inter sanctos Patres requisitio non parva versata est. Sed utrum ipsa ab Adam descenderit, an certe singulis detur, incertum remansit, eamque in hac vita insolubilem fassi sunt esse quaestionem. Gravis est quaestio, nec valet ab homine comprehendi. Quia si de Adami substantia anima

whether the soul comes into being either by procreation or by being blown in by God." 1)

Do they fall with the bodies?

Martialis: "Though we die according to the body, yet nevermore according to the spirit. For the spirit is called forth of God without death." 2)

Give me one testimony of his immortality.

Methodius: "That the soul is immortal, the Saviour taught clearly, saying it both himself and through Solomon. Even in the story of the rich man and Lazarus, where he says that the latter, after laying down his body, rests in Abraham's bosom, but the latter, according to what he makes Abraham say to him, is in torment. But by Solomon in the Book of Wisdom, "The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and no torment toucheth them." 3)

If they do not die with the bodies, where do they go when they are detached from the bodies?

In Justin: "After going out of the body, there is immediately a separation of the righteous and the unrighteous. For they are led away by angels into places corresponding to them: namely, the souls of the righteous into paradise, where they meet with the angels and archangels, and see the same, add, also beholding the Saviour Christ; but the souls of the unrighteous are brought into hell." 4)

Isn't there a middle town?

Augustine: "There is no middle place where he who was not planted in that kingdom would not be in punishment." 5) The same: "The

cum carne nascitur, cur non etiam cum carne moritur? Si vero cum carne non nascitur, cur in ea carne, quae de Adam prolata est, obligata peccatis tenetur? Gregory. 1. 7. indict. 2. Ep. 13-

Nesciri potest sine periculo, utrum vel ex traduce sit anima, vel ex afflatu Dei. Aug. 1. 1. de orig. anim. c. 15.

Etsi morimur corpore, nunquam tamen spiritu. Spiritus enim sine morte citatus est a Deo. Mart, in ep. ad Burdeg.

Quod immortalis sit anima, clare docuit Salvator, et per semetipsum et per Salomonem locutus. Per seipsum quidem in historia divitis et Lazari: hunc quidem in sinu Abrahae quiescere dicens post corporis depositionem; illum vero in doloribus, per ea, quae Abraham loquentem introduxit. Per Salomonem vero in libro Sapientiae: Justorum animae in manu Dei sunt, et non tangit eas tormentum. Method, ap. Epiph. 1. 2. tom. 1.

Post exitum de corpore statim fit justorum et injustorum discrimen. Ducuntur enim ab Angelis in loca se digna: videlicet justorum animae in Paradisum, ubi congressio est et conspectio Angelorum et Archangelorum, adde et conspectum Servatoris Christi; injustorum autem animae ducuntur in inferni loca. Apud Justin, autor Respons. ad qu. Orth. 75.

Non est locus medius, ubi non sit in supplicio, qui illo non fuerit constitutus in regno. Aug. 1. 21. de Civ. c. 25.

Faith of the Catholic believes on divine authority that the first place is the kingdom of heaven. The second is hell, where every apostate, or one who is far from the faith of Christ, will suffer eternal punishment. A third we know not at all, nor do we find in Scripture that there is one." 1) St. Bernard: "There are three places: heaven, earth, hell, and each of them has its own inhabitants. Heaven only good; earth mixed; hell only evil." 2)

But the Papists believe that the souls of the pious go to Purgatory, and only after the lapse of several centuries to Paradise?

Nazianzenus: "Every pious and God-pleasing soul, after it has been loosed from the bonds of the body and departed, immediately comes to the sight of the good that awaits it, cleansed as it were from darkness and consecrated. Yes, I do not know how to say it, she rejoices with a marvellous joy and exults, and overwhelmed with joyful courage, she goes to her Lord." 3) Anselmus: "By Christ's death so great a peace is brought about, that now the souls of the righteous, when they depart from the body, immediately pass into heaven under the joy of angels." 4)

Subscription Invitation.

In whatever field and with whatever weapons of reason and science the Scriptures, or any divine truth contained therein, have been attacked, God has always raised up and equipped men to meet the enemy on his own ground, and to fight and smite him with his own weapons. As resolutely as our old orthodox teachers held that the holy Scriptures were the only principle of knowledge of all theological truths, they were far from willing to enter into any struggle with those who had rejected their principle.

Primum locum fides Catholicorum divina autoritate regnum credit esse coelorum. Secundum gehennam, ubi omnis Apostata vel a Christi fide alienus aeterna supplicia experietur. Tertium penitus ignoramus, imo nec in scripturis esse invenimus. Aug. 1. 5. hypog. c. Pelag. et Serm. 118. de verb. Apost.

Tria sunt loca: Coelum, terra, infernus; et habent singula habitatores suos. Coelum solos bonos; Terra mixtos; Infernus solos malos. Bernh. in sent, moral.

Omnis bona ac Deo accepta anima, postquam a corporis exolvitur vinculis et hinc discedit, quam primum ad contemplationem boni, quod ipsam manet, pervenit, tanquam a tenebris purgata et lustrata; vel nescio, quomodo dicere debeam, gaudio quodam admirando laetatur et exultatur, ac hilaritate perfusa ad suum accedit Dominum. Nazian. orat, in funere Caesar.

Morte Christi pax tanta effecta est, ut nunc animae justorum, cum de corpore exeunt, mox penetrent coelos gaudentibus Angelis. Ansh. in Col. 1.

cip, already for that reason they rejected them. They even went into the reasons of an atheist, and, taking up what he still had to accept as truth, they sought to convince him of the existence of a God and of the necessity and existence of a supernatural revelation. Thus Calov writes: "The principle of knowledge from which the theological conclusions are derived is solely this: 'Thus hath the Lord said'; or, 'All that God hath asked is reverently to be believed.' Hence divine revelation is revered as the principle of religion. But if any one denies that there is a divine revelation, that principle is proved elsewhere, not only on those grounds with which the truth of principles is usually corroborated, but on far more formidable ones (*eminentioribus*), which are above all objection. For if it is "proved" (if this is denied) that there is a God, and that there must be some way in which God is worshipped by men, it must first be taught that it is impossible that God should not have revealed this way, in order that he might be worshipped in a due manner; then that God willed that men should be led to his enjoyment, and that therefore it must also have been revealed to men in what way they might be led to it; But finally it must be shown from history that God really revealed himself, and willed to furnish this revelation most abundantly with those miracles and evidences by which we are made unmistakably certain that the same is a truly divine one." (*System, locc. theol. Tom. I, p. 268.*)

Since in our day it is above all the natural sciences, and among them especially geology, that are brought into the fray against Christian revelation, and indeed with a confidence as if those sciences, especially the latter, had already once and for all done away with the Christian faith by quite indisputable facts, it is impossible for the Church of our day to avoid altogether the task of proving that the new discoveries in the field of natural science, surprising and dazzling as they may appear at first sight, have brought to light nothing less than such established facts as those who now, like a Goliath, make a mockery of the witness of Israel with them pretend.

It is true that many writings have already been published, even by excellent geologists in their field, in which it has been irrefutably proven, partly that many things are taken for established facts by geologists who are hostile to revelation, which they are not, and partly that the conclusions which they draw from facts that have indeed been established are not compelling conclusions, but nothing but their own fantasies and merely inspirations of their hostility to the revealed facts.

are the plain truth. With these proofs alone, the foundation of the whole proud construction of unbelieving geologists is taken away. Unfortunately, however, many who have so far accepted the cause of revealed truth in this respect, still make many concessions to the opponents, which are not compatible with the unmistakably clear statements of the written Word of God.

Hence the article of Mr. Pastor Eirich, of Albany, N. Y., "Das Hexaemeron im Verhältniß zur Geologie," which appeared in the twenty-second volume of this journal, has been read, as the writer has been assured from various quarters, with the greater interest, as it was free from all those compromises of semi-belief.

Encouraged to do so by lovers of the full truth, Pastor Eirich has now set out to further develop the article referred to and to expand it into a booklet. However, since this booklet had to be written in a language whose comprehension requires a certain degree of intellectual education and is therefore only intended for a limited circle of readers, an invitation to subscribe is hereby issued in order to determine whether the costs of printing will at least be covered by the purchase of the booklet. The book will not have quite the strength of Pastor Fick's "Es ist ein Gott" and therefore the price can be set very low. Our general agent, Mr. Barthel, will accept the subscriptions. It would indeed be most deplorable if the book could not be published for lack of prospect of acceptance. The Church would undoubtedly miss out on a great blessing intended for it. The excellent essay that has already appeared in this journal is sufficient guarantee that the subscriber will receive for a few cents a book of excellent value, of rich instruction on one of the most burning questions of our time, to strengthen his faith. If all readers of this journal would at least hurry to send in their names as subscribers, then the printing of this new apologetic contribution will proceed without delay. Under the title:

The Hexaemeron and Geology

the writing will consist of the following sections:

Chap. I. Historical Introduction.

Chap. II. Theology and geology.

Chap. III. the double creation hypothesis.

Chap. IV. The creation in six periods.

Chap. V. The Biblical Doctrine of Creation.

Chap. VI. The geological hypotheses.

§ 1 Preliminary analysis of these hypotheses.

§ 2 Equality of direct and indirect creation.

- § 3 No fiery primordial state of the earth.
- § 4 Contradiction of geological systems.
- § 8 Limited knowledge of the earth's crust.
- § 9 Uncertainty in the boundary definition of mountain species.
- § 10 Different order of mountain types.
- § 11 Inexplicability of mountain building.
- § 12 Lack of material for the stratified rock types.
- § 13 Miracles of geology.
- § 14 Impossibility of volcanic mountain building for chemical reasons.
- § 15 Impossibility of rock formation from the different specific gravity of minerals.
- § 16 Impossibility of mountain formation from the different fusibility of minerals.

Chap. VII. Paleontological Conjectures.

- § 17 Uncertainty of paleontological determinations.
- § 18 Change of animals and plants by the curse of sin and the flood.
- § 19 Ignorance of the now existing species of animals and plants.
- § 20 Extermination of some animal species through hunting, clearing of forests and climate change.
- § 21 The flood of sin in its effect.

Ch. VIII. no long duration since creation.

Chap. IX. Final consideration.

C. F. W. W.

Miscellany.

Chiliastery. In the Delitzsch - Guericke'sche Zeitschrift of this year, pp. 307-322, there is a review by Lic. Ströbel of that part of Dächsel's Bible work which contains the Revelation of St. John, from which excellent review we believe we must share at least the last section with our readers. It reads as follows:

In the "Concluding Remarks" (pp. 173 ff.) he (Dächsel) has added a kind of apologia, in which he once again presents his principles of interpretation and exegetical results as the only correct ones. Our readers would hardly be served by a reply to this futile pretence, after we have already shown them the ways and aims of Dächsel's apocalyptic. Only one of the "Concluding Remarks" must not be left untouched, because it reflects Dächsel's position on the faith, doctrine and confession of the Saxon Reformation. He begins with the words: "Those members of the Protestant (? "Sardis"?) Church, who faithfully and intimately

the Lutheran (?=,unevangelical? = "orthodox"?) confession, will not easily forgive the editor for having taken such a completely different course in the doctrine of the last things than that laid down by that confession; indeed, they will perhaps for this very reason partly fall apart with the biblical work and regard it as a gift of which they have long rejoiced, but which they now, in order to protect their souls from the poison of false doctrine, would have to put away. Let Wilh. Löhe, now blessedly accomplished and, as we do not believe otherwise, so faithful to the Lutheran Church in his earthly life, step in here and cover the editor with his authority!" And now follows a long Löheian lunge at the "Missouri Synod in America," the contents of which throw a strange light on the delusion of a certain class of German "Lutherans." Löhe, Dächse! and their kind claim in all seriousness to have been worthy of a higher divine enlightenment than Luther and the other Reformers. They say that they do not want to reject the Reformation doctrine, but "could not resist the light of the divine word," for they had recognized "that in these our days God wants to give his poor church greater light and more beautiful clarity in some respects than our fathers had." To these points also belonged (!) eschatological[^], especially concerning the hope of Israel, the 1000 years, and the Second Coming of the Lord. As in general in exegesis and history, so especially in the knowledge of the prophets and the prophetic view of history, the modern age is blessed and more richly endowed than the sixteenth century and those that followed it! Therefore the modern theologian "does not appear as a derogator, but as a faithful one, if he accepts the gift that God offers, and does not despise it because his fathers did not have it. In general, one should not forget: 1) that "among the more important theologians of Germany, there are hardly two who agree with the men of the sixteenth century in matters of eschatology," and 2) that one can "subscribe to the antichilastic Article 17 of the Augsburg Conf. Conf. "can be subscribed to, and that from the bottom of the heart, without therefore agreeing with the teachers who have thrown the baby out with the bath water," etc. etc. What are we to take this exhortation for? Certainly for the short epitome of that super-Lutheranism which, in alliance with the "conservative" powers of the time, demands the due respect for its faithful progress from the Reformation to the Union. He certainly wants to be thought a religious "authority" in the Lutheran Church; hence his mortal hostility to all who disagree with him, including especially the Missouri Synod. Well, Missourians do not believe in the normative enlightenment of the "heavenly prophets" of "1857" and "1875", not in Zinzendorf's "Philadelphia", not in the general Jewish conversion of 1897, not in the Bonapartist Antichrist of 1992, not in the 1000-year Reich of 1996, not aü

the "Second Coming of the Lord" fixed for the year 2996, and since they do not believe in all this, they cannot consider the present "Interpretation of the Revelation of John" to be the bread of life and its author to be only a scribe of the grace of the state, the culture war, and self-conceit. No matter how abhorrent and offensive this rejection of German-Lutheran new faith may be to some, it can only be concluded from this that the Missourians consider our Protestant faith to be something essentially different than the "private opinions of the Reformers", and that they accept our evangelical confession without "*quatenus*," without ifs and buts, without mental reservation, with a righteous "*hvis*," and that they really stand "not as derogators, but as faithful ones" with regard to our evangelical doctrine. And so it behooves every honest Lutheran Christian. Let him know, first of all, that the practical summa of the whole Apocalypse lies in the sentence, "Hold that which thou hast, that no man take thy crown!" If he has but thoroughly grasped this, he will learn to appreciate duly the spiritual gifts and experiences of the Reformation period without vain confidence in his own powers and achievements, in true self-knowledge and modesty. If, on the other hand, the pygmies of the nineteenth century rise in ridiculous pomposity above the flocks of the sixteenth century, this does not remind us (as one would like to persuade us) of the commands of the Holy Scriptures and their last book, but rather of the fable of the wrens, who, sitting on the eagle's tail feathers, allowed himself to be carried by it to the clouds and then, fluttering a few inches higher, called out to the birds with spread pathos: "Look, everyone; I have flown highest! Such a high-flyer was also the classical Unionist Stier, who even heckled Dr. Luther in the pulpit as a mentally and spiritually neglected avenger. But the end of such conceit will be, as it is written, "I will learn not the words of the puffed up, but the power." The gospel of 1517 has successfully contended with pope and emperor, with Müntzer and Bockbold, with death and the devil,-what has the gospel of 1817 hitherto directed? Has it produced houses of worship, divine service, godliness, or has it produced men-servants, materialists, social democrats? - We could illustrate this a little more; but what for? It will already become apparent to everyone of its own accord. In the general test of spirits, which has begun since 1848, Luther and his followers will pass with honor, but the modern reformation preachers will fail with shame.

Unionism. At the same place there is also a substantial, excellent review of Pieper's writing: "Die Einheit der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands etc." (The Unity of the Protestant Church of Germany etc.). With preface by Dr. Dörner. Berlin, 1875", also by Lic. Ströbel, belonging to the ever rarer grains of gold which are lost in the Guericke'sche Zeitschrift. Excerpts from this review may find place here:

That the apostles considered religious and moral error to be no small thing is evident from such sayings as Gal. 1:8, 9; 5:9; 1 Cor. 5:6, 7; 2 Cor. 1:19; 1 Tim. 6:3-5. Nowhere do we read in Holy Scripture that a little sweet dough sweetens the whole dough, or that Jesus Christ was Yes and No, nor that anyone who preaches a gospel other than that of Jesus and the apostles should be considered by every Christian to be a fellow believer. It is true that Mr. Pieper demands "the expulsion of all fundamental false doctrines" from the church. But what does he call "groundbreaking"? Let us read what he says about "the contrast between Paul and Jacob" (p. 39 ff.). All the prophets and apostles testify that man is justified without works of the law, but only through faith in Jesus Christ. We ask, does not soul and salvation depend on this doctrine? Is not, then, the opposite of this doctrine a "fundamental" error? No, it is not! our pamphlet tells us in all kinds of phrases and glosses. So it may be preached that justification comes by works, not by faith? Yes, answers Mr. Pieper, and refers for this antichristic error to the antilegomenous Epistle of Jacob! - More! All the prophets and apostles testify: "The Bible is God's Word, inspired by the Holy Spirit." Many newer theologians, on the other hand, teach that the Bible is the word of men, inspired by their own spirit. Is the latter doctrine not a fundamental error? No, it is not, says Mr. Pieper, although "the doctrine is important enough, and the opposition of opinions is so important, that here and there adherents of the older opinion can easily suspect unbelief in the newer way of teaching." But "the confession remains here as there: the Bible is God's Word" (!?!). Therefore Mr. Pieper chides as "servants of the letter" those who, like Luther and "our partisans," believe and obey the holy Scriptures even "in regard to the story of creation, of the pillar of cloud and fire, of the standstill of the sun, or even in regard to the impediments to marriage laid down in the Mosaic law. Only the "spirit" of sacred Scripture is to be accepted, not its "letter," even though "this distinction between letter and spirit has often been misused" (p. 172. 204). - Now, then, if in the church of Pieper's Confession it is preached that man attains eternal blessedness by his own virtues and good works, not by Christ's sacrifice and merit,-or that the holy Scriptures are not God's Word, but "a book of religion" full of fables and human statutes,-these doctrines are by no means "fundamental" errors, which must necessitate exclusion from the church fellowship. But what then does Mr. P. consider to be "fundamental heresies," since he does not even regard the rejection of the evangelical formal and material principle, and thus the very falsification and overthrow of the foundations of all Christianity, as "fundamental"? To this

This question is easy to answer from the standpoint of the brochure. In the projected "Protestant Church of Germany" there can be only one "fundamental" heresy: the opposition to neutrality of faith, indifferentism, religious mongering, and political union fabrication. We already know this from the history of the Union. When the Union was forcibly introduced into Prussia more than forty years ago, the Rationalists, Pietists and Pantheists, theologically trained by Wegscheider, Tholuck and Schleiermacher, and politically protected by Frederick William III, ruled in the "national church. In these three parties one saw the "Lutherans" and "Reformists" who were to be united into a "Protestant" church. None of these three parties was found to have any "fundamental heresy", even though the Pietist party was based on Catholic foundations, the rationalist party on Jewish foundations, and the pantheist party on pagan foundations. "Fundamental errors" to be eradicated by dismissal from office, imprisonment, graft, dragoons and other manifestations of "love" were found exclusively among those professors, pastors and congregations who, adhering to the Wittenberg Reformation, believed in the normative authority of Holy Scripture, in justification by Christ's satisfaction alone, and in a living, personal God. And wherein consisted the "fundamental" error of these people? Solely in the denial and rejection of the principle of union, which is still no different today than it was then. They now pretend to the ignorant (as they did then) that the Protestant Church must be held together outwardly by imperative human commandments, but that inwardly it must have "room for divergent doctrinal opinions. This is especially demanded by the apostle Paul. He opposes the opponents of the principle of Union, for "he did not belong to those who make peculiar views (!) a reason for divorce. He let himself be guided by the 'spirit of moderation and mildness,' by declaring the erring only to be 'weak,'" and so on. (p. 47.) "Different doctrines" had always prevailed in the apostolic church and among the apostles themselves, "not uniformity in all points. Therefore "the opponents of the union speak their own judgment: their zeal is a noise about nothing; the opposition is not of religious, but only of theological importance, so that it does not affect the confession. The Lutherans, he said, would first like to learn "what theology is as distinguished from religion." The "Christian religion" would always "explode" the Lutheran faith "through its inherent need for a simple world view"; "an artificial system of statutes" could no longer be maintained, for "the nineteenth century turned back to the sources of life on which the earlier centuries had nourished themselves" (!). And what are we Lutheran "statute people" to do now? Yes, "there is no other advice than this: Rise to the position of faith, which is the only justified one in the Lutheran (?) Church; you should give up nothing,

each keep what he has, only you must subordinate your opinions to the faith and therefore unite" (p. 220. 214). - Well, today's unionism is again quite full of words. Well, then, it behooves "confessionalism" also to keep its mouth full, since it is not, like the latter, a statute of men, not an invention of "the rulers of this world, who are perishing, but a wisdom of God, which none of the rulers of this world has known. As the weakest voice of such imperishable wisdom of God, we first of all declare Mr. P. in his own words (p. 219): "No honest and sincere man will be expected to allow himself to be marketed with in real matters of faith, least of all a man like Luther, who courageously defended his faith before emperor and empire." Truly, a good word, the best in the whole pamphlet; let us make use of it! "Honest" lasts longest. And "honestly" put forth, all Untreuer, from Bucerus to Mr. Pieper, are engaged in the business of "marketing" and bargaining for the "faith" which Luther defended before emperor and empire. And for the profitable operation of that business the newer unionists even set out to transform the whole Christian religion into nothing but human problems, theologumena, and private opinions. Rationalism, pantheism, nihilism, denial of Christ's divinity, supernatural birth, resurrection, return to the Last Judgment, etc., all this and much else they declare to be "Christian doctrines" which must find "room" and justice in the united church, because "every man may be blessed according to his own fancy. If this world-view (which our forefathers called "Mamelukenthum") is joined by a political tendency, then the thought arises all by itself that without Christianity "the Protestant Church of Germany" can exist and prosper, but not without union. To introduce this thought into the congregation in as opaque a disguise as possible, Mr. P. offers everything possible and impossible, especially in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the pamphlet.*)

*) Only two more short quotations from the review. Pieper had said in his writing that in his Protestant church the formula of administration: "This is Christ's body" should only be used alongside the formula: "Christ says: this is my body", because the latter was used by the Saviour at the institution of the Lord's Supper ("what blatant nonsense!" adds St.), and the former was only used by the Lutheran pastor who administered it. On this Ströbel remarks: "We thought this ridiculous humbug of 1830 had been buried long ago; but behold, in 1875 one reads again in the Union Bible: 'Jesus gave the disciples the bread, saying, Our Saviour saith, This is my body! So Christ's Savior!' To carry out the Union, Pieper proposes to publish the main symbols of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches together. To bring all these writings together in one volume should be an essential need for "the unity of the Protestant Church of Germany." That would be, Ströbel notes, a church union brought about by typesetters and bookbinders, a *unio typographica*. How "cheaply and badly" one fabricates even in this field in Germany!

Literary.

A. Anton Lauterbach's, Diaconi zu Wittenberg, Tagebuch auf das Jahr 1538, die Hauptquelle der Tischreden Luther's. Edited from the manuscript by *Lic. theol.* Johann Karl Seidemann. Dresden. Published by Justus Naumann's Buchhandlung (Heinrich Naumann). Price 3½ Marks.

As is well known, Luther's students and friends took great pains to record and collect all of his sayings, even those made in intimate circles. These were later published under the title "Table Talks. Since Luther did not see them and did not approve of them, it goes without saying that all reasonable people, with the exception of obdurate enemies, such as the papists, can deduce nothing decisive from them concerning his person and doctrine. As much as it is to be acknowledged that they meant well, since they believed they had to collect and preserve all sayings as much as possible, it is nevertheless to be regretted that they did not proceed more cautiously. For, on the one hand, it is certain that not everything that even a great man says in a familiar circle is suitable for printing, even though it may have been of great interest to those who heard it. On the other hand, everyone will have to admit that in such conversations not everything that is said is always understood correctly. And it is unmistakable that many things have been included in these collections which the dear, zealous friends who distinguish everything have not correctly understood. From time immemorial, therefore, the enemies, especially the papists, have used the Table Talks as weapons to attack Luther's person and teachings. In spite of the shortcomings, however, which cannot be concealed, we are nevertheless grateful to Luther's dear students and friends for this gift of theirs. Despite these shortcomings, the Table Talks remain an important, essentially credible source for our knowledge of Luther's inner and outer life, even if it must be used *cum judicio*.

Among the collectors of such sayings made by Luther in familiar circles, one of the first places is occupied by M. Ant. Lauterbach, who was Luther's housemate and table companion for a time and died in 1569 as Superintendent at Pirna. Aurifaber based his edition of the Table Talks on Lauterbach's notes, but, as he writes, "distribuiert und verfasset in *locos communes*". It is therefore extremely interesting and important to be able to see Lauterbach's complete work for oneself, as he wrote it down. *Lic.* Seidemann has published it under the above title from the manuscript in the Royal Public Library in Dresden. He says about it in the introduction: "The sheets printed below were originally mostly written down in Luther's apartment and at his table, and they are still in use.

Therefore, in contrast to the various revisions and transcribed copies, through which the table speeches, like Luther's letters, have never gained, because very early the right sense of Luther's life and nature had been lost, the whole freshness and lack of make-up of what was heard, to which even the clumsiness of the Latinity forced to written use in the fleeting moment testifies. The diary, as it now exists, he certainly compiled himself for the year 1538 from his papers, as far as they were still at hand." If what applies to the Tischreden in general also applies to this work, it still has a special value as an original work and as an old, venerable document. The value is still increased by many important valuable historical notes, which Mr. Lic. S. has added in the introduction and below the text. . In addition, the book is excellently equipped and provided with an index. G.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The Tennessee Synod had formerly adopted two degrees of ministers: pastors and deacons, and therefore a double ordination. Later it adopted the unlicensed system common in this country, but abolished it again in 1876. As we can see from its synodal report, at its last meeting it dealt with the question of what to do about those who come forward as candidates, since it does not have a seminary, as other synods do, and yet according to its constitution a probationary period of at least one year is required. It resolved that all candidates should be under the supervision of a pastor before hand until ordination, and should complete their studies under his direction. G.

The announced church congress was indeed held in Philadelphia on December 27 and 28 of last year according to the program. We would only be pleased if we could report pleasing results. But how could any benefit be expected from the procedure adopted? There were readings by certain men and a few remarks added by this and that. It might have been useful if, after the truth had been defended, and after the discussion had taken place, the question had been asked, "Are we all agreed on this? That would have been of use. But this true unity on the basis of truth was not in view, but the old false union. It is true that it will be objected that it was testified in advance that neither party would make concessions to the other by participating in the church congress. But union can still be made, and it was made in Philadelphia. Dr. Morris, the chairman, used the name of the brethren in his salutation, and we have not found that the councilmen protested against it. This is union with false believers. For the General Synod has been repeatedly and irrefutably proven to have fallen away from the Lutheran faith. It is true that Dr. J. A. Brown set forth in his wherein the four general Lutheran bodies convention, viz. in the common name, in the

The church believes in the common origin, in the common acceptance of the Augsburg Confession, in the doctrine of justification by faith, in the priesthood of the faithful and the Christian ministry, in the religious education of the youth, and in freedom and diversity in worship. But this is not absolutely true. The General Synod, for example, does not accept the Augsburg Confession as Lutherans accept it, namely, without support. Or does the General Council want to be regarded as accepting the Augsburg Confession as the General Synod does? Further, the General Synod is also not in agreement with the true Lutherans in the doctrine of justification. For even if it leaves the proposition that we are saved by grace alone through faith without works, it follows that when it comes to the development of it, it is decisively rejected. We only remind you of the Liturgy of Prayer and Reception, in regard to which it (the General Synod) again wholly abolishes this doctrine. Nor is it true that, according to Dr. Brown, the same general differences (as exist here among the four larger Lutheran bodies) have existed from the beginning in the Lutheran Church, without causing separation and preventing common work. We would like to see the proof from history. As far as we know, soon after Luther's death, people like those found in the General Synod, the crypto-Calvinists, wanted to force their way into the Lutheran Church, but were pushed out by the Concordia work. With such faithful Lutherans could not and cannot work together. - Dr. Mann spoke of the Lutheranism of the fathers of the Lutheran Church in America, and in his essay described the doctrinal position of the same as unmistakably Lutheran. Now it is to be acknowledged that they had a good will to bring the Lutheran confession to bear, but their Lutheranism, since it arose out of Pietism, was not a healthy and decisive one. Or is Mühlenberg's friendship with the one founder of the Methodist sect, Whitefield, is his pulpit fellowship with Episcopalians "unmistakably Lutheran?" One more curiosity should also be mentioned. Dr. Conrad spoke on the characteristic of the Augsburg Confession, and there also showed his great erudition by asserting, among other things, that the Wittenberg Concord had had an influence on the Augsburg Confession. Dr. Krauth reminded us that the Wittenberg Concord came into being a few years after the Confession. - We add what the "Zeitschrift" says. It says: "On the 27th and 28th of December, 1877, the free conference of 'Lutherans,' organized under the name of '*Diet*,' especially through Dr. Morris' efforts, was assembled in Philadelphia. The attendance was a moderate one, considering that the conference was to be an entirely free one, open to people of all colors and shades. About one hundred pastors and some thirty members of the congregation attended. The papers presented were, as might be expected, of very different value. In addition to very superficial and basic things, one also heard healthy, thorough, and stimulating thoughts. The discussion that followed each time the paper was read was rather poor. It almost seemed as if a certain reserve and trepidation prevailed, which at the beginning did not want to let it come to the right expression. But the longer the meeting lasted, the freer and livelier the discussion became. There was no question of any real discussion of the points at issue. Nowhere did it come to that, and of course not to an agreement on any particular point. That was not intended according to the program. It is not surprising that sometimes somewhat unpleasant reminiscences of 'York', 'Fort Wayne' etc. appeared. But on the whole a thoroughly decent and benevolent tone prevailed. To the younger pastors from our circles, who have never had the opportunity to see for themselves and to come into personal contact with outstanding members of the church, it was a great pleasure.

To get to know the spirit that animates the General Synod and the position they take, a rare opportunity was offered here. The impression was admittedly not a particularly favorable one. One could see that there was a distinct lack of proper acquaintance with that which in truth forms the content of the Lutheran confession. Not infrequently, an unfriendly, even hostile attitude toward the whole of this confession was revealed. Even where it was a matter of simple historical data, it was evident that these men had gone to school, and were still going to school, with the opponents of our Lutheran Church, and that their overall theological view was therefore everything but Lutheran. We became aware, as never before, of the wide gulf that separates us from that side, and of the tremendous progress that the English brethren in the General Council represent beyond that standpoint. They have a different spirit. And if anyone in this Dwt wanted to smell any inclination on their side to give up something of their present position and to flirt with the General Synodal element, he had the opportunity to convince himself thoroughly of the opposite. That one would, of course, be willing on the other side to learn something and to recognize and give up a fundamentally wrong position, of that there was also nothing to be felt. Direct results, therefore, cannot be expected from this first church congress; one would have to be completely blinded to the naked reality

Lutheran Observer. How an editor can use his own paper to glorify himself, the general synodical "*Observer*" gives us a shining example in its number of 14 December. Under the heading: "a beautiful and learned lecture" it prints a note from a secular paper in Allentown, about a political lecture which he held in St. Paul's Church there. It says: "Dr. Conrad has evidently devoted deep and thorough study to the subject, and he shows a familiarity with facts, dates and figures which is truly astonishing. He is an accurate historian, a sound logical thinker, a warm friend of his native country and its form of government and institutions, and a devout, God-fearing man, one of the outstanding pillars of the Lutheran denomination (?). Dr. Conrad is an eloquent, fluent, pleasant speaker." And in this style it continues. I suppose that's what they call modesty and "*journalistic courtesy*" in General Synod? (Gembl.)

History of the origin of Methodist newspaper articles. We find the following curiosity in the "Merry Messenger": "You see, dear Br. Mittendorf, today it is Monday and the woman is washing, and she is every Monday. She's right about that, too, because she has the whole week ahead of her. You see, then I have to look after the baby, because the others are at school; so I get the paper ready and write a piece for the ambassador. I give the baby all it wants, so that it plays and is quiet, and often we have both got quarrels (you know what that is), because everything is mixed up when mamma comes; but then it is written, and the ambassador gets it. Have not the other preachers a baby? and do not their wives wash on Mondays, so that they can write too? That's why I'm so glad we've still got a baby; I don't know how it's going to be, when it's going to be big."

H. W. Beecher has recently, in a sermon, most solemnly renounced the belief in the existence of a hell, yes, among the most gruesome blasphemies against God's eternal punishment. An unbelieving journalist, who five or six years ago heard Brecher preach the opposite, apparently with great earnestness and zeal, protests in a political newspaper against Brecher's present declaration. Had Brecher, says the journalist, when he still had a good bourgeois reputation, the

If the pastor had denied hell, this could have been "reconciled with the usual pulpit politics of the sensational preacher"; today, after all the world knows that the shepherd of souls belongs in the hell once proven and preached by himself, "no one doubts that he has abolished the eternal hellfire only for selfish motives". He concludes with the words: "So we did not bet that the pastor would send sinful laymen to hell: but that he would deny hell as soon as Lucifer himself seized him by the collar. Where would religion come to, if every caught shepherd of souls could strike out eternal righteousness, hell, and its fiery pits, and steal into heaven with nothing to show for it? What is right for one is right for another." - How low poor Beecher has fallen from his former height! A preacher who has fallen into sin and disgrace can do nothing better than to retire into seclusion, and there to his dying day to mourn over the dreadful trouble he has given. The more humble he shows himself, the sooner he can hope that even the world will not dare to mock him and seek in his example a reason to despise the word of God and the sacred office. But if a fallen preacher wants to hold on to his ministerial dignity by force, it does him no good with the world if he now wants to play the liberal. Even the world, which indulges its own prophets, the ungodly apostles of unbelief, even in the most manifest immoralities, has a justifiable abhorrence of preachers who present to others the way to heaven as a narrow one, but are themselves revealed as secret comrades of those who go the broad way of the flesh. W.

The Cumberland Presbyterians are also doing missionary work among the Germans. Here in St. Louis they have two German congregations.

Ireland supplies the largest contingent to the Roman population in America. Of the 10 archbishops, 4; of the 56 bishops, 29; of the 5200 priests, not less than 3000; and of the 6,500,000 laity, 4,000,000, are from that country.

Jews. A certain Rev. David Rosenberg, M. D. in Columbus, O., has published the following call: "A call for a national convention is hereby issued to all Israelites who are now willing to accept Jesus Christ as the promised Messiah of the world, as well as to all those who have already accepted Him in their forefathers and have maintained their membership in the tribe of Israel through their name or otherwise. God says Gen. 49:10: "The scepter shall not be taken from Judah, nor a master from his feet, until the hero (Shiloh) come, and to him shall the nations cleave." The scepter and the master was stolen from Judah 1878 years ago. That is why Shiloh came and "we knew him not." The purpose of this convention is to 1. Establish an alliance of all converted Jews and Israel throughout the world, and set a time to confess the sin of the nation in rejecting and crucifying Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and thus bringing God's wrath upon the nation. Therefore, God has said, the nation shall be scattered abroad, until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in. God has promised, "If we confess our sin, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sin, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." 2. To form a basis to a national existence on the Scriptures of the New Testament as the statute and law of the nation. 3. To petition the world powers to restore Palestine to the people of God; for this is the day of grace. The conflict in the East indicates that the Day of the Lord is near.

II. Abroad.

Pastor Diedrich writes in his "Dorfkirchenzeitung" of the month December v. J. in relation to the Concordienformel jubilee celebration: "One has symbols to it, at them with like-minded to recognize itself for this church going together in heaps through

the world; but to celebrate festivals for it is quite vain." Only a Diedrich is capable of such a ("Schwarmgeisterische", or stupid?) judgment.

W.

Lauenburg, the former duchy, politically united with Prussia, is to be drawn into the great union body of the national church. For the time being it is united with Schleswig-Holstein and placed under its synodal constitution. In the pre-synod of Sept. 20. (8 clergy, 16 seculars, Superintendent Dr. Brömel, 4 appointed by the King), the Schleswig-Holstein constitution, about which so weighty complaints are raised in those countries by those faithful to the confession, was unanimously accepted, but with reservations. On November 7, the King confirmed the resolutions of the Synod and acknowledged the reservations; namely, the confessional status is not to be touched and the old church order of Lauenburg is to remain in its present validity. How long will this be tolerated by a liberal majority in the Synod? - So we read in the Elsaffer "Friedensboten".

Bohemia. The "Ev.-Luth. Friedensbote" of December 2 of last year writes: From a letter of Superint. Molmar in Prague: "The Bohemian Lutheran Diocese, of which I am Superintendent, consists of 14 German and 12 Bohemian congregations. The German congregations belong to the western seniorate, the Bohemian to the eastern seniorate. With God's grace I succeeded in maintaining fraternal harmony in the Superint. convent. At the beginning of the Convention I gave a lecture. About the internal condition of the church I said: "Although there is much to be desired, we must nevertheless gratefully confess that the vineyard of the Lord is nowhere desolate. In all congregations, in all pulpits, and as much as is known in all Protestant schools in this country, the pure and clean Word of God is preached and taught. Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God, our Redeemer and Beatificator, is the focus of preaching, and the sacraments are administered everywhere according to the institution of the Lord. But it must not be concealed that the participation in the Lord's Supper has diminished alarmingly, especially in the congregations of the western (German) Seniorate, so that in 1876, out of 10,731 souls, only 3419 communicants were counted, while the eastern (Bohemian) Seniorate, with 12,620 souls, had 11,463 communicants. - The schools are in a satisfactory condition; the double burden (contribution to the state and the church school) presses the parishes sensitively, but the 20 schools of the diocese can be maintained, even increased, so willing are the parishes to sacrifice. The whole diocese counts 1638 school children under 29 teachers and 2 female teachers. - We are preparing for the centenary of the Josephine Edict of Tolerance, Oct. 13, 1881, and wish that at the same time as our congregational hymns, the shout of jubilation will resound; our church has guaranteed and secured its planting sites, the Lutheran school!

Bavaria. At the General Synod in Ansbach in October of last year, Professor Dr. v. Hofmann from Erlangen was chosen as the speaker of the Catechism Committee, as reported in the "Allgem. ev.-luth. Kirchenzeitung" reports. At this news one is tempted to exclaim with Cicero: "*O praeclarum ovium custodem (ut ajunt) lupum!*" "The "Kirchenzeitung", of course, says: "In any case, the question of catechism in Bavaria has taken a significant step forward, and the one who has contributed the most to this is Prof. Dr. v. Hofmann, who has responded so lovingly to the needs of the school, has recognized so clearly and sharply what it needs and needs, and has known how to put everything into the right words". That v. Hofmann believes neither in a triune God, nor in a real reconciliation of sinners through Christ, nor in justification by faith, thus denying more or less what Christianity means, is of course not amused by the "Kirchenzeitung". W.

Bavaria. "The missionary institute in Neuendettelsau intends to open a heathen mission among the Papuans in community with the Immanuel Synod (Fr. Diedrich). Would not chiliasm be an obstacle here, which the students of Neuendettelsau do not allow to be forbidden?" Thus writes the Elsasser "Messenger of Peace." He does not seem to know that the Immanuel Synod is quite versatile. At times it can take a very exclusive position, but at other times it can also take a very liberal stand. Both according to need. Its principle seems to be: Everything but the appearance of being Missourian; and at least this principle she also carries out with iron consistency. W.

Sweden. The last General Synod of the Lutheran Church of Sweden was held in the Parliament building in Stockholm and closed with a speech by Archbishop Sundberg. The Synod represented in its deputies two parties, the High Church and the Pietist. The former counted its representatives mostly among the clergy, the latter among the laity. The subjects which occupied the Synod most were a new translation of the New Testament, a revision of the catechism and the liturgy, the internal and external missionary activity of the church, and others. The most important question, however, was the bill concerning those who had left the Church. The government had submitted this new law to the Synod for approval or rejection. It was passed by a large majority. It stipulates: Members of the Lutheran National Church may leave the same when they have reached a certain age. Mixed marriages may be contracted and consecrated by the regional church if requested by both parties. The bishops shall assign a place on the burial grounds to those who have left, in order to bury their dead. - The bishop's cap and robes of splendor are to be abolished. - The spirit of the liberals in Germany had also infected several Swedish gentlemen, who made all kinds of proposals. But none of them passed. One wanted to grant conjugal blessing to those who were not confirmed and did not communicate. Another wanted to take away from the pastors the keeping of the registers of births, marriages and deaths - which would be no harm and hopefully not against the confession! A third thought that the children should be relieved of the heavy burden of learning the catechism by heart.

Australia. As we read in the "Kirchliche Mittheilungen" of the Löhneys in No. 11 of this year, Pastor Rechner, a member of the Australian Immanuel Synod, writes to Inspector Deinzer in Neuendettelsau: "As far as the agreement with the South Australian Synod is concerned" (he means the now "Evangelical Lutheran Synod in Australia"), "which we would like to see, the last thread of hope has now been cut, since the South Australian Synod, in its March meeting of this year, has issued its final statement. Lutheran Synod in Australia", "which we would like to see, the last thread of hope is now cut off, since the South Australian Synod in its church constitution, issued in March of this year, expressly states the following provision: 'Not to permit the teaching of Chiliasm in its preaching chairs.' We, on the other hand, wish to maintain: 'the doctrine of chiliasm is not church-dividing.' We do not deny church fellowship to those who do not have it" (certainly a great liberality!), "but we will not have it forbidden us." The Immanuel Synod, so far as its doctrinal position is concerned, seems to be quite equal to the Iowa Synod here, only as far as honesty is concerned, it seems to excel before the latter. W.

Ritualism in England. We read the following in the "Evangelical Lutheran Messenger of Peace" of 9 December last: "England is often praised as the Protestant country *par excellence*. But in many respects Protestantism there looks sad. To speak of only one thing, the movement in the national church in favor of ritualism, it must unfortunately be conceded that it is increasing more and more....

takes. Then the Protestants, who for years have fallen back to the Pabst Church, will get a large increase through these ritualists (who take papal ceremonies into the liturgy and the service and still want to be Protestant), if they have to leave. In the meantime they have founded an 'Order of *Corporate Reunion*' and invite people to join by means of an appeal. This appeal enumerates all the reasons why their State Church cannot be the Church of God, solemnly protests against the appointment of bishops by the State, and appeals to the next 'free, general council of the one, holy, Catholic Church'. The appeal continues: 'Our longing, our prayer and our activity is directed to the real reunion of Catholic Christians through the assembly of such a general council under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. In the name of God the Triune and under the patronage and protection of the Blessed Virgin and Mother of God Mary, the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, St. Gregory the Great and St. Augustine of Canterbury (the Apostle of England) we have solemnly and formally united ourselves to the Order of Universal Reunion, pledging to our chosen Superior in the said Order and to each other fidelity and cordial adherence in conformity with the present and subsequent statutes to be determined by the Authority. As the basis of this union we accept the Catholic faith as it was established by the first general church assemblies, recognized by the entire church of the East and West before the great deplorable schism, and as universally accepted in the Apostolic, Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds. We declare our unreserved submission to all these sublime doctrines, as well as to the principles of ecclesiastical institution and discipline established and approved by those seven general councils. Further, until the whole Church shall declare itself on this point, we also accept all those dogmatic provisions of the Council of Trent which have reference to the doctrine of the sacraments.' In the following issue, the "Messenger of Peace" writes the following on the same subject: "The danger to the Anglican Church posed by the ritualism of which we have recently spoken is shown in a paper by Lic. Mettgenberg in Bonn. It shows how, among the ritualists, one papal doctrine after another, one abuse after another, is growing like mushrooms on the swampy ground of ritualism. Already they accept priestly ordination as a sacrament, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Presentation of Bread, the papal heresy on confession and absolution, even the Assumption of Mary, plus the adoration of the Host, the adoration of the saints, processions and petitions, monastic vows, and the celibacy of priests." - The Anglican Church, alas, did not once break completely with natural reason in matters of faith, nor with the mechanism and hierarchism of the papacy. Now the apostolic word is fulfilled in her, "A little leaven leaveneth the whole dough," and, "Her word eateth about her as the crab."

W.

Necrological. On December 20 of last year, on the eve of his sixty-seventh birthday, the full professor of theology at the University of Erlangen, Dr. Joh. Christ. Konrad v. Hofmann, known by name as the author of the dogmatic work "The Proof of Scripture". He was born on December 21, 1810 in Nuremberg, where he also received his high school education, then attended the universities of Erlangen and Berlin, was first professor of theology in Rostock, then since 1845 until his death at the University of Erlangen.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 24.

March 1878.

No. 3.

(Sent in by Dr. Sihler.)

To the confessional registration and its pastoral use.

Motto: "And the LORD said, What a great thing is a faithful and prudent steward, whom the LORD hath set over his servants, to give them their hire in due season." Luc. 12, 42.

Unfortunately, it is an obvious fact how miserable and pitiful the situation is in many cases in the various Lutheran synods with regard to the personal registration for confession. In the so-called General Synod, which, thoroughly unionist, holds on to the Lutheran name like a robbery, against all law and truth, the rapturous practice takes place with impunity, that this and that of its *speechmakers*, in a good methodist way, also invite members of other ecclesiastical communities of *good standing* to the The latter, being no better learned and instructed, are well pleased with the liberality and broad-mindedness of their fashionable pulpit orators.

Even in the area of the General Council, which in spite of all theses continues to give no round, simple, unambiguous, honest answer on the basis of the Holy Scriptures and in accordance with the church confession - even in this church body, to our knowledge, personal confession does not take place as a standing custom and church order of the individual congregations of the various synods. In the large congregations of the East, as is well known, lodge brethren and those who are not lodge brethren live together in harmony, and unionists and reformists are not lacking among them. How would it be possible that such preachers, who fear men more than God and His Word, are more concerned about their belly and honor than about the honor of God and the spiritual benefit of their congregations - how would it be possible that such preachers, in an evangelical way, would have introduced the personal confession by thoroughly instructing their congregations. Instead of this, it is the custom now and then, that he who has made the holy

The priest who desires Holy Communion sends his pastor a note with his name on it. And thus it happens that the pastor is unable to examine the state of knowledge in this person, whether it is sufficient to receive Holy Communion salutary. In such a case, however, the pastor is not without blame if this or that communicant partakes of the sacrament to his judgment; for it is not necessary for one to be a dog or a sow (Matt. 7:6) in order to justly receive the sacrament.) to justly refuse him even the sanctuary and the pearl of Holy Communion, which refusal even in this case occurs only exceptionally in the Lutheran state churches of Germany; He may also be so ignorant of the nature of the law and gospel, of the nature and custom of the sacrament, of the proper nature of repentance and faith, and at the same time be afflicted with all kinds of superstitions, and perhaps also be in some kind of hatred or unforgiveness toward his neighbor, that the enjoyment of Holy Communion would only be to his serious harm and ruin.

It is therefore either a criminal ignorance or a still more criminal unconscionability on the part of Lutheran pastors, in or out of General Council, if they do not "persevere in all patience and doctrine" to introduce personal confession in their congregations. It is about 33 years since a pastor from a certain synod declared to the writer of this, that this would not do in America; and whichever pastor attempted it, would soon find that the congregations opposed this institution like a man, or divisions arose. And here we are! We have tried and succeeded, and neither of these evils has come to pass, with the exception of a very few cases. And if there were some stubborn and somewhat troublesome heads who at first did not want to submit to this wholesome ecclesiastical order, we went to them and visited them in their homes and instructed them and asked them about the state of their knowledge of the wholesome enjoyment of the Sacrament. The usual course, however, was for them to be ashamed and then to come to the register of their own accord, like the others. For in every righteous synod it should be a matter of conscience that, according to Article 25 of the Augsburg Confession, the Lord's Supper should be administered only to those who have first been "interrogated" in a confessional and pastoral manner, i.e. not juridically and inquisitorially, and who are found to possess sufficient knowledge and are also able, according to the apostle's words, to "examine themselves" before they go to the table of the Lord.

Now it is impossible that the word of God, according to Isaiah 55:10, 11, should come back empty and remain without fruit, if the pure doctrine of the law and the gospel has been in existence for a long time, publicly and especially. But it will not only show its light and power in this, that the Holy Spirit, through it, in producing repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, will bring salvation to the sinner.

and converts these and those baptized who have become unrighteous from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God; furthermore, it will not only prove similar in that it keeps the converts in the true faith and godly nature and holy conduct until the end, but it will also have an average effect on the believers of an increasing knowledge of sin and grace, although the hypocrites will only gain a head knowledge from it.

With such a growing ability for self-examination, partly in general, partly before the enjoyment of Holy Communion, the question now arises for the servant of Christ and his congregation: How should he, as a spiritual father, pastorally use their confession for his individual church children, for their benefit and good, in the wisdom of Christ's love?

The summary answer is contained in the above saying; for although the context teaches that this word of Christ does not refer exclusively to the ministers of the word and stewards of God's mysteries, it is at the same time evident from it that it refers preferably to them.

So Christ testifies that it is a great thing, an exceedingly precious gift of God, to have a faithful and prudent steward. Faithfulness is based on the attitude, prudence on the way of proceeding. This consists in the fact that the servant and steward of Christ, in all his official work with and according to the word of God, as it says, publicly and especially keeps in mind the glory of God and the salvation of the whole congregation as well as of each individual member of it. In this, he should show steadfast obedience to the will of Christ, the master of the house. Prudence consists in having the understanding and skill to give the servants of the master of the house, the servants and maids of Christ, that is, the members of his household and the children of the church, their due in due time.

This does not only refer to the public preaching and teaching of the divine word, but also to its use and application to the individual church children, for which the personal confession offers the best opportunity to their spiritual father and pastor. This, however, is all the more important since the better earlier communion books, which also helped the confessor to examine himself more closely, have pretty much fallen into disuse, but in the pietistic era also degenerated and contributed to a certain self-torment and unfruitful disturbance of consciences. Luther's questions for those who want to go to the Sacrament, with their answers, are also hardly used by many. All the more, then, does the pastor have the reason, indeed the duty, to serve and help his parishioners by the evangelical, loving and wise use of the personal confession and to promote their spiritual benefit. It is also reasonable to assume that many of them already in a serious mood of mind have gone to

confessor and are therefore all the more receptive to his ministry of love. And if some come thoughtlessly and absent-mindedly, they are brought into the right mood by the appropriate questions, teachings and admonitions.

But there are many spiritual needs of those who go to their pastor to partake of Holy Communion.

First, there are the young people, including the newly confirmed. Here it is necessary, especially for the latter, to first have a piece of the Catechism recited; for the sender of this has more than once encountered that children who were confirmed at Easter and had been instructed in the Catechism for 4-5 years by faithful and capable teachers, of whom a main piece with explanation was recited before each Catechism lesson, could no longer memorize it in the fall, since then, of course, little or nothing of the inner understanding was present. So repugnant is divine truth to our flesh, and so great is the indolence of so many fathers of the house, who do not perceive their household priestly profession, and who have the very good time, in the evening after the meal, to have their school children and the confirmed ones, whom they still have in the house, recite to them a main piece of the catechism with the explanation, and to add now and then a fatherly instruction and exhortation.

With the young people who have grown up more and more, who serve as apprentices, merchant servants, servants and maids, their pastor now has a desired opportunity to enter into a confessional conversation, first of all with reference to the first and fourth commandment and with the use of Ps. 119:9, and to go into more detail about the Christian guidance of their particular profession. In it he would have to instill in them the fear of God, warn them against all service and greed for reward, encourage them to serve their neighbors, show them the love of Christ, admonish them against carelessly changing their jobs or even their profession, and encourage them to patiently bear even the most difficult masters. Furthermore he should have warned them on the basis of the holy scriptures, e.g. 1 Joh. 2, 15-17. He should also warn them fatherly, on the basis of Holy Scripture, against the lusts of youth and the love of the world, against visiting drinking houses and dance halls, against the addiction to finery and favors, and against secret love affairs behind their parents' backs. He should warmly admonish them to persevere in the use of the divine word, as in church, so at home, and to pray, and he should paint before their eyes the lovely and enticing picture of a godly and godly youth and virgin, who take Ps. 119:9 to heart.

On the other hand, fathers and mothers of households also come to partake of Holy Communion, either together or, as is usually the case, separately. Now the steward of Christ has a new opportunity to give these members of his household their due, and that for the sake of

the better, the longer he uses them and the better he knows them. For example, there is a householder who is weak in the knowledge of sound doctrine, yet willing to learn. To him, then, he must interpret the Scriptures as plainly and comprehensibly as possible in those points in the knowledge of which he is still weak, as being useful and wholesome "for teaching," in order to strengthen and promote his knowledge. Another, influenced by the Unionist spirit of our time, does not view the dangerous and pernicious heresies of the Reformed Church with the eyes of a sound Lutheran, enlightened by the Holy Scriptures. God's Word, which is also useful "for punishment," for the refutation of error, is to be brought closer to the mind and conscience of the latter.

In the case of the third, fourth, etc., there are many weaknesses and infirmities in the Christian life and walk. The first is anxious and careful, especially in these troubled times; the second is careless or indolent, and not faithful enough in his earthly occupation. A third is easily overtaken by anger at home and thus becomes unjust to his wife and children. A fourth is not so liberal and willing to sacrifice in matters of the kingdom of God as he ought and could be according to his circumstances. A fifth is in danger of making himself like the world, whether in the way of acquiring and increasing money and goods, or in taking part in various worldly pleasures and amusements, and also otherwise abusing his Christian liberty against the love of his neighbor. A sixth, who was a drunkard before his conversion, is still not careful and watchful enough against the formerly popular and habitual sin, and has not yet brought himself to abstain from strong drink to such an extent that he does not fall into heavy temptation again and again, even if he does not get drunk as he did before. A seventh still holds no or no regular house service and recitation of the catechism of his children. An eighth is guilty of marital discord one way or another. A ninth fails in the discipline of children, either through the excess of legal strictness, which degenerates into harshness or capricious arbitrariness, or, what is more common here in this country, through softness and laxity, through lack of wholesome discipline and restraint, and the excess of letting them loose, etc. Finally, there are often quite a few of them who are lax in attending public worship, especially on Sunday afternoons and weekday evenings, when it takes place. And since the public punishment of this indiscipline does not usually accomplish enough, the individual culprits are more easily dealt with when they register.

In all these and other cases the Holy Scriptures are to be applied "as a useful remedy," and each particular patient is to be offered from this spiritual apothecary the healing remedy that is suitable for him. And if it is accepted with repentance and faith, it has, of course, the inestimable

It has the advantage over all earthly medicines against bodily diseases that it is always effective, has a healing effect and produces and maintains spiritual health.

If the housemothers make a special request, their pastor will have a desirable opportunity to impress upon their hearts in a serious and loving way the great importance of their maternal profession, in which the feminine and the domestic culminate and are perfected; For in the busyness of their daily domestic work, it must be made clear and impressive to their minds and consciences, from and according to God's Word, that and how the truly Christian education of children, "the discipline and admonition to the Lord," is also involved in their part, in short, this exercise of their maternal profession is much more important than all their skill and ability in cooking, roasting, baking, washing, sewing, darning, and mending, even though all this is also a pure service of God if it flows from true faith in Christ and is done in the love of God and neighbor.

Here their spiritual father must earnestly admonish them and sincerely ask that they daily call upon God for grace and wisdom for the godly direction of their so highly important maternal profession; For it will be clear enough to them from their own experience that in the discipline of children we are all unable by our own reason and strength to be sometimes too strict, sometimes too lax, sometimes to enjoin or forbid too much, sometimes too little, and do not persistently insist on punctual obedience, even if we have to force it by blows. Furthermore, it will be difficult to conceal from them how they, when they undertake it on their own ability, often provide for it, e.g. For example, they do not punish temperamental naughtiness of the child, which is annoying to them, too harshly or untimely, but moral transgressions against God's commandments with the seriousness they deserve, they make an evil distinction out of carnal preference for one or the other child and act unjustly against the other children and thereby cause envy and hatred in them against the preferred child, they also do not sufficiently distinguish the different dispositions of the children, in that each is to be treated in its own way, and so on. So dear mothers, ever mindful of their own inability, would have great cause to call upon God daily with great earnestness, that out of and according to his word he would bestow upon them by grace mouth and wisdom and the right word in the right place, in order to bring up their children "in discipline and admonition to the Lord. And Christ said, "He that asketh receiveth."

At the same time, however, their pastor urged them to earnestly ask God's blessing on their Christian discipline and admonition, so that it would also be effective in their children; for this, too, was God's free grace and was not earned by their labor of love as a debt due to God. On this occasion they also referred to the godly example of Timothy's grandmother and mother, Lois and Eunice.

which St. Paul mentions in 2 Tim. 1, 5. and 2 Tim. 3, 15. further testifies that through their ministry "Timothy knew the holy scriptures from his infancy, which instructed him to salvation through faith in Christ Jesus". For this is certainly the noblest service of possible love, when godly mothers paint their Saviour vividly and warmly before the eyes of their children from an early age and seek to press him into their hearts, after they have first sharpened the law for them and, especially in the case of grosser transgressions, have uncovered their naturally evil hearts and made them palpable in their consciences, and, whether God wills it, have produced repentance and sorrow in them. With law and gospel, then, the dear mothers must continue; for in their interpretation and application consists the whole "discipline and admonition to the Lord.

Here, as above in the relationship to the fathers of the household, the spiritual father of both must at the same time apply the Holy Scriptures as "useful for chastisement, i.e., for education in righteousness," namely, how both, as believers, are to lead a godly, righteous, Christian life through the light and power of the divine Word also in their occupation as fathers and mothers of the household.

According to Romans 15:4, the Holy Scriptures are also useful "for consolation. And the pastor is likewise to make appropriate use of it on the occasion of the confession, in order to give his church children, who are in need of consolation and eager for consolation, their due. But alas, God be lamented, there are on an average far fewer of them to comfort than there are to punish. And mostly these are only those who suffer over outward crosses and afflictions. The one, for example. In the present inhibition and stagnation of business transactions, one person has no work, and thus no income, for weeks and sometimes months; another has much illness in his family or in his own body; a third has had deaths in his house; a fourth has all kinds of disagreements and quarrels in his relatives through no fault of his own; a fifth has peaceful, churchless neighbors; a sixth has lost the money he lent, a seventh the money (or goods) he put at risk by a guarantee, and so on.

These are, of course, very mixed cases, in which the pastor must distinguish and proceed wisely and carefully, and not apply comfort too hastily and liberally; for in the last two and similar cases punishment is often more appropriate than comfort.

In addition to those mentioned, there are also parishioners who are naturally afflicted with a melancholy temperament. They are often plagued by the unbelief of fear and worry, often walk as if in a dense fog, often see nothing in the sky but threatening storm clouds, and are in constant anxiety and worry about what the near future may hold for them in terms of gloom and difficulty.

so that the childlike thanksgiving even for this and that special goodness and benefit of God in the present is swallowed up by this petty fear of the future.

Here the faithful and prudent steward has the task of painting the goodness and grace of the master of the house, according to all three articles of the Christian faith, out of and according to God's Word, comfortingly before the eyes of these weakly believing, anxious and fearful members of his household, and to lay it to their hearts, so that their faith may be strengthened, the dim black clouds dispersed, and Christ, the sun of righteousness, may again shine comfortingly and brightly into their hearts.

The most gratifying opportunity for comfort, however, is offered to a righteous pastor by consciences awakened and startled from their sleep of sin by the thunder of Sinai, hearts which the hammer of the law, in spite of their rocky nature, has thoroughly crushed, and whose sins pass over their heads, so that they begin to experience thoroughly in their own hearts the penitential psalms of David, according to the side of the law; For the demanding, threatening, cursing, killing, and condemning of the divine commandments are ever before their eyes; their conscience, thus awakened and sharpened, which adheres to the law of God, stands up against them continually as a true accuser, incorruptible witness, and righteous inward judge; and they become aware in their anxious spirit that God is a zealous God against sinners, and a consuming fire.

The great pity is that in older congregations, where the pure Word of God, according to Law and Gospel, has been preached for decades, and where the preaching is not lazy and sleepy, but thorough and edifying, such poor penitent sinners, who are very anxious for comfort, become less and less known to the pastor, whether among the younger or older members of his congregation. And from this it is to be feared that the multitude of Christians who are false, hypocrites, with whom the word of God falls by the wayside or among the thorns, will increase more and more. These are the people who perhaps, especially on Sunday mornings, come very diligently to church, enjoy the sacrament a few times a year, avoid grosser sins, show themselves civilly honorable and just, are probably also, in a human way, good friends and faithful neighbors, are service-minded and obliging, but are not insistent on their outward affiliation with the Lutheran, i.e., orthodox, visible church. They rely on their outward affiliation with the Lutheran, i.e., orthodox, visible church, but in the worship meetings they draw near to God with their mouths and honor him with their lips, but are far from him with their hearts, for they are neither poor sinners in Adam nor righteous in Christ; And notwithstanding all their preaching of the law and the gospel, of repentance toward God, and of faith toward our Lord JESUS CHRIST, they continue in vain to build up their righteousness before God out of their outward churchliness and godliness and civil righteousness.

Their saying is, "What am I lacking?" but not, "What shall I do that I may be saved?" They are called Lutherans, that is, orthodox and orthodox Christians at the same time; but in their hearts and in their minds they are the Pharisees of old and the Papists of new times. And though they pretend with their mouths that they are sinners, and that Christ is their Saviour, yet inwardly they continue to resist the word of God, so that, from God's righteous judgment, they become more and more blind and obdurate, and the hammer of the law only makes their hearts harder and harder like an anvil, while they abuse the gospel for carnal liberty, or at most make Christ a stopgap.

Nevertheless, their pastor cannot refuse them Holy Communion, since they usually have the necessary knowledge and cannot be accused of unbelief from their works. Of course, however, their pastor will not fail to explain to them the spiritual nature of the divine law, to strike their conscience where possible, and to awaken them to righteous repentance toward God. And on the other hand, he will not fail occasionally to lure them into the blessed state of a truly believing Christian who lives not for himself but for his Saviour. If he does not succeed in the former, he has nothing else to expect. If he does not succeed in the former, he has nothing to expect but that this spiritually adulterous generation will become even more hostile and hateful to him than it has already become through his sharp sermons of repentance.

But, as noted above, a small number of poor and penitent sinners still exist, praise be to God; and so their spiritual father has a time of refreshment even when they register for the sacrament, so that he can bring the riches of God's love and grace in Christ to his repentant parishioner's heart and conscience quite forcefully and movingly, and also for his own comfort, in order to kindle or strengthen faith in Christ in them, that it becomes more and more certain that the grace of God in Christ is much more powerful than the sins of the whole world, and that the merit of Christ in the one bowl of the righteous judge weighs much heavier than the guilt of all sinners in the other, for he himself is only a small piece and part of the world and only a single sinner; And since the Father did not spare his own Son, but gave him up for us all, in order to spare us in his judgment, and to turn us from accursed slaves of the devil into his blessed children, he is also included in this.

Apart from those just mentioned, however, there are now and then some Christians in need of consolation and eager for consolation, who are already in the state of faith, but to whom, in one way or another, the evil one shoots his fiery darts of spiritual temptations into the heart. It is not the place here, of course, to go into further detail about this matter. But the main part of the comforter's work in such cases consists in guiding his church child, who, for instance, also registers for the Lord's Supper, according to the nature of the challenge,

the shield of faith and the sword of the spirit, the word of God. At the same time, however, he must accustom the one under attack, who has not relapsed into sin against his conscience, not to look upon the diabolical temptation as coming from his heart, which is terrified of it, but to hurl it in Satan's face as devil's filth, to despise the haughty spirit, and to make as little of it as if caterpillars were under a tree on his cobblestones. He should despise the haughty spirit and make as little of it as if caterpillars fell on his sleeves under a tree or a bird hovering over him dropped its droppings into his hair.

In the case of weak, but otherwise sincere Christians, the pastor must then, on the occasion of their confession, from time to time, in a kind and loving way, make clear whether and how they have, through the word of God heard and read, increased in the right knowledge of God according to law and gospel, as well as of themselves, then in repentance toward God, in true faith in Christ, in the practice of it through love, in patience under the cross, in holding fast the hope of eternal life.

These are the main things in which the faithful and prudent steward must give the servants of the master of the house, the members of his household, their due. It goes without saying that he must have time for this, and that in larger congregations, and especially when the pastor has been in office longer and is more intimately acquainted with the spiritual needs of his individual parishioners, it is difficult to set aside too little time for the confession than, say, one day a week. For hardly has he entered into a pastoral conversation with one of his parishioners, since, moreover, in city parishes most of them come in the evening, than the other one is already knocking at the door. And if, moreover, in larger city parishes Holy Communion is distributed only every four or three weeks, it will hardly happen, even to the young people, that much more than the names are written out. -

But someone might object that the spiritual benefit for the individual parishioners indicated above could also be achieved through home visits. To this the following is to be replied:

First of all, in the case of home visits, partly because of the locality, partly because of the perhaps unsuitable time, partly because of various domestic affairs, especially those of housewives, it is much more difficult for the visiting pastor to enter into pastoral conversation with the individual than in the case of confession.

On the other hand, the same receptive mood for such conversation is hardly present in those visited as when they come to their pastor for this purpose, so that he, according to their spiritual need, may apply God's word to them as teaching or punishment or correction or comfort or chastening in righteousness, and seek to help and serve them in it.

Thirdly, the pastor, especially in larger congregations, has almost daily work of ministering love for special home visits. There is almost never a lack of sick people, some suffering from acute illnesses, others afflicted with chronic diseases, such as consumption, who need the spiritual medicine of the divine word in one way or another. There are negligent church-goers who, of course, very seldom come to partake of Holy Communion and are therefore to be visited in their homes and punished and admonished with severity and kindness. There are confirmed persons who, for example, have no parents or caring relatives in the place, and who, seduced by unbelieving and unchurched young fellows, are in danger of completely alienating themselves from the church and are therefore to be sought as lost ones by the faithful shepherd and brought back by God's grace. There are proud, separatist spirits who belong to the church, but who increasingly leave the worship meetings and brood at home over all kinds of fanatical heresies that the devil and their flesh have put into their hearts, or who take offense at the many hypocrites in the church instead of punishing them when they are revealed to them and proving themselves to be salt. There are married couples who, mostly through mutual fault, get into quarrels and disputes and therefore need a visit from their pastor in order to hear both parties and, if God wills, to help both of them so that Christian unity and mutual support in love will become more and more constant. From time to time there are also gross cases of sin and offence on the part of individuals, which have become public knowledge and of course must also come before the congregation. In such cases, of course, the pastor must first seek out the guilty person in order to lead him to repentance and, if possible, to persuade him to appear at the congregational meeting, if the congregation has already matured ecclesiastically to such an extent that it can take the entire process of church discipline into its own hands. There are people who, until then unchurched, yet, humbled and made weary by many a wholesome penal discipline of God, begin to come to church and to hear and learn God's Word. Of course, the pastor must also visit them and kindly entice them to persevere in this and lovingly show them the wholesome fruit of it before their eyes. There are some who are challenged and who, in addition to appropriate pastoral care when they go to confession, also need a special visit from their pastor at home. There are women whose husbands do not belong to the congregation, these being papists, reformed or unchurched, and moreover perhaps hostile to the church confession of their wives, and who put all kinds of obstacles in their way to attend their church diligently. These women then also need the comforting encouragement of their pastor in their homes. There are poor and, moreover, sickly childless widows, who, even if they are supported physically by the congregation and also otherwise need the physical and spiritual support of their pastor.

The church members, who are not without godly members, need the spiritual care of their shepherd more than others, in order to strengthen their faith and patience.

In all these and similar cases, house calls are indispensable for the pastor, and especially in larger urban communities he will have to spend several hours a day on them, if he wants to be faithful in this part of his profession. But it is just as certain that he will not have the same favorable opportunity to act in a pastoral and fatherly manner with his individual parishioners as he does when he registers for confession, if he sets aside the necessary time for it. But he must have this time; for what is more important and more necessary than the public preaching and teaching to the assembled congregation than the proper care of the individual soul? for, according to Ebr. 13:7, he must one day also give account for this. -

At the same time it goes without saying that he must not refrain from diligently lifting up his prayers and intercessions to the Lord, not only for his whole congregation, but also for those individuals whose spiritual need is more precisely known to him.

V on the power and efficacy of absolution.

The understanding of this doctrine is of great benefit both to the confessor and to the confessor. We assume here as certain and proven in other places, 1. that our Saviour Jesus Christ has truly given his church the power of the keys and the right to pronounce forgiveness of sins, according to Matth. 18, 18. Joh. 20, 23. 2. that a distinction is to be made between the right of the church and the exercising of it. The right to pronounce forgiveness of sins on the broken-hearted belongs to the church and to all its members. Therefore, in case of need, or in the absence of proper ministers of the church, any one may comfort his neighbor, who is in distress and temptation, with forgiveness of his sins, but not publicly. The public exercise of this right, however, rests solely with the ordinary ministers of the church, to whom God has commanded the preaching of the word, the administration of the sacraments, and the power of the keys. Balduin *Cas. consc.* 4, 10. c. 1. This, as we have said, we here presuppose. We will therefore consider the question here, what is given by absolution to the penitent, and whether by absolution there is only a declaration and announcement of the forgiveness of sins, which the penitent has already obtained from God by repentance and true faith or true penance, and whether, therefore, absolution is nothing else than an outward declaration of what has already happened before, or whether by it forgiveness of sins is truly given to the penitent, as by God's word as a certain organ. For thus the Tridentine Council declared concerning absolution (can. 9):

"If anyone says that the sacramental absolution of the priest is not a judicial act, but only an office of pronouncing and declaring that the sins of the penitent are forgiven, "if he only thinks that he is absolved..., let him be accursed." On these words, the same Chemnitz, in his *Examen* (II, p. 199.), remarks: "Because the ninth Canon condemns those who say that absolution is the mere office of declaring that sins are forgiven, I think that a controversy should be added. For among the Sacramentarians some argue that sins are not forgiven by absolution, since men cannot forgive sins, and this belongs to God alone. Therefore they argue that the faithful do not receive anything in absolution, but that it is only an outward declaration of what they already have." Therefore a controversy is certainly necessary, whether absolution is a true and real communication and bestowal of forgiveness of sins, or only a declaration of forgiveness already received.

Arcudius I. 4. c. 3. has dealt with this question, and from Hugh of St. Victor *de sacramentis fidei* 1. 3, 14, 8. he cites the opinion of some who allowed themselves to ascribe the power to forgive sins to God alone, that is, that they did not at all want to admit that a man could be granted the same. Their reasons were these: 1. because the sinner is absolved directly by God as soon as he truly repents; 2. because absolution is like the cleansing of the leper, Matt. 8:3, 4, whom the Lord first restored himself and then sent to the priests, not that his cleansing was effected by them, but that it was only confirmed by their testimony. This opinion is also adduced by Bonaventure in sent. 4. dist. 18; and many have been moved by the reputation of Jerome, who, explaining the words of Matt. 16, "And I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," expressly compares absolution and the power of forgiving sins with the declaration of the Levitical priests. For he says: "The bishops and presbyters, since they do not understand the sentence, assume something of the arrogance of the Pharisees, that they partly condemn the innocent, and partly think to absolve the guilty, since it is not the judgment of the priests but the life of the guilty that is inquired for with God. In Leviticus we read of the lepers, where they are commanded to present themselves to the priests, and, if they have leprosy, are then made unclean by the priest; not that the priests can make lepers and unclean, but that the lepers have knowledge and can distinguish who is clean or unclean. Therefore, as there the priest makes the leper clean or unclean, so here also the bishop and presbyter bind and loose." So much Jerome. The argument, then, is this: What the truly penitent has already before, he cannot by the

Absolution. But the truly penitent has forgiveness of sins beforehand; consequently he cannot receive it through absolution. Hence also Arcudius p. 354 calls this an exceedingly vexatious objection. "For," says he, "the objection concerning the penitent, who is thought by God to be redeemed before he receives absolution from the priest, seems exceedingly vexatious. For if a man is truly penitent, and feels sorrow for his sins, he is absolved by God before he goes to the priest and receives absolution. Therefore, when he goes to his spiritual father, he receives nothing anew, but is only declared to be one who is absolved, for the same sin is not forgiven twice." So far Arcudius. All this is of such a nature that it can easily lead to the assumption that it (absolution) is a mere declaration.

Now, in order that this objection, which is so difficult, and this objection, which is not easy, may be removed, some have made a distinction between *contritus* (a penitent) and *attritus* (one who has only an imperfect penitence), and have admitted that the argument proves something concerning *contritus*, but not *attritus*, as may be seen p. 354. Hugo also agonizes miserably in the place cited; for he says that the sigher becomes blessed, namely, in the last draughts and in the emergency; but soon after he denies that the sigher is perfectly absolved, except when the emergency intervenes, and says that to obtain the whole remedy it is required that he should repent in his heart and confess sin with his mouth. "I hold," says Arcudius, "that the penitent is thus absolved by God, that he is also required by divine ordinance to submit to the judgment and keys of the Church." "Therefore," he continues, "the sense of those words, 'I absolve thee,' is not this: 'I declare thee absolved,' but: I absolve thee of the sacrament of absolution, or what is the same, I absolve thee of the grace which, as far as it goes, reconciles God and pardons sin.' The Tridentine Conciliar says *sess. 14 de contrit. c. 4.* that sins are indeed forgiven, but not to the exclusion of the desire for confession. For it says: "It teaches, moreover, that although it sometimes happens that this contrition is perfected by charity, and reconciles man to God before this sacrament is actually received, yet this reconciliation is not to be ascribed to contrition itself without desire for the sacrament, which is included in it.

But Arcudius rightly urges against this opinion, according to which absolution is a mere declaration, with Hugh, that the Lord Christ, Matt. 16:19, did not say to Peter: What thou shalt redeem, that is, what thou shalt show to have been redeemed, but: it shall be redeemed; because the judgment of heaven does not precede Peter's judgment, but follows it. And truly, says Arcudius, p. 353,

if the priests did not somehow, and as true ministers and ministerial causes, co-operate effectually in the administration of the Sacrament at absolution, what power would Christ have conferred upon them, since he has conferred upon them an exceeding great one? Surely no cause is conceivable why he should utter such glorious words concerning them: Whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven them; and: "Whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Then, he continues, what a great perversion it is in the literal sense, that the words, "You will redeem," should mean, "You will show redeemed," since the Lord says, "It will also be redeemed in heaven. But what shall it mean, to be loosed also in heaven? You will not, I think, say (it means as much as), it will be shown to be solved in heaven? For where in all the world and by whom will it really be solved, if both on earth and in heaven that which is solved will be shown, and is not rather truly solved. So truly redeemed is meant here, but nevertheless the latter depends on the former and flows from it. For the Lord did not say, What I shall solve, ye shall solve; but the opposite. So far as Arcudius, who disputes about this quite rightly.

The true and orthodox opinion, therefore, is that absolution is not only a mere and external declaration of what the penitent already has, but that it is a means and organ by which grace and forgiveness of sins are truly communicated and bestowed upon the penitent, that is, that the confessor thereby effectively acts as a ministerial and instrumental cause, and through absolution truly forgives the sins of the penitent. Therefore (Dr. M.Chemnitz teaches that absolution is nothing other than the voice of the gospel itself, which proclaims the forgiveness of sins freely for Christ's sake to all in general who repent and believe the gospel, And it is to be assumed with faith that the individuals believe the voice of the gospel in absolution, and certainly believe that for Christ's sake forgiveness of sins is freely given, imparted, and sealed to them by God through the ministry of preaching. And afterward: But God, who alone forgives sins, does not do this without means, but by the ministry of the word and sacraments. But private absolution proclaims the voice of the gospel, by which, without any doubt, God is active and forgives the sins of those who in faith hold to the voice of the gospel in absolution. In absolution, therefore, God himself, through the ministry of the gospel, forgives the sins of the individual believers, and so the absolution of the church minister is a testimony of divine absolution, and therefore the conscience has testimony that sins are truly forgiven by God.

All this, that it may be better understood, we will explain by examples. Accordingly, as 1. there are various organs and means on the part of God, by which the body and blood of Christ are presented to us, namely, first, the word of the gospel, by which they are presented to us for spiritual food and drink, according to the word of the Saviour John 6:53 f.; and secondly, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, by which they are presented for sacramental food and drink. Secondly, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, by which they are offered for sacramental eating and drinking. There are also two organs and means by which, as far as absolution is concerned, forgiveness of sins is offered and given to man, namely, first, the general word of the gospel, in which God's grace is offered, and by which man, as soon as he sighingly takes hold of it in true faith, obtains the offered forgiveness of sins; Secondly, the word of absolution, which is as it were a special word of the gospel, by which truly God is active, and truly forgives sin to the penitent. Therefore, just as the worthy communicant already has Christ's body and blood beforehand, offered to him through the word and communicated to him through spiritual food and drink, and yet also receives the same body and blood sacramentally in the high holy communion, so also the truly penitent has forgiveness of sins already before absolution through faith, from the general word of the gospel, which cannot lie or deceive. But nevertheless he receives the same forgiveness of sins, as by another offering organ and means also by the word of absolution, as by the specifically applied word of the gospel; which specific application is founded in the power of the keys. And so it is the same grace and the same forgiveness of sins, but presented and received by different means and organs. For, first, in devout prayer and confession before God, sins are forgiven on the part of God to him who blasphemes, by means of the general promises of the Gospel; but in absolution, sins are forgiven by means of a specific word and (specific) announcement of the Gospel, or, to express it more clearly, by means of the power of the keys. On the other hand, in devout prayer and confession before God, God forgives the sins of the penitent directly or without the mediation of a servant or messenger, as happened with the penitent publican, Luc. 18:14. But in absolution God forgives sins indirectly, by means of the power of the keys, which by great grace he has entrusted to his church, and by means of the ministry of the preacher; as Paul says, 2 Cor. 2:10, "I have forgiven you in the person of Christ. Thirdly, There sins are forgiven, as it were, in a manner not affecting the senses, and after a general announcement; but here in a manner affecting the senses.

By a special word of the gospel, which the minister proclaims to the penitent, and by which is truly offered on the part of God forgiveness of sins by the power of the keys. And what other distinctions and remarks may be made here.

As therefore 2. Blessed Chemnitz in the *Examination* of the Tridentine Council *p. II. de sacramentor. necessitate* p. 16. 17. rightly raised the question: What is the use of the sacraments, since everything is in the Word? and answered it thoroughly, namely, "They are necessary, first, according to the divine institution, as the means of grace, and as the visible word; secondly, because of the weakness of faith, that they offer, apply, and seal to us the grace of God contained in the general promises"; and further, "We admit, therefore, that the sacraments are necessary to salvation, as an instrumental cause, but not so exclusively as the word and faith"; and, as he said, p. 21, in answer to the question of what Abraham said to the Lord, and what he said to the Lord. 21 to the question, what Abraham received by circumcision, and Cornelius by baptism - answered: The same grace of God which they had before, and which the sacraments confer, but by other means; wherefore they also had the same grace before entirely on the part of God, but were made the more sure of grace on their part, because they received the same by a double means; And, thirdly, as believing adults receive the same grace in the same manner as Abraham and Cornelius through baptism, so also in absolution the truly penitent receive the same grace and forgiveness of sins which they had before, but by another organ and means, namely, by the power of the keys and by the ministry of the confessor, that is, by a specific and palpably pronounced word of the gospel. From this it is evident, first, in what sense blessed Chemnitz says in the words cited: "And therefore the absolution of the minister is a testimony of divine absolution, wherefore conscience has testimony that sins are truly forgiven it by God; for by testimony he understands not an explanatory testimony, but one that falls on the senses and is real, as he says in P. II. P. 16, that the sacraments are external visible testimonies of the appropriation of the gracious promise of the gospel; for it is an organ and means on the part of God. Secondly, (it is evident from this,) what is to be answered to the above argument; for the supersentence was this: What the truly penitent hath before, he cannot receive by absolution; but forgiveness of sins, etc. *Ergo*. It must be said that this supersentence is false; for this may be done by different organs, and therefore the truly penitent may receive the same forgiveness of sins by absolution, as by another instrument, means, and organ, namely, by the power of the keys instituted by God.

(Dr. Chr. Chemnitz in his *Brevis instructio futuri ministri ecclesiae*. S. 305 f.)

Miscellany.

The Present State of Things in Germany. In the preface to the current volume of the Mecklenburgische Kirchen- und Zeitblatt we read among other things the following: "The realization that we are already standing on the edge of the abyss, that things cannot go on like this, that a reversal is necessary, is gaining ground in ever greater dimensions. Even in the liberal camp, in which gray theory tends to obscure the view of real conditions, one is beginning to appreciate the present conditions more correctly, even if, through lack of self-knowledge, one misjudges the cause of the ruin that has broken in and, in vain confidence, underestimates the depth of the rushing floods. It must have come a long way, however, if liberalism seems to be frightened by the fact that we have come so gloriously far, and in its outstanding leaders and organs exhorts us to turn back, not to Christianity, but to more ideal ideas. Even a materialist like Virchow considers it necessary to warn against the infallibility of modern science, especially of natural science, and to exhort to 'moderation' and 'wise limitation' by declaring: 'Problems should be investigated, but not taught. For the problems one may try to interest the nation, at least that part of the nation which is sufficiently educated and capable of judgement for such things; but these things must never become the subject of a teaching to be presented in the general educational institutions ... we cannot teach, we cannot call it an achievement of science that man descended from the ape or from any other animal', and all the less so since 'socialism is already in touch with this theory'. Agreeing with Virchow, the Nationalzeitung writes: "On hearsay of Darwin's teachings, everyone now believes that they can have their say about the deepest secrets of nature; hypotheses are carelessly thrown together with results, dubious observations and discoveries are proclaimed as infallible truths. From the primordial slime one then builds, in contrast to the one that has become historical, an entirely new world - a swamp world in which neither law nor civil liberty, neither the fatherland nor paganism, neither science nor art have a place to stand, from which everything and everyone slowly sinks back into the primordial mash. Modern man, convinced of his ape descent, involuntarily yearns back to the animal kingdom and the freedom of the primeval forest." - On the same subject the Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kz. expresses itself in its preface, as follows: "Whether the old historical Christianity or the new Christianity of the modern way of thinking shall be justified in the church: this question is in the foreground of the present decisions. For about this one cannot doubt

Let there be two quite different ways of thinking which are opposed to each other here. And it is a deceptive hope to think that they will at length get along in the same house. The equality of tendencies' is only a Spanish wall behind which the dispute is concealed for a time, but which will soon be thrown down by the combatants. And then it is a question of domination: either this or that. Equal rights become exclusive rights, and the guest becomes an intruder who turns the right of hospitality into the right of domicile. For the two ways of thinking cannot get along with each other; they are principally different from each other. . . . Nor do the two peoples clash in the body of the Church. And the church regiments, as a rule, regard it as the triumph of their wisdom to keep them locked up in the one body and not to allow them to be separated. How long will it last? For it is an unnatural state of things that two such disparate religions, for that is how it is, should be united in One Church Community. They will always tread on each other, and at last the one will tread under the other. What does not belong together shall not remain together. With and against cannot pull on the same rope. In the end it only tears. He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth." This is the one word that is especially told us for this time." - The Pilgrim from Saxony writes in his preface, "Our Church faces a momentous decision. Will she be able any longer, with the dependence of her outward forms on the rulers of the state, to preserve her essence and to make use of her spiritual treasure? Or has the time long since come, as others maintain, to give up the protection and treasure of the secular regime, and with it, as things still stand, the great mass of the Christian people, in order to withdraw into the Free Church with small remnants of church-conscious Christians? And what is to take the place of the broken form of existence? Shall there still be a church regiment, or the pastors alone, or the congregations alone, regulate and maintain the new order of church things? As yet all attempts to reach an agreement on this have thoroughly failed." (Really? And if it were so, would that necessitate remaining in ecclesiastical fellowship even with outspoken enemies of the Gospel, contrary to God's Word?) - Pastor Lohmann writes the following in the preface to his Pastoral Correspondence: "We cannot therefore entertain too great a hope that (the Saxon) this largest Lutheran (?) regional church in Germany would at length offer successful resistance to the push toward a German national church. There are, of course, small territories, e.g. Mecklenburg, where the situation is more favorable, but they will not bring the decision. We in Hanover, in our closed church constitution, have a favorable position for resistance, to which other circles may also be inclined. But that we

We must be careful not to overestimate the ability of the entire national church to react, as we are reminded by the very depressing impression made from beginning to end by the handling of the Nahmendorf case at the Jeinsen District Synod. If we do not soon take a decisive turn toward more serious action against the Protestant Association and similar elements in our midst, our national church as such will naturally eventually become a prey to the Union or the National Church."- To complete the picture, it is necessary to add what Münkler writes in his preface: "The Social-Democrats are (in Germany) a significant fraction, numbering several million." It is not to be overlooked here that the latest appeal of the Association for Socialist Reform begins with the words: "To an attentive observer the perception cannot escape that some symptoms of the present are reminiscent of the time before the French Revolution."

The Lutheran congregation in Geneva - so writes Father Müller, pastor of the German Lutheran Church in Geneva, to the Mecklenburg K.- und Ztbl. -, the only one of this confession in the whole of Switzerland, is like an advanced post on the military road between three countries. In this beautiful, hospitable corner on the Rhone River and Lake Lemman, which is separated from France by the Jura Mountains and from Italy by the mighty peaks of the Alps, our congregation was founded at the beginning of the last century (1707), at first as a spiritual hostel between Germany and southeastern France. Six German merchants of Lutheran faith (all but one from southern Germany), who owned trading houses in Lyons and had to travel frequently back and forth between there and Germany, wished to establish a church station for the celebration of Holy Communion according to Lutheran custom on the French border, on free Swiss territory, which could hardly have been done in Lyons itself under the conditions of the time. The first Lutheran preacher, Magister Schulz from Berlin, appointed by them for this purpose with the consent of the republican government of Geneva, soon expanded the quarterly celebration of Holy Communion to a Sunday service, which then opened itself hospitably to the beginnings of the German colony in Geneva. The leadership, as well as the procurement of the maintenance for the service and the preacher, remained in the hands of those merchants as the founders of the congregation, but trusted men from their bosom assisted them and the pastor under the name of "adjuncts". As early as 1739, the congregation had grown and strengthened to such an extent that an ordained afternoon preacher was appointed to support and temporarily replace the pastor. However, as death tore one gap after the other in the row of the preceding parish benefactors, the outer existence of the work was more than once in question, even if the vacant positions were filled as well as possible, preferably with descendants and relatives of the benefactors. There it was God's

It was a protective providence that directed the love of a pious German prince to the tender plant soon after it was planted in the soil of Geneva. Duke Frederick II of Saxe-Gotha, interested in the cause through his sons, who had enjoyed attending the German Lutheran services there during their studies in Geneva, committed himself for himself and his successors to the payment of an annual pension in the amount of 220 florins Rhenish, with the proviso that the congregation would not deviate from the teachings of the Augsburg Confession. 11 years later - in the year 1731 - a formal protectorate developed from this, which the ducal-Gotha government took over with the involvement of its Oberconsistorium; from which it now also derived the right and duty to confirm clergymen who were otherwise universally found to be capable and suitable for the post on the proposal of the parish council.... The law on foundations (*loi sur les fondations*) enacted by the Geneva government in 1849, which placed all associations and communities, including religious ones, under the sanction of the state in their property matters, and the principles of congregational representation by universal suffrage, which had long since become naturalized in the Swiss Reformed Church and were in the meantime (after 1848!) also advancing more and more generally in the congregational constitutions of Germany, gave the Geneva Lutheran congregation the form which it still has today. In 1850, with the due recognition of the Geneva state authorities, a from now on unified congregational council was established, which, under the name of Direktion der Genfer lutherischen Kirche, otherwise administers its internal and external affairs quite independently - the bond with Gotha has been loosened more and more by time. . . . Our church school, brought to life by the most urgent need and maintained for a long time in the face of all obstacles, died about two years ago. Its reopening must become the real question of life for the congregation in the near future. A church without children, or with meager offspring, that is, built on the shifting sands of the currently living sex, leaves its future existence unsecured. An unhealthy and precarious situation for a church, when often only one-sixth or one-seventh of the number of its baptized children is given to its confirmation classes! Where have all the children gone? The French-Swiss nationalism flowing around our little church has inexorably driven them towards the ruling French-Protestant church, alienated them from the church of their homeland and their parents. If there is any help here, it can only come through a German school, which would preserve the mother tongue of the children baptized in our church during their time of education. No church can do the same-

It is a valid sight to see the noble pledges of their baptized children go to other churches, only because they grow up learning the prevailing foreign language, while their own becomes foreign to them. But even the small number of our children who remain faithful to the church that baptized them arrive at confirmation classes almost without any fundamental knowledge of church doctrine. Neither the so-called Sunday school, nor the often only short Confirmation lessons, which are also often inhibited by the slowness of the children in understanding and expressing themselves in German, are sufficient to imprint our small catechism firmly and durably on the children; the school must have laid the foundation. Moreover, the great majority of our children go through the state schools, which leave Christian religion entirely outside their curriculum and their care, and only permit the church to provide the children whose parents wish it, in addition to the actual school lessons, with religious instruction which is naturally only scanty and very general under such circumstances. However, the law allows private schools all the freedom they desire. - In the following, Pastor Müller asks for gifts of love for a German church school in Geneva.

Rationalistic equivocation or rogue language. In a report of the inaugural sermon of the rationalist Pastor primarius Späth in Breslau, the Luthardt'sche Kz. of December 28 of last year writes: "Just in this sermon, which in some respects it does not behoove me to call a model sermon (!) for such occasions, it has again become quite clear to us that Protestant ministers can, under certain circumstances, make use of the same words in their sermons as the positive pastors, without, however, associating with these words the same ideas which, according to church doctrine, tend to be connected with them. Here as there they speak of the "Saviour Jesus Christ," of the "beatifying gospel," of the "divinity of the holy Scriptures," etc., but on both sides they mean something quite different. And if it is often difficult for us to separate the Protestant core from the Christian shell, how can we blame the simple man, when he is only in the rarest cases able to do so?"

Dr. Philippi writes in his "Kirchen- und Zeitblatt" of January 23 **about being "confessional,"** which many in Germany now claim: "Not all who stand up for the confession stand by the confession. Rather, many who are celebrated as pillars of the kitchen are nothing more than gravediggers of right doctrine and the true church. To some, right doctrine is absorbed, or rather submerged, in the concept of freedom of faith and conscience; others find it in the spirit of the confession or in the substance of the confession; still others in the fundamental doctrines, whereby, of course, each regards what he likes as the substance of the confession or the fundamental doctrine; still others see right doctrine either in the spirit of the confession or in the substance of the confession.

The term "right doctrine" is used by some to refer only to the *credimus, docemus, and confitemur* of the symbols, or only to those articles of faith which our church either has in common with other confessions or in which it differs from other confessions; others again designate as right doctrine the confession of Jesus Christ as the Son of God, or the fundamental truths of Christianity as laid down in the Augustana, or the facts of salvation with the exclusion of dogma, or only the solid foundation of incontestable facts of salvation. Some exclude history from the concept of right doctrine, because history is subject to historical research; others want to exclude dogmas, because dogmas are subjective views, etc.; but all these definitions are untenable for the very reason that they leave the decision as to what is right doctrine to the subjective discretion, just as these definitions in general are made to love the ever-increasing subjective will to teach. In order that every one may sell his little bundle under the guise of right doctrine, the concept of right doctrine is defined as broadly as possible and as indefinitely as possible. The ecclesiastical system of doctrine, however, is a richly structured, logically coherent structure, in which no member is a superfluous ornament, but in which every member is closely connected with the foundation and is not only supported by the foundation, but also in turn supports the foundation; consequently, it cannot be left to the subjective discretion of the individual. Rather, the entire organically structured and logically ordered, positively and negatively developed, self-contained ecclesiastical doctrinal system is to be regarded and accepted as right doctrine, even including the doctrinal propositions that are not expressed *expressis verbis* in the symbols, but result only *per consequentiam* or *per analogiam fidei* from the expressed doctrinal propositions. This does not exclude the possibility of a further development of church doctrine, but such a further development must be integrated into the closed system and can therefore really only consist in the expansion of individual doctrines that already exist. However, such a further development, even if we admit its possibility *in abstracto*, seems to us both unnecessary and improbable; in any case, everything that presents itself in recent times as further development is nothing less than further development, but rather apostasy from right doctrine."

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The Concordia (English) District of the Ohio Synod (formerly the Concordia Synod) held its first regular session from Aug. 29 to Sept. 2, last year, at the congregation of President H. Wetzel, in Shenandoah County, Va. The subject of the doctrinal proceedings was: communion with false believers, vs.

to which the Synod bore serious witness. Church visitations were also discussed and it was decided that the president or persons employed by him should visit the congregations of the district at least once in three years.

On the "Church Congress" in Philadelphia. In the debate on the relationship to other denominations, Dr. Späth said, among other things: "Whether German or English language, whether church skirts and forms are secondary matters, but the main point is doctrine, pure doctrine. Here, however, in this St. Matthew's Church (in which the Kirchentag held its meetings) I could not send a member, a child, but I would have to warn: do not go there, for where one does not have Luther's Catechism unadulterated and the Augsburg Confession, I must warn against that!" - From the report of the "Zeitschrift" (No. 5.) we learn the following: "Dr. Conrad presented to the Kirchentag his wondrous mystical view of an inner calling, which was understandable to the speaker alone. Dr. Mann declared that if a man who claimed to be called in such a way came to him, he would tell him what Luther demanded of the Anabaptist prophets in Wittenberg, do miracles, then I will believe that you are really called. A miraculous calling demands a miraculous confirmation of it. If everyone had to believe that he was really called by God, who, for the sake of his morbid spiritual condition, pretended to have an inner calling, what a colorful mixture that would not make in the end! Dr. Wedekind of New York spoke on 'the concepts of education and the sacraments in the Lutheran Church and their relation to piety'. The essay was clearer than the subject. Redner showed how much the scriptural doctrine of Holy Baptism had come into discredit among the people. Baptism is everything to them but what the Scriptures teach about the same. The one goes hand in hand with the other. Those who do not think much of God's Word naturally do not think much of the Christian life either. There is much boasting of regeneration; as if a man could be born again a dozen times. The natural man who is born once is born once for all; he may be washed and healed of disease many times in his life, but that he should be born a second time is impossible. It is equally foolish to boast of certain means, not baptism, which are supposed to effect spiritual regeneration. When a child is once born again in baptism, he is born again for his whole life, and a second spiritual rebirth is as impossible as a second bodily one. But that baptism works regeneration is undeniable, for one would have to deny the clear statements of the Lord and the apostles. A baptized Christian may fall into great sin, but for that reason he is and remains born to the Father, a child, and may return as the Prodigal Son." - Concerning these latter expressions we must ask, Where is the word of the Lord left there, "The perverse and wicked kind fall from him; they are reproaches, and not his children." Deut. 32:5. Where is the doctrine of regeneration? We find it questionable that the "Zeitschrift" communicates these statements to its readers without criticism.

General Synod. In the January issue of the "Zeitschrift" it was reported that a pastor of the General Synod had publicly claimed that there was no command to baptize in Scripture. In number 7 of the same magazine, a reliable friend wrote the following: "We need not be surprised at W.'s statement, mentioned in the magazine, that there is no command to baptize in the Bible, since the same man tried to argue at a meeting of his synod that the Lord's Prayer is not a Christian prayer at all. Of course the synod was ashamed of this, and decided that nothing of it should be printed in the proceedings, lest it should become known; but it did not expel him, and yet calls itself Lutheran!"

Calvinism. Dr. Schaff, in his latest paper on the harmony of the Reformed confessions, says that the Presbyterians and Reformed have at present tacitly abandoned the Calvinistic doctrines of their confessions, and that at present it is generally taught that all children who die in their early youth are saved. The "Christian Intelligencer," organ of the Reformed Church in America, protests against this. The "Evangelist," a Presbyterian church paper, commends some things in this paper, but not what is stated. (Ref. Kz.)

A meeting of Irish Catholics was held at Father McNamara's Mission, on Water street, New York, January 20. The purpose of the meeting was to organize an Irish national church. These people oppose Rome and the Italian spiritual dignitaries. They say that man must look to the cross and not to Rome. (Apol.)

The Roman Catholic Church papers in the United States, between thirty and forty in number, are proceeding with the idea of forming a Catholic Affiliated Press, for the purpose of uniting the ecclesiastical press against error in all its forms, and against all that opposes Catholicism. (Apol.)

A Jesuit Colony in the United States. A local political newspaper reports the following: "Loud complaints are coming from the territory of New Mexico about the activities of the Jesuits, who have taken up residence there for some time. Of course, they could not choose a better field for their activities. According to the census of 1870, New Mexico had a population of 92,000. Of these 51,000 were over 10 years of age, and of these 51,000 49,000 could not write and 48,000 could neither read nor write! The inhabitants of New Mexico are by far the greater part of Mexican descent, and speak the corrupt Spanish of the lower Mexican classes. This language is even the official language of all authorities of the territory, from the legislature down to the justices of the peace (there called *Alcalde* with the Spanish word). Only in two counties does the English language claim its place as the language of the law. In the midst of this ignorant population, a colony of Jesuits has nested for some years now, who, after the possession of Rome by the Italians and the abolition of the monasteries in the Papal States, had migrated abroad. The "holy fathers" at once interfered in politics and united the ignorant Mexicans into a "Catholic party," just as they had organized the party of the Centre in Germany. Their organ, the "*Resitza Catolica*," continually exhorts the Mexicans to drop the petty political quarrels between Republicans and Democrats, and unite into one great Catholic party. As such, they could rule the territory as they pleased (i.e., at the behest of the Jesuits), otherwise they would be ruled by others. Their machinations have not been in vain, and the present legislature is already so composed that the federal authorities are almost powerless, and the Jesuits the real rulers of the country. They have recently passed a bill through the legislature and, in spite of the governor's veto, made it law by a two-thirds vote, by which the Society of Jesus is formally incorporated in the territory of New Mexico and clothed with extraordinary privileges. As Corporators are named in the Bill: Donato Gasparri, Rafael Baldosaro, Luis Gentile, Salvador Persoul, Pascal Tomasine and "all other persons who now or in the future will unite with the same." The Order is granted the right, by its individual members or as a whole, "to do anything not prohibited by law to further the purposes of the Society." As such purposes, the establishment of schools and the direction of school instruction are stated above all, and then it is expressly declared: "All property and proprietary rights of the members of the Order shall be reserved."

of this Corporation, used in carrying out the purposes thereof, is hereby exempt from all and any taxation." The American and German inhabitants of the Territory, among them not a few Catholics, will turn to Congress with the request that it deliver them in some way from the intolerable domination of the Jesuits. It is fortunate that the proposal to make New Mexico a state, which was floating in Congress in 1876, has fallen through; otherwise the Jesuits would now have quite a free field in New Mexico and make the state a new Paraguay. Since it is still territory, many things can happen on the part of the federal authorities and Congress. But that even they are not omnipotent in the face of a fanatical and uniformly guided majority of the people in a territory, especially in a territory closed off by deserts and mountains (as both New Mexico and Utah are), is shown by the example of Utah, where, in spite of all the laws against polygamy and in spite of all the measures taken with soldiers, marshals and judges, Mormonism still stands almost unshaken. - So far the newspaper. Nothing helps a state against the Jesuits but the expulsion of the same. If America, with its abstract idea of religious liberty, thinks it may not go so far, eS will not repent of its blindness until it is too late. W.

Jesuit Work in New Mexico. Many a Jesuit expelled from Europe is now doing his satanic work in New Mexico among the ignorant, superstitious Mexicans with better success. The latter is evidenced here by the institute of the flagellants, whose members in some counties form more than half of the inhabitants. The ceremonies which the "*Fraternidad piedosa*" performs during Easter week are appalling. Almost stark naked, they scratch each other's backs bloody with sharp flints, whereby some fall down unconscious as a result of the loss of blood; or they tie their arms and legs with ropes, so that the inhibition of the circulation of blood soon produces the most terrible pain; or they drag heavy crosses on their knees, sliding over stony ground up a hill; yes, some time ago one of them had himself crucified for the atonement of his sins! G. Kröning.

The "school brothers" form a very important and strong corps in the papal army. In France they have 11,000 with 1,900 schools and 300,000 pupils; in Belgium 1000 with 16,000 pupils. In Canada they have 41 schools with 13,000 pupils; in St. Louis 23 schools with 4,200 pupils; in the city of New York 58 schools with 17,000 pupils. (Apol.)

Freemasonry. We read the following in a local paper: "An anti-Masonic association has formed in Michigan, consisting chiefly of clergymen, who oppose Freemasonry for the following reasons: As Freemasonry binds its members by a solemn oath not to admit any woman as a member of a secret lodge, and as Freemasonry thus destroys the mutual conformity and confidence which ought to exist between husband and wife, be it enacted, That Freemasonry be declared the sworn enemy of womanhood, and that it be the duty of every American woman to side with anti-Masonic reform and to work with the National Christian Association in the destruction of this heathen, anti-Christian and anti-Social institution. Resolved, That the support of preachers of the Gospel who adhere to Freemasonry be declared to be a payment to Judas to betray Christ and His Bride, the Church, and to deliver Him up to the enemies. Resolved, That the oaths to be taken at the initiation into Freemasonry be declared unlawful, immoral, and contrary to the Holy Scriptures, as these oaths are inconsistent with duties against the country, the family, and God." - As pleasing as this opposition to the shameful Masonic system is on the whole, the American flavour in the motive is unpleasantly touching. W.

II. foreign countries.

Separation. Lohmann reports: "In our regional church, since I wrote No. 1 of this word "at the turn of the year", it has really come to the beginning of a separation, but without the actual decision having already been made. After the removal of Pastor Strombürg in Scharnebeck has been confirmed by the Landesconsistorium, several fathers of families in the city of Hanover (one hears so far of three, among them Pastor (ret.) Grote and merchant Rocholl) have registered their resignation from the Landeskirche with the Amtsgericht and have begun to hold separate services. The separation of Stromburg, as regrettable as it is, would not cause us too much trouble if it were not followed by the separation of Hermannsburg. The decision on this has still not been made.

Separation in Hanover. Pastor Lohmann writes in his "Hannoversche Pastoralcorrespondenz" of February 2, "that the petition from Hermannsburg to the Emperor has been struck off, the suspension of Pastor Harms has taken place, and the registrations of resignation from the regional church have already begun." - "Of the conference of the Renitents held in Rocholl's house in Hanover on January 9," it continues, "the paper 'Unter dem Kreuz' reports that a large number of brethren, some of them from far away, from Hildesheim, Lüneburg, Verden, and Osnabrück, met together and, in a pleasing unity of spirit, essentially agreed on the right and duty of leaving the State Church. It was not the purpose of the meeting to discuss and initiate any organization of the free church, since one would have to be patient with such plans until the fate of the recalcitrant clergy had been decided, none of whom were present at the conference. The news that a small congregation in the city of Hanover had already separated and elected Pastor Grote as their pastor was declared by the latter to be completely groundless. It is especially noteworthy that in his New Year's article he tries to "push the marriage issue, which gave rise to the rupture, into the background" (Excellent!) "and to place the general "distress" (or rather "gray") "of the state church, which he alone has not lamented for a long time," (unfortunately almost only lamented) "in the foreground as the decisive factor for the separation. - As comfortable as those who until now have clung to the strong arm of the state church have felt in the face of all threats to leave because of the introduction of civil marriage, so little do they feel when they see those who are guided by the right reason, by the words of the Lord: "Depart from them! (Rom. 16, 17.) "Come out from them (the unbelievers) and separate yourselves!" (2 Cor. 6:17. cf. 14.) "Put away from such!" (1 Tim. 6:5. cf. 3-5.) "Avoid a heretical man!" (Tit. 3, 10.) "Take him not into your house, neither salute him!" (2 John 10.) W.

Hanover. Pastor Lohmann writes in his "Pastoral-Correspondenz" of January 5: "I repeat once again that I cannot acknowledge the conscientious objections of those dear brothers in office as truly justified; and that I must regard a separation because of this laches as absolutely unjustified and wrong according to Lutheran principles. Such a lopsided separation, in which precisely the anti-confessional aspects of the polemic against the new form of marriage would be especially emphasized and cultivated, would be highly regrettable, even apart from the mourning for persons and congregations who were held in high esteem, because of its pernicious consequences for the entire future of the Lutheran Church in our country. It is also not improbable that, unless the church government decides to take more serious action against the Protestant Unificationists in the preaching ministry of our state church, the Hermannsburg Separation would soon be

a second one in the sense of the Missourians would follow, in that one would find it intolerable to remain in a church community in which men like Harms were deposed and forced out for the sake of a ceremony, while men like Spiegel, with their open rejection of the basic teachings of Christianity, remained unchallenged in office. Also, the paralyzing and deterrent effect of the discord and probably also violent struggle between the two separations would give little comfort to those who, under these circumstances, have little confidence in the longer existence of a Lutheran national church. On the other hand, at this stage of the matter I too must once again testify how deeply painful it is for us to experience in this outcome of the efforts of our church authorities the oppressive bondage in which our national church finds itself because the decisive head of the church government lies outside the Lutheran church and therefore, precisely in the most serious cases, the decision is made so little out of the sense and interest of the same." - We confess that it is a real mystery to us how Lohmann, who is otherwise so clairvoyant, can still agree with his conscience to remain in the Hanoverian Church. As the mind recognizes, so the conscience judges. What might be the wrong principle that leads the otherwise so excellent man to such un-Lutheran consequences? It is true that he also writes: "As our fathers in Augsburg declared in principle that they would continue to bear the church government of the bishops if they did not hinder the preaching of the pure gospel and the expansion of the church on this basis, so we also want to bear the existing government in spite of all its grievances, as long as nothing is demanded of us that we cannot agree to with a good conscience. For we by no means want to take upon ourselves the responsibility of bringing about the complete collapse of the present form of the church, which would be the necessary consequence of a violent break with the sovereign church government, without urgent necessity. But this cannot keep us from wishing that this relationship be resolved peacefully and that the Lutheran Church among us be led into a different arrangement of its external church life without a disruptive break with the past." But where and when has such a radical transformation ever taken place "in a peaceful manner"? Vain hope! But as for appealing to the fathers in toleration of the state-church regiment, the same should at last cease, since it lacks all analogy. When some Lutherans had taken offense at Melancthon's having declared himself ready to restore to the bishops their jurisdiction, Luther wrote to Melancthon for his comfort: "They" (those Lutherans) "do not fully understand this, and do not see what circumstances have been brought about for it." (S. Luther's W. XVI, 1830.) But in the "Glosses on the Supposed Imperial Edict," Luther writes in 1531: "It is offered to them by ours at Augsburg.... to gladly accept their jurisdiction, provided they would release the Gospel and stop the abuses, which they themselves know to be abominable abuses, and that they would not only leave the Gospel free, but would also preach it themselves and save life and limb over it; then one could well deal with the benefices, and appoint capable pastors" (p. 2048). (p. 2048.) But is Pastor Lohmann's highest state church authority willing to "put an end to the abuses" and "appoint capable pastors"? - Apparently not. Therefore, the Lutherans should now get rid of theirs, just as "our fathers" once got rid of the papist church regiment. W.

Hanover. The Allgemeine Kz. of December 21 of last year writes the following: "The recent decision of the Minister of Culture regarding the temporary continued use of the old agendaric form of marriage again places the Lutheran Regional Church of Hanover in a crisis that was already considered to be almost overcome: the

Proposals of the Landesconsistorium in matters of the Renitenten and the request, based on an expert opinion of the Synodal Committee and founded in the Synodal Constitution, to possibly be allowed to make a personal presentation to the Emperor, have been rejected by the Minister of Culture." What will Harms and comrades do now? - Probably they will be inclined to do neither, neither to stay nor to go, since they have placed themselves in a position in which both must now seem to them to be wrong. For that the prohibition of a copulation of civil law validity is no reason for separation from the national church, they now see; but that there are otherwise sufficient reasons for separation, they evidently do not see. W.

Lauenburg. The synod for the Lutheran parishes of the Duchy of Lauenburg, which met in September of last year, consisted, as the "Pastoral Correspondenz" reports, "of 9 orthodox clergy and 20 almost entirely 'liberal' secular members, so that resistance to the adoption of the government bill, according to which the Lauenburg parishes were to be affiliated with the Schleswig-Holstein Synodal Union, was hopeless from the outset. Truly a sad state of affairs: all members of the Synod from the preaching ministry 'orthodox' and all from the laity 'liberal'! Should there be only a lack of congregations! W.

Schleswig - Holstein. In the new elections of church representatives, the Social Democrats, especially in southern Holstein, have been eager to bring people of their party into the church representation, and have succeeded in doing so in several places, such as Wandsbeck, Ottensee and Neumünster. In Wandsbeck half of all church representatives are now Social Democrats, and in the church council at Ottensee there are no less than eight Social Democrats among twelve members, so that the Socialist "Berl. Freie Presse" thinks, not without reason, that "the care of the church will be the end of the matter.

Darmstadt. In a recent address to the congregations by the synodal committee for the deanery of Darmstadt, it says, among other things: "It must become a matter of honor for the young people who are becoming independent, especially the educated youth, not only to be able to participate in church and worship, but to be allowed to live into the congregation, instead of fleeing it from Confirmation on. Participation in the holy covenant meal of love must once again become a point of honor and a living inner urge, a duty practiced without shyness or scruple, and the confession of membership of the independent members of our Protestant church. Sunday rest and sanctification must be cultivated, in accordance with the intended goal, not first by weapons and acts of police power and law, but as acts of voluntariness, of the Christian sense of honor with competitive conscientiousness." - Shepherd and flock must indeed be in a desperate state in Hesse when the church regiment tries to win the people back for their church by attacking their honor. W.

Strasbourg. About the ecclesiastical conditions there, the following is reported to the Allg. Kz. among other things: "From a human point of view, the church is entirely in their (the liberal party's) hands: the theological faculty is liberal to a large extent, the majority of the directorate and the O. Consistory is liberal. Consistory, most of the pastors in Strasbourg and other cities are liberal, and if we have not yet been more 'liberalized' in constitutional questions, we owe this largely to the wise moderation of some truly liberal laymen who are serious about the 'equal rights of all directions' and are willing to preserve the rights of the large orthodox minority in the church. Liberalism, however, is thereby well assured of its dominion. ... The real people, in spite of their so favourable position, they have not yet. Their

Purified' Christianity is not 'popular', neither in the cities nor in the countryside. In Strasbourg, the one church at which no liberal clergyman is employed is also the only one that one finds regularly and densely occupied, and in the countryside it is likewise the churches of the 'Lutheran' pastors that show the best church attendance." - But how, under such conditions, a truly Lutheran preacher could remain in such company is indeed a mystery. W.

From Alsace Dr. Münkler writes to the Neues Zeitblatt: While in other parts of Germany the church struggle moves from the apostolic creed on through the various shadings of the so-called middle parties to the subtleties of Missouriism; it seems as if we in Alsace cultivate the most comfortable calm in church and school.... However, the unearthly fire of unbelief is quietly spreading; here are some facts which may well be counted among the rarities in other places: That the Apostolic Confession is also in great dispute with us is to be presupposed as known, but it is nevertheless conspicuous that many a pastor, without any authorization, virtually omits it at baptisms, as well as the Lord's Prayer; It is striking that recently, at the funeral of a clergyman, where the Apostolic Confession was prayed, as expressing the faith of the deceased, a clergyman pressed himself to the altar, and counted it to the shadowy side of the deceased, that he still professed to such articles, not to remember other expressions about his confessional state.... The church authorities tacitly, if not benevolently, look upon all this and yet officially call it a Directory of the Church of the Augsburg Confession.

A Voice from Holland. The "German pastor at the Dutch Lutheran congregation" in Amsterdam, L. K. Lentz, addressed an open letter to Max Frommel in the Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kz. of January 4 as a "contribution to understanding. Among other things, it reads as follows: "I ask, however, on the basis of Scripture and the Confessions: may complete agreement on all doctrinal points be demanded as a *conditio sine qua non* of the Lord's Supper and thus of church fellowship? May, for example, Breslau keep away from those who do not share its views on the importance of the church government, or may the Missourians keep away from those who think differently than they do about the power of the keys, as non-Lutheran believers? I think that this introduces a very dangerous and unscriptural principle into our Lutheran Church, against which, as against the death of all dogmatic-theological research and development, a loud enough protest cannot be made. ... The faith which presently grasps Christ in Word and Sacrament is a matter of the heart and will; dogmatics and the assent to the conception of doctrines which are in a wider, but not in a direct connection with the core and central point, have to do more or less with the intellect. The agreement in this must be left to development, as even the apostles always denied the Judaizing direction, but did not exclude the followers of it. (?) Therefore, if an understanding is to be reached between the present Lutheran Free Churches in Germany, and if the unedifying "biting and eating" among each other is to cease, I see no other way to do this than, first, to come to an understanding about the minimum (cf. Acts 15:24) that must be required for church and communion with each other, without becoming unfaithful to the Word of God and the principle of our church, and therefore to examine the above-mentioned whether it cannot be accepted as authoritative. Secondly, that it be acknowledged that one doctrine in all things and in all persons is the goal, but not yet attained, and that therefore 'open questions', about which it is the duty of love to argue, are permissible. Thirdly, that each particular Free Church be allowed the liberty of constituting itself as it pleases.

it is not only in accordance with the fundamental views of our church, but also corresponds to its particular views and leadership. Let it not be said that by the exception of such borscht the Union, from which one has renounced, is sanctioned and brought into the Lutheran Free Church. Pure, for that is a confusion of terms. Ecclesiastical union with other confessions places us on an entirely different ecclesiastical ground. But the admission in our midst of 'open' doctrinal questions yet to be settled is nothing other than the conscious submission to the Scriptural demand to grow also 'in the knowledge of God' (Col. 1:11)." In the following, Mr. Pastor Lentz urges Pastor Frommel to pursue his plan of bringing the Free Churches together even further and to send out a second Scripture for this purpose. The dear man seems to have no idea of the implications of his theory of the open questions. If, as he thinks, the relationship of the Free Churches to one another were only a matter of one being further ahead of the other in knowledge, who should not then with a thousand joys hold out the brotherly hand to the one still weak in knowledge? But alas, it is not so. The one conclusively says yes, the other conclusively says no, but a true church will never unite with another on the basis of a yes and no theology. 2 Cor. 1:17-20. W.

Necrological. On January 6, Dr. th. J. L. Pasig, senior pastor and superintendent at Schneeberg, in the Saxon Erzgebirge, formerly deacon at Waldenburg in the Princely Schoenburg, for a number of years editor of the Pilgrim from Saxony, also known by the book for daily home devotions published by him, but already out of print, called "Luther's Home Blessing." Was an amiable personality. W.

East Indies. Missionary Blomstrand reports in the Leipziger Missionsblatt of Jan. 1 that he hopes to finish the second part of the Tamulian Concordia Book, on which our dear Pastor Zucker had previously worked, at the end of 1877.

As is well known, the papists also behave in a **rebaptizing manner** here in America. Almost without exception, they rebaptize those who convert to them from Catholic communities. They do this, no doubt, in order to create the impression among their people that with them alone true, valid baptism still exists, that they alone, therefore, are the Christian Church. If the papists baptized such as came to them out of communities which deny the Holy Trinity, or were baptized by notorious rationalists, that would be quite right. If God would that no Christian preacher should recognize such baptisms, it would be most likely to bring to their senses those who now, out of mere ignorance and imprudence, without paying homage to unbelief themselves, have their children baptized by rationalistic penitentiaries. But it is shameful when the papists, out of purely proselytizing tendencies, baptize those of whom they know or could easily learn that they have been validly baptized. This is a much more ungodly act than the rebaptizing of the Baptists, who in their blindness consider infant baptism a *non ens*. In Germany, too, the Papists practice their rebaptism; and while in Bavaria, for example, it is forbidden to publicly condemn the abominations of the Papacy, and if it were done only by reading out the old Württemberg Summaries, the Papists, on the other hand, are permitted to rebaptize the children of the Bavarian State Church, and therefore to declare it in fact to be outside of Christendom, without the ministry condemning it. We read the following in the Lutheran General Gazette of Dec. 21 of last year: In the meeting of the Bavarian General Synod of October 13, Baron v. Rotrnhan, at the request of the Diocesan Synod of Memmelsdorf, reported to the astonishment of the entire assembly the fact that children of Roman Catholic parents who are parishioners in the Protestant parish of Altenstein, who were at that time baptized by the Protestant Church of Bavaria, have been baptized in the Protestant parish of Altenstein.

The same also informed that on all complaints made as a result of that event no decision had been made so far. The same also informed that no decision had yet been made on all complaints made as a result of that event. At that time, the General Synod expressed its deep sorrow over these conspicuous occurrences by a general rising from its seats, and combined this with the request that a decision be asked for as soon as possible. This decision was made on October 23, and we see from this that already on May 14, 1875, the District Government of Lower Franconia asked the Ordinariate of Wuerzburg for information about this conspicuous rebaptism, and that on July 19, 1875, the Ordinariate of Wuerzburg sent a letter to the Protestant Church. J. in a manner insulting to the Protestant Church. But the Minister of Culture declared that he could not find any invecitive in that reply, and that he therefore found no reason to take any further action. The Ministry, by the way, took this opportunity to obtain the opinions of all the Ordinariates, which give an interesting insight into the different positions they hold toward the Protestant Church. Thus, for example, Bamberg declares that it only permits a conditional repetition of baptism 'if the baptizing clergyman adheres to the Free Church. Augsburg declares even more specifically that it does not know a repetition of baptism at all, and only permits a conditional repetition if there is a justified doubt, which cannot be the case with children who were baptized by Lutheran or Reformed clergy, at most with Protestant sects that do not administer baptism consistently in a Christian manner. Such cases could, of course, increase in the future, if the currents hostile to the positive Christian faith, as they are currently emerging in Northern Germany, would also spread in Bavaria. - So far the church newspaper.

W.

In Austria, one way of trying to "help" **Old Catholicism is to allow an** Old Catholic who has been copulated by an Old Catholic priest, if he returns to the Roman Church, to dismiss his wife and to enter into a new marriage without further ado. The end, after all, justifies the means in the Jesuit Church!

W.

Social Democratic. In accordance with a public call, a meeting took place in Berlin on January 3, which was to have as its object the founding of a "Christian-Social Workers' Party. In addition to several other pastors, the court and cathedral preacher Stöcker was present, as well as many Social Democrats, who wanted nothing less than to see a Christian-social workers' party founded. Therefore, however great concessions the former might make to the Socialists and however eloquently he might prove that the worker would attain his best ends without the violent overthrow of all that existed, best of all in alliance with the Church, he had to listen to the most terrible blasphemies against "priests," religion, and the Church, and finally genuine Social-Democratic resolutions were carried by a large majority. The Social-Democratic agitator Most, among others, shouted to the court preacher, with tremendous bravado, those well-known words: "Make your reckoning with heaven, your clock has run out." Stöcker, however, did not allow himself to be frightened and on January 5 arranged a closed after-meeting, in which 60 workers joined the newly organized Christian-Social Workers' Party, who now want to meet every week, not only in order to break into the atheistic Social Democracy and keep back the unsuspecting from it, but also to discuss measures for the improvement of their sad situation. The party is now also publishing a paper under the title of "State Socialist" as a weekly. To found and lead a socialist association is, of course, outside the profession of a church servant; nevertheless, the courage and energy that Rev. Stöcker has put into this.

W.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 24.

April 1878.

No. 4.

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

(Continued.)

X. Concerning the Doctrine of Providence.

Thetic.

Joh. Gerhard: "The divine providence maintains the course of nature in an orderly way. Thus the heavenly Father makes his sun rise and lets it rain, Matth. 5, 45, and gives every grain a body, as he wills, 1 Cor. 15, 38. Therefore, whatever is created by God in such a way that it works like nature, in it God receives the power to work like nature; whatever is created in such a way that it works freely, in it God receives the power to work freely. Hence that well-known saying of Augustine's in his State of God: 'God governs all that he has created, so that he also makes it exercise its own movements.'" *)

Calov: "The holy scripture ascribes the movement of the heavenly bodies to God alone, as the author, and his order, Job 38, 12. that He commands the morning in its time, and shows the dawn its place and lets the evening star rise, Is. 40, 26., that He should bring out the host of the stars by number, Jer. 31, 35. that He should give the sun for the light of the day, and the moon and the stars according to their course for the light of the night, Matth. 5, 45. that He should cause the sun to rise; but He does not impute this to the angels." **)

„Providentia divina institutum a se naturae cursum ordinarie conservat. Sic Pater coelestis solem ἀνατέλλει et pluit, Matth. 5, 45., dat unicuique grano corpus, sicut vult, 1 Cor. 15, 38. Quae ergo sic a Deo sunt creata, ut agant naturaliter, in illis conservat virtutem naturaliter agendi; quae sic sunt creata, ut agant libere, in illis conservat virtutem libere agendi. Hinc usitatum illud Augustini 7. De civitat. Dei e. 30.: 'Sic Deus administrat omnia, quae creavit, ut etiam ipsa proprios motus exercere sinat.'" (Loc. th. de providentia, § 66.)

) „Sacrae literae motum corporum coelestium referunt ad solum Deum ceu auctorem, ejusque ordinationem; Job. 38, 12-, quod diluculo praecipiat et

B. Antithetical.

Dr. v. Hofmann: "God's spirit has a determining influence on human nature and the physical world in its aim at the same. ... Even the clearing of the sky and the driving away of the clouds are said in Scripture to take place through the Spirit, the breath of Jehovah, in that the wind which chases the clouds is thought to be the manifestation of the Spirit of God, which is effectively present in the physical world, of the breath of life which goes out from God into it, and its relation to the Spirit of God is thought to be similar to that of the spirit of man to the same. ... The phenomena of the corporeal world (however) are called the effects of the spirits of God. ... In the name XXXXX XXXX [*Jehovah of hosts*] the relationship of Jehovah to this majority (which is resolved in the expression XXXXX [*Elohim*]) is presented in such a way that it appears to be united under him. Accordingly, in the consciousness of God, which is everywhere presupposed in Scripture, there is at the same time with the one eternal I the multiplicity of a divine race in contrast to the corporeal world; the eternal I in its historical relation to the world of man is not conceived without a multiplicity of spirits. . . . According to this view, God acts through personal beings who, in relation to the physical world, are known together with God, but in relation to God, are known as the personally living means of his action. God does not appear to be enclosed in once and for all ordered, immutable laws of nature, *) but his will is carried out through the free use of those living and personal forces. . . . With Jehovah, in contrast to the world of man, they are called his environment, a congregation of gods around him. (Ps. 89, 8. Job 5, 1. Zech. 14, 5.) ... But then also his activity in the corporeal world, towards which they are gathered together with him and under him, is not to be thought of without them..... And it is not the case that God only works extraordinary things through angels instead of through the ordinary forces of nature: Scripture sees the activity of spirits in the whole of natural life. ... It is acknowledged by the apostle, and not merely adduced as an opinion of the heathen (1 Cor. 8:5), that there is a plurality of gods and lords..... Throughout the whole of Scripture, all the individual phenomena of the world's life, even those that conflict with one another, are traced back to the working of the spirits, without these ceasing to be united under God as the executors of his will. - What concerns us now is only this, that all the good and bad phenomena of the world's life are in the hands of God.

luciferum in tempore producat, ac vesperum surgere faciat, Es. 40, 26., quod educat in numero stellarum exercitum, Jer. 31, 35-, quod det solem in lumen diei, statuta lunae et stellarum in lumen noctis, Matth. 5, 45., quod sinat solem oriri; non autem id tribuit angelis." (System. Tom. IV, 51.)

*) Quite true; but if only v. H. would stop at that!

lifeS can equally be traced back to the working and activity of a spiritual multiplicity" (from the Scriptures!) ".... Creative life, into which the certain fullness of God's being enters in order to become a variety of faculties, serves the eternal God to make Himself present to His world.... If it is creative life by means of which the certain fullness of the divine essence spreads out into the diversity of those qualities which God, present to his world, operates in it, then he can and will also be thought of without this self-activation of himself in the world,*) a knowledge which prevents the majority of the qualities of the God operating in it from being turned into a majority of gods. **But the world, to which God imparts his presence through creative life, is finite, for where God makes himself present to it, there it has its beginning. This twofold knowledge is important enough to let us understand why God not only bears the name XXXXXX XXX XXXXX XXX' in the Old Testament, (2 Sam. 6, 2. ['HErr Zebaoth, who dwells above the cherubim.']) Ps. 80, 2.), but why he also does not appear in the Apocalypse, where his world government wants to be represented, without the four throne beings enthroned above the world. There the spirit world is seen together with God in three ways: in the four throne-beings it is represented, as in it his one being is manifolded for the presence of the world; in the twenty-four elders, as it participates in his knowledge of the world and his counsel over it; finally in the seven angels, or also in the innumerable multitude of angels, who stand before him, as they are ready to serve for the revelation and execution of his will.

. . But if this is the case with the doctrine of angels in Scripture, then it also has a place in our doctrine that is in accordance with Scripture. For then God, in his relationship to the world, will not want to be thought at all without the spirits, in that, on the one hand, through them he communicates himself to the world in the multiplicity of its individual phenomena, as this appears differently in the cherubs, differently in the divine council, differently in the host of angels, while, on the other hand, the corporeal world is the object of divine activity not by means of a once-for-all ordered natural connection, but by means of forces personally active in it: a fundamental view, which is then the basis for all the weathered content of the theological doctrine.

*) Instead of a divine providence, therefore, v. H. should speak of the angelic providence ruling over the world.

**This "knowledge" seems to protect us still more from the assumption that the dear God is burdened with the care of the world government and thereby naturally disturbed in his sweet and blessed rest.

†) According to v. H., therefore, God is not directly present to the world, but only by means of the angels.

whole of the indispensably ever-present background remains. ... But we have not only said of the multiplicity of spirits 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, it is precisely this statement of the difference in the work of God's Spirit, in so far as it has a determining influence on the world in its aim at man, and in so far as it brings forth the multiplicity of its individual phenomena through the multiplicity of spirits, that is the essential content of the doctrine set forth above. . . . The Scriptures cause the work of God to be done as one and whole by the Holy Spirit, but all individual things, so far as they are exercises of power over the corporeal world, to be done by the ministry of the spirits." (The Proof of Scripture. 1852. i, 273. 274. 275. 276. 281. 282. 302. 308. 313. 325. 326. f. 351. 354. 355.)

On this point Dr. Th. Kliefoth, in his excellent criticism of v. Hofmann's proof of Scripture, makes, among other things, the following remarks:

"If it were really true that God does not want to be thought without a plurality of spirits, and that he works everything that he works in world and natural life through angelic powers and never without this, that man therefore has the angels between God and himself in the whole area of his being according to spirit, soul and body, - certainly, we could not stop at regretting Schiller that he did not experience this return of the beautiful time when 'a Dryas lives in every tree', but a peculiar concern should seize us for the thinking of Christianity, which through many centuries has thought of God as he does not want to be thought according to Scripture, and has believed to feel its own God's finger in the history of the world and its own wrath in the weather, while there are only the angels, into which the unworldly, who otherwise cannot come to the world, has manifolded itself in order to become unworldly. But since it is hard for us to assume such a general aberration of Christian thinking, we would like to consider it possible that H. is mistaken on his part. And so it is confirmed on closer inspection.

"There are two points in this angelology of H. H.'s which we must object to: First, that God works everything and anything in the corporeal world through angelic powers, and could not work otherwise; second, that the One Spirit of God has manifolded Himself into a multitude of spirits.

"For the first proposition, that God works all things in the corporeal world through angels, v. H. has only the proof of induction: because God has here and there worked through angels, because it is said that this and that is or will be worked through angels, God must work all such things through angels. But this does not follow. Genesis 28:12 and all similar passages assume no more than that God, when and where he wills, also uses angels to minister in the world and to communicate with men. Because

the waters in the pool of Bethesda were moved by an angel, all waters are not yet moved by angels; and because Revelation 14, 18. 16, 5. gives angels power over fire and water for a special direction, there are therefore not yet pressed angels of fire and angels of arms; because Jacob Gen. 48, 16. Because Ps. 34, 8. comforts us that God can also send angelic help, because Ps. 91, 11-12. holds out the prospect of the same help to a certain individual, it does not follow from this that all protection and harm to man in the visible realm is wrought by angels. And Ps. 104, 4. may be said what it will, at least this is not said that all flames and winds are transformed angels. And if in Matth. 18, 10. so much should really be said that God lets all children be guarded by angels for the sake of their general helplessness, it does not follow from this that an angel must appear in the wind that plays around the ridge of my roof. Finally, it does not follow from Dan. 10:4 that all historical movements would once and for all be wrought by angels standing behind the nations and political rulers. All these facts and statements in no way justify making a general proposition out of them, and saying that God works everything in the sphere in question through angels. And yet, H. H. does not stop there, but proceeds to the still much more far-reaching proposition that God cannot work in the world and in the natural life of man in any other way than through angels: his activity in the world cannot be thought of without them; they are the necessary mediation for his activity in the world. And this proposition is made without even attempting to prove it in Scripture, as indeed none can be produced. Thus, while Scripture testifies only that God, where and when he wills in individual cases, avails himself of the service of his angels in his work and activity in the world of man, v. H. goes beyond the contents of Scripture with the two further assertions that God works everything in the world through angels, and that he is also bound to such mediation. How extremely questionable this is, however, we shall best see if we follow Mr. H. into some of the applications which he himself makes of these assumptions of his in the above.

"v. H. wants to recommend his doctrine of angels to us by the advantages it grants: thus God's activity in the world does not appear to be carried out by blind natural forces according to unalterable natural laws, but as the free use of living personal forces; thus only would there be a God of miracles. But all this is only apparent. It is not right to speak of "free" use, if God cannot work without this mediation. The laws of nature, at least, are not necessary means for God to reach the world. Nor will anyone who holds fast to the belief in a personal God call the laws of nature immutable: God can just as well suspend and change the laws of nature,

than give personal angels different orders. In this respect, then, there would be little difference. The concept of miracle, however, seems to us to be made not only no better, but worse, even by this doctrine of angels. The concept of a miracle always requires the immediate personal intervention and action of God, who breaks through the orders of nature which he has made, either by his own action, or in such a way that he gives creatures, men or spirits, power to break through them by action which he has wrought or permitted. Now, if one denies the laws of nature altogether, and does not allow God to act at all in the world, and allows everything, the most ordinary as well as the most unusual, to be wrought by angels, then everything is a miracle; and if everything is a miracle, then nothing is a miracle. - This is exactly what happens when H. H. applies his doctrine of angels to the concept of revelation. Not only all manifestation, but also all revelation of God is mediated to him by the service of angels: wherever a single revelation takes place through face or word, there we have to think of an effect of God mediated by angelic service. The proof of this is again given by way of induction: Because Apost. 8, 26. Zech. 2, 7. and in the Apocalypse angels impart revelations to the apostles and prophets, v. H. extends this to all cases. But nothing gives him a right to supplant an angel with every prophetic "the Lord spoke to me," and to cancel all the prophets' seeing, all God's speaking to his people from mouth to ear, all the Holy Spirit's speaking in the hearts of God's men, in favor of his angelic mediation. There is therefore no scriptural ground for this. But now add that then, according to v. H.'s theory, nothing else happens to the prophet who receives a revelation than to the smoke from my chimney which the wind curls, for angelic action happens to both. And further, consider that the angels are only 'the personally living forces of nature'. What then becomes of revelation, which is wrought by personally living forces of nature, as is the case with everything? We must note this, too, in connection with v. H.'s views of revelation and Scripture. In sum, however, we draw the result from these applications that H. H. makes of his angel doctrine to miracles and revelation, that through them, on the one hand, God and God's personal work and activity are separated from the world by the interposed angels, pushed back into the supramundane, on the other hand, miracles and revelation appear to be worked by personally living natural forces in the same way as the most ordinary things, and consequently seem to be drawn down to these most ordinary things.

"Of course, if everything in the world and in the natural life of man is wrought by angels, and indeed by the determining inner workings of them, then also evil must be wrought by them. Thus we find that this consequence is indeed drawn, and that what was said above about the working of the manifestations of evil through the Spirit of God is also true.

was here transferred to the spirits and angels, or rather continued by means of the angel doctrine. . . .

"Everything, however, that we had to object to in H. H.'s teaching about the relationship of the angels to the world, is now made all the worse by what he teaches, secondly, about their relationship to God. It is true that H. H. says that the angels are creaturely beings, but we know that their creation is not a calling into being by the almighty word and speech of God, but that God creates what he creates out of himself. Now the expressions used of the relation of angels and spirits to God correspond to this: The Cherubes are creaturely beings, but 'creaturely life, into which the eternal fullness of God's being enters, in order to become in it a variety of faculties', so that the eternal God thus makes himself present to his world; 'in the four throne beings his one being is manifolded for the world's presence'; In the world of spirits, the unity of God's being is manifested in the variety of his attributes to be exercised in the world; in it, the unity of God's spirit manifests itself.' These are the expressions used of the origin of the spirits and angels and of their relation to God. In order to visualize how H. thinks of the process, one may resort to this or that of the expressions used in similar fundamental views, to emanation, or to the self-differentiation of God, and the like. H.'s more detailed statements fluctuate back and forth: soon, the unique fullness of God's essence, in that it goes into the cherubim, becomes a multiplicity of faculties, so that the cherubim are personal faculties, powers of God; soon, the unique essence of God, in that it sets the spirit world out of itself, unfolds into the multiplicity of its properties, so that the spirits and angels are God's properties that have become personal. But it always boils down to the fact that the angels and spirits are not created by God in the ecclesiastical sense, but that the One Spirit of God has placed Himself in a multiplicity of spirits, has unfolded Himself into the multiplicity of spirits. This multiplicity of spirits, thus set forth from the Spirit of God, remains in the One Spirit of God, so that it is an assembly of Gods, a divine race in God. And now let it be added that, according to the above, not only are the evil spirits thus resolved in the Spirit of God, but also that these spirits stand behind all phenomena and changes in the world, yes, are the 'personally living forces of nature' themselves. How seriously the latter is taken, and how thereby God and the world come to stand to each other, is quite clearly shown by what, at the beginning of our above extract, Mr. H. says of the wind, with quite unjustified reference to Job 26:13: "The wind is an appearance of the Spirit of God, inasmuch as the same, as the breath of life proceeding from God, is effective in the corporeal world against the wind.

The wind, therefore, relates to the spirit of God in the same way that the spirit of man relates to the spirit of God. After all this, 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 the question in the affirmative.

(To be continued.)

(Submitted.)

Dr. Seiss and the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

The "*Christian Union*" had written the following: "The doctrines of the Lutheran denomination are not very dissimilar to those of most Protestant churches. The main point of difference concerns the doctrine of the Lord's Supper" (Every well-versed Lutheran knows that this is not so. For other main points of difference concern the doctrines of free will, of regeneration, of conversion, of the sacraments in general, of absolution, and others, but especially the doctrine of justification), "concerning which it has been generally asserted that they (the Lutherans) hold the doctrine of consubstantiation, that is, that the body and blood of Christ are really and essentially present in the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper after Consecration." (The Lutherans, to be sure, do not hold the doctrine of consubstantiation, but have ever and always rejected it when the same has been attributed to them. But neither is consubstantiation, "that the body and blood of Christ are really and essentially present in the bread and wine," as the "*Christian Union*" says here, but that the body of Christ and the bread together become one mass or even one being in the Lord's Supper; which yet does not happen. While, therefore, we reject the doctrine of consubstantiation, we do, however, teach that the body and blood of Christ are really and essentially present in the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper after Consecration in use. If only our enemies and others, who still ascribe to us the doctrine of consubstantiation, would remember this for once! To a great extent, many dictionaries are to blame for the wrong understanding of the word consubstantiation; for even Kaltschmidt, in his otherwise excellent dictionary of the German language, says that consubstantiation is "the divine presence in the holy supper.") The "*Christian Union*" continues, "This assertion, however, is contradicted by the Lutherans, who hold that it is the transfigured, but not the essential presence of Christ, which they discover in the elements." (Lutherans believe in the essential presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper; but that this presence ever underwent any special glorification or transfiguration, which

We do not know anything about the fact that the apostles did not have it at the first supper. It is true that we now receive the transfigured body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, because there is now no other body and blood of Christ, whereas in the first Supper the apostles received the body and blood of Christ with bread and wine, when Christ was still in a state of humiliation. Thus the Lutherans believe that the now transfigured, but none the less true, natural, human body and the true, natural, human, now transfigured blood of Christ, that is, the very same heavenly goods which the apostles received, are truly and essentially present in the Lord's Supper. The presence of the transfigured Christ and his essential presence are, after all, not opposites). "In the 'Wittenberg Concord' (1536), written by Luther and other leaders of the Church, it is asserted, 'We deny the doctrine of transubstantiation (transubstantiation), as we deny the local inclosure of the body and blood of Christ in the bread.'" *) (This would be correct; for that Christ's body and blood are there, we know, and that chiefly from the "words of institution" of the Lord's Supper; but how and in what manner they are there, we do not know, since they are there in an un-spatial, heavenly, and mysterious manner. We must add, however, that we not only deny the local inclusion of the body and blood of Christ in the bread, but we deny that the body of Christ is locally included in the bread and the blood of Christ in the wine, which ordinary Christians also receive with us. But incorrect is what follows, namely:) "'If it be asked,' says Dr. Waterland, in his work on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, 'what they admit and insist upon, it is a sacramental union, not a *corporeal* presence.'" (Lutherans teach both a sacramental union and a *corporeal presence* when this is rightly understood, namely, a presence of the real body and blood of Christ in Holy Communion. However, we reject a *corporeal presence* when it is understood to mean a presence in the manner of the

*) In the other article of the Wittenberg Concordia Formula of 1536, the words in question are as follows: "Although they (the undersigned) hold no transubstantiation, that the body of Christ is *localiter* i. e. Although they (the undersigned) do not hold that the body of Christ is locally (i.e., spatially) enclosed in the bread or otherwise persistently (or *durabilem*, in the Latin text) united with it outside the use of the holy sacrament, they nevertheless confess and hold that for the sake of sacramental unity the bread is the body of Christ, that is, they hold and believe that together with the bread the body of Christ is truly present and truly offered, etc., and that the body of Christ is truly present and truly offered. For apart from the use and enjoyment, when the bread is laid aside and enclosed in the monstrance or sacramental chalice, or when it is carried and presented in procession and creed, as is done in the papacy, they hold and believe that the body of Christ is not present." (S. Lutheri Werke, herausgeg. by Walch. XVII, 2529. the Latin text is found in Seckendorf's *Commentarius de Lutheranismo*, L. III, s. 15. § 47. add. c. f. 132.)

Body, i.e., a spatial one. Our doctrine of sacramental union is based precisely on the certainty that Christ's true body and his true blood are present in the Lord's Supper; for sacramental union takes place between the bread and the present body of Christ, which are both distributed with one another and eaten by all communicants with the mouth, and between the wine and the present blood of Christ, which are both distributed with one another and drunk by all communicants with the mouth; as our children soon learn in the church school).

Now this concerns the ecclesiastical position of Dr. Seiß. As is well known, he has always argued for the admission of false and erroneous believers to our Lutheran pulpits and to our Lutheran communion table, while he wants to be Lutheran. His Lutheranism, however, must be in a very bad way, since he has printed in the "*Lutheran and Missionary*" (January 24), of which he is the editor, that which is communicated above from the "*Christian Union*" about our doctrine of the Lord's Supper, without refuting or reproving the falsehoods in it with a single word. Now all the readers of his paper have read that utterly false presentation of our doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and those who are not better instructed naturally consider the whole thing, which is in part obviously false and in part confusing, to be correct, because a "Lutheran" periodical itself reprints it without a word of explanation or disapproval. This is not the way to spread Lutheran doctrine. It is therefore not surprising that Dr. Seiß, in the same number of his journal, in another place, when speaking of the nature of the Lord's Supper, does not let himself be heard differently than when one hears a Calvinist speak. Among other things, he writes: "Bread and wine are not the body and blood of Christ, but when they are given and taken according to Christ's order and institution, the body and blood of Christ are shared and sealed as the food and drink of the soul to the worthy communicant." The Reformed confession *Confessio Tetrapolitana* uses very similar language on the same point. In the 17th article it says: "The Lord, as in his last supper, so also this day, gives his faithful, when they keep this supper, his true body and blood truly to eat and drink for the food and drink of their souls unto eternal life." Further, Dr. Seiß writes: "By his (Christ's) gracious institution and ministrations, the bread we break and the cup we bless are communion, the sharing of that sacrifice (Christ's), the circumambulation of or participation in the same. ... Thus," he says, "we understand the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and this we hold and teach to be the doctrine of the holy Scriptures concerning that subject." Why is the Lutheran, that is, Scriptural doctrine of the Lord's Supper not roundly expounded by Dr. Seiß?

...what she's like? Does he not know it? Where are the unworthy communicants with him? Do they not receive the body and blood of Christ? And what can not be meant by the "sacrifice" of Christ? Besides, the apostle clearly says in 1 Cor. 10:16: "The blessed cup which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" These words Dr. Seiß flattens and obscures. It is true that in his article he also uses expressions which want to be Lutheran, such as: "The bread and the wine are the earthly vessels, and Christ himself, whose body is broken and whose blood is shed for our blessedness, is the heavenly treasure which he gives us by means of the bread and wine when they are used according to his command and ordinance"; but the Reformed also speak in this way here and there in their confessions. Wherefore the old orthodox theologian Quenstedt also writes: "Another is, that the whole Christ is present in the Lord's Supper, and another, that the whole Christ, as if he were the heavenly thing (in the Lord's Supper), is united with the elements of bread and wine, and thus also wholly enjoyed in a sacramental way. The former we affirm, the latter we deny. For we say that Christ's body only is united with the bread, and his blood with the wine, and sacramentally partaken of with the mouth of the body, but that the whole Christ is spiritually received with the mouth of faith." (*Theol. did. -polem, part. IV., cap. 6., sect. 2., q. 2., fol. 200.*)

A Lutheran.

On the miraculous powers among the first Christians.

Testimonies of the fathers.*)

Justin Martyr: And now ye may learn from that which is done before your eyes; for many of ours, the Christians, have many demon-possessed in the whole world to and fro, even in your city, by conjuring the same by the name of JEsu Christ, who was crucified under Pontio Pilato, who could not be healed by all other spirit-banners, conjurors, and sorcerers, healed, and heal such even now, by making powerless and casting out the demons which possess men, (*Apol. I, p. 45.*) For every demon is overcome and subdued, who is invoked by the name of this same Son of God, who is the firstborn before all creation, born of the Virgin, and made man, who was able to suffer, and was crucified

*) These statements, given here in translation, can be found in the original language in an article of the "Zeitschrift für luth. Theologie und Kirche", which bears this heading.

Of your people, and died, and rose again from the dead, and ascended into heaven. *Dial. c. Tr. p.* 311. Even now we who believe in our Lord JEsu Christum, crucified under Pontio Pilato, have all demons and unclean spirits, if we conjure them, in our power. *Ibid.* S. 302.

Irenaeus: They (the heretics) are so far removed that they could raise the dead, as the Lord raised them, and the apostles by prayer. And often in the fellowship of the brethren, when the congregation of the place confessed it for necessary causes, with much fasting and communal prayer, the spirit of the dead man returned, and the man was given to the prayers of the saints. *Euseb. hist. eccl. v, 7*. But if they say that the Lord has done this even by a deceptive work, we will lead them to the writings of the prophets, and show them from them that all things have been thus foretold by him, and have come to pass quite reliably, and that he alone is the Son of God. Wherefore also in his name his true disciples, who have received grace from him, do for the good of other men, as every one of them hath received the gift from him. For some really and truly cast out demons, so that even often those themselves who have been cleansed from evil spirits have become believers and remained in the church. Others have foreknowledge of things to come, have visions, and can prophesy. Others heal the sick by the laying on of hands, and make them whole again. Also, as we have already said, dead men have been raised and have remained with us for many years. In short, it is impossible to count the gifts which the Church has received from time to time throughout the world, and which she uses every day for the good of the Gentiles in the name of Jesus Christ crucified under Pontius Pilate; by which she neither deceives anyone nor makes money; for as she received them freely from God, so she also serves with them freely. *Ibid.* II, 32, 4. As we also hear that many brethren in the church have prophetic gifts, and speak by the Spirit with all manner of tongues, revealing the hidden things of men for the common profit, and declaring the mysteries of God. *Ibid.* V, 6, 1.

Tertullianus: All this can be taught you officially and by the same lawyers who themselves enjoy the benefits of Christians, let them cry what they will. For even the secretary of such a one, having been thrown by a demon, has been delivered, as has also a relative of such a one, and the boy of another. And how many distinguished men (of common ones we do not speak here) have been cured either of demons or of diseases? Even Severus, the father of Antoninus, was mindful of Christians; for he called to him the Christian Proculus, surnamed Torpacion, the steward of the Euodia, who had once healed him with oil, and till his death

keep with him, *Ad Scap.* c. 4. Let one, who is known to be driven by a demon, be brought before your courts. Asked by any Christian to speak, that spirit, according to the truth, will confess that he is a demon, while otherwise he falsely pretends to be God. In like manner bring one of those who are supposed to be driven by God. . . . If then these (who are thought to be gods) will nod and confess that they are demons, since they will not dare to lie before the Christian, shed the blood of this exceedingly impudent Christian on the spot! What can be more evident than this? What more credible than this proof? The simplicity of truth is before every man. He is attended with subtle power, and suspicion will not be possible. That there is sorcery or other such fraud, you would say, if your eyes and ears permitted it. But what can be objected to that which is set forth in such undisguised honesty. *Apolog.* c. 23.

Origen: Moreover, it is to be said that there is another peculiar proof of the Word, a more divine one than the Greek one taken from the dialectic. This more divine one the apostle calls proof of the Spirit and of power: of the Spirit, because of the prophecies which are able to bring men to faith, especially in what is said of Christ; but of power, because of the miraculous powers, the occurrence of which can be shown from many other things, as well as from the fact that traces of it are still preserved in those who live according to the command of the Word. *Contra Cels.* I, 2. -.. JEsus, whose name, as has been seen with eyes, has already cast out innumerable demons from souls and bodies, and has been powerful in those from whom they were cast out."-Ibiae. 25. they cast out demons, and perform many healings, and see according to the will of the word many things to come. Ibiä. 46. God is witness to our conscience, that we will not confirm the divine doctrine of JEsu by lying reports, but by manifold evidence. Ibid. We have also seen many healed of dangerous fits and convulsions and frenzies, and of very many other (diseases), which neither men nor demons could heal. Ibid. We believe him that saith, I have no devil: for he cannot open the eyes of the blind, nor do such signs as are written, of which there are traces and remnants in the churches of Jesus unto this day. In *Joann.* 20,28.

Cyprian: O, if thou wouldest hear and see them, when they are summoned by us, and tormented with spiritual scourges, and cast out of possessed bodies with the blows of our words, when they howl and groan, with human voice, and in consequence of divine power, feeling the scourges and blows, confess the judgment to come. Come and stand, that what we say may be true, *Ad Demetr.*

(Uebersetzt von Prof. A. Crämer.)

Compendium of the Theology of the Fathers

From

M . Heinrich Eckhardt.

(Continued.)

V. The end purpose.

Why did God create man?

Damascenus: "For communion with Himself God created man." 1) Basil: "Even the form of thy body teacheth thee to what end thou wast made. Thou wast made that thou mightest look up to God; not that thy life should roll in dung; not that thou shouldst feast on earthly things in a beastly manner, but that thou shouldst wallow in the heavenly kingdom." 2)

VI. The time of his creation.

Why was man created last among all things?

Nazianzenus: "No wonder that man was created last, who is honored by the hand and with the image of God. For it was necessary, as it were, to set up a residence for the king beforehand, and so at last to introduce the king who was already well provided with everything." 3) Tertullian: "For God made the world for man, not for himself." 4)

VII. Its original properties.

What was man like in the beginning?

Tertullian: "He was innocent, very friendly to God, and aⁿnsassen of Paradise." 5) According to Damascenus, this is: "God created man pure, free from corruption, right, brave, loving, carefree, adorned with every virtue, adorned with all goods, as it were a second world, another angel, a king of things, who stood on earth." 6)

Ad consortium sui ipsius condidit Deus hominem. Dam. 1. 4. orth. c. 4.

Ipsa figura corporis te docet, in quem finem factus sis. Factus es, ut in Deum suspicias: non ut in terra volvatur vita tua; non ut pecuino more in terrenis delectes, sed coelestem patriam obeas. Basil, in Hexaem.

Nil mirum, si homo novissime prolatus est, manu et imagine Dei honoratus. Oportebat enim tanquam Regi prius regiam constituere, et ita demum Regem jam stipatum omnibus introducere. Naz. orat. 6. in nov. Dom.

Mundum enim Deus homini, non sibi fecit. Tert. 1. 1. contra Mare.

Innocens erat, Deo proxime amicus et paradisi colonus. Tert. 1. de Patient.

Fecit Deus hominem purum, pravitaeque carentem, rectum, fortem, jucundum, securum, omni virtute decorum, omnibusque bonis ornatum, veluti quendam secundum mundum, alterum Angelum, eorumque, quae in terra sunt, Regem. Dam. 1. 2. orth. cap. 12.

Was he contrary to his power, mutable and free to both?

Cyril: "Our father Adam was of a changeable nature, and it was inborn in him that now he might love righteousness and hate iniquity, now, on the contrary, he might embrace iniquity and thrust righteousness from him." 1)

How do you prove that?

Tertullian: "This proves the very commandment given by God at that time. For no commandment would have been given to him who had not in his power the obedience due to the commandment; again, the threat of death for transgression would not have been added, if the disregard of the commandment had not also been given to man in his free will." 2)

Further, was he mortal or immortal?

John Maxentius: "We confess that Adam was created right by God in all things, neither mortal nor immortal, but capable of both, having it in the power of his free will both to will and to be able to do all things, i.e., good and evil." 3)

Why do you say that he was neither mortal nor immortal?

Nyssen: "If God had made man mortal from the beginning, he would never have condemned the sinner to death, for he never condemns a mortal to mortality. But if he had made him immortal, he would by no means have created him in need of food, for no immortal has need of bodily food." 4)

So you're not claiming anything specific about this?

Note the twofold distinction: Beda: "Thus man was created immortal, that, if he would sin, he might nevertheless die; and thus he was created mortal, that, if he would not

Mutabilis naturae Pater noster Adam fuit, eratque innatum illi, ut posset modo justitiam diligere et iniquitatem odire; modo contra iniquitatem amplecti et justitiam respuere. Cyrill. 1. 8. thes. c. 1.

Confirmat hoc ipsa lex, tunc a Deo posita. Non enim poneretur lex ei, qui non haberet obsequium debitum legi in sua potestate; nec rursus comminatio mortis transgressioni adscriberetur, si non et contemptus legis in arbitrii libertatem homini deputeretur. Tert. 1. 2. contra Mare.

Confitemur rectum in omnibus a Deo creatum Adam, non mortalem, nec immortalem, sed utriusque capacem, habentem in proprii facultate arbitrii et velle et posse ad omnia, h. c. ad bonum et ad malum. Joh. Maxent. in Cath. prof. de Christo.

Si hominem a principio mortalem fecisset Deus, nequaquam peccantem morte condemnasset: nam mortalem mortalitate nullo modo condemnat. Si autem immortalem fecisset, nequaquam eum esca indigentem creasset, nullum enim immortale esca corporali indiget. Nyss. 1. de creat. hom. c. 2.

sinned, neither could he die." 1) Justin: "God created men that, if they would arrange their lives according to his will, they should live with him and reign immortal." 2) Beda: "Mortal he was according to the constitution of his animal body; immortal by beneficence of his Creator." 3)

From the latter limb of this answer two questions arise: one: If man was immortal, would he therefore always have lived on earth?

Gregory: "For this purpose man was placed in Paradise, that, if he would unite himself to obedience to his Creator by the bond of love, he might one day come to the heavenly fatherland of the angels without the death of the flesh. Whither, therefore, since the time of redemption, the elect have wandered after the death of the flesh, thither, without doubt, our first parents, if they had persevered in their created state, could have been transplanted even without the death of their bodies." 4)

The other: Was that original immortality the same as that to which we shall attain in that life?

Beda: "The first blessed life of man was immortal, so that man could not have died in the same, if he had carefully preserved himself from the seduction of sin: but the second will become so immortal, that man cannot die in the same, nor be challenged by any seduction of impulsive sin." 5)

VIII. The image of God in man.

You have said several times that man is made in the image of God: what then is this image?

Nyssenens: "When Scripture says that man is made in the image of God, it sums up everything at once in one general expression. For this is the same thing as if it said that the

Sic est immortalis conditus homo, ut tamen, si peccaret, posset mori: et sic mortalis est conditus, ut si non peccaret, etiam posset non mori. Beda, homil. in 8. epiph.

Condidit Deus homines, ut si vitam ipsius voluntati contemperarent, cum illo degerent, immortalesque regnarent. Justin. Ap. 2.

Mortalis erat conditione corporis animalis: immortalis beneficio conditoris. Beda in 2. c. Gen.

Ad hoc in paradiso homo positus fuerat, ut si se ad conditoris sui obedientiam vinculo charitatis adstringeret, ad coelestem Angelorum patriam quandoque sine morte carnis transiret. Quo igitur post redemptionis tempus, carnis morte interposita, electi transeunt: illuc procul dubio parentes primi, si in conditionis suae statu perstitissent, etiam sine morte corporum transferri potuissent. Greg. in 3. c. Job.

Prima hominis beata vita fuit immortalis, ut posset in ea homo non mori, si se a peccati seductione cautus servaret: secunda vero ita fiet immortalis, ut in ea homo non possit mori, nec ulla peccati pulsantis seductione tentari. Beda, homil. in 8. epiph.

human nature has been made partaker of all that is good." 1) Gregory: "The image and likeness of God is: to hate evil with excellent hatred, and to love good with perfect love." 2)

Is this image not merely in the outward form of the body?

Basil: "That we are made in the image of God, we have not in the likeness of our bodies. For after the body is corrupted, the image is lost." 3)

What then is the object of the divine image?

Epiphanius: "The ecclesiastical doctrine believes that the whole man is after this image, but does not distinguish in which part this lies, that he is after the image." 4)

Is the image of God still found in man?

Damascenus: "In an uncorrupted state God had made man for the sake of communion with Himself. But by transgressing his commandment we have blurred the features of the divine image, and being now entangled in the bad, we are justly deprived of communion with God." 5) Nyssenus: "The integrity of nature is destroyed." 6) Basil: "Having lost the image of the high heavenly workmaster, man has assumed the image of the earthly one." 7)

But who is the restorer of that vanished image?

Beda: "The seal of the image of God, which had been rubbed off and obliterated by the sin of Adam, is restored by Christ through repeated expression.

Scriptura, cum ad imaginem Dei hominem factum retulit, generali quadam voce universa simul complectitur. Idem enim est hoc, ac si diceret, humanam naturam omnis boni factam esse participem.

Nyss. 1. de hom. c. **17.**

Imago et similitudo Dei est, inclyto odio malum odisse, et amore perfecto bonum diligere. Greg. 1. 2. in I Reg. 2.

Ad imaginem Dei factos esse, in forma corporis non habemus. Corrupto enim corpore figura perit. Basil, in Hex.

Ecclesiastica doctrina credit, secundum imaginem esse totum hominem; non decernit autem, in qua parte situm sit id, quod est secundum imaginem. Epiph. 1. 3. tom. **1.**

In incorruptione fecerat Deus hominem, propter sui ipsius communionem. At per transgressionem praecepti divinae imaginis characteres oblitteravimus, et nunc in malitia constituti, divina communione juste sumus privati. Dam. 1. 4. c. 4.

Naturae integritas est contrita. Nyss. 1. de vita M.

Homo postquam supercoelestis opificis imaginem amisit, terreni similitudinem assumpsit. Basil, in ps. 48. Signaculum imaginis Dei, quod per Adae peccatum attritum fuerat et oblitteratum, rursus per Christum iterata impressione restituitur. Beda 1. 3. in Job.

Man, through sin, has taken on the image of the evil one. Therefore Christ, being made like unto us men, came that we might be unformed again into his image." 1)

By what?

Origen: "The good of nature snatched away by occasion of the fall is renewed by grace, and restored by the teaching of the word of God." 2)

(To be continued.)

Literary.

Word and Sacrament. An instruction for the right use of the means of grace as a gift for life, especially for confirmands and newly confirmed. By G. Chr. Dieffenbach, Lutheran pastor at Schlitz. Second edition. Gotha, G. Schloßmann.

The author "has made it his task not to treat Confirmation itself in detail or to attach special exhortations to this solemn act, but rather to place the essence, the blessing, and the right use of the means of grace in the right light. Concerning the order of the sections, he thus states: "Since all our salvation rests on the gracious redemption through Jesus Christ, and the means of grace want nothing else than to communicate to us the dear redemption we have acquired and its eternal blessing, the first section, the introduction, presents this work in brief words. . . The II. Division then deals with Holy Baptism. For it is through this sacrament that we first became partakers of salvation, and every Christian must continue to remember the holy grace of baptism, live in it, and return to it from all human error. The position and significance of confirmation is also discussed here..... The third section deals with the Word of God and seeks to encourage and guide the faithful and fruitful use of this means of grace. The IV. Section IV presents the Holy Communion in its essence and shows how one should prepare oneself properly for it. Confession is accordingly also discussed here." Section V deals with prayer, which, however, is not counted among the means of grace, as many do. The subjects treated here are therefore extremely important, and it cannot be denied that the author has treated them with much warmth and acknowledges their importance. The language is a

Homo maligni imaginem adduxit per peccatum: ideo Christus venit in similitudine hominum factus, ut nos ad ejus imaginem reformemur. Orig. homil. 1. in Genes.

Naturae bonum praevaricationis occasione decerptum per gratiam reparatur, et per doctrinam verbi Dei restituitur. Orig. homil. 4. in Cant

informal, vigorous. Especially the sections on baptism and Holy Communion are spiced with words of Luther and our confessions. We are sorry to be compelled to draw attention to *naevi* as well. On p. 49 we read: "A repetition of baptism is neither necessary nor possible. As little as we are born bodily several times, so little can we be born of water and the Spirit several times. As long as the period of grace lasts, the new life once given can be awakened again by God's grace, even if it seems to have almost died out under the nature of this world. Such revival of inward new life God the Holy Spirit wants to work in us through the Word." P. 53 it is said, "This new birth ... takes place only in holy baptism." According to these words, then, only baptism, and not also the Word, would have regenerating power. According to these words the given new life could never be completely lost. This is contrary to Gal. 4, 19. 1 Pet. 1, 23. Jac. 1, 18. Notwithstanding other glorious sayings of man's sinful ruin and God's grace, yet we find p. 92 the more than alarming words, "Not all follow the calling; we can both follow or resist." But according to God's Word we can only resist. On p. 91 f. there is talk of the calling through the gospel and of the enlightenment according to Luther's explanation of the third article. There is talk of a double enlightenment, of one wrought by the law, and of one wrought by the gospel. Although there are theologians who speak catachristically of an *illuminatio legalis*, they do not mean an enlightenment in the sense in which Luther uses the word here, and this so-called *illuminatio legalis* would not be placed between the calling through the gospel and the enlightenment through the gospel, but before the calling. S. 94. It is said, "Right conversion comprehends two things in itself: repentance, or turning away from sin, and faith, or conversion to the gracious God." Against this it is to be noted that no repentance without faith is a turning away from sins. The following is a description of "right repentance" and "true faith"-both distinguished. Of "right repentance," which is also ascribed to the publican, who, after all, entered his house justified by faith, it is said: it is "not only recognition of sin, but also heartfelt sorrow over sin and desire for deliverance from sin." But this "desire" is nothing else than faith; the author, however, does not seem to regard it as such, and thus makes a "right repentance" without faith. This, to say the least, shows great obscurity, and may have a very confusing effect. According to p. 200, the Lord's Prayer is addressed only to God the Father. This is to say nothing of other misleading and imprecise expressions. Regarding the enclosed prayers, it would be desirable that older prayers had been given throughout. The book contains VI and 244 pages 12°.

G.

WAY-MARKS FOR THE CONFIRMED. Translated from the German. Philadelphia: Lutheran Bookstore.

This booklet, published by the *Lutheran Bookstore*, contains many beautiful, excellent testimonies, which will certainly not please many in the *General Council*, but of which we are heartily glad; nevertheless, we cannot recommend it completely, since it also contains some questionable things* In the first part is described: the journey, the crossroads, the end, the two ways, the broad and narrow, and the choice. In the description of the 2 ways occur the words, "What shall be thy end, and where thy final stay shall be, is for thee to decide." P. 20. But according to God's word, man cannot choose his salvation. That a man should choose the narrow way is God's grace alone. This should have been strongly emphasized at the beginning of the fourth section ("the choice"), while it merely says: "So then, my dear young friend, you have decided to remain faithful to your Savior." p. 30. P. 30. It is certainly not in keeping with sound doctrine when, in p. 25, the "heavy demands and commandments" of the narrow way are simply stated: "'Ye shall be perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.'" . . . "Repent and believe the gospel, etc.'" In the second part, counsel is given for the "journey." There the order is most curious: "1. keep that which is committed unto thee; 2. remember the Sabbath day, that thou mayest keep it holy; 3. hold thy Bible dear; 4. keep up prayer; 5. partake often of Holy Communion; 6. seek and keep the company of believing Christians; 7. keep up fellowship with thy Saviour JESUS CHRIST." This latter exhortation is prefaced with the words, "But now, my friend, we come to the main thing. All your church-going and Bible-reading, all your praying and communion-going, and all your fellowship with devout Christians, will avail thee nothing, if thou hold not fast that One thing. It is the one truly necessary thing, the one indispensably necessary thing for time and eternity." But should not this have been put above? Do not the words of the first exhortation bring it with them, "Preserve, etc."? See p. 34. And is it not, after all, a mere outward going to church, reading the Bible, etc., to which exhortation has been given? The warning against sects, p. 34, should be more specific. The exhortation to celebrate Sunday, p. 37, is undoubtedly not based on the Lutheran doctrine of Sunday. The third part, entitled "Faith and Love," gives the text of the Ten Commandments (the first, third, and fourth, unfortunately, in the Old Testament Reformed version), the Three Articles, the Lord's Prayer, the words of Baptism (with Baptismal Covenant and Confession), the words of the Lord's Supper, Luther's Questions, Morning, Evening, and Table Prayers, and the Table of the House. The booklet contains 99 pages 16°.

G.

Memorial Booklet for Confirmed Christians. Second edition.

Hanover. Published by Heinr. Feesche. 1876.

This 44-page booklet contains the following: Remembrance of Confirmation, exhortations concerning prayer and the use of Scripture (along with a table on the use of the Psalms), the sanctification of Sundays and public worship, the Lord's Supper and confession, the Christian walk and Christian ministry (along with the main points of the act of baptism in the event that an emergency baptism is to be administered). The individual sections are accompanied by prayers, sayings, hymns, etc.. Even if there were some criticisms concerning the arrangement of the material, certain obscurities, e.g. concerning Sunday, certain imprecise expressions, recommendations of writings, e.g. Fresenius' Communion Book (which recommendation, as far as this book by Fresenius is concerned, can have very bad consequences), the booklet is, on the whole, quite beautiful. The language is appropriate and natural. G.

Ecclesiastical - Contemporary.**I. America.**

Lutheran and Missionary. The editor of this paper, Rev. Seiss, recently showed what a brainchild he is by joking in an article nearly a column long about the last meeting of the small but faithful Concordiasynode (now the Concordiadistrict of the Ohio Synod). G.

The Synod of Canada is **a church fellowship divided in itself**. A correspondent of their "Kirchenblatt" writes: "Only two things are possible: either the delegation at the last council has represented and supported its subjective view of the 'rule question', and then naturally ceases to be the representative of a whole body; or else the church journal, organ of the synod, has spoken personally and then naturally ceases to be the organ of the synod. The latter is hardly to be supposed, for the Church Gazette is conducted in conformity with the standpoint of the Synod,' nor has the present Editorial been officially censured for its standpoint in regard to the Rule, consequently the standpoint of the Editorial is the standpoint of the Synod for the Rule without exception, and last year's delegation to Concil cannot be adopted as the delegation of the Synod of Canadas." The editorial staff of the "Kirchenblatt" comments on this: "This sentence is probably to be understood only in such a way that last year's delegation represented only its personal opinion, but not the view of the Synod as such, and that no further action may be taken in this matter without a formal decision of the Synod. That no resolution was ever passed by the Synod of Canada in this matter, and that it has therefore hitherto been left to the discretion of each delegation to vote one way or the other, is an error which cannot be denied, and ought not to be denied. The fear of looking this question squarely in the face must cease."

General Synod. The "*Lutheran*" reports of a pastor in Maryland that at Christmas, instead of preaching to his people, he went to the church of the "United Brethren" and took part in their communion. - At a conference of the Maryland Synod, Pastor G. Scholl read, as the "*Observer*" says,

"In it he makes a comparison between the church of the present time and the apostolic church, naturally to the detriment of the former. In the discussion that followed, most of the members of the conference declared that, although in some respects the church of our day was inferior to the apostolic church, on the whole a great advance had taken place. Probably the reverends of the General Synod are also better pastors than the apostles.

Bishop Cheney of the Reformed Episcopal Church in Chicago has won the case brought against him by the late Bishop Whitehouse of the Protestant Episcopal Church for the ownership of the church where Cheney was rector before the organization of the Reformed Episcopal Church. The Superior Court ruled that the property belonged to the Reformed Episcopalians.

Methodism. A reader of the "Apologete" in Switzerland submits the following question to the editors of this paper: "Is it right for Christians to eat blood sausages? To this the Apologist replies: "In our opinion, eating blood sausages is one of those old customs which remind us of our pagan ancestors and should have been discarded long ago. In the Concilium of the Apostles, the proceedings of which are reported in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, the converts from heathenism are expressly commanded "to abstain from filthiness of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood" (v. 20.), and these things are called "necessary things": (v. 28.). We do not wish to make a mere note of a treatise, or we would throw some more light on the question, and that from the physiological point of view, and show that blood-affliction is injurious to health, and inimical to all the nobler impulses." - The enthusiasts, of course, cannot understand that the apostolic precept (Apost. 15.) applied only to that time, in which rS there were Jewish Christians who were still too weak to use Christian liberty even in this piece.

A Methodist preacher, as reported in the *Lutheran Standard*, has published an article in a Methodist paper in which he seeks to prove that hell is a moral place in which sinning is no longer possible. And what are the reasons he gives for this? Because in hell there are no idols to worship, no Sabbaths to break, and no opportunity for murder, adultery, and theft, there can be no sins there.

The Southern Methodist Church demanded compensation from Congress for the fact that during the war with the South its publishing house in Nashville was occupied and used by the Bunde troops. They estimated their loss at \$450,000. The Congress decided to grant \$150,000.

The Tunks argue whether the baptism, since at the first immersion the name of the Father is mentioned, at the second that of the Son, and at the third that of the Holy Spirit, is valid or not. Some of them reject such a baptism, since none of the three immersions is in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.

Of the conflict of a series with the State, the public papers report the following: Joseph Lighty, of Bryan, Ohio, has a suit pending against John Holdeman and others, seeking damages of \$10,000 for inducing his wife not to live with him. All involved are members of the so-called "Church of God". In May of last year, Lighty was excommunicated by the members of the Congregation for reasons which are not stated, and a ban called "avoidance" was imposed. The same obliges the wife, who is a member of the sect, not to eat with her husband at the same table, nor to speak with him, nor to sleep with him, under penalty of expulsion.

expulsion from the congregation and excommunication from the church. She was, however, permitted to keep house for him and his four children. Mrs. Lighty followed the church ordinances during a year, and during that time her husband was incessantly endeavoring to induce her to perform her conjugal duties. At various times he had almost succeeded in regaining her affections, when again the churchwardens intervened and warned her not to be reconciled to him, or she would be eternally lost. Lighty hereupon sold his farm and moved away in the hope that his wife would follow him, but the same influence again asserted itself upon her, and she would not leave the church. Hereupon Lighty sued the members of the church, and demanded compensation. The churchwardens appeared in person before the court, and plaiditren that they thought nothing of advocates. They often read passages from the Bible. As a commentary they used Menno Simonis. Relying on the free exercise of all religions under the Constitution, they demanded a decision favorable to them. The jury awarded the plaintiff \$2,500 in damages. - A religious community which offends against institutions which the state recognizes may not complain if the state punishes it for doing so.

W.

Prayer Abomination. At Des Moines, Iowa, recently, the Chaplain chosen by the Legislature sitting there, a certain Rev. Thorpe, prayed at the opening of the sessions, as follows: "Dear God! may thy blessings rest upon thy servant, the President of the United States. May it please thee to cure him of the madness he has shown in his irresponsible inclination to a national state, and open his eyes to the fact that it is his duty to have regard to the feelings of all. May his will be bent under thine by thy power to save sinners." One German representative found this insane politicking in prayer too much, so he moved and obtained a resolution of censure from the House of Representatives. In deep indignation, the clean Caplan spoke out about this, among other things, as follows in a newspaper article: "I have taken dozens of insults for the sake of Christ (!), but I will accept none more for my own sake. True, the Savior says: If anyone gives you a blow on the right cheek, offer him the other also!" I have been struck on both cheeks, and in future will follow my own feeling, which commands me not to pray further in the Legislature during this session." It is to be hoped that such increasing examples of the most worthless abuse of prayer for the purpose of outbursts of vile political fanaticism will result in the Christian-minded members voting for the abolition of wretched prayer in the Congress and State Legislatures. W.

II. Abroad.

The Chemnitz Conference of the Orthodox Lutheran members of the Saxon Regional Church, which had met in February of last year and for the sake of its resolutions had been accused by the Regional Consistory of unappointed partisan interference in matters of church government, met again in Chemnitz on February 12 of this year, and showed that the warning issued to it from a higher place against all agitations disturbing the sweet peace of the Regional Church had not failed to have an effect. In the reassuring consciousness that the Conference was thinking of nothing less than something as frightening as disturbing the peace, but that it was a quite harmless society, the Conference took up Pastor Auerswald's paper from Ponickau: "Our Position on the Landeskirche." The paper contained the following three theses: "1. We recognize it as our duty to adhere to the Saxon state church,

as long as the Lord does not show us another" (how reassuring! for what this "other" is, the courageous Confessors do not say; shrewd as they are, they fear that at last this other might also come to pass, and then - the world would see that strangely enough they nevertheless remained in the national church). "We recognize and deplore the defects and dangers which cling to and threaten the national church from within and without" (O you great heroes! they even mention among the dangers "the penetration of false doctrine into the teaching office"; but the solemn installation of false teachers and blasphemers of Christ by the church government is, of course, not thought of, for that would be against all due respect for the high church government, which is so faithfully and fatherly concerned for the welfare of the national church). "We want to do everything in our power to ensure that our Saxon regional church continues to develop and build itself up in accordance with its nature as expressed in the Lutheran Confession" (how pleased the high church regime will be about this "activity" that has been promised! since the gentlemen do not remotely want to assume that the national church will be reformed in its head and members, but that it will only "develop further", since it only suffers, like all churches, from certain "deficiencies" and therefore only needs "further development"). - Lic. Stöckhardt remarks in the "Ev. Luth. Freikirche" of March 1: "The debate which followed this lecture, as the 'Luthardt'sche Zeitung' states, 'revolved around the question of whether a certain line can and may be designated, up to which remaining in the national church can be justly and rightly possible and offered. The result of the debate was the recognition that it would be very difficult, perhaps impossible, to fix a line of demarcation in this direction that would bind all equally, that rather the ways of the Lord were to be expected in quiet patience, and that the decision was a matter of conscience for each individual. So there is no sure line that separates the national church from separation - where is God's word, *norma* and *regula fidei et vitae*? In place of the clear norm of Holy Scripture, which binds all without exception, a secret revelation, which is enjoyed by this one and that one, is substituted. One waits in silent patience until the Lord shows another, that is, for signs and wonders, as has always been the way of unbelief, which understands and misses everything but obedience to the clear, simple commandment and word of God. Verily, with seeing eyes they see not, with hearing ears they hear not. The judgment of blindness and hardening, which has also seized the Orthodox of the country church, develops and completes itself in haste, with power."

W.

Religious Freedom in Saxony. Under this heading, Mr. Stöckhardt writes the following in his paper "Die Evangelisch-Lutherische Freikirche" of March 1 of this year: Freedom of religion is, however, seriously threatened in Saxony, in that it has been possible for various articles of the 1877 volume of our "Free Church" to have given rise to a judicial investigation. The undersigned, the author of the articles in question, has been sued by the public prosecutor for insulting the state church, as a state-recognized religious society, and for insulting Dr. Peter in Dresden at the Royal District Court in Zwickau. And whereupon? Because he had called the State Church "un-Lutheran," "degenerate," "apostate," a "faithless harlot," a "Babel," because he had asserted that it was "grown together with lies," that "the Saxon church regiment promotes and protects lying prophets," that "the State Church Order belongs neither to the natural order of God nor to the order of grace, but lies in the same line with Rome, from which Luther begat. the papacy at Rome, founded by the devil," "the church government does not belong to the fourth commandment," and so on. Commandment," etc., etc., etc. That Dr. Peter, an open denier of the Trinity, an "apostle of the devil," the church council which appointed him, "unbelieving," those so-called "apostles of the devil," and so on.

The fact that the congregation of St. John's, which appointed such a preacher and church council, was called "a synagogue of Satan" is said to be an injuria, against which the Saxon State Consistory considered itself obliged to protect the officials subordinate to it. Instead of refutation by word, by Scripture: Accusation, trial, certainly, such weapons befit a state-church consistory that would know how to help itself with reasons from the Bible and confession just as little as David did with Saul's weapons. Go ahead, gentlemen, these blows do us no harm. You betray your true form and nature more and more clearly. What is said in the passages under suspicion is, as the undersigned has also proved in his justification, nothing other than the speech and judgment of the holy Scriptures and the Lutheran confessions about such persons, conditions, communities with which we are dealing. May the matter, with God's permission, run and end as it will: no power on earth, if God gives grace, shall ever prevent us from judging, testifying and writing about the national church and the Consistory just as we have done up to now on the basis of and in accordance with the Word of God and the Confession. If they want to condemn the Bible and the Lutheran symbols, let them do so in the name of God; God's Word, God's cause, will certainly not lose out in this deal. - The responsible editor of the "Free Church," Mr. Herrmann, the printer, is also being sued; Professor Walther in America has also been honored by his old fatherland because of his evaluation of the last Saxon state synod, and his name has been included in the list of complaints.

The Pastoral-Correspondenz of March 2 reports, among other things, the following about a **Hanoverian conference which took** place on February 19 in the city of Hanover and to which about 80-90 persons had gathered for a free discussion "in order to seek an understanding about the burning question of the present time. Pastor Lohmann presented three theses, the first of which read as follows: "We cannot recognize the renunciation of our national church begun in Hermannsburg and other places as one justified according to God's Word and the principles of the Lutheran church, since in the new form of marriage nothing contradicts the Word of God and the confession of our church, and the Lutheran confession is still the legally valid public doctrine of our national church." In this connection it was remarked, among other things, that "the proceedings in the Hermannsburg Separation were therefore all the more reprehensible, since no proof had ever even come close to showing that the doctrine of marriage prevailing there was founded in Scripture. It must be presented as a swarming confusion that when the leader of that separation claims to have convinced himself of a thing, it is then presented as founded in God's will. Therefore it was high time to instruct the congregations clearly about the doctrinal points in question, and also not to be afraid of openly stating that such a separation was not in accord with God's Word. The trouble is there, altar stands against altar, and even if a communion of the sacrament is apparently promised by that side, the same already falls away with the fact that Harms has openly declared that he will never acknowledge the pastor who is employed in Hermannsburg by the regional consistory as pastor of Hermannsburg." The assembly naturally also discussed the position they would now have to take with regard to the Hermannsburg Mission; in the end, the following was said: "With the request to the Mission Board, which, by the way, consists mostly of members of the regional church, that it should place the Mission in such a way that we can participate in it, we have to combine the declaration that we still want to support and demand the Hermannsburg Mission with our prayers, with our gifts, and with our ministry, as long as it is not *made* impossible for us from there. Thus the opinion also goes that the missionary pupils should be kept as before.

her to hold their missionary hours, provided they do not interfere with ecclesiastical questions, and leave the peace of the churches undisturbed." - The second thesis was, "But we grievously lament that the matter has come to this crack by the entire denial to a few congregations of the unchanged marriage form of our old church ordinances, expressly reserved in the church law, and urgently advocated by the orderly representation of the church. The bondage of our national church by the state power, which is foreign to it and yet dominates its government, and which we have again experienced so disastrously in this outing, weighs heavily upon us; and the manner in which in this case the sovereign church government has been exercised by the minister responsible for the non-denominational state representation, rejecting the prospect of a personal hearing of our highest church authority by law, strengthens our conviction that without a thorough reorganization of this relationship, the continued existence of a Lutheran state church will hardly be possible. Since, however, the preservation of the same is also dear to us, we recognize it as our sacred duty to work for such a transformation with all the proper means at our disposal." At this it was remarked that now was the time "to cry for deliverance from Babylonian captivity, and to bring the people to a consciousness of their bondage," thinking of the subjection of the Church to the power of the State. The third thesis was: "If, for our position of conscience within the national church, we appeal to the fact that the Lutheran confession is still the legally valid public doctrine of the church, we can do this with a clear conscience only under the condition of a sustained struggle to ensure that, in contrast to the efforts of the Protestant Association and its like-minded comrades, this norm of church doctrine and church action is now also really taken seriously. It is not only the job of the church government, but also of the synods, church councils and members of the congregation to stand up for the fact that clergymen who openly contradict God's Word and the church confession are not tolerated in the preaching ministry of our Lutheran church. - This all sounds very nice, of course; but if the brethren do not immediately "take this seriously," they would only have appeased their consciences for a short time with these good intentions, but would only have mocked God. God in mercy protect them from this! Finally, those present thank Mr. Superintendent Rocholl that he has only resigned from his office and intends to cultivate a field of work in Pymont, thus, to their joy, not helping to strengthen separation! W.

Hanoverian Separation. In the parish of Wridel the separation has begun under the leadership of Pastor Dreves, who has been dismissed from his office, has also renounced his appeal and has declared his resignation from the regional church. In the large barn of the local chief Studtmann in Brockhöfde the first service is held on the Feast of the Purification of the Virgin Mary. In Scharnebeck about two hundred adults are said to have joined the free church. In the *Neue Zeitblatt* of February 14, Dr. Munkel also writes: "In Hermannsburg, as in other places, according to several reports, one of which can be read in the 'Deutscher Volksfreund' (German Friends of the People), there has been a great deal of unspiritual agitation and activity. It can be assumed that many a problem child and many a crab has been caught in this way. At the moment the confusion and aberration of the minds is frighteningly great in Hermannsburg," writes the above-mentioned newspaper on February 9. The greater part of the community does not yet seem to have any inclination to throw itself into the maelstrom. In addition, the separation completely lacks a leading personality who would be man enough to solve the difficult task satisfactorily; for the hardships of the separated are just beginning.

How one Münkcl judges the separations in Hanover can be seen from the following outpourings, which are found in his Neues Zeitblatt of February 7: "The separation continues to spread, as the first heat of such movements brings with it. From a separation undertaken for the sake of conscience and the sanctities of the faith, one should expect an elevated state of Christian piety, that is, the spirit of discipline, of love and humility, of sincerity and truthfulness, which sends itself into the cross with faith and patience. Those who have hitherto observed the course, the weapons, and the nature of the Hanoverian separation will, of course, no longer entertain great expectations. There are many reasons given for the separation, by one in this way, by another in another; but do not let the side battles draw you away from the main meeting. It all boils down to this: one does not want the 'Staatskirchentum,' especially since this Staatskirchentum is a Prussian one. This is the special blessing, that the movement has not been free from the beginning from political turbulences, which, by the way, we call only a frequently occurring sometimes predominant addition. Hence the wild fire and the carnal vehemence with which one seeks to replace the power of faith and conviction and to carry away the undecided, so that only the pile may become quite large. One scolds to the utmost the after-church, the national church Babel, the state and bread monkeys who put their belly above their conscience, the dumb dogs and godless authorities. Some blasphemies and slanders cannot even be reproduced. The well-known political agitator Pastor (ret.) Grote opened the new year of his Volksblatt 'unter dem Kreuze', the main organ of the Renitenten, with a strong outburst against the LandrS-Consistorium.... . There have been several Lutheran separations in Germany hitherto, but none of them is so confused in itself, and so deeply lacking in inner justification and evangelical or moral value, as this becoming separation." To such weapons the worshippers of the national church must at last resort! But no matter how much dirt they throw at the separation, they will not be able to withstand the collapse of the old rotten building and prevent the escape from the dangerous prison of those who want to save their souls. W.

Sectarianism. Dr. Münkcl writes in his Neues Zeitblatt of Feb. 21: "How sad it is that Harms should conclude his national church career as a sectarian, and let his brother's work merge into a sect! For separation on false doctrines is sectarianism, and this sectarianism is unprecedented." - To make Harms' separated congregation a sect for the sake of false teaching about civil marriage is wretched sectarianism. How would Dr. Muenkel thunder if we Missourians so seduced! Schism and sect are well to be distinguished; and in the present case it is added that Harms has separated himself, not from a right-believing, but from a most depraved ecclesiastical community, which ought to be right-believing by its own confession, but is not. W.

The latest news from Hermannsburg is as follows: On February 4, the Consistory pronounced the dismissal or deposition of Pastor Harms because of his refusal to use the liturgy of the marriage law of July 6, 1876. Harms accepted the same without appealing to the Landesconsistorium and then also registered his resignation from the Hannoversche Landeskirche beim Amtsgericht Bergen. The separates are said to have the intention of building a temporary wooden church with 1200 seats on the yard of one of the former churchwardens, master baker Alpers, who has also left the church, at an estimated cost of 2400 Marks. The ecclesiastical organization of the free congregation there is also already complete according to the paper "Unter dem Kreuz": the congregation has placed itself on the basis of the Scriptures, all Lutheran confessions and the Lüneburg church order and has 7 churchwardens and a church council.

7 Almoners elected. About the number of souls, which the separation now includes, the reports are very different: from one side, more than two-thirds, from the other side, considerably less than half are given; with the latter information, it is true that up to February 12, 909 Confirmerte, among them 507 from Hermannsburg, were registered with the district court; this can only be clearly seen when, after the six-week period, the actual resignation has taken place. So reports Pastor Lohmann in Wahrenholz. The same reports at the same time that Pastor Harms, as he had declared, did not want to cancel the communion with the regional church, but that immediately after his suspension he had advised a dying woman to rather do without communion than to take it from his successor in Hermannsburg, his former friend Pastor Plathner. Finally, Pastor Lohmann rebukes Harms for claiming that marriage only becomes valid before God through the marriage of a pastor, and that he nevertheless says: "he does not want to argue about this with people, he is caught in his conscience, he cannot deviate here, God has given him that/, Pastor Lohmann correctly remarks on this: "But if one stands as a leader and leader, whom so many consciences are inclined to follow, it is not enough that he asserts such a thing to his end: he must also justify it clearly from God's Word and, according to 1 Petr. 3, 15. 3, 15. he must be ready to answer to everyone. But it is most striking that Harms also emphasizes there that he wants and must stay with Luther's way of marriage, because it is clear and unambiguous and is also found in our symbols. Luther's Marriage Booklet, in its preface, bears the strongest and most unambiguous witness against Harms' new doctrine that marriage belongs to the church in the sense that it must be so that the bride and groom become husband and wife through the church wedding."

Necrological. On the morning of February 4, Prof. Dr. H. E. F. Guericke died in Halle a. d. S. after three weeks of severe suffering at the age of almost 75 (he was born in Wettin on February 23, 1803), after almost 54 years of academic activity there.

South Australia. Pastor Lohmann reports on the Lutheran Synod in South Australia in the Hannoversche Pastoral-Correspondenz of February 2, including the following: The German Lutheran Church in South Australia deserves our special attention not only because of the significant relationship of the Hermannsburg Mission to it, but also for its own sake and its overall pleasing prosperity. Its origin can be traced back to the Lutheran Gemeindm who emigrated there during the persecution of the Lutheran Church in Prussia and even after it under the pastors Kawel, Fritzsche and Öfter (who died on the way there). It immediately had to endure a time of severe challenge, in that the chiliastically-minded Kawel emerged more and more clearly as a swarm spirit, and by openly rejecting the symbolic books brought about an ecclesiastical schism. In the face of him and his followers, the Lutheran Synod of South Australia, headed at first by the faithful servant of God Fritzsche, who labored in great blessing, stood firmly on the ground of the Lutheran confession. According to the news that came from there more than 20 years ago, those congregations seemed to be going through a serious crisis at that time, as the growing new generation and later immigrant foreign elements rebelled against the original strict church discipline. From what one hears now from these congregations, one gets the impression that this crisis has been overcome: probably, with the complete ecclesiastical freedom of that country, the most reluctant elements have left; on the other hand, the strictness of discipline may also have been somewhat lessened. The reports on the conditions there and the negotiations in the "Lutheran Church Messenger for Australia", which was published in Adelaide by the

The book published by Pastors Homann and Stempel indicates serious church congregations that are consciously rallying around the Lutheran confession. Among the pastors, three tendencies seem to me to wrestle with each other in brotherly love: among the old tribe, one related to the Breslauers; among the younger ones, one energetically inclined toward the Missouri Synod; and, mediating between the two, the Hermannsburg element, which in recent years has taken up an ever broader space. Before the synodal assembly of the last year, the fighters of the second direction demanded a reorganization of the entire constitution according to the Missourian model and, in particular, the elimination of the church council at the head, while those of the first direction were just as resolutely in favor of the previous constitution. At the synod itself, however, the matter seems to have been settled very peacefully (probably under the decisive influence of the mediating Hermannsburgs), so that only the defects in the constitution and the position of the church council that had arisen in practice were changed. Pastor Öfter, a son of the above-mentioned, has been at the head of the church council for quite some time. - The Synod is not lacking in external struggles, especially in recent times with the chiliastically minded Immanuel Synod, which is connected with Neuendettelsau. The pressing shortage of pastors among those German congregations has been remedied several times by sending Hermannsburg disciples. This German Lutheran Church abroad does not need our support in the form of funds, since the external situation of the colonists there is predominantly a favorable one, so that many gifts of love in Australian gold have already flowed from there to Germany.

Sweden. The former "readers" (Pietists) have been followed by the Baptists and others. In recent times about 25,000 persons have addressed a petition to the King, asking him to make the administration of Holy Communion, as well as the preaching of the Word of God, free to all, so that it may be celebrated everywhere without duly appointed pastors. The archbishop's council in Upsala, the highest ecclesiastical court, has declared itself decidedly against this, because such activity would dissolve the church. But the petitioners are determined to the utmost, and in case of a negative decision they will leave the national church. As it seems, they do not want to receive the holy meal indiscriminately with the big bunch and indiscriminately from every pastor. This is the war that is being declared on the state church. (Münkel'S Ztbl.)

Schleswig-Holstein. The Breslau "Kirchenblatt" of February 15 writes: There is great excitement in Schleswig-Holstein. Pastor Paulsen in Kropp had attacked his brother Dieckmann, who had instructed his teachers to leave out the miracles in the biblical story, for breaking his oath of office. Therefore he was sentenced by the district court to 600 marks. He has appealed. On the other hand, the Consistory has initiated a disciplinary investigation against Dieckmann. - There has been talk of resignation there for some time, and the introduction of the new synodal constitution, which is now before the state parliament, will make the situation there even more complicated.

The Württemberg Regional Synod has been busy with its synodal constitution. The readers shall not be bored with the individual proceedings. But one piece deserves to be highlighted, because it is one for all. It was about what qualities he ought to possess who should be elected a churchwarden, or into the representation of the congregation. This is significant and decisive for the whole synodal constitution. The draft stipulated: "The electors are to direct their attention to men of good reputation and ecclesiastical sense", i.e. the election is to be made home to the decision of the electors. A more serious-minded minority wanted the Hanoverian provision, which also in a weakened form with

33 against 19 votes; the draft remained, for which also the Consistorial President Bitzer declared himself in favor. The decisive reason given for this was that a synodal constitution was to be created for the national church as the national church really was, not for a confessional church which could draw its borders as narrowly as it liked, but for a national church which was determined by the borders of the country. In this constitution, the confessional church has had to give way to the mass church, even if the confession is retained as an ornament of the constitution. That is where it wants to go with the newer synodal constitutions. Then one could have spared the provision that the voters should direct their attention to men of good reputation and ecclesiastical sense, if it was not likewise a matter of an ornament. (N. Ztbl.)

Württemberg Regional Church. At the Württemberg state synod, Dean Mezger from Calw stated the possibility that even a father who brings his children to the Roman Church can be a good Protestant Christian on the whole, who has only seen himself forced to take such a step by the circumstances. What might this dean think of a "good evangelical Christian"? Even the verse from Backmeister's Song of Love does not fit here: "Such a person, such a 'good Christian,' would be like a shell in which there is neither spirit nor life

Prussia. The "Reichsbote" reports that the government of Koblenz, in agreement with the Consistory, has ordered that certain questions and sayings from the two catechisms in use, the reformed Heidelberg Catechism and the so-called Religious Catechism, may no longer be taught during religious instruction, namely, those that contain the Trinity of God, original sin and reincarnation. - After it had already been forbidden in former times to expound to the children in school the two main parts of Baptism and Holy Communion, because these things were allegedly too high for the children, one now goes further and further, until at last one will no longer be allowed to teach either: "There is one God!" May God have mercy on our poor Germany. W.

Prussian State Church. That the rationalist Hoßbach was declared incapable of being transferred to another position for the sake of his unbelief, and yet was left in his previous parish, this inconsistency caused great offence even to the radical unbelievers. In a meeting of the Social-Democrats a worker declared: "If a Hoßbach is good for one parish, or if a Sydow is allowed to attack the faith out of office, and yet to remain in his place because he did not do it in office, I no longer like to be in a church where such a thing is possible!" The democratic "Frankfurter Zeitung," too, in discussing the contradictory decision of the Oberkirchenrath, sneers: "But you, Roman clergy, tremble before this rock on which the Imperial and Royal Prussian Germany wants to build its Protestant church." From this the gentlemen who govern the Church should see that, far from reconciling or winning over the unbelievers, or even keeping them with them, they are only making a mockery of themselves and their Church before the unbelievers with their concessions. The pilgrim from Saxony writes about this matter: "The verdict of the Berlin Oberkirchenrath in the matter of Hoßbach has now been rendered, and indeed it bears that 'yes' and 'no' character which tends to be peculiar to the Prussian church leadership. It reads in its first part: Hoßbach is not confirmed for St. Jacobi. This is to keep the faithful in good stead, so that they do not follow the call: depart from Babel! follow. In its second part, however, the verdict is: Hoßbach will not be disciplined, but will remain unchallenged in St. Andreas. This is to keep the unbelievers in good stead, so that they do not think that the false prophets are merely second-class preachers or even such to whom the door would be shown." W.

State church conditions. The Kirchen-Blatt der Breslauer of January 15 wrote the following about them: "Now look at the more recent ecclesiastical development of the Lutheran regional churches. At every turn one encounters influences that are nothing less than ecclesiastical. It was not for ecclesiastical reasons that the Saxon Church changed its ordination requirement; it was not for ecclesiastical reasons that the Hanoverian marriage form came into being. It was not for ecclesiastical reasons that the Hanoverian marriage form came into being; it was not for ecclesiastical reasons that so many provisions of the new church orders are to be explained. And it is not for ecclesiastical reasons that the toleration of openly false teachers in Saxony, Hanover, Bavaria, Hamburg, etc. can be explained. Earthly considerations, earthly powers, earthly thoughts are revealed in all this. That the caretaker of heavenly goods must, in many important matters, allow earthly considerations to direct her ways, is a manifest thing, and this condition is the one that rightly exists. It is true that it exists rightly only in terms of ecclesiastical order, not in terms of confession. But this is precisely the evil state of affairs, that the church order rightly existing in the Lutheran regional churches is not in harmony with the confession, which likewise rightly exists. Article 28 of the Augsburg Confession is in fact annulled by the Church Order. But how can a church which lets its own life be determined in important respects by the earthly, and that at the expense of the eternal, successfully testify against the earthly sense! How can she preach, 'Love not the world,' when she herself must give of her goods for the love of worldly life? How can she say, 'seek only to please God,' when she herself must always keep one eye fixed on worldly powers and public opinion, lest she spoil it with them!" And yet the church paper does not call for resignation!

W.

Palatinate. By resolution of the recently held Palatine Synod, as the "Pilgrim from Saxony" writes, the clergy of the Palatinate are no longer to be bound by the rightly existing church doctrine, but only to "faithfully and dutifully present the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures on the basis of the (amended) Augsburg Confession. And as that was not enough for the left, the Consistory, while adhering to the wording of the cited official instruction (?), nevertheless issued a declaration, the meaning of which is that whoever does not want to bind himself to the symbol, let it be, namely not the office, but the binding, but whoever binds himself to it, may also do it, and it will and may not - how gracious! - no one should put him out of the Palatine Church because of it! The recitation of the apostolic confession of faith on high feast days is henceforth left to the discretion of the clergy, and also at baptism and confirmation this "confession" is not to be confessed, but merely communicated, so that no one knows whether the one who communicates it thereby expresses his faith or not.

Pastor Lohmann says of **Pius IX** in his Pastoral-Correspondence when he reports his death: "It was precisely this Pope Hai, with his enthusiastic exaltation of the cult of Mary in the dogma of the Immaculate Conception and with the completion of false prophethood in the dogma of infallibility, who called to the ears of our hard-hearted generation that among all the changing forms of *anti-Christianity*, the Roman Pope is and remains the *antichristus magnus*. Such a thing was not brought about by the raw godlessness of Alexander VI, nor by the fine unbelief of Leo X with his fable of Christ: to this belonged just such an ideal nature as that of Pius IX, in whom the 'enthusiasm', i.e. the swarming spirits of Pabstism, of which our Confessions speak, so rightly blossomed. How strange it must look in the soul of a man who has made it his aim in life to establish his own infallibility!"

"A declared miracle." Under this heading Dr. Münkcl writes: "For centuries the Catholics have had bleeding hosts in several places, by which it was to be proved not only that the true body of Christ was present in the Lord's Supper, but also that the body of Christ without the blessed chalice contained the blood of Christ, and that apart from its consumption. According to the Catholic V.-Bl., Professor Müller has placed in the microscopic aquarium at Berlin two halves of a roll, each with bloodstains. Under the magnifying glass the bloodstains dissolve into an immense quantity of blood-red round infusion-animals, which move lively through each other. In damp churches, sacristies and pantries, under favourable heat conditions, this miracle forms on all flour dishes.

Religious instruction in the schools. The following is reported by vi. Münkcl: A petition of 100,000 Catholics was discussed in the Prussian House of Representatives on January 23. It demanded that religious instruction in the schools should be given only by those commissioned by the bishop, and that the supervisors of Catholic elementary schools should be exclusively Catholics. On the part of the government, the petition was rejected because its purpose was nothing other than to bring the school under the control of the Church. Catholic religious instruction in elementary schools was still given by 2140 clergymen, and only 1806 clergymen were excluded from the supervision of the 10,545 schools. To his speech the government commissioner Ständer added the words: "Consider that perhaps in a few years the time will have come when you will be glad to have any religious teachers at all." Does this hold out the prospect of the religionless school, and is it to say: you are not satisfied with our government, after our government may come a worse one? After all, it's not impossible. The culturist by profession, Dr. Virchow, urged that the law of instruction should soon be presented, and that otherwise all motions should be rejected. "Here," he said, "is the middle point of the culture war, and at this point it must be ended." When the church is entirely pushed out of the school, the cultural struggle has won its case.

The civil marriage exists also in Italy. In Rome, however, where the clergy have a completely free hand, 2600 marriages have been contracted ecclesiastically, of which scarcely ANY have previously or subsequently performed the legal marriage. 2000 marriages are therefore invalid according to the law, and in most cases this is not due to reluctance, but to ignorance, about which they are not informed by the priests.

The "Pilgrim" writes of **Christoph Hoffmann**, the friend of Jerusalem, that in his "Deutsche Warte" (German Watch) he is increasingly scoffing and mocking at our fundamental Christian truths, e.g. the Trinity, in the spirit of unbelief. The latest articles in his paper will hopefully open the eyes of even his most devoted followers and show them to what degree of aberration their so celebrated leader has progressed.

Gartenlaube. The infamous article "the Wupperthal as a stronghold of orthodoxy" is well known. Pastor Seeger in K. had expressed himself in the pulpit that the Garten taube was "a disgraceful newspaper with an immoral tendency. He was therefore accused by the Gartenlaube of defamation. In the beginning of this year, Pastor S. sat in the dock before the Elberfeld District Court, surrounded by the entire clergy of the city, and brilliantly defended by Advocate v. Hurter. The verdict of the court acquitted him, "since Seeger had not judged Keil, the editor, but only the newspaper, which was greeted by the very large audience with loud, never-ending bravos. Thus the Gartenlaube did not succeed in having a judicial certificate of morality issued for its degenerate articles. Instead, it will continue to fire its poisonous projectiles at the Mucker from the bush.

(Dr. Münkcl's N. Z.)

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 24.

May 1878.

No. 5.

Did Christ humble Himself according to His divine nature?

To this question the old Leipzig theologian Hieronymus Kromayer, who died in 1670, answers the following:

"Among the Reformed, as they wish to be called, there are theologians who hold that Christ was also abased according to the divine nature. But since this opinion is contrary to Scripture and to orthodox antiquity, we reject it on the following grounds:

1. Because according to that nature, whereby he became a servant, and suffered the death of crucifixion, Christ was abased, and afterward exalted. But according to the human nature he became a servant, and died the death of crucifixion. The first clause is proved from Phil. 2, 7.; the second clause is evident from the fact that the King of kings and Lord of lords is incapable of suffering and dying (*ἀπατῆς καὶ ἀ^άναρτος*), 1 Tim. 6, 15. 16. not being able to serve, suffer, and die servant-like. Hence the ancients said: 'The Most High cannot be exalted.' Further, 'Not the Most High, but the flesh of the Most High is exalted.' Further, 'Exaltation concerns not him who accepts, but that which has been accepted.' *)

*Luther: "All that is said of Christ's abasement and exaltation is to be attributed to man, for the divine nature can neither be abased nor exalted. (Kirchenp. XII, 210.) Hereby, of course, Luther does not deny that the *subjectum quod* of abasement is the whole Christ, God and man in One.

The first thing that Luther says is that the divinity of Christ was not a person, but merely that the divinity of Christ was the *subjectum quo*, i.e., that part according to which Christ humbled Himself. Luther therefore continues below: "Although the two natures are distinguished, yet it is One Person; that all that Christ does or suffers, God certainly did and suffered, though the same thing was only encountered by One Nature. In the same way, when I say that a man's leg is wounded, I say that the man is sore, but his soul, or the whole man, is not sore, but a part of his body; therefore the body and soul are one thing. As therefore I must speak differently of body and soul, so also of Christ."

130 Did Christ humble himself according to his divine nature?

2. Because the divine nature cannot relinquish the use of its dominion, which belongs to it by virtue of nature. Therefore Christ Joh. 5, 17. says: My Father works until now, and I also work? But if Christ, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, in the days of his flesh, ruled this universe according to his divine nature, then, according to this very nature, humiliation does not belong to him.

3. Because the exaltation Phil. 2, 9. is called a *charisma*, a gift. God, it is said, *ἐχαρίσατο*, i. e., gave Christo by grace a name which is above all names. Now God can receive nothing by grace. As God Christ gives all things, as man He receives all things. But if Christ was not exalted according to the divine nature, neither was he abased according to it.

4. Because God is not subject to change. Ps. 102, 28: 'But thou remainest as thou art? Mal. 3, 6.: "I am the Lord who does not lie" (original text: XXXX XX = I will not be changed). Yes, he is struck, as James 1:17. speaks, nor the shadow of a change (*τροπῆς ἀποσχίσμα*). *)

5. Because this opinion was rejected by the grey and pure antiquity as tasting of Arianism. For thus writes Leo the Great in his 23rd Epistle (as is quoted from the Concordia formula toward the end): 'So then the adversaries of the truth tell us when the almighty Father, and according to what nature, exalted his Son above all things, or to what *substantia* (or nature) he subjected all things? For to the Godhead, as to the Creator, all things have always been subject. If his power has been increased and made greater, if his height has been increased still more, he has been less than he who has exalted him, and has not had the riches of nature, of which he had need; but those who are so minded, whom does Arius receive into his company? **) See there still more passages. †) -

*Therefore both are true: that he abideth for ever above, and yet descendeth without change and change in the Godhead. Luther, Erl. Vol. 46,328.

**) See: *Concordia*, ed. by Müller, p. 808.

†) Especially the following (the last) negative of the 8th article of the Epitome belongs here: "Accordingly we reject and condemn as contrary to God's word and our simple faith.... since it was taught and the saying Matth. 28: "We therefore condemn as contrary to God's word and to our simple faith, the teaching and the saying of Matthew 28, 'All power is given unto me,' etc., being thus interpreted and blasphemously perverted, that Christ, according to the divine nature, was restored in the resurrection and ascension, i.e., was again given all power in heaven and on earth; as if, in the state of his humiliation, he also, according to the Godhead, had laid it aside and forsaken it" (*exuisset* = emptied himself). "By which doctrine not only the words of Christ's testament are perverted, but also the way is prepared for the damnable Arian heresy, that finally Christ's eternal deity is denied, and thus Christ is utterly lost together with our blessedness, since such false doctrine would not be contradicted on the constant ground of divine word and our simple Christian faith." (Op. cit. p. 550.)

In defense of the opinion that humiliation and exaltation belong to Christ according to both natures, the Reformed argue:

1. That species of humiliation according to which the Son of God, who had not yet become man, lowered Himself from the highest height of heaven to this earth and assumed human nature.

But we answer by distinguishing between abasement in the proper sense, of which the question in this controversy is, and that which is not properly so called. When the Son of God assumed human nature, this was not humiliation in the proper sense (because the Son of God, by becoming man, did not relinquish the divine glory, nor divest himself of the use of the government of this universe), but what is improperly called humiliation, namely, the condescension of his mercy toward the human race.)

2. That Christ had suffered *ησυχάζοντας του λόγου*" (as Irenaeus expresses itself) "i.e. while the Logos (the personal word) rested.

But we answer that this resting of the word is not to be understood in general, but in relation to it, that is, in relation to the warding off of the inclemencies of human nature, but not in relation to the keeping off of the government of this universe. Otherwise the divine nature, while the flesh was subjected to the rigors of the enemy, showed itself glorious by miracles, by darkening the sun, by shaking the earth, by tearing the rocks.

3. That the divine glory of the Logos had been obscured (only) with respect to men.

But we answer, that in this place it is not of the revelation or obscuration of the divine glory with respect to men, but of the true manifestation of the divine majesty in respect of use. Christ also commands to pray that the name of the non-man made God be sanctified, Matth.

*) J. Gerhard also warns against confusing the word humiliation in the ecclesiastical and biblical sense. He writes: "The humiliation of Christ is taken 1. in the ecclesiastical and 2. in the biblical sense. Ecclesiastically, i.e., according to the style of the teachers of the Church, it is taken for the mild condescension by virtue of which the Logos condescended to have mercy on us, and to come to our aid, and, descending from heaven, to assume human nature. This *humiliation*, so called in the ecclesiastical sense, is called the *humiliation* of the *incarnation* (*humiliatio incarnationis*).... This is to be explained in a manner suitable to God from the condescension from the insufferable majesty into the lowliness of the body.... In the Biblical sense, or according to the style of the apostle Phil. 2. the abasement is actually taken for the divestiture of JEsu Christ, or the Logos incarnate himself." (*Exeges. locc. Loc. 4. § 293 s.*) Calov rightly says that when the Incarnation is called by the doctrines of the Church a degradation, etc., it is an anthropopathy. VII, 622"

6:9, although he is and remains holy in himself, that is, with us, in our hearts. Therefore the glory of the Father, though not acknowledged by all, is not said to be abased.

4. That the Son of God had taken the form of a servant.

But we answer that by the form of servitude is not understood human nature itself, but the state of human nature. Much less does this condition of servitude belong to the divine nature itself. Nor, therefore, has any reproach fallen upon God's Son, or made him inferior to the rest of the Persons of the Godhead, that he assumed human nature, because the union *ἀτρέπτως καὶ ἀσυγχύτως*, i.e., without some transformation and mingling of natures has taken place. *)

5. Because Christ asks Joh. 17, 5. to be transfigured with the clarity that He had before the world was. So he did not have it at that time.

But we answer that this is because of the identity of the person. But especially are the words omitted in the interjection to be observed, 'Transfigure me thou, Father, with thyself.' So the revelation of the glory is by no means understood with respect to men only. - Three things in particular follow from this golden saying: 1. That Christ, according to human nature, lacked that clarity with which he asks to be transfigured. 2. That this clarity is the infinite clarity which the Son had before the foundation of the world. 3. That this transfiguration takes place with God, and not only before men, as the Calvinists would have it with respect to divine nature, and the Tübingeners with respect to human nature.

Finally, when they make the comparison with the sun covered with clouds, which the Fathers of the Church make use of, it is to be noted that this is rather because of human nature, through which, as through an exceedingly dense cloud, the rays of the divine majesty communicated could not penetrate in the state of divestiture, while the sun itself (the divine nature) lost nothing of its light." (Theol. positivo-polem. I, 256-258.)

W.

Luther: "A good prayer belongs to a good sermon, that is, when one has given the word, one should begin to sigh, and desire that it also have power and produce fruit". (On John 17:1, VIII:669.)

*Others add that if the Incarnation were the humiliation taught in Phil. 2, Christ would either still be in the state of humiliation, or in the state of exaltation he would have to have laid aside his human nature.

(Sent in by Pastor Doehler.)

The state of the present interpretation of the Revelation of John according to one of its latest commentators.

The interpretation which the superscription has in mind has already been thought of once in these pages.) It is that of Dr. Kliefoth,**) of whom it has been complained that she also does not lead the Lutheran doctrine of the Antichrist.

But it would be justified to take further notice of this interpretation, because it almost seems that with this book a new epoch of the interpretation of Revelation begins, and certainly not one that can be congratulated. It is, after all, a book written with the full apparatus of modern interpretation; it is, after all, in part new in the results of the interpretation, as well as in the application of the evidence for its results. Our exegete, after all, knows how to cover the weak, fallacious, and void foundations of his exegetical assertions with an artificial dialectic, to emphasize them with many words (as a not praiseworthy mason covers the insufficient stone with much lime), and then to make use of what he has gained under his hands as of irrefutable arguments. But how can that which appears in theology with the appearance of the spiritual and in the form of new views lack followers today? Thus, an even newer interpreter of the Revelation of John, Oberconsistorialrath v. Burger, has already given the ideas of Dr. Kl. a popular form. But the "noble simplicity and popularity" of Burger's interpretation is praised by defenders of chiliasm, to which therefore without doubt also v. Burger pays homage.

Thus we have before us the remarkable fact that an interpreter who wants to be antichilastic nevertheless works into the hands of chiliasm. That "far-future Antichrist" is just right for him! Thus Dr. Kliefoth, too, would hardly ever have been surpassed by chilastic interpreters in literalism and many a monstrosity. †) And how does his interpretation relate to the analogy of faith? The more modest Chiliast, with his kingdom full of the fullness of the Spirit, of fruitful times, without sorrow, but with the controversy against sin not yet abolished, ††) would be able to claim not to be in conflict with it.

*) S. "Lehre und Wehre" of the year 1875, p. 125.

**) It was published by Dörfling und Franke in Leipzig in 1874.

†) As an example of this we anticipate the interpretation of Revelation 2, 18. ff. According to the cl., Diefjesabel is the wife of the bishop of Thyatira, who lives in an adulterous relationship with heretical people, the Gnostics, from which the children are born in v. 23.

††) Compare Bengel, Offenbarung, zu Cap. 20.

The author's teaching is more in harmony with the Scriptures than Dr. Kl. with his church of the last days, which already in this life attains "the fullness of holiness". With this doctrine, which is both unscriptural and contrary to Scripture, the author pursues the reader, as it were, throughout his entire book. This "fullness of holiness" is an effect of the great tribulations of the last days. But we never learn why the nameless tribulation of pagan persecution, as well as that of the papacy, did not have the same effect! Well, we should not be surprised if one day we see that the American Methodists are competing with the chiliastic writers to put the interpretations of Lutheran doctors and church counsellors into popular form! It is reasonable for us to guard against such authorities, but rather to endeavor to provide their books with a warning label, according to God's ability. In this we have only the wish that Christ will give his church men and witnesses who will also interpret this book of holy scripture anew in a learned, comforting and refreshing interpretation, as the interpretation of our fathers from Chyträus down to Gerhard, Kromayer and Hoe von Hoenegg is so abundant. Until this happens, we flee from such dreary books (already the above-mentioned lecture in "Lehre und Wehre" (Doctrine and Defense) made the desire apparent that we would rather not see Revelation interpreted in this way, which seems completely justified for those who take cognizance of this interpretation) back to our fathers. If we draw a parallel between them and this present interpretation with a few traits, then the latter could often be more specific; but we are also not, as today, crushed by a mass of details, which after all only concern the scenery*) of Revelation. The Fathers are indeed in agreement as to the doctrine of the Antichrist and what is connected with it, but they are very tolerant of an explanation of individual passages that deviates from their own, so long as it does not violate the analogy of faith. How different is the attitude of an interpretation that wants to supply at all costs its "understanding of the contents and the structure of the Apocalypse," which "view of the contents of the Apocalypse is not to be found in any other direction. In this way, of course, an author who otherwise made it his business to combat false systems of scriptural interpretation becomes himself a bearer and servant of such. In their favor he now criticizes. And it is true: this criticism mows down all. But their sword is like Saul's; it rises against the Philistines, but also against the heroes of Israel. When we ask what remains, the result is often a very small one. We are reminded of the farmer who wanted to improve his meadow, but after applying the new remedy saw everything disappear, weeds and grass alike. Or is it to be called an interpretation,

*) Already Bengel looks with preference at the apocalyptic pictures, and false realism forgets the core above the shell.

If C. 12, 5.: "And her child was caught up to God and his throne" according to Dr. Kl. is so much as: God will well keep his cause with him even as the Judge of the world? *) One would also like to say, "Praise God, a child of seven years knows" that God does not need to hide the world-judge from Satan. Nor will the unprecedented holiness of the church, as claimed by Kl., draw Christ down, but he will come when the time of his judgments, and at the same time the time has come, that he may save his elect in "a short time." But the child is nothing else than the church. The woman beareth a son in torments taken collectively; she beareth children by word and sacrament. - Our fathers, of course, are historical interpreters; they hold a position which Dr. Kl. regards as one who has tried to interpret the revelation without nut. The pure commentators proceed as Luther advises in the preface to the Revelation of John: "Since it is supposed to be a revelation of future stories and tribulations, we think that the next and most certain way to find the interpretation would be to take the past stories and accidents from the histories and hold them up against these pictures and thus compare them to the words. Where then it would rhyme and coincide with each other, one could rely on it as a certain, or at least as an unobjectionable interpretation." Now, it is true that for Dr. Kl., too, the Revelation must be fulfilled historically; but the difference is that, if our Lutheran interpreters have hitherto thought that the Pabstium rhymes finely with C. 13, this new interpretation, from C. 4 on, still sees nothing but unfulfilled things. Nothing is to be expected in this part of Revelation that goes back into the time of the present course of the world, that belongs to it, but only the events that prepare the end after this course of time (I, 86). Now it cannot be lacking that, as the ecclesiastical-historical interpretation of the revelation in this or that ge-

*As this very passage gives a bright insight into the manner of this interpretation, we give it in full: "When in the last days Christianity will have become the inwardly victorious conqueror of the world, and in consequence of this the Lord will have been sent to judge the world and will be ready to execute judgment, then Satan, who well knows that his power will then come to an end, will be very desirous to put an end to this Lord above all, or to his quality as judge of the world; But he will not succeed, because then God will have decided the mission of judgment firmly with Himself, and will well keep His Son also with Him as world-judge; Satan will then have nothing left but to try whether he cannot better accomplish it with the final congregation, whose (perfectly holy) state is the reason for the nearness of the world-judge. This safe-keeping of the world-judge with God, this certainty, guaranteed in the divine counsel, that the world-judgment will break in, when once the condition of Christendom has so far matured, - that is what is to be demonstrated under the Rapture of the one born to be the world-judge."

If this interpretation sees the fulfillment of a historical event, then also this interpretation has to construct certain future events out of the words of the revelation. How Kl. succeeded in this in the construction of his "far-future" Antichrist to a kind of historical image, we will see later. But when we now see what this way makes for history in comparison to the historical interpretation (which was content with history as God makes it, or rather, in what gifts he gives to the fine church, in the admission and direction of evil), in that it writes a kind of fairy tale book out of Revelation, it already judges itself, and it is also said of this kind of prophecy: "By their fruits you shall know them." Thus we hear of the fall of the stars, of the hail mixed with blood, all *in natura*; we hear of a sealing of the servants of God, by which they are distinguished from other men, recognizable to the eyes of men (II, 87 f.), and how the 144,000 (C. 14, 1.), because they could not attain to marriage without the recognition of the antichristian world power, preferred to remain celibate, and are therefore called virgins. Then Kl. also expects the great apostasy (I, 243). But this time of miracles, as Kl. calls it, cannot possibly pass in a short time; this is already contradicted by the fullness of things, which the revelation presents to us from C. 4. to C. 20. Thus, according to this interpretation, there is still a long time before the last day. Where did one see such hail? where did one see two witnesses, like Huss and Jerome, Luther and Melanchthon, go alive to heaven? *) How mistaken you are, Father Luther, when you say: "The devilish pabstry is the last calamity on earth. - Thou hast revealed unto me the great apostasy before the last day, which is not far off, but at the door, which shall be upon the light of the gospel. **It is a characteristic of false prophets, according to the Scriptures, that they fail to recognize the present apostasy, that they disregard it, and in consequence say, "There is peace, there is no danger" (1 Thess. 5:2, 3). This interpretation also bears the character of false prophecy in the sphere of doctrines in which it moves. It is, after all, one of the characteristic peculiarities of this book that it contains no trace of an actual testimony against the papist abominations in doctrine and deeds. Rather, this interpretation agrees with the Romans in their explanation of the Antichrist,

*It is also one of the descriptions that Clare gives of the distant future (I, 44), that the Christians of the last times will believe, under the pressure of the tribulations, in overstimulated hope, that Christ has already come. Since Christ's coming in great power and glory is quite incomparable to what otherwise happens in the natural course of events on earth, Dr. Kl. predicts that the Christians of the last days will be in a state of feverish delirium; only to them would it be possible to imagine that the Judge of the world has already come, while the world still continues to evolve. It is only a pity that Dr. Kl. confuses the sources of this future event. He looks for them in Matth. 24, 23, but they exist only in his imagination.

**) Against the papacy at Rom, Walch XVII-, and on the deathbed.

with the Reformed in that it leaves no place in revelation for the divine act of the Reformation,*) and with the Chiliastes it competes in adventures.

It is obvious that a literal interpretation, such as Dr. Kl. uses in the passages cited and in many others, comes very close to a system of interpretation that places the fulfillment of the prophecies almost exclusively in the future. If, for the ecclesiastical interpretation, the fulfillment is the touchstone of its correctness, then this new way can, conversely, only prove itself correct by appealing to the non-fulfillment. With a certain inner necessity, therefore, such a system enters the realm of miracles and marvels, if it can only somehow find support for it in the text. It reaches for these wavering supports for its self-preservation. But one of our old theologians says, in reference to the interpretation of the Revelation of John: "Although one should not easily deviate from the letter, yet, if the context advises otherwise, we can do so with certainty. For it is not only the literal sense that flows directly from the letter, but also that which is intended by the author (remember, for example, Acts 10:11). Yea, rather, the literal interpretation becomes an error when the letter is pressed against the sense and intention of the speaker, of which Augustin says that the letter sometimes leads into error." †) But it is against the intention of the Author of Scripture, the Holy Spirit, to ascribe a special holiness to celibacy, not even if, as Dr. Kl. says, "not the abstention from marriage, but the motive driving them to it," non-recognition of Antichrist, should prove "its holiness" (to C. 14, 1.). For every one who, knowing the divine truth, turns away from the pontifical, unrighteous, and other errors, and suffers all things for them, "shall be a sanctified vessel" (2 Tim. 2:21); does the same thing as these virgins do, who, therefore, according to the usage of Scripture (2 Cor. 11:2), are called virgins, not because of actual celibacy, but because of preservation from idolatry and false worship. For the objections to an allegorical, that is, non-literal, interpretation of Revelation can undoubtedly be raised least where it speaks in images, which Scripture also uses in other ways. And as under the image of the virgin is a good thing, so still more frequently is the apostasy from God and his word, and the establishment of false worship under the image of carnal fornication, a

*The Reformed exegetes make light of every reference of the Lutheran exegetes to Luther and his Reformation, even if this leads them into the greatest absurdities. This spirit still lives in them today. Thus, for example, the Reformed Professor Ebrard interprets Philadelphia from the Reformed Church and Sardis from the Lutheran Church.

†) Kromayer, *Comment, in Apocal.* p. 160.

evil thing under an ugly image. How, therefore, can our interpreter, in his literal interpretation of the Jezabel of Thyatira, bring forth abominations which one might reluctantly impute, and which must have continued to grow for years under the eyes of the apostle John! Would not John have acted there as Paul did with the incestuous man? Can the love, the service, the faith, all that the Lord praises in the angel of the church at Thyatira, stand with him, that he makes himself a partaker of such sins, of which one can also say: the Gentiles do not know to speak of it?

And concerning the stars, the Lord Himself explains their meaning (C. 1, 20.). So Luther and others learned it from him. "The lights of the church," says J. Arndt, "dim first, and the pillars of the church fall first." When a star falls from Christ's hand, it certainly falls from heaven. Also, "buying" is used in an improper sense in Scripture. As a good spread before a man arouses his desire, and he does not fail to take possession of it, so we are to appropriate in faith the heavenly goods which the Word lures us to lay up before us. Thus "to buy" is metonymic for to appropriate. Is 55:3; Prov 23:23; Revelation 3:18.

Now, according to Dr. Kl., the beast Revelation 13 is not actually a beast, but his personal world-powerful Antichrist. But if the acting person is introduced under an image, then his actions will also be understood figuratively and inauthentically. Thus our commentators have held with Revelation 13:17, and we understand that the beast is contrary to men's appropriating (i.e., buying, which comes first) the highest goods of God, the forgiveness of sins for Christ's sake, without any works, as well as to those who lure and offer them for appropriation, namely, those who teach rightly about Christ and the righteousness that is valid before God; these are the ones who sell. Compared with this action of the beast, that which Dr. Kl. attributes to it, that it will exercise control over tea and sugar, as Napoleon once did with the Continental lock, and over world traffic with world power, is quite child's play! This would not greatly incommode even the saints, who can do both: starve and be full. However, it must be admitted that the boundary between literal and allegorical interpretation in this book of profound mysteries and rich in imagery is often difficult to determine. It seems to us that even the old Lutheran commentators are often at a loss when it comes to this book. But they never become tactless about it! From this they are protected by a pure system of doctrine, which always remains within the limits of the doctrines attested by the bright passages of Scripture, e. g., in regard to the doctrines of sin, justification, the church, and election by grace. Revelation, in its relatively dark visions and prophecies through images, cannot be any different from the

The teaching of the New Testament must be more clear, and the dark passages of the Revelation must be explained according to those passages. Dr. Kl. cannot but bring this principle into application even to C. 20. He finds that "other passages of Scripture tie the general resurrection directly to the Parousia." If, therefore, the thousand years were to be taken really, or only as a long period, there would be a contradiction between the Revelation and the rest of Scripture, since the Revelation here divides the resurrection into two acts (III, 272. 270). *) But what is to be said, when certain doctrines, foreign to the whole canon, are elicited from passages of the Revelation, **) in which no interpreter has yet found them, which also lie neither in the words nor in the sense therein; where nothing less than the right way of interpretation seems to be held, of which Luther says: "The holy teachers have the way of interpreting the Scriptures, that they take light clear sayings, and thereby make dark wobbly sayings clear; is also the way of the Holy Spirit to dispel darkness with light"? Luther represents as the opposite: to take from "a text a darkly wavering word" and "thereby make a light and clear text dark and wavering." †) Thus Dr. Kl. says: "John looks at the people of the 144,000 who have been preserved through all the final tribulations, praised by the heavenly ones and provided with the testimony that they are not only faithful, but (as the last congregation of the saints) blameless" (1, 88). If this blamelessness could be understood from a higher degree of a sanctified life, which an *ecclesia pressa* might have in advance of one living in times of persecution, we are informed that this is not what is meant. It is further said, "The people of God must come to their maturity," as the development of sin must reach its full measure (III, 41). And if it were still unclear what is meant by this maturity, we are further instructed to this effect: "Because of the plural, δικαιώματα (C. 19, 8.) cannot mean justification or righteous-

The church's righteous deeds, its perfected state of sanctification, do not signify the redemption of the saints, but only their righteous deeds. - The faithful of the last world week have already "attained the fullness of sanctification" in this life (they have attained it in

*) How then does the author help himself? He makes us a *quid pro quo*: the thousand, as a symbolic number, does not pay, but expresses a concept, that of completeness. Since this completeness is not applicable to the years, it is to be referred to that which the years comprise, the victory. With this, to be sure, the gentlemen chiliasts are not satisfied; and yet probably not unjustly! For though the number be symbolical, yet what it pays for is not a victory, but years, which, however many there may be, comprehend a time.

**Sentences such as: "The church of Jesus is not ready for marriage until it is also perfected in sanctification" (III, 244) are presented as dogmatic truths.

1) "That these words - still stand firm". E. A. 30, 113.

of the great tribulation), "thereby stood by the Lord in bribery of the Antichrist and bondage of Satan, reigning with the Lord, standing up before all other believers." "There is no question of Pelagianism in this, since they are given to it" (III, 244. 272). It is to be remarked in regard to this interpretation, that here, indeed, like Rom. 5, 18. legal fulfillment, means righteous action; but by this is not meant the legal fulfillment of the saints, but of Christ. By believing in Christ, God imputes to them all the doings of the righteous. Their righteousness is foreign, not inherent in their nature; therefore it is compared to a precious garment, which is also apart from man, and is put on him. The garment, therefore, is nothing else than the imputed righteousness of Christ. If this silk (Luther), this robe of byssus, were the "righteous deeds" of the saints, there would, however, be a time when the Christians (unlike Dan. 9:18) would lie on their righteousness before God.) But imperfect sanctification is no less a general thing, unworthy of the whole human race, which is again accepted in grace in Christ, than is sinful corruption. If the sinless conception of Mary is a lie against the generality of sinful corruption taught by Scripture, so also is the "fullness of holiness" of any church on earth and at any time on earth. There is no time on earth when a Christian would not have to say with Paul, "I wretched man," etc., or with John, "As we say," etc. (1 John 1:8-10). For the "fullness of holiness" would have to include the perfect fulfillment of the law; indeed, it would actually consist in this. Now, as is well known, the fullness of holiness is as good a papist as the unholiness of the law.

*Also the united theologian Hengstenberg understands by the white robe of byssus the virtues of the saints. He says to our passage: "Does already C. 3,18., Vergl. 7,14., where the white garments likewise designate their virtues, the bestowal of the same appears as a gift of divine grace. - To the moral condition (?) also refers the nuptial garment Matth. 22:12." It is also followed by)>. Kl. in the translation "right deeds," although he C. 3, 18. interprets the white garments rightly from the righteousness of Christ or the wedding garment. But in order to gain scriptural support for the fullness of holiness, this exegesis gives the saints yet another garment from their "righteous deeds. But it is a fact that Hengstenberg (whose book on Revelation, by the way, contains much material for the interpretation of this book, as well as a well-founded refutation of the Chiliasmns ss. "L. u. W.", 1869, September issue) publicly expressed his deviation from the Lutheran doctrine of justification during the last period of his work. Let it be stated here that this is already found in his Revelation of John (caused by the revolution of 1848). This is already evident from what has been said. But it is still explicitly stated in C. 3, 2: "The works, on which everything ultimately depends, compare Matth. 7, 21 (as if the doing of God's will was something different than believing in the son and remaining in Christ's speech), Joh. 14, 21" (as if Christ's commandments were not the main evangelical teaching, but the Decalogue).

the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. The Fathers of Trent curse those who say that the commandments of God are impossible to keep even for a justified man (*Sess. 6. de justit. can. 18-20*). Their doctrine is: You can keep them. So the Church Council of Trent also teaches the "fullness of holiness," in which the Lutheran Church Councils of our day agree with him. Is it to be wondered at that the top of the tree (for instance, the doctrine of the Antichrist) lies on the ground, when, on a closer survey, one perceives that the whole tree is near to toppling? But Kromayer says of Revelation 19:8: "The Scripture immediately explains itself what is understood by the byssus-cloth, namely, the righteousness (*δικαιώματα i. e. justificationes*) of the saints. By this itself (the *δικαιώματα*) is signified the righteousness of Christ imputed to us by faith, a more shining and sure covering than the indulgence bulls, the adulterous byssus garment (Revelation 17:4.). The Papists, as Ribera, indeed understand by *δικαιώματα* the merits of the saints; but in truth the merits of the saints are not pure byssus; because the works of the born-again are always defaced and stained by clinging sin (Heb. 12, 1.), by clinging evil (Rom. 7, 21.), by indwelling sin (Rom. 7, 17.). Thus they assert: But the works of the saints are stained with Christ's blood. Answer, Not the works, but the persons of the saints are dyed with Christ's blood; that is, the blood of Christ, or the merit acquired by Christ's blood, is imputed to them. But our righteousness is an unclean rag, as (Isa. 64:6.) the Jewish church confesses. As often as the Scripture bears witness of our imperfection, so often does it beat to the ground the figment of our works dyed with Christ's blood, as if Christ by his blood had acquired a meritorious power to our works. - It is true that otherwise *δικαίωμα*, *δικαιοσύνη*, and *δικαίωσις* are distinct; - but in this place *δικαίωμα* is put for *δικαιοσύνη* itself, and that in the plural either because of the perfection of righteousness, or because of the active and suffering obedience of Christ, or because of the multitude of saints. "**)

In connection with the doctrine of the fullness of sanctification, however, there appear to Dr. Kl. other teachings contrary to Scripture. "It has come to this," he says, "that Christianity, in the struggle with this becoming antichristic power, has lost to it not only the dead elements still existing in it, but also its holy city (?), even all that may be called its courts, has lost its whole position in the world, but has thereby also been purified, freed from its many rotten members, and converted in its remnant, has become a congregation of the saints, - that God's kingdom and the world stand opposite each other, separate and distinct, as an antichristic world power and a pure congregation of the saints, - which just thereby has also become capable and mature, now, to receive the Lord Jesus as the

*) A. a. O. p. 465.

Lord and bringer of the eventual glory in the same way (I, 95. 97). - It is a characteristic of the last time that then the former state ceases, in which only the Lord knows His own, in which believers and ungodly are mixed in the church in a way that is indistinguishable to human eyes, that then the believers go out of the world,*) are also outwardly separated from the mass of the ungodly, and like the ungodly on the other hand, become recognizable to human eyes. - The seal of God on their foreheads (C. 9, 4.) serves expressly as the distinguishing mark of his servants of God (II, 88). But the men of the world power are marked with the mark of the beast (III, 117). - Therefore, in the middle of the last world week, the Lord will come forth as judge, as can emerge from the womb of this church, because its existence makes its appearance possible to report. - God would be ready to let his kingdom come, but the accusation of sins and the love of the world prevent it. Only when God's people will be, as v. 1. and 11. (of C. 12) present it to us, God can let his kingdom come. This will not happen in the present course of time" (III, 40. 41.).

This is certainly spoken in no uncertain terms. It is taught that the church, if not today, will at some time be visible and recognizable in its true members on earth. But if this doctrine is now found in Revelation 12:1, 11; 9:4, it is then certain that a "dark wavering word" is twisted out of a text, and a "bright clear text made dark wavering." The bright, clear text of Scripture teaches that wheat and tares will grow together until the end, that the elect will not be separated from the wicked in outward separation. For two shall lie undivided in one bed, grinding in the mill; the foolish virgins shall keep company with the prudent, until the Lord make a great separation.

The Lutheran Church has never believed that Christ in the Revelation of John could contradict himself or change his clear sayings. Therefore, the Augsburg Confession confesses that "in this life there are many false Christians and hypocrites, even public sinners among the pious. Just as little do Luther and others know of the church which Dr. Kl. stands forth in the latter days. Thus says. Luther: "So this is the opinion that Christ here (Matth. 13, 24 ff.) does not speak especially of the heretics, but presents us with a likeness - of the whole Christian church, as it is here on

*It almost seems as if our interpreter, who so often speaks of this exit from the world, did not even know that it is carried out continuously by true Christians; that it does not require emigration into a desert, indeed that even in the desert a man can be a child of the world.

And it shall remain until the end of the world. - That therefore good seed and tares grow together in the churches, that is, good and evil are one among another, will never be prevented here in this life. But in that life there, the pious and the wicked shall be distinguished and set apart. **) J. Gerhard speaks similarly: "The object of the parable (Matth. 13, 24 ff.) is by no means to teach that the true church is older than the false (as Bellarmin thinks), but that in one and the same visible church the wicked and rejected are continually united with the good and elect.**) In the Church of this country it is taught in agreement with this: "But what does Christ mean when he says, 'Let both grow together until the harvest'? Hereby Christ not only means that until the end of the world it will never come to pass that His Church will become a visibly glorious kingdom and completely pure from sins, infirmities, and ailments, but that Christ will nevertheless preserve His Church until the last day, but also, first of all, that the Church should not punish anyone - with death." †) Therefore, as there is no time when any other than the present doctrines of sin, sanctification, will be taught, so there is none when any other than the present will and can be taught of the church and election of grace. Never will the truth lose its validity on earth: "The Lord knoweth them that are his," the golden vessels before them to dishonour, but not we men (2 Tim. 2:19, 20.). If, therefore, John stands in vision the servants of God sealed in their foreheads (Revelation 7:3), it does not yet at all follow that we see the same thing on earth; for such an inference is contrary to the bright, clear passages of Scripture, and to the analogy of faith. But this is to be concluded from the fact that God, under the lies and seduction of the antichrists, keeps his people in error, sealed with his spirit and gifts.

Actually, Dr. Kl. also disparages the apostles when he says of those kept through all the final tribulations that they were "so educated through the unheard-of tribulation of these last times - to personal sanctification, here in a sense that not even the most earnest Christian will be in this course of the world" (I, 97). But will the sons never be more than the fathers? These are rather the examples set by God for the church in doctrine and life (2 Tim. 1, 13.; Phil. 3, 17.), from whom the church learns at all times "how God is gracious and merciful, and wants to be patient with sinners" (Luther). And will those who are alive at the Parousia be changed, because they will "be such that they need not first pass through a purifying (?) death - but that the Lord can change them" (that is, because they have a prerogative before the Lord)?

*) House Postil, 5th Sunday after Epiphany.

**) *Loci, de eccl.* 164.

†) C. F. W. Walther, American Lutheran Gospel Postilla p. 87.

(For if they have the same ability and skill as all those who are alive and have died before, are they capable and able to undergo the transformation?) But Paul teaches the opposite, namely, that the transformation of the living is not a preference (not an advance) over those who have fallen asleep in Christ, as the Thessalonians in part with Dr. Kl. thought. The act of transformation has its reason and cause not in the unique holiness of those who remain, but in the order and succession of things ordained of God, which shall and will take place at the last day. *) Our most enlightened theologians know nothing of such preferential treatment of those still living. We cannot determine whether the transformation is connected with a certain taste of death (the wording of Scripture, however, does not hint at it) or not. **But even if the latter will be the case, they who experience the glory of Christ's future, but also the anxiety that precedes it, will be no better off than the soul of Simeon, which goes with peace and joy before that day. - Unspeakable sufferings have befallen the Church of Christ. We admire and marvel at the steadfastness of God's heroes, we still lament their torments, we still strengthen ours by their faith. We find, too, that the imagination of our interpreter, in his emergency bachelors and virgins and similar pieces, falls far short of the bloody reality and refined cruelty of the pagan and Roman persecutions: yet the tribulation of those living under his utopian Antichrist is still supposed to educate them to a quite different sanctification than ever was that of a mortal! But what is this but pure exegetical caprice and an unlimited play of human fancies? But all this is not like faith, not like the Apostles' Creed, which believes in a congregation of saints, and does not see the living members, and does not let Christ come because the holiness of men drags him down, but that he may judge the living and the dead. Or, to put it briefly, the Christian faith has no such thing in its consciousness, because nothing of the kind is presented to it for belief. Dr. Kliefoth's *theologia acroamatica* (learned theology) is a confusion of *theologia catechetica*. But how it stands with this, of which the interpretation of Revelation 21:12. affords an example. The holy city "had twelve gates, and upon the gates twelve angels." To this it is said:

*) Gerh., *de resur.* 117.: "Without the intervening transformation, bodies and souls could not be moved in the clouds to meet the Lord."

**Augustin, *lib. 2. retr. c. 33.*: "Either they shall not die, or, by the very rapid transformation from life to death, and from death to eternal life, as in a moment, they shall not feel death." Luther, "Thou shalt sit over table-soon, in a moment, thou shalt be changed, that is, dead, and be alive again." Declares himself immediately afterwards, "This is the change, that they who have fallen asleep - at the same time with us, who are still alive, shall be changed to a new life" (Sermon on 1 Cor. 15. v. 1545).

"Angels keep watch at the gates, guarding their entrance and exit, as the cherub does Paradise: this eternal city is under God's own guard. The theocracy also, the Christian church also, were and are under God's guard, but personal angels, as here, did not and do not do night duty with them" (IV, 314 ff.). How? we ask in amazement; do the angels not do night ministry to us? Do we not pray, "Thy holy angel be with me?" Christianity sings, "Who keep us safe; - but the host of angels keep watch, - to ward off the devil's cunning." Or are the angels not *verae hypostases* (true persons)? The

Lutherans also agreed with the papists that angels are *verae hypostases*, and as such are sent out to minister according to Scripture. But if their ministry is a night ministry (Matth. 18, 10.; Ps. 34, 8.; Ps. 91, 11. etc.), it is also a night ministry of personal angels. In his time, the Lord High Church Administrator has been earnestly endeavoring to bring the Catechism of Luther back into practice in schools and churches in Mecklenburg; now we learn that he himself does not believe it! Therefore we will not be at all surprised if such theologians of new thoughts also lead the modern doctrine of Sheol as an intermediate state. Revelation 5:13. gives all creatures - in heaven, - on earth, and under the earth prize to him that sat on the throne and to the Lamb. "Hengstenberg wants to understand *ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς*" (under the earth), it is said there, "of hell, i. e., of the devil, the demons, and the damned, who would be compelled to join in the praise. - But (it) is a price of redemption (because brought to the Lamb); and since redemption cannot be praised by the devil and the damned, we have rather "under the earth" to understand Sheol as the abode of those who died without being called to salvation while alive" (II, 50). But what then gives Dr. Kl. the right to limit the little word *παν* (all), and to exclude the devils, even creatures of God? And will then those who are in his Sheol be able to praise salvation? This also only the man who is born again can do. But Scripture knows nothing of conversion in Sheol. Apparently, however, Dr. Kl. does not regard the souls in his Sheol as damned, who, according to him, cannot praise salvation, but as converted, or at least accessible to conversion. The papal commentators also understand the creatures under the earth to mean the souls in purgatory, i.e. with Dr. Kl. something that does not exist at all.

Since the refutation of other details must be left to an interpretation of Revelation - if it is to take any account at all of the present interpretation - it is only to be remarked that, just as Dr. Kl. in what has been said throws overboard knowledge hitherto held to be inviolable, so he also, in substantiating his system, challenges hitherto generally accepted interpretations of Scripture - and we shall have to give an example of this in the following short outline of his system -

on the head. Far from being a pleasant phenomenon in the field of scholarly exegesis, this book can be compared to the twilight that pleases only sick eyes. The shooting light and the soot, which have attached themselves to the light of revelation since the time of the chiliastic exegetes, and which even Bengel has not substantially diminished; for he is also a child of his time, - which the otherwise so excellent strong man does not distinguish from the light; for he places the most adventurous and the most excellent next to each other without judgment, - which remain attached to all later interpretations: they have probably reached the height in our book *); Hengstenberg's interpretation also still appears more sober and in part more in accordance with Scripture. The ancients now say that the heretics serve certain people as a plaster of light, in that they are stimulated and driven by them to trace the knowledge that is true to Scripture, and to secure it from the beginnings of error. Let us apply this to certain interpretations! Let them put the plaster of light into the hand of a pure theologian and exegete, equipped and taught by God, that an interpretation of Revelation may be given to us, agreeing with the doctrine of the Confessions concerning the Antichrist (for Revelation has no other doctrine), carefully using the treasures of the interpretation of our fathers (today's exegetes hardly dignify them with anything but a superficial knowledge), also investigating how far the history of almost three hundred years does not show new moments of the fulfillment of prophecy, finally: also recognizing their own time, as the ancients also recognized theirs.

(Conclusion follows.)

Romanism in England.

A correspondent of the Leipziger Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung of March 8 writes: If all signs do not deceive, the Roman Catholic Church is yet to have a great harvest in England. ... In 1839 there were about seventy priests in the district which the Westminster Province, established on September 29th 1850, comprises, among them, by the way, many Jesuits living as private persons. In 1870 this Province, consisting of the Diocese of Westminster with twelve Suffragan Dioceses, and with the Archbishop Cardinal Heinr. Manning at its head, numbered 221 priests and 123 churches, chapels and stations. In 1839 there were two convents of women in that district; in 1870 the number had increased to thirty-eight. In 1839 there were ten churches in London, small and unsightly; in 1870 there were fifty there. The Weekly Register, January 1, 1871, estimates the number of converts to the

*) Of course, against this some accurate and pertinent comments can not compensate.

Roman Catholic Church for the year 1870 in London alone to two thousand and notes that there was only a lack of priests to add to these a significant number of those who were still wavering. The growth of Catholicism in England is most noticeable in the diocese of Shrewsbury. This place became the seat of a bishop in 1851. At the 25th anniversary of the diocese, celebrated in 1876, the following facts were reported. Whereas in 1851 the diocese referred to had 26 secular priests, seven regular priests, 31 churches, etc., one religious house for men and one for women, in the year 1876 the above numbers changed to 66, respectively 32, 84, 4 and 9. The most remarkable thing is that the conversions to Catholicism take place especially in the higher circles, which makes their importance all the greater. Not only in pecuniary respect does the Roman Catholic Church, which as is well known does not receive the least support from the state, derive the greatest advantage from this, but this circumstance is also very important for the spread of propaganda in a purely religious respect.

If one asks for the cause of this conspicuous phenomenon, then quite particularly an ecclesiastical direction within the English state church comes into consideration here, which one can virtually call the bridge to Romanism. . . . The prehistory of the direction which one is accustomed to call the ritualistic or, after a chief representative of it, the puseystic, comes less into consideration here. Only this much may be mentioned, that already in the whole peculiar deviation of the English state church from the Reformation state of that country lay hidden the deepest roots of today's ritualism. In England the Reformation did not proceed from the people, least of all from an experience of divine facts dominating the life of the people, as was the case with the Lutheran Reformation in Germany, but from the throne; it was predominantly political in nature. What was asserted by the Calvinist spirit and developed in Presbyterianism and Puritanism is of later date. The real English state church was supported by a different spirit. It remained in the main negative towards Romanism; it rejected only particulars of Roman ecclesiasticism, in the rest it firmly insisted on the same principle. "The doctrine of the one, visible, Catholic Church remained, the doctrine of the priesthood remained, the institute of bishops remained, and that not as congregational officials, but as persons specially sanctified by apostolic succession. On this the whole hierarchy could easily be rebuilt, except that its supreme seat was transferred from Rome to Canterbury."

If we now take a closer look at the most essential principles of ritualism, it is above all the dogma of the clergyman as "priest" which is everywhere in the foreground. Great weight

is placed on the apostolic succession. The bishops are the successors of the apostles; they confer the Holy Spirit with special graces on the priests by the laying on of hands. The bishop is the representative of Christ, and the priests are the representatives of the bishops. In the "*Catechism of Theology*" it is even said, "*The priest at the altar is virtually Christ himself.*" Accordingly, since priesthood and sacrifice are correlative terms, the concept of sacrifice in the Roman Catholic Church must also find its representation in ritualism. "When our Lord instituted the sacrifice, he at the same time ordained the priesthood," and indeed the first of the "*Tracts for the Day*" remarks: "The Christian priesthood unites in itself the offices which in the Old Covenant were distributed among different persons. The priest was the sacrificing, the prophet the preaching, the judge the ruling officiant. The Catholic priest at the altar offers the adorable sacrifice, of which the bloody burnt-offerings under the law were mere shadows; in the pulpit he declares the oracles of God, and in the confessional he sits in his judicial capacity." But inseparably connected with the doctrine of the unbloody sacrifice is that of transubstantiation. ... In "*The Kiss of peace*," for example, it is said: "The Holy Spirit, active when the priest consecrates, effects a transubstantiation of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ." . . . Furthermore, the veneration of the saints is also quite Roman, above all the Virgin Mary, who is called "our life, our sweetness, our hope, and is honored with many other mystical names. Joseph, Mary's betrothed, is also referred to as "a mighty intercessor with God." Likewise the ritualistic veneration of relics is in no way inferior to that of Rome; there, as here, is found the laying down of weight on monastic sisterhoods and brotherhoods, on "monks and nuns whose praises make Jesus smile, whose virginal chants heal the wounds of the Ever-Crucified and gather His drops of blood." Of celibacy, however, the *Church News* of April 7, 1869, asserts, "that so long as a single life is practiced among men, and especially among priests (that is, not merely among them after all) in very wager circles, an important aspect of the perfection of the Christian Church is lacking." The position which confession and absolution occupy in the system of the ritualists; the fact that blessedness is made dependent on both, that the "judicial" judgment of the priest is at least substituted for the "divine judgment," is evident from the statement: "The man who confesses to God can obtain forgiveness; he who confesses to a priest must obtain forgiveness." . . .

Under such circumstances it is easy to explain why some of the ritualists indulge in downright exorbitant condemnations of the Reformation. . . . The "*Church News*" of February 19, 1868, writes: "We would like to know what the Church of England is doing with the spirit of the Reformation."

and the principles of the Reformation, except to get rid of them as soon as possible." .

That under such circumstances the return of English ritualism into the fold of the Roman Catholic Church is only a question of time is obvious.

(Translated by Prof. A. Crämer.)

Compendium of the Theology of the Father

From

M . Heinrich Eckhardt.

(Continued.)

IX. The first sin.

Thou hast mentioned the sin of the first man, say what was its nature?

Leo: "It was pride, because man preferred to be rather in his power than in God's; it was also theft from God, because he did not believe in God; also murder, because he plunged himself into death; also spiritual fornication, because the integrity of man's soul was destroyed by the serpent's eloquence; and theft, because he seized the forbidden food; and avarice, because he desired more than should suffice him."1) Anselmus: "Since they desired to have more than they had received, they also lost what they had received. "2)

Is God the cause of this sin?

Clement: "That man chose, and that he chose what was forbidden, of this the blame is not to be laid on God." 3)

To whom?

Tertullian: "As God hath put man in the state of life, so man hath put himself in the state of death." 4)

Sup erbia fuit, quia in sua homo potius esse, quam in Dei potestate, dilexit; et sacrilegium, quia in D e o non credidit; et homicidium, quia se praecipitavit in mortem; et fornicatio spiritualis, quia integritas mentis humanae serpentina suasionem corrupta est; et furtum, quia prohibitus usurpatus est cibus; et avaritia, quia plus, quam sufficere illi debuit, appetivit. Leo ep. 86- ad Nic. Aquil.

Plus volentes habere, quam acceperant, et quod acceperant, amiserunt. Ansh. in 1 Tini. 6.

Quod homo elegerit, atque adeo id, quod erat vetitum, elegerit, non est culpa in Deum transferenda. Clem. 1. 4. Strom.

Sicut Deus homini vitae statum induxit: ita sibi homo mortis statum attraxit. Tert. 1. 2. adv.

Marc.

Is man himself, then, the "cause" of his fall and of the misery that follows from it?

Quite. Eusebius: "For if a man, while he has the faculty of choosing good, does not choose it, but willingly, with contempt of what is better, prefers instead to follow evil, who can say that he was not the cause of his disease, especially since he willingly despised the implanted and wholesome law?" 1) And Athanasius: "God made man in His own image, and willed that he should persevere in incorruption. But men, turning away from the eternal and toward the corruptible, have been to themselves the authors of their corruption, which has death dwelling with it." 2) But could not this fall have been prevented, if God had not made man mutable, nor free-willed?

Athanasius: "But he made him in his own image, and gave him the gift of his reason, that he might persevere in the blessed life, a true, yea, indeed, a life of the saints in paradise. Again, beholding the free will and choice of man to turn to either side, he timely guarded this grace which he had given them with the protection of law and place." 4) Did he sin by being compelled from elsewhere, or enticed by his own will?

Aponius: "Of his own free will, through his own fault, in that the devil persuaded him." 4)

Why dost thou add, that by the devil's persuasion?

Justinus: "Because Eve, being an uninjured virgin, having received the word of the serpent, gave birth to disobedience and death." §Ambrose: "For the devil persuaded the first, evil gullible men, by poisonous lies, that they thought they would be better than they were.

Cum enim virtus ad eligenda bona inest, si ea non eligit, sed sponte, melioribus spretis, mala imitatus sequitur, quis potest dicere, eum morbi su causam non fuisse, praesertim cum insitam atque salutarem legem volens contemserit? Eus. de praepar. 1. 6- c. 5.

Ad suam ipsius imaginem Deus hominem effiguravit, et in incorruptibilitate perseverare volebat: Homines autem ab aeternis aversi et ad corruptibilia conversi sibi suae corruptionis, quae in sede mortem habet, autores fuere. Athan. 1, de humil.

At suam ipsius ad imaginem effiguravit, deditque illi suae rationis dotem, ut perseverare posset in beatitudine vivens, veram et revera sanctorum in paradiso vitam. Rursum animadvertens arbitrium delectumque hominis utroque vergere, mature hanc gratiam, quam ipse dederat, legis et loci praesidio communivit. Athan. ibid.

-Per liberam voluntatem, propria culpa, persuadente Diabolo. Apon. 1. 2. in Cant.

Quia, cum integra virgo esset Heva, concepto verbo serpentis inobedientiam mortemque peperit. Justin, in Tryph.

if they excelled in the freedom of their will, than if they remained within the bounds of the given law. "1)

Further, what has become of the descendants of the first men? are they born holy and sinless?

Gregory: "The spotless Lord willed that man should be born without the stain of sin, and that the order of human offspring should be propagated without the defect of carnal lust. And therefore he made Adam so that he would have begotten children without sin, if he had persisted in the obedience of his Creator. But because the human soul disdained to obey its Lord, the begetting of children became a sinful one." 2) Justin: "By his sinning Adam brought his offspring under death, and made all of this sin penal." 3)

X. Classification.

How many are the people after the fall?

Prosper: "Man by man all men are created by God, and out of this whole shall some be damned with the devil, and others shall reign with Christ. "4)

In how many states is man considered?

Augustin: "Let us distinguish 4 states of man: Before the law; under the law; under grace; at peace. Before the law we follow the lust of the flesh; under the law we are drawn by it; under grace we neither follow it nor are drawn by it; in peace there is no longer any lust of the flesh. Before the law, therefore, we do not fight, because we not only lust and sin, but also approve of sins; under the law we fight, but are defeated; under grace we fight and conquer; in peace we do not fight, but rest in perfect and everlasting peace." 5)

(To be continued.)

Diabolus enim primis hominibus male credulis per mendacia venenata persuasit, ut meliores se futuros putarent, si in libertate arbitrii sui prosilirent, quam si in legis datae custodio permanerent. Ambr. 1. 10. Ep. 84-.

Voluit immaculatus Dominus, ut homo sine macula nasceretur peccati, et absque vitio carnalis delectationis humanae sobolis propagaretur successio. Et ideo talem fecit Adam, ut absque peccato filios ederet, si in conditoris obedientia stetisset. Sed quia Domino suo obedire anima humana renuit, filiorum procreatio in peccatum incidit. Greg. in ps. poenit.

Peccando Adam posteros suos morti subiecit, et universos huic delicto obnoxios reddidit. Justin. Dial, cum Tryph.

Universi homines a Deo singillatim creantur, et de hac universitate alii sunt damnandi cum Diabolo, alii regnaturi cum Christo. Prosp. resp. ad cap. Gall.

Distinguiamus quatuor hominis gradus: Ante legem, sub lege, sub gratia, in pace. Ante legem sequimur concupiscentiam carnis; sub lege

Martin Geyer.

As wrong and unworthy as it is to open the Bible or any other godly book for the purpose of finding out God's will in a serious matter of conscience, in order to accept the first sentence that catches the eye as God's decision, God sometimes arranges that a reader who is searching for God's will in an important matter will, contrary to expectation, find God's answer to a silent question shining in his eyes as soon as he opens a book. An example of this is the godly theologian Martin Geyer. When he was in doubt as to whether or not he should accept the call as high court preacher at the court of Chursachsen in Dresden, and he took his prayer book (Olearius' School of Prayer) to present the matter to God, the words of Jeremiah 1:7 first came to him when he opened the book. 1:7, "Thou shalt go whithersoever I send thee." These words made such a deep impression on him that he immediately took them for a divine hint and followed the vocation. To prove that Geyer belonged to a class of court preachers that is becoming more and more rare, Tholuck tells us that he was once offered an estate worth ten thousand thalers as a gift by his Elector, but that he rejected the gift with the remark: "*Ne negotiis domesticis distraheretur*," i.e., so that he would not be drawn away by domestic business (from his official duties). This "Saxon Daniel", as he was called after his death, died in 1680. W.

Anecdote.

A preacher who loved to hunt once boasted that he could not be outdone in finding hares. "If I were a hare," said a Quaker who was present, "I would sit down in a place where I was sure you would not trouble me from the first of January to the 31st of December." "Where would you sit down?" said the preacher. The Quaker answered, "In your study." (Menn. Fr.)

trahimur ab ea; sub gratia nec sequimur eam, nec trahimur ab ea; in pace nulla est concupiscentia carnis. Ante legem ergo non pugnamus, quia non solum concupiscimus et peccamus, sed etiam approbamus peccata; sub lege pugnamus, sed vincimur; sub gratia pugnamus et vincimus; in pace non pugnamus, sed perfecta et aeterna pace requiescimus. Aug. in exp. prop. Ep. Rom.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Council. An American correspondent of the "Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kz." Dr. Luthardt, in the number of March 1, reports, among other things, the following: It (the Council) has now been in existence for about a decade, and unfortunately all too rapidly built up on unbalanced antagonisms, the battlefield of which embraced the whole distance from the General Synod over to Missouri. At first the liberal principle, represented especially by the English Lutherans of the Pennsylvania and Pittsburg Synods, prevailed. But even among these Americans a movement began, albeit very slowly, toward a clearer grasp of Lutheran doctrine. Considering that these pastors and congregations came out of the embrace of the General Synod with its syncretism and rationalism, one must gratefully acknowledge the progress they have made. In one matter, however, they have lagged behind themselves, so to speak, in the matter of pulpit and communion with those of other faiths. In the General Synod even every thought of order or discipline in this was perhorrescited. But even in the English congregations of the General Council the old habit could not yet be entirely got rid of. On the occasion of reformed synods, for example, it is the custom in Pennsylvania, in accordance with American courtesy, that the Lutheran pulpits of the synodal city are offered to the reformed "brethren". Even such eminent, decidedly Lutheran men as the long-time president of the Pennsylvania Synod, Dr. Greenwald in Lancaster, and the energetic Dr. Schmucker in Reading, who did not deny the old German vigorous streak, did so in an ostensible manner as late as last year. This question was from the very beginning one of the burning puncta. When, therefore, the first call for a union was issued to all the Lutherans of America, including the Missourians, many synods demanded that an agreement should first be reached in free conferences on all pending doctrinal questions. But there was not enough patience. It was hoped that agreement would be easier after unification, and the General Council was formed and immediately given this Pandora's box of the so-called "five punctures" as a dowry. The Council opened the box very cautiously, but the farther it went out the more uneasy it became; Iowa would not join, Ohio walked away, Illinois withdrew, and now the crack has fairly penetrated into the very heart of the Council. At the earlier annual meetings attempts were made to cover it up, but it grew worse, and since the meeting at Galesburg in 1875 this question has become the vital question. The American element was confronted by the more brittle and strict German contingent and the Swedes, whose opposition was becoming more and more evident. The latter spoke out very vigorously against the American mischief at their synods, and soon the Germans, especially in the New York Synod, sided openly and clearly with them. At Galesburg the German party gained the victory. Pulpit and altar fellowship with dissenters was rejected as contrary to Scripture. The Americans also concurred, but reserved exceptions, which were known to be perfectly equal in practice to the rule.... President Dr. Krauth was instructed to prepare theses for the meeting of 1877, and to publish the same sufficiently in advance. ... On October 10, in the magnificent new Church of the *Holy Communion* of Dr. Seiß, the Council was opened. ... The debate was a very lively, often passionate one. On the part of the unirt-minded Americans, especially Dr. Seiß and Past. Kunkelmann, whimsical

The confessions of faith that were made were not to be expected in a Lutheran congregation and in some cases aroused great displeasure. But all such omissions were only as many challenges to the faithful confessors, who did not lack open-hearted words. In front stood invincible, with iron calm, burning heart and relentless logic the president Dr. Krauth. His words were often ravishing. He confessed his own errors in earlier times and was glad that they had been overcome. Dr. Krauth is the good genius of the Council. It is not doubtful to us for a moment that without him the Council would have long since broken up.... However, in spite of the splendid words of Krauth, who often captivated his listeners for hours, and in spite of the motion of the New Yorkers, the meeting took a course which, on the whole, was not very satisfactory. For more than ten years this important question had been debated, and yet it was considered too early to give a clear decision. Indeed, Dr. Krauth almost contradicted himself when, after the manly, energetic declarations, he himself called for a postponement. We fear that there the American and diplomat won out over the Lutheran.... The General Council as it is now proves only too clearly that it is a false speculation to want to bring together what does not fit together.

The Weinbrennerians now also want to found learned institutions. The "Luth. Zeitschrift" reports the following excerpt from the "Christi. Kundschafter" the following excerpt from the negotiations of the various Aeltesterschaften: "The Iowa Aeltesterschaft decided: 'As learning is necessary to the whole man - body, mind, and heart; and as learning is indispensable in the preaching of the moral and religious duties of men, preachers should use all eligible means to train themselves in the useful sciences, that they may all be serviceable to the affairs of society.' Of the Kansas-Missouri Aeltesterschaft it is said: 'It is enacted, that as education in learning is most necessary in the ministry, the preachers shall diligently train themselves in all necessary knowledge; shall be annually subjected to a course of study, and shall be examined thereon.' In the Illinois Aeltesterschaft 'it was also voted in favor of instruction'. In the report of the meeting of the Southern Illinois-Indiana Aeltesterschaft it says: 'The attacks of the unbelieving worldly wise upon God's Word and Church induced the adoption of a resolution strongly urging the preachers to train themselves in all the sciences pertaining thereto'. In the Nebraska Aeltesterschaft 'a church school was strongly favored, and the young preachers were earnestly enjoined to train themselves diligently in all needful knowledge.' Michigan: 'The necessity of learning among preachers was asserted, and the establishment of a church school advocated.' Indiana resolved 'that the preachers should be more diligent to be trained in scholarship.' In the Texas Aeltesterschaft it was even 'strictly enjoined upon the preachers to train themselves in Bible and general useful sciences.' In western Ohio, 'scientific education was strongly enjoined.'.... A suitable person is also to be employed to compile and disseminate the doctrines of the sect. In Michigan, foot washing is on the wane among the faithful, so the Aeltesterschaft resolved .to enjoin the preachers to preach more on this holy ordinance of the church, and to help practice it themselves.' In Eastern Pennsylvania the state of religion is 'very low' in regard to conversions."

A new sect has recently organized itself in the East, which wants to be a religious community and secret society at the same time. It calls itself the "Independent Brotherhood of Christian Believers". Its purpose is the "spreading of the kingdom of the Holy Spirit in human hearts". She probably has not read Matth. 10, 27.

It is well known **that the Methodists** hold infant baptism in low esteem and probably only maintain it in order to be able to draw lukewarm Lutherans into their nets. Now and then, however, the wolf does peep out from under the sheep's clothing, as may be seen from the following advertisement, taken from a political paper in Omaha, Nebr. "At the Methodist Church on 18th Street, next Sunday evening, discussion will be resumed on the interesting subject of "infant baptism a doctrine of devils and popes." J. S.

II. Abroad.

Church Council Election in the Kingdom of Saxony. According to the report of the "Pilgrim from Saxony," a churchwarden was elected in one parish who was rejected by the pastor and the church council because he had conspicuously kept away from church and sacrament, and was openly accused of mocking the Virgin Mary and blaspheming Christ. Since he did not want to be rejected, the case went to the Landes-Consistorium, which confirmed the election as a lawful one. The reasons for this confirmation are given in a "correction" which the L. Consistory sent to Pilgrim a. S.. The elected man denies the mockeries and blasphemies which he is guilty of. He is said to have said before the magistrate: "He did not use such mean expressions"; perhaps, therefore, his mockeries were less juicy. On the other hand, he has conceded, "I believe in a creation, a supreme being; I cannot believe in a personal God." It was now a question of whether he was eligible for election under the church council regulations, if the same only excluded from election those "who, by contempt of the word of God or dishonourable conduct, have given public offence which cannot be remedied by sustained correction." The explicit contempt of the Word of God was not proven, so it only remained to decide whether the simple denial of God was to be regarded as a contempt of the Word of God. On this the L. Consistory "could not decide. - Something (only "something"?) monstrous, however, is the matter at any rate. The existence of the church and the whole synodal order presupposes the belief in a personal God and is a complete absurdity, even an impossibility without it. To this testifies the very electoral provision which excludes despisers of the word "God," and is intended to protect not only faith in God but also his holy word against sacrilege. It goes without saying, therefore, that deniers of God, who are not even members of the Church, must be excluded from the Board of the Church. Or if the Lutheran Consistory refers to the wording of the above provision and finds no justification therein for the exclusion of a denier of God, then we have before us the blatant fact that in the Lutheran (??) Church of Saxony deniers of God are not only entitled, but can also take part in the leadership of the church by virtue of a law. What kind of synodal constitution (and church) leads to such conclusions! However, the case leads to quite different considerations. The church council constitution counts among the duties of a churchwarden the "enlivening of the Christian sense in the church congregation." How should a God-denier begin to do that? Should he sermonize? To our astonishment, the L. Consistory is really of the opinion "that the person in question can fulfill his duty in this respect," which is "not excluded by his still inadequate Christian (!) knowledge. Does the L. Consistory then pay homage to modern morality without religion? That is the strongest thing that can be said by a church authority, and sounds just as one is accustomed to hear it in the Protestant Association.

(N. Zeitbl.)

Hermannsburg. A Hanoverian correspondent has sent an article to the Leipzig Allg. Kz. which wants to orientate about the present crisis in the Hanoverian church. In this article, which appeared in No. 10 of this year, it says, among other things: Now, however, we have to mention one more serious circumstance. Hermannsburg, as the fountainhead and source of life for many thousands, as the seat of the popular mission supported by the people, and with its missionary journal, has been the leader and almost infallible for thousands of the best in our congregations in the spiritual field, and today we feel it as a self-accusation that we did not testify early and seriously enough against this very often fallible infallibility, and that we have kept silent, partly out of prudence, partly out of fear. For now the circles awakened from Hermannsburg are deeply agitated in many congregations and ask, what shall we do, stay or go? The clergy are for the most part in a difficult situation, and although only three or four congregations are really beginning to separate, in many places it is happening in an uncanny way. It is time to make a public declaration to the congregations.

The Hermannsburg Missionary Institute. Pastor Lohmann writes in his "Hannoversche Pastoral-Correspondenz" of March 30: "It is often asked whether the Hermannsburg Missionary Institute as such has been separated from the Hanoverian Regional Church by the separation of its director and has become an institution of the Lutheran Free Church. The statutes of the Missionary Institute do not leave the slightest doubt that its legal position has not been affected in any way by the separation, since it continues to be under the supervision of the Royal Consistory of Hanover with regard to property law. In addition, all members of the committee can still belong to the Landeskirche, and at least half of them actually still belong to it and will probably belong to it in the future. In the following, Lohmann communicates the statutes of the institution as they are found in the Hermannsburg Missionary Gazette of 1856, No. 12, from which, however, it can be seen that the same Harms once subordinated his institution to the Hanoverian state church regiment in great trustfulness, so that it must be regarded and treated as a state church institute in spite of its separation. W.

Pastor Th. Harms declares in his missionary bulletin of February: "I still recognize myself as pastor of Hermannsburg." The dear man does not seem to see the implications of these words. According to the same, his consistorials are not only not representatives of the country church regiment, but are also persecutors of Christ, and Pastor Plathner a thief and robber. W.

Dr. Münkelt writes in his Neues Zeitblatt of March 14, concerning the Hermannsburg separation: "Harms, of course, in the February issue of his Missionsblatt, drew us a lovely picture of peace in his separated community. However, according to many credible reports, the conditions in Hermannsburg are deplorable and one is in doubt as to how far we are dealing with a political or an ecclesiastical separation..... Some congregations have already refused to contribute to the Hermannsburg mission. The real test for all this will be whether he succeeds in getting into the right relationship with the regional church community in Hermannsburg. We cannot recognize conciliation and peaceableness in the fact that the same hands that give this congregation a handshake are held out to others for the sake of the mission; and just as little can we give you, the regional church congregation in Hermannsburg, as a Cinderella to cultivate love and fellowship with those who have placed themselves further away or alienated themselves from us." In the number of March 21, Dr. Münkelt, in reference to Harms' concerns about the doctrinal position of the Landeskirche, says: "There is no question that

no one is to enter into judgment with the teaching of the national church who cannot himself pass judgment when measured according to Lutheran standards, not to mention marriage. What results would probably come out if our freedmen, to speak only of the outstanding ones including Harms, were to be measured according to this measure!"

Separation. Since Hermannsburg has separated, we have encountered a strange change in the way separation is spoken of in the German newspapers. Thus, for example, we read in the "Pilgrim from Saxony" of March 24: "We do not see an obstacle to joint Lutheran missionary work in the different church positions of the Lutherans. But much greater seems to us the danger that through such separations without just cause the holy cause of separation itself will be endangered and damaged, the separation, that is, which must take place where God's Word and Sacrament are in question." Who would have thought it possible a short time ago that the "Pilgrim a. S." would speak of "the holy pool of separation"? God help on! W.

Divorce. To what unbiblical church-regimental decisions the false doctrine of honor, which Dr. Huschke brought to the Breslau Synod, leads, is evident, among other things, from the following decision of the Ober-Kirchen-Collegium of February 21 of this year. If married couples who have divorced and remarried for any reason in another church or religious society that does not recognize or practice Christ's prohibition of divorce, come to our church, a dissolution of their marriage on our part shall not be demanded

Testimony from the Immanuel Synod. Thus Pastor Simon MeeSke in Luzine (Silesia) writes in his paper "Concordia" of March 1: "The mystery of godliness, the true and real incarnation of the Son of God, also indicates to us within the Evangelical Lutheran Church our firm and definite position vis-à-vis all false directions that appear in it and seek to gain citizenship in it. Such directions are, to the right, the catholicizing and chiliastic, with which, outside the Lutheran Church, the irvingiamstic and puseyistic directions are still related, and, to the left, the rationalizing in all kinds of shades down to the Protestant Association. The catholicizing tendencies look around again for the fleshpots of Egypt and head back to Rome. Puseyitism, too, has become a bridge to Rome for many. The chiliastic direction is essentially Judaistic and wants a king on earth and a kingdom of this world with the Jews, just as the Romans created one for themselves in the pope and the papacy and therefore grumble about the revelation of the incarnation of the Son of God. The rationalistic direction, like that of the Protestant Union, also abolishes all mysteries, and therefore also the mystery of the incarnation of the Son of God above all things. It is self-evident to a Lutheran that such tendencies have no place in the house or church of God, and whoever tolerates them denies the mystery of our faith and undermines the church of God. We must also call catholic the idolatry which many who allow themselves to be scolded as Lutherans practice with the sovereign church government, and indeed in general the idolatry and cult which one practices with men and makes the existence of the church of God dependent on them. It is also catholic when men, who by God's grace have finally got away from it, postulate and invent in the church of God an authority *secundum evangelium* or *juris divini*, to whom a Christian owes obedience for God's sake, and therefore let the church be, if not primarily, yet also essentially a secular police force, etc. The direction of the so-called 'open questions' is also rationalizing, which declares this article and that article to be an open question, according to its convenience, about which therefore

each may believe and teach what he pleases. We cannot allow any room for all these new and newest trends in the Evangelical Lutheran Church, in the house of God, which stands and is rooted in the mystery of godliness, in the church, which is a pillar and foundation of truth, because we would thereby touch the real and true incarnation of the Son of God and would thus become anti-Christian. For it is a quite inanimate and inorganic, even purely mechanical view, unworthy of a Christian and servant of Jesus Christ, to suppose that all these false directions do not touch the mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God. We joyfully and confidently confess that the living pulse of this mystery still stirs and moves in the most peripheral article of our faith. And we will have and keep our faith entire, and will not let any creature in heaven or on earth mutilate the same." - Certainly a good statement. But what is one to say to this, when it sometimes sounds out of the said synod, while the president of the same faithfully slanders Lutheran synods in the most disgraceful manner in his paper, by imputing all kinds of lies to them, and mocking and scorning them again and again, thus persecuting them, while holding out the brother's hand to syncretists?

W.

Bavaria. Thus the Breslau "Kirchen-Blatt" of March 15 writes: "A pastor named Jlling could not convince himself for a long time that the church doctrine of the divinity of Christ was correct. That is nothing rare in our time. But it is rare that Jlling was sincere enough to draw the consequences of his conviction. He put aside the old Lutheran baptismal formula and baptized the children 'in the name of Almighty God, Jesus the Son and God the Holy Spirit'. Spirit'. Of course this did not work and he was suspended from his office. Since some unrest arose about the case in liberal newspapers, the Ansbach Consistory publicly declared that this suspension was only about the baptismal formula of the congregation, but not about the orthodoxy of the pastor. This Consistorial announcement is the most significant thing in the whole story. A truly and purely ecclesiastical authority would have announced: It is true that at first it was only a formula, but we had to intervene against this formula all the more because it was based on a doctrinal deviation. But the nature of a state'-ecclesiastical authority means that it prefers to avoid 'captious' doctrinal questions. It will bear frighteningly bitter fruit, however, that doctrine will be treated more and more as an area in which one might well look into this and that." - As true as all this is, the "Kirchen-Blatt" evidently also "avoids" a question that is likewise "captious" for it, namely, the question of what a Lutheran has to do who finds himself in such an ecclesiastical community.

W.

From Denmark, the Allgemeine Kz. of March 15 writes: "The whole church life of Denmark has greatly benefited from the fact that only the Lutheran church doctrine and church direction, and not at the same time the Reformed, has broken through in the country. Thus Denmark has been preserved from all forms of unionism, and much noble energy has been saved, which elsewhere has been wasted and expended in confessional struggles. To whichever of our churches one may therefore go, one will everywhere hear a decidedly Christian testimony, and not a single preacher will be found who departs from the foundation of the old Christian faith." - If only it were true!

The Alliance and the Renitents in Hesse-Darmstadt. The General Lutheran Church Newspaper of March 22 reports: Last late summer, quite unsought, the news had reached England through a private letter from a Lutheran layman.

that in Hesse-Darmstadt the pastors of the Old Lutherans are being brought before the courts and sentenced to fines and imprisonment because of their church services..... This news spread quickly in Christian circles in England and came to the knowledge of members of the Evangelical Alliance in London, among others, who expressed their heartfelt sympathy about these sufferings and asked for detailed authentic information..... On the basis of private communications, the secretary of the Alliance, Rev. Davis, wrote a summary which he presented at a committee meeting in mid-December, and as a result of which the Alliance Council decided to send its secretary to Darmstadt. In mid-January Rev. Davis himself came to Darmstadt and to Reichenberg to inform himself personally and to initiate the steps of the Alliance. The President of the Darmstadt Consistory, Dr. Goldmann, then sought to justify the conduct of the government against the Renitents in a letter to the London "Times". Mr. Davis replicated this in the same paper under the heading "Religious Intolerance in Hesse-Darmstadt" and in this essay sought to refute Goldmann's reasons. Finally, the Evangelical Alliance submitted a detailed letter to an authoritative body, in which it asked for tolerance for the free Lutheran Church in Hesse and for recognition of the same. With what success, of course, remains to be seen, since the resisters refuse to form a new religious community distinct from the national church, but insist on being the old true national church! W.

Non-confessional schools. The "Pilgrim from Saxony" of March 3 writes: Who will receive the lion's share in the present indifference to the Confession is evident from the following fact. At the Gymnasium in Frankfurt a. M., originally a Lutheran foundation and institution, which is nevertheless also attended by Catholic youths, they are taught history by a decided ultramontane. The Protestant pupils, however, with the exception of two lower classes, all receive their instruction first in the history of antiquity up to the advent of Christianity, on which the teacher must therefore in any case take a stand, from a Jew. Then the history of the Middle Ages, including the time of the Reformation, is taught by a Roman Catholic priest who has recently been employed as a teacher, and finally the history of modern times is taught by the same decided Ultramontane who teaches history to the Catholics. With such a state of affairs, the Romans can laugh and let the culture fighters shout themselves hoarse: we are not going to Canossa! Unfortunately, according to the expected Prussian teaching law, it will be the same in the elementary schools as in the Frankfurt grammar school.

Necrological. On February 28, Prelate Dr. Karl v. Grün eilen, for many years President of the Eisenach Conference, died in Stuttgart, especially known for his efforts in the field of ecclesiastical art.- On March 20, Professor Dr. Th. Fr. Ehrenfeuchter also died in Göttingen (born December 14, 1814). - On March 26 of this year, after six years of severe suffering, Pastor Sir". Eduard Gustav Kellner in Schwirz in Silesia (formerly in Hönigern) at the age of 75 years.

Religious Freedom in Germany. The state of this freedom is shown by the following item taken from a German political newspaper: On March 14, the comedian J. Laska stood before the Regional Court in Ljubljana, accused of having given up the riddle: "What is more liquid than water?" at a performance on November 24 of last year, and thus of having answered: "The Pope, for he is superfluous." The prosecution charged that since, according to the dogmatic teachings of the Catholic Church, the Pope is its visible head and the Vicar of Jesus Christ, he is not the head of the Church.

If the defendant is a Catholic, such an utterance, spoken from the stage during a theatrical performance, seems perfectly suitable to ridicule and disparage the teachings and institutions of the Catholic Church, concerning the head of the same, and to expose the head of the Catholic Church to public ridicule. Defendant Julius Laska, 28 years old, Catholic, denied any evil intent. He had heard the same riddles in the Linz theater and, convinced that he was doing nothing wrong, had produced them in Ljubljana. Incidentally, the defendant remarked, he had very often read in Viennese journals the discussion of the unnecessary nature of the papacy, and in some plays the papacy and the high clergy were used by the author himself in a far worse way than he had done by his statement. The public prosecutor upheld the charge in its entirety and described it as aggravating that it had been made against the population of a city that was, after all, almost exclusively Catholic. Finally, he recommended to the court that, given the defendant's previous lack of criminal record, he be brought below the legal level. The Court found the defendant guilty of the accused offense and sentenced him to twenty-four hours' imprisonment, intensified by fasting.

Eared confession. Nearly half a million members of the English state church from all ranks have signed a motivated petition and sent it to Queen Victoria, in which they ask her to "use all the influence at her command to suppress auricular confession.

Social Democracy and Liberalism. On the relationship of the two to each other, the Allgemeine Kz. of February 8 says the following: In former times it was thought, and in many cases it is still thought, that atheism, hostility to religion, did not really belong to Social Democracy, but was merely an accidens which it had retained only from its spiritual father, liberalism. Now, however, it becomes clear that it is essential to consistent, purposeful Social Democracy to be hostile to religion, even if religion is declared to be a private matter in the Social Democratic program. The assertion that mass withdrawal from the church and avowal of atheistic materialism is the only correct answer to the appearance of the Christian Social Party is proof of this. But this does not alter the point that the Social Democracy's hostility to religion stems from liberalism. Liberal pantheism is only the preliminary stage of Social Democratic materialism, and the atheism of a propertied liberal is just as valuable as that of a propertyless Social Democrat. Nor were the reasons with which the Social-Democrat Most and all the other Social-Democratic speakers wanted to justify atheism and materialism as the corresponding faith of a right Social-Democrat any different from those which liberal rationalism puts forward against positive faith. Nor is the mass exit of the Social Democrats from the church anything other than the actual execution of what the Berlin Protestant Association and Progressive masses recently threatened. This is probably now unpleasant to liberalism and the Protestant Association, and both now want to disown their children, a disowning which, however, is also nothing but a liberal specialty; one only has to think of the spiritual father of liberalism, Rousseau.

Statistics of the Jesuit Order. As can be seen from the recently published Catalogus Provinciae Austriaco-Hungaricae, the Society of Jesus counted 225 members more in 1877 than in the previous year. The total number of members amounts to 9771, of which only 2030 are active as missionaries in other parts of the world, but not less than 7741 are from the European states. Since 1869, the number of Jesuits has increased by 1088.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 24.

June 1878.

No. 6.

(Sent in by Dr. Sihler.)

What is the will of God in regard to the own household regiment of the ministers of the church?

The Pastoral Epistles are indeed an invaluable treasure for us shepherds and teachers, whom the Lord Christ still places in His church; for they do not keep to the general, how our doctrine and our life should be according to God's will, but also deal with the individual and particular. They give specific instructions as to how the servant of Christ is to conduct himself in his church under particular circumstances. They instruct him how to deal with the wisdom and love of Christ, sometimes with earnestness, sometimes with kindness, according to the peculiar spiritual need of the individual sheep of Christ entrusted to his care. They instruct him how to be not only a faithful, but also a wise steward of his master's household, to give his household members, his parishioners, their due, with and according to God's word, be it teaching or admonition, punishment or comfort. In their instruction, they carefully consider the various circumstances and conditions of the individual parishioners, with regard to age, gender, marital status, and widowhood.

Above all, the Pastoral Epistles inculcate the purity of Christian doctrine, warn against the seduction of apostate false teachers and their doctrines of the devils, which have flowed together in the papacy as a horrible basic soup. They also show the difference between the law and the gospel, and instruct how the faithful servant of the Lord should conduct himself against those who have been convicted, and yet remain malicious and obdurate, spreading false doctrine, i.e. heretics.

In the third chapter of the first letter to Timothy (cf. Tit.1, 7-9.) from v. 1-7. now also the Holy Spirit through St. Paulum, his helpers in the gospel, has given to Timothy and Titus and in them all shepherds

In this essay, the necessary requirements of a righteous servant of Christ and His church are revealed, both with regard to the prevailing attitude, as well as to special qualities and gifts, and the reputation among men. There is also a brief summary of the answer to the question and title of this essay, which reads: "He who is well disposed over his own house, who has obedient children with all honor. But if a man know not how to preside over his own house, how shall he provide for the church of God?"

But before I proceed to the interpretation of this answer, it will be pertinent and expedient first to exhibit and briefly answer an introductory question. But it is this: How should a single and especially a younger servant of the Church proceed in order to find a Christian spouse and to establish his household with her? For that of his household will also depend to a great extent on the nature of her. How then, how shall he do it? Shall he do according to Genesis 6:2, where it is written, "Then the children of God looked on the daughters of men (the unconverted children of the world), as they were fair, and took them wives whom they would"? Hardly; for that these words are not to be understood merely historically, but are written in a reproving and punitive manner, is plain enough from the connection with v. 3. and 4. Nor is he to follow Samson's example, who answered to the punitive reproof of his parents, "She (the Philistine woman) pleaseth mine eyes." But the special meaning of Samson's choice, as is evident from Judg. 14, 4. will hardly take place with him. A passionate infatuation with a beautiful face or form, or both, is certainly evil, and may very soon turn into the opposite. In the same way, a young pastor should not allow himself to be determined to be free by worldly fortune, or by some knowledge and ability, or by the social gifts and personal kindness of a virgin. If he himself does not have a mere outwardly acquired school faith, but an inwardly true and living heart faith in his Savior, then he will have every interest in obtaining a like-minded spouse who is adorned with shame and discipline and has a quiet gentle spirit, who also possesses the necessary domestic virtues and is not a foreigner, but a housewife. A cloistered seclusion is, of course, also evil, and nourishes narrow-mindedness and the overestimation of one's own, but it is much more dangerous, and has already caused much mischief in these and those congregations, when the pastor's wife has a chatty and gossipy spirit, goes about in the houses, and extends her social intercourse without need. And it is still more dangerous if her husband informs her of many things from the sphere of his personal pastoral care which are none of her business and are only fodder for her washy tongue. In addition to the above requirements of a marriage candidate for a pastor's wife, however, the following is necessary

It is still necessary that she has a loving and understanding nature to deal with all kinds of parishioners, especially women, in the right way. Praise be to God that here in this country there is no such gulf between the pastor and his family on the one hand and his church children on the other, especially in the country, as in our old fatherland. But now and then a certain arrogance might creep into this or that woman pastor, especially if she is a farmer's daughter, as if she were of a different sort and, as it were, of spiritual nobility, so that she does not strike the right note in her behavior toward members of the congregation, and this defect is almost worse than the opposite, if she cultivates too great a familiarity with these and those women, by which envy, distrust, and jealousy are easily engendered in the others.

In sum, a virgin who is suitable to be a righteous pastor's wife must be faithful, domestic, understanding, loving, economical, moral, and discreet. Blessed is the young pastor who focuses his attention on these attitudes and qualities and, through God's grace and guidance, obtains such a virgin for his spouse. But woe to him who, by deceiving his flesh or by evil counsel, or by both, marries to his neck a pretty, perhaps even beautiful, but at the same time unconverted, frivolous, garrulous, finicky, profligate, and circumspect girl, or an angry, haughty, and domineering one. For if she is not thoroughly converted by God's word in righteous repentance toward God and in true faith in Christ in connection with the wholesome discipline of God in various marriage crosses, she cannot fail to give the congregation repeated trouble. She then does her part honestly to make it difficult, almost impossible, for her husband to "lead his house" according to God's word and will, and to be an example to the fathers of his church.

For no matter how careful and anxious the pastor may be to conceal his wife's sins and bad habits, he cannot prevent them from becoming more and more evident and from exerting their corrupting influence. If she is proud and arrogant, she arouses hatred and dislike in the congregation. If she is frivolous, fussy, and worldly, she arouses contempt in some and imitation and discipleship in others, that is, in some of the women. If she is both garrulous and gossipy, and if, moreover, her husband is a weak-minded man and limited enough to inform her of this and that member of the congregation or of other congregational affairs that are none of her business, which she naturally does not keep to herself, then multiple annoyances inevitably result from this. And what wonder if the trust of the congregation in its pastor is noticeably weakened by this, and he becomes the

as one who does not know how to take care of his own wife. And here the conclusion cannot fail to be drawn by the apostle himself, "how shall he supply the church of God?"

The trouble that such an unconverted pastor's wife causes is even worse when God gives her children, for she cannot do otherwise than bring them up wrongly, for she lacks the help of the Holy Spirit, the grace and wisdom of God, and the right application of his word, because of her unbelief. The common course is that she carnally attaches her heart to her children and makes them her household idols, and likes to dress them up above the status and income of her husband. Since, in her spiritual blindness, she does not recognize the fundamental sinful corruption in herself, she naturally does not see it in her children either, and has neither the understanding nor the skill, with and according to God's Word, to combat the manifold outbreaks of this corruption in the real sins of her children with strong and persevering discipline, and to accustom the children to punctual obedience. She knows neither how to use the law nor the gospel on the souls of her children, nor how to paint Moses or Christ before their eyes. She does, of course, sometimes punish the bad temperament of her children, which is annoying to her, but she does so excessively and without understanding. She does not take moral transgressions against the commandments of God very seriously, even if they are lies, and lets them pass through her fingers. Sometimes, however, she commands or forbids many things in one breath, but more according to her whim than to factual necessity, but she does not insist that what is commanded be done or what is forbidden be left undone. She seeks to drive out the grosser defilements of the flesh by arousing arrogance and ambition, but does not see that thereby only a black devil would be driven out by a white one, the latter being much more dangerous than the former; for what are outwardly mastered defilements compared with the implanted self-righteousness and righteousness of works, inasmuch as we all by nature already carry the Pharisee and Papist in our hearts?

In sum, as an unconverted woman, she is not at all able, by the right application of the divine word to her part, to help her children, by God's grace and blessing, to begin to walk in the fear and love of God in the steps of the fourth commandment. She is content if they are outwardly smooth and polished and behave well and mannerly before the people.

Now let us suppose that her husband, the faithful pastor who is guided by the word of God even in the highly important matter of child rearing, does everything possible to counteract his wife's perverse ways - will he succeed? Hardly. On the average, the children of hypocrites, who only under certain circumstances obey the commandments of their father, will not succeed.

The children, who were afraid of punishment, obeyed outwardly, but the mother's forgiveness was much more pleasing to their flesh. And the mother does not fail to compensate her flesh and blood for the father's wholesome discipline and restraint by letting them go free in all kinds of ways. Now, of course, in this or that child, by virtue of the grace of baptism, the teaching and discipline of the divine word from the father's mouth may, by way of exception, come through powerfully and overcome the corrupting influences of maternal foolishness. As a rule, however, this will prevail, and so the servant of Christ and his church will hardly be able to meet the apostle's demand that he "have obedient children with all respectability.

This evil will not be hidden from the church, any more than the evil of his unconverted wife. And so it happens that the trust in him is weakened still more, as he is hardly able to provide for the church of God, because he does not know how to preside over his own house. And how is his mouth closed by this, that he should occasionally give his congregation thorough instruction from and according to God's word, concerning the nature of a Christian marriage, and the Christian discipline of children corresponding thereto; for the fundamental words of Christian life which are found in Holy Scripture, are to be preached in his time in connection with the doctrine of justification and faith.

Summa, if an unmarried young pastor wants to comply with the above words of the apostle, he should first call upon God diligently for such a spouse as is described above. Then he should seek the advice of his parents, if he has them, or of other experienced older relatives or friends who know him better, and perhaps also a virgin of that disposition and quality who is suitable for him and suitable to become a righteous pastor's wife and mother. And if, by God's grace and blessing, he obtains such a noble estate as is not to be doubted, he will then also be able to preside well over his household, and, if God gives him children, also to have obedient children.

For only a wife of this kind is capable of acknowledging and honoring her husband as her head and her lord according to God's order of marriage, as, for example. the godly pastors' wives did in the blessed time of the Reformation; for from their letters, some of which are in print, it can be seen how they occasionally mention their husband as their "Lord" to their friends - an expression, of course, that seems to our slack, washed-out time and our soft sentimental Christianity to be unbearably harsh, old Frankish and baroque, and would put the lady of an American *speechmaker* into the highest indignation; for here in this country, in spite of the marriage form in the *Common Prayerbook*

especially in the hearts of the wives of moneyed aristocrats the saying, "he shall be your fool, but not your master."

A truly faithful pastor's wife and healthy Lutheran, however, will honor her husband in her heart as her head and her Lord, in spite of the many weaknesses and infirmities that he may have and that will not remain hidden from her, for she stands in reverent awe before God and his word, which commands her to do so. Such a one, then, will be adorned with shame and discipline, and will show a quiet and gentle spirit toward her husband. Such a one will also be a true housewife, economical and housekeeping, but not out of avarice, but in order to be able to be generous and hospitable. Such a one will also keep her dress simple, according to her husband's income, will show good taste in it, and will not go along with the folly of fashion, which usually jumps from one tasteless extreme to the other, and soon disfigures Eva's daughters in one way, soon in another. Such a one, in cheerful conformity with the will of her head, will also keep to the right measure in the cultivation of sociability, will be neither a foreign woman nor a nun, and in conversation will avoid lazy chatter as much as solitary reserve and reticence, but here, as at home, her discourse shall be loud, sweet, and seasoned with salt, and shall contribute to a quiet convivial mirth, which rests in the members of the congregation upon the ground of the righteous fear of God and his word. Such a pastor's wife, however, will not only attend the public church service with diligence, but will also deepen herself more and more in God's Word at home, increase in its knowledge, even ask her husband occasionally and "learn in all submission and silence. And if, in addition to the heart formed by the divine Word and her faith in Christ, she has other educational instincts, she will not lack, even with the help of her husband, educational material in good books to satisfy these instincts; for it is no great glory for a pastor's wife if she is very much at home and familiar with the kitchen, cellar, floor, and pantry, but the earth and its inhabitants, and especially her country and countrymen and their history, are quite foreign and distant to her.

In sum, such a pastor's wife is a righteous handmaid of Christ, the joy and crown of her husband, and a quietly shining example for the housewives of the congregation. And since all her feminine and especially domestic activities, according to the prevailing attitude, flow from faith in Christ and are carried out in the love of God and neighbor, they are pure service to God. In fellowship with such a woman, her head and lord will preside over his own house and, far from causing trouble, will find joyful recognition and imitation in a part of the congregation.

Such a wife will be a blessed helpmate in the upbringing of his children, if the Lord provides them with one. For as she is a faithful fellow-worshiper and intercessor with him, so she will also, for the fulfilment of her maternal profession, in which her feminine calling culminates and is perfected, be daily in God's ears, that he may daily grant her grace and wisdom for this, to bring up her children together in discipline and admonition to the Lord, and that this may also be effective with the children, which is likewise the free grace of God.

They will use the law and the gospel in harmony, for there are no other means of education for Christian parents, and they are quite sufficient when properly interpreted and applied. They will use the law in such a way as to break the various outbreaks of original sin, to make the will and earnestness of God perceptible to their consciences, and to enforce outward obedience, even by beatings and other wholesome punishments. At the same time, however, they will not fail to humble themselves before the Lord that they have the wickedness and naughtiness of the flesh from them through natural procreation; for as many children as they have, so many mirrors of repentance has God presented to them; and especially the sinful naughtiness of their own temperament they behold again with great heartache in their children. But this shall not hinder them to continue in the teaching and discipline of the law, to sharpen the fear of God in them, to expose to them more and more the sins against the fourth commandment with increasing understanding, and to accustom them to sincerity, truthfulness, compatibility among themselves, helping and serving.

On the occasion of a grosser transgression of the divine law, they also have a suitable occasion, after the necessary punishment has been carried out, to deal with the guilty child alone, to thoroughly expose to him from God's law his inherited sinful nature and to exhort him to righteous repentance towards God and, where necessary, to the repentant confession of his sin also against himself. If God gives grace to do this, the parents then have the desired opportunity to paint Christ before the eyes of the penitent child and now let the Gospel prevail; for this then stirs the child to seek and find forgiveness of sins with God through faith in Christ. And out of this, through the grace of the Holy Spirit, grows the willing and childlike obedience to walk in the commandments of God and to do them.

Of course, this discipline and exhortation to the Lord from father and mother is connected with the daily action of the divine word, in which the servant of the church waits for his house priesthood, and about evening also has a main piece of the catechism recited to him and holds a short table examination B. after supper.

In this way, then, it happens that the one who is well in front of his house

Pastor, by God's grace and blessing, also have "obedient children with all respectability". And if now and then a child should go astray, the parents have not brought it on themselves through slackness or excessive severity, and can console themselves with our converted first parents, with Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

Finally, however, let it be expressly and emphatically testified once more that this godly and godly home regiment and child discipline is only possible for the servant of Christ and His Church if he, as a young unmarried pastor, does not allow himself to be beguiled by any Delila, but proceeds in the fear of God in the above manner, in order to obtain, by the grace and blessing of the Lord, a godly and godly spouse who unites the Marian sense with the Marian hand. -

(Sent in by Pastor Doehler.)

The state of the present interpretation of the Revelation of John according to one of its latest commentators.

(Continued.)

The first thing that I want to say is that I do not want to be a part of the world, but I do want to be a part of the world. This view, however, causes everything that we have already mentioned as errors. Even a great error, it is the fertile mother of many others, and mother and children may well be called the system of this interpretation. It has its bases chiefly in three assertions. 1) The source of the revelation of John, in how far already existing prophecies of Scripture come into consideration here, is in the Old Testament the prophet Daniel and in the New Testament Matth. 24 and the corresponding parallel passages of Marcus and Lucas. In the prophet Daniel now C. 9, 26. 27. "not - of the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, but of the last enemy of the people of God, of the Antichrist". The abomination of desolation does not come from Dan. 9, 26. 27. but from Dan. 11, 31. When it says in Matth. 24, 15. that the abomination of desolation "stands in the holy place", then by the holy place, the temple, is to be understood the same as Paul means in 2 Thess. 2, 4. Judea (from where the Christians are to flee to the mountains according to Matth. 24, 16) is the ground where the Christians are settled. By this people, of which it is said in Luc. 21, 23, "there shall be great distress on the earth, and wrath upon this people," are meant those who are to flee from the Babylon of the last days, namely, the New Testament people of God of the last days. The Lord does not speak in the whole passage Luc. 21, 20-24. of the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, but of

the very last tribulation of the city and the holy people of God by the far future Antichrist. According to Matthew it was a time of unheard of misery (Matth. 24, 21. 22.). In the time that has passed since Jerusalem was taken, none of this is to be found. The conclusion is: therefore all this will come in the time of the distant Antichrist, none of it is fulfilled in this present time (I, 38 ff. 58. 67 ff.).

2. The seven churches of chapters 2. and 3. of Revelation represent in their then state the whole ecclesiastical development, i. e. αἰσιν (what is, or as Dr. Kl. translates: what they are), the αἰών οὗτος, the present course of time, which extends to the beginning of the end. Μετά ταῦτα (after this, according to this) is that which is imminent immediately after the present αἰών" (course of time) (Revelation 1:19.). Thus all that is written after the 3rd chapter must yet come, awaits its fulfillment. That which belongs to this development reaches to the beginning of the end (I, 151 ff.). The words of the Lord to the seven churches are contemporary; but the churches are at the same time types, models of those moments of development, phases and states, which the whole church of Jesus has to pass through in its whole long historical development - in this present course of time, during which the people of God have the form of their church (I, 85).

3. It is clear to the author exegetically that the revelation does not speak of the destruction of Jerusalem, - of Nero or other emperors, any more than of the pope and the Turk. The rising beast is not the Pabst (for that belongs to the αἰών οὗτος, the present course of time); but the slain head is the Roman empire, which, after its fall, revives in the ten-kingdom with the Antichrist. The Apocalypse, according to an overview of the present course of church history, which does not predict anything factual, but only indicates the inner moments of development, speaks only of the great facts of the end.) This also includes the indignations of one people over another (Matth. 24, 7.). The masses of the apostasy would then fulfill 2 Thess. 2, 3. The counterfeits of doctrine would be more massed in the last times, as 1 Tim. 4, 1. 2 Pet. 2, 1. says (I, 3. 82. 2. 29. 32).

As for Matth. 24. and the parallel passages, it is neither worth the effort to follow the booklet of interpretation, which the author now derives from this in its way also newly discovered source, through its wide swamp area - it takes up a small book in itself - step by step, nor can it be expected of the reader. Various alleged findings fall to us so incidentally still in

*By the 10 virgins is to be understood the entirety of his churches and congregations, of which he found the most half asleep in a fine parousness; that is just the time of the great apostasy, of which 2 Thess. 2, 3. speaks (I, 78). So we are living in the happy times of the only wise young thaws!

the Schoß. Some things have already been mentioned; here, then, it may only be added that Dr. Kl. under the τοῦτο τό εὐαγγ. τ. βασ. (the Evan The gospel of the kingdom, which according to Matth. 24, 14. will be preached in the whole world) is not the gospel in the usual sense, but the specific proclamation that the parousia and with it the kingdom of glory is near (I, 33). This would not be without fruit, although Matthew only emphasizes in general that it would be preached as a testimony to all nations. What would it help us to remind this interpretation: But Marcus says: "The gospel must first be preached among all nations" (Marc. 13, 10.); but the gospel is not in itself the proclamation of the kingdom of glory, so Matth. 24, 14. can be understood by the preaching of the kingdom nothing else than the actual preaching of the gospel? Our interpreter would answer: We have seen that Matth. 24, 14. the preaching of the kingdom can only mean the preaching of the glory kingdom; therefore also Marc. 13, 10. can mean nothing else. For since in Luc. 21, 24, in the words: "They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and be led captive among all nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles," the relation and direct prophecy to the fate of the Jews and Jerusalem, which the Romans under Titus had prepared for them, comes out too nakedly and unmistakably, this also appeared to Dr. Kl. to be questionable. But he knows how to help himself! Instead of ascertaining the sense of the passage in Matthew - if it were at all obscure - by the still more unmistakable statements of Lucas, Lucas must rather allow himself to be explained according to the sense put into Matthew by Dr. Kl. "Luc. 21, 24. would" - it is said there - "not mean the destruction by the Romans, if he meant the same thing that Matth. 24, 15. meant; since it has been proved to us that in Matthew this is not meant" (I, 48).*) We do not want to persevere in refuting individual features of this interpretation (as, for example, the false spirits of Christianity, which will be in flight from the world [that is, the flight to the mountains Matth. 24, 16.] should counsel to expect and seek the reappearing Saviour in places of refuge in the wilderness and in the chamber, and how they would pretend that the Lord was already there, also confirm their pretence with miracles; or how Luc. 21, 22. should express the thought that the city of God s the Christianity^ the desolation which is lately about to befall it is not without the fault of those in

*) Nempe qui non ad verba ipsa attendit, sed praejudiciis suis indulget, et verba scripturae ad ea detorquet, etiam in locis perspicuis ac sensu genuino investigando errare potest (Obviously, he who does not pay attention to the words themselves, but follows his preconceived opinions and turns the words of Scripture according to the same, can err even in clear passages in investigation of the original meaning). Baier.

(I, 54. 51)); but we only want to remember an old saying: to cite certain opinions is - to refute them, and we want to reject this disgraceful interpretation as an impudent deception by means of the word and the word. For the Jews have fallen by the edge of the sword, have been led captive; Jerusalem is trodden down to this day; the bright and clear fulfillment of these prophecies is there. It is therefore a rabbinical-Jewish way to change such bright prophecies, along with the facts of the fulfillment, into others in the interest of the tendency, as well as it obviously contradicts the intention of the prophet. It is Christ's word in Luc. 21, 20. the answer to the question of the disciples v. 7.; just so he explains Matth. 24, 15. more closely what he had implied v. 2. of the ruin of the temple. Christ's purpose is to tell the disciples how and when not one stone would be left upon another. So also the prophecy of Jerusalem's and the temple's desolation contains many other passages, all of which confirm the actual sense of the Lord's words Matt. 24:15, &c. If, as Baier says, the rule of interpretation, founded in natural reason, demands that the proper meaning be retained, unless necessity compels us to resort to the improper meaning, there is no reason to do so here. That Dr. Kl. nevertheless does this only proves that he knows how to transform historically fulfilled things into false types just as well as typical things into false history. But his interpretation here is a *fallacia testimonii* according to logical and hermeneutical principles. When he preached to us, "As Jerusalem, so shall it be to apostate Christendom," he had meant to say, like Paul, "Ἀτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα." (This [said] is [also] figuratively spoken [Gal. 4, 24.]). But as, according to Paul, the Agar is never really the one testament, but only shadows it, models it, so also Jerusalem and its temple, where the abomination of desolation stands, is never the Christian people itself, but it is only typical of all who reject the word, and its judgment is a model for the world judgment itself. But such an interpretation is in contradiction not only with the interpretation of the Lutheran Church, but also with that of the universal Church. Chrysostom, for example, says: "Pray that your flight may not come to pass. . . and it shall not come to pass. But you stand that this discourse was delivered concerning the Jews, and concerning the tribulations which fell upon them. For neither did the apostles observe the Sabbath day, nor were they even in Judea, when this came to pass by the Romans. For many of them were already departed, and if any were alive, they were in other parts. Then those who are in Judea are to flee to the mountains. The "then" is indicated by a "when": at the time when the abomination of desolation would stand in the holy place. So then, he says, when the

If the Fathers understand in part (Origen, Eusebius, Chrysostom) under the abomination of desolation the Roman army with its insignia, in part the imperial statue which Pilate had erected, all understand that here misfortune is prophesied over Jerusalem and the temple, not over the Christian church! And what need is there to cite Luther, Chemnitz, Gerhard, Arndt, etc.? Even the more recent interpretation of Scripture - as far as we can overlook it - has not contradicted their interpretation. Thus Dr. G. A. W. Meyer says of Matth. 24, 15: "What Jesus understood by the $\tau\omicron$ βδέλυγμα της Ἀρημύσεως (the abomination of desolation), - is, - what the words mean: the abominable desolation in the temple-place in general, which occurred historically by the Romans at and after the conquest of the temple. ***) No! The Synoptics have no prophecy or threat of punishment against Christianity in the passages in question, so Christian interpretation has never found it in them. But what confidence can be inspired in a system of interpretation which begins by reversing the simple Christian understanding of Scripture? Cannot it be said to the author's very face that this first pillar of his house - is founded on sand? And it is the same with Dr. Kl.'s interpretation of Dan. 9, 26. 27. (of the Antichrist), even if the Papist commentator Salmero is of the same opinion with him, and yet he assures us that he has proved all this to the point of evidence in his Commentary on Daniel. To understand this prophecy, like Matth. 24, 15 (which refers back to Dan. 9, 26. 27 - according to the Lutheran exegetes, also the Gospel Harmony and the newer Meyer, not to Dan. 11, 31, as Dr. Kl. wants), it is only necessary that one, as Paul demands of Agrippa, believes the prophets, then it and its fulfillment, which is before everyone's eyes, is understandable to every Christian reader of the Bible. The understanding of the prophecy of the Antichrist undoubtedly requires more preconditions of a spiritual and theological nature. †) Will we be able to expect this where not even this exists? Most probably, however, our interpreter once understood the passages of Matthew and Daniel in question, as did Luther and others, but when he sought supports for his self-made distant future Antichrist, and put aside the testimony of true theology, - then the understanding of Scripture also disappeared from under his hands in things that are relatively much easier to explain. Martin Geier remarks on Dan. 9, 26. 27. (And on the wings will stand abominations of desolation):

*) *Chrys. Hom. 77. in Matth. 24.* Chrysostom means by the Jerusalem the earthly one; the whole homily speaks only of this.

**) Critical exegetical commentary on the New Testament.

†) "A Christian must not be of low spirit, who shall know eS" (Luther, *Wider das Pabstthum zu Rom*).

"The hostile Roman army, which has already been indicated in v. 26, may here be suitably understood. - The servant who executes the divine decrees is here called the destroyer. - Now that the Messiah has been slain by them, the complete, inevitable, irrevocable (hitherto it was still a temporary) desolation follows; because the curse will continue to trickle over this destroyed place and this desolate commonwealth, until the complete destruction takes place with that of this earth-circle. But it belongs here to what, according to Ruffinus, Socrates, Chrysostom, is reported of the restoration of the temple, which was often attempted in vain. - The desolation of Jerusalem was a prelude to the Antichrist, even to the last one, that of the world; hence one perceives such a close connection in Matt. 24. ***) One may add to this, that though Matt. 24. prophesies of the Antichrist, yet the *sedes originaria*, of this prophecy is not to be sought in v. 15. but in v. 24. where Christ prophesies of the false Christs and false prophets. Thereby the question arises, whether the author misleads us under Jerusalem, Judea and the Correlates, tabernacle and temple, scriptural terms, when he says among other things: "Beside Jerusalem also the names tabernacle, temple, Zion are common as designation - of this term of the place of the divine presence of grace and of the place, where God's people come to their God. When - the people of God from all nations - were to be gathered in the form of the church, - from then on the place of the presence of grace became supramundane (?), where the exalted Christ is, - from where the Lord gives word and spirit to gather a people. When the Lord shall close this course of the world by his Parousia, God will have for this new humanity a new place of the presence of grace, - the new Jerusalem, which will be the same for the new humanity, what the Old Testament Jerusalem was for Israel, the upper Jerusalem, Gal. 4, 26. Ebr. 12, 22. ff., is for Christendom." Now, since there is still a Jerusalem on earth also, "On earth also Christendom has its city of God-we are it ourselves. - Wherever on earth the Lord gives his word, and believing hearers are found to it, there is Jerusalem and its congregation of people. This is how the Scriptures look at it." **): so the author has a fourfold Jerusalem. But this is a vain falsity! If the Christian church has not both the place of the divine presence of grace (to speak with the author) among her, and the Jerusalem of Israel, the shadow would be more than the essence. If we see what Luther understands by the upper Jerusalem, we shall find a better understanding of Scripture: "Now the heavenly Jerusalem, which is above, is nothing else than the dear church or Christendom, - the faithful, - in the

*) Praelectiones Academicæ in Danielelem (Edit. alt.) p. 760,763,764.

**) III, 302; I, 64. 67.

scattered to and fro throughout the whole world. - For it is said of the faithful that their walk is in heaven (Phil. 3:20). - The Jerusalem which is above, - is not the fatherland which we have in the life to come, or the holy estate and being which God has set apart from this world to the kingdom of glory, as the idle unlearned and untried monks and sophists have dreamed, and called *ecclesiam triumphantem*, i.e., but founded and established here below on earth, that it should be our mother, of whom we are born, spiritually, through the ministry of the Word and the Sacraments. **) To this may be fairly added an excellent testimony of our Church: "St. Paul further writes: "But the Jerusalem which is above, which is free, which is the mother of us all." Gal. 4,26. The Christian church is therefore the archetype of the exemplary visible Jerusalem, the entirety of those who have attained to the freedom of the children of God through faith, which does not have its place on the visible mountain Zion, but above in the heavenly being, into which it has been transferred (Eph. 2, 6.); it is therefore invisible. (***)

Now what about the supramundane place of the divine presence of grace? Surely the learned author does not mean that the Father and the Son are graciously present to one another? But one can speak of a place of divine presence only in relation to men. Then it must be among them; we cannot enter into the light where God dwells. Scripture also never calls this the place of the divine presence of grace. But this is the place of the divine presence of grace, where God has promised to be and to rule over men with grace. He had once promised this to Jerusalem, but even more gloriously to the New Testament Church. Therefore, just as Luther transposes the upper Jerusalem of Dr. Kl. to the earth, so also his place of divine presence of grace - otherwise it remains a *contradictio in adjecto* - is to be transposed there. If God once promised: where I place the tabernacle and the mercy seat, there I will come to you, then the place of the divine presence of grace is now there, where the archetype of the Old Testament mercy seat, Christ, is preached and one believes the divine preaching, †).

*) Another interpretation of the epistle to the Galatians to C. 4, 26.

**) Die Evangel.-Luth. Kirche die wahre sichtbare Kirche Gottes aus Erden, by C. F. W. Walther, p. 11.

†) If the beast "blasphemes his tabernacle" (Revelation 13:6:), this σκηνή (tabernacle) is not supposed to be the Christian church, as Hengstenberg interprets, whom therefore the author refutes, - for this interpretation is always endeavoring to render dead the reasonable exegetical thought which is opposed to its way, but the σκηνή is "the dwelling-place of God in heaven, in which, since the Lord broke his temple in three days, he has the place of his presence of grace," etc. etc. As if the beast, a ver-

Dr. Kl. stands less solitary in his view of the seven congregations, which are supposed to signify the whole Church and its historical formation. But while others, *) e. g. Stark, see only certain periods of church history realized in this or that congregation, e. g. in Sardis the 12th century up to the Reformation, in Philadelphia the Reformation period, Dr. Kl. does not see certain church history, not specific prophecies in it. - A significant part of these prophesied series of developments has already been realized historically; only the conclusion formed in Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea is still backward. The five foolish virgins are Laodicea (are therefore still backward!) (I, 268 ff.). We see that here, too, everything aims at the fact that the Antichrist, who arises out of the great apostasy, is still future. But it may be said in general that the seven churches have after all a lasting significance for the Church, as that which is said in them, in that they embrace the possible conditions of the churches of Christ and of their individuals for all time, without it being necessary therefore to see in them a prophecy for the whole historical formation of the Church. Such a prophecy is not directly expressed or implied in Revelation. It would be called a mystery, just as the number of the beast is one, but with the difference that the mystery is indicated by the number, while here, in the seven churches, the interpretation finds both the mystery and the solution. If, on the other hand, it is historically certain that John stood in a relationship of apostolic leadership with the Asiatic churches, as Tertullian, Eusebius, Irenaeus, and Clement of Alexandria testify,†) and that therefore these churches are first of all historical, even if they are still lasting types of spiritual conditions, then the content of church history prophesied above and beyond this will always remain of a very problematic nature. But this would be considered a pious opinion, as long as it did not appear, as in the case of the author, so tendentious. The epistles to the seven churches, which are supposed to be the whole church, are not supposed to be specific predictions; nevertheless, in the epistle to the church of Philadelphia the conversion of the Jews is prophesied (Revelation 3:9). The writer turns against Philippi, who in the 2nd edition of his Epistle to the Romans has given up the former great conversion of the Jews, and teaches that it will yet come. ‡) After all, according to him, we are hardly Thya-

the following power, whoever it may be, must now also have had our interpreter's concept of the place of revelation and must have spoken against it, and not rather all persecution was directed against the word on earth and those who confessed it (Revelation 1:9).

*) Vitringa also holds this opinion of the importance of the seven churches.

†) The source citation s. at Hengstenberg, I, 79 ff.

‡) For the orientation of the reader, the reasons of the book for this conception of the seven churches may stand here: The Lord is leader of His church, so the churches, as whose leader He appears Cap. 1, 12. 13. - must mean the whole church and its historical development. Ephesus starts with the history of the development of the

tira, perhaps Pergamus first. Philadelphia is still future. But that would be a rather specific prediction. But one would like to ask here how it comes about that nothing is prophesied to us Thyatira-, Pergamus-, or Smyrna-ites, since the revelation is certainly given to the church of all times for comfort, since we have had Diocletian, Arius, Turks, and the pope? Then the author answers us: "Revelation prophesies nothing about the Pope! What is far-fetched, like the Philadelphian conversion of the Jews, you may well find in Revelation. But one should not look the papacy so closely in the face; otherwise one would find that it rhymes very well with Cap. 13, that we are therefore in a completely different time than that into which Dr. Kl. wants to exegete us, that Sardis and Laodicea are not before us, but behind, beside us. If we cannot at all approve the interpretation that the seven churches mean the whole church, we approve still less the use which our interpreter makes of it. What understanding of the history of the church, of sin, of heresies, of our own time, is that which would have us believe that there is as yet no Sardis, Laodicea, in the world; since, as J. Gerhard says, the pope has declared himself to be the antichrist, in that his doctrine is a certain summary of all heresies (that is, the summa of apostasy) which arose in the church in the first six centuries, before the antichristian rule of the pope subjugated it? *) But if in the Reformation Church the apostolic doctrine has been renewed, neither do we look for Philadelphia, i.e. a Church of which eS says: thou hast kept my word, in the future; believe far more Dr. Luther's prophecy, when he says that the evangelical doctrine will (indeed) be corrupted by its disciples, and especially by the false brethren in the article of justification, but that it will not yet be (even) exterminated before the last day,†) than that of Dr. Kl. of the conversion of the Jews. For Luther's prophecy, praise God, has been confirmed by success (*eventus*); those of Dr. Kl. lie, together with their fulfillment, all in the land of Utopia. ‡) We therefore reject the author's assumption that, according to Cap. 4, 1. there is no more talk of the present (the future, which the letters to the seven churches did contain, belonged to the present course of time), as one that lacks certain and undoubted foundations, and we understand by

apostolic church, Laodicea is the state at Christ's coming. The first three epistles do not point to the parousia, but the last four increase, one is near and nearer to the last day (I, 152 ff.).

*) Loci, de eccles. § 230.

†) On Gal. 3.

‡) Irenaeus, adv. Haeres., lib. 4th: Nemo igitur vitio nobis vertere poterit, quod, antequam accedat complementum, incertis - opinionibus fidem adhibere nolimus. (No one will be able to make it wrong for us that we do not want to believe uncertain opinions before the fulfillment).

the μέλλει γίνεσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα (what will happen after this) - not that which, according to Cl., is to begin indirectly after the οἶτος, an unlimited world period so called by him, with the beginning of its so-called last world week, but - that which, according to the then state of the seven churches, is to happen after John's time - according to Cap. 1, 1. shortly. Because 1) the last hour is already here; nor can any man set the boundary between a so-called present course of time and a so-called beginning of the end. Because 2) in the course which the church has already traversed, there are such extraordinary and astonishing things for Christian contemplation that, in view of them, one would have to conclude a priori that God had also added them to what John was to write and what would happen after him. Because 3) these things that have happened are also consistent with the other prophecies of Scripture, and agree with them. Because 4) the things that have already happened, which we recognize as the fulfillment of the prophecy, as the Antichrist and his Correlate, the Reformation, as that which God intended to make good, are much more astonishing and mighty than those which a present-day interpreter thinks up in his study and tries to substitute in their place. We shall find this confirmed when we finally consider Dr. Kl.'s Antichrist.

(Conclusion follows.)

(Translated by Prof. A. Crämer.)

Compendium of the Theology of the Fathers

From

M. Heinrich Eckhardt.

(Continued.)

Chapter III.

Don of the preservation of the creatures.

I. Whether there was one.

Is there a providence that sustains creatures?

Anselm: "As nothing is made except by a creating being, so also nothing lives except by a sustaining power of the same." 1) Theodoret: "The Creator governs what is created, and does not leave the ship he has built without a helmsman, but the builder of the ship himself and planter of the material directs the helm." 2)

Sicut nihil factum est, nisi per essentiam creatricem, ita nihil viget, nisi per ejusdem potentiam servatricem. Ansh. in Monol. Gubernat creaturam creator, et non relinquit navim a se conditam sine gubernatore, sed ipse navis fabricator et materiae plantator dirigit gubernacula. Theodor, serm. 1. de Provid.

From what does one prove this care and providence of God?

Just from the book of nature. Bostius: "For just as this world would never have been brought together into one form from such different and opposite parts if there had not been One who united what was so different, so also the bound together diversity of natures, conflicting with one another, would separate and tear itself apart if there were not One who also held together what he had bound together. Nor would such a definite order of nature appear, nor such regulated movements in places, times, effects, interstices, conditions, unfold, if there were not One who, Himself fixed, ordered this multiplicity of changes." 1) And Chrysostom: "When God withdraws from human things, then all things go headlong." 2)

What, then, is the answer to be given to the Epicureans who deny God and His providence?

Theodoret: "Consider the nature of visible things, their position, order, state, motion, conformity, harmony, grace, beauty, grandeur, use, delight, variety, change, perseverance in that which is perishable. You see the providence of God manifest in every part of creation. You see it in the sky and in the lights of the sky, in the sun, the moon, and the other celestial bodies, in the air, in the clouds, in the earth, in the sea, in the plants, the herbs, the seeds, in the rational as well as in the irrational living creatures, in the land animals, birds, fish, and worms. Consider, then, who it is that holds together the firmament of heaven, that in so many thousands of years the heavens have not grown old, nor have they undergone any change, but, though they have a perishable and perishable substance, yet they have remained as they were, sustained by the Word of Creation, ...and so many years by so great a fire rolling about the heavens, namely, the sun, the moon, and the rest of the celestial bodies, does not melt, does not dry up, does not burn, while yet the fire dissolves gold, silver, iron, brass, lead, tin, and these like things, into a liquid substance." 3)

Sicut enim mundus hic ex tam diversis contrariisque partibus in unam formam minime convenisset, nisi unus esset, qui tam diversa conjungeret: ita conjuncta ipsa naturarum diversitas invicem discors dissociaret, atque divelleret, nisi esset unus, qui, quod nexuit, contineret. Nec tam certus naturae ordo procederet, nec tam dispositos motus, locis, temporibus, efficientia, spatiis, qualitatibus explicaret, nisi unus esset, qui has mutationum varietates, manens ipse, disponeret. Boet, *prosa* 12. 1. 3.

Quando Deus res humanas deserit, sursum ac deorsum volvuntur omnia. Chrys. in 1. c. Rom.

Considerate visibilium naturam, situm, ordinem, statum, motum, consonantiam, harmoniam, vetustatem, pulchritudinem, magnitudinem, usum, oblectationem, varietatem, alterationem, permansionem in corruptibilibus. Cer-

But does not the course and influence of the heavenly bodies govern earthly things?

Leo: "It is not on the power of the heavenly bodies, which have none, that the progress of worldly things depends, but all is ordered by the most equitable and benevolent will of the supreme King." 1)

But they say God rested on the seventh day?

Albinus: "He has rested from the creation of new creatures, not from the government of created ones, of which truth itself says, My Father worketh hitherto." 2)

II. Your description.

What is providence?

Damascenus: "Providence is the care springing from God for what is. Or, the will of God, by which all that is enjoys a corresponding direction." 3)

III. The generality of its subject matter.

Does Providence order and direct all things, or is it limited to certain things and kinds?

Chrysostom: "God foresees all things, but the one he works, the other he permits. All evil happens only from our will. All good from our will (namely, renewed) and with his help." 4) Augustine: "Some things God both makes and directs, but others he merely directs. The righteous he both makes and directs; but sinners, inasmuch as they are sinners, he does not make, but only puts in order, as.

nitis providentiam Dei, in qualibet parte creationis manifestam. Cernitis ipsum in coelo et luminaribus coeli, sole, luna et aliis astris; in aere, innubibus, in terra, in mari, in plantis, in herbis, in seminibus, in animalibus tam rationalibus, quam irrationalibus, pedestribus, volatilibus, in natatilibus et reptilibus. Cogitate apud vosmetipsos, quis sit continens coelestes apsidas, quod tot millibus annorum coelum non consenuerit, nullam mutationem recipiens; sed tamen passibilem habens et corruptibilem substantiam, manebat tale, quale erat, verbo creationis sustentatum; et tanto igne circa coelum vecto, sc. sole, luna et aliis luminaribus, per tot annos non liquefit, non exsiccat, non incenditur; cum tamen ignis aurum, argentum, ferrum, aes, plumbum, stannum et his similia in liquidam dissolvat naturam. Theodore, serm. 1.

Non de stellarum potestate, quae nulla est, secularium negotiorum pendent proventus, sed aequissimo et clementissime summi regis arbitrio cuncta disponuntur. Leo, serm. 5. de Quadrag.

Requievit a novarum conditione creaturarum, non a conditarum gubernatione, de qua ipsa veritas ait: Pater meus usque modo operatur. Albin, in 1. c. Eccl.

Providentia est, quae ex Deo est in ea, quae sunt, cura. Seu: Voluntas Dei, per quam omnia, quae sunt, convenientem gubernationem suscipiunt. Dam. 1. 2. c. 29.

Deus omnia providet, sed alia operatur, alia permittit. Mala omnia ex nostra tantum voluntate fiunt. Bona omnia ex voluntate nostra (sc. renovata) et ipsius adjutorio. Chrys. in 2 Tim. 3.

Who, while he hath set those on his right hand, setteth these on his left." 1)

Are sins, then, also subject to providence?

Fulgentius: "Although God is not the author of evil thoughts, yet he is the director of evil wills, and does not desist from working good out of the evil work of every evil." 2) Herein belongs the difference: Damascenus: "The providence of God is either in approving, or in permitting. And that is in approval in everything that is good without opposition." 3)

Are among the objects of providence also the little things which some regard unworthy of God's care?

Gregory: "He who governs the highest does not miss even the lowest, because the care of government is so applied to the greatest that the same is not withdrawn even from the smallest." 4)

How is it further with free will? for some fear that it will be destroyed by providence.

Augustine: "God so governs all that he has made, that yet he also makes it exercise and make its own movements." 5) Here is probably not inappropriately drawn what the same Augustine wrote concerning the foreknowledge of God: "We are in no way compelled, either, by holding the foreknowledge of God, to abolish the freedom of the will, or, by holding the freedom of the will, to deny (which would be ungodly) that God foreknows things to come; but we hold both, confess both faithfully and truly; the one that we may rightly believe, the other that we may rightly live." 6) (To be continued.)

Quaedam et facit et ordinat Deus, quaedam vero tantum ordinat. Justos et facit et ordinat, peccatores autem, in quantum peccatores sunt, non facit, sed ordinat tantum, quippe, cum illos ad dextram, hos ad sinistram constituit. Aug. de Genes, c. 5.

Deus licet autor non sit malarum cogitationum, ordinator tamen est malarum voluntatum, et de malo opere cujuslibet mali non desinit ipse operari bonum. Fulg. 1. 1. ad Monim.

Providentia Dei est vel secundum acceptationem, vel secundum permissionem. Et secundum acceptationem quidem quaecunque sine controversia bona sunt. Damasc. 1. 2. c. 29.

Qui summa regit, etiam extrema non deserit; quia sic impenditur maximis, ut tamen haec eadem cura regiminis non praepediatur a parvis. Greg. in 37- c. Job.

Deus sic administrat omnia, quae creavit, ut etiam proprios exercere et agere motus sinat. Aug. 1. 7. de Civ. c. 30.

Nullo modo cogimur, aut retenta praescientia Dei tollere voluntatis arbitrium, aut retento voluntatis arbitrio, Deum (quod nefas est) negare praescium futurorum, sed utrumque amplectimur, utrumque fideliter et veraciter confitemur; illud, ut bene credamus; hoc, ut bene vivamus. Aug. 1. decorrept. et gratia c. 9.

Ecclesiastical - Contemporary.

I. America.

General Synod. At a conference of the Oelzweig Synod, as reported in the "Zeitschrift", a certain Rev. Hamma of Indianapolis read a paper in which he wanted to prove from passages of Scripture that women were permitted to pray and preach in public.

General Synod. How Char Friday is celebrated by pastors of the Eastern Pennsylvania, or General Synod, of this only One example. On the last anniversary of the celebration of the death of our Saviour, Pastor D., who serves a congregation in a little town in Schuylkill County, had promised the same to deliver a humorous discourse on the subject, "Where to hang your hat." No service was held in the morning. In the evening a number of mostly young people had gathered to hear the humorous lecture. The speaker said at the beginning that it had occurred to him this morning that it was Char Friday today, and that he therefore regretted that he was not allowed to make as much fun in his lecture as he would otherwise have done. Now he first gave a sketch of the suffering and death of our Saviour, and then proceeded to his lecture, in which his old, torn hat, as he himself called it, played a leading part. With a vigorous sweep of his arm he threw it on the floor so that it splashed, to the great amusement of those present. Such was the lecture of a pastor belonging to a synod calling itself Lutheran, in a so-called Lutheran church on the holy Friday of Charity! "Church friend" and "Observer-" will now, I suppose, again raise their clamor of slander and falsehood. We turn not back upon it. The Lutheran name, which such people disgrace, obliges us to expose such goings-on. L. Ztschr.

The validity of marriages. An important decision in regard to the validity of marriages has been rendered by the Supreme Federal Court. In a suit brought in Pennsylvania, the said court held that the failure to enforce the laws of a state requiring a marriage to be performed before a clergyman or justice of the peace does not invalidate a marriage at common law. The decision is of great importance in its scope, and establishes once and for all the principle that a marriage contracted without civil and ecclesiastical authority is valid, unless the laws of the State expressly declare a marriage so contracted to be void.

(A. d. W.)

A Marriage License Law. At a Baptist Convention in Philadelphia, the following resolution was adopted: "That we urge the Legislature of Pennsylvania to enact a law respecting marriage, license, and registration, which shall relieve the preacher or magistrate performing the marriage ceremony from the responsibility of determining the legal competency of persons desiring to marry." It goes without saying that a conscientious Christian preacher, even after the enactment of such a law, could not marry all those to whom the authorities grant a license, and is therefore by no means completely relieved of responsibility.

The "Gemeindeblatt" calls attention to a **new law concerning the blessing of marriage** in Wisconsin. It writes: "The Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, at its last session, passed a law which came into force on the sixth of April of this year, and the knowledge of which is of great importance to the preachers of our State. I take the liberty, therefore, of giving an extract of the enactment. Every person entitled to the blessing of marriage is obligated to at least

one of the persons to be married shall be questioned on oath as to the legality of the intended marriage and as to the age of the persons to be married. If the groom in question has not attained the age of twenty-one, or the bride the age of eighteen, either the parents or guardians shall attest to their consent by their presence, or shall express their consent in a written document to be signed by two witnesses present at the time of its issue. (The penalty for failure to do so is a fine of \$50 to \$500, or confinement in jail for a period of one to twelve months). It would be advisable for the pastors to record a written act in the form of a so-called affidavit in each individual case.

Incestuous Connection. The "Yazoo Valley Flag" from the State of Mississippi tells the following story: A Mr. D. W. Thomson in our county sought and obtained a marriage - license to marry Mrs. M. A. vew. Roberts, and Rev. A. W. Wilson was obtained to perform the ceremony. Within a few hours after the ceremony Mr. Wilson was notified that the lady in question was a Mrs. Roberts, and the mother-in-law of W. D. Thomson, he having formerly married a daughter of Mrs. Roberts, now deceased. Immediately Rev. Wilson sat down, having ascertained what he had heard, and wrote a note to the couple, saying that under these circumstances the marriage was morally and religiously unvirtuous. On the following day the law was examined and found to declare and forbid marriages in this relationship to be "incestuous and void. The two were also informed of this fact. What the alleged spouses will do is not reported. Since the persons had a license, the copulator is, however, without responsibility towards the state; whether before God and his conscience is, of course, another question. Only too often preachers here, if they have the state license, do not make a strict investigation as to whether the alleged marriage to be confirmed could also be concluded according to God's word. Now it is indeed in the power of the civil authorities to determine the conditions under which the state recognizes a union as a valid and legitimate marriage; but this is not enough for the conscience. Thus Luther wrote as early as 1524: "Even if he is otherwise uncertain, he cannot be sure by the consent of the prince, since it is not his business to decide anything in this matter, but the office of the priests to give the answer out of God's waiting, as Malachi says, 'that out of his mouth one may seek the law of the Lord.'" (Luther's Epistles. By de Wette. II, 459.) W.

Episcopal Church. The *Church Journal*, an Episcopalian paper, now united with another, wrote not long ago: "After common agreement, the 39 Articles have now ceased to be regarded as binding. A citation from one of them as authoritative would be accepted with a smile." Who, then, may now say what the gentlemen Episcopalians believe? Have they then now become ecclesiastical freebooters?

Presbyterians. In their General Assembly the question of the validity of Roman Catholic baptism was left to the individual sessions (the pastor of each congregation and its ruling elders).

Presbyterians. In the United States, however, there are 4,800 Presbyterian ministers, but only 1,788 are actual congregational ministers, 1,250 are indefinitely employed ministerial administrators, 182 are in the home and foreign missionary service, 59 serve churches of other faiths, 265 are teachers and newspaper writers, 321 are clerks and "evangelists," 957 are unemployed! (Pilg.)

Ireland in Prophecy. In New York a certain Wild is pastor at a Congregationalist church, who entertains the wild idea that the Irish are descended from Israelites of the tribe of Dan, who settled in Ireland. The prophet Jeremiah, their leader, was none other than St. Patrick; for from "St. Patriarch" the name St. Patrick was gradually formed. He had buried the Ark of the Covenant and Tablets of the Law, and had introduced Freemasonry, which would remain there until the Ark was recovered; then the same would go before the Jews on their return to Canaan. Jeremiah, he says, brought with him to Ireland a princess of the house of David, from whom Queen Victoria was descended. Not only does the preacher carry this delusion with him, but, what is worst of all, he also preaches it and misuses God's Word for this purpose. The above heading was recently the subject of his sermon and Is. 41, 4. 5. his text.

Alien Baptism. The Baptist "Messenger" writes: "There is much talk of '*alien baptism*' in some English Baptist papers. What these brethren mean by '*alien baptism*' will probably be best made clear to the reader by our bringing before him an example. If, for example, a Methodist preacher immerses a believer in his confession - which happens not infrequently - some Baptists call this a baptism by strangers - *alien baptism*. - Now such people do not want to recognize such a baptism as valid, because the baptizer himself is not baptized in the biblical way."

Methodists. A Methodist paper, *The New York Methodist*, compares the bishop who distributes the preachers at the conferences to an auctioneer and puts the following words into his mouth: "Gentlemen of the various church committees, assemble around the auction stand. We have to-day an excellent lot of Methodist preachers of various ages and proficiency to be sold to the highest bidders for a year. The terms of payment are easy. Immediate cash payment is never demanded, though prompt payment is always acceptable. Your promise to pay will be sufficient, and if you do not keep your promise, it will mean nothing. No suit will be brought to compel payment. A very safe transaction, as you can see. Buyers have the privilege of keeping the articles for three years, after which time they must be returned to the Conferences in good condition, general wear and tear excepted."

Two Methodist preachers, one in Michigan, the other in Connecticut, were recently prevented from preaching by indisposition. Under these circumstances their wives thought themselves called to ascend the pulpit.

Unirt-Evangelicals. At the recent meeting of the 4th District of the "Lutheran Synod of North America" here in St. Louis, papers were presented, as reported in the "Messenger of Peace," on the question: "Can congregations be admitted into our Synodal Union which call themselves Lutheran or Reformed in their statutes, but think and live in their relationship to one another and to us in the sense of our Confession Clause?" A lively debate followed. The District decided, however, to refrain from making a pronouncement on this important subject for this year and to leave it to the Pastoral Conferences for closer discussion.

Ear Confession. In Massachusetts a recent trial of auricular confession took place under the following circumstances: At the poorhouse in Marlborough, Mrs. Hogan, an inmate, sent for the Catholic priest, McKenna, to confess and receive absolution. When the priest arrived, Mrs. Cooper, wife of the superintendent of the asylum, was in the room, and the priest requested her to step down during confession. This she refused to do, and the priest forcibly led her out. Now

Mrs. Cooper sued the priest for damages for the assault made upon her. The priest's lawyer claimed that the latter had come to the almshouse on a peaceful mission, had not violated any rule of the institution, and had only acted in accordance with church regulations by forcing Mrs. Cooper to leave the room during ear confession. The matter finally went before the State High Court and this confirmed the prohibition of the lower instance against the priest. Mrs. Cooper had been in the room as a representative of her husband and had had a perfect right to do so. The court had nothing to say about the question whether Mrs. Cooper should not have left the room for reasons of propriety; but the priestly character of McKenna and his religious mission had given him no special right to the room, nor the authority to force or otherwise compel Mrs. Cooper to leave the room. So reports the Ref. Kirchenzeitung. From the judicial point of view the verdict should be unchallengeable.

What the notorious Beecher believes about the Bible. From a conversation between B. and a reporter, the Christian ambassador communicates, among other things, the following: "R. What do you think of the Bible? B. On the whole, the Bible is a good book, but some books, e.g., the 1st and 2nd books of Moses, are outdated." It is added: therefore the ten commandments.

American Free Schools. The "New York Staatszeitung" writes: "Mr. Anthony Comstock, the well-known active agent of the Society for the Prevention of Crime, learned some time ago that obscene literature of the most indecent kind was circulating among the school youth, especially that of Brooklyn, and that it was being read avidly by both boys and girls, and was having the most corrupting effect on the young minds. He immediately set to work to find out what was true about the matter, and the result of his efforts was that he found his worst fears confirmed. He now first requested the Brooklyn School Board to take measures to put a stop to the mischief, and set down the perceptions he had made in an open letter to the public. In this letter Mr. Comstock states that for months an astonishing amount of obscene literature of the most pernicious kind had been read by the pupils of the Brooklyn public schools, and that he had found books of the filthiest contents in the cherubs of girls and boys from 8 to 13 years of age; that he had informed the parents of some of these children of the state of affairs, and that they were not a little astonished and distressed at the information he had to give them. Then the letter goes on to say: I am not publishing this to create a sensation, but out of the deep and painful conviction that parents and teachers must learn what great danger threatens their children and pupils. If all parents, as soon as they read this, wish to subject the effects of their children to a thorough search, they will in many cases be horrified at what they find..... To my great regret I must say that I have found such things mainly in the children of well-situated people. I very frequently receive anonymous letters in which I am informed in a very vague manner of the existence of the imagined malady."

II. Abroad.

Saxony. The District Court of Zwickau has acquitted Pastor Stöckhardt and printer Herrmann of the charges brought against them by the Saxon Ministers of State *in the Evangelical* Church of violating the honor of the State Consistory and other personalities in the State Church. On the other hand, the judicial prosecution because of the insult of the Christian religion and church charged against both of them, is to be based on

Operation of the Consistory take its course. However, the Christian religion and church could hardly be insulted more harshly than if a faithful witness, confessor, and defender of the same, such as Stöckhardt, were to be condemned by the state as a blasphemer for punishing the false, unchristian Sulze-Peter religion and its protectors. But do the gentlemen of the Consistory have any idea of the judgment into which they are plunging themselves when they proceed for their own and Sulze's honor against Christ's honor? Do not be mistaken, God will not be mocked!

(Ev. - Luth. Freik.)

Saxony. The Saxon Minister of Culture declared at the last Diet: "The government is guided solely by the point of view of personal dignity and scientific distinction; therefore, with regard to the theological faculty, for example, it does not ask whether a person belongs more to the orthodox school of thought or more to the critical school of thought, but only whether he is an excellent scholar and a worthy personality. The Saxon. Kirchen und Schulblatt correctly remarks: "In this broad framework, however, a man like Strauß would have found room.

The rightful existence of the confession. The "Volksblatt für Stadt und Land" recently called out the right word to the Hanoverian state church: "It is not confession that the almighty state fears, but confession

Pastor HarmS' Separation and the Immanuel Synod. We read the following in Pastor Lohmann's "Hannov. Pastoral-Correspondenz" of May 11: "When I said in No. 6 that it would now become more and more evident that the various Free Church communities would like to take a favorable view of the separation that has taken place and, if at all possible, would like to extend their hands to it, this soon became apparent in the debates from the midst of the Immanuel Synod in a way and to a degree that surprised me. I think I know the spirit of the Immanuel Synod and the spirit of the Hermannsburg Separation quite well, and I cannot judge otherwise than that there is a rather strong contrast between the two. I only recall that for many years the Immanuel Synod petitioned the government and the people's representatives again and again for the introduction of compulsory civil marriage, though first of all because of the personal state of emergency, that in some cases members of it could not, in the former state of the law, reach legally valid marriage by means of emergency civil marriage, but nevertheless also in complete harmony with its fundamental view of marriage matters, which was entirely in accord with Luther's Protestant free position on the same. In view of this, I was surprised that Pastor Rätjen, in the "Immanuel," welcomed the beginning of the Hermannsburg separation with jubilation, without any criticism, and expressed his joy at its cheerful progress. In the "Lutherische Dorfkirchenzeitung" Pastor Diedrich (now in Frankfurt am Main), in a long article*) in his well-known dialect, then leaves himself very dismissive about Münchmeyer's sermon and the Hanover February Conference, although he cannot deny that Münchmeyer asserts the right doctrine of marriage against HarmS. Of Harms he basically judges that he does not understand himself and his actions correctly, and that he has only misunderstood his expression in his false sentences. "Whether the marriage formula was the real reason for the separation is very doubtful to me, even if Harms said so." The many and varied incorrectnesses which he cannot deny in the latter are yet amply outweighed to him by the one great correctness, that he is free from the

*) The first half of the same is now printed in No. 17 of the sheet "Unter dem Kreuz".

Landeskirche has separated. Diedrich repeats essentially the same thing more briefly in "Immanuel", where he takes precautions against the assertion that all Lutheran Free Churches condemn Pastor Harms' separation. Even more strange, however, is a statement by Pastor R  thjen in No. 7 of the same newspaper. There it says: "Of what heresy is Pastor Harms to be accused? He has made statements about marriage that deviate from the traditional Lutheran way of speaking. But it is not this or that way of explaining a worldly thing that makes a false doctrine; rather, it is above all a matter of touching something of the blessed faith. Marriage and the contract of marriage have nothing to do with blessedness. If any one speaks differently of this, it may be considered and well corrected; but to speak of false doctrine concerning marriage is quite strange." I was not a little surprised at this broad church definition of false doctrine, which stands in the most cutting contrast to the origins of the Immanuel Synod. Pastor Harms is reproached for grossly mixing the order of creation and Christ's kingdom of grace by the way he ascribes marriage to the church; has this nothing to do with the pure teaching of the gospel? How differently one used to judge Huschke's remarks on matters of marriage, which lay in the same direction, without drawing this consequence! I miss in the present judgment the salt with which the Immanuel Synod otherwise does not use sparingly. - So far Pastor Lohmann. We are not at all surprised that the Immanuel Synod, or rather Pastors Diedrich and R  thjen, take the position described above on Harms' separation. That the Immanuel Synod suffers from ecclesiastical politics and sacrifices unity in the faith in defiance of otherwise established better theories in Prussia has already been shown all too clearly on several occasions. When Pastor Diedrich, in particular, does not tire of attributing church-political agitation to our Synod, he evidently practices the well-known: "Stop the thief!" W.

Hanoverian Separation. Major Ruschenbusch, a man who left the Landeskirche together with Pastor Harms, writes in the "Pastoral-Correspondenz" of April 13: "We merely ascribe the responsibility of the separation of the church to those who have brought it about that the Lutheran Landeskirche of Hanover no longer leaves room for consciences to serve their God according to the order of the fathers, although it tolerates openly false teachers and deniers of its confession in office." This is, to be sure, a strong and just reproach, but how can the dear man justify it in this state of things, that he and his co-religionists have only at last been coerced out of the national church by refusing the marriage ceremony? Is not the toleration of manifest false teachers reason enough for separation, even according to his conviction? - It is strange, by the way, that the Major adds: "The withdrawal was certainly a very painful one - but it always seems to me as if only a free mission church has promise according to the epistle of Michaelmas and not the present national and state churches. One sees from this that, after the dear men have been taken away from the magic circle of the state church conditions, although on an erroneous path, an ever clearer light about these conditions finds entrance with them. This makes the separation of Hermannsburg a particularly important event before other separations. - After the above had already been written, we found very similar statements by Pastor Harms in the March number of the Hermannsburg Missionary Bulletin. He writes: "I see in the connection of the church with the modern state, as it is, the ruin of the church, and see no help for the church but in separation from it. That pastors are tolerated in office, even protected, who preach false doctrine, deny the deity of Christ, the existence of the personal devil :c" is consistent with the concept of the Lutheran church.

in which all emphasis is to be placed on pure doctrine and pure sacraments. I could not remain in it any longer, because communion of the sacraments with members of the Union, even if they call themselves Lutheran and believe themselves to be so, is not only actually practiced at many altars, but has also been approved in higher places. And so on." Pastor Harms himself thinks of the fact that it must surprise everyone how he, with such knowledge, could have remained in the national church until now, and was only moved to separate by the new marriage liturgy. He therefore continues: "The reason that the break only occurred with the new wedding liturgy, and not earlier, is that in it we were commanded to do something which, according to our conviction of conscience, is against God's word and therefore sinful. But even supposing-not admitting-that the latter were true, is not the actual holding of communion with a church false in doctrine and practice also a "doing?" Does not Past. Harms not himself, for the sake of such doing, deny the so-called Lutherans in the Union communion of the Sacraments? W.

"The Church Marriage, its History and its Relation to Civil Marriage. By Dr. Dieckhoff." This writing is reported in the Kirchen-Blatt der Breslauer of April 15, among other things, as follows: What the author often reproaches Luther's doctrine of marriage for, that it was an "inwardly uncertain" one, one will have to say with even more justification of his own view. He by no means succeeded in arriving at a certain uniform result. The correct views of the nature of marriage and the importance of the civil act, from which he does not wish to escape, intersect with the desire to increase the importance of the marriage ceremony as much as possible. On p. 302. 3, for example, the author says: "If a marriage, which in itself is according to the word of God, is contracted in a legitimate manner, the contracting of it is known to the omnipresent and omniscient God, and is valid before him, even if it has taken place without the invocation of God, and those who thus enter into marriage are bound before God by God's marriage law, whether they allow themselves to be bound by it or not. Being bound by God's law does not depend at all on whether one acknowledges it or not. It does not become binding on man only when he submits to its application in his hearing. The law of God is in force through God over all men. The faith of Christians includes obedience to God's law, and in particular to God's law of marriage. There can be no doubt, therefore, that a marriage which is merely civil, if it is not in itself contrary to the word of God, is bound together before God by the indissoluble bond of matrimony according to Matt. 19:6, and is therefore to be regarded as one joined together by God for the church. And likewise it is no question that children of such a marriage must be acknowledged as legitimate children also by ver Church. But no matter how undoubtedly true all this may be, the necessity of ecclesiastical marriage for the proper mode of ecclesiastical matrimony is not thereby removed. For if marriage is consummated only by means of the civil act and without a church wedding, and if, therefore, what follows for the proper manner of marriage from the fact that marriage is a divine union is disregarded, then a marriage comes into being that is also valid before God and bound before God by God's law of marriage; but the manner in which the marriage is consummated is contrary to what piety demands with respect to the manner of marriage. Marriage is fully contracted; but it is not contracted, as it ought to be, in a pious manner before and with God." This the author explains more fully by the example of the bread, which is received in very different ways - namely, with thanksgiving and without thanksgiving - by the ungodly and the pious. But how is it consistent with this exposition, that the author should afterwards

again declares that only through and after the marriage ceremony of the marriage in question the word Matth. 19, 6. is valid! That by virtue of the civil law the marriage is not yet bound by the divine law of marriage (p. 308)! Here is an uncertainty which is often found in the explanatory and critical remarks which the author adds to the views of the ancients which he gives. - This is again a sad proof of the wavering basis on which the newer theology builds itself. W.

Church law and state law. Dr. Münkel writes: On March 26, the former Minister of State and Culture, Freiherr v. Hodenberg, stood before the High Court of Hanover, accused of rebelliousness against the authority of the State and of inciting disobedience to the marriage law enacted by the Emperor in an article signed with his name in the "Kreuzblatt" by Pastor Grote. Passing over the details of the proceedings, we note only that v. Hodenberg essentially conceded the correctness of the charge, insofar as it was his opinion that the clergy and bridal couples were not only entitled, but under certain circumstances also obliged, not to turn to this marriage formula, but above all to keep their consciences pure.... Mr. v. Hodenberg is thus sued and convicted for incitement to resist state authority and marriage law according to § 110 of the Reich Criminal Code. This law has the title: "Resistance against the power of the state", and counts as an incitement "to disobedience against laws or legally valid decrees of the authorities", and the defendant seemed to admit the applicability to the marriage law, especially since an earlier decision by a higher court had already declared this to be the case. It was therefore not examined here whether a church law can be taken for a state law without further ado, and whether resistance to it is to be treated as resistance "against the authority of the state". It could come to the point that the church's mouth would be tied under severe penalty, and resistance in word and deed would be denied, if the church authorities, king and church authorities, passed a pernicious law on doctrine, sacraments, etc., which interfered with the word of God. This would then have to be treated as a state law, and would bring real state power or state tyranny over the church. As long as everything in the church revolves around God's Word and conscience, a profound distinction will have to be made between church law and state law, and it will have to be investigated whether a lousy law such as the purely internal church marriage law, which in its synodal origin and its nature is quite different from state law, may be treated as state law without the consent of the Diet simply because of the royal or supreme episcopal decree.

Hanover. The following is what we read in the Evangelical Lutheran General Gazette of April 19: Baron v. Hodenberg has been sentenced to 300 Mk. for an article published in the Kreuzblatt, in which the clergy are called upon to resist the new form of marriage. The editor of the Kreuzblatt, however, has been sentenced to three months' imprisonment for the inclusion of this article, and to this must be added another two months' imprisonment for a poem about the Union published in the same paper, in which a defamation of the Prussian state church was recognized. In these criminal proceedings we miss the consistency with regard to the Social Democratic newspapers and other writings, inasmuch as many of them pass unchallenged, although they are full of overflowing with mockery of all that is holy.

Mecklenburg-Schwerin. Since the enactment of the Reich Civil Status Law, i.e. in the two years 1876 and 1877, of the 36,720 children born to Lutheran parents, 4 children have remained unchristened, and of 9200 marriages between Lutherans, 29 couples have remained unmarried, of whom 12 couples have been consistently married by Social-Democratic

The other 17 couples were refused marriage by the church either because of previous divorce, or because of too close a relationship, or because of religious differences. Compared to other national churches, this is indeed a favorable ratio!
M.

State Church Constitution. In his "Pastoral-Correspondenz" Pastor Lohmann reports that in an article in the Breslau Lutheran Church bulletin, testimony was given against the increasingly unnatural and oppressive, but no longer tolerable bondage of the regional churches under the state church regiment, and that the article pointed to "a new opportunity" which God would undoubtedly give the Lutheran Church to seize the freedom due to it, while an earlier opportunity for this, given to it by the revolutionary year of 1848, had still caught it unprepared. Pastor Lohmann comments on this: "The basic idea of this has been spoken out of our souls. That the present situation of the State Church Regiment is quite unnatural and becomes more untenable with each passing year, I have repeatedly stated; and what we have experienced in recent months has certainly deepened and strengthened this conviction in wide circles. To be sure, I am not so certain that God will give the Lutheran Church an opportunity to seize the freedom to which it is entitled without forcibly shattering its entire present external structure; to me, the compulsion of conscience to break the present church structure is more probable than a peaceful solution of the unnatural tension. Nor would we be responsible if, looking forward to such a future opportunity in the present conflicts, we were to omit anything that our conscience, bound as it is in God's Word, commands us to do; if, in order to avoid a seemingly premature rupture, we were to bear and forbear anything that it forbids. But in this, the view of the possibility of ways, as yet unknown, in which the Lord can redeem His people in His hour, should strengthen us, however, that we do not, without a real need of conscience, wilfully do anything that must lead to the violent destruction of the present shape of the Church; that, waiting for the Lord's hand, we also bear the great distresses of it, sighing, as far as that is possible with an unblemished conscience." - So, according to the first of these sentences, Pastor Lohmann does not want to wait for "an opportunity", and smelled after the last ones "waiting for the hand of the HErrn, also sighing to bear the great emergencies of the present church form"! That rhymes, who is able; we are not able.
W.

State church matters. The pilgrim from Saxony reports: "Some Reformed in Leipzig and Dresden had complained that they had to pay taxes on their real estate for Lutheran local parishes, and both Reformed consistories asked as a result for the repeal of the relevant legal provision, which calls on the immovable property in a church and school district to cover the expenses necessary for church and school purposes, even if the owner belongs to another confession. The 2nd Chamber wanted to leave it up to the municipalities concerned, with the consent of the government, to grant exemption in each individual case. The 1st Chamber, however, rightly found that such an exemption would be unjust to the other taxpayers and rejected the petition altogether, all the more so because the present method of taxation was centuries old, but according to the Minister's explanation, the proposed abolition of it would make individual parochial communities virtually bankrupt." - The latter reason is evidently a communist one, but the whole matter of taxation is a shameful tyranny of conscience and a mockery of Saxon religious liberty and freedom of conscience.
W.

Agricola's Catechism. In the royal library in Copenhagen there is, among other rarities, a small book from the time of the Reformation, which is called

should rather expect to find in Germany than in Denmark. This is Agricola's Catechism, but not his "Hundertunddreißig Fragstücke" (Hundred and Thirty Pieces of Questions), which are available in the original edition at the library in Leipzig, but his actual "Catechism for the Latin School". Prof. Fr. Nielsen, who has already rendered outstanding services by reprinting the oldest separate edition of Luther's Traubüchlein, has now published a careful reprint in Copenhagen of this strange little book, which most strongly expresses Agricola's antinomianism.

From Schleswig-Holstein, the following is reported in the Luthardt Kz. of March 29: In such ecclesiastical conditions, nothing would be more urgently needed than for the ministers of the church to unanimously testify clearly to everyone, through doctrine and conduct, to the one way of salvation according to the truthful confession. But it is precisely the unity and purity of the faith of the clergy that is still lacking in us, as in most of the national churches of our day. This can hardly be otherwise as long as many, during their preparation for the service of the church, are so little instructed in the faith of the same, but are rather led away from it by modern science. Since this is abundantly represented in most theological faculties, and in Kiel no less so for some time, it is understandable that some of our theologians turn to it during their studies and, with the small number of candidates, enter the teaching office of the church with these views soon after the ministerial examination..... For some time now a young Pastor Diekmann in Wesselburen has been so open and challenging with his views that he has caused a general stir. For more than four years he has been the deacon of that large unchurched congregation, and he has conducted his ministry quite openly according to his view of Christianity, without causing offence, since there has not been much else there for a long time. About three quarters of a year ago, however, Diekmann gave a lecture at a conference of North Dithmarsch clergymen on "the teaching of biblical history in the elementary school," in which he declared it necessary that this teaching should break with the traditional way, since according to newer science it was untenable and therefore harmful. Since this lecture and its justification met with much opposition among his colleagues, but Diekmann did not consider himself refuted, perhaps even irrefutable, he probably wanted to appeal to the higher pedagogical authority of the "world of teachers" and therefore perhaps had this lecture somewhat popularized and amplified in the "Schlesw.-Holstein. Schulztg. (1877, No. 25 and 26), so that demands and assertions were made in it which even the most "liberal" pedagogues and theologians of our country had not allowed themselves to make in such a way. Diekmann demands to break completely with the miracle stories, i.e. not to present them as having really happened, since they are only figments of the imagination, which would cancel out the uniform world view and therefore confuse the minds of the children. That is why the story of Jesus was concluded with his death. Furthermore, it is said that teaching according to the Scriptures in many cases declares bad things to be good and "confuses the moral concepts", since "especially the 'holy' history claims for itself the sad privilege of sanctioning most unholy things"..... The "Kropper Kirchl. Anzeiger" then declared that Diekmann, by his omissions, was instructing the teachers to falsify the Bible and was breaking the oath of office by which he had pledged to "faithfully adhere to the pure doctrine of the divine Word as summarized in the Augsburg Confession. Confession, to preach and present the same purely and unadulterated. About this, Rev. Diekmann filed a complaint of iniquity against Rev. Paulsen in Kropp at the District Court in Schleswig, and this found the accused guilty of public insult and fined him 600 Mk, event, with 40 days imprisonment..... Pastor Paulsen has appealed against this verdict to the Court of Appeal in Kiel, and a rectification of the same can be expected. Already earlier, however, the Kiel"

Consistory called upon the Rev. Diekmann to a responsibility about the given trouble and the relationship of his position of faith and his efforts to the oath of office taken, on the defense which Diekmann had submitted, a disciplinary investigation was imposed on him, and at the end of January he then had to undergo a detailed interrogation before several members of the Consistory. The decision has not yet been made, but is generally expected with great excitement and will in any case be of no small significance for our regional church. Since Hermannsburg has many warm friends, the separation there is deeply lamented, but generally not approved. Nevertheless, it has already been declared that believers could not remain in a church which tolerated such unbelief in the magisterium. Many, however, hope for an unambiguous act of the Consistory in order to prevent the threatening disintegration of the national church..... Diekmann refers to having a number of like-minded ministers in Schleswig-Holstein who also adhere to the liberal theology in office, and even more who do not interpret the Scriptures literally.

Austria. On the occasion of the simultaneous meeting of the Austrian Lutheran and Reformed Synods in Vienna in November of last year, the Lutheran (?) Synod issued an invitation to the Reformed Synod for joint consultation in common matters, but the "sister Synod" most decisively rejected this request. Strangely enough, however, the Lutheran Synod approved the Reversal for the "Clergy" drafted by the church authorities. In it the obligation of the church servants to preach the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures in conformity with the church confession is expressed. One member wanted to be bound only by the spirit of the church confessions, but no one agreed with him. If one did not know what is now generally understood by "conformity to the ecclesiastical confession," that resolution would certainly be most gratifying; but what is now called confessional? W.

Pastor Katterfeld in Sarata, Russian Bessarabia, along with his wife, made great personal sacrifices in the Russian-Turkish war to care for the wounded and to alleviate the hardships of war. He placed his own deaconess house and five other hospitals at the disposal of the military authorities, and provided care for many hundreds of wounded. Then a Russian archbishop passed through Sarata, and the ringing of the bells of the Protestant church was required to greet him. Protestant bells were rung only in honor of the emperor, so Katterfeld forbade the ringing. This was reported, and by order of the falsely reported minister Katterfeld was deposed on February 1 with the prohibition of ever again holding a clerical office in Russia. According to recent news, however, the Emperor has reinstated Pastor Katterfeld in his former office in Sarata, and after the icing of the extensive parish of Roshishtshi in the Volhynian governorate in May he wanted to resume his interrupted activity in Bessarabia.

Necrological. On April 26, Professor Heinrich Leo, the well-known historian, died in Berlin.

From Brazil is written to the Luthardtsche Kirchenzeitung: According to all appearances, the new ministry of Sinimbu will bring about changes which will also exert a great influence on our Protestant Church. It is said that several articles of the political constitution are to be partly deleted, partly changed, and above all those provisions are to be dropped which make the Roman Catholic Apostolic religion the state religion (Art. 5) and from this derive privileges for the confessors of this religion (Art. 95, No. 3)..... For the German colonists, the Committee for Brazil in Barmen and the Missionary Committee in Basle have gradually sent so many clergymen that they have been able, albeit with some hardships, to serve almost all of the

German co-religionists the message of the Gospel. Through the struggle against the ever more openly revealed intrigues of the Jesuits, the contrast between "Roman" and "Lutheran" has been made more conscious and has also become better known to the Brazilians of Portuguese descent. While the German Catholics, with the exception of the "enlightened" ones, have become literally fanatical, especially in the last years of the Kulturkampf, the waves of which are beating with power against our coast, the Portuguese Catholics behave rather indifferently. That the work of evangelization has a future among them is shown by the successes of the Presbyterians and Methodists, who are expanding more and more in the provinces of Rio de Janeiro and S. Paulo and have recently also begun to work in Rio Grande do Sul. That we have to leave this great field of work to the sects is a source of great sadness to us.

Pabsthum in Scotland. In Scotland the appointment of Archbishops and Bishops is exciting a very energetic opposition. It is intended in all seriousness to attach a process to the Papacy, and a member of the Free Church has offered \$25,000 as the first tax for this purpose.

Papal Infallibility. A correspondent of the London Times draws attention to an error made by the Pope in his "Apostolic Letter" concerning the Scottish hierarchy. He writes from Rome to the said paper: "The Pope gives a survey of the Scottish Church from its beginning, pointing to 'St. Ninian, who was instructed in the faith of Beda Venerabilis'. St. Ninian died in 432, while Beda Venerabilis was born in 673, 241 years after St. Ninian's death."

Idol-making in England. From London it is written: No one is surprised when one hears or reads from heathen countries that idol-makers there advertise and offer their wares in newspapers and in markets like other articles of commerce; but one is astonished when one learns quite the same thing from Christian England. A mercantile house in Birmingham, where the disgraceful business of idolatry is assiduously carried on, recommends the products of its factory to its customers in the East Indies in the following manner: Yuman, the god of death, wrought in fine copper, and very tastefully wrought. Nironi, the prince of demons, in great variety. The giant on which he rides is of the boldest drawing, and his sabre fashioned after the present manner. Baroness, the god of the sun, vividly represented. His crocodile is of copper, and has a silver tail. Bouberen, the god of wealth. This god is of very exquisite workmanship, and the manufacturers have devoted their best efforts to its production. Smaller demi-gods and other sub-gods in greatest variety. Credit is not given, discount for cash payment." (Herold.)

A Protestant preacher by the name of Kalthoff, in Nickern near Züllichau, had the peculiar idea, probably out of sheer prestige, to report in writing, without being asked, to the Berlin Ober-Kirchen-Rath that he stood theologically just like Hoßbach (whose election the O.-K.-Rath rejected, as is well known, but whom he left in his previous position). In any case, Mr. Kalthoff thought that this scornful petition would have no other consequence than to make him famous. However, things turned out a little differently: he was suspended from office for the sake of his insolence, and his conduct was dismissed by his own unbelievers as a stupid prank. W.

Misprint.

Pg 135 line 2 from above instead of "his cause" read "his son".

A. G. Doehler.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 24.

July 1878.

No. 7.

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

(Continued.)

XI. From the fall of man.

Thetic

Brenz: "Tell me, then, what is the meaning of God's forbidding the enjoyment of the fruit of a tree, and not rather another species of sin? Is the tree or its fruit in itself evil and corrupt? And why does not God rather recite to Adam the Decalogue which he later recited to the Israelites in the wilderness of Sinai? - First, the tree was not evil in itself, nor was the fruit thereof corrupt. For God looked upon all that he had made, and it was very good. Second, God did not recite the Decalogue because it was planted in Adam's heart at the time of creation, and Adam understood it well and delighted in knowing and observing it. It is the natural law. Nor would it have been necessary for it to be repeated in the wilderness if the knowledge of it had not been obscured by sin. Therefore, since Adam was still of an uncorrupted nature, it pleased God not to recite to him the Decalogue, which was already known by his human reason, but to prescribe for him a special divine service, which would not be implanted in human reason, but by which human reason should testify to its obedience and reverence. He was to give God the praise and glory of wisdom, and to confess that he owed obedience to God. For God did not wish to lay upon Adam anything extraordinary and difficult, but something that seemed to be ridiculous and was quite easy to perform, in order that

also the obedience of the same would be more manifest, and he could not be excused for the difficulty of rendering it." *)

Brochmand: "Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil it is not only said that it was pleasant to look upon and good to eat, but it is further added that it was a pleasant tree because it made wise. Therefore the first parents did not sin both by tasting the fruit of this tree as one that was pleasant to look at and good to eat, and by using the fruit of this tree as an effectual means of acquiring such knowledge as would be equal to the knowledge of God himself. This explanation of ours confirms the devil's tempting speech in Genesis 3:5, as well as God's address to Adam after he had already tasted the fruit of the forbidden tree, Genesis 3:22." **)

Quenstedt: "The essence of the first sin in general is the deviation from the will of God, which had been revealed by the positive law given to the first men, not to eat of the tree of knowledge good and evil. . . . This deviation, according to its extent, involves several different sinful acts From the historical description of the case Gen. 3, 1. ff. this order can be deduced.

*) Quaesio te, quid hoc sibi velit, quod Deus prohibeat esum de fructu arboris et non potius aliud genus peccati? Num arbor, aut fructus ejus per se mala sunt et perniciosi? Et cur non potius recitat Adam decalogum, quem postea Israelites in deserto Sinai recitavit? - Primum, arbor per se non fuit mala, nec fructus ejus per se perniciosus. Vedit enim Deus cuncta, quae fecerat, et erant valde bona. Deinde non recitat decalogum, quod hic jam ante in creatione insculptus erat Adamo, quem et Adam optime intelligebat et cognitione ac observantia ejus maxime delectabatur. Haec est lex naturalis. Nec fuisset opus, ut postea in deserto repeteretur, nisi cognitio ejus fuisset per peccatum obscurata. Quare, cum Adam esset adhuc naturae incorruptae, non est visum Deo, recitare ei decalogum, jam humana ratione cognitum, sed praescribere ei singularem cultum, qui non esset humanae rationi insculptus, sed in quo humana ratio testaretur suam obedientiam et reverentiam, ut, cum non intelligeretur natura sua, quid sibi hic cultus vellet, daret Deo laudem et gloriam sapientiae, ac fateretur, se debere Deo obsequium. Voluit enim Deus Adamo- nihil vel eximium vel grave imponere, sed quod videretur ridiculum et esset praestitu facillimum, ut et obedientia ejus illustrior fieret et non haberet ullam excusationem propter difficultatem." (Opp. Tom. I. f. 35. s.)

**) „De arbore scientiae boni et mali non modo dicitur, quod fuerit visu jucunda et utilis in escam; sed porro additur, quod arbor illa fuerit desiderabilis ad intelligendum. Unde non tam peccarunt primi parentes gustando hujus arboris fructum tanquam jucundum visu aut utilem in escam, quam usurpando arboris hujus fructum velut efficax quoddam medium comparandi talem scientiam, quae ipsam ipsius Dei scientiam aequaret. Quam explicationem nostram confirmat tum suasoria diaboli oratio Gen. 3, 5., tum Dei ipsius ad Adamum, gustato jam arboris vetitae fructu, alloquium Gen. 3, 22." (System, univers. th. Art. IX. c. 1. s. 8. f. 121.)

The first sinful act was unbelief, as Luther says of Genesis 3, or, as others would have it, doubt about the truth of the divine word. For they doubted the express divine threatening, and so sinned first by the sin of unbelief and doubting. Hence Dr. Dannhauer, in his *Hodosophy*, p. 341, says: 'The first root of sin was unbelief, and in the same first error, then doubt, finally distrust.' The second act was the desire for godliness and exaltation, with which man was inflamed by the lying words of Satan. From this arose, thirdly, the resolution to transgress the law and eat of the fruit of the forbidden tree. And at last followed, fourthly, the actual execution of this resolution." *)

B. Antithetical.

Dr. Delitzsch: "The tree of knowledge was a tree of blessing according to its purpose, but was it also so according to its nature? In other words, is the death threatened to man to be thought of only as the consequence of the transgression of the prohibition that happens to be attached to this very tree, or as the consequence of the powers active in this tree? To me, the latter seems to be in the sense of the story. For the tree of knowledge of good and evil is not chosen only when God places the prohibition, but it stands from the beginning, v. 9, as the tree of decision in the garden; already v. 9, one notices that it forms a contrast to the tree of life standing in the midst of the garden. But the tree of life, by virtue of the nature created for it, 3:22, so the tree of knowledge will also work death by virtue of its nature. But by virtue of the nature created for it by God? Death, as we know from Genesis 1, is not something originally willed by God; therefore, the power of death in this tree will not be something creatively ordained by God.

*) "Forma primi peccati in genere est recessus et deflexio a voluntate Dei, per legem positivam, primis parentibus de non comedendo ex arbore scientiae boni et mali latam, revelata. . . . Complectitur haec deflexio ambitu suo aliquot distinctos actus peccaminosos. . . . Ex descriptione lapsus historica Gen. 1. sqq. ordo hic erui potest, ut primus actus vitiosus fuerit ἀπιστία seu incredulitas, ut inquit Lutherus in cap. 3. gen., vel, ut alii volunt, dubitatio de veritate verbi divini. Divinam enim comminationem expressam in dubium vocabant, atque sic peccabant primum peccato infidelitatis seu dubitationis. Hinc D. Dannhauerus *Hodos*. p. 341.: 'Prima', inquit, 'peccati radix fuit ἀπιστία ac in ea primum error, deinde dubitatio, tum diffidentia.' Secundus actus fuit affectatio deformitatis, animique elatio, qua inflammatus fuit homo verbis Satanae mendacibus cupiditate excellentioris status. Tertio hinc natum, legem transgrediendi et de arboris vetitae fructu comedendi, propositum. Ac denique quarto sequuta est ipsius propositi hujus in actum deductio." (Theol. did.-pol. P. II. c. 2. p. 1. f. 510- p.)

be. If we now remember that man's paradisiacal vocation is to overcome the evil that has penetrated creation, we cannot be surprised that in paradise itself there is a tree which God created, but which the power of evil has taken possession of, the enjoyment of which puts man in relation to evil and therefore kills him, and which, so that man does not fall into the company of evil and thus into death, is surrounded by the divine prohibition. (The Genesis. Lpz. 1852. p. 107. f.)*)

Dr. v. Hofmann. Instead of letting Dr. v. H. himself speak here, we repeat the exposition of the same's doctrine of the Fall, as given by Dr. Philippi and Dr. Kliefoth. The former writes: "According to v. Hofmann *Schriftbeweis* 2nd ed. I, p. 465. ff. the sin of the first men consisted only in the self-willed abolition of the barrier set to his world dominion in the image of God. Sin, he said, was in general the desire to remove the barrier of world possession, which barrier was set for the first man precisely at the tree of knowledge. Adam's sin consisted not, then, in self-deification, nor in the selfishness of an I that set itself against God and what is God's, but in an I that coveted what was created by God in an anti-divine way. Let us now ask how this conception can be reconciled with the clear words: If we now ask how this conception rhymes with the clear words, "Ye shall be like God, knowing what is good and what is evil," we learn, to our astonishment, that good and evil (XXX XXX) are here to be taken not at all in the ethical but in the physical sense, and are therefore to be translated not good and evil, but good and bad. (!) The bad consisted in the evil of death, which the eating of the fruit of the tree resulted in. The evil that befell man through the eating of the fruit made him conscious of the contrast between good and evil. Now, since men possessed their good in the life into which God had created them, they will become aware of the contrast between good and evil when Tob befalls them. Cf. op. cit. p. 475. f. If we add that we are speaking here of physical life and death, what remains of the history of the Fall, which gives us in sin, as the striving after godliness, the right Satanic depth of the same.

*From the 3rd edition of the Commentary on Genesis, which unfortunately is not available to us, the following is reported in the Kliefoth'sche theologische Zeitschrift, among others. In the history of the Fall of Man, the earlier view that in the tree of knowledge the corruption that had penetrated into the plant world" (already before) "was put under lock and key by God and unleashed again through man's guilt and brought to freedom from power, is defended against the objections raised and confirmed by reference to the ancient popular belief according to which one can wedge the plague and other evils in trees. With visible preference, it is further emphasized that man has become the seducer of a beast, an appeal to the recently popular animal principle, which, to our regret, we also encounter in the author's commentary on the Psalms."

The first man, like a disobedient and covetous child against his father's prohibition, had eaten a poisonous fruit and thereby suffered death as a well-deserved consequence. How fatal this flattened view of the events of the Fall must become for the doctrine of the nature of sin in general is evident. But if we now ask further how there can be any question of an opposition of good and bad in the Hofmannian sense in God Himself, and in what way men have arrived at God-likeness through the experience of good and bad, we learn to our even greater astonishment, cf. p. 411, that in the plurality of spirits united under the One God there is experience of good and bad, in that this opposition divides them into good and bad spirits. If the ethical opposition of good and evil is meant here, it does not at all coincide with the physical opposition of good and evil, which is afterwards called the experience of man, and moreover, if we understand rightly, *) the opposition of good and evil, even of angels and devils, appears to be placed in God himself. If then God says that Adam became like one of us, knowing what is good and what is bad, God will probably give this honorable designation to the devil, for only a spirit that has become evil, not one that has remained good, has had experience of good and bad. In any case, it is clear that the conception of the Fall in question is disgraced by *Eritis sicut Deus!* But when Tholuck, *Lehre von der Sünde und dem Versöhner*, 7th ed. p. 215, has remarked of that poison-tree theory: 'He who thus fails to recognize the essence of sin cannot, if he is consistent, recognize the significance of Christ's atoning work': so this has been fully confirmed in Hofmann's doctrine of atonement, whose contrary to Scripture and confession, as is well known, has already come to general recognition." (Kirchl. Glaubenslehre. III. Zweite Aufl. p. 172. ff.) - Dr. Kliefoth writes of v. Hofmann's doctrine of the Fall, among other things, as follows: **We already know from our previous article v. Hofmann's view of the original state of man: before the Fall he was not in a state of holiness and blessedness, but in one of indifference; the Spirit of God was in him, but not in such a way as to determine him morally, but only in such a way as to make him live, and to give him the possibility of developing himself.

*) So even a Philippi must say, if he wants to reproduce the doctrinal development of a B. H.!

**Some of our readers may be disconcerted by the fact that in one and the same issue of this journal, in which a work by Dr. Kliefoth is subjected to an equally just and sharp critique, he is listed as the author in another field of doctrine; but the interested reader may learn from this how gladly our journal acknowledges the good that modern times offer it and how gratefully it makes use of it.

to determine himself. According to God's will this self-determination should happen in such a way that man would let himself be determined by the spirit of God and thus enter into God's ways, but it could also happen in the opposite way and had not happened yet. Then God gave the prohibition in Genesis 2:17. God did not intend that man should remain in childish innocence, that he should not experience the difference between good and evil, but only that he should not experience it in himself: as something that exists apart from him, man should learn to know evil, but not take it into himself, not make it his own. But from this prohibition man took occasion to determine himself for the first time in his relation to God, and that against God's wish and will. Thus, not according to Scripture, but according to what v. H. reads between the lines of the story of the Fall, the Fall of Man was initiated.... Furthermore, v. H. now takes three moments out of the story of the Fall in order to explain the origin of sin. First, he emphasizes that this self-determination, through which man fell into sin, did not begin in man himself, but that he came to it through seduction, deception. If, he thinks, this self-determination had begun in man himself, it would at any rate have had a better outcome; but now he was subject to cunning and enticement. Also, if this self-determination of man to evil had arisen in man himself, man would have immediately confronted God in negation, and so would have been destroyed at once; but now, as this self-determination to evil did not take place in man himself, but came to him from without, man remained alive, for now it was not so evil with it....*) But v. H. connects with this at once the second, that the seduction of Satan passed first to woman, and so to man. If man, he thinks, had still been sexless, he would not have been accessible to such seduction by means of a tree-fruit at the time of his knowledge of the world. For the same reason, Satan would not have succeeded if he had at the same time made man and woman in the union established by Creation. But Satan used the division of the original One Man into two, and turned to one after the other. He turned first to the woman, taking advantage of her independence, which had been established by Creation. And when he had overpowered this weaker half, man was again attracted by the

*The fact that man fell as a result of temptation from the devil has the serious meaning that, by virtue of this event, sin in this world stands in a historically living connection with sin in that world, but it does not serve to explain Adam's fall psychologically. H. likewise does not serve to construe the how and why of Adam's transgression, but only to weaken the significance of this transgression, to take away from it the character of apostasy, of fall, of guilt. Consequently, v. H. also never speaks of Adam's 'fall'. (Kliefoth.)

sexual affiliation with the woman to follow her. Therefore the woman is also affected by the consequence that her relationship to the man is unilaterally changed, that she has come under the power and guardianship of the man.... *) Thirdly, however, v. H. places such great weight on the fact that sin began with the bite of the apple, that is, with the desire for an earthly, worldly good, that from here he comes to a total reversal of the ecclesiastical views of sin and its origins. Man, says H., stood indifferent in his relation to God. Now, however, of the trees of the garden which He gave him to enjoy, God set apart one. Thus God set up a barrier to man's relationship to the world in the image of God: man was set to be lord of the earth, as God is lord of the world in general, and this relationship of lordship received a barrier at the tree that was eliminated. Satan's cunning attached itself to this barrier, taught man to feel it as a barrier, made him believe that he would enlarge his dominion over the world, that he would become more like God, if he crossed this barrier; and man did so. Thus it came to pass that sin, as the desire of a thing belonging to the corporeal world, began in the sphere of man's relation to the world. And this was one of the most important consequences. If sin had begun with man's determination against God in his relationship to God, if he had set his will directly against the will of God, sin would have begun as enmity against God, and then man would have had to die, and could not have been saved for grace. But sin did not begin in this way, but with man's wrongly determining his relationship to the world: it was not his intention to deny God's will; he only wanted to have one more earthly good, only to extend his dominion over the world. Of course, this was a direction that must lead man to enmity against God, to the conscious opposition of his will to God's will. But this was not the beginning, but the result of the further development of sin. It was not until God confronted sinful man with the grace that sought his conversion, and gave him

*The fact that first the woman and then the man is seduced by means of the woman is again correct. But what V. H. puts into this fact is only the weathering of the theosophical phantasists with whom we have already become acquainted: just as the differentiation of the spirit of God into the spirit-multitude is the point at which the opposition of good and evil enters the upper world, so the differentiation of the sexless human being into man and woman is the point at which the evil that enters the human world from the upper world begins. That is why, at the creation of woman, H. H. immediately pointed to the Fall of Man. But evil thereby also immediately got rid of the moment of a natural evil, and is thus from the outset placed in a relation to natural life, more closely to sexual life." (Kliefoth.)

Only then did sin become enmity against God in those who disobeyed and disbelieved God. The beginning, however, was only that man lusted after a bodily thing more, and this was not so bad that God could not have let man live and save himself for a mercy. This is v. H.'s Hamartiology. *) The same arguments by which v. H. seeks to show that the gulf between the state before sin and that after it is not too great (I, 409), must now also serve him quite logically to explain how God could let man live and see grace in spite of his sin: If man sinned in consequence of seduction, by virtue of his separation into man and woman, not out of enmity against God, but merely out of lust for a worldly good, it was not so bad; and if it was not so bad, God did not have to regard man's relation to him at once as negated, and to give him up to death. Yes, the matter was even better for man. God himself had planted the forbidden tree, and thus made it possible for man's sin to be directed not toward God, but toward the physical world; God himself had created the woman, the temptress, and thus made it possible for the deception to succeed; God himself had created the serpent, which the devil used, and had given the devil the power to tempt man, and thus made it possible that the unhappy self-decision did not begin in man himself. So,

*According to the ecclesiastical view of these things, a man who is in a state of holiness and blessedness, and who is livingly united with God, has inwardly torn himself away from God, and in incomprehensible blindness against his God's express word, has detached his will from the will of God, and has thus come to the sin of sin, to the transgression of the divine barrier also in his world-life. Then sin begins with enmity against God, and sin and disturbed world-life are its consequences. In H. H., a man who is indifferent to God allows himself to be tempted by the devil, grasps at a thing of this world, and so, since he is not supposed to have it, comes to stand against God unawares, and even, under certain circumstances, to be at enmity with God. Then sin begins as a lowly act of sin committed in the life of the world, and in the last stage of its development becomes enmity against God. Thus, where the ecclesiastical views begin, the former cease; and where the latter cease, the former begin; and one is the very antithesis of the other. The further difference between the two is that H. H.'s hamartiology is very accessible to unenlightened reason, because according to it everything seems to be developed quite genetically, and because it leaves no room for the concepts of the fall, apostasy, and enmity with God, and weakens the concepts of sin and evil; that, on the other hand, the ecclesiastical views present difficult words for repentance and thus for eternal life. Where there is no knowledge of sin, there is none of salvation; where sin is not a fall and apostasy, there is no grace in salvation; and where sin does not begin with enmity against God, salvation does not begin with reconciliation. This always keeps pace." (Kliefoth.)

God himself made it possible for the matter to take this course. For God willed that man should become God, and for this purpose he created man; but at the same time he considered the possibility that this man might determine against his will; and in order that in this case he might not be compelled to let man die, and thus see the purpose of his creation frustrated, he himself arranged those circumstances, so that man's sin, if man should decide to commit it, might find a less dangerous way out.) . . . What at first took place for the first-created immediately from their fall was, according to v. H., this: By yielding to Satan's temptation, man immediately fell into dependence on him. Satan, who, like all spirits, has his sphere of activity in the physical world and, as an evil spirit, strives to dissolve it, asserted this dependence on man from the side of nature, especially of his physical nature. Man 'thus learned to know evil; for it is not of 'good and evil' but of 'good and evil' that Genesis 3:22 is to be understood; to understand it of a moral opposition is a mistake. And it was at this point that Satan proved the dominion he had gained over the physical nature of man. The tree, of which men ate against the law, was by its nature apt to make man experience in his body that evil which is the antithesis of the good that is given to man in life. In short, it was a poisonous tree. **By tempting man to eat the poisonous fruit of the tree, Satan at the same time corrupted man's physical nature. For this effect of the fruit was natural, as all evil we-

*) "v. H.'s genetic progress and his tendency to make the falling man appear not so incapable of help and unworthy of it, leave no room for grace. Also, v. H. himself rarely uses this expression. He prefers to refer to God's "loving conduct," that is, to that urge of love in which God created man; and the connection with him is as follows: Out of love God wants man to become God, and therefore creates man; but out of love he also wants that this will of his should not be thwarted, and therefore, in case man should want to sin, he foresees that way out from the beginning, and, when the case occurs, directs everything into this prospective way. Thus evenly and smoothly does the work of redemption begin in v. H.: it is not the work of a God whose heart breaks in pity for his lost creature, but it is a modality of the plan of creation and of the world that is anticipated for a certain case, and realized with the occurrence of this case." (Kliefoth.)

**The unfortunate supernaturalism of the last century, which wanted to maintain the ecclesiastical dogmas, but no longer understood their meaning, Reinhard, Döderlein, have brought up this fairy tale. It is sad enough that an idea that has been cited innumerable times as a real specimen of bad taste can be served up here as the most sublime spirituality; but hopefully it has not yet come to such a point that one needs to seriously refute such a thing." (Kliefoth.)

The first thing that happened in the physical world was Satan's work. In the meantime, death did not come immediately for the reasons I have mentioned, but at first only a corruption of the body. Man's bodily life was ruined in so far as the body was used for procreation in sexual relations. For men are henceforth ashamed of their nakedness before one another, and in consequence of that indulgence have the feeling of an unworthiness of the body in sexual relation. And this, of course, is a result of the most serious consequences, for the fact that the devil began to have an effect on human natural life at this very point, where human natural life had become generic through the creation of woman, meant that this human natural life had become a place of world-dissolving evil; that is to say: Because the devil, by means of the apple, has corrupted and poisoned the sexual life of man, this evil, from which all sins with their misery arise, is now inherited through reproduction. Thus v. Hofmann." (Kirchl. Zeitschrift. Sechster Jahrg. Schwerin 1859. pp. 516 - 530.) (To be continued.)

(Sent in by Pastor Doepler.)

The state of the present interpretation of the Revelation of John according to one of its latest commentators.

(Conclusion.)

In Revelation 13:4 the healed head was the rise of the world power of the end. This healing is the process of the revival of the Roman pagan world-powerful being, which is to be brought about by the great apostasy from Christianity, and which will give existence to the beast, the antichristian ten-kingdom of the end. This would only come about in the end times. The world power promulgates certain doctrines, admittedly not the best ones. These achievements were the loquacity of old age. Not only (but) with speeches, but also with deeds, this world power would give expression and emphasis to its principles and tendencies. This beast is the Antichrist according to Dan. 7, 21. Now the other beast (v. 11), with horns like a lamb, has a gospel, but of a different content. It is the false prophet C. 16, 13, and so on. The author is of the opinion with Hofmann (!) **) that as the first beast represents the antidivine world power of the end and its ruling Antichrist, so the second one represents that false teaching and wisdom which is the religious moral agent of this last and outermost spawn of the total human sin.

*) Probably because his Antichrist is a world-man, the author pays himself to the historical interpreters of the empire, among whom he emphasizes Hofmann, Luthardt.

^) Where is a trace of πληροφωρία (full conviction) to be found in these expositors? with which Luther pronounced the doctrine of the revealed Antichrist (C. J. H. Fick, das Geheimniß der Wickheit im röm. Pabstthum, p. XXV.)?

will be. This false prophet was prophesied in 1 Tim. 4, 11. ff., 2 Tim. 3, 1. ff., 2 Thess. 2, 9. At the onset of the great apostasy, new doctrines (which deal with him) would be formed and would stand by the side of the antichristian world power that would arise from the apostasy, and its intelligence would be the state religion. This religion would be the second animal. This wisdom would become a new natural religion of materialism. It is also conceivable that there will be a personal main bearer of this pseudo-prophecy. This pseudo-prophecy would make use of the fact that the pagan world-powerful being would rise from the dead in a new, unseen power, while the kingdom of God would lose its footing on earth, in order to prove that Christianity was a vanquished position. After v. 14, an image would really be made for worship; the step from state omnipotence to that was not so far (III, 84-101).

So the future world power of Dan. 7, 21. is supposed to be what the Lutheran interpreters (as Kromayer says) unanimously declare for the Turk. Thus also M. Geier says to Dan. 7, 25: "With these words 'he will blaspheme the Most High' are undoubtedly meant the great blasphemies, which are spewed everywhere in the Alcoran against the triune God's justice, mercy, truth, the will to make blessed. Yea, in boldly lying (as also that Christ was caught up, not crucified) that he was the noblest prophet of God, he could scarcely have spoken more harshly against God, to say nothing of the familiar conversations with the angels, the (claimed) perfection of the Alcoran above the law of Moses and Christ." If we leave aside for the present the world-powerful Antichrist, and look after the new pope, the future pseudoprophet of Dr. Kl., it is as if, although he is supposed to be still so distant, we actually saw in him an old acquaintance. His pseudoprophethism is a precipitation of all the ideas - not of the best kind - of the 19th century! In the latter is the loquacity of old age; in modern parliamentarism unbelief, glorification of the world, the natural religion of materialism are spreading. Do we not complain to-day of state omnipotence? How many voices do not daily assure us that Christianity is a vanquished position? Has not the Protestant Union, Unionism, a different gospel? As Hengstenberg therefore saw in the lamb (Revelation 13:11) the antichristic heathen wisdom (of course of his time), *) so now also Dr. Kl. paints himself in the further pernicious shaping of the (yet only so-called) religiously moralistic Christianity.

*With what meaningless reasons such an interpretation of the symbolic doctrine of the Lutheran Church is then opposed, is shown by Hengstenberg, who says: "The beast bears on its heads names of blasphemy. This leads to an obvious opposition to God and Christ, and does not fit the papacy, which, even in its proudest pretensions, always presented itself only (yes, but hypocritically!) as a servant of God" (II, 28).

The Lord's will was the only agent of his time to be a false prophet. For evidently men cannot predict future things without God's moving them, be it even a prophecy like that of Anani about Jerusalem, or of Cassaignac about the great ones of France before the first French Revolution, be it also only future formations of sin. Who in Louis XIV's time could have predicted the world-conqueror Napoleon, or in Frederick the Great's time the Communists of to-day, with their doctrines and intentions? So also our interpreter cannot predict future history. But since his ideas do not adhere where they ought to adhere, to the Antichrist of Scripture and to his characteristics according to Scripture, they can only adhere to the phenomena of the time, and by standing them increased. The anti-Christianity of these temporal phenomena should not be misjudged. As the moving force which underlies many efforts (e. g. those for the religionless school), only the Psalm words can be recognized: "Let us break their bands," etc. The antichristian aspect is also evident in the fact that the principles, which are enforced by legislation, often lead to the actual oppression of Christians. And where and how far all this will go we do not know; but certainly it will not lead to Dr. Kl.'s Antichrist! First of all, however, it is to be believed that God intends to make it good there, too. If the Protestants have a different gospel, and yet they are swallowed up by the Lutheran national churches, if the Uniate Church has long since falsified the gospel, and counts those who deny it among its members, and has become manifest as another Babel, then God also speaks at this time all the more audibly: "Come out of her, my people. He will make it good with the poor Christians, that they shall and can keep God's word and Luther's doctrine, though in this yet another word of Luther's must prove true, when he says, "But nevertheless this may come to pass, that there shall be no public preaching-seat in the world, and vain Epicurean abominations shall be the public discourse, and the gospel shall be received in the houses alone by the household fathers." *) And why do Luther's opinions apply to us more than those of Dr. Kl.? Because not these, but Luther's thoughts - apart from anything else - have a well-founded support in Scripture. The Lord, indeed, describes the state of the world in his future primarily as that of Epicurean certainty: "They ate, they drank," etc. (Luc. 17, 26. ff.). And indeed, if one asks what will emerge from the ecclesiastical conditions of our old homeland and from the preliminary stages of the future prophethood of Dr. Clare as its next and inevitable consequence, it can only be a prevalence of earthly and pagan sense, of security, of contempt for the Word and the Church. This will be, as Noah and his ark were under

*) To Dan. 12, 7.

his contemporaries, lonely, despised and ridiculed. But suppose a kind of rule were to come with the handling of materialistic, communistic doctrines, which would also cause great tribulations to Christians: will the people who want to turn the churches into cheap workers' dwellings then sit in the temple of God? will the bearers of many other doctrines of today - not of the best kind - sit in it? Is it not rather true of them, "What is their business outside?" - It is astonishing how the author ignores the characteristic testimony of Scripture to the Antichrist, and does not even engage in measuring and comparing the Antichrist of Scripture with his own. Yes, indeed! the Antichrist whom our Lord God "makes",*) is also quite different from that of Dr. Kl. The latter never says that the gospel is an overcome position; he boasts of it, and - curses it as soon as it is taught. He does not want a new, different gospel, but the old one; but in so doing he promulgates the doctrines of devils in its place. Thus, too, he has long since forbidden marriage, - we need not look for the prohibition only in the Antichrist of Dr. Kl., - and he condemns, as Gerhard says, all the testimonies of the Church which have ever risen up against this devilish doctrine. If the Tridentinum is his speech, he has long since given emphasis to his principles by deeds. That there is a Reformation Church, that we are still Protestant Christians, is all God's miracle. And a Lutheran theologian and doctor can see nothing of this? And for the one so mightily set up by God (that we may be able to recognize him) he wants to foist upon us a fine straw man? But since the author lets his lamb emerge from the present, we will be justified in at least looking for points of contact in the present for his world-powerful Antichrist. And indeed there are none; nowhere is there a preliminary stage of a world empire to be seen. The empires of the world have - so teaches Daniel and so confirms history - reached their end with the Roman Empire. Only the Turk and the Pabst follow this, but not as analogous to the four world empires, but as peculiarly blasphemous apparitions. Before the Antichrist of Dr. Kl. is one *prior tempore potior jure* (rather according to time, more powerful according to the [diabolical] right), and it is not at all conceivable that the more than two hundred million who are entangled in the papacy would submit to the Antichrist of Dr. Kl. For this belongs to the lying miracles of the

*Luther: Quando ergo deus omnia in omnibus movet et agit, necessario movet etiam et agit in Satana et impio. Ipse bonus male facere non potest, malis tamen instrumentis utitur, quae raptum et motum potentiae suae non possunt evadere (Because, therefore, God moves and drives everything in everything, he also moves and drives with necessity in Satan and the ungodly. Even good, he cannot act evil; however, he uses the evil instruments, which cannot escape his mighty enticing and moving). De servo arb. (E. 21. p. 124.

Satan, all of which our interpreter still expects him to keep his kingdom together. Thus he expects the great tribulation only with his Antichrist. However, he finds it in a passage of Scripture where it is not in the literal and proper sense, but where something else is spoken of, namely in Matth. 24, 21. 22. This tribulation would come upon the people of God with the Antichrist, which the Lord would put an end to according to 2 Thess. 2, 8. through His Parousia. No flesh would be saved; all would perish in body and soul if these days were not shortened. He asks boldly, "Is then the time that has been running since Jerusalem was taken-now even a little of all this" (1, 42. 43. 53.)? To be sure, we believe Christ's word: there was a tribulation at the destruction of Jerusalem, such as never was, nor ever will be.*) The very assurance that there shall be no more such tribulation indicates that it is a tribulation which will not come at the time of the Parousia. That there will be no more after the Parousia is self-evident; the Lord does not need to assure us of this. Thus the tribulation of Dr. Kl. would not actually be one. But who would deny that tribulations will come? For God daily searches the world with them, and who can determine the measure of those yet to come? But if persecution is a sign of things to come before the last day, this portent has already been painted in bloody pictures in history. The ancients estimate the number of Christians killed in the pagan persecutions at two million. According to Kromayer, hardly fewer may have perished under the Roman Antichrist than under the emperors, to say nothing of the Turkish sword. Dr. Harleß once estimated the number of those killed in the Reformation alone at 400,000. So we believe that God says: enough is enough. Even if gruesome aftermaths still came and may come: the great battle is done. The great world-cutter of Dr. Kl. belongs to the fables of his system. The Christian Church will no longer resemble Abel as well as Lot. And yet the pious ancients are right when they say: *Sine ferro martyres esse possumus, si patientiam fideliter custodiverimus*. Without doubt we do not live in the time when the beast, like a lamb, is able to do all the might of the first beast, but when they bite their tongues, have bitten them long ago, but blaspheme God over it (as three hundred years ago, so today). Thus also Luther says to Daniel 12:1: "He means here (by the time of tribulation) not bodily tribulations, which were much greater in the destruction of Jerusah.

*For it was not inflicted on the heathen, who suffered it as an inevitable fate, but on the people whom God had trusted, but who now, blinded and obstinate, sought help from God in vain, and were therefore desolate, while the Christian martyrs were comforted by divine consolation. The tribulation is great before others, especially in qualitative terms. Bellarmine also takes the words of Matth. 24, 21. literally and actually from the persecution by the Antichrist.

The time had come for Michael to wake up and not let Christianity perish in the last stages. - And here we see that after the time revealed by the pope there is nothing to hope for but the end of the world and the resurrection of the dead. Here the scripture is finished, and all prophecy has an end." That Matt. 24:21. is to be applied in a wider sense to the antichristian tribulation, is not to be denied. -

As proof of how the author accepts the opinions of the older interpretation from above, his interpretation of the number 666 should be mentioned. Already in the introduction he remarks that he does not find any Kabbalistic and Gematria in Revelation 13, 18. The number 666 is the designation of a certain perfection in the worldly, but with the defectus of divine perfection; it designates that which man can gain by work, that which does not bring it to divine perfection in itself, that which is worldly power hostile to God: all of which we gladly leave undecided. Now why should it be reprehensible that many pure interpreters have found in the Greek word the meaning of the number 666, which is in fact represented by the Greek letters? As is well known, Irenaeus (and he is not the first) called attention to this circumstance. Thus Dr. Kl. says: The word is not called *lateinos*, but *latinos*. Did not Irenaeus understand Greek as well (at least) as we do? If he read it thus, this form must have been in use, even if it had not been preserved for us in writing. But the old interpreters also note that the Latins used to render the long *i* by *si*, so Plautus would find *capteivi* for *captivi*; so would *lateinos* for *latinos*. *) Then, however, the author is quite at ease when Hofmann contrasts the number of the letters of the word Jesus (*Ιησους*), 888, which signifies a new beginning (according to Dr. Kl.'s symbolism of numbers: the contrast of the earthly), with 666; only our fathers do not do him justice! "But yes, says Kromayer, this name (which Irenaeus means of the Roman empire) fits the Antichrist; for the pope fortifies his empire by the Latin language." The use of the alphabet for numerical signs was peculiar to the Hebrews and Greeks; so the interpreters use only this peculiarity of the language for their research, and do not, as Kabbalism does, attach to the characters themselves new meanings quite foreign to them in ordinary use. But there is also the (otherwise less known) circumstance to be added that the word Romanus also in Hebrew letters (XXXXXX) results in the number 666, as anyone can convince himself by taking his Hebrew grammar to hand. That now the Lutheran interpreters did not want to pass by this unique circumstance, but rather a

*) Bellarmin raises the same objection with Dr. Kl.

The fact that the Christians found in it a miraculous play of divine wisdom and a secondary proof *) for the symbolic doctrine of the Antichrist is well explainable to us, as well as that this is very inconvenient for the interpretation of Dr. Kl. But Kromayer remarks on this wonderful number: "The number is not expressed more clearly, so that Christians may be trained in the study of the apocalyptic number and the comparison of prophecy with fulfillment, and also avoid dangers. For if it had been said that the Roman bishop would be the Antichrist, that the τό χαρέχον (which stops him) would be the Roman power which should be shaken before that, such prophecies would either have been destroyed, or even innocent bishops might have been killed before the time (of the Antichrist)." **)

That the author does not find anything of Luther, of the Reformation, in chapter 14 of Revelation, has already been mentioned; that he cannot find anything is already evident from the fact that the angel with the eternal Gospel only comes after his materialistic world kingdom with the Antichrist. Thus the angel (Cap. 14, 6.) - is an angel! Babel, with Hofmann, is the capital of the future world power, in which world city the world empire has the pulse of its life. The Antichrist divides himself with the world-city; he chastises it, that afterward the turn may come to him also. What is the use of following him on his errand who passes by the door that leads into the mysterious hall? Neither shall we wait for a Paris and Berlin in higher power, but remember the word of the Lord: "Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth," "wherewith is signified the unexpected coming of the Son of the most high God, who shall destroy the ἀνομον (the lawless one), and which words he cries out, that the slumberousness of security may be put out of men's eyes, if they do not yet see the kingdom of Antichrist quite destroyed, and therefore think that he will remain unconquered" (Crom.). But the sleep addiction even of the wise virgins can only be promoted by books that ignore the apostasy, and therefore can no longer warn against it. Luther's word: *Deus vos impleat odio Papae* seems no longer to apply to them. Basically friendly to antichrist, this interpretation is modern in that it (like modern natural science and science in general) acquires a new principle, from which it constructs a new world, that it does not take it exactly with the purity of doctrine. The words of our brethren in Germany, in their testimony to the doctrine of the Antichrist, also prove true: "All false doctrine, even all the finer doctrine of the evangelicals, ultimately amounts to a Roman lie." †) Alone - and this is the great question - has then the pope become different since Luther?

*) For the first proof is to be taken only from the words of Scripture, not from numbers, as Luther speaks as early as 1521: "I find it in Scripture, and am sure of it, praise God!"

**) A. a. O. p. 319. ff.

†) Cf. Lutherans, Vol. 33, p. 147.

Did not the Tridentinum, the dogma of the misguided chain, all of which Luther did not see, only confirm his doctrine? But if the Antichrist has not become different, then surely the Lutheran theologians must have become different! Therefore, we may not follow the author even where he indulges in theological side remarks, pious speculations. If such things cannot be called heresies, then here, too, we are confronted with a strange, - morbid trait. *Vestigia terrent*. Thus the overcomers on the new earth are to be an instrument of God, "through whom life and blessedness shall come to the perfected ones from God and his tabernacle." In the consummation, each Christian will stand opposite the other consummates, giving and sharing in his own gift, - so that all will be giving and so far subordinate, but all will also be taking from others and so far superior (I, 222). However, the idea that blessedness comes to the individual through instruments contradicts the immediacy of blessedness, which flows without means from the vision of God. The blessed have everything enough there; therefore they need not take anything from one another (except that they love one another and rejoice with and in one another). They are all kings; therefore they are not the one inferior to the other. Yet we find in the fathers another than this way of speaking of eternal life. "Blessedness is the sufficiency of all goods," says Anselm; "the blessed are blessed in that they are partakers of God," says Augustine. And Gerhard: "Because in their nature and essence they are not unchangeable in good and blessedness, therefore they have that blessedness in them, not of themselves or in themselves, but of God and in God, - God will be their blessedness." *) So let this interpretation have been written only to be repented of. Let it be read only, - to be rejected. As many interpretations, which, after God had revealed the Antichrist through Dr. Luther, wanted to find him in contemporary phenomena, the French Revolution, Napoleon, etc., have soon fallen into oblivion, so may it also happen to her.

(Submitted.)

On defense.

In No. 8 of the Luth. Herald, Dr. Moldehnke has again proved to what degree his hatred of the Missouri Synod has blinded him. Professor Asperheim, who used to teach at the theological seminary.

*) Loci de vita aeterna § 49, where also the following saying of Scotus is found:

Beatitudo est bonum sufficiens, excludens scilicet defectum et indigentiam; est et bonum perfectum et completum, excludens imperfectionem seu diminutionem; est bonum ultimum, excludens tendentiam ad aliud completius bonum.

who was employed by the Norwegian Synod in Madison, had said that he disagreed with the Missouri Synod in doctrine, and among other things reproached it: "in the doctrine of election by grace one excludes faith as a moment in election. Also in the field of the interpretation of Scripture one follows tradition too rigidly and one-sidedly." The pastoral conference in Milwaukee, as well as his colleague, Professor Schmidt, reproached him for this, and Pastor Ottesen was instructed to teach the erring brother better.

This effort of faithful Lutherans to practice doctrinal discipline in a brotherly manner on an erring person, to which they are sacredly bound by God's clear Word, now gives Dr. Moldehnke cause to blaspheme the Missouri Synod in an immoderate manner. He accuses Professor Schmidt, who has irrefutably exposed the mischievousness and dishonesty of the leading spirits in the Iowa Synod, of malicious distortions and lies, and concludes his article: "But how could he dare to doubt the infallibility of Missouri! The Lord preserve us here in grace from such more than papal yoke."

As far as the accusation is concerned that the Missouri Synod follows the tradition too rigidly and one-sidedly in its interpretation of the Scriptures, a glance at the doctrinal writings of the Synod shows that this accusation is absolutely unfounded. As proof we cite only the writing of Dr. Walther: "The Evangelical Lutheran Church the True Visible Church of God on Earth," in which p. 70 in the 15th thesis it says: "The Evangelical Lutheran Church recognizes no human interpreter of the Holy Scriptures whose interpretation for the sake of his office is to be regarded as infallible and binding, a. not a single person, d. not a particular state, o. not a Particular or Universal Council, 6. not a whole church." Further, Thesis 16: "The Lutheran Church accepts God's Word as it interprets itself." To this the venerable author adduces as a proof saying 2 Petr. 1:20: "This ye ought to know for the first, that no prophecy in the Scriptures is done of its own interpretation. " To which he declares, "By this single saying the interpretation of any man, whoever it may be, if it be his own, self-made and self-invented, is rejected, and only that is acknowledged of which the interpreter can prove that it is not his own, but that of the Holy Spirit Himself."

Hereby the honor is given as clearly as possible to the Holy Spirit, that he alone, who inspired the holy Scriptures, is also the infallible interpreter of them, and that his interpretation alone is binding on our conscience. With this, all human authority, tradition, and glosses, which want to place their own little foundations above or beside the interpretation of the Scriptures by the Holy Spirit, are at the same time rejected, and only that interpretation is recognized as permissible which is in accordance with the meaning of the Holy Spirit.

Now, since this is the rule of Scripture interpretation in the Missouri Synod.

as her writings prove, von Moldehnke is very wrong to approve of Asperheim's reproach that she follows tradition too rigidly and one-sidedly, since he must know that the same is completely groundless.

Furthermore, Asperheim had raised the reproach against the Missouri Synod: "in the doctrine of election by grace, faith is excluded as a moment in election. It is evident from this in what a great error he was. If faith, which is in a man, is supposed to be the motive of election, his blessedness is in the last analysis ascribed not to the grace of God, but to the doings of man; for, inasmuch as faith is God's work itself, it cannot again be a motive for God; and so, then, by the doctrine that faith is the motive of election by grace, the doctrine of election by grace and justification by grace is entirely annulled. This doctrine has always been rejected by the Lutheran Church. Thus it is written in the Concordia XI, *Antithesis* 4: "Accordingly we reject the following errors: Item, that not only the mercy of God and the most holy merit of Christ, but also in us is a cause of God's election, for whose sake God has chosen us to eternal life." "Which are all blasphemous, erroneous, and frightful doctrines, whereby Christians are deprived of all comfort which they have in the holy Gospel and use of the holy Sacraments, and on that account are not to be tolerated in the Church of God." *)

From such false teaching, which is condemned by our Church in the strongest terms, the Norwegian Lutherans sought to convert the erring man by fraternal instruction. When Dr. Moldehnke angrily exclaims, "The Lord preserve us here in grace from such a more than papal yoke," he only proves how his antipathy to Missouri has made him quite inaccessible to a correct understanding and just judgment of Missouri's doctrinal position. H. F.

(From the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church.)

From the Grand Duchy of Hesse.

The ecclesiastical events of the last decade in the Grand Duchy of Hesse provide an instructive glimpse into today's church history. Therefore, please allow me to go a little further in sharing them with you. - As in general the Hessians are one of the most powerful German churches.

*By the way, not only the symbolic books, but all orthodox dogmatists of our church without exception, teach that faith is indeed a part of the order established by God in election, but by no means the moving cause of it; and this is it, and nothing else, that Missouri teaches of this.

Since the Reformation, ecclesiastical life has developed in a peculiar and vigorous manner in Hesse. The northern part of the old Hesse, Kurbessen or Lower Hesse, was unfortunately alienated from the Lutheran church by its landgrave and led into a reformed church. The southern part, the later Grand Duchy of Hesse (along with a part that later came to the Electors, in and around Marburg), remained a faithful and decidedly Lutheran country. As a result, a predominantly Lutheran trait continued to be planted in the Christian revivals and movements of more recent times in Hesse. - As early as 1832, however, a unit ecclesiastical regime was introduced in the Grand Duchy of Hesse, and the new constitutional edict published at that time spoke of a state church, but in such a way that each congregation should retain its own confession. There were only a few Reformed congregations in the country. In seven places Lutherans and Reformed were united by special local deeds of union to form united congregations. This was a particular reason why the faithful Lutherans of Hesse later spoke of only seven union congregations in Hesse and claimed for themselves the special right to be well Lutheran, in spite of the united church government that went over all of them.

The newer times brought a widespread Christian revival also in Hesse. In the beginning, of course, it was pietistic, as everywhere in Germany, but in some places it was directed into Lutheran ecclesiastical paths. Especially in Hesse, a powerful circle of faithful preachers gathered in a highly gratifying manner. The Lutheran confession and the Lutheran church soon became the shibboleth among them. They formed an ecclesiastical association 15-20 years ago, which they called the "Lutheran Unification," and which counted over 100 members in Hesse. Preservation and implementation of the Lutheran confession and the Lutheran church in Hesse was the purpose of this "unification." Meetings were held twice a year, where things were lively and from which a rich blessing seemed to emanate. A fresh, vigorous spirit seemed to blow through these Hessians at that time, which justified the most beautiful hopes. There is no doubt that God intended to rebuild his church in Hesse, and he moved many hearts to do so, but human sin and foolishness thwarted almost everything. - At the head of all spiritual and ecclesiastical life in Hesse was Professor Vilmar in Marburg, from whom most of the younger Hessian theologians derived their education, as well as their entire Christianity. Vilmar was also the leading head of the Hessian Lutheran Unification and its conferences. At the latter, he usually took the floor. One must have known Vilmar (now long since deceased); he was nothing less than a parochial scholar, but with all his theological erudition a man of equally great gift for practical church life. In this he was a

Vilmar was an impressive, heart-warming personality and possessed a power of ravishing eloquence, not so much in the outward sound of speech, he rather spoke and preached very plainly, popularly and simply, but in the peculiar gift, which also Blessed Harms in Hermannsburg possessed to such a high degree, to speak in such a way that it came so directly from the heart, and therefore also penetrated so deeply to the heart. Thus Vilmar was without doubt for his circles completely the man gifted by God, through whom God intended to re-establish His Church in Hesse. Oh, that unfortunately Vilmar also shared the vice of other highly gifted and pardoned men, whom God gave to His church in Germany in recent times, namely, the being lost and trapped in one's own self-made theological ideas and views, which one prizes as special wisdom and further development of the Lutheran confession, and then - the sad and hopeful way of only wanting to speak and govern oneself. Vilmar, too, spoke at the Hessian pastoral conferences in this way; he could not bear to be contradicted, but demanded blind submission to his ideas, which he received only too willingly. Thus, as the future taught, Lutheranism in Hesse degenerated into a miserable Vilmarianism, and the "theology of facts," with which Vilmar and his followers had once done so great, finally came to nothing.

In my Steedener Blatt, March 1874, I already told how we Nassau Lutherans came into contact with Hesse 12-15 years ago, and how several small groups of Lutheran Christians, who demanded pure Word and Sacrament, joined us, first in Gedern in the Vogelsberg, who had left the Hessian State Church with Father Hofmann (now a member of the Immanuel Synod in Magdeburg), then in Kleinlinden and Allendorf and several places in the district of Giessen. It is likewise told there how we from the beginning stood in opposition with the Lutherans of the State Church in Hesse. Not only Vilmar's doctrine separated us from them, which we had to reject from the bottom of our hearts as gross heresy, but also our church practice. We did not engage in verbal disputes about the extent to which the Lutheran confession still rightly existed in Hesse; We demanded only, by virtue of the Bible and the Symbol, an actual renunciation of all ecclesiastical fellowship with false doctrine, while those who persisted in the national church were content with endless fruitless struggles and protests to the church government, and hoped that through the greatness, power and authority of their party they might finally obtain certain concessions and the restoration of these or those ecclesiastical rights. Thus a number of years passed. Then, in the autumn of 1873, the Hessian State Synod convened and, on the basis of its resolutions, the new ecclesiastical Union Constitution, dominated by a completely liberal spirit, was introduced in the Grand Ducal Hessian State Church. Despite all protests, synodal fights and counter-speeches of

On the part of the believing party, this constitution remained unchanged until today. With it, all Lutheran ecclesiastical efforts within the Hessian regional church had reached their end. The "Lutheran Unification," which had always sounded the trumpet of the Lutheran name and confession so loudly, dissolved; a number of about 15 of the more decided Lutheran pastors entered the path of renitence, a few with a number of congregation members," but by far the majority more or less silently put up with the new Union Constitution. Among them was the well-known Dieffenbach, publisher of the *Hausagende* and many a beautiful book of edification. Especially among the Lutheran pastors of Hesse it became evident in the saddest manner how there must be a lack of true unity and determination, of courage and strength for any firm church action, where the hearts are not clear and firm in pure Lutheran doctrine. A more disgraceful end, a deeper defeat than the so-called "Lutheran unification" in Hesse has suffered, has hardly been experienced in the ecclesiastical field in modern times. Apart from other half-measures, Vilmar's false doctrine of church and office completely closed the eyes of its followers to the image of a separate Lutheran church, free from the power of the state and built in faith only on the basis of the Word of God. Instead, they continued to chase after the phantom of a Vilmarian Romanesque outer church building, of a Hessian people's church, etc., preferring to remain in the Union rather than to take upon themselves the despised, poor and lowly sectarian form of separation.

This was especially evident in the case of the Hessian Renitents. Instead of thinking of the new building of a separate free church on a purely biblical-symbolic basis, of taking pleasure and joy in it in their hearts, and of praising God who had placed them on this pure ground, now loosened from all former ecclesiastical and state ties, no, instead they held tenaciously to the idea that they, the Renitents, were still the legitimate members and remnants of the Hessian Lutheran state church that had existed until then, the renitent pastors claimed to continue to hold their previous state church pastorate in spite of suspension and dismissal and, in spite of all punishments, actually continued it among their followers, by virtue of their old Lutheran ecclesiastical law they only rejected the new union constitution as an unholy one. A vain deception. For just as certainly as the Hessian Land Synod of 1873 was a synod consisting of lawful representatives of the *Landeskirche* and whose resolutions were later introduced in a manner conforming to church order, so certainly did they apply to the entire body of the Hessian *Landeskirche* and all its members, and only the right remained for each to separate or secede from this church fellowship, which had now been formed in such a manner. But the Renitents persisted in their ideas, and persistently continued their struggle to this day. Only after long frictions with the be-

After having been condemned to hordes and sentenced to heavy fines for every official act performed by them, they are said to have recently issued an actual declaration of separation in order to finally get peace. But time has thinned their ranks enormously! Of the 15 Hessian pastors who were renitent in the beginning, only a few are still there. Most of them went abroad, to various places, as a sign and testimony of the ecclesiastical ambiguity that prevailed among them. The Rev. Ebel and Schüler went to Prussia to the Breslau Synod, Strich to the Immanuel Synod; Rev. Baist, one of the main speakers formerly in Hesse, went after the dissolution of his renitent congregation to the Bavarian Regional Church, a number of others went into the service of the inner mission, Rev. Schlosser (already earlier) to Frankfurt, Rev. Zinser to Leipzig, Rev. Palmer to Bielefeld (to the Prussian Regional Church). Only 3 renitent congregations still exist in the Grand Duchy of Hesse, under the 3 pastors Lucius, Bingmann and Anthes, together comprising about 300 souls. They have elected Father Bingmann as their superintendent, according to Vilmar's doctrine and the old Hessian order, according to which the church was governed by superintendents and only the holders of the office of preaching were entitled to church government. These renitent congregations in the Grand Duchy of Hesse have lately been joined by Rev. Schedtler in Dreihäusen near Marburg. The latter, to be sure, goes much further than the others in following Vilmar and in various errors, as far as we know, but this does not seem to disturb the fellowship among them. In the case of Pastor Schedtler and his congregation, however, the most obvious thing is the crooked position and direction of the Renitents: not to build a Lutheran church according to biblical-symbolic doctrine, not to possess such a orthodox church in and for itself, no, but to maintain and preserve the Hessian regional church, the old rights and privileges of this Hessian regional church, that was the goal and striving from which they started. Not as a fight of faith, but as a "legal fight", especially Rev. Schedtler and those like-minded to him called their renitence. Accordingly, from the beginning, Father Schedtler willingly accepted anyone who declared that he wanted to join him in this legal struggle, so that a crowd of 1500 souls gathered around him and has remained with him to this day. This group, however, represents the image of a genuine country church congregation, church discipline is not practiced, but in this respect one calmly continues on the old country church path, satisfied that one has happily preserved one's "church right" after all. Recently a large new church was consecrated in Dreihäusen, where Pastor Bingmann acted as Superintendent, consecrated the church and then handed over the newly consecrated church to Pastor Schedtler, as we are told by those present. Here, too, Vilmar's ideas of episcopal church constitution seem to have played a role. - The Renitents in Hesse seem to have no prospect at all of increasing their numbers.

to have. On the contrary, lately, after the first excitement and movement caused by the new church constitution of 1873 has subsided, everything in Hesse has sunk into a complete sleep of death; the Landeskirch pastors, realizing the uselessness of all further steps and endeavors, persist in mute resignation in the bonds in which they are forged, and in the congregations, likewise, everything rests in Ktrchhof peace, now that the time is past when God has once more visited the Hessian people in grace. But what a sad, lamentable outcome of things in Hesse! What a mighty ecclesiastical rain and activity only 10-15 years ago, what a loud cry and public struggle in writings and protests for the Lutheran confession and the long-established right of the Lutheran church in Hesse, how strengthened one was to persist in one's post and to faithfully defend the good cause of the church and the Lutheran faith even unto death! And today? The ship has sunk in the midst of the ocean storm, the waves and billows have crashed over it, and deathly silence now covers ship and crew; only a few small groups have saved themselves from being swallowed up.

The Breslau Synod has also settled in the Grand Duchy of Hesse in recent years, specifically in Allendorf near Giessen, in view of our small separated congregation that was first founded there. This happened in a very strange way. A nice numerous circle of believers was already found 12-15 years ago in our Allendorf. When I first appeared there with the trumpet of pure Lutheran doctrine, everyone seemed very much inclined toward us; but when some joined us completely and it became known that the path we were taking was toward separation from the regional church, the faithful pastors of the regional church put themselves in the middle. Especially Pastor Schedtler in Dreihäusen and Pastor Baist in Ulfa warned against our doctrine as well as against separation: one must bravely persevere in one's position in the regional church, where one is placed by God, defend the right of the Lutheran confession within the regional church, must not yield a finger's breadth to the enemies, etc. At the same time, they suspected that our Nassau Church was on the way to separation from the regional church. At the same time, our Nassau Lutheran congregations were suspected of not being true Lutheran congregations because we had no church government. Thus, unfortunately, many of the believers in Allendorf allowed themselves to be heard and withdrew from us. They kept to themselves for a long time under the leadership of some outstanding members among them. When we appointed Pastor Wagner 3 years ago, they did not want to stand back, but were prompted to turn to the rebellious Pastor Lucius in Usenborn, who also came to Allendorf several times and administered Holy Communion there. But suddenly the matter took a completely unexpected new turn. Namely, Pastor Schüler resigned from his office in Hesse, took the side of the renitents and seemed to hope to find a position and congregation among the faithful in Allendorf that would be suitable for him. As we know from credible

worthy source, it was not exactly fine how Pastor Schüller sought entrance in Allendorf, appeared there one Saturday morning, urgently persuaded the faithful who had already turned to Pastor Lucius, partly by written, partly by verbal promise to call him, whereupon he wrote to Pastor Lucius that the Allendorf congregation had called him, that it was now his. It is a fact that from then on Father Lucius no longer came to Allendorf, but Father Schüller officiated there from then on. But it seems that his plans did not work out as he wished; perhaps he hoped for a large increase and the possibility to settle down as pastor in Allendorf. But the calculation failed. On the whole, there were only 6-8 families in Allendorf who were loyal to Pastor Schüller; in addition, there were a few more in the surrounding area. So Pastor Schüller took a different path, he accepted the Breslau congregation in Rade vorm Walde and promised his Allendorf parishioners to visit them from there every 4 weeks. This has happened until today. But God is to be lamented that all this confusion has been created in Allendorf, and woe to him who is to blame for it! He will have to bear his judgment one day. How sadly torn are the believers in Hesse! How has God's word been hindered and destroyed in Allendorf! How they first tried to keep the believers away from us and to remove them, pretending that they would not be separated, that they would faithfully stand on the post of the regional church, and now they finally fall into the hands of a pastor who leads them to the separated people in Breslau and promises to pastor them from a distance of almost 100 hours at the greatest expense! And all this without the slightest knowledge and distinction of pure or false doctrine, merely through human impulses, through self-chosen doing and making. If one had followed the biblical Lutheran path, especially in Allendorf, which was shown there by us Nassau Lutherans, with simplicity and without vows, what a flourishing Lutheran congregation, united and firmly established in itself, under the leadership of its own pastor, could now exist there! Thus the devil has succeeded in hindering God's word, most of the believers have gone their own self-chosen ways, and thus everything has fissured into parties, to the Christians' deep heartache and annoyance, to the world's scorn and ridicule. May God graciously intervene and have mercy on his poor church in Hesse, which has been shattered by so many ailments. Brunn.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Pulpit Fellowship in Pennsylvania. When the Reformed Synod met a few weeks ago in Lancaster, Pa., five Lutheran (?) pulpits were opened to the Reformed pastors, among others.

The New York Ministry cannot find a congregation in whose midst they can hold their meeting. The secretary publishes the following notice in the Lutheran Herald "in the name of the synod officials": "After the Honorable Lutheran Ministry of the State of New York, according to the resolution of June 13, 1877 (Synodal Report 1877, p. 64), has left the determination of the place for the next annual meeting of the same to its officials, I hereby bring to the knowledge of all Synod members that the officials, in spite of all efforts, have not succeeded in fulfilling this order. Both the public request made to our synodal congregations for this purpose (Herald of March 21, 1878) and various inquiries made privately for this purpose have remained fruitless." - According to the last number of the "Herald" the Synod has found a place - Utica.

Dr. Moldehnke calls Pastor Severinghaus's "Kirchenfreund" of June 15 a "good guide in regard to the road which in the Lutheran Church is called 'the right one'-and which in the articles on church and ministry leads not via St. Louis, but via Buffalo." - Happy voyage! But the destination will probably be Rome.

W.

From the South. At the Southern Lutheran General Synod, recently assembled at Newberry, S. C., Dr. Seiß was present as a delegate from the General Council. A letter of welcome was received from Dr. Butler, President of the Northern General Synod. It was decided to restore the former fraternal relationship with the Northern General Synod and also to send a delegate to the General Council. It seems, then, that no great difference is found in the South between the Northern General Synod and the General Council. After such symptoms, how might Dr. Seiß have felt? - Rev. Hawkins, to whom the "*Lutheran Visitor*" is now committed, begins his new career with a denial of the Lutheran doctrine of the descent into hell. After citing the same, he says, "But there is no ground for it in the Bible." He seems to draw his theology from Knapp, according to the editorial in question. But so long as the American Lutheran theologians draw their dogmatics from Knapp, and their church history from Mosheim - and in some cases from even worse writers, things cannot get better. - A certain Rev. J. B. Davis lectures for the cause of the *Patrons of Husbandry in North Carolina*. While the editor of the *Lutheran Visitor* regrets that this gentleman is deprived of the pulpit by this work, he says of the work itself that it is "good and noble, and exceedingly needful in the South." This is shameful.

Indian Mission. About what the General Council is doing in regard to the Indian Mission, the following is reported in the Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung of May 3: Among the Indians the mission had always had a difficult work. The vices of the whites, the brutal, faithless treatment on the part of the government, the nomadic way of life of the tribes had often placed insurmountable obstacles in the way of missionary work and forced many a post to be rescinded. The Missourians had many a bitter experience in this field. Now the Swedish Augustana Synod, one of the best members of the General Council, has begun to tackle this field. In 1876, Rev. Oolssvn made a journey among the Indians, and on the same met the chief of the Delawares at Lightning Creek. This chief was also a Baptist preacher and was called Rev. Journeycake. Oolsson learned that the Baptist mission among the Delaware tribe had existed for 42 years, but that only 218 Indians had been baptized during that time. Journeycake had no objection to a Lutheran mission among his tribe, if only they would let him alone. He advised him to go to the Pawnees. The Kansas Conference of the Augustana Synod now resolved in the

In 1877, the synod decided to send Pastors Oolsson and Dohlson to the Indigner area. They were followed in April of last year by the missionaries chosen by the Synod, Johs. Telleen, pastor at Des Moines, and Sjöberg, formerly a worker in an organ factory at Mendota, Illinois. These two missionaries traveled throughout the Territory from the beginning of April to the middle of May. During their sojourn among the Delawares, they found that this tribe had dwindled to about 1000 souls. The daughter of the Reverend Jourmeycake, the chief, conducted a Sunday school. A small church of the Indians had been destroyed by the storm. The outrages of the whites are hair-raising. The service, which Pastor Oolsson held, they disturbed in every possible way. The Indians had held their services in the pastor's home next door after their church was destroyed, but this house was riddled with shotgun blasts fired by the whites during the services. The Sunday school building was also almost entirely destroyed by the whites. From the Delawares the travellers proceeded to the Pawnees, who dwelt about a hundred miles inland from there. Sir found no field here, however, the Quakers having the Pawnee agency in their hands, and therefore moved on to the Cheyennes, where they were quite well received. But as the Mennonites already had a station here, the brethren journeyed on to the Hiowas, Comanches, and Apaches. These tribes are completely uncivilized; their homes are in the area around Fort Sie. From there we passed through the territory of the Chickawas, who are to some extent civilized and live in nice houses and have good schools and even seminaries. At the Choctaw station we found some Swedish families and a Dane who had never heard God's word here. Pastor Telleen preached here for two days, visited the families, and found them kindly received. At Fort Gibson they were also cheered up to missionary work by two Presbyterian missionaries. At their last meeting in May, B.C., the Synod now resolved to apply to the government at Washington for an Indian agency. The answer was delayed, and it was decided to establish a station near Fort Sie for the present. Into the collegium of the synod at Rock Island, Ill, were admitted in the fall, three youths of the Delaware tribe; two of them baptized of the Baptists, the other still a heathen.

The Reformed Synod was assembled at Lancaster, Pa. from May 15 to 23. From an account of the meeting given in the "Reform. Kirchenzeitung" we find the following: "Divided into two camps, as these delegates of the forty-five classes of the church met, the main interest culminated at the very beginning in the election of the president. Whether high or low churchmen, as the two directions are usually distinguished, have the majority, was to be decided by the election of the president by ballot. The first ballot showed equality of votes. Some believed that this was a divine indication that the Synod should now decide by lot. But the other view, that a second vote must take place, prevailed, and this resulted in Dr. D. Van Horn, the candidate of the so-called Low Church, being elected by a two-vote majority. The tension between the two directions, however, continued until Monday evening, the 20th. At this meeting Dr. Weiser, of Pennsylvania, read a paper which he had been carefully preparing for some time, and which . . . contained certain propositions . for the formation of a commission to be appointed by the various district synods in proportion to the number of members, and to which all points of difference pending in the church are to be referred, in order to initiate a reconciliation. After this point had been settled, and the necessary arrangements had been made for the appointment of the Peace Commission, as we shall now call it, the business of the Synod moved on to the next point.

to the conclusion in a new channel. - Whereas, at former assemblies, appeals upon appeals were made from the decisions of the presiding officer to the synod, where, on all important questions, the yeas and nays were demanded, or the 'foredays' proposed, this never occurred at the present assembly." - Hereafter it would seem that both directions have become more and more indifferent as time has gone on, which admittedly evinces nothing less than hopeful progress.

A convention of the United Brethren Church was recently in session at Dayton, Ohio, for 3 days. On the part of the Committee on the State of the Church, an order of resolutions was called, declaring that lay delegation and prorate representation was more just and should be made an element of church government. The most important act of the convention was the appointment of a board of trustees for the establishment and publication of a journal to represent and enforce the principles of the convention. Among the resolutions adopted was one declaring that the convention looked favorably upon a union of the Brethren Church with the Protestant communion.

(Chr. Botsch.)

II. Abroad.

Saxony. The "Sächsisches Kirchen- und Schulblatt" (Saxon Church and School Gazette) of May 9 reports from Dresden: "The consecration of the newly built St. John's Church aroused a participation which showed in an uplifting way that the church-friendly sense has not died out in the big city. According to this, one would think that at least no unbeliever would take the pulpit in the newly built church. The "Pilgrim from Saxony" of May 12, however, which also brings the news that the newly built church is very beautiful, adds at the same time: "Unfortunately, in the person of Deacon Dr. Peter, a pastor has been chosen for the newly built church who loves to put his gifts at the service of the church-destroying Protestant association." When "believers" report with joy about the dedication of a beautiful church, in which Christ and His Word are blasphemed, this indeed suggests a strange "faithfulness".

W.

Separation is now considered in Germany almost the sin of all sins, while fighting it absolves from all heresies. In reference to the wretched writing of the Alsatian pastor Hackenschmidt, "On True and False Lutheranism," the Breslau "Kirchenblatt" of May 15 says: "When one sees that the same has found a commendatory recommendation in the Lutheran church newspaper, one must painfully come to the belief that in certain circles a writing becomes commendable simply because it speaks against secession. - Among other things, Hackenschmidt declares it to be wrong when the 7th article of the Augsburg Confession is thus applied by certain Lutherans: "In the church the gospel is to be preached purely. Let us look at our Alsatian, Bavarian, Saxon regional churches. It is evident that many deviate from this. So we must demand of the church authorities that they punish and expel such false teachers. If our protest finds deaf ears even with the state authorities, then the only thing left for us to do is to separate and found a new church, for a church without doctrinal order and doctrinal discipline is no longer a true church." Strangely enough, however, the "Kirchenblatt" adds: "Here we could already counter that perhaps the Missourians speak in that way, but that we, who are the first Lutherans to leave the church, do not speak quite in that way, as, for example, it was recently called out to the Lutherans of the state church in these papers: if you only do your duty within your office, then we will not be able to do anything.

the further things will be found. According to this, the Breslauers seem to claim that because they were the first Lutherans to leave, they should know best when it was time to leave. W.

Free Church and National Church. In his *Neue Zeitblatt* of May 2, Dr. Münkler criticizes Pastor Harms and his congregation for, among other things, stating: "The Creuz congregation heartily confesses the full confession of the Lutheran Church, from the *Symbolum Apostolicum* to the *Concordia* formula included," because without a doubt only very few members of the congregation have even read the *Concordia* book. Hereupon he continues: "Do not object that with such principles the congregations of the regional church must fly apart. These principles are not at all applicable to the *Landeskirche*. The national church takes people as they are, good and bad, ignorant and insightful, in order to nurture them and train them in faith, knowledge and Christian life, even if it only achieves this purpose in the smaller part. But they, the separated, are offended by unbelief, ungodliness, religious strife, and union in the national church, and since they separate from it, urged on by conscience, it is their sacred duty to do the opposite in all this, and to set the example of pure faith in well-founded knowledge and holy conduct. If this really happens, one may deplore and blame the resignation, but the national church will still have wholesome preachers of repentance for those who have left. But if this is not the case, the separation is doubly evil. Therefore it is unacceptable to try to justify the wrongdoing in separation with the wrongdoing in the national church." No "believer" has ever more recklessly disregarded the abominations of the national church than Dr. Münkler does hereafter. W.

"In the *Mecklenburgische Kirchen- und Zeitblatt* of May 29, Pastor Plaß writes the following, among other things: "In the past I did not send regular gifts to Hermannsburg for the mission. Now I do, and doubly joyfully. ... Now is *status confessionis*. Missouri is leading the fight in America, the 4 missionaries in India, besides others Brunn in Steeden, Harms in Hanover. As in every battle, mistakes in tactics, even sins, could not be avoided by both parties. I do not represent every word, nor every step, which the four named parts of the troops have made known. But I am all the more vociferous and resolute in my opposition to Lutherans treating our historically inherited **symbols** as if they were tea leaves, from which they filter a beverage for themselves, which, after all, is the spirit of the Lords themselves, but not the spirit of our Lutheran fathers.... . Hermannsburg used to have almost too much money. If Leipzig and Hermannsburg could not be helped, Leipzig, the *poor mission*, had to have the preference. Now many who do not stand by the letter and syllables of the Lutheran symbols turn to Leipzig to get rid of the thorn in their conscience that the Hermannsburgs have thrown in. Even if I were to admit that Harms' doctrine of copulation was false, which I do not, would a breadbasket law recommend itself for the sake of such a false doctrine concerning 'ceremony'? If now, in the case of leaders of the Leipzig mission, many deviations from the wording of the symbols are admittedly found, why should a different measure and weight be applied in the case of Leipzig?" - A strange position! This much is true, however, that it is a great inconsistency to no longer support the Hermannsburg Mission for the sake of conscience, while remaining faithful to the Leipzig Mission.

W.

Hanoverian Separation. The *Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung* of May 3 reports: The separated congregation in Hermannsburg, consisting of 1320 souls, has received the Missionary

Inspector Sülmann was chosen as their second pastor and assured him a salary of 1500 Marks along with free housing. The orphan school, whose teacher was dismissed by Harms quite simply because he could not decide to separate, has been transformed into a parochial school. The building of the church, for which many materials have been donated, is already being diligently worked on." Dr. Münkkel wrote on May 16: "As a result of the separation, 400 copies of the Missionary Gazette were cancelled some time ago. In addition, there is the great need for money in Africa with an empty missionary treasury. In order to cover the debts, the Mission has borrowed 60,000 Marks from the Hermannsburg Savings Bank, for which some members of the Committee have vouched with their farms." It is not nice when Dr. Münkkel, in his bitterness, writes: "It tastes strongly of enthusiasm when one imagines the Hermannsburg congregation to be a congregation of saints, and now even sees it gathered in the 'Creuzgemeinde' that has left. Not the 'salt', but many a good grain of salt has been separated out, besides also parting water, vinegar and very foul-smelling puddle water (e.g. almost all the drinkers and drunkards of the old congregation), which nevertheless looks quite lovely in the light of Harms' description. The new righteousness of separation covers the sins tolerably, that Harms cannot see them." - Now it is bad art, in the national church, thus to run down poor Harms. To attack what was wrong with him at the time when he was still generally celebrated as the greatest ornament of the Hanoverian Landeskirche, that took more. But then Dr. Münkkel not only kept silent, but also branded those who were pleased to criticize even Harms in all modesty.

W.

Ecclesiastical marriage. If marriage, as we have already noted elsewhere, must be consecrated by a church minister in order to be valid, because it is a state endowed by God, then authority, which is also a state endowed by God, must also be consecrated by a church minister in order to be valid. A certain Pastor Fähndrich has now also asserted the latter in a pamphlet to combat civil marriage! He writes: "Through which human organ does the king receive his kingship and with it his royal right also over the lives of his subjects, as far as it is due to him? Not also through the priesthood? Such is the ancient order in the kingdom of God." So then one error always gives birth to others, and to greater ones.

W.

From Stade in Hanover the following is written to the "Hannov. Courier" the following is written on May 5: "Some (lay) members of the local Protestant Association, who have always disliked the abstention from public worship forced upon them by the retention of formulas and confessions that have become obsolete for them, have believed that for the sake of essential, purely human statutes they should not continue to withdraw from church fellowship. They have asked to be admitted as guests to the public communion according to the previous Lutheran rite. They have done so, however, so as not to offend probity, only with the express declaration that they do not recognize the Lutheran doctrine of the real enjoyment of the true body and blood of Jesus Christ in the Lord's Supper, but rather see in the presentation of bread and wine only a symbolic act for the celebration of the dedication and remembrance of Jesus Christ. The act itself, however, was higher to them than the scholastic subtleties attached to it, and they, for their part, after this open preservation of their subjectivity, could accept the Lutheran formula: 'That is,' etc., unobjected to. At the same time, they would like to be able to demonstrate how unfounded the assertion is that the Protestant Association wants to destroy the Church of Christ. The admission to the Lord's Supper thus sought is refused by one of the city preachers, -not by another." - The

Pastoral-Correspondenz rightly remarks on this: "The path to 'church peace' recommended here could only be entered into with gross denial of the principles of our church concerning admission to the Lord's Supper." But what does the church regiment say to this, if one of its pastors enters this path after all?
W.

Bavaria. The "Society for Inner Mission in the Sense of the Lutheran Church", once founded by Blessed Löhe, has reported through its chairman, Pastor Wucherer, about its activities in the past year. It is remarkable what is reported from Neuendettelsau. In the "Freimund" of May 2, we read the following: "The report of the Neuendettelsau District Association begins with the complaint that the association is comparable to an aging tree, which soon here, soon there a withered leaf, a branch falls off, but to which one may not yet apply the species, remembering the word: 'Do not spoil it, there is a blessing in it. The association is still active, even if only to a small degree; it is still a loose cohesion of the better elements in the community; if it were to fall, we would not know what to put in its place; we must not call it a pure relic that we only keep because it has been brought here once: This is reason enough for us not to break the traditional form of our social life, but to cultivate it and wait patiently to see whether the Spirit of the Lord cannot and will not breathe new life into it.... Some names stand in the membership directory with the same right as Pontius Pilate in the Credo. When I look at the membership list of our Society, I always have the impression: There is still too much of the people; and this strengthens my conviction that the preparation of a new list of members would considerably sift and clear the names/ Thus the report of the Neuendettelsauer, who can nevertheless report that they held seven meetings, at which they had the advantage over others of being able to share letters from former missionaries and other interesting news from the American and Australian mission field; likewise also from the history of the Lutheran Free Church on this side and on the other side of the ocean."

Unrighteous communion discipline. The "Evangelisch-Kirchlicher Anzeiger" of Berlin reports: "In a local church on one of the last Sundays, a young man dressed poorly came to the communion guests in order to participate in the holy communion. A woman who was present informed the sexton that the young man in question was not confirmed. Without causing a stir, he was summoned to the sacristy and the question was put to him by whom he was confirmed. The answer was: 'From the registrar'. The person in question was excluded from taking part in Holy Communion and informed of the reasons for the rejection." - Whether the poorly dressed man believed in the mystery of Holy Communion or not would have been immaterial, but whether he was confirmed according to the church order or not, that decided the admission. S. Matth. 15.

Erlangen. Hofmann's successor in Erlangen is Dr. Zahn, who opened his academic activities there on May 2. Professor Zahn, so reports the Ev.-Luth. Allg. Kirchenzeitung, once sat at Hofmann's feet for three semesters and gladly confesses that he was a grateful student of his.

Consequence of the Assassination. In a correspondence from Berlin of June 7 it says: "Until now one consoled oneself (on the part of the Liberals) with many wishes and hopes that a change of throne would bring fulfillment to many of them. Now this prospect must be regarded as diminished. For the fact that the Crown Prince is intimidated seems beyond doubt. The Protestant orthodox, who were to fear from him, are on top." - It may be remarked in passing on this occasion that the

disreputable Nobiling, who carried out the second assassination attempt on the Emperor, is, according to recent news from Germany, the son of a Prussian "Old Lutheran" and is said to have received a strict Christian education in the house of his parents.

Kalthoff, of whom we reported in the last issue (p. 192) that he was suspended, has, according to more recent news, finally been completely relieved of his parish office by this authority "because of violation of essential official duties," as the united Collegium of the Consistory and the Provincial Synodal Board would like to express it.

Old Catholicism. When the Old Catholics in Germany held their fourth synod at Bonn on the Rhine last year, as "Freimund" wrote on May 2, they gave their total number as 53,640, the number of their clergy as 56. Prussia has 21,797, Baden 18,866, Bavaria 11,338, Hesse 1155, Oldenburg 247, Wuerttemberg 237 souls. In Prussia, for example, there are 35 congregations with 6510 independent men and 25 clergymen. The largest congregation is in Cologne with about 3500 and the second largest in Breslau with 2900 souls. Although the number of souls had increased by several thousand in comparison with the previous year, the hope that was so confidently entertained by the wide spread of Old Catholicism has not yet been fulfilled and will not be fulfilled. And yet an extraordinary amount has been done to bring the number of Old Catholics to hundreds of thousands, even to millions. The professor and collegiate provost Dr. Döllinger in Munich famously said that thousands of priests would think like him and publicly declare themselves against the infallible Pope. He had to learn that the latter did not happen. Not even a single hundred of Roman priests in Germany have publicly declared themselves against the infallibility of the Pope. Döllinger himself has for some time noticeably withdrawn from the Old Catholic movement and kept quiet. In spite of so much and so energetic support, Old Catholicism does not want to go forward as desired. One clergyman after another turns his back on it. - We have just read the news received from Bonn on June 14: "The Old Catholic Synod has adopted a resolution against the celibacy of the clergy by 75 votes to 22." Good as this resolution is against the antichristic and diabolical prohibition of marriage and the unfaithfulness connected with it, it now comes too late.

W.

Divination. The ultramontane Germania reports about a meeting in Eisleben, which dealt with the production of a Luther monument. To its concluding sentence: "The monument is to be erected on the four hundredth anniversary of Luther's birth, November 10, 1883," the Germania makes the addition: "That would be too late; on November 10, 1883, the Lutheran Church is no longer alive." - So reports Dr. Münkel's Neues Zeitblatt of May 9. So great a spiritual blindness it betrays, when the Papists prophesy the downfall of the Lutheran Church, that those who do all they can to prepare the downfall of the true Lutheran Church in Germany should not too surely despise even such prophets.

W.

The Jesuit Curci, who, as is well known, wrote so zealously against the necessity of the temporal power of the papacy, has recanted and now recognizes it again as an article of faith. One sees here again that as long as a papist remains captive to the papist doctrine of the church, there is no papist error, however atrocious, that should not at the same time hold him captive; just as Luther, too, could not recognize the gospel clearly until the pure doctrine of the church went out to him.

W.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 24.

August 1878.

No. 8.

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

(Continued.)

XII. Of original sin.

A. Thetic

Schmalkaldic Articles: "Such original sin is such a deeply evil corruption of nature that no reason can know it, but must be believed in the revelation of Scripture." (III., 1. p. 310.)

Concordia formula: "But if it be further asked, what then is original sin an accidens, that is another question, whereon no philosopher, no pope, no sophist, yea, no human reason, however keen the same may be, can give the right explanation, but all understanding and explanation must be taken from holy scripture alone. Which testifieth that original sin is an unspeakable pity, and such a corruption of human nature, that in it, and in all its inward and outward powers, there remaineth nothing pure nor good, but all things especially are corrupted; that through original sin man is truly spiritually dead before God, and dead unto good with all his powers." (Art. 2. Rev. p. 586. f.)

Augsburg Confession: "Further, we teach that after Adam's fall, all men who are naturally born are conceived and born in sins, that is, they are all full of evil desire and inclination from their mother's womb, and can have no true fear of God, no true faith in God by nature; that also this same inherent pestilence and original sin is truly sin, and condemns all to the eternal wrath of God, who are not born again through baptism and the Holy Spirit." (Art. 2. p. 38.)

Quenstedt: "One has to distinguish between the natural and the moral head. Adam, in so far as he is the natural head of the human being.

Inasmuch as he was, according to the other way, the moral head, representing the whole posterity, inasmuch as what he himself sinned, is by imputation passed on to the posterity." (*Theol. did.-pol. P. II. c. 2. f.998.*) *)

The same: "The 7th question is: whether the Adamic Süde is in truth and rightly imputed to the whole human race by God? . . . The point in dispute here is, ... whether that first act, inasmuch as it was a sinful and temporary one, is ascribed and imputed to us as if we ourselves had stretched out our hand to the forbidden tree and sinned? . . . The first sin is 1. On the part of Adam himself, who, by a single transgression of the law, entangled all his posterity both in guilt (oulpue), and in confusion (*reatui*), and in punishment, inasmuch as the will of him was by all means the expressor of the will of all those, Which, as the Scripture speaks, were in his loins, or which lay hid in his seed, to whom sin already became proper by being expressed, that is, by being born with the absence of the perfection which should be in them. The will of Adam, as the principle and root of the human race, was not considered essential to ours, but as having come to expression. For the first man had the wills of all his descendants, as it were, laid down in his will, and therefore, contrary to the given law, he manifested to himself and his descendants his and his descendants' dispositions. (2) With respect to God, as the judge, who, according to the supreme right that is proper to him, punishes the crime of his violated divine majesty also in the descendants, as those who fell in Adam, through the lack of original justice, as such, and therefore imputes the Adamic sin in a more just manner to them for damnation. ***)

*) Disting. inter caput naturale et morale. Adamus, in quantum caput naturale generis humani, infecit omnia membra, atque ita ab ipso per propagationem transiit malum inhaerens in totam posteritatem; posteriori modo, in quantum fuit caput morale, repraesentans totam posteritatem, in tantum imputatione derivatum est in posteros, quod ipse peccavit."

) Quaestio 7.: An peccatum adamiticum vere meritoque toti humano generi a Deo imputetur? ... In controversiam hic venit, ... an primus ille actus, in quantum sc. fuit actus peccaminosus et transiens nobis ita approprietur, itaque imputetur, ac si ipsi manum extendissemus ad malum vetitum et peccassemus. . . . Spectatur peccatum primum 1. ex parte ipsius Adami, qui unica numero legis ruptione omnes posteros cum culpa, tum reatui, tum poenae implicuit, quatenus nempe voluntas ejus interpret erat voluntatum omnium omnino eorum, qui, ut Scriptura loquitur, in lumbis vel femore ejus erant sive qui

B. Antitheses.

v. Hofmann: "Nor does Scripture teach that there is sin and death, or what the concept of sin and death is, nor search that sin and death are hereditary, but only traces both back to man's first moral self-determination. . . . We have no more need of a separate statement that all men are sinful by birth than that all are mortal by birth. But Scripture teaches neither the one nor the other, neither that all men are sinful and mortal - for it ought to teach the latter as well as the former - nor that sinfulness and mortality are inherent in human nature. All that is brought to prove such a doctrine of Scripture is but recollection of a fact which is self-evident." *) (The Proof of Scripture I, 425. 441.)

He said: "The biblical account of the sin of the first-created man teaches us that it was an object of the corporeal world toward which his desires and actions were sinfully directed. His will did not oppose God's will in such a way that he did not want what God wanted because God wanted it, or in such a way that he knowingly wanted the exact opposite of what God wanted. God had given him power over the fruit of the trees around him, excepting only one tree whose fruit would bring him death. To lift this barrier of his God-image dominion over the world around him, he allowed himself to be determined by the tempter." (Op. cit. p. 411. f.) "Leaving aside what sin becomes by opposing itself to the grace of God, it is essentially desire to make the world

in virtute ejus seminali delitescere, quorum jam interpretative proprium factum est peccatum, ita ut nascentur in absentia perfectionis debitae inesse. Voluntas, inquam, Adami utpote principii et radicis generis humani censebatur nostra, non formaliter, sed interpretative. Nam primus homo omnium posterorum voluntates in sua quasi voluntate locatas habuit, unde et contra datam legem pro se et posteris suis suum et posterorum declaravit animum. 2. Respectu Dei, ut iudicis, qui jure, quo pollet, summo crimen majestatis laesae etiam in posteris, utpote in Adamo lapsis, carentia, qua tali, justitiae originalis punit, adeoque peccatum adamiticum justissime illis ad damnationem imputat." (L. c. f. 993. s.)

*Philippi writes: "Hofmann himself says that the Holy Scriptures contain no actual doctrine of sin and death, but presuppose as a matter of course what is generally known and recognized about them. This means, however, that it teaches nothing but what is already known to the natural understanding of man from general human experience. But this consciousness, as is well known, is expressed in the rationalistic proposition that man is a lapsed being, subject to death and given over to the impulses of sensuality, and that therefore his personal spirit, originating in bodily nature and rising out of it, finds itself conditioned and dominated by this nature." (Ecclesiastical Doctrine of Faith. III. Second ed. 1867. p. 237.)

to possess as God has given it to man in general or to this man in particular nickt to possess, desire for removal of the barrier of his possession of the world. In a word, it is (desire)." (p. 413.) "The narrative of the Fall, and the Pauline passage discussed above (Rom. 7:7.), make us realize with how good right sin has also been named as the love of the creature instead of the Creator, or as sensuality. According to Scripture, it was not the beginning of human sin to want itself in contradiction to God, and it is still the beginning of its practice, but to want the world for itself in contradiction to God; and the serpent's seductive promise that they will know God as good and bad, that is, as to what this contradiction is, does not change this, in that it makes man long not for self-deification, but for God-like knowledge of the world and mastery over it. This, however, is not the selfishness of an ego that sets itself against God and what is God's, but that of an ego that covets what is created by God in an anti-divine way. Hence also the way in which God restores sinful man to his salvation, consists in this, that he lets him know how he has made an evil his own instead of a good, and that he presents him with a good, namely, himself in Christ, that he may rather gain the same than the good of his desire, which he has recognized as evil." *) (p. 414. f.)

The same: "As long as the ego is still a developing one, it cannot be said, as it was afterwards, that it is the subject of sin, but it becomes so in the measure in which it becomes itself, in which it consciously begins to determine itself, or rather to allow itself to be determined by the inherent sin.

*Philippi makes the following remarks on these and similar statements by Hofmann: "For our part, we are unable to find anything in these propositions other than the usual rationalist theory of sensuality, and we are also convinced that, apart from von H. and his school, no one can and will find anything else in them. This theory, which appears in various forms with the same basic principle, appears here only in a specifically Hofmannian form. The frailty and mortality of the bodily human nature, which is one with its innate sinfulness, prevents the personal spirit from making the bodily nature thus constituted the means of its self-actualization; instead of mastering it, it is mastered by it: but this sinful natural will or natural instinct becomes actual sin only in the measure in which it forms itself into the consciously personal act of transgression." (A. a. O. p. 235. ff.)

**Philippi: "Hofmann's doctrine of the present sinful nature of human nature, so far as we have come to know it, does not differ essentially in any point from the doctrine of ordinary rationalism. Hofmann knows no evil will that is naturally inverted in itself; he knows only a physical or physical-psychic, not an ethical corruption of nature. - It is only in this that Hofmann's theory differs from the rationalist theory, that whereas the latter

The same: "The apostle speaks (Rom. 2, 14.) of the case that Gentiles, without possessing a law, a revelation of the demanding will, do that which the will of God revealed in Israel demands, and says of such doing of them that it happens φύσει (by nature). .. Thus the apostle (Rom. 2, 14.) considers it possible that, by virtue of this law, a man may be able, though only in particulars, to act according to divine demand, that he holds out the prospect that, perhaps, on the day of judgment, out of the thoughts produced by the testimony of conscience, a self-justification may be made before God, which may then be graciously accepted by him who exercises his judgment through JESUS CHRIST, the Mediator of grace. ""*) (A. a. O. p. 494. 495. f.)

He said: "We do not need any artificial assumption, such as that all the descendants of Adam were in him, or that he sinned as the covenant head of the human race, but remain with the simple fact of the unity of the human race, by virtue of which each individual is not only a member of the race, but also the beginning of it. The individual did not share in Adam's sin, but because the beginner of the race did it, it is the sin of all who come from him. In this sense we have it in our

The present nature of man sits with you as an original one, v. h. it as one that has become later. For it is to him a nature imparted by the transgression of Adam." (A. a. O. p. 247. f.)

*) On this Philippi remarks: "This, nevertheless, according to p. 570 (ed. 2.) this is not to contradict what our ecclesiastical confession teaches of man, how he, in relation to God, is in himself and apart from all effects of grace, that he is incapable of some good and inclined to all evil, as this, as is well known, is the peculiarity of Hofmann's theology, that in spite of the fact that it nowhere teaches the same thing, indeed mostly the opposite, it still wants to agree everywhere with the ecclesiastical confession. Now what is the formula by which this beatification of the Gentiles by the works of nature is harmonized with the ecclesiastical creed? The apostle, we are instructed, knows of an effect of grace, not only of the God who sent Christ, but also of the God whom Christ will send; and he knows of it not only within the Old Testament community of salvation, but also outside of it. For in order that men (as descended from Adam) should have life in the world, they continually become aware of God both outside and within themselves. The Spirit of God, which indwells them to make them live, does not leave them without witnessing to God, whereby a conduct against God may be wrought in them, which he will return with eternal life on the Day of Judgment. But this is God's work and not their own. (!) It is his love which makes them live, and through his Spirit, the spirit of their life, he bears witness to them. So here again we have nothing but a play with words, a naturalizing mixture of the spirit of God as the spirit of the natural life set by creation and the spirit of the spiritual life set by redemption. If at the beginning the exposition seemed to amount to enthusiasm, at the end it is shown that it amounts to rationalism." (Op. cit. p. 242. f.)

(A. I. O. p. 491. f.)

A. F. C. Vilwar: "One should not have identified with this word *reatus* the older and sharper Latin word *culpa*, as the imprecise and in the use of words especially of the rhetorical synonymy often downright careless Latinity of the 16th and even more of the 17th century did**): *culpa* denotes authorship; and this can only belong to the protoplasts, not to the afterborn. This mixture of *culpa* and *reatus*, in which already the Apology of the A. C., then the F. C., participated, was followed with the beginning of the 17th century by the concept of *imputatio*, imputation, which, strictly speaking, corresponds only to the concept of *culpa* . . . According to this, a distinction was made between an *imputatio mediata* = imputation of guilt because of the transferred sinfulness (*defectus* and *concupiscentia*), and an *imputatio immediata* = imputation of Adam's sin in and for itself. To this latter, *imputatio immediata*, the question now arises: how can a foreign guilt be imputed to me? and this question, so understood, cannot, however, be given a sufficient answer. ... The *imputatio immediata* cannot be justified in any other way than by the doctrine, contrary to Scripture, of the preexistence of souls, which existed before Adam, and at his fall (or before) were directly, immediately, as presently, and also co-operated." (Dogmatics. I, 370. ff.) (To be continued.)

(From the Mecklenburgische Kirchen- und Zeitblatt of June 12.)

Church and Ministry.

As I remarked at the conclusion of my last article on the conferral of office (1877, No. 14), the narrow scope of this journal does not permit more than a passing mention of the exceedingly comprehensive questions of church and office.

*Philippi: "The present nature of man is to him mediated by the transgression of Adam, but as such it is also quite self-evident, because the physical nature of man, which has since been subjected to sensual corruption and physical death, is also reproduced in Adam's descendants. We see by this example how the dissolution and transposition of revelation into a series of historical facts goes hand in hand with the dissolution and transposition of the Word of God into human doctrine." (A. a. O. p. 248.) - And with such a false teacher, who dissolves the whole doctrine of the Christian religion and converts it into the doctrine of men, those who wanted to be decidedly Lutheran have, with the exception of Philippi and a few others, cultivated brotherly fellowship, praised him as a pillar of the Lutheran Church, and now they are going about erecting a monument to him even after his death!

**This is a mistake. *Culpa* and *reatus*, as can be seen, among other things, from Quenstedt's last thesis above, are, however, precisely distinguished by our dogmatists.

touch. I have therefore seen fit to refer repeatedly to "the voice of our church in the question of church and ministry," to which, as to the Lutheran doctrine, I also now heartily confess myself. *) I would also be able to limit myself to this now, if the articles on "Priesthood and Ministry in the New Testament" did not call for a renewed response on my part in this paper as well. Without wanting to spare myself a thorough reading of the aforementioned book, it seems expedient to me to place the entire theses of the same here and to use them as a basis to reject the objections made or otherwise common in this paper by means of brief remarks, with the urgent request to want to read for oneself the exact Scriptural proof given there along with the testimonies cited.

"First Part. Of the Church."

"I. Thesis.

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

What this first thesis confesses is fundamental to the whole Lutheran doctrine of church and ministry; here the basic differences come to light; here the deviations of modern theories from the scriptural teaching of our symbols prove to be fundamental. "The church" is identical with the "congregation of the saints"; the church is "the whole," or the sum of the faithful, as such is unfortunately denied on the opposing side. But he who denies this, pays homage to a doctrine long since rejected by our Church, and altogether foreign to Holy Scripture. - We would also point out how wrong and misleading it always is when, in teaching about the Church, one mixes together the various terms, the various senses in which the word "Church" is used, and does not make a clean distinction between what the Church actually is and what is also called "Church. In the end it would occur to someone to say that the church is "on one side" a building intended for worship, whereby the confusion would become great and a true monstrosity of "church" would arise! It is all in our interest that

*The honored readers who sincerely seek the truth and are willing to accept it, even if it were to be found in the so generally despised Missouri Synod, and who shy away from condemning a church with its doctrine without knowing it, we call attention to the fact that the above-mentioned book (at a price of only 3 Marks) as well as all "Missouri" and generally all good Lutheran literature can be obtained from Heinrich I. Naumann (Dresden Pirna Str.), where catalogues are also available free of charge. Naumann (Dresden, Pirnaische Str. 36), where catalogues are also available free of charge.

that the confession of the Apostolicum, "One holy Christian church, the communion of saints," not be falsified. As long as there is no agreement on this point, all debates about church and ministry are completely fruitless; we will never reach an agreement.

"II Thesis.

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

No one who calls himself a "Lutheran" may contradict this thesis either. But so do all those who speak of "sick members of the body of Christ. If nothing else than the imperfection of all Christians were meant by this expression, it could well be heard, since Christ is the physician of the sick, not of the healthy, although they, as members of his body, are healthy, "without spot or wrinkle," but this expression is expressly referred by the moderns to the unbelievers, who, according to Lutheran doctrine, are outside the church, in the realm of the devil.

"III Thesis.

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

Who denies this? All those who say that the church is an "organism of congregation and ministry. The ministry (here, of course, understood *in concreto**) is not something invisible, and can therefore never belong to the concept and essence of the invisible church. The church is not a visible organism, but the sum of the faithful, the children of God, who through the Holy Spirit have holy fellowship with Christ and among themselves, and as the invisible body of Christ form an invisible organism, but not a visible organism of church and ministry. For "though the wicked and ungodly hypocrites have fellowship with the true churches in outward signs, names, and offices, yet if we would speak truly of what the church is, we must say of this church, which is called the body of Christ, and has fellowship not only in outward signs, but has goods in the heart, the Holy Baptism and faith." (Apol. C. A. Art. VII. & VIII. p. 154. 12.) True, the communion of the invisible church is mediated by the outward signs, but neither these signs nor the outward communions belong to the concept and essence of the church in the proper sense. "For, praise God, a child of seven years knows what the church is, namely, the holy believers, and the little sheep that hear their shepherd's voice." Who sees there an organism of which he can say: This is the Church?

*) When we speak of "office", we must distinguish the office *in abstracto*: the authority of office, and the office *in concreto*: the office bearers.

"IV. Thesis.

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

If, after the foregoing, it is certain what the church actually is, it is evident that all the goods, etc., which are given "to the church," belong to the church in the proper sense, that is, to the believers. The whole church has faith, inasmuch as every individual Christian has it; the whole church has the Holy Ghost, inasmuch as every individual believer has it; the whole church has Christ, inasmuch as every individual believer has him; the whole church has the word of God, inasmuch as every individual Christian has it, whole and undivided; the whole church has the keys, or the ministry, etc., inasmuch as every individual Christian has them by the Holy Ghost, through faith in the word. What heavenly things then are these, which may be had without faith? Outward profession, indeed, as a mere servant of another, as a commissioner of that which is not one's own, one may be, as well as Balaam, but never actual owner, possessor. But if in our thesis the words "holder" and "bearer" are used, only gross ignorance or deliberate disregard of the remarks on this thesis can understand them in the sense in which all believing Christians are actually holders and bearers of the public office as ministers in the concrete sense, as pastors. Rather, they are so in the sense in which a prince is the holder and bearer of all the offices, powers, and official positions which he confers on certain servants in his country who are suitable for administration. He, therefore, who touches this thesis, touches the right of faith and of the faithful. But that this right of faith is "identical with the right of the Word of God" and has nothing to do with the right of "a subjective faith, may it believe what it will" should be sufficiently clear from the thesis alone. If, therefore, Pastor Techel acknowledges all that he cites on p. 103 from Professor Dieckhoff's writing, he may well agree with the present thesis.

"V. Thesis.

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

Is this not quite the same as what is read in the excerpt from Dieckhoff's writing p. 120 d. Bl.: "Not, in which persons the church,

The place where the keys are given can be known, but only where it is can be known by the certain characteristics of it. It is there where the word of God is preached"?

"VI Thesis.

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

According to this, the visible church or the visible churches are not identical with the invisible church, nor, as some teach, is it the same church viewed only from another side (as, for instance, a body may be viewed from the right or from the left), nor is it another, second church, but the word "church" is used in another (inauthentic) sense. A synecdoche takes place here, in that I call the visible community "church" for the sake of the invisible church hidden in it, just as I call a field of wheat mixed with weeds wheat for the sake of wheat (for a *potiori parte fit denominatio*).

"VII Thesis.

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

Does not our opponent also admit this when, following Dteckhoff, he writes: "She (the Church, namely) can never in herself appear as an acting subject; she remains in herself, according to her nature, an invisible one; and the visible Church, in which she is acting, whose acting is to be her acting, and without whose acting she herself can have no acting*), etc."? And when he adduces the classic words of Luther: "Quare ubicunque praedicatur verbum dei et creditur, ibi est vera fides, petra est immobilis, ubi autem fides, ibi ecclesia, ubi ecclesia, ibi sponsa Christi, ubi sponsa Christi, ibi omnia, quae sunt sponsi. Ita fides omnia secum habet, quae ad fidem sequuntur, claves,

*) Underlined by me. H.

sacramenta, potestatem et omnia alia?" - But this thesis, as we shall see further, is of the greatest importance for the doctrine of the ministry. Actually, all ecclesiastical power is vested only in the actual Church, for she is the bride and owner of all treasures. "For the visible church, about which the question of the ecclesiastical constitution is concerned, it is true that every one, also every collection of parts of it *) has the right to enforce the right of the church, i. e. the right of faith according to the word of God," as T. states from D.'s writing, naturally for the sake of the church hidden in it, whose existence is recognized precisely by its characteristics. But because the invisible church has all heavenly treasures only through the faith of its individual members, to each of whom all belong, we cannot share the view that the key ministry, etc., is given only to the whole church as a whole, and that therefore each individual church has it only through the mediation of the whole invisible church. The whole church, as stated above, has faith, the Holy Spirit, the Word of God, etc., only in the individual members, and indeed in each individual fully and completely. The power of the keys, etc., is not, like the invisible church, scattered over the whole world as a whole, so that in different places there are always only certain parts of it, but where there is a part of the invisible church, there is not a part of the power of the keys, but the whole power, whole and undivided.

"VIII Thesis.

Although, where God's Word is not preached wholly pure, and the holy Sacraments are not administered wholly according to the institution of JEsu Christ, God gathers a holy Church of the elect, if there God's Word and Sacrament are not altogether denied, but both remain essential; yet every one, in his blessedness, is bound to flee all false teachers, and to shun all erroneous churches or sects, and, on the contrary, to profess and respectively hold to the orthodox churches and their orthodox preachers, where he finds such. to keep where he finds such."

In this thesis the principles of a right, scriptural, Lutheran separation and union are set forth, the same principles by which the Missourians, as true Lutherans, are also practically guided, since their confession is not a mere "science" to them. They must therefore, of course, be "a sacrifice of all people," but blessed are they that they may suffer shame for the name of Christ. And blessed is their union on the foundation of the pure word of God and in the unanimity of the confession. There the word of God is truly the only rule and guideline of all faith and life (even though daily everywhere people sin against it, as it cannot be otherwise among sinners). There "the right of faith, the right of the word stands above the right of the decisions of the (empirical)

*) Underlined by me. H.

communio sanctorum" (as such their position on the "open questions" clearly shows). There is the church discipline commanded by God and thus a firm barrier against the "rule of the subjective spirit" in doctrine and life. Such arbitrary doctrine as in our national churches, which have fallen into decay, is foreign to them. Even the "lord omnes," the "unorganized masses abandoned to demagogic agitation," cannot decide there, as here, by "majorisiren," for instance, the elections of pastors, or whatever else it may be. We therefore have every reason to seriously repent, instead of using all means to suspect those from whom we should not be ashamed to accept instruction and strengthening of faith.

"IX. Thesis.

Only communion with the invisible Church, to whom alone those glorious promises concerning the Church were originally given, is absolutely necessary for the attainment of blessedness."

In this thesis the ecumenical spirit is rightly manifested in relation to the large and small sects which make salvation dependent on membership in the external church fellowship, as one hears much talk that whoever separates himself from any church fellowship separates himself from the church. He who confesses this thesis from the heart cannot be misled by the question where he ought to go if he gives out a false church fellowship and no other is ready. Thus we remain "under heaven or in heaven," we would answer. The first and main question is not to which visible church fellowship one is to adhere, but that one is a member of the body of Christ, the invisible church, and only then that one separates himself from the false church and adheres to the orthodox church.

D.

H.

Miscellany.

State Church. In a review of the paper: "Zur Existenzfrage der evangelischen Landeskirchen," Lic. Ströbel remarks in Guericke's Zeitschrift d. J. p. 490: "The lack of suitable ministers in church and school will of itself destroy the state church and school, and only the free church will be possible."

Alsace. From this province, the Allg. Kirchenzeitung of May 31 wrote, among other things, the following: Concerning doctrine, one might think that because we are still a church of the Augsburg Confession (as this at least can be read on the official stamp of our church documents), church doctrine is also directed according to this confession. Whoever thought this, however, would be in great error. For in fact, in doctrinal matters we have a truly "paradisical freedom. On a comparatively small church prayer there is a whole number of catechisms.

The church has been authorized and in use for many years. And, we add, not to the detriment of the church, but for its good. For if the church authorities were at present to introduce a uniform catechism, a liturgy, or a hymnal, which, according to the existing conditions, could not be other than in the sense of liberalism, this would lead to severe struggles and easily to a separation, for which, as it seems to us, one is better prepared and prepared in Alsace than in many German countries. The regional church association is therefore carefully preserved; but our liberal church regime seeks, as naturally, to make it as difficult as possible for confessional textbooks to find their way into the congregations.

New Literature.

The Creeds of Christendom. New York 1877. Harper & Brothers

The following is what we read about this work in the Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung of June 21:

The lack of such collections of symbols, which are designed according to the principle, if not of absolute completeness, then of the greatest possible richness, has been attempted to be remedied by the well-known North American theologian Dr. Phil Schaff, professor at the *Union Theological Seminary in New York*, by means of a work of truly significant design published last year. His three-volume "Bibliotheca symbolica Ecclesiae universalis" (with the special English title: "*The creeds of Christendom, with a History and Critical Notes*"). New York 1877, Harper & Brothers [gr. 8.] 60 Mk.) aims at giving, besides the ecumenical symbols of the early church period, as complete a compilation as possible of particular creeds of all the denominations of Christendom at the present time. The "History of the Creeds", which precedes the texts of the symbols, fills the first main part, a volume of close to 1000 pages. It combines, as the author's earlier writings, especially his "History of the Old Church" (Leipzig 1867), show, a concise and elegant form of presentation with solidity of content based on thorough studies. That the author is German by birth, that he is a theological disciple of Neander, and that he is a scholar who is essentially familiar with the course of the newer church-historical research since Neander, is just as evident in every point of his presentation as his current contact with the ecclesiastical-theological circles of the new world and his familiarity with their peculiar endeavors and forms. The luminous clarity and the practical skill with which he also deals with many of the more difficult matters of the history of dogma and theology, which are supported by specific theological presuppositions and are less accessible to the uninitiated.

The historical introductory passages referring to the Greek, Roman, and Calvinist confessions seem instructive and worthy of imitation for many of his German colleagues. In particular, the historical introductory sections on the Greek, Roman, and Calvinist confessions are worthy of our almost unqualified praise in terms of their clarity and attractiveness for wider circles. The detailed prehistory of the Vatican decrees, for example, which is given on the basis of the best German, English, and American accounts, may be called a true model of popular treatment of such material from the realm of the recent ecclesiastical past; it corresponds, precisely because it also contains interesting details of a more external nature from Pius IX's deeds and politics, as well as from negotiations, with vivid precision. The addition of the so detailed critique of the dogma of infallibility may appear as an excess of the task set to the author in this respect, and not less also the following chapter on the Old Catholics is written from the point of view of an overestimating the importance of this party.

Among the most meritorious parts of the historical section is also the history and appreciation of the reformed confessions of Anglicanism and English-Scottish and American Presbyterianism. The sections devoted to it would make a handsome volume if printed as an independent work. None of the previous accounts of symbolism has devoted to the 39 Articles of the English Church in particular, as well as to the Westminster Confession, an equally thorough account with regard to their history of origin, their dogmatic significance, and the various revisions and attempts at revision which have befallen them. The author's many years of residence in North America, as well as his familiarity with the ecclesiastical conditions there, and his cultivation of active relationships with the various main denominations of Reformed Christianity there, must have been of particular benefit to this part of his work. He understood excellently how to use the advantages that accrued to him from this for the treatment of the relevant area of his task. Also the presentation of the newer, mostly reformed sects and their confessions in the final chapter has drawn substantial benefit from his position as co-founder and long-time leader of the North American branch of the Evangelical Alliance, which is evident in more than one aspect.

The least satisfying section of the historical part concerns the Lutheran Church and its confessions. Not as if it were not also given a rather detailed consideration; the author by no means looks down on it with the sovereign disdain as so many others do.

The author is a member of the Lutheran Church and is a member of the Lutheran Church. He has an independent knowledge of the history of Lutheran dogma and the historical-critical and dogmatic literature relating to the symbols of our church, which shows relatively few gaps. He develops the doctrinal disputes that serve to explain the Formula of Concord with thorough interest and with similar clarity as the prehistory of the Synod of Dordrecht and the Synod of Westminster, or as that of the Vatican Council. But the objectivity and impartiality of exposition which he has elsewhere preserved, leaves him here entirely. He writes like an excited accuser of Luther, not like a calm and level-headed critic. In particular, he does not know how to do justice to the Concordia formula in its peculiarly great importance in historical and dogmatic terms. He calls it the "*sectarian* symbol of Lutheranism" in contrast to the Augustana, as its "*catholic* symbol"; he thinks that Luther, viewed from the standpoint of the Concordia Formula, should have been considered a bad heretic; he finds it inwardly contradictory that Article 2 of the Formula upholds Luther's doctrine of original sin in full rigor, while Article 11 condemns predestination: a contradiction that can only appear to him to be an absolutely irreconcilable one as a result of the blatant exaggerations and one-sidedness with which he conceives and presents the doctrinal content of both articles. In the history of the origin of the Formula of Concord, as well as in the more distant history of orthodox Lutheranism, he includes a number of features of the most unfavorable kind, compromising both the theological luminaries and the dogmatic formulation of the confession. Selnecker, Phil. Nicolai, Calov, etc., occasionally also Luther himself, are branded as detestable examples of Lutheran zealotry, while on the other hand, where similar samples of uncharitable zeal and spiteful quarrelsomeness would have had to be pointed out from the history of the emergence of reformed symbols, e.g. the Helvetic Consensus Formula, silence is virtually total. Only Lutheranism should appear to be afflicted with such a bad *chronique scandaleuse*! In Calvin, on the other hand, and especially in the Heidelberg Catechism, the encomia of older and newer theological critics of both confessions are presented in lavish abundance; the historical sections relating to them read like veritable panegyric!

The author's evangelical alliance position is not to blame for the one-sidedness, but rather the traditional bias in confessional-reformist prejudices, perhaps already carried over from Germany to America, as well as the intimacy of the relationships he maintains with a part of modern union theologians. As he often enough cites Planck's hostilities against the Lutheranism of the Concordia formula without making any criticism of them, so he all too often follows Heppe's hardly less one-sided representations.

However, he seems to have remained completely unfamiliar with the critical treatment of the relevant events on the part of more recent Lutherans, such as with H. Schmid's "Kampf der lutherischen Kirche um Luther's Lehre vom Abendmahl im Reformationzeitalter" (Leipzig 1867). If only he had at least tried to imitate Schneckenburger and M. Goebel more abundantly and consistently than he has done here and there in their objective and prudent procedure in assessing the confessional differences in doctrine and life between Lutheranism and Reformedism! His ecumenicalism and broad-mindedness in the sense of the Evangelical Covenant should have guided him to such a way of evaluation that more strictly adhered to the maxim of *suum cuique*. That he repeatedly deviated from this and became a one-sided eulogist of his own confessional position does not at all correspond to his favorite motto: *In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas*.

We come to the consideration of the second and third part of the work, of which the former presents the Catholic, the latter the Protestant creeds, partly in the original text with attached English translation, partly at least in the latter. Here, too, the richness of what is offered is to be emphasized above all as meritorious. We know of no collection of symbols that comes so close to the goal of at least relative completeness. The editor himself obviously did not strive for absolute completeness; in part, the Calvinistic one-sidedness of his position prevented him from achieving even greater completeness, as will be shown in a moment.

In the second part, in addition to the ecumenical symbols, namely the three usually so named, along with the Chalcedonense and the antimonothelite symbol of Constantinople (680), the more important rules of faith and private confessions of the pre-Nicene fathers have also been included, accompanied by brief historical introductory and exegetical notes. These explanatory notes cannot, of course, replace what C. P. Caspart has done to comment on this literature in the great work: "Unprinted, Unnoticed and Little-Noticed Sources on the History of the Symbol of Baptism and the Rule of Faith", as well as what the second edition of A. Hahn's well-known "Library of the Rules of Faith and Symbols", published in the previous year, offers on the basis of this work, but on the whole they appear to be suitable for introducing further circles to the study of symbolic sources. The Roman symbols follow, including the three derived from the Pontificate of Pius IX (*Decretum de immaculata conceptione*, *Syllabus errorum*, and *Decreta Vaticana*), but without the Roman Catechism, which has been omitted because of its low authority and because it would have expanded the scope of the work too much. Even of the Greek symbols of the seventeenth century, only the *Orthodoxa Confessio* and the *Confessio Dosithei* are considered to be the

The author has not included the two most important ones. The author has omitted the many only secondarily important confessions of the Oriental epoch of symbolism, such as the *Confessio Critopuli*, etc. He has, however, provided a complete English translation of Philaret's larger Russian church catechism of 1839. On the other hand, he offers, and thus he has undoubtedly significantly increased the value of his collection, the larger Russian church catechism of Philaret from 1839 completely in English translation, an admittedly less original document, which, according to its content, largely coincides with the Orthodox Confession of Mogila, but nevertheless important, which is missing in Kimmel's collection of oriental symbols and even in W. Gaß's "Symbolism of the Greek Church" has a passing mention. The meaning of the two Old Catholic symbols given in the last section of this volume: the 14 theses of the Union Conference in Bonn in 1874 and the resolution of a second conference held there in 1875 concerning the origin of the Holy Spirit, can be judged differently. Nevertheless, the communication of these documents serves to complete the material concerning interesting ecclesiastical events of recent times.

The third part begins with the texts of the Lutheran symbols; but here he allows himself three omissions of grave importance, insofar as he offers only Luther's Small Catechism and only the *Epitome of the Concordia Formula*, but omits the Schmalkaldic Articles altogether. It would be difficult for him to gain the approval of any Lutheran theologian of the old or the new world for such a shortening of our *Corpus librorum symbolicorum*. Especially the mutilation of the Concordia formula includes a real injustice in view of the mentioned attacks on this symbol in the historical part. The peculiar merits and beauties of its doctrinal development can only be seen in the executed form of the *Solida declaratio*; the relationship of its shorter and longer parts to each other resembles in more than one respect that between the Augustana and its Apology. Far sooner than these integrating parts of our *Concordia*, the articles of the visitation of the Electorate of Saxony from 1592 should have been omitted, which the author has added as an appendix, after he had already given their text in English translation once, on occasion of their history of origin in the first part.

The area of the reformed confessional writings has been considered by the author even more completely. Here, even such documents that only temporarily attained a certain importance are not missing, such as Zwingli's 67 Articles of 1523 or the Bernese Ten Theses of 1528, or the Calvinist Lambeth Articles of 1595 and the Irish Articles (Usher's) of 1615. The text of the Westminster Confession of 1647 is also accompanied by the later American amendments. Likewise, several of those congregationalist "declarations" by which

the English and American Independentism characterized its special position in relation to the Westminster Confession, co-known in the main by it, found admission; so the Savoy Declaration of 1658, the Declaration of the *Congreg. Union of England and Wales* in 1833, that of a Boston Council of 1865, and that of a Council held at Oberlin in Ohio in 1871. Also several Baptist and American Presbyterian confessions, which are missing in the other better known collections of symbols, are included in this last section, which refers to the newer sects. However, this part of the history of the sects lacks real completeness. All the confessional writings of Swedenborgians, Irvingians, Unitarians, and Universalists are completely missing, and several of these defects are quite sensitive in nature. If, in order to save space, the author wanted to refrain from including such voluminous writings as Swedenborg's "*Vera Christiana religio*" or the Rakau Catechism of the Socinians, some smaller documents that serve to characterize these very parties or their offshoots, e.g., the universalist Winchester Catechism, would still have to be included. For example, the universalistic Winchester Confession of Faith of 1803, which has been persistently ignored in European works on symbolism, although it is held in no small esteem within the party in question, should necessarily have been included. Nor should the author have passed by such sects of the German Lutheran Church as several of the Würtemberg sects, e. g. that of the Templars, so entirely. Of the Herrnhutters or, as they are called by him, the "*Moravians*," he communicates the Easter Litany of 1749 in German and English, but omits the London Short Confession, the so-called *Brotherly Agreement*, etc., which has become important for the development of this party in England.

If some of these omissions, and not only those concerning the Lutheran symbolic literature, but also, e.g., the complete ignoring of a still and especially also in North America so powerful party as that of the Unitarians, are explained by the editor's strictly Calvinistic direction, then, on the other hand, also his stay of many years in the New World may have contributed to making him more distant from some of the phenomena which an enterprise of his kind, aiming at the greatest possible completeness, could not ignore, e.g., those sects of Würtemberg, and thus making their transfer seem more or less irrelevant to him. e. g. those Würtemberg sects, and thus to let their transfer appear more or less irrelevant to him. In any case a part of the gaps in his on the whole quite rich literature reports is explained by his living on the other side of the ocean and by the for the time being still only sluggishly going bookseller traffic between over there and over there. In his description of the oriental-ecclesiastical relations he has not used the great work of Pichler: "History of the ecclesiastical separation between the Orient and Occident" (Munich 1864), has studied the Roman symbolic literature and church doctrine without consideration of J. Delitzsch's "Doctrinal system of the

He has worked on some of the Lutheran symbols without knowledge of the latest monographs concerning them (e.g. on the Apology without knowledge of G. Plitt's book "Die Apologie der Augustana geschichtlich erklärt" [Erlangen 1873]), and has even discussed the origin and significance of Calvin's Institutes without taking note of Köstlin's thorough analysis of this work in the 1868 volume of "Theol. Studien und Kritiken". In relation to the actual richness of what he offers, these and some similar omissions certainly do not mean much. However, it is clear enough from what we have said that the work, by virtue of its comprehensive structure and execution, claims an outstanding place in our modern symbolic-theological literature and must be called indispensable for anyone who is committed to in-depth studies in this field.

Explanation.

The undersigned was informed some time ago that Dr. F. W. A. Notz, Professor of the Northwestern University at Watertown, Wis, had made the assertion in the "Schul-Zeitung," edited by him, and sought to substantiate it, that small theological seminaries are capable of accomplishing more in every respect than a larger one, e.g., a comprehensive seminary, the establishment of which was proposed and recommended within the Synodal Conference on the occasion of the meetings of the same in the years 1876 and 1877 by representatives of some of the synods belonging to this body. While the undersigned did not think he could doubt the reliability of the information given to him, he took the liberty of rejecting this assertion in the strongest possible terms as being contrary to all reason and experience in the public meeting of our Synod of Delegates this year. From an article in the "Schul-Zeitung," which bears the heading "Zur Seminarfrage," and is to be found in the second to fourth numbers of the said paper a. c., we now see that we have been misreported; we therefore declare with great pleasure that our criticism was quite without object, and that in that article Dr. Notz has developed principles to which we ourselves must confess to be as biblical as they are experiential. C. F. W. Walther.

Ecclesiastical - Contemporary.

I. America.

Pennsylvania Synod. This Synod held its meeting this year at Easton, Pa. during Trinity Week. Those who think that this time the Synod has made progress "toward a decidedly sound Lutheranism" are very much mistaken. That this is not so is already shown by the resolutions presented by Dr. Krauth concerning the change of delegates with the Reformed Synod. According to the translation of the journal, they read: "1. If this Ministry, by means of an exchange of delegates, maintains friendly intercourse with the General Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States', it is not its opinion to weaken in any way the firm conviction which both Churches hold alike, on which their separation rests, and to which their mutual symbols, as well as their efforts for their self-preservation and self-perpetuation, continually bear witness: That the confessional differences which divide them are not *trifling*, but things of the greatest importance, - so important, indeed, that they alone justify them before their own consciences, and before the judgment-seat of Christ, when they maintain their separate organizations, and testify against each other, as of old, continually, in all those points in which one accuses the other of departing from the word of God. This *correspondence* between the two Synods is therefore in no way based on unionism and does not justify any unionist conclusions, and cannot by law have any influence on any principle regarding altar and pulpit fellowship that this ministry may "deem necessary" if it wishes to remain consistently a Lutheran body that accepts the Augsburg Confession and the other parts of the Book of Concord in thesis and antithesis without reservation. The "*Lutheran*" reports that the resolutions are a had been adopted with difficulty. The journal says: "the resolutions were adopted with some protesting votes." In another number it also says that they were adopted unanimously. The "Pilgrim" writes: "Last year voices were raised that wanted to abolish the exchange of delegates with non-Lutheran bodies; this year they were silent. Why? Dr. Krauth's 'resolutions' muzzled them, and that is perhaps the saddest effect of them." The same "Pilgrim" goes on to write: "All this reads quite nicely and would suffice under certain circumstances. But if one considers the usual change of delegates with all that is attached to it, one must testify from a Lutheran standpoint: the declaration, in spite of the strong language in which it is written, is insufficient; it will certainly not eliminate the unionist greetings of the mutual delegates and the unionist pulpit fellowship on the occasion of certain synodal meetings, etc.; but one will still seek to justify such unionism precisely by the change of delegates." The journal judges: "Obviously the emphasis of these resolutions lies not in what they say about the change of delegates per se, but in the protest against unacceptable consequences which have been attached to it in many cases." But we think these inferences the Pennsylvanian Synod, notwithstanding all its resolutions, will not be able to escape, any more than a society could do so, which would evidently do wrong, and yet resolve: Resolved, That this wrong shall by no means entitle us to inferences, that we do contrary to God's commandment, or desire the same to be somehow abolished, and if we act contrary thereto, to be delinquent. Fraternal intercourse with false believers remains sin, however much it is dressed up. Synodal decisions lift up God's commandment and prohibition

not on. The "Zeitschrift" further says: "The author of the same (resolutions) has, after his manner, handled the matter with ice-gloves." But as long as this happens, one has not yet taken a proper step toward "a decidedly healthy Lutheranism." A decided Lutheran does not allow himself to be ruled by the fear of man and the pleasing of men, but is only afraid of God's Word, Isa. 66:2. By the way, Dr. Krauth did not touch the matter at all, when seen from the bottom of things. But what was the other important subject besides the briefly agreed upon one already mentioned? The "funeral question." "Three years ago," relates the journal, "two congregations ... made an inquiry of the Honorable Synod of Pennsylvania, how the burial of suicides was to be treated. The matter was referred to the Conferences for discussion. After the same had occupied themselves for two years with the discussion of this question, the result was communicated to the Synod at its (pre-) last meeting in Allentown in the form of theses, but the subject was again recommended to the Conferences for discussion." So the discussion of the theses was resumed this time. "Unfortunately," says the "Pilgrim," "they did not get far in the same. The first thesis reads: 'The ecclesiastical funeral is that burial of a deceased person in which a duly appointed minister of the Church officiates, regardless of whether individual parts of the usual ecclesiastical funeral ceremony are changed or omitted altogether.' Unfortunately, it was not even possible to agree on this sentence, which was obvious even to a child of ten years. An amendment, however, according to which only the officiating of the pastor 'at the grave' should give the funeral a church character, was happily voted down." - According to the report of the "Zeitschrift", we can see the following from the further negotiations: "Dr. Späth reported on behalf of the committee which had been appointed last year to discuss how the teachers of our parish schools could be brought into a closer relationship with the Synod: 1. That the duly appointed male teachers of our parochial schools be kindly invited to attend the meetings of the Conferences; 2. That the District Conferences be instructed to admit the same as advisory members upon sufficient credentials or personal examination; and 3. That the proper change be made in the Constitution of the Synod." These "proposals provoked, to the surprise of many, an exceedingly warm debate, which, however, ended in a resounding victory for the Committee Report. The opponents were mostly on the English side, but not exclusively.... The objections which were raised against the extremely cautious committee report were sometimes of a very strange kind: then all Sunday school superintendents, or all elders and superintendents of the congregations, and who knows who else, would have to be given advisory votes! This would destroy the balance of the Synod, and a one-sided influence would be exerted in favor of those congregations which have parochial schools. Of course, these are very few in our synod!" - Another resolution is: "That the pastors be obliged, when administering Holy Communion, to use no other words than those which are found in the liturgy issued by the General Council." "This," says the "Magazine," "is contrary to the Unionist second form found in the old Agenda, wherein are the words: 'Our Lord JEsus Christ speaketh'." Thus, then, the Synod decided something good. The bishop question was not settled. Some pastors were exempted in a ministerial session. So the laity still have no say in the admission of pastors, according to well Grabau's concept of the church.

The Canavasyndod. From the report of the meeting of the Lutheran Canavasyndod, which is found in their "Kirchenblatt", we learn the following: "Also

With regard to the rule without exceptions' with regard to pulpit and altar fellowship, the synod came significantly closer. All members agreed that exceptions should not be made. However, since such exceptions may occur here and there in the various synods, the majority did not dare to pass a positive resolution against the exceptions. Decisively the Synod condemns the invitations of foreign (that is not Lutheran) preachers to a Lutheran pulpit, as so often happens in Pennsylvania. What we wanted has happened this time/they have not ignored this important question, but have looked it openly and honestly in the face, so that we now know rather how each individual stands on the matter and we need no longer read in future printed proceedings:

Since we in Canada have made use of the Galesburg rule in recent times, and since pulpit fellowship does not take place in our country, it was said that no further resolution on this matter was necessary. Pastors Veit, Vockrodt and Spring voted against this resolution because the words 'without exception' were taken out." - But as long as the Canada Synod does not pass a positive resolution against the exceptions, no faithful Lutheran will be able to recognize them as faithful Lutherans.

The Synod of Texas, at its last meeting, resolved to disestablish its college. "In order, however," reports the "Magazine," "to make a last attempt, though at a later time, it was finally decided to rent the college buildings to the people of Rutersville, as the sellers, for the time being for one year for school purposes; but if they would not agree to this, the college committee should of necessity sell the buildings at their best discretion."

How Iowa denies the faithfulness of our fathers. In the Iowa Church Gazette of June 15 it says: "It may be that we find fault with the way our fathers fought against Zwinglians and Calvinists, that we cannot adopt some vehement expressions, some harsh judgments, which, by the way, were hardly less severe on their side. We may consider it more correct and more pleasing to God to give our testimony against them with greater calm and moderation, emphasizing the still existing unity of faith and letting it determine our conduct. We may let those church communities, as much as is in us, work beside us in peace and quiet, and stand in friendly intercourse with the members of them, as with fellow-Christians, although erring fellow-Christians. But we cannot and must not overlook the existing differences of confession as if they were trifles; we cannot and must not regard and treat Zwinglians and Calvinists as full brethren in the faith, and allow them access to our altars and pulpits, so long as they persist in their errors."

The herald writer loves plays of peculiar kind, so peculiar that only he can write, perform, and enjoy them. He has set such a play in No. 11. I. J. as follows: *Eigenhümliches Schauspiel* in 3 Acten. Persons: He, the herald writer. Missouri. A Missourian-Norwegian professor. An imaginary majority. Prof. Dr. Walther and some. Napoleon III. One who lays a kukuk egg. Several who hatch it. Count Orindur. Dr. Luther. Act I. The herald writer admires the zeal and progress of Missouri, and comes to the conclusion that something must be done about it. He meets a depossessed Missourian-Norwegian professor who seeks weaknesses in Missouri and wants to press him. (Has not got him yet. If he gets him, he will certainly form a triumvirate with a certain someone against Missouri; in the meantime: "Dear fatherland, may you be quiet.") - Second Act. The herald-writer wishes for a discord in the Missouri synod, and he dreams he meets her just now at work, as she is

...and paste one up. Professor Dr. Walther and some pull convulsively to one side, an imagined majority to another, but Missouri looks at Napoleon III and paste. The herald-writer awakens and struggles against falling asleep again. He succeeds only by thinking of One who has laid a kukuk egg in his own peaceful synod, and of those who now hatch it. He falls asleep again, sees the little kukuk hatched, pushed out of the nest in which the truth remains. Startled anew by this, he makes a prayer to Count Orindur. - Third Act. (A spooky story.) The writer of the herald quotes Dr. Luther, who calls out to him in a ghostly voice: "Take care that you do not burst, otherwise you will be quite unfit. Then the curtain falls. - N.B. Will be continued until the herald writer finely moderates and Christianly proves false doctrine to us, then we will answer him chastisingly. B.

Philadelphia Seminary. The "Herold" reported the following about the examination held there: "The majority of the seniors had managed to avoid the examination and were currently either at 'mother's', or elsewhere, where they were not much more necessary, at least not as necessary as before the examining professors. Involuntarily we were reminded of that student from Halle who tried to make the slogan of his time in the student world: 'Revolution must be, the dog tax and the examination must be abolished'. However, the case at hand was not viewed entirely in this light; but it was unanimously described as an improper criticism, and the decision was made that in the future no one can graduate from the seminary who has not taken the final exam."

A curious incident occurred **at the meeting of the Southern Presbyterian Assembly** at Knoxville. A Dr. Dabney brought in a report for the purpose of subjecting all the old squabbles between the Northern and Southern Presbyterians to a thorough investigation. His report was printed by resolution of the General Assembly, and a certain hour was appointed for its deliberation. When the hour had arrived, and every one present had read the report printed, 'the presiding officer called attention to the fact that the time had come for the discussion of Dr. Dabney's report. A general silence of five minutes ensued. No one took the floor. At last Dr. Dabney himself moved for the adoption of his report, but without further discussion the report was laid on the table by an overwhelming majority. (Ref. H.)

Methodism. The "Merry Messenger" writes: "The *show-being* of the fraternity, which occurs between different churches at conferences, etc., - for it is more a show-performance than anything else - also has plaisiric sides here and there. So it went with a Southern and with a Northern Methodist preacher, as a Southern Methodist paper relates as follows: Rev. J. Hughes was a loyal Methodist preacher, and in war time was in the Union army, and lost an eye. Not long back, in those days of the fraternity, he invited a Southern Methodist preacher to preach in his pulpit, who had been a zealous rebel in the war. This preached with very eloquent words from heaven, and said, among other things, that all transfigured bodies were quite perfect. Turning to Br. Hughes, he said: 'Br. Hughes, there are no one-eyed saints there.' 'That is so,' replied Br. Hughes, 'for there are no rebels there to cast out eyes.' The preacher's enthusiasm was quite chilled by such percussive reply.

Methodism. Bishop Foster remarked the other day that 2000 young people were applying for preaching positions in the Methodist Church, but that there were none available for them.

The Jehovah People. The newest sect in the sect-rich United States is the so-called Jehovah people. This sect is based in Mocapin, New Jersey,

and their religious practice is vividly reminiscent of the flagellants of the Middle Ages—namely, the Jehovah people sing and dance, contort their limbs, do somersaults, and vomit like lunatics. The history of the origin of the sect is as follows: Their present provost, the countryman Nathanael Merrill, dreamed while lying under a tree that he could fly. When he awoke, he took this dream for a revelation, climbed the tree, stretched himself in the air, moved his arms up and down like wings, and at last jumped down from the tree and fell into the topsoil. As this was very soft, he did not break any of his limbs. Encouraged by this success, he climbed the tree again and flew into the topsoil, and again suffered no harm. When it happened a third time just as well, Merrill thought himself an instrument of Providence. He ran into the village, shouted and danced out of the street, told his astonished fellow farmers that the Holy Spirit had entered him, and really managed to get the whole community to believe him. Everything jumped, danced, shouted, and the following Sunday the minister saw the congregation begin to do somersaults in the middle of the sermon. The Jehovah people constituted themselves and soon their numbers increased with new followers. The Sabbath laws of the sect are very strict; not even a fire may be lit and food cooked on Sunday. (Weltb.)

A Greek Catholic Magazine. Under the title: *The Oriental Catholic Magazine*, the Rev. N. Bjerring, employed at the Greek-Russian Chapel in New York, will publish a quarterly with the permission of the Metropolitan of St. Petersburg.

Pabstthum. At the 23rd General Assembly of the Catholic Central Association, the Roman Bishop Spalding of Peoria said: "It is necessary that we Catholics get to know each other, and that the day comes when the whole Church of the United States will be represented annually in such assemblies, where bishops, priests and laity consult with each other in the bond of love and unity of faith. And when this is once done, our power will be increased a hundredfold; then we shall enter upon another career, and advance from step to step, toward the goal of our aspirations."

Pagan blasphemy. The "*Lutheran*" of June 20 draws attention to such a blasphemy. He first says that he had already pointed out a year ago the atrocities that are increasingly developing out of the doings and activities of the secret association "*The Grand Army of the Republic*" (*G. A. R.*), especially in the pompous religious-military demonstrations on the day of the decoration of soldiers' graves; he had pointed out the emergence of a perverse religiosity and the secret introduction of a worship of the dead. He then shares some of the speech given on the last day of the grave decorations by a preacher (?), a senior chaplain of the *G. A. R.*. In it he said, among other things: "Their graves are the altars of our patriotism, and when we look upon them, or rather look around them, may we say, as if reciting a litany of the church, in earnest and humble reverence: from all ingratitude to the heroic sacrifice of the past - keep us, dear Lord God! From all forgetfulness of that brave and loyal manhood, by which the Union was preserved, and the Constitution of the United States defended, - keep us, dear Lord God! From all lack of zeal, from all indecision, from all timidity in believing in the final victory of a courageous and valiant patriotism over the spirit of treacherous compromise and sentimental indulgence, which are but other names for treason, secret conspiracy, and injustice done to the nation - keep us, dear Lord God! With such a litany, let these questions and answers be added: On what does the hope of the republic rest? A country and your flag. How can this country be preserved and this flag kept unsullied?"

...become? Through eternal vigilance, which is the price of freedom. One country and one flag! Eternal vigilance the price of freedom! These are the great commandments of the *Grand Army of the Republic*. These constitute the supreme law of self-sacrificing and heroic patriotism. God of the Nation! As Thou hast in the past bestowed upon the Grand Army of the Immortals obedience unto death, so also unto us members of the 'Grand Army of the Republic' (G. A. R.) in any adversity, in war or peace, for the sake of Thy Cause, which the of our land, incline our hearts to keep thy law."

II. Abroad.

The Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung of 14 June once again puts itself on the high horse vis-à-vis Missouri. That is of course nothing strange. But on the horse, which the church newspaper has mounted this time, it makes a strange appearance, yes, it looks downright funny. She speaks in the tone not only of a privileged connoisseur, but also of a strict representative of genuine Lutheranism. In No. 10 of the "Ev.-Luth. Freikirche," Pastor Ruhland had criticized the fact that Pastor Harms had forced his Free Church to adopt an older state-church order; thus, he claimed, he had proved that, in spite of his separation, he had by no means stepped out of the sphere of influence of the state-church. Referring to "the time of the classical theology and most orthodox teacher of our church, a Gerhard," etc., the *Kirchenzeitung* then remarks on Pastor Ruhland's article, among other things, as follows: "We fear that we have thus arrived at pure sectarianism. For what is sectarian, if not the spirit that does not respect the ways of God in history, but wants to see the church constituted according to its own thoughts and views, and that puts the essence of the matter into external forms and orders and expects salvation from their form and manner? On the ground of the non-German Reformed nature, we are accustomed to making questions of constitution and external order of the church, free church or state church, and the like, the decisive questions for church formation and church membership. To the very nature of the Lutheran Church this way of thinking and demand is alien from the beginning. We may consider either state-church or free-church order of things better and more desirable; but to make the question of the truth or falsity of the church dependent on this, and to make free-churchism the principle and prerequisite of the essential freedom of the church, which is spiritual and heavenly in nature, is an apostasy from the spirit of the Lutheran Church."—Should Dr. Luthardt, or whoever may have supplied the essay in question while he wrote this, really have forgotten how our Augsburg Confession and its Apology, how Luther so often and so strongly, how after Luther's death a Flacius, a Wigand, a Heshusius, a Simon Musäus, &c., and as still in more recent times a Rudelbach testified as with trumpet tone against the mingling of State and Church, and bitterly complained of the tyranny of conscience which the State has ever and ever exercised towards the Lutheran Church? Was the writer of the article in the *Kirchenzeitung* mindful of this, what then shall we call it when he brands Missouri's testimony against the state-church form in which, since Luther's death, our Lutheran Zion has stood there in an ever more conscience-disgracing manner, as "sectarianism" and as "apostasy from the spirit of the Lutheran Church"? Was it, for example, a sign of his apostasy when the blessed Rudelbach in 1853 (p. 6) looked forward with longing to the time when "the Church of Jesus Christ, redeemed from the Babylonian state-church prison, would have regained its natural, innate, rightful freedom"? Or was it not rather a sign that Dr. Luthardt was not in the spirit of the Lutheran church, when he

wrote in the preface to his church magazine of 1871: "Our program includes the preservation of the national church" (euphemism for state church) "at any possible price"? or when he declared on May 23, 1872 at the Leipzig Pastoral Conference: one has to "hold on to the previous connection between state and church as long as possible, as long as we are still given even the little finger"? Admittedly, it is made to seem as if this were only the adiaphoron of a harmless constitution; but is it an adiaphoron when a constitution substitutes human will for the Word of God, moral and physical coercion for Christian freedom, and authoritarian orders for conscience? Luther wrote in 1530: "A bishop, as a bishop, has no power to interpret some statute or ceremony to his church without the consent of the church in plain words or by implication.... The bishop, as a prince, can still less impose anything on the church, for that would be to mix the two sovereignties together, and there he would be quite an *allotrioepiseopus*, or a bishop reaching into other people's things; and if we let him have his way in this, we would owe the same to the Church. Here we must rather leave life than allow such impiety and injustice. I speak of the church as something special from the police." (XVI, 1207. f.) W.

Pulpit fellowship. Up to now, Dr. Mönkel's *Neue Zeitblatt* has criticized the pastors of the Free Churches for their fanaticism in not wanting to cultivate pulpit fellowship with the regional churches. Now the paper itself opposes such fellowship. We read the following in the number of June 13: "In No. 23 of the 'Hannoverschen Sonntagsblatt' there is an advertisement of a mission festival in Rametsloh for Thursday, June 13. Pastor Borchers from Sinntorf, Pastor Harms from Hermannsburg and Pastor Hoffmann from Harburg are announced as preachers. The first thing that struck us about this announcement is that a mission festival is to be celebrated in Rametsloh, where there is currently a preacher's vacancy. Has the temporary absence of a local pastor for the holding of the mission festival there perhaps been desired by its leaders? - We also noticed that two clergymen of our national church had no hesitation in working together with Pastor Harms at the intended mission festival, as if nothing had happened in the meantime. Do these clergymen not know that Pastor Harms, even though he so assiduously extends his brotherly hand to his dear brethren, is in fact pulling out all the stops to unhinge the Landeskirche and to save as many elements of it as possible into the harbor of the all-singular Free Church? After Harms has succinctly declared the altar of the national church to be an altar of lies, after he has ruthlessly deposed the missionary inspector v. Lüpke from his office, which he administered with the greatest devotion and fidelity for ten years, for the sole reason that he could not decide to separate because of his conscience, one should know what our national church and its faithful clergymen have to take care of from Harms. How is it possible, however, that the clergy of the regional church, in spite of all this, still participate with Harms in mission festivals? In our opinion, the already serious confusion of the laity about the right or wrong of the Hermannsburg Separation must only become much greater and worse through such a fraternal union of pastors of the regional church with the head and leader of the Separates. With the mission festivals that are now beginning again, it seems to us that it is indeed high time to seriously consider this.... In any case, the advertisement in question should be a renewed reason to conscientiously consider whether, after Harms' break with the regional church, it is still permissible for regional church clergy to organize mission festivals with the personal participation of Pastor Harms. We

In view of the obvious present conditions in Hermannsburg and in view of the markedly hostile position which Harms has taken towards the national church since the separation, we on our part must decisively deny this question". We read something similar in the Lutheran Church Gazette of June 14. It says: "We find the questions about communion and pulpit fellowship with the Separates quite superfluous; the Hanoverian Regional Church will hopefully be spared such a state of emergency that it would have to seek help from Harms and his followers, even for mission festivals. As for those who are separated, however, they may see for themselves how to satisfy their spiritual needs; that is no longer the business of the regional church from which they have broken away. Besides, one can be active for the Lutheran mission to the Gentiles even without Hermannsburg, whereby we do not want to blame those who continue to send their missionary gifts to Hermannsburg. But the Hanoverian Church as such can no longer have fellowship with this institution. Or does one think that the Consistory could examine and ordain these missionary pupils who have decidedly gone over to separation, and continue to send the official collection of the basin to Hermannsburg? Or will Harms still send the pupils to the highest authority of an 'after-church' and have them ordained at an 'altar of lies'? We would like to doubt that very much. What the mission experiences as a result of this sad separation is the responsibility of the one who broke away from the national church and, together with his Lutheran brethren, did not want to bear the pressure of the state power, which is admittedly unpleasant but does not hinder the administration of the means of grace in the Lutheran sense, nor did he have the patience to wait whether the times might not change.

Regarding altar and pulpit fellowship with the Separates in Hanover, Pastor Lohmann, in his Pastoral Correspondenz of June 8, states, among other things, as follows: "If we now draw from the above the conclusions about the position that we Lutherans of the Lutheran Church have to take toward these Separate congregations: first of all, the important proposition results from this that we are principally in communion with them at the evening meal, since we recognize the confessional fellowship by which this is conditioned and justified. We must, of course, at once add that the actual consummation of this fundamental fellowship will often be hindered and made impossible by the division that has occurred. But this is not to say that, for its sake, there must be a complete suspension of communion between the two ecclesiastical bodies as such: this would, in fact, annul the fundamental recognition. No, even if from that side the communion of the sacraments were to be abolished outright, which has not yet happened at all, this would not yet be a reason for us to deny access to our altars outright to those whom we recognize as confessors of the same faith; the barrier around the table of the Lord is not to be abused for repressive measures.... For the time being, of course, as long as the first heat of the spirit of separation lasts, this question of communion will seldom become practical. More serious, perhaps, will be the question of pulpit fellowship in the very near future. Here, too, the situation is such that, on the basis of the existing confessional fellowship, it is to be recognized in principle; but the necessity of a suspension for the sake of the rift and opposition that has occurred will probably assert itself here even more emphatically. If the communion of the Lord's Supper goes even deeper, then here the responsibility of the pastor comes to the fore to a much greater degree, and he must be careful whom he allows to preach in his pulpit. Quite apart from the more formal question of ecclesiastical law, which also affects only a part of those clergymen, is whether we may grant our pulpit to preachers who have been deprived of their office by our church authorities,

The more aggressive the action against our national church becomes from the other side, the more unnatural the calling of them to this place becomes. Where the rift has already passed through our own congregation and the counter-pulpit has been erected in its sphere, such a calling will hardly occur. But will it not also confuse the consciences of the members of his own congregation, if the same preacher, by whom the pastor is represented in his pulpit, perhaps serves a separate congregation a few hours away, and zealously exhorts the members of the national church, who attend his service, to leave the corrupt national church? The pulpit fellowship will, according to the state of things, be especially in question for the mission festivals; it is precisely at them that some will wish to hold on to it and cultivate it in the interest of the common mission work." - This, unfortunately, is all that a man like Lohmann can say on this important question, so long as he himself holds to the thoroughly corrupt national church. W.

Hanover. In the paper "Unter dem Kreuze" ("Under the Cross") it says in No. 20. among other things: IT is a sad series of ecclesiastical sins that have shaken the edifice of the Hanoverian Landeskirche. In the catechism controversy not only the misguided church people rebelled against the Lutheran catechism, but also the church regime, if one wants to put it mildly, pitifully defended it; the abrenunciation (repudiation) at baptism was sacrificed to the urging of unbelief by placing a sad parallel form full of ambiguities next to it; the Prussian military church order, which, as is well known, most strictly implements the Union, has not been resisted in earnest; the "guest" admission of non-Lutheran members of the united church has blurred the boundaries of the Lutheran national church; Finally, the marriage form of the church ordinances, after having been used unchanged alongside the Civil Act for some time (just as it was with respect to the French Civil Status Law at the beginning of the century), has been changed for non-church reasons, and this change, while leaving obvious opponents of the right doctrine in office, has been carried out with such decisiveness that acknowledged faithful clergymen, among them Harms, have been declared deposed because they could not overcome conscientious objections to the new form of marriage. If one looks over the series of these facts, one will have to say: without repentant conversion - and such has not taken place at any point - the end cannot be doubtful.

Dr. Uhlhorn, Superintendent and Oberconsistorialrath at Hanover, has been elected by the Convent of the Loccum Monastery as Abbot and thus as the highest official of the Hanoverian Regional Church.

Alsace. In Dr. Munkel's N. Zeitbl. of June 20. June, an Alsatian writes, among other things, the following: "Among many congregations in Alsace on which non-Lutheran pastors have been imposed, there are two which have thereby found themselves in an unusual situation: based on the legal principle that a Lutheran congregation has a right to the Lutheran means of grace, these congregations, which because of their local situation would have had to do without such a right, since they had too long a distance to the nearest Lutheran clergyman, did not want to accept the non-Lutheran pastors imposed by the authorities. They protested against their appointment in various vigorous filings, which are said to be in the archives of the Directorate; a rare adornment of its leaders! It did not help! Several strong deputations set out for Strasbourg to support the petitions in person; these simple people will probably not be remembered by the gentlemen in Strasbourg, for many have since followed for the same purpose. They asked, they threatened, it was of no avail; they protested again, it was in vain. What were these churches to do? They got rid of the un-Lutheran pastors by not attending their services, and each appointed a Lutheran minister, with the er-

The parishioners explained that because their written and verbal protests against non-Lutheran pastors, one of whom unambiguously professed his allegiance to the Protestant Association, had remained without consideration, they would now in fact have to emphasize their protest until they were able to restore their right to Lutheran preaching and the administration of the sacraments. Hence the term protest congregation has been adopted, and it is the correct one, because it corresponds exactly to the matter. Thus in Alsace there is neither separation nor renitence (the latter denying withdrawal from a church because it does not belong to it), but there are two congregations which are in fact temporarily protesting against the illegality of an authority which wanted to deprive them of Lutheran doctrine and the administration of the sacraments. One of these congregations is Heiligenstein, which has been protesting for more than 10 years, and the other is Plobsheim-Daubensand, which is already in its sixth year of waiting in vain for its right. Since they protest only for the sake of their conscience, they do not agitate in other congregations, least of all in those that are supplied with clergy who teach the law, as if the national church were condemned to demolition and free churches had to be established everywhere. It is true that the national churches are crumbling and dissolving, but it is first true that groups of church members have long since separated from Christ into the natural being. They are crumbling and dissolving, for the national church is not in itself a calamity, as Missouri thinks, just as the free church is not in itself a salvation." - Who told the writer that Missouri so teaches or yet "means"? Missouri testifies against the state-church or rather state-church form only when, according to the 28th article of the Augsburg Confession, "the two regiments, spiritual and secular, are mixed and thrown into one another," and false teachers are not dismissed by the church regiment, but tolerated, yes, protected. If the Elsasser Correspondent can remain in such a state church with a good conscience, he still lacks a Lutheran conscience at any rate. W.

Among the "Breslauers" there seems to have been a reaction against certain errors that had become prevalent among them. We conclude this from the following "news" reported by Pastor MeeSke in Luzine in his paper "Concordia" of July 1: "According to the 'Official Announcement' in the church bulletin of Superintendent J. Nagel, according to which the General Synod is scheduled for September 4. pastors and members of the congregation who have any objections to the wording of the so-called 'Public Declaration', whether in form or content, and who wish to raise them with the Ober-Kirchen-Collegio, should register them by August 1, c.". This is indeed joyful news.

May the Lord God help that the said Synod thoroughly revise this declaration according to God's Word and our confession and remove everything that is contrary to the Word and our confession, and thus that which has strengthened and widened the known rift be done away.

Mecklenburg-Schwerin. On June 19, this year's Diocesan Conference of the Parchim Superintendency took place in Parchim. Among others, Prepositus H. O. Köhler from Picher, who has been distinguished by many excellent articles published by him in various journals, gave a lecture on "Missouris". Köhler from Picher gave a lecture "on the Missouri Synod and our position on it". The Luthardtsche Kirchenzeitung of June 28 reported the following: "In his spirited, pithy manner, the speaker developed the dogmatic position of the Missouri Synod, fully acknowledged its earnestness and zeal to prove itself a faithful daughter of the Reformation in adhering to the Lutheran confession, but also firmly rejected as reprehensible the practical action of the Missourians to break up our German regional churches through separation. With gratifying unanimity and decisiveness, all speakers in the debate also rejected this procedure of the Missourians as unjustified. On the other hand, the second thesis of the speaker, in which the Missourians were granted the right

The attempt to sharpen the consciences of the German Lutherans was rejected, in that it was emphasized, on the one hand, that they lacked any profession for such sharpening of consciences, and, on the other hand, that they by no means taught Lutheran doctrine in all respects, but rather had established propositions that were not contained in our symbols. The polemics of the Missourians, as practiced both against the national churches and against individual theologians, and which in many cases deny the simplest ethical principles, were characterized in sharp words by all speakers." - It is a pity that pieces are not named to you in which the Missouri Synod does not teach Lutheranism, and that it is not shown in what way their polemics violate the "simplest ethical principles." W.

Schleswig. Pastor Paulsen in Kropp has, as previously reported, been sentenced by the Schleswig District Court to a fine of 600 Marks for accusing Pastor Dieckmann of violating his oath of office and instructing the teachers under his supervision to falsify the Holy Scriptures because of a printed article. Dieckmann had shown in the article in question how a teacher must treat the sacred Scriptures with evasion and circumvention of miracles. The Kiel Court of Appeal, to which Paulsen had appealed, upheld the decision of the District Court because proof of the truth had not been furnished. One must be all the more curious about the decision of the Consistory, which has opened a disciplinary investigation against Dieckmann. If it turns out just so, then a separation is imminent there. (N. Ztbl.) ,

Schleswig-Holstein. The Consistory's decision in the case of the rationalist deacon Diekmann (see *Lehre und Wehre*, June issue, p. 190 f.) has finally appeared. About the conclusion of the same the *Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung* of June 28 reports as follows: "In view of the decisive importance which must be ascribed to the normative standing of the Holy Scriptures for the existence of our Church, the Consistory has therefore had to seriously consider whether a clergyman whose theological standpoint in this respect gives rise to essential misgivings can be left in his office. In deciding this question, both the previous development of our church and what positive Christian content is contained in the sermons presented had to be taken into consideration. In the first respect, the long period of toleration granted to clergymen of a rationalistic persuasion caused the Consistory to proceed with the greatest possible leniency in this case as well. In spite of some ambiguities and strong rhetorical coloration, the delivered sermons also reveal a struggle for overcoming sin and for peace, and at the same time contain the confession that without the help of Jesus Christ he could not attain the goal of blessedness he longed for. Since, in addition, there are no complaints against him from Diekmann's congregation, but rather 800 members of the same congregation support him, and even the church elders, although they have declared that they do not approve of the content of the incriminated articles, know nothing to report about a given offense, it was possible to refrain from removing the accused from office. It may and must be expected, however, that he will let the incident serve as a serious reminder, and that he will in no way make his opinions, which deviate from Holy Scripture, the object of his magisterial proclamation." - Among other things, the church newspaper makes the following comment on this: "Some simple Christians will certainly not be able to understand how a clergyman who denies the miracles of the Holy Scriptures and has demanded in a school newspaper that they be removed from teaching can be left in office. And it is indeed regrettable that the simple Christian consciousness has not been able to obtain complete satisfaction. Nevertheless, we must say that the right of the Church is fully preserved, since the normative authority of sacred Scripture and the juridical validity of the Augustana, as its symbol, have been removed.

and, on the other hand, the grave ecclesiastical offence which Deacon Diekmann has given has been reprimanded and his theological standpoint has been just as decisively rejected". - One sees here again what significance it has when one now so often invokes in defense of the national churches that everything depends on what is *doctrina publica*. This is nothing but a hypocritical evasion. For as often as an open blasphemer of the doctrine of Scripture is taken to task in the national churches, the final verdict of the church government is regularly to leave the blasphemer in office, whereupon the "Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung" hastens to excuse, even to justify, the church government. O blind and dumb watchmen! W.

The Leipzig Mission. In the "Kirchenblatt für die ev.-luth. Gemeinden in Preußen" of July 1 we read: "In the usual manner the mission festival was celebrated in Leipzig during the Pentecost week. The main question that moved the General Assembly was the question of workers. For the field of work is large; but the workers are few and are becoming fewer. As is well known, our mission has so far sent out only those missionaries who were prepared for their ministry in the same way as our native clergy, and who had studied at universities for three years. But for some time now, no students or candidates have been found who would have been willing to serve as missionaries. Even an appeal issued by the Missionary College at the beginning of this year has remained without response. Since, however, if the work of the mission is not to be left undone, new workers must be sent in after the older ones, the Mission College, with a heavy heart, made the proposal, and the General Assembly adopted it, to establish a Mission Seminary, i.e. to have the missionaries who are to be sent out prepared as thoroughly as possible for their profession in the mission house itself by one or several capable teachers. This institution should be started as soon as possible, in case students or candidates do not come forward for the missionary service in a very short time. Since this is not to be hoped for, our mission will henceforth have to follow the way of the other mission societies with regard to the training of missionaries, and since this will not be done out of willfulness or out of earthly considerations, but out of necessity, because according to God's guidance the former way no longer seems practicable, the Lord will also give blessing to the new way and remove the obstacles on it. The next task will be to find suitable teachers."

Belgium. The Pilgrim from Saxony writes: After the ultramontanes had been at the helm in Belgium for quite a number of years, they have been put back into the minority at the latest chamber elections. As a result, the ultramontane ministry has submitted and received its dismissal. The Belgian spirit is essentially dependent on the French. The decline of ultramontane power in France since Mac Mahon's capitulation could hardly remain without succession in Belgium. However, even the Belgian ultramontanes had lately handled the laws in such a way that perhaps even without the advance of France the reversal would have occurred. Thus a court had recently condemned a Belgian because he denied the miraculous power of the stigmatized Louise Lateau (who allegedly bore the wounds of Jesus on her body and sweated blood from them), thus (!!) offending religion.

Dr. Nobiling and the Old Lutherans. Pastor Nagel writes in his "Kirchenblatt" of July 1: "In some newspapers the news has recently been spread that the author of the assassination attempt, Dr. Nobiling, is an Old Lutheran; other newspapers at least name his mother as Old Lutheran and his father as a friend and comrade of the Old Lutherans. Now the cause of Old Lutheranism is not made worse by the fact that this news is true, and it is not made better by the fact that it is not

are true. However, since these statements arouse unpleasant feelings in many, it may be stated here, on the basis of exact inquiries, that all of the above statements are false. First, not a single member of the family has ever been Old Lutheran; not even the mother; she has only retained a certain general interest in the Old Lutheran cause from her father, who - although personally unbelieving - preferred to employ Old Lutheran officials and workers. In the second place, the father, too, has never been a kindred spirit of the Old Lutherans; on the contrary, he stood very free in ecclesiastical relations, and has more than once declared that it was "impossible for him to believe." "If a newspaper reports that he furnished or built the church hall for the Old Lutheran congregation in Birnbaum, that is also quite inaccurate. He only gave, like all the surrounding landowners in that area, a contribution to the poor Old Lutheran congregation for the furnishing of the church hall. In sum, Dr. Nobiling and his work have nothing to do with Old Lutheranism, and even the attempt to explain his development from general "pietistic" influences must be considered a failure in view of his father's position as described above.

Socialism in Germany. On the occasion of the General Assembly of the Rhenish-Westphalian Association for Inner Mission, held in Cologne on May 1, Court Preacher Stöcker gave a lecture on "the personal responsibility of the propertied and educated in the solution of the social question," which is said to have made a deep impression on the approximately 300 participants. According to a report in the Allg. Kz., Stöcker spoke, among other things, as follows: "An Englishman has said that twenty-five years ago the German people respected spirit more than money; now it is the other way around. There is an egoism that can drive thousands to ruin in order to enrich oneself. Atomism is connected with this in the false, unifying addiction to freedom, which resists grouping the people into fixed orders; society becomes an aggregate. This then becomes dangerous in its isolation to weak workers; from their isolation, unfortunately, the wrong alliances arise among them; the red flag rallies them around itself, and thereby family and community life, patriotism and religion are abandoned to destruction. The face that has been shown to the people from above comes back from below in a much more caricatured form. In the hatred against Christianity, which alone truly reconciles and unites rich and poor, in the hatred against truth, which wants to be a common people's capital, all these evil currents converge, as the Berlin assemblies, especially those of women, have eerily demonstrated. Irreligion has now been elevated to the status of a party matter of Social Democracy, which is the natural daughter of the spirit of the age and of sin, and threatens to plunge the spear into the heart of the people. We are faced here with an enormous task, and are no longer dealing with isolated extravagant social dreams, but with a comprehensive world outlook which turns our present order upside down. Social democracy is an implemented and organized irreligion; it draws only the consequences from the spirits that reign in the air. How is it to be helped? 650,000 Social-Democratic votes, its press with 70 daily papers, the considerable generative power of personal talents in this party, so that even if outstanding representatives go to prison or to sea, there are always new ones: these are undeniable facts. If it goes on like this, it goes into the abyss. Such spirits do not die out of themselves, nor can one strike at them with the sword. Social democracy must be overcome spiritually, by the spirit of Christianity."

Misprint in previous issue.

Page 218 line 12 read instead, the church friend - the church friend.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 24.

September 1878.

No. 9.

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

(Continued.)

XIII Of Free Will.

A. Thetic s.

Luther: "Free will after the Fall is an empty word without content, and if it does as much as there is in it, it sins mortally." *)

Quenstedt: "The unregenerate man, or the man before his conversion, has of himself no powers, either of mind or will, to begin, promote, or effect spiritual actions, which are such in truth and in the proper sense"; That is, he cannot, with his natural powers remaining after the fall, discern or assent to spiritual truth with a view to his understanding; choose, desire, and accept spiritual good with a view to his will; prepare and send himself to the grace of God, or accept the same when it is offered in the Word; turn to God, or in any way begin or promote his conversion; keep the commandments of God; and do truly good works, and works pleasing and acceptable to God." **)

*) „Liberum arbitrium post peccatum res est de solo titulo, et dum facit, quod in se est, peccat mortaliter." (Propositio 13. Heidelbergens. a. 1518. Vid. Lutheri opp. lat. ad reform, historiam pertinentia. Cur. Dr. H. Schmidt, Francof. 1865. vol. I, p. 388-)

**) "Homo non renatus sive ante sui conversionem ex sese nullas habet vires, sive in intellectu, sive in voluntate, ad actiones spirituales, vere et proprie tales, inchoandas, promovendas aut efficiendas, h. e., non potest suis naturalibus, post lapsum relictis viribus ratione mentis verum spirituale cognoscere aut illi assentiri, ratione voluntatis bonum spirituale eligere, appetere et amplecti, ad gratiam Dei se praeeparare et disponere, aut eam in verbo oblatam acceptare, sese ad Deum convertere, aut conversionem suam aliquo modo inchoare vel

Concordia formula: "When Luther says that a man is *purely passive* in his conversion, that is, that he does nothing at all to it, but only suffers what God works in him: his opinion is not that conversion takes place without the preaching and hearing of the divine word; nor is his opinion that in conversion no new movement at all is awakened in us by the Holy Spirit, and no spiritual effects are begun; But he thinks that man of himself or of his natural powers is not able or able to help his conversion, and that conversion is not only in part, but entirely, an effect, gift, and work of the Holy Spirit alone, who by his power and might, by the word, works and effects it in the mind, will, and heart of man in *subjecto patienti*, that is, since man does or works nothing, but only suffers. . . . But the mind and will of the unregenerate man is nothing else, but only *subjectum convertendum*, which is to be converted, as the mind and will of a spiritually dead man, in whom the Holy Spirit works conversion and regeneration, to which work the will of man, which is to be converted, does nothing, but lets God alone work in him, until he is born again, and then also works with the Holy Spirit in other subsequent good works, what is pleasing to God." (Art. 2. Of Free Will. Repetition. p. 609. f.)

Do.rscheus and Dannhauer: "Latermann adds: that the grace of God gives man the ability to convert.... What is that ability of man? in which does it rest, by grace, to perform or not to perform what is necessary for conversion? in which does it lie, to want to convert and not to want to convert? as Latermann speaks. He will not say that these are the powers given by the Holy Spirit, and the given ability itself. For what kind of assertion would that be, that it rests with the new powers and faculties given, to perform or not to perform what is necessary for conversion, to want to convert and not to want to convert? Are these new powers indifferent to conversion or to turning away, to willing and not willing? So there will be a power in man before the powers and faculties given by the Holy Spirit, by which, with the help of the grace overcoming him and the powers given, that which is necessary to conversion will be accomplished, and by which that which is not willing to convert will be enforced. And this is precisely Pelagianism and Synergism. **) - So he who, like the Helmstadt Synergists,

promovere, praecepta Dei servare et opera vere bona, Deoque grata et accepta facere." (Th. did.-polem, P. II, c. 3- s. 2. q. 2. f. 1099.)

*) „Addit Latermannus: ,gratiam Dei facultatem ad conversionem homini impertiri/ . . . Quae est illa potestas hominis, penes quam residet, per gratiam

If he teaches that man is converted through the powers of grace, but that he converts himself through them, he must necessarily attribute to the unconverted natural man the power to use the powers of grace, or absurdly assert that God liberates man so that he may be liberated, revives him so that he may be revived, and converts him so that he may be converted. But more of this in the locus of conversion.

Kromayer: "The 12th proof is given (to the synergists) by the passage Mark. 12, 34, where the Saviour speaks to one of the scribes, who had answered 'reasonably': 'Thou art not far from the kingdom of God. Now, if one is nearer and more sent to the kingdom of heaven than the other, it follows that man can send himself to grace. For the comparative presupposes the positive. - But we answer, by the little word 'not far off,' not a greater skill, but a lesser unskillfulness is implied. For One unborn is not more skillful to grace than the other, but One is less unskillful than the other." *)

Joh. Ad. Osiander: "As a ship is said to turn back, not in the active sense, but in the neutral sense, because it is turned back by the skipper, so conversion is indeed attributed to man, and yet it does not really come to man, but is an act of God alone."

**))

ea, quae ad conversionem necessaria sunt, praestare vel non praestare ? in qua situm est velle se convertere et nolle se convertere ? ut loquitur M. Latemannus. Non dicet, esse ipsas vires et facultatem a Sp. S. donatam. Quae enim haec esset asseveratio: penes novas vires et facultatem donatam residet, ad conversionem necessaria praestare vel non praestare, velle se convertere et nolle se convertere? Suntne illae novae vires indifferentes ad conversionem vel aversionem, ad velle et nolle? Erit igitur potestas aliqua in homine ante vires et facultatem a Sp. S. donatam existens, a qua adjumento gratiae supervientis et donatarum virium praestantur necessaria ad conversionem, a qua perficitur nolle conversionis? Atque hoc est ipse pelagianismus et synergismus." (Facultatis theol. Argentoratensis Responsum a. 1646 Regiomontano ministerio missum. Vid. Calovii Syst. X, 49. s.)

*) „ Argumentum 12. (synergistis) suppeditat locus Mare. 12, 34., ubi Salvator ad unum ex scribis, qui cordate responderat, dicit: 'Non procul abes a regno Dei.' Quodsi jam unus altero propior et magis dispositus est ad regnum coelorum, sequitur, hominem semetipsum ad gratiam disponere posse. Comparativus enim positivum praesupponit. Sed respondemus, per particulam *ὅν μακράν*, i. e. non procul, non majorem dispositionem, sed minorem indispositionem innui. Non enim unus irreginitus altero magis dispositus est ad gratiam, sed unus altero minus est indispositus." (Th. positivo-polem. I, 544.)

**) „Sicut navis dicitur se convertere, non active, sed neutraliter, quia convertitur a nauta; ita conversio quidem homini tribuitur, nec tamen homini competit revera, sed actio solius Dei est. (Colleg. th. P. V. p. 63.)

B. Antithetical.

Luthardt: "Martensen speaks of an ancreated grace, which, identical with essential freedom, comes to a breakthrough within the natural will in the surrender to grace. 8 204. p. 336. The more decided ecclesiastical theologians, while rejecting this synergism, yet demand (so Thomasius, Harleß, Frank, &c.) that not only the active conduct in conversion on account of the inwardly liberating influence of the grace of salvation be emphasized, but also the possibility of a state of preparation for the grace of salvation on account of the general action of God through conscience, &c., be recognized." (Compendium of Dogmatics. Third ed. p. 135.)

The same: No matter how near grace may come to man, it is man himself who must open the door for Jesus to enter. (The Doctrine of Free Will. 1863. p. 427.)

The same: "It is not the willing itself that he works" (God's Spirit), "but so liberating on the bound will that it thereby receives a new ability to will." (Ibid. p. 441.) Then, then, he can will, and it depends only on whether he wills!

The same: "The Scriptures describe conversion partly as a work of grace, partly as an achievement of man. As a work of grace already in the Old Testament . . . but especially in the New Testament. ... On the other hand, repentance and faith are demanded of man" (this underlined by L. himself) "as his achievement: *μετανοείτε και πιστεύετε*- at all stages of the history of salvation. The demand of repentance the called should and can immediately comply with Ps. 95, 7. f. Heb. 4, 7. ff., and faith is free obedience, which man performs, e. g. 1, 5. Thus, then, conversion-also Jer. 31, 18. convert thou me, etc., *) the chief place of our ancients" (namely, for their counter-sanctified doctrine!)-"is man's own doing, for which reason also *ἐπιστρέφειν* is used only in the activum and medium, never in the passive.

- The mediation of both statements lies in the divine appointment to the *μετάνοια* ũ. s. w., towards which man has freedom of rejection or acceptance. . . . The older dogmatists (e. g. König and Quenstedt) act first of *regeneratio*, then of *conversio*, but in such a way that the two terms essentially coincide in substance, and advert more only formally distinguished from each other. ... In this definition of *conversio*, the moment of man's moral self-deed is missing, which will have to be called a defect (!!)

in the dogmatic version. . . . As for the conduct of the will to grace in conversion, the

*Luthardt translates this passage: "Convert me, that I may convert. (The Doctrine of Free Will. 1863. p. 426.)

Orthodox dogmatics on the whole emphasizes the divine factor (*conversio transitive*) one-sidedly in connection with the Concordia formula. The Concordia formula usually" (not always?) "allows the activity of one's own will to occur only after conversion. . . . This presupposes that conversion is a momentary act. ... In more recent times ... Lutherans (especially Thomasius I, 445. III, 1. 466. ff.) have replied that there is a difference between being seized by grace and the actual decision for salvation. The former happens without man's doing and, through the word, exerts an effect on man's personal thinking and willing that he cannot escape and yet produces a real receptivity and the possibility of a decision for salvation. The other, however, is his self-acting conduct, which is only made possible by it.*)" This limitation of the old dogmatic proposition: *in conversione homo se habet mere passive*, is now as good as generally recognized." (Compend. of Dogm. Third ed. p. 202-206.)

Kahnis: "Melanchthon, by the doctrine of the mediation of the human will in the acquisition of salvation (synergism), had entered upon the right, evangelical, and at the same time truly traditional way of **) holding fast the substance of the Augustinian doctrine without its excesses. . . . The proposition that the spurning of salvation has its ground in man neutralizes not only the concept of predestination, but also the concept of grace of the Concordia formula. This proposition, after all, demands, according to irrefutable logic, that the man who can reject salvation is not without will in grasping it. For he who can resist and does not resist does not want to resist. And he who does not want to resist, just wants to receive. †) This Melanchthon had clearly discerned." (A. a. O. II, 539. 543.)

The same: "With Augustine, our confession also acknowledged that man, who has freedom in purely human things, can perform humanly good works (A. C. Art. 18. Concordf. p. 640. 657.). But this human good should have nothing to do with the spiritual good. But this gulf is against Scripture (!), experience, and the reason of the matter. Scripture teaches most definitely that the gospel is connected with this human good. (AG. 10, 35. [!]1 Pet. 3, 1. [!]Joh. 3, 21. [!] ... It is an indisputable fact that the fast

*) According to Luthardt, therefore, the doctrine that God converts man has only the meaning that God makes it possible for man to convert himself by virtue of a free moral act of his own.

**) So Kahnis is unsirt enough to explicitly profess synergism.

†) Of course man wills, he may resist, or accept, the question is only whether the unconverted is converted by his willing, or whether it is God who creates the willing and just by this and thus converts man.

The spread of Christianity on the soil of the classical world can only be explained by its preparation for Christ, which in turn presupposes a point of attachment of Christianity in the natural man". *) (A. I. O. III, 310.)

He says: "Augustine exaggerates the teaching of Scripture that sin gained dominion in all men through Adam's fall into a doctrine of the natural man's complete immaturity to goodness and of mass damnation, which is contrary to Scripture as well as to tradition and Christian experience. Scripture teaches, and experience testifies, that in the natural man there is a pull toward the true, toward the good, toward peace, which, though it is not capable of breaking the powerful downward pull of the flesh, can certainly be a link to grace. With the same dualistic and rapid leap with which Augustine immediately exaggerated the dichotomy between the divine and human wills in natural humanity to the complete lack of freedom of the latter, ... Augustine now also taught that only grace brings the completely unfree will to salvation. The renewing power of grace gains a beatific form in man only in that it sets all powers in motion and drives them to cooperation." **(The Lutheran Dogmatics. 1864. II, 137. f.)

v. Hofmann: "As the apostle Rom. 7, 14-25. is not meant to deny all good deeds of the Old Testament believers, so in the present passage he even says of individual cases of good deeds of the Gentiles; without thereby contradicting what our church confession teaches of man, as he is constituted toward God, in himself and apart from all effects of grace, that he is incapable of some good and inclined toward all evil. He knows of an effect of grace, not only of the God who sent Christ, but also of the God who will send Christ, and he knows of it not only within the Old Testament community of salvation, but also outside of it. . . . The Spirit of God, who indwells them" (fallen and unconverted men!) "to make them live, does not leave them without that witness of God, by which they have both,

*That, according to the teaching of our church, this preparation of the classical world with its culture for the gospel is nothing, the doctor himself will not deny. Only compare the Concordia formula, Art. 2. p. 589. f. In classical Athens, Paul also learned nothing of the fact that one was prepared for Christ there before others, and we think that the Doctor also learns nothing of this in his classical Leipzig, but the opposite; namely, in so far as the gospel is still preached there.

**So there must also be forces left in fallen man which help him to convert.

His holiness and their sin, but also His goodness as well as their nothingness. But by this means a conduct against God can be wrought in them, which he will return with the reward of eternal life on the day of that judgment which John saw after the resurrection of the faithful.*) But this is God's work and not their own. It is God's love that makes them live, and by his Spirit, the Spirit of their life, he bears witness to them." (Scripture Proof. Second ed. p. 570. f.)**)

Philippi: "God's consciousness and conscience still dwell in the natural man, even if in a darkened form. He can either drown out the voice of conscience in wanton and unbridled self-surrender to earthly pleasures, and so on. But he may also, and this is the normal use of reason in fallen man, in striving for truth and justice, become conscious of the insufficiency of his own reason and power, and in this not unnaturally haughty, but naturally modest position, be inclined, where a proclamation as a word of supernatural revelation and divine help offers itself to him, and is addressed to him, not to reject this voice in disdain, but to listen to it, and to consider its contents with earnestness." (Ecclesiastical Doctrine of the Faith. IV, Second ed. p. 71. f)

*Compare with this the parallel passage from the "Proof of Scripture," p. 494. 495. f., given in the preceding volume, p. 229.

**When v. Hofmann here asserts both the inability of the natural man "to do some good" and the good deeds of certain heathens through an effect of God's grace, which is reciprocated with the reward of eternal life, it is evident that v. Hofmann speaks both of the spiritual inability and of the divine effect of grace in a quite different sense than the biblical and ecclesiastical. As his doctrine of the divine image, of the fall, of original sin, contains only the ecclesiastical terms, not the ecclesiastical doctrine thereof, but his own philosophical theorems, so also his doctrine of man's incapacity in the spiritual after the fall before conversion. Philippi rightly declares, with reference to the passages from v. Hofmann's "Proof of Scripture" given above: "Here again, then, we have nothing but a play with words, a naturalizing mixture of the spirit of God as the spirit of the natural life established by creation and the spirit of the spiritual life established by redemption. If at the beginning the exposition seemed to amount to enthusiasm, at the end it is shown to amount to rationalism." Further on, the same says: "that v. Hofmann's doctrine of the binding of the will of the person by the inherent corruption of nature for the sphere of God-pleasing doing nevertheless does not abolish the freedom and responsiveness of this will." (Ecclesiastical Doctrine of Faith. III. Second Edition. p. 242. s. 247.)

†) It is true that we cannot agree when Luthardt, after having communicated Philippi's criticism of v. Hosmann's doctrine of free will, adds: "What he (Philippi) himself brings, however, is not essentially different from what has gone before. (The Doctrine of Free Will. p. 386.) Between Philippi's and v. Hosmann's doctrine of free will, however, there is an essential, a heaven-wide difference.

C. Epilogue.

As an encore, we are permitted to share with you the remarkable words with which Balthasar Meisner introduced his disputation "On Free Will" in 1618. They are the following:

"After the high doctrine of predestination has been explained, there follows the question of free will, which must be treated all the more diligently, the greater its weight. For if one has erred here, many articles and the very ground of blessedness fall away at the same time, and the most noble principal of the gracious forgiveness of sins is shaken. For all that is ascribed to free will in the conversion of man is subtracted from divine grace, according to that saying of the ancients: 'The advocates of nature become enemies of grace.' In reference to this Augustine says (in the 2nd B. of Original Sin Cap. 24): 'Grace (*gratia*) is not grace in any way unless it is freely given (*gratia*) in all ways/ This our Luther knew well and he often inculcated it. Thus, dealing with free will, he wrote in the 36th Assertion: 'In the other articles: of the Pabbacy, of the Conciliarities, of Indulgences, and other unnecessary antics, is to be borne by the Pabbacy and his own levity and folly; but in this article, which is the best of all, and of our things the highest, it is to be mourned and lamented that wretched men are so frenzied.'" (*Ἀνθρωπολογίας sacrae disp. 21. p. 3.*)

(To be continued.)

(From the Mecklenburgische Kirchen- und Zeitblatt of June 26.)

Church and Ministry.

"Second Part. Of the sacred office of preaching or parish ministry."

"I. Thesis.

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

Father T. denies that the priesthood is an office. But what is it? Are we Christians called to be spiritual priests, to be Christ's

But what Philippi writes in the above quote does not contain biblical or ecclesiastical teaching. According to Scripture, the natural man is spiritually dead, therefore he can never prepare himself by a so-called normal use of reason in such a way that he would be inclined to listen to the gospel. Philippi writes the above in his exposition of the locus of election. The concern to get into logical contradictions in the exposition of this mysterious divine counsel has already become a cliff for many theologians, at which their orthodoxy failed in regard to the doctrine of free will. In the article on election that will follow later, we will prove this with passages from other recent dogmatic works as well.

If we are called to preach virtues, to make spiritual sacrifices, and to serve God and our neighbor, this service, to which we are called and bound, is nevertheless an office. But in this thesis it is expressly declared that the sacred office of preaching is distinct from this priestly office of all Christians, and not identical with it.

"II Thesis.

The preaching office, or pastorate, is not a human order, but an office instituted by God Himself."

Here it is asserted that God, according to his word, wills that certain special persons should be set apart to the office, and that these should be regarded as having been placed in their office by God, and should hold their office in the name and instead of God. This, then, is what we mean when we speak of an office instituted by God.

"III Thesis.

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

According to the above three theses, as everyone can clearly see, the Höfling doctrine of the office is excluded, according to which "the duly appointed common office comes into being in a God-ordained and God-proven way with inner necessity, without an outer ceremonial-legal necessity or a special divine appointment, different from that of the general office of all Christians, needing to be claimed for it." (Principles of the Evangelical Lutheran Church Constitution. luth. Kirchenverfassung. 3rd ed. Erlangen 1853. p. 63.) Therefore we also read in "Lehre und Wehre" (Dec. 1858) in a note to a review of Kraußold's doctrine of the ministry: "Unfortunately, it has come to this, that now everyone who rejects the Romanistic doctrine of the ministry is considered a court lingian in this doctrine, and is suspected as such, while Höfling's doctrine of the ministry and that of the Romanizing Lutherans are the two opposite extremes, between which the pure Lutheran doctrine, to which alone our Synod has professed and still professes, lies in the middle."

But what are we to say when, in view of these first three theses, we read in No. 7 d. Bl. Bl. as the fourth reason against "the theory of transmission": "It abolishes the divine endowment of the ministry. To be sure, Luther held to this, but not his followers, who either deny it directly, or at most allow the functions of teaching, etc., to be divinely endowed, and thus go straight against the Scriptures"? Who are Luther's "copycats"? Should the Missourians really be meant? They, who, as we know, do not accept anything because Luther or any other great man has said something, for that is "Missourian" spirit, not to be regarded as a person.

(Who is Luther? Who is Walther? Servants they are.) But, indeed, they walk in Luther's shoes, as in the doctrine of justification, etc., so also in the doctrine of church and ministry. How is it then that it is imputed to them that they deny the divine endowment of the ministry? Because we cannot believe anything worse, we suppose it to have been done in ignorance. But is it right to condemn publicly what one does not know? - Among the "followers" of Luther in regard to the doctrine of the ministry are also Melancthon with the scholars assembled at Schmalkalden, and all those who subscribe to the appendix of the Schmalkaldic Articles. For there, after all, reference is made with clear words to Luther's earlier writings, now so frowned upon: "*Quum autem haec tota controversia copiose et accurate tractata sit alibi in libris nostrorum, nec recenseri omnia hoc loco possint: referimus nos ad ea scripta, eaque pro repetitis habere volumus.*" (Dract. äs xot. st xriui. xaxas. sä. Nusllsr x. 332. 22.) Also, their doctrine quite agrees with Luther's. But that Luther, in his earlier opposition to Papism, brought out a different side than he did later in his opposition to Anabaptism, is quite natural and explicable. We do the same. One thing does not cancel out the other.

"IV. Thesis.

The office of preaching is not a special holier estate, opposed to the common Christian estate, like the Levitical priesthood, but an office of service."

This thesis beats back the personal-succession of office-bearers, which our opponents must consistently teach. For they always and everywhere presuppose a dualism of "office and congregation", of "governed and governed", "pastured and pastured". In their opinion, no office can come into existence in coucrsto without the cooperation of already existing office bearers. So then they may proceed to say with those Hessians, "Where the ministry is not, there is not Christ, etc." That then is rightly to say, a holy estate is erected, which reproduces itself from itself, has a special "character," etc. Our opponent says, "Consider the office as a gift, as an objective good from above." Well, that is what we do, in that we regard the office in *abstracto*, i.e., the authority of the office, the power of the keys, even the provision that it shall be administered by special persons, as a gift, and also the persons equipped with efficient gifts for the administration of the office, as an objective good from above, but not the office as a state propagating itself from itself. It is not, then, that the church (even the visible church of which we speak) is always an "organism of office and congregation." It should be so, and where it is not yet so, it should become so, for the church, according to Th. 3, is bound to the up-bringing of the church.

The church is bound to the organization of the preaching ministry. But to say that it is already organized, where the organization and the principles of the organization of a church are concerned, is a simple *petitio principii*.

"V. Thesis.

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

Hardly anyone would want to contradict this thesis, which vindicates the independent right of the ecclesiastical office, if he did not want to deny the pastors the handling of the binding key, i.e. the ecclesiastical court, contrary to God's Word. -

Up to now, the word "confer" has not appeared in any of the theses, and it has been unfairly made into a key word and turned into an enormous controversy, although the actual difference between Lutheran and modern Romanist official doctrine lies deeper. In the following thesis we encounter the word "transferred" for the first time.

"VI Thesis.

The office of preaching is conferred by God through the congregation, as the holder of all church power or keys, and by their divinely prescribed profession. The ordination of the called with the laying on of hands is not divine appointment, but an apostolic ecclesiastical ordinance, and only a public solemn confirmation of that calling."

Whoever reads the elaboration of this thesis will be able to convince himself that the meaning of the word "transfer" is no other than that of calling, and that I have not erroneously "substituted" for it. By the way, the expression "transfer" is exceedingly convenient and significant, and was not invented only now. What unnecessary trouble has been taken*) to give this simple, otherwise so common expression the most whimsical interpretations! If it still said, "The priesthood is conferred." But it says, "The office of preaching is conferred," the office of preaching, which, as Proposition 1 says, is not identical with the office of priest to all believers. It is scarcely comprehensible to me how, with some knowledge of the "Missouri" doctrine, one can still say that those who confer would be "disenfranchised" by the conferral, "reduced to passivity," and the like. Is a prince also "disenfranchised," "reduced to passivity," when he governs through his ministers, conferring the government upon them? And what then are ministers but ministers, as servants of God and the Church? *Quod quis per alios fecit, ipse fecisse dicitur*, is an old familiar rule. He, therefore, who confers the office, acts himself

*) Recently again Pastor v. Nolcken, against whose treatise one also wants to compare "die missourische Uebertragungslehre" in "Lehre und Wehre", October, November and December 1877.

through the officials. The very words of the thesis, "by God through the church," should make this clear, that the office of preaching is conferred by the church in the same sense as by God. If God is not "disenfranchised," from whom, as the HErrn, so neither is the church, the bride, the household honor, by which [^](namely, by their indirect vocation) the office is conferred on the ministers. Mr. T. himself cites the words of Luther, which speak quite in our sense: "We are all priests, and the so-called priests are servants and ministers of the common priesthood." These words do not merely mean that the servants of the priesthood perform their service for the benefit of the priesthood, but also that they act as its servants on its behalf, as John Gerhard also writes: "The ministers of the church, as stewards, 1 Cor. 4:1. (*loc. theol. de min. eccl.* § 87), and, "All that the church servants, lawfully called, and rightly administering their office, do, they do not in their own name, but in the name of God and the church." (*Ibid.* § 89.)

Now, however, one is offended by the fact that it should be "the congregation" that transmits. But if it is possible, let us understand what is meant by "the church. In the first place, and properly so called, is the invisible church, which, according to Proposition 4 of the first part, is in royal possession of all divine powers in all its parts. Then, according to Proposition 6 of the same section, it is every visible congregation, in which the characteristics of the presence of a part of the invisible church, Word and Sacrament, are found. We are now reproached: "This doubt (is probably a misprint for: this duality, namely, of office and congregation?) is torn asunder by the theory in question, in that it sets the laity in opposition to the office, assigns the investiture into the office to them, and takes away from the latter his due share in it, so that precisely the whole church does not come to its rights." With what injustice this is said again, may be seen by any one who reads in the "Voice of our Church," p. 273: "If the congregation which calls also includes church servants who already administer the office, they too, of course, according to the office which they already bear in the church, belong before all to those who call, so that if they are denied the participation appropriate to their office, the call of the 'multitude' has no validity in such a case; because the same is then issued not by the congregation, but by individuals in the congregation, which, if properly ordered, consists of preachers and hearers. If, however, there are no ministers in the congregation which is called, the call of the multitude is valid even without the participation of the former, but it requires (1) the love and unity which, according to Christ's will, ought to take place and be manifested among all the members of his body, (2) the honor which the faithful owe to the faithful bearers of the office, and (3) the holiness and importance of the cause.

The church itself: that even a single congregation does not act solely according to its own insight, but that it actually consults already existing ecclesiastics, if it is able to do so, and that it makes use of their advice and instruction in this matter, and especially leaves the examination and proper public solemn installation of the elected person to them. The model for this is, among others, Apost. 6, 1-6. for all times presented to the church." We see here that the dualism of office and congregation is by no means denied, as should be clear from the first theses on office. Only this we most decidedly deny, that this dualism must always and everywhere exist as absolutely necessary, if otherwise a church is to exist and an organization of the same is to come about, and this we say, for example, that a multitude of Lutheran Christians, who may have gone over the sea and have no pastor, and also find no orthodox congregation to which they can join, have the right and duty to come together and appoint a pastor for themselves, or to confer the spiritual office upon a pastor. For where two or three are gathered together in Christ's name, there is He in the midst of them with all His gifts and powers, even though there be no minister among them.

But we are even more accommodating: Not only do we show due consideration for the office already established, but it does not even occur to us to want to disregard any of the existing ordinances of creation in the congregation. Has anyone ever heard that the Missourians send children to their congregational meetings or that women appear to speak? The fact that the twenty-one year olds are entitled to vote is a purely coincidental, human church order, an accommodation to the civil conditions there, from which it is evident that they do not in principle deny the *status politicus*, if the persons holding the official dignity and those participating in it belong to the church, a participation in the church.

But this is the position we hold: we respect all these ordinances, if and so far as they are in the church. But if they are either not there at all (for it would be to think that two or three or more quite equally situated men would be cut off from all the world), or else if they will not place themselves wholly and decidedly under God's word, we let the ordinances go, and take hold of God's word, and make ordinances for ourselves according to it, as well as we can. For the order of salvation is above the order of creation; the latter is only to be serviceable to the former.

"VII Thesis.

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

He who does not approve of the foregoing theses will not, of course, be able to agree with this one either. He, on the other hand, who accepts it, will find in it nothing but a simple conclusion. For as we speak, for instance, of the divine Trinity, without finding the expression in Scripture, by drawing a conclusion from the two propositions, that there are three persons who have divine essence, and yet that there is only One God, similarly here also.

Here is the point against which the main attack of our opponent is directed. The controversy is whether the sacred office of preaching is the power "to exercise the rights of the ecclesiastical priesthood in public office by common ways," and it is asserted by the opposing side that the functions of the office are different from those of the ecclesiastical priesthood. There was a time when this thought, which I also got from Prof. Dieckhoff's writing, was also decisive for me. Nevertheless, I let it go. We will certainly say with Dieckhoff that the office has to do with the "pasturing of the community". And it is obvious that the spiritual priesthood has nothing to do with this. But we also say that the spiritual priesthood has nothing to do with exercising its rights "in the public office of the community. The difference of office is admitted by both. The question is whether this also implies a difference in the substance and functions of the office, that is, whether the office implies a substance and thus a character, or whether it implies only an accessory.

The functions of the spiritual priesthood are spiritual sacrifices. Are the functions of the spiritual office not to be called pure sacrifices? Whether the person who sacrifices does so from the heart and in faith, that is, whether he is really a spiritual priest or not, to which Father T. repeatedly refers, is of no concern to us at all. We know well: "Obedience is better than sacrifice," but we have not to do here with the personal position of the heart, but with the outward functions themselves. These, however, are the same in substance; they may be done publicly or privately, by a pastor or a layman. How? If a layman prays, praises, gives thanks, teaches, exhorts, comforts, absolves, serves God and neighbor, does anything at all by which God's name is magnified, these are sacrifices; and if a pastor in public office performs quite the same thing, these are not sacrifices? Understand this, who can! The interpretation which Mr. P. T. gave of Rom. 15, 16. did not satisfy him himself. We refrain from giving a better one than Art. 24 of the Apology gives, with which article our opponent has proceeded wondrously. In this article it is important to prove that the Mass does not work *ex opere operato* and that it does not merit the forgiveness of sins. The word *sacri-*

In the Confession, ours have diligently avoided the term "*ficium*" "for the sake of uncertain understanding," because the adversaries always understood it as a sacrifice of atonement, but here they go into the concept of sacrifice thoroughly and speak of it with extraordinary clarity. First, a distinction is made between "*sacrificium unb sacramentum*, sacrifice and sacrament." "*Sacramentum* is a *ceremonia* or outward sign or work, by which God gives us.... Again *sacrificium* or sacrifice is a *ceremonia*, or work, which we give to God, that we may honor him." Holding fast this distinction, we shall not be able to counter that the minister's official acts are merely sacramental. It is understood that they are, and we have never denied it. The pastor gives in God's stead, God gives through him. And if it were a question here of the doctrine of the means of grace and of the effect of the ministry, we would most zealously defend this sacramental character. But we are not now speaking of this, since we are dealing with the performance of the office, and here every one must of necessity acknowledge that the service of the means of grace, the acting, the doing, the work, the giving, which is the very point here, since we are speaking of the performance of the office, is at the same time something which we give to God, "good works of the saints," a *sacrificium*, a sacrifice, not a bloody, propitiatory, but certainly an unbloody, fruit-offering, thank-offering, minchah. The minister as such does not take, but he gives, gives not merely sacramentally, from top to bottom, but at the same time sacrificially, from bottom to top. There is not a single function of the spiritual office which is not sacrificial. "Now the sacrifices of the sons of Levi, that is, of them that preach in the New Testament, is the preaching of the gospel, and the fruits of the preaching, as Paul saith, Rom. 15, I am to be a minister of Christ among the Gentiles, to offer the gospel of God, that the Gentiles may become an offering acceptable to God through faith." (Apol. C. A. ed. Müller p. 256.) And, "If only we keep with us the preaching of the gospel, and the right custom of the sacrament, we have without doubt the daily sacrifice." (p. 259). But again I content myself with simply referring to Art. 24 of the Apology, because I cannot write more clearly than was done there. We have no doubt that the functions of the spiritual office are priestly functions, sacrifices, identical in substance with the functions of the spiritual priesthood.

But should we not say, on the basis of the quite correct description of the functions of the ministry as "pasture for the congregation," that these are substantially different from those of the spiritual priesthood? It would seem so, but it is not the case. For as soon as we attempt to define what the pasturing of the church actually consists in, we must say that it is nothing else than to supply the herd with all that is due to it, and that all this is done in detail and in individual cases.

The fact is that the common Christians do in private what the pastor does in public and by virtue of his office. There is no substantial or material difference between *pastor* and *ovis* in the spiritual sense, as is the case in the natural, but an accidental, relative difference, a difference of office, of profession, and one must be careful not to draw false conclusions from such pictures of holy Scripture. "*Bene cum adversariis agitur, si patimur nos vinci allegoriis. Constat autem, quod allegoriae non pariunt firmas probationes*" is once said in the Apology. (This also applies to all kinds of strange conclusions which have often been drawn from the image of the Church as the "Body of Christ").

We therefore most emphatically deny that a substance, and thus a character, is imparted in the calling to office. What is conferred with the office is rather only an accidens, namely, the power "to exercise the rights of the ecclesiastical priesthood in public office by common ways. With the endowment of the special office no special substance is endowed. We insert here a passage from the above-mentioned review in "Lehre und Wehre" (1877, Oct., p. 301) which agrees with this: "Just as the activities of the general priesthood consist in the office of teaching, exhorting, etc., so also the activities of the **public** office consist in nothing else - only the one takes place in a private way, the other in a public office. The activities are the same - the spheres are different. So also the church, in calling to the office of preaching, does not confer any office which, in its nature and activity, is different from that which it itself possesses. The manner of calling, the spheres of activity, and the derivation of authority in the public ministry of preaching are quite different from those of the general priesthood. There it is the public congregation and the conferring of the office by congregational election; here it is baptism and faith, the home and the whole world outside the public preaching office in the congregation."

As for the derivation of the right of vocation or transfer from the general priesthood, in the repeatedly cited passage in the *tract de pot. et prim. papae*, it is probably correct to say: "Where the lesser is, should not the greater also be? But if this conclusion is to be correct, then the lesser and greater compared must necessarily be something of the same substance; indeed, the lesser must be contained and given in the greater substance. Otherwise the possession of the *sacerdotii* could not be a "legal ground" for the granting of the *claves*. For what one does not have, one cannot give.

"VIII Thesis.

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

This thesis is especially to be defended against those who, in the Roman manner, pretend that various levels of offices, even a special office of church government, were instituted by God, contrary to our Lutheran confession.

"IX. Tesis.

Reverence and unconditional obedience are due to the preaching office when the preacher is leading God's Word, but the preacher has no rule in the church; therefore, he has no right to make new laws, to arbitrarily set up the middle things and ceremonies in the church, and to impose and exercise the ban alone without previous knowledge of the whole congregation."

Here the high dignity of the office standing in God's stead is emphasized, but also the limits of its powers are clearly and sharply drawn according to holy Scripture. It cannot be emphasized enough that the government of the spiritual office is divine, and no less that it is spiritual, not secular, and must not be confused with the church government.

"X. Thesis.

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

In our time and under our circumstances, where there are some who seem to know no other enemy of the church than "liberalism," and where there is a true *horror* of the participation of the laity in ecclesiastical synods, this thesis will naturally appear to some as the ruin of the church, for the slogan of the Jesuit Bellarmine, that the laity are the *oves*, *who* alone are shepherded, governed, etc., but who, by the way, must remain silent, has become dominant here and there. A voice like that of John Gerhard, who never tires of repeating that the sheep of Christ are not stupid sheep, not *oves brutae*, is not heard, nor that the Lord Christ says John 10:4 and 5: "The sheep follow him, for they know his voice. But a stranger they follow not, but flee from him: for they know not the voice of strangers." - But a main ground against this thesis will be found in the fear, though not unfounded, of the "Lord *omnes*." For where the commandment of Christ to be obeyed, and the "Lord *omnes*" to be put out of the church, is thought to be donatism, there, of course, every effort must be made to

set not to let this Lord come to rule, for that would be the abomination of desolation in the holy place.

But there is One who "calls, gathers, enlightens, sanctifies, and keeps all Christianity on earth in the right, united faith of Jesus Christ," not by outward ordinances, not by state coercion and means of power, but by the means of grace: Word and Sacrament. Where we have these pure and unadulterated, there is enough for the unity of the church. But what matters is that we should not merely have them, or be allowed to have them, or be supposed to have them, but that we really have them in unanimity; then everything will go on honestly and orderly among us, and the ceremonies and constitutions may be as they please.

D .

L.

Dr. Seiss and his Chardon Thursday.

Dr. Seiß holds to the "modern (!) church" that Christ was not crucified on a Friday, but on a Thursday. Why? He says in the "*Lutheran and Missionary*" of April 4 of this year,

"That it is no matter of faith whether the Saviour was killed on Thursday or Friday; that the Church, in celebrating his death on Char Friday, does not mean that he necessarily died on that day. That a great many theologians, chronologists, and commentators hold that the Lord was really crucified on Thursday, and that it is really of no consequence to the nature of the faith, or to the propriety of our observance of the Lord's Day, to take the position that Christ was laid in the grave on Thursday evening." Further, he writes, "Commissioners and preachers" "say that since Christ was in the grave part of Friday, all of Saturday, and part of Sunday, he is rightly said to have been three days in the heart of the earth. But while this saying holds sting, though weakly, in regard to the 'three days,' it holds no sting in regard to the 'three nights.'"

Dr. Seiß asserts that the Church does not mean that Christ died on a Friday; but it is more rightly asserted that the Church does mean that Christ died on a Friday. Why then should she from time immemorial have kept Char Friday, if she thought the same was not Christ's day of death at all? The Scripture clearly says the one time that it was "the preparation day at Easter" on which Christ was crucified. Of this same day of preparation it is said again, Marc. 15, 42, that it was the "pre-Sabbath" or the "next day" (cf. the Weimar Bible on the passage cited) before the ordinary Sabbath. Accordingly, the day of Christ's crucifixion would have been the day before the ordinary Sabbath as well as before the Jewish Easter,

so that the usual Sabbath and Easter fell on one day, and this is without doubt the reason why this Sabbath was called a "great" Sabbath. Joh. 19, 31. On the mentioned preparation day in the evening Christ is laid into the grave, Marc. 15, 42. It says Luc. 23, 54: "And it was the preparation day, and the Sabbath began." This Sabbath (from six o'clock in the evening until six o'clock the next evening) the women were silent according to the law. Luc. 23, 56. But when this "Sabbath was past," "they came to the grave on a Sabbath very early (πρωὶ τῆς μίας σαββάτων)," that is, on the first day in the week. Marc.

According to the evangelists, the three days mentioned above, the preparation day, the Sabbath, and the first day of the week, follow each other in such a way that no other day can come between them. Thus Christ would irrefutably have died on our Friday of the afternoon, and risen early on the following Sunday of the morning. It is quite incomprehensible how men who call themselves doctors of Lutheran theology can, in view of this fact, write to the world that Christ was crucified on a Thursday. The report of the holy Scriptures does not create any real difficulty for the exegete, much less an insurmountable one. For when the Lord Christ says (Marc. 8, 31.) that he will "rise again about (μετά) three days," these words find their sufficient explanation in the fact that Christ (Matth. 16, 21., which is a parallel passage to Marc. 8, 31. and in other passages) also says, that he "shall rise again the third day (τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ)," so that the third day, with which we are here concerned, need not necessarily have reached its end by the resurrection of Christ. And when the chief priests and Pharisees say to Pilato (Matt. 27:63.), "Lord, we perceived that this deceiver spake while he yet lived. I will rise again after (μετά) three days." It is evident from their words, which follow, that they by no means supposed that Christ meant that the third day must necessarily be a full one. They say (v. 64.), "Therefore command that the sepulchre be kept until the third day." Winer, in his Grammar of the New Testament Language Diombs (6th ed., p. 359), adduces the passage Matth. 27, 63. and remarks, "where the popular expression can have no difficulty; . . . as then also the well-known μετ' ἡμέραν *interdia* actually means *post lucem*, after daybreak." The expression "above three years" (Deut. 14, 28.) is explained by the Holy Spirit himself by "in the third year" (Deut. 26, 12.). The seeming greatest difficulty, however, Dr. Seiß finds in the words of Christ: "As Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the midst of the earth." Matth. 12, 40. In the interpretation of this passage Dr. Luther, who always remains master even to such people as Dr. Seiß, has without doubt,

He has hit on the right thing, so that there is hardly any need for many more words about it. He writes: "The Scripture has a way of speaking, which is called synecdoche, almost common, that is, when one speaks of a whole thing, that only one piece is so. As that Christ lay three days and three nights in the grave, when he lay there but one day, and two nights, and two parts of two days, Matt. 12:40; so he saith, Matt. 23:23, 37; Jerusalem stoned the prophets, when there were a great part of godly men in it. Thus saith one, The clergy are covetous, seeing there are many pious men among them: and it is almost a common manner in all languages to speak so, especially in the holy scriptures." (Exposition of the Epistle on Christ's Day. XII, 139.)

Since Dr. Seiß prefers to follow certain "theologians, chronologists, and interpreters" who make Thursday the day of Christ's death, rather than the simple-minded "commentators and preachers" who, according to Scripture, hold Friday to be the day of Christ's death, to whom, as we have seen, our own Luther also belongs, and since he is these commentators and preachers, and preachers, who are rightly content with an improper way of speaking in the words "three days" and "three nights" of the passage in question, in Christian humility, and therefore easily solve the apparent difficulty that occurs in them, he may now see for himself where he is to get the three full days from according to his previous calculation. For if Christ had spoken of the three days and nights in the passage in question not figuratively, but actually, he would have had to be three full days in the grave; thus, if he had been crucified on Thursday, he could at most have risen on Sunday afternoon after three o'clock. - Now, how may Dr. Seiß's account stand? Every one sees that it will turn out "feeble" enough. -

C. S. K.

(Translated by Pros. A. Crämer.)

Compendium of the Theology of the Father

by M. Heinrich Eckhardt.

(Continued.)

Chapter IV. Of the end of this world.

I. Oh such a one. Do you think that God will finally smash this world edifice? Yes. Cyprian: "For this is the judgment of the world, this is the law of God, that all things which are made perish, and all things which are grown grow old; that things which are strong become weak, and things which are great become small; and afterward things which are small become weak.

That which has become perishes." 1) Olympiodorus: "As the creature world was created by the word of God, so it will also once pass away by divine command." 2) Basil: "That which began to be in time must of necessity also cease and pass away in time. And if it has a beginning in time, do not doubt its end." 3)

But the psalm says, "the earth stands still"?

Albatus: "Significantly, he says: it will stand still, not: it will stand forever. For heaven and earth shall pass away, and all things shall be made new." 4)

II. The way.

How will the annihilation happen?

By fire. Albinus and Gregory: "The world will be burned by the fire of judgment, not destroyed by the waters of a flood." 5) The same seems to indicate, according to Ansbert, the coloring of fire in the rainbow. "When the rainbow appears in the clouds, it is partly bluish, partly red, which colors reflect the shape of water and fire. In the water is pointed to the previous Sindfluth, in the fire to the future burning of the world." 6)

III. Time.

When will this burning happen?

Gregory: "From the words of the Lord we know that the end of the present world is already at hand." 7) Cyprian: "For you should know that the world has already grown old, and is no longer in that strength in which it once stood, nor does it have the same freshness and strength by which it was formerly distinguished.)

Haec enim sententia mundo data est, haec Dei lex est, ut omnia orta occidant, et aucta senescant; ut fortia infirmentur et magna imminuantur; diminuta post et infirmata finiantur. Cypr. contra Demetr.

Sicuti per verbum Dei creatura mundi est creata: ita et divino jussu quandoque resolvetur. Olym. in Eccl.

Quae tempore coeperunt esse, tempore quoque desinant ac definiantur necesse est. Et si temporis initium habent, noli dubitare de fine. Basil, in Hex.

Signanter dixit, terra in seculum stat, non in secula seculorum. Quia coelum et terra transibunt, et facta erunt omnia nova. Albin, in 1. c. Eccles.

Mundus iudicii igne cremabitur; aqua diluvii non delebitur. Albin, qu. in Genes, et Gregory, in Ezech.

Arcus Iridis, cum in nube apparet, ex parte est caeruleus, et ex parte rubicundus: qui nimirum colores aquae et ignis speciem reddunt. In aqua diluvium praecedens, in igne vero concrematio seculi futura demonstratur. Ansbert. 1. 5. c. 10. Apoc.

Ex verbis Domini agnoscimus, quod praesentis mundi jam terminus iuxta est. Greg. 1. 9. ind.

4. Scire enim debes, senuisse jam mundum, nec illis viribus stare,

What are those words of the Lord from which the nearness of the burning is discerned?

It is the foretelling of the signs that Lactantius cites: "When, he says, the eventual end of the world shall approach, wickedness shall abound, all manner of vice and deceit shall increase, righteousness shall perish, there shall be no faith, no peace, no mercy, no shame, no truthfulness; if good men are still found, they shall be taken for a prey and a plaything; no one shall show reverence to parents; covetousness and greed shall corrupt all things; there shall be murders and bloodshed, there shall be external and internal wars." 1) Beda: "As trees driven to fall are wont to send forth signs of breaking and wavering, so at the approaching end the elements, as it were terrified, waver and tremble." 2)

IV. The parts.

How many times is the end?

Isychius: "A twofold end is brought in by God upon all things visible: the one, namely, of every one of us; but the other, the common of the human race and of the things which belong to the present course of the world." 3)

V. The end of each person's life.

Does the same depend equally on God's command?

Rabanus: "Without God's will, not even a sparrow falls to the earth, let alone man, whom He created for His glory and in His image." 4)

quibus prius stetit; nec vigore et robore eo valere, quo antea praevalerat. Cypr. contra Demetr.

Cum coeperit, inquit ille, mundo finis ultimus propinquare, malitia invalescet, omnia vitiorum et fraudum genera crebrescent, justitia interibit, fides, pax, misericordia, pudor, veritas non erit; si qui erunt boni, praedae ac ludibrio habebuntur; nemo pietatem parentibus exhibebit; avaritia et libido universa corrumpent; erunt caedes et sanguinis effusiones, erunt bella externa et interna, etc. Lact. in Epit.

Quomodo impulsae ad casum arbores fragoris motusque praemittere solent indicia: sic termino appropinquante quasi paventia nutant ac tremunt elementa. Beda in Luc.

Duplex infertur a Deo visibilium omnium consummatio: Una quidem uniuscujusque nostrum; Alia autem communis generis humani ipso- rumque horum, quae hanc, quae nunc est, conversationem constituunt. Isych. in 25. levit.

Sine nutu Dei nec passer super terram cadit: quanto magis homo, quem ad gloriam et ad Imaginem suam ipse creavit. Raban. 1. 8. in Eccl. c. 18.

But is there a specific goal in life set for individuals by God?

Rabanus and Eucherius: "God, who foreknows everything that is to come, has decreed before the time in what manner it shall be ordered in time. For it is appointed unto man how much either happiness in the world shall come to him, or how much adversity shall befall him. It is also determined by eternal truth how long each man shall live in this mortal life." 1)

But why does God limit the lives of most people to such a short duration?

Algerus: "Lest the wicked should sin too long, to their greater punishment, nor the good be discouraged from living in this exile of the world, when too great a respite from glory would become to them, God has shortened the days of human life." 2) (To be continued.)

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The Lutheran Ministry of New York held its convention this year at Utica, N. Y., August 1, and the following days. Dr. Krauth was present as a delegate from the Synod of Pennsylvania. The following we gather from the report of the "Magazine"; "Rev. Hoppe resigns the office of President, and Rev. Philip Krug, of Newark, is elected in his place.... The protest question again engages the attention of the Synod. The party of protest consists of those who hold to the Missourian idea of communal rights, and recognize the 'Witness of the Truth' as their body. The other party holds to the hereditary view of synodical and parochial rights, and has the 'Lutheran Herald' as its organ. This party is the stronger and the 'Herald' is also the synodal journal. After the 'Witness' had been launched in October last year, a special meeting of the Synod was held in New York at the beginning of December, and there the action of the protest party was declared 'hasty, unbrotherly and disorderly'. But with this nothing was settled; the publication of the 'Witness' was proceeded with, and the Synodal body declined. This is the state of affairs. Pastor H. C. Kähler now proposes, 'since the members of the protesting party have continued in their conduct, which the Synod has declared to be hasty, unbrotherly, and disorderly, and since they have freely and publicly declared that they will not comply with the resolution, be it resolved that the members be called upon individually to declare by yea or nay whether they will see their error and henceforth comply with the resolution.' Pastor J. U. Hoffmann declared the hand-

Cuncta Deus futura praesciens ante secula decrevit, qualiter per secula disponantur. Statutum quippe homini est, quantum illum vel mundi sequatur prosperitas, vel feriat adversitas. Statutum quoque est in aeterna veritate, quantum in ista vita mortali unusquisque temporaliter vivat. Rab. ibid. Eucher. in 1. reg. 4.

Ne malis diutius liceret peccare ad maiorem sui poenam; aut bonos in hoc mundi exilio taederet vivere, si nimia fieret eis dilatio ad gloriam breviavit Deus vitae humanae dies. Alger. 1. 2. de Eucher. cap. 7-

He criticizes the protest party as unmanly, dishonorable and unchristian and thinks that they should leave the ministry. Pastor Volz criticizes both parties and accuses them of having pulled together more than they have built up. Pastor Kühn is of the opinion that the Synod should protect its body. Pastor König asks whether the Synod wants to tolerate the unruly activities of the protest party. Now is the time to exercise discipline. Pastor Halfmann concludes from the proposal that nothing less is meant than that they (the members of the protest party) leave. Pastor Kähler's proposition is hereupon laid on the table by a vote of 45 to 16. Pastor Hoppe declares that both papers are organs of opposition. The ministry has never thoroughly investigated the cause of opposition. Our old constitution, under which we are still, knows nothing of discipline against a party. Individuals can be impeached. The whole matter is out of order. I can start a paper anywhere, no one can forbid me to do so. If the Synod has anything to object to, they may sue me. Great commotion ensues. The decision follows that the second part of the proposal, which Pastor Kühn had made at the special meeting, is in order. It reads: The Ministry condemns the action of the protest party as unbrotherly, hasty and unconstitutional. Resolved, That it be required of the brethren of the protest party that they comply with the above paragraph and cease publication of the "Witness." Finally, on the proposition of Pastor Ehrhart, it is resolved that the President appoint a committee of five from each party to propose a basis for union. This conference committee shall consist of the following: Pastors Ehrhart, Flath, Siebke, Busse, E. Hoffmann, H. Sommer, Baden, Halfmann, Stücklin and Drees. These are joined by Deputies Nothacker, Klinker, Bohm and Tietjen..... The Conference Committee presents its report on Saturday morning. It reads as follows: Your committee, after careful consideration of the points dividing the Synod, has come to the opinion: 1) That the protesting party, although convinced of the correctness of its opinion about the relationship of the congregation to the Synod, has violated the constitution of the Synod by the hasty publication of the 'Witness of Truth'; but that it believed itself challenged to this step by the manner in which the official body was conducted. Nor can the Committee deny that during the whole of the latter time we have been wanting in personal relations, which each should confess to his God and forgive the other. 2) We readily admit that the real differences are in doctrine, which must be discussed in an honorable manner according to the word of God, and propose that this be done in connection with the discussion of the new Constitution proposed to Synod. 3) That we mutually undertake 'as soon as possible to bring about a union of the two sheets, and as long as this is not done, to abstain from all complaint and counter-complaint, personality and bitterness. 4) We propose to the venerable Synod, for the above reasons, to drop all complaints now before the Synod, which have arisen from these deplorable conditions. 5) The brethren of the first Conference are to be requested to assemble henceforth as one body." The first point is accepted after a short debate. The second point is also approved, but with strong opposition to its second part. The third punct also finds acceptance, after an attempt to demand that the protesting party cease publication of the 'Witness' had failed. The fourth point is now raised to a resolution, after Wehrere had declared that they wanted to drop their accusation against Dr. Moldehnke. The fifth and last Punct is unanimously adopted. The Synod now, after these misunderstandings had been settled so unexpectedly quickly, joins in a song of thanksgiving." - Thus, in the New

York Ministry, a *Formula Concordiae* has come into being, only not a monastic one from 1577, but such as our time is used to bring about. God help all those who have recognized the truth, so that they do not embezzle and lose the jewel given to them by God, taken in by human consideration.

- The "Magazine" further reports, "The English Lutheran Trinitatis congregation of New York is, with regret, given permission to separate from the Synod; also Dr. Krotel and Dr. Schmidt of New York." Of the new constitution, the first three paragraphs were adopted. "The fourth clause, which has not yet been adopted, but has been thoroughly discussed, reads as follows: § 4. (a) 'In all proper municipal matters, the synod shall have only an advisory authority; but the congregations shall obtain and hold in honor their council in all important cases, etc.' ... The draft Constitution is referred to the Conferences and congregations for further discussion.... The Delegation to the General Council presents its report.... Synod resolves: 1. That we cannot but deplore the treatment which our Appeal has received from the General Council. 2. That we intend to take further action on this matter at our next meeting."

Of the Pennsylvanian Synod, the *Messenger* rightly says: "It is

In fact, then, that these people do not in reality regard the Galesburg Rule as founded on God's Word. If this were so, it would be absolute and could not give way to a mere 'Lutheran'."

Synod of Pennsylvania. About the following omission of a paper in Philadelphia the "*Lutheran*" is very displeased: "The Rule of the Lutheran Ministry of Pennsylvania, which excludes other preachers from Lutheran pulpits, is very strictly enforced. The ministry accepts fraternal delegates from the German Reformed Church, but it has adopted a resolution which specifically states that the acceptance of such delegates does not include admission to Lutheran pulpits. Even if a Reformed preacher did not desire to preach in a Lutheran pulpit, he would hardly expect a more friendly reception in the ministry for the sake of this resolution." The "*Lutheran*" calls this an unpardonable error which must be corrected. The same further says: "The ministry of Pennsylvania has not adopted any such rule, nor even undertaken to carry it out, and has never made any such declaration as that here attributed^A to it. The message seems to have come from a hand that has taken it upon itself to arouse prejudice and do mischief. There is no ground for the malicious blow which is thus dealt and set forth as if it were based on historical truth." - It is true that the Pennsylvanian Synod did not pass such a resolution, but the indignation of Dr. Seiß that others should dare to think such a thing of the Pennsylvanian Synod, clearly shows whose brainchild he is, and with him the Pennsylvanian Synod, which allows him to defend his syncretism in the "*Lutheran*" without defense.

Reformed Episcopalians. In their recently held General-Concilium, a whole number of the most diverse proposals for innovations were made. Some proposed to delete the word "Sacrament" wherever it is found in their "Prayer Book" (Creed, Agende, Liturgy, and hymns) and to substitute the word *OrckiriicriLtz* (order, regulation) for it. Andre wished the liturgy changed, and again Andre recommended that the phrase: "eternal damnation" be eradicated from all books issued by the church (ref.-episc.), and the words inserted instead: "damnation of the gospel." A certain Campbell, a pastor of his profession, wants to do the same among the Reformed Episcopalians.

if they guarantee him the right to lay his hand on the confirmands together with the bishop. However, before the Council takes up these proposals for innovation, it will first have them considered by committees. (L. Ztschr.)

An appearance was recently made in a **Congregationalist church** in Chicago which caused much sensation. The pastor of the church, Dr. E. P. Goodrin, had given a series of lectures on the kingdom of Christ and His second coming, and in them had set forth the views of No. Moody and other so-called lay evangelists. At the close of the last lecture, Rev. H. L. Hammond, a member of the church, arose, stood before the pulpit, and began to read a protest against the views presented by the pastor. This caused great confusion in the congregation, during which many rose to go out, and Rev. W. Brecher (a brother of H. W. Brecher) called upon No. Hammond to desist. An overseer, however, appeased No. Brecher and led him to his seat. The pastor asked the people to remain and hear what brother Hammond had to say. After order and quiet had been restored, Mr. Hammond proceeded to read his protest. The *Advance* wrote of the contents of the protest thus:—"Mr. Hammond protested against making the Correct out of the piety, usefulness, and. Mr. Hammond protested against the piety, usefulness, and prayerfulness of people being used to prove the correctness of their Biblical interpretations, against the literal interpretation of all the prophecies of the Old Testament, against the view presented as a Judaistic and ritualistic one, involving a return to sacrifice and circumcision, as contrary to Scripture and uncongregationalistic, as a view that takes away the joy of praying and working for the conversion of the world by destroying the hope of it, as one that increases the number of religious growlers and disheartens the patriot (!), as a deceptive one, claiming to inspire to a higher degree of holiness or pious activity, as one evidently injurious to the harmony, prosperity, reputation, and usefulness of this Church, nay, as a revolutionary one, leading to make the Church like the 'Second Adventists' or 'Plymouth Brethren.' No. Hammond addressed the church, asking it to wait a while and hear the other side before adopting the new view." No. Hammond published his protest.

Children's Teaching. At the invitation of the *Congregationalist*, forty New England pastors have declared that in their opinion one sermon on Sunday would be sufficient, and that the remaining time of the service should be used to teach the children, or rather the whole congregation, the catechism. So reports the "Magazine." Certainly a welcome sign of disillusionment.

Among the Unirt Evangelicals it is at present a burning question: "Can congregations be admitted into our Synodal Union which call themselves Lutheran or Reformed in their statutes, but in their relationship to one another and to us think and live in the sense of our confessional paragraph? We already reported in the June issue that the Fourth District of the "Lutheran Synod of North America" abstained from making a determination and referred the matter to the Pastoral Conferences. In the case of the Second District, however, the feeling for honesty seems to have stirred more. The latter, as reported in the "Messenger of Peace," "concluded that the admission of churches with confessional names was unethical and inconsistent with our principle and practice." It "was resolved that the District, for internal and external reasons, answer the question submitted to it in the negative." In the report given by the "Messenger of Peace" on the proceedings of the third District, it is stated: "On the whole, only 18 delegates voted, one of whom was only in favor of the admission of congregations under the name of 'Lutheran' or 'Reformed' congregation, but the remaining 17 delegates were all of the opinion that with the petition for admission

in our synod the bittstellende congregation could also let the name 'Lutheran' or 'reformirt' go and adopt the name 'evangelical' for it." Further discussion was referred to the pastoral conferences.

The recently corrupted poet, W. C. Bryant, belonged here in New York to the Unitarian Church on 20th Street, of which Dr. Bellows is pastor; but at Roslyn, on Long Island, where he had his country home, he was a member, even Trustee and Communicant in the Presbyterian Church there. So reports the "Herald." Probably the difference between the two societies is not of such importance that one cannot belong to both at the same time.

The danger which the Roman Catholic Church brings to our country lies chiefly in the fact that the politicians dare not vote against grants of money and laws by which the Catholic Church is favored. If they vote against such proposals, or if they vote to punish injustices of the Catholics, they lose the votes of the Catholics, because the latter are much more under the influence of their priests than the Protestants. This is the cause why a society, mostly secret, has been formed among the English Protestants, to strengthen the weak knees of the timid politicians, that they may not be afraid of losing Catholic votes. So one wants to drive out one evil by another. We fear that this will not help much, and that it is not right before God.

(Ref. Kz.)

II. Abroad.

Saxony. On June 25 and 26, the conference called after the place of its name met in Meissen, and in the usual manner, the so-called church conference was held on the first day, and the pastoral conference on the second. We take special note of the latter because it is the conference most favored in Saxony by the ecclesiastical regiment. We take special note of it because it is the conference most favored by the church regime in Saxony and therefore betrays the goal toward which the regime of the Saxon state church is heading. On the first day, the appearance of the Christian social party was discussed. On the second day a pastor, Dr. Hoffmann, gave a lecture "on the sinlessness of Jesus," which he called "the minimum of the Christian faith. Christ's deity and atonement can thus be denied without the denier being denied that he has the Christian faith. The speaker therefore also asserted that "from the JEsus in Scripture to the dogmatic JEsus of Quenstedt there has always been a leap." The mention of the *communicatio idion atum* was, as the Saxon Kirchen- und Schulblatt of July 18 (from which we take our notes) reports, "greeted with mirth" as a *crux examinatorum*. The second speaker, Superint. Dr. Schmidt of Annaberg, presented the following theses to the Pastoral Conference "on the position of the ecclesiastical middle parties within the extreme directions": "1. In order to do justice to the tasks which the present time presents to the Church, and to secure for itself its due position externally, the Church needs above all unity internally. 2. (2) The danger of internal division threatens the church not so much from the various tendencies asserting themselves within its bosom as from the one-sidedness with which each of them seeks to uphold the principle it advocates, possibly to its ultimate consequence. (3) That the various tendencies and parties are not in themselves dangerous to the church is proved by the development that has taken place behind us. Truth has always developed out of the opposites. (4) In the present ecclesiastical situation, two tendencies oppose each other, one representing the principle of authority, the other that of subjectivity. Pursued to its ultimate consequence, the former will lead to catholicizing reprimination, the latter to contentless negation. 5 It

Neither of these parties is to be wished victory in the sense that one overrules the other and comes to dominate alone. 6. The task and importance of the ecclesiastical middle parties will be to unreservedly recognize the moment of currency represented by each of these opposing parties and to fight only against the excesses in the representation of it. As to the motivation of these theses, the author noted, among other things, the following: "It is given to the church to seek the truth through all kinds of contradictions. If the division of the church into different confessions, none of which has the full truth, but each only a moment of truth, is to be explained from this, then one must also strive again toward unity and not forget that which unites us above that which separates us. On the untouched ground, since Jesus Christ is the cornerstone, the different directions are to be granted a right to exist. In this diversity lies a special charm and blessing. Not the principles, e.g., of authority and subjectivity, but only their excesses are to be confronted. Luther, it is true, was not a man of the middle; but God objectively confronted him with the extremes of the directions existing in himself in such phenomena as Carlstadt and Erasmus, and thereby saved him from them. Saxony was not a land of ecclesiastical extremes, but was now in danger of being made one; a break with the national church was to be feared. In our time it is not a matter of the truth of the Protestant Church, but of the preservation of the general Christian Church. Here it was necessary to forget all party hatreds and quarrels and to fight against the common enemy. The time had come when the various parties would have to join hands." The theses were finally adopted by the Conference by a majority resolution (albeit by a weak majority). It should be mentioned, however, that good counter-witnesses were also heard. The Kirchen- und Schulblatt reports among other things: "After this, court preacher Dr. Löber (Dresden) spoke, subjecting the theses, with which he knew absolutely nothing to do, to a devastating criticism. If the church has developed out of opposites, it certainly does not follow from this that it takes up into its own life as an equal 'direction' the life forces hostile to it, in the struggle against which it has grown stronger (against thesis 3). A principle that cannot be defended to its last consequences is not worth existing at all; it is not the consequence, but the principle itself, that is to be fought (against Thesis 2). It is quite incorrect to contrast the principle of authority with the principle of subjectivity in such a way that the former is supposed to the Catholic Church and the latter to the Protestant Church; for while the dogma of infallibility is the perfect outgrowth of the crassest subjectivism, the Protestant Church has recognized the Word of God as the authoritative authority of all (against Thesis 4). Such worn-out formulas melt like snow in the warm hand. He was fundamentally repelled by that half-measure, since one was only serious in that nothing was really serious. Rather, it is necessary to confess fully and completely Jesus Christ and the eternal truth revealed in him, whether we are victorious or defeated. We do not want victory at the expense of truth, but as Christ won the victory precisely in being defeated." Pastor Merbach from Leipzig remarked very well: "The truth does not result from error, nor can it be gained from extremes; rather, one must have it in order to be able to represent it. Paul also says: There must be breeds among you, so that those who are righteous may be evident among you' (1 Cor. 11:19); but Paul was not the man who wanted to unite both yes and no, but his theology was only yes, as the word (Gal. 1:9) proves: 'If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be anathema.'" - Even if one does not bring into play

Even though the not insignificant Protestant Union wing of the Saxon ministry was not represented at this conference, except for one of these "negative spirits," the Saxon regional church was clearly reflected in this conference as being nothing less than Lutheran, but rather as being untainted by the purest water. The lecture of Dr. Hoffmann, in which Christ's divinity is denied, is recommended for printing as an able, scientific work, and the theses of Dr. Schmidt, in which that which is common to faith and unbelief is presented as the only thing to be held fast, are accepted "*per majora*"; but when a Stöckhardt calls the blasphemers of Christ devil apostles, he is tried as a blasphemer of Christianity, in order to bring him to the penitentiary! W.

Hesse. The Old Lutherans in Hesse have finally announced their withdrawal from the regional church.

Hanover. At the Pentecost Conference, we read in the Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung of July 5, Pastor Beerr said: "I can better bear it when clergymen like Spiegel and Grütter deny Christ's resurrection, or divine nature, than when a Harms throws a torch into our congregations. And on this the church newspaper makes the remark: "In any case, this statement was a paradox inasmuch as the church cannot possibly judge fundamental false teachers who impugn the majesty of the Savior less harshly than the momentary aberrations of a man who, standing in the faith of the church, has consumed his entire life in the service of the Lord. But this paradox contained and still contains two great truths. First, the subjective truth that many souls are far more grieved, annoyed, tempted, and endangered by a Harms than by men who already have one foot outside the Lutheran Church. On the other hand, there is the objective fact, connected with this, that through the Protestant Association only those who have already fallen away inwardly are alienated from the church, but through separation it is precisely the most lively and zealous Christians who are alienated. We meet with a similar phenomenon in East Frisia, where ten Klapp do not do such mischief in the congregations as a single Baptist preacher. The old saying is here confirmed: when the devil wants to catch souls, he hooks saints. The seduction which proceeds from highly pardoned Christians is the most dangerous of all, and the most responsible is that which angers one of the least of these who believe in the Lord Jesus." - To these gentlemen, to err in the national church and to fall away from it seems to be more dangerous and more pernicious than to err in Christ and to fall away from Him. This is indeed quite appalling. W.

Hermannsburg Separation. As is known, Harms dismissed his missionary inspector v. Lüpke from his office because he did not want to separate with him. Harms, however, asked him, before he left, to take over the sermon once again, as before, on the occasion of the mission festival to be held on June 26. The ex-inspector agreed, but abused the trust given to him by Harms to the extent that he used this mission sermon held in the church of the Separates to justify, even glorify, the national church before the Separates, whereby he naturally had to misrepresent God's Word in the most miserable way. On the basis of Matth. 28, 18-20, he asked himself the three questions: "1. Who gave the Great Commission? 2. to whom is it given? 3. what means are given to carry it out?" According to the notes already made in the church by Pastor Beer, who was present at this mission feast, the Pastoral-Correspondenz of July 20, among others, informs us of the following concerning the sermon and the movement which it produced among the listeners: "The second question found the following answer. Does anyone ask: To whom shall the Great Commission be carried out? - It says that all nations are to be

can be won. This is especially important for our time and for our circumstances. Of course, the missionary practice of the apostles was to lead individual souls from the mass of the people to Christ and to gather them into churches that stood as small groups in the midst of the nations. Nevertheless, Jesus had already said that he wanted the nations. According to this word of the Lord, therefore, the missionary practice of the church changed as soon as circumstances permitted. The kings and the powerful in the countries were sought to be won over, and when this was successful, popular orders were set up, schools founded, etc., and in general popular arrangements made, in order to prepare a place for Christianity among the people in the whole country. This is how our pagan fathers proceeded, this is how we proceed now, and our Hermannsburg missionaries also act accordingly. How glad we are when we can report that a king has been converted, that Christian churches and towers are being built back and forth in the land, that bells are ringing throughout the land, that catechists and clergymen from the tribes of the heathen themselves can be brought in to work, and that a network of Christian institutions and facilities covers the whole land. When this happens, it is said that the Lord Jesus has been victorious in this land, and our endeavor is that he may win such a victory. There are, of course, still many defects and sins in such Christian national churches, but we bear them willingly and would consider it wrong to leave the national church for their sake. But it follows from all this that we must not leave our L.C., which came into being in such a way, for the sake of its deficiencies; no, we must thank the Lord every day that He has left us the L.C. and that the devil has not yet succeeded in tearing the L.C. down. According to JEsu's missionary commands, his word is to be heard in the whole country among all peoples, but not only in privileged, especially Christian circles. (All at once it had begun to become restless among the listeners; v. L. therefore continued:) I beg you not to be offended by what I say. Since I am called, I do not want to leave without giving a sincere testimony of my position here. You will probably object: "We also want the people's church according to Christ's command. But this is precisely the reason why the right popular order has been abolished in the Hanoverian Landeskirche, the old beautiful wedding order, by which the name of God was brought into the Christian families of the people, and by which alone Christian discipline and right faith can be maintained among the people, and exchanged it for an ugly, ambiguous wedding formula - because the traditional form of the church has been broken off at one point and the core of the Christian people has been angered. That is why we have renounced the Hanoverian state church and want to rebuild a different church as a free church." - Well then, beloved, I acknowledge that you want what is right according to Christ's command; but that is why, in wanting to fight for it, you achieve the opposite. By separating yourselves, you renounce the Christian people, you throw away the Christian peoples. You do as that general did, who wanted to fight faithfully, but

(The agitation that now broke out made the epilogue unintelligible. For some time there had been shaking of heads, looking at each other, standing up and walking out of the room. At these words the Corona rose from under the pulpit and the whole congregation almost followed. One looked with great astonishment at the preacher, and it almost seemed as if a general exodus or the like was to take place, v. L. therefore concluded, as follows: Dear friends! I must stick to the truth. But since I perceive that you will not long hear my word, hear again, as the Lord Jesus commanded, 'Go ye, and teach all nations, etc.'.)

world end.' Prayer, Our Father, etc., followed, and v. L. left the pulpit." - The word "nations" Matt. 28:19. reduplicative to

The

is indeed an absurdity of which a man who claims a theological education should be ashamed. It is no less appalling that, according to Herr v. Lüpke, the holy apostles proselytized against Christ's mission and that only the later church should have carried it out. But according to Mr. v. Lüpke, not only did the holy apostles err in the concept of the church, when they wrote: "Put out of yourselves them that are evil," 1 Cor. 5:13, but Christ also contradicted Himself, when He declared of His kingdom, that is, of His church, "Neither shall it be said, Lo, here or there it is. For behold, the kingdom of God is within you." Luk. 17, 21. The national church was probably never defended worse, more unscriptural. But we fear that even if other theologians who want to be Lutheran do not dare to speak like Mr. v. Lüpke, they do not carry in their minds any other image of Christ's church, namely a state influenced by Christian values and customs. May God have mercy on such theologians! They are heading with power toward the national church. Luther alone escaped the seduction of the antichristian after-church through the congenial concept of church. W.

Separation and the National Church. The pastors of the regional church participated in large numbers in Harms' last mission festival. The Luthardt'sche Kirchenzeitung of July 26 says about this: "In our opinion, such a position is untenable, and seems to us to be a threatening sign for a further spreading of separation, if any special occasion should arise. And some already believe that such an occasion will arise if, with the present composition of the Landesconsistorium, a decision should become necessary because of the canonical" (euphemism!) "qualities of a liberal candidate."

Chiliasm. It is gratifying to read what is reported in Luthardt's church newspaper of July 19 about the unirite (but wanting to be Lutheran) Köslin Pastoral Conference, which was assembled on June 25 and 26: One item on the agenda was the lecture by Pastor Rohde of Simötzel on chiliasm, or, to state the subject precisely and thus at the same time designate the tendency of the lecture, "against chiliasm, both gross and subtle." The speaker stood firmly on the standpoint of Lutheran church doctrine, polemicized against the modern revival of the overcome chiliastic error, emphasized the practical significance of chiliasm, its church-destroying effect, and sought to prove by way of thorough exegesis that the millennium of the Apocalypse belonged not to the future but to the past. The discussion that followed revealed, in addition to many differences of opinion on this difficult question, the essential agreement of the assembly with the speaker.

Gemeindeschule. Dr. Munkel writes in his N. Zeitblatt of July 18: "The mixed school, supported by liberalism, is making its move in Germany, and is being promoted by the governments, largely for the sake of church peace. The struggle against it has therefore been in full swing for a few years. From the Protestant side, in the Rhineland, where the danger is especially great because of the mixed population, an "Association for the Preservation of the Protestant Elementary School" has been formed under the chairmanship of Pastor Lindemann in Hückeswagen, whose board also includes Pastor Schlosser in Frankfurt a. M. and Oberkirchenrath Dr. Mühlhäußer in Wilferdingm. The association, which up to now has 1050 members, does not want to be a Rhineland association only, but wants to spread its net over all German regions and use all its strength to keep away a damage from the Protestant Church, which is more serious than all the damage done to it by the previous liberal legislation. The association has employed a salaried managing director, and takes care of an agent and a paper.

Parochial freedom, or, as it is also called, "freedom of movement of the congregation," has been granted to the regional church of Alsace by its higher authority (in Strasbourg). The believers, scattered to and fro in the congregations, have petitioned until they have achieved this goal. In Alsace, therefore, every member of the congregation may, without falling outside the order of the national church, go to preaching, baptize children, be married, and give communion within this national church, wherever he wishes, and none the less remains in all the rights of the congregation where he has his residence. Outrageous as this "order" is, it is nevertheless a proof of the prudence of the Alsatian church government; for after this ecclesiastical freedom of movement was introduced, there is almost nothing to be felt in Alsace of a tendency to separate from the national church, since the believers of the present time are accustomed not to worry about the great whole to which they belong, and to look only at what they personally come into contact with. W.

The Eisenach Church Conference, opened on June 20 of this year, has decided on a joint annual celebration of the Reformation Feast in all of the so-called Protestant regional churches on October 31 or on the Sunday after October 30 (as desired) and on the writing of a joint military hymnal and prayer book. Again a step further on the way to the German national church. W.

Necrological. The pastor of the Bethlehem Church in Berlin, Gustav Knak, who was much reviled and ridiculed because of his confession of the wording of the Holy Scriptures in opposition to Copernicanism, died suddenly of a heart attack on July 27 at the age of 72.

Presbyterianism. The pastor of the Free Church at Holgrood, in Scotland, has charged a brother minister, the Rev. W. Smith, of Edinburgh, with heresy before his presbytery, because the same has held a Christmas service in commemoration of the birth of Christ. The accuser calls this proceeding an innovation consistent with the natural man, and quite likely to introduce a mass of superstition into the church. What was hardly to be expected from Presbyterians, the Presbytery acquitted the accused by 14 votes to 6.

Germany. The Eisenach Church Conference will again unite the representatives of the German Protestant church governments in the near future. The subject of the discussion is the simultaneous celebration of the Day of Atonement. From all the circumstances, however, it must be concluded that the discussion of an even more important matter will be continued, which has already occupied the Church Conference greatly in the past, namely, the representation of the regional synods at the Eisenach Church Conference. In this way a kind of unity of the German Protestant Church is to be initiated, toward which the Minister of Culture, Falk, has been working for years with the Berlin Oberkirchenrat, a German Church with Prussian leadership. The Minister of Culture has chosen Dr. Dove of Göttingen to represent Hanover. (N. Zibl.)

Germany and Rome. In Münkel's N. Zeitblatt of July 11 we read: The Crown Prince declares to the Pope: "No Prussian monarch will be able to comply with the demand expressed in your letter of April 17 that the constitution and laws of Prussia should be amended according to the statutes of the Roman Catholic Church, because the independence of the monarchy, the preservation of which is incumbent upon me at present as an inheritance from My Fathers and as a duty to My country, would suffer a diminution if the free movement of its legislation should be subordinated to a power standing outside it." This is to say: to Canossa we will not go! Since the Prussian Government publishes this letter, it must be assumed not only that it wishes to justify itself with regard to the much-discussed negotiations, but also that the negotiations have come to a standstill as unfruitful.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 24.

October 1878.

No. 10.

(Sent in by Dr. Sihler.)

In what manner was the controversy existing in the New York ministry tried at fine meeting this year at Utica? *)

Readers of "Lehre und Wehre" may well remember that, especially at the suggestion of Dr. Ruperti, the St. Matthew's congregation in New York, in 1875, subjected the existing synodal constitution to a closer examination according to God's Word and the church confession. The conclusion was that this constitution in several respects encroached upon the evangelical rights of the individual congregations and attributed to the synod, or rather to the ministry in the assemblies against the Word and the confession, a kind of legislative and judicial power. This knowledge of the truth, gained from Scripture and confession, was now brought up before the public synodal assembly, and the amendment of the constitution of the synod, according to the word of God and the confession of the church, was proposed. The proposals of St. Matthew's congregation for this change found willing acceptance and strong support in a number of pastors and congregations, and were discussed in detail during the Synodal year 1876-77 in the "Lutheran Herald," the organ of the Synod. Likewise, they found thorough discussion at the Synodal Assembly of 1877, and the Synod elected a committee to report to the next Synodal Assembly.

*) In taking up this article, the editorial staff declares that it does so not with the intention of opposing the good men of the so-called protest party, but merely in the consciousness that it requires faithful brotherly love when it sees brothers in danger of being seduced by false brothers, to warn them, to strengthen them, to encourage them, so that the work of God that has begun will not be stopped or even brought to a standstill. We contend in the Spirit with the witnesses of truth so dear to us, and will not cease to implore steadfastness and victory for them also before the throne of grace.

D. R.

The Council recommended that the Commission submit proposals for the amendment of the Constitution and recommended further thorough consideration of the matter during the year.

After a new editor of the synodal organ, Dr. Moldehnke, had been elected, he declared in the first number of the paper that the "Herold" would not permit any debate of this most important matter in its columns. He took the liberty of returning or arbitrarily altering articles sent to him, and sought in a most unjust manner to cast suspicion on the propositions of St. Matthew's congregation and its representatives. The latter, therefore, saw fit to protest against such one-sided and presumptuous conduct. But this protest was not heeded by the editor, who refused to include it in the paper.

The protesters now felt compelled to go a step further and called a general meeting of like-minded pastors and congregations of New York and the surrounding area. This was held on September 17 in the lower rooms of St. Matthew's Church and was very well attended.

Then it was decided, because the editor of the "Herold" did not want to give any space to the testimony of truth in the synodal journal in a thoroughly unjust, arbitrary and rapacious way, to publish a journal of its own under the title: "Witness of Truth", the first number of which appeared on October 1, 1877.

In accordance with its name, this paper has, in the consecutive numbers, testified to the suppressed truth in the relevant doctrine on the basis of Scripture, and in accordance with the church confession, also with the attraction of our church father Luther, in a thoroughly objective and moderate manner. Likewise, it did not respond in the same way to the bitter and spiteful outbursts of the "Herold" and punished the various dishonesty of the editor of this paper rather too mildly than too harshly.

How did things go at the meeting of the so-called New York Ministry held on August 1 with regard to the points at issue?

In our opinion, the representatives of the "Witness of Truth", the so-called Protest Party, should have first insisted that the committee elected by the Synodal Assembly of 1877 immediately introduce the proposals for the amendment of the Synodal Constitution to be submitted to this year's Assembly.

Secondly, it should have insisted that, in connection with this, its summarizing fundamental proposition be thoroughly negotiated, which thus reads: "According to the teaching of the holy Scriptures and our confessions, the Christian congregation gathered around the Word of God is the holder and bearer of all ecclesiastical authority."

Thirdly, she would have had the editor of the "Herold" at the Synod in

He should be charged with the fact that, while his predecessor in 1876-77, undeniably also according to the wish and will of the Synod, had opened its organ to a detailed discussion of the proposals of St. Matthew's congregation and the Scriptural teaching on which it is based, he had done just the opposite and in an unjust and arbitrary way closed the columns of the Synodal organ to this discussion and had been guilty of many gross dishonesty and obvious sins against the 8th commandment.

Don all this, however, nothing happened. The protesting party also consented to the proposal of the Rev. Ehrhart of New York, "to appoint a conference committee from both sides, whose duty it should be to agree on certain points, and to submit such as a basis of peace to the Synod." This proposal passed almost unanimously, and the President accordingly chose 5 pastors and 2 delegates from each side as members of this Conference Committee.

As a final result of the negotiations of this committee, the secretary then read the following "resolutions" before the synod:

1. "Your Committee, after having thoroughly investigated (?) the existing points of difference, has come to the conviction that the protesting party, although convinced of the correctness and importance of its view of the position of the congregation in the Synod, has none the less, by the rash (?) publication of the 'Witness of Truth', committed an offence against the Constitution of the Synod, to which, however, it saw itself provoked by the manner of the conduct of the Synodal body."

In view of this first Resolution already, one cannot help regretting that the co-counseling and co-deciding members of the previous protest party were rather moved by the love of peace of a Melancthon than by the joyful spirit of witness of a Luther. For while they were fully justified before God in helping the evangelical truth, which had been suppressed by the editor of the "Herold," the synodal organ, to its right by the publication of the "Witness of Truth," also for the benefit of the sincere but weak members of their synod, it seems almost as if they therefore put on a penitential garment, that by this publication they had "transgressed against the constitution of the synod. But where it is a matter of defending the honor of God and his word, and the truth of the confession of the church founded thereon, the witness of truth, orally and in writing, should trample under his feet every article of the constitution of a synod which stands in the way of this witness, and make no confession of sin.

Then it makes a strange impression that those who have protested up to this point have put up with their constant testimony of truth being called only one (subjective) "opinion" in this first resolution, as if there were other opinions that were in the same right, and there were several kinds of truth. And whereas in the first number of the "Witness to the

Truth" rightly consider and declare it a matter of conscience to publish this paper, they agree that this Conference Committee calls this publication "premature".

The conclusion of the first resolution is thus: "Furthermore, the Committee cannot conceal from itself that during the whole of the latter period there has been a great deal of mutual lack in personal relations, which sin each may confess to his God and forgive the other."

From this compromise, too, the all too great love of peace on the part of the members of the previous protesting party, who were appointed to this Conference Committee, is unmistakably perceptible. For every Lutheran, even outside the New York Synod, who has read the serial numbers of the "Witness of Truth" without preconceived opinion and without bias, will admit that its punishment of the editor of the "Herald" was objectively just, without personal bitterness and spite. The protesters of Dr. Moldehnke, however, have had to experience this in abundance in the "Herald," along with all kinds of distortion of the facts and dishonesty. Of this, however, repentance towards God and righteous apology also towards the offended neighbour was to be demanded. Unfortunately, however, neither here, nor in the following "resolutions," nor later in the proceedings of the Synod is anything to be read of the serious, just punishment which Dr. Moldehnke had richly deserved; for as if he were the Synod's personified and absolutely averse to the scriptural reformation of the Romanizing Synodal Constitution, he, against the Synod's earlier wish and against the practice of the former editor of the "Herald," as the Synod's organ, as a kind of Pabst, partly did not include the submissions of the protesting party in the paper, partly allowed himself "arbitrary changes" in order to make room for his and his followers' hierarchical Grabauian views.

2. The second resolution thus reads: "We freely confess that the real differences are in doctrine, which must be honestly considered in conformity with the Word of God (no mention is made of the ecclesiastical confession), and propose that this be done at once in connection with the consideration of the present new Synodal Constitution."

That there was no hurry with this "immediate honest consideration", but that, after the imitable proceedings of the *General Council*, the hearing of the matter was postponed to the next year, of this the last resolution of the Synodal Assembly, which this assessment will cite later, provides the necessary proof.

3. The third resolution is in these words: "We mutually undertake to bring about a union of the two sheets as soon as possible, and as long as this union is not achieved, to abstain from mutual combat, as well as from all personal attacks and bitterness."

As much as the latter is to be approved of, of which, however, "the witness of truth" is not guilty against his opponent as the latter is against him, it is still not quite clear how the fight against the "herald" by the "witness of truth" can cease as long as the latter holds fast to his erroneous assertions and contradicts the testimony of truth. For only then, when, by God's grace, the "Herald" would give up both and, rejecting his former errors, would recognize and testify to the same evangelical truth in the doctrines in question - only then could the struggle cease, only then would true union exist, and only then could there be talk of a fusion of the two papers.

4. In the fourth resolution, the reporting and proposing conference committee states: "We recommend to the honorable Synod, on the basis of the preceding resolutions, that all mutual complaints now before this body be dismissed.

If among these complaints on the part of the so-called protesting party against the editor of the "Herald," as can hardly be otherwise assumed, was also the just and well-founded one that he refused to admit their submissions to the synodical organ, this resolution is a new proof of the love of peace exercised in the wrong place by the protesters who took part in the Conference Committee; for true love, even for Dr. Moldehnke, necessarily required, as already mentioned earlier, his serious punishment because of his unjust, high-handed and presumptuous proceedings, which, as can be seen from the whole, was completely omitted.

According to No. 23 of the "Witness of Truth", which reports on the conclusion of the synod, it has now really come to the presentation of the proposals. The 4th paragraph, which deals with "Rights and Duties," now says: a. "In all actual congregational matters the synod has only an advisory authority, but the congregations are to seek and hold in honor its counsel in all important cases."

Pastor Kuehn, of New York, introduced a substitute, the second part of which is thus enunciated: "In all doctrinal and vital questions, which, after the application of the church discipline procedure prescribed in God's Word (as if this were to be applied in doctrinal questions at all times), have not found a satisfactory solution within the individual congregation, the synod, as an association of all synodical congregations, shall have a decisive voice."

Professor Dr. Krauth, who was present and also took a lively part in the debate on this point, gave even more emphasis to the conclusion of this substitute by saying: "The Synod should never seek to enforce its advice with coercive measures; it should, however, give official advice, and compliance with such advice can be demanded on the part of the Synod, and it should always carry with it a moral weight. In my opinion, this article should be unanimously adopted."

Strangely enough, neither in this substitute, nor in its amplification by Dr. Krauth, is there even a single mention of the Word of God; for only then could the Synod have a "decisive voice" and the observance of its "official counsel" (which, however, would then no longer be mere counsel) "be demanded" if it could thoroughly, clearly, and irrefutably prove the truth and correctness of its decision from the holy Scriptures. In this case, but only in this case, it has the right to demand obedience from the congregation referred to it, or, if not, to exclude it from its association; but, mind you, the synod has this right not as a kind of judicial assembly, as is the case in secular courts, but only as a servant and orthodox interpreter and user of the clear Word of God, the Holy Scriptures, which is also the basis of the ecclesiastical confession.

Without this connection, without submission to the divine word in every case, no synod has the right and power to oblige any congregation to obey its decision in conscience. Moreover, the history of the Church teaches how larger and smaller conciliar bodies, because they did not submit unconditionally to the Word of God, have repeatedly erred in matters of doctrine and life. Thus, for example, at the Council of Nicaea in 325, the 318 bishops were close to decreeing the celibacy of the servants of the church - so early had a false legalism against evangelical freedom penetrated into the church - if the only pope, who was not a bishop, had not, on the basis of 1 Tim. 4 and other related passages, resolutely opposed this intention of the bishops and overcome them with God's word, so that they refrained from their presumption. And so, according to God's will, and with a right view of the nature of the church, it should always remain. To the youngest so-called lay delegate in a synodal assembly all pastors are to yield and submit, if he has God's word on his side in any doctrinal or vital question.

By the way, certain words, which Dr. Krauth, as the "Witness of Truth" reports, uttered on this occasion, are strange; for though he first correctly remarked that the synod had only so much power as the congregations voluntarily conferred upon it, yet it had, though in a derived manner, a divine prestige. In our opinion, this prestige (or authority) can only have that which has divine institution for itself, that is, the gospel and its seal, the sacraments, together with the office of the keys and the entrustment of the same to certain persons. Everything else in the church, whether it be bishop, presbytery, consistory, college, or synod, stands only in a servile relation to the means of grace and their official administration, and is only a human order. But this is made

to none divine, if, for example, in the Lutheran church of this country the congregations of a synod were so ignorant or foolish as to transfer by congregational resolutions certain functions of their self-government, ordered by God in his word, as, for example, the appointment and dismissal of their pastors and the final act of church discipline, the ban, temporarily and under certain conditions to the synod for administration. For this delegation is not ordered and ordained of God, as is that of the administration of the means of grace on the part of the congregation, as the household of Christ and co-owner of the same, to certain persons, so that these may also publicly administer the means of grace in their name, that is, at their behest and in their stead, for the common benefit.

Dr. Moldehnke, who unfortunately, as already mentioned, did not receive the well-deserved punishment from any side, deigned to declare that "as far as municipal rights are concerned, he agrees with the opinion of the so-called Proiestpartei, even if he deviates from it in the consequences".

With this concession the party in question seems to have been quite well pleased and satisfied; for he was not attacked on account of his concluding words, which, as it were, annulled his concession again; for if a proposition is true in the doctrine of the church, i. e. If a proposition is true in the doctrine of the church, i.e., if it is founded in God's Word, then it must prove itself true and correct in all its consequences, and these consequences are, as it were, the backward test and proof of it; if, in a correct conclusion, one would arrive at reprehensible consequences, then the very proposition placed at the head would be incorrect.

Finally it says: "However, it was by no means intended to bring such an important matter to a conclusion without first discussing it thoroughly, if possible exhaustively. Therefore, at the end of the debates, it was decided: 1. to recommend the entire proposal to the individual congregations and conferences for discussion, and 2. to set Friday and Monday of the next synodal assembly for discussion of the same. Such, then, in brief, is the course and conclusion of this year's meeting of the so-called New York Ministry in the doctrinal points in question.

It is indeed to be deplored that this matter was not thoroughly discussed and brought to a conclusion, and that its discussion was postponed again, for which the so-called protest party is not without blame; for they should have shown more vigorous energy and courage as witnesses, and should not have declared themselves satisfied with these and those half concessions, but should have shown themselves as confessing ecclesiastical characters in the synodal assembly.

Since, however, Dr. Moldehnke, instead of the serious punishment he deserves, has regained the election to publish the "Herold" from the Synod, not exactly to their honor, it is to be expected that his "Herold" will save the "Witness of Truth" and the otherwise sincerely Lutheran-minded so-called protest party from losing their salt. -

Johann Salomo Semler, the father of rationalism.

The man who exercised the greatest influence in the circles of "Protestant" Germany at the time of the second half of the eighteenth century, helped to put Orthodoxy, Pietism, and a certain Enlightenment in their coffins for a short time, and paved the way for Rationalism to reign in the Lutheran Church, was Johann Salomo Semler.

He was born on 18 December 1725 in Saalfeld. His father, who held the position of a preacher there, was a man who was well versed in theology and who was very "keen on an exemplary life", and his mother is said to have been an understanding, simple, pious woman. Semler was scarcely fifteen years old when he lost her. It was the first powerful intervention in the development of his outer and inner life. Another was closely connected with it, and it became even more disastrous for him.

At that time, Pietism had won the victory at the Saalseld court and had settled under ducal protection with all its hours, associations, means of edification and conversion. Whoever did not want to be judged disadvantageously, as if he were not "in the state of grace and rebirth," whoever made it his business to escape many a setback even in outward life, easily found himself in the praised orders and customs, along with the "special hours of edification and new songs. That honest souls were also serious about the matter, who would, who could deny it? Others of the better minded, however, remained aloof, and expressed their displeasure more or less loudly. The Herrnhutian nature united with the Pietist nature, and both continued to grow inexorably in churches, schools, and homes.

Thus Semler's youth fell in the heyday of Pietism, and he first became acquainted with it when his older brother returned home from Jena. There he counted among his friends "all pious, converted or awakened students, who spent a lot of time in prayer meetings, and considered all scholarship to be very dispensable, at least connected with some danger to the soul. But the conscientious, more melancholy-minded young man did not have such a sweet fate as many of them. Semler himself reveals to us in his own description of his life what despair seized his poor brother, and in his words is reflected a bright, or rather a very dark picture of the aberrations of Pietism. "Easy as it became," he relates, "for many brethren to state the day, the hour of the sealing, from which time they had every cause to live in pure spiritual, heavenly cheerfulness, and were immediately raised to the rank of God's children who had come to the breakthrough, my brother could not forgive himself this imitation and spiritual lie. It met

-He remembered nothing of what others so easily and so innumerably said. So he fell into an unmeasured sadness over the greatness of his sins, which alone prevented him from doing so; he not only prayed, he whimpered half the night before the Savior, and no change was found in his consciousness. He seldom ate meat, no white bread or rolls; he thought himself quite worthless, even of his existence. Every night, when I had fallen asleep, he would steal secretly out of bed, creep into the adjoining little bookcase, kneel or lie completely on the ground, and gradually lose his care to speak softly and quietly in the heat of the moment; his bright whimpering and moaning would wake me up. I sought him, and as little as I could trust myself, as a much less converted disciple, to find great entrance, I sometimes recited to him such beautiful lines or verses, even in Greek and Hebrew, that he often embraced me and sighed: "Oh, if that were my business! I would sometimes hastily reply, what a man's perversion this was, instead of conversion; how impossible this way could be right and true." Grief and inward discord soon put an end to the poor youth's life. But he is and remains an irrefragable witness of the perversity and unhealthy goings-on of Pietism.

So the first impression had not been a favorable one. The pitiful condition of his brother had nothing tempting for Semler to draw him into the path of pietism. Now, however, the boy was struck by the fact that his father, "without an inner urge of the heart, only out of external considerations, suddenly changed his way of thinking after the death of his mother, and "used to mix in more new dialect than usual. This circumstance was not likely to win the son's heart to Pietism. When Semler left his father's house and entered his school, he again encountered the new dialect and the new piety in his teachers and pupils; but here, too, he was annoyed by many things about the latter. He believed to notice in the most praised "partly real moral disorders"; "consequently," he thinks, "one would be satisfied with outward hypocrisy, and that could not possibly be called a power of godliness; partly most of the pupils were ignoramuses, and loved such hourly work, because it would be much easier than to attack oneself in study." The healthy mind of the boy had again struck the sore side of Pietism. But his criticisms were in vain, and all his resistance was of no avail. It was said, after all, that the court was not indifferent to the fact that the archdeacon's son was still unconverted, and wished to remain so, to the ruin of so many other pupils. Then the father exhorted conversion, and directed him to attend the Rector's "heart or private edification lessons." Semler followed, and judging from his testimony, he took all possible pains to cast himself aside, and did "all the steps and footsteps of the new piety." But in spite of kneeling in all the corners of the house, in spite of

Despite the many tears he wept, the sealing and the certainty of his childship did not come. He was and remained under the law, as the pietists said.

What he had begun in his father's house in Saalfeld, Semler continued at the university in Halle. His inner condition was a poor preparation for a healthy study of theology. His scientific knowledge had probably not been promoted very much in the last time by the lessons in school; Semler, however, had made up for the mistake of his more pious than learned teachers by iron diligence and his own work. But he lacked a sure guiding star out of the confusion of his inner thoughts and his ways to the knowledge of truth and salvation in Christ. What he did not have, Halle could not give him. Lange, the famous champion of Pietism, was still alive, but was at the end of his career and complained bitterly that his colleges were empty. Of the remaining professors only one distinguished himself, and knew how to captivate the students by his lecture: Dr. Baumgarten. But he did not have the best reputation among the Pietists; they missed in him "spiritual juice and nourishment of devotion" and reproached him with too much learned knowledge; although in his lectures he still outwardly adhered to the Scriptures, he was nevertheless the secret forerunner of a new age, and thought differently than Pietists and Orthodox about theology and religion. At Halle Semler met a circle of old acquaintances from Saalfeld, all of whom belonged to the pious through complete surrender to the Saviour, but whose Ketner could show the newcomer the way of sober repentance and healthy faith.

Lange did not listen to Semler; he visited him, but did not buy the *Oeconomia Saluti* (a work of Lange's), which was offered to him cheaply, but put it down again, and did not go to his college. He first took up residence in the orphanage, and kept lively company with the Pietist and Herrnhut students. They sought to win him completely to the Savior, and persuaded him harshly that only the "unfortunate studying hindered him; he should reject it, the Savior could teach better than men. Semler, who, under their direction, became more and more restless, so that he wished to be a lump of ice or a piece of wood, tried to find peace, and the motto now became for him: Piety (in the pietistic, sense) or scholarship. Between these two he wavered in embarrassing uncertainty of heart. At one time he bought several Latin books with joy, at another he was frightened by this sin of his, when his friend's mouth admonished him to keep a better watch over his heart. But the love of scholarship won the day, Semler became for the time being one of Dr. Baumgarten's most ardent admirers and knew only of libraries, books, studies and scholarly works. Differently disposed than his brother, Semler, like him, entered the school of Pietism,

did not find the peace and tranquility of his soul in it any more than he did and took leave of it to satisfy his unrestrained hunger for knowledge and study. In the logical development of the intellectual work of his age, he grew up to be a determined opponent of the Confession and the Scriptures, and did away tremendously with what was proper to Christianity, while his education, in addition to his dry, philistine, but honest nature, made of him the man who, through outward piety, was an offence to the unbelieving children of the time.

How different the development of the man who, with the light of Scripture, on the basis of justification by faith alone in Word and Sacrament, redeemed Christendom from the Roman statutes and from the works of men! His penitential struggle in the monastery at Erfurt was more shattering through anguish and torment of conscience than anything that Pietism called by that name. But it was nothing of his own making, and led infinitely more into the depths of the knowledge of sin and of God's punitive justice. The false and corrupt Pietism lacked above all the understanding of the law. We shall have to return to this decisive point in the development of Semler's teaching. But then, how pathetic all these stories of breakthrough and sealing are in comparison with the certainty of the Lutheran faith, the heartfelt confidence of the poor sinner in the immutable work of his redemption through Christ, the firm trust of the soul in God's eternal word in the gospel of his grace and free love, the adherence to his saving deeds in baptism and the Lord's Supper! How childish, miserable, and unevangelical this timidity of study and science! How cranky, unsober, and fundamentally wrong this Pietistic piety in comparison with the "good works" of the fathers, "done, not that one should trust to merit grace thereby, but for God's sake and to praise God"! But of this no idea came over Semler. Pietism, which broke with the basic teachings of Scripture and the Reformation, became for him the bridge to rationalism.

When Semler broke with Pietism, he lived only his scholarly studies, and occupied himself more and more with theology. The warning to beware of "cold subtlety" and not to study "beyond Christ", the well-meant advice to seek only that where there was "strength and juice", found deaf ears with him, and already his mind was floating with the ideas that later became the basis of his entire outlook. When he had received his master's degree, he left Halle (1750) and moved to Coburg to take over the editorship of the *Staats- und Gelehrten Zeitung* there. One year later he was appointed professor of history at Altvorf. Here he spent the most beautiful time of his life, so that it became difficult for him to leave there when he (1752) was appointed professor of history by the influence of his teacher Baumgarten.

Theology was appointed to Halle. This appointment became decisive for his whole life.

Semler knew that his new colleagues disliked his choice, and he became anxious at the question of what position he would take towards them. In Semler and his pietist colleagues, two irreconcilable opposites were at odds with each other; however, they were not merely one-sided or unhealthy, but fundamentally wrong directions, the further development of which was immediately fatal to the Lutheran Church. Semler saw quite clearly in many points the weak side of his opponents, and draws an instructive picture of the last days of Pietism in the last century. "Many," he reports in his own description of his life, "had become accustomed to an outward, pious routine, if I may call it that, as I regard it; whoever did not also consent to this straightforwardly and already conceded to them the preference, was regarded as alienated from the life that is of God. On the other hand, whoever properly employed much time and hours, even well appointed, in talking or hearing talk about conversion; whoever often sang special songs or distinguished them from others, who were, as it were, observers; whoever, in addition, did not sigh or complain of very many persons who did not enter into the former pious circle: he was still called unborn again, and was excluded from the number of the children of God." But Semler did not see through the deeper apostasy and inner contradiction of Pietism with Scripture and Reformation; what he recognized still less was the wrong path which he himself had entered, and on which he now continued to progress. He thinks, of course, that he would not have taken the same path if his colleagues had given him more love and greater trust. He may have been mistaken about this himself: in any case, it is certain that his whole natural disposition and the position of his heart drove him to it, and the mistrust of his colleagues can at most have been the further external cause.

Semler now studied in Halle with untiring zeal everything that presented itself to him, and collected enormous treasures of scholarship, which he stored in his memory or in his notes from all areas of theology. A restless worker, dry and bourgeois, ponderous in thought, awkward in the expression of his thoughts, familiar with all books, doctrines, opinions and events, but with an infinite wealth of knowledge without deeper insight and clarity in the various questions and situations, he represents the faithful image of one of those scholars whose erudition we marvel at, while the oddity, as well as the superficiality of his own judgment strikes us as equally strange. Soon Semler, who had left the rutted track of his predecessors and directed the study of theology in new directions, had gathered around him a numerous crowd of students; soon his reputation spread far beyond Halle, and when he presented the results of his studies to the century in writings of all kinds

Some, however, rejoiced at his appearance, so that there was no lack of honor and struggle for him. This is not the place to describe the development of Semler's theology, but we would like to outline its main features.

The slogan of the Reformation had been justification by faith alone; what it emphasized was Christ for us in Word and Sacrament; notwithstanding that it necessarily saw in faith the beginning of a new life in good works, it laid all weight on Christ, whom faith grasps in the means of grace, and not on the new obedience or any work of man.

Pietism, which from the beginning placed the emphasis on the vitality of faith, lost Christ more and more, and his living faith gradually became the main thing for him. Pure doctrine could no longer have much value for him, and an outward, Christian walk in "pious routine" replaced everything.

At this point Semler intervened and continued the pietistic thread of apostasy. He completely abandoned the faith, also abandoned the "pious routine," and retained only the moral life. With this, however, Protestant Germany sank into the barren depths of arid and barren rationalism with its reason and virtue.

Semler knew nothing of the misery of sin, and as he had not even a deep idea of the holiness and righteousness of God, so he also knew nothing of the torment of a conscience troubled for the sake of transgression. Besides, he thought highly of man's reason, the use of which he had not well in science, but in learning. He felt more thirst for knowledge than for truth in divine things. In both of these pieces, then, Semler's position was from the outset different from that of Luther and the Reformation. There, the deep knowledge and living experience of sin, the firm conviction of the impotence of human reason in divine things; with Semler, on the other hand, the value of his "moral feelings" and the anger because of the "harsh judgments" of Augustine, Luther, etc., about reason.

From this standpoint, of course, the Scriptures had to lose their former prestige for Semler. He not only rejected this or that outgrowth of seventeenth-century theology; he downright denied that the Scriptures were inspired by God, and thus had no sure, infallible guide to faith and life in them. In his criticism the Old Testament came off badly in this respect, and basically the new one did not fare any better.

What was Semler supposed to do now? Go the way of philosophy, like the naturalists and enlighteners of his time? That would be the only logical

right path from his point of view.... But Semler didn't want that, just as all rationalists and liberals don't want that. . . . Semler, under the influence of his previous development and in the course of his scholarly studies, made up his own mind about religion, theology, Christianity and the church, and formed a moral worldview that was nothing but his own image and the work of his poetry. This, however, he then identified with the Bible and Christianity. Of course, his view, the teaching of Scripture and the confession of the church did not coincide. Semler knew how to remedy this. Since there was nothing wrong with his views and opinions, he improved the Scriptures. With a merciless hand he eliminated from it everything "local" that only owed its origin to a certain time or to the circumstances of a particular place. Of course, everything was "local" that Semler did not know how to accommodate in his "private religion"; the remnants of Semlerian extracts had stripped away everything "local"! Thus he was at peace with Scripture; it said only what he taught it, and he taught what it said.

Furthermore, he got himself two cabinets: one was titled Religion, the other Theology. In the one he put the "moral feelings," everything that might religiously or morally appeal to or stimulate the mind and spirit; he called this the private religion of Christians, as diverse as times, years, peoples, and persons. In the others he included all religious doctrines; whatever their origin, they all had one, i.e., no value, and were considered as much as the cursed and condemned heresies. Again, he derived their origin purely from "local things"; time, place, circumstances, the condition of men, surroundings, needs of the moment had created them; they were of no concern to simple Christianity; every one could do with them in his private religion, take from them and reject from them what he wanted or what suited him.

Churches and confessions, sects and heresies did not present an insurmountable obstacle to his indestructible working power. With the "historical local, individual reason" Semler already knew how to help himself through. For the purpose of a "public form of religion," the "union of a great multitude into a special Christian religious society," he had the parties compile the "sum of doctrines. According to him, the articles of doctrine were merely to secure the "outward subjection of the ecclesiastical subjects and the firm union of a great church state." The dogmas of the Concilia or of the "ecclesiastical Diet" are only conditions for entrance into the (ecclesiastical) "society," and stand in no relation to the blessedness of Christians.*) "All these confessional writings," he means,

*I confess to myself that such ecclesiastical assemblies were useful in those days, but not at all in order to preserve and distinguish correctly the foundation and content of the Christian religion, but in order to prevent even more external disruptions.

"have first of all a bourgeois, external intention." Their right is therefore only a political one; for the sake of order and tranquillity a certain doctrine must be publicly led and propagated, and the State has an interest that this shall be done. Besides this, however, no one is to be prevented from living according to his own private religion. No one has had less understanding of the great doctrinal struggles in the course of time, and church history has never suffered more than under his hands. Just think of his judgment on the martyrs of the first centuries: how roughly he treated them, and how silly is his judgment on the first persecutions of Christians! *)

Semler now came into conflict with the naturalists of his time, and they resented him very much for taking a stand against them and their work. What separated them was not the content of faith or unbelief, but rather a certain reverence for the Bible and Christianity that Semler had retained. Like them, he had suffered shipwreck in the faith, and had really done away with Christianity; but he still wanted to save an outward appearance, and in this respect his naturalistic opponents were more consistent than he. His activity was a "great (!) rummaging"; but he did not know how to really develop and carry out his principles. On the other hand, he preserved a certain piety, which, however, was no more Christian than his knowledge was Protestant. .. In this respect, too, Semler was probably not like most of the naturalists of his time.

In 1779, Semler had reached the pinnacle of his career; from then on, his name lost the sound it had previously had among his contemporaries. He stuck to his views to the end. His century, however, took from his writings only the weapons that he had prepared and honed against Scripture and confession, and listened with a shrug of the shoulders when Semler opened his mouth to speak out against Christianity. Then they believed

of the Catholic introduced church state law and even to prevent civil unrest (!). All Christians who did not want to participate in ecclesiastical positions and promotions were not concerned with these new decisions about the *homousian* (consubstantiality) of the Son of God, about the Holy Spirit and two natures" (!!!). "But as soon as I thought of the outward union of such a great multitude of churches or of their bishops with others of their like, I saw that it was quite a necessary means to this end, general union of all bishops among themselves, to introduce and maintain a general public language of all churches, in order to have a uniformity in public prayers, hymns, wherein the subordination of the clergy to the bishops would have to be continually exercised and proved."

*) "But I could find no valid excuse why these Christians did not obey the command or prohibition of their authorities in all cities, and yet assembled secretly at night, since they could much more decently assemble publicly and request the presence of an authority. All lies, accusations, and blasphemies against the Christians would have become impossible in this way."

they did not give the much-vaunted prophet any more, and accused him of fear and hypocrisy. In the end he stood abandoned by all the world. Dissatisfied with the turn things had taken in theology and the church, he turned more to natural science and alchemy. "Full of the conviction that, as from small seeds great trees grow, so gold and silver also have their own seed, which grows easily in its soil, he saw alchemy raise its head with pleasure. He, who in his earlier years had lived in constant struggle with superstition and with enthusiasm, allowed himself in the last years of his life to be tinged with theosophical enthusiasm, and firmly believed in honest secret chemistry, in honest private physics, in a vanished world of light of the ancients, and for a time manufactured with full conviction air and stink gold and hermetic medicines." *)

Thus Semler reached March 14, 1791, and when he died, the victory of unbelief had already been won in Germany. Over the Rhine, however, another torch blazed, and the Lord wielded a scourge over Germany's neck, whose blows had a humiliating effect in the night of suffering; at the same time, he made the lampstand of his word bright again. Now this is the judgment, that light is come into the world, and men love darkness rather than light: for their works are evil. (Joh. 3, 19.).

(Evangelical Lutheran messenger of peace from Alsace.)

(Translated by Prof. A. Crämer.)

Compendium of the Theology of the Fathers

From

M. Heinrich Eckhardt.

Chapter V.

From the crldsung by Christun.

I. Redemption in general.

Who is the author of our salvation?

Albinus: "The most gracious **Creator**, not wishing that the image of His likeness should be eternally lost, sent His only begotten Son, the God through whom He created man, so that he might be redeemed by the very One through whom he was created.

*) Bibliographical sketch of his life, published after his death, from the pen of an enlightened man.

1) Mitissimus **Creator** nolens facturam imaginis suae aeternum perire, misit Filium suum unigenitum Deum, per quem creavit hominem, ut **per eundem** redimeretur, per quem est creatus.

Albin. 1. 3. de Trinit. c. **12.**

gave us to be redeemed, to cleanse us by his blood from the old ungodliness, and to give us life, whom we were already beginning to destroy because of the wickedness that was in us." 1)

It seems to me that the expression is suspicious that Christ redeems us from the old ungodliness, but is this the same thing that some say Christ did enough for only one kind of sin?

AnselmuS: "Christ invented in his blood the redemption of all, not a temporal, but an eternal, because the price he gave was so great as to procure eternal liberty for the redeemed. For he hath put away both original and real sin, and hath brought forth all righteousness, and hath opened the kingdom of heaven." 2)

Since you say that in Christ's blood redemption is invented for all, is redemption therefore universal?

St. Basil: "There is a price found for all men at once, the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which he shed for us all." 3) Origen: "Christ came on earth, and suffered in his human body for the salvation of all men, that by his suffering he might put death to death, and by his resurrection bring new life to light for all." 4) The same: "The only-begotten God, who in the last time descended from heaven, and made of the virgin the vessel of the earthly body, took away and washed away the pus, the uncleanness, and the rottenness of the whole world, bearing the sins of all, by whose wounds also all are healed." 5)

Christus dilexit nos, dans semetipsum pro nobis redemptionem, ut nos sanguine suo mundaret ab antiqua impietate, et vitam nobis praestaret, incipientibus jam perire pro malitia, quae erat in nobis. Ign. ad Trail.

Christus in sanguine suo redemptionem omnium invenit, non temporalem sed aeternam; quia tantum fuit pretium, quod dedit, ut aeternam redemptis libertatem redderet. Delevit enim tam originalia, quam actualia peccata; et omnem justificationem exhibuit ac regnum coelorum aperuit. Ansh. in 9. c. Ebr.

Inventum est unum pro omnibus simul hominibus dignum precium, sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, quem pro nobis omnibus effudit. Basil, in serm. de hum. nat.

Christus ad terram veniens in humano corpore passiones sustinuit pro omnium hominum salute, ut per passionem mortem interficeret, et per resurrectionem recidivam cunctis vitam ostenderet. Orig. 1. 1. in Job.

Descendens de coelis unigenitus Deus in novissimo tempore, terreni corporis testa ex virgine se induens, totius mundi saniem, immunditiam et putredinem rasis atque mundavit, omnium peccata supportando, cujus livore omnes etiam sanati sunt. Id. 1. 2. in Job.

II. Some names of the Savior.

1. Why is he called the Word or Logos

First, Epiphanius: "The Son of God is called Logos, or the Word, because he is the declarer of the will of God." 1)

Second, Theodoret: "He is also called the Word, because he was born without time and suffering, and nothing of the birthing was hurt, torn, or broken through." 2)
 Chrysostom: "Since he wished to teach us that this Word is the only-begotten Son of God, lest anyone should think of the lethal nature, he takes away all suspicion by the pre-possessed name Word." 3)

But anyway that name once did the heretics deny Christ's personality?

Ignatius: "The word of the Father is not an uttered, but an essential; not an articulate speech of the mouth, but an effect of the Godhead, namely, a begotten substance, well pleasing in all things to its producer." 4)

2. Why the reflection of the Father?

Sedulius: "Because, as the radiance does not separate from the sun, so also the reflection of the glory of the Father is inseparable from the Father Himself." 5)
 Dionysius Alex, calls it the "Broden of the power of God." 6)

3. Why the other Adam?

Anselmus: "Because Adam was a figure of Christ, partly in likeness and partly in contradiction. By likeness: because, as Adam was made by God from the virgin earth without a father, so Christ was made by God from the virgin Mary without a man's seed. As he is the father of all living creatures according to the flesh, so Christ is according to faith. Adam slept that Eve might be made; Christ slept that the Church might be made. While Adam slept, Eve was made from his side; and when Christ was dead, his side was pierced with a spear, that the sacraments might flow out, of which the church is made.

Filius Dei λόγος seu Verbum vocatur, quoniam interpret est voluntatis Dei. Epiph. 1. 3. tom. 1.

Vocatur et Verbum, ut qui sine tempore ac passione provenerit, nihilque gignentis violaverit, divisit aut abruperit. Theodor. 1. 2. de prine.

Cum nos docturus esset, hoc verbum unigenitum esse Dei Filium, ne passibilem quispiam naturam suspicaretur, praeoccupata Verbi appellatione omnem aufert suspicionem. Chrys. homil. 1. in c. 1. Joh.

Verbum patris est, non prolative scilicet, sed substantiale; non locutio articulata vocis, sed operatio Deitatis; substantia sc. genita, in omnibus bene placens suo genitori. Ignat. ad Magnes.

Quia sicut splendor a sole non separatur: sic ipse splendor paternae gloriae ab ipso patre inseparabilis est. Sedul.

In 1. c. Hebr. dion. Al. vocat vaporem potentiae Dei.

was formed. In the antitype also Adam is a figure of Christ, that as by the latter's disobedience many sinners were made, so by Christ's obedience many were made righteous; and as in the former all die, so in Christ all are made alive. For as Adam, by the counsel of the devil, did bite the dust, and all that are born of him perish unto death; so Christ hath fasted, and all that are born again by him are restored unto everlasting life. As the former communicated sin and death to his seed, so the latter communicated righteousness and life to his own. As the former is the father of the present world, and the author of strife; so the latter is the father of the world to come, and the prince of peace. But it is not as with sin, so also with the gift." 1)

More common is the name Christ: what is that name?

Chrysostom: "Christ and HErr are not names of essence, but of dignity." 2)

Has it but One meaning, and is it peculiar to the Son of God alone?

JuniliuS: "God alone, God's natural Son, is called Christ par excellence; but when others are called Christ, they are called another's Christ, as: the Christ (Anointed) of the LORD, my Christ (Anointed)." 3)

(To be continued.)

Quia Adam forma fuit Christi, partim a simili, partim a contrario. A simili: quia sicut Adam sine patre a Deo ex virgine terra factus est: ita Christus ex virgine Maria sine semine a Deo creatus est. Sicut ille est pater omnium viventium secundum carnem: sic Christus secundum fidem. Dormivit Adam, ut fieret Eve: dormivit Christus, ut fieret ecclesia. Dormienti Adae facta est Heva de latere; mortuo Christo lancea percussus est latus, ut profluerent sacramenta, quibus formaretur ecclesia. A contrario quoque est Adam forma Christi, ut quomodo per illius inobedientiam peccatores constituti sunt multi: ita per Christi obedientiam justii constituerentur multi; et sicut in illo omnes moriuntur: ita in Christo omnes vivificantur. Sicut enim manducatum est ab Adam, suadente Diabolo, et omnes, qui nascuntur ex eo, morti sunt addicti: ita jejunatum est a Christo, et omnes, qui renascuntur per eum, vitae aeternae restituuntur. Sicut ille communicare potuit filiis peccatum et mortem: sic iste suis justitiam et vitam. Sicut ille est pater praesentis seculi et princeps discordiae: sic iste pater futuri seculi et princeps pacis. Sed non sicut delictum, ita et donum. Ansh. in 5. c. Rom.

Christus et Dominus non substantiae nomina sunt, sed dignitatis. Chrys. in 1. c. Joh.

Solus Deus naturaliter Dei filius Christus dicitur absolute; cum autem alii vocantur Christi, alterius dicuntur, ut Christus Domini, Christus meus. Junii. 1. l. c. 16.

Miscellany.

Influence of Judaism. In the Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung of May 31 we read: "Repeatedly we have received statements from the "strangers in our home" that the decline of Christianity points to the fulfillment of their hope of elevating Judaism to the status of world religion, and if not Judaism with its national statutes and customs, then at least the modern Jewish worldview. Already years ago a chief rabbi said: "Take pains, these limited and short-sighted Christians, to snatch a soul from us here and there, and rejoice royally when they have done so! But they do not notice that we are also missionaries, and that we are better, more skilful, and more successful than they, that we are gaining ground after ground on their own soil. Only a short time yet, and all that is truly educated among Christians will no longer need Christ, and can do just as well without Christ as we can. The time is approaching when the great majority of Christians will have returned to our faith in God, to our monotheism. The future belongs to us. We are converting *en masse* and unnoticed." From a simple Jewish teacher who was Chasan (precentor in the synagogue) we heard the same thing pronounced. Therefore, give the Jews now only the simultaneous, non-denominational elementary school, or whatever you want to call the thing, and they will seize this lever for the fulfillment of the hope of modern Israel, and we will no longer be surprised when, as has really happened, the local school council of a Bohemian community does not entrust the writing of the so-called school prayers to the Catholic or Protestant pastor, but to the rabbi, or when a Jew, as the teacher of a simultaneous school, writes "a prayer that is suitable for all confessions" and forbids the name of Christ to be spoken.

Atheism. The progressive Volkszeitung writes: "Now, after the indomitable power of natural science has shattered the entire miraculous edifice of the former world view, to come before the growing generation once again with the broken toy of faith and promise it miraculous things which it has long since smiled at, is a true ruin of every moral uprightness and only promotes the evils which one wants to eliminate. In complete agreement with this, the Social-Democratic paper "Volksstaat" says: "One of two things. Either there is no God, and then we can change the old laws as much as we like, or there is a God, and then we would be glued. Fortunately, however, no one has yet been able to prove the existence of God; *consequently we* must also suppose that morality and law are made by men, and can therefore also be changed by us according to need. And the so-called eternal principles, even these remain only as long as we consider them passable." -

Literary.

The Hexaemeron and Geology. A defense of the Mosaic account of creation against the false geological theories. By P. Eirich, pastor at Albany, N. Y. St. Louis, Mo. 1878.

It gives us great pleasure to be able to inform you that this book by Pastor P. Eirich has now appeared as a result of the "Invitation to Subscription" published in No. 2 of this journal. It needs no further recommendation and we therefore refer the honored readers to this "Invitation", in which the content of this extremely important, valuable writing is also communicated.

The book contains 244 pages 8vo and costs 75 cts, with postage 80 cts. G.

Lutheran Monographs. Philadelphia. J. Fred'k Smith, Publisher. 1878.

Under this title the said gentleman will publish Lutheran Monographs. An issue is to appear every two to three months. Each booklet is to be devoted to one subject only, and therefore complete in itself. The whole volume of about 600 pages is to cost \$3.00. The present first issue of 120 pages costs 50 Cts. broschirt and contains 2 treatises concerning the Augsburg Confession. The first:

A Chronicle of the Augsburg Confession takes up the largest part of the booklet and is an interesting work by Dr. Krauth of Philadelphia, which demonstrates great diligence and great knowledge. Dr. Krauth begins the chronology of the Augsburg Confession with the Marburg Colloquium (October 2-3, 1529). The second section covers the period from April 3, when Melanchthon begins his work, to May 4, when he expresses his desire to deliver his work to Luther. The following section reaches to May 15, the next to May 22, since the Augsburg Confession was again sent to Luther. Another section covers the time from May 23 to June 8 and tells what was done to make the Augsburg Confession a confession of all Lutheran states. The following section extends to the day of the surrender. d. June 25, etc., etc. The chronicle is not a sterile statement of what happened on each day for the Augsburg Confession and in regard to it, but also contains disputes, evidence by documents, etc. Concerning these documents, we would have wished that the original text in German or Latin (perhaps in notes) had been given at the same time. - The other treatise in this issue, *A Question of latinity* by Dr. H. E. Jacobs, is a vindication of Dr. Krauth's

Uebersetzung der Worte Melanchthons: Praesentibus principibus et aliis gubernatoribus et concionatoribus disputatum est ordine de singulis sententiis. Missa est deinde et Luthero tota forma confessionis, qui principibus scripsit, se hanc confessionem et legisse et probasse." G.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The Pennsylvania Synod "has only 153 Lutheran Sunday schools, and only 19 parochial schools, but 301 communal, i.e., un-Lutheran Sunday schools. There are 1,950 teachers and 15,431 pupils in the 153 Lutheran Sunday schools, and 23 teachers and 1,255 pupils in the 19 common schools; but 3,837 teachers and 30,431 pupils in the 301 un-Lutheran Sunday schools. Isn't that outrageous?" - So writes a paper appearing within this Synod, the "Pilgrim." -

Miraculous church policy of a Grabauian. Dr. Moldehnke writes in his "Herold" of September 19: "We were struck by the fact that the administrator of the Wartburg Teachers' Seminary announced that they were about to send two young people to the Teachers' Seminary of the Missouri Synod in Addison, Illinois. Thus the foundation of a teachers' seminary in the East, for which Pastor Drees has been striving for some time, seems to be a long way off. It was also pointed out from one side that one could get along more cheaply in the teaching institutions in the West than in the East, and that one should send the young people supported by the Synod there. Certainly, however, the Seminary and College at Mendota, Ills. were not thought of. We therefore call attention to these institutions, maintained by the Iowa Synod, where one can get along very cheaply."

New York Ministry. According to Dr. Moldehnke ("Herold" of August 22), this Synod has already shown "clearly and unequivocally that it does not want to be nor become Missourian" by electing the Rev. Ph. Krug as president with 56 out of 81 votes.

The end justifies the means. We were reminded of this Jesuit principle when we read in the "Herold" of August 22 the essay with the heading: "A Lamentation from the Wisconsin Synod". Dr. Moldehnke says, among other things: "Other synods belonging to the Missouri Synodal Conference must also learn that Missouri still does not consider them baked (Hos. 7, 8.) enough to be able to recommend them with full recognition." He refers to the fact that in the Confirmation booklet "Timothy" our Missouri Synod alone is recommended as a right-believing one, and to the fact that the Wisconsin Brethren's church bulletin complained about it in its review of the book. He now shares this discussion "as a cry of complaint from the Wisconsin Synod," but is careful not to share the explanation that followed in the "Lutheran" of April 15, in which it is said that this recommendation dates from a long time ago and was left out of pure oversight, and that the dear brethren would most graciously forgive this oversight. Furthermore, Moldehnke gives the remarks of the Iowans in their "magazine" to the best, who also communicate and exploit the complaint of the Wisconsin, without taking the slightest notice of the explanation of the "Lutheran". The end justifies the means. It is a matter of sowing hatred. - In the last issue of September 19, he urges

now admittedly this statement from the "Lutheran," but cannot refrain from making spiteful remarks here also. G.

The so-called Lutheran Wartburg Synod, which belongs to the General Synod, has again "deposed" the infamous A. Schabehorn, whom it accepted, since "his total unworthiness has become apparent. Disgraceful, however, for a church community that accepts such filth and does not put him away until he is rolling in the muck again.

From General Synod. American pastors usually have vacations during the hot summer months. A distinguished member of the so-called Lutheran General Synod, Dr. Stelling, used the vacation time granted him to serve a Presbyterian congregation! G.

How so-called Lutheran church papers recommend sectarian newspapers. As one example out of many, we share the following. The "Lutheran Visitor" says of a Methodist paper, "It is neatly printed, and as usual filled with interesting matter." Concerning a newly formed Methodist Quarterly, the same paper writes: "It gives us pleasure to announce that the Southern Methodist Episcopal Church intends to commence the publication of a *Quarterly Review* in the fall. We have often wondered,

why so great and strong a church, having so many men of eminent talent as thinkers and writers, has not yet a precinct of the first class. There is no reason why the same should not be well maintained and immediately made as good as the best. We wish the same rich success." So un-Lutheran does the "Visitor" write, and in his own articles. We will now disregard, for instance, his recommending a Presbyterian paper in his advertisement columns as the best family paper. He is naive enough to complain in the same column of his paper about the "Standard," which had pronounced that the independent synods not belonging to the Southern General Synod were more decidedly Lutheran than the latter. Indignant about this, he demands, as an act of honesty and justice, that anyone who henceforth makes such a statement should prove it. Truly, we have not recently seen a greater mockery of Lutheranism. We think that the required proof is herewith fully supplied. G.

Necrological. From the "Luth. Kz." of Columbus we learn that Professor Fr. Winkler, who for a long time assisted Pastor Grabau in Buffalo as a teacher in the "Martin Luther College", died recently (at the age of 68 years, 9 months).

Episcopal Church. The Episcopal preacher Morgan of Cincinnati, as reported in the "Zeitschrift," speaks of the Episcopal Church as follows: "I solemnly testify that the doctrines and customs peculiar to the Roman Catholic Church, with the exception of the doctrine of the rule and infallibility of the pope, are believed, taught, and practiced in the so-called Protestant Episcopal Church without any hindrance. Among these false doctrines may be mentioned: the equating of tradition with Holy Scripture, the restriction of freedom of conscience and of privacy, the invocation of the saints, prayers for the dead, Purgatory, etc. Although this had been known to me for a long time, I still had enough confidence in the church that it would purge itself of such unevangelical clutter. But I was deceived in my expectations. The Roman nature continues to proliferate and to take deeper roots. Instead of taking steps to rid the Church of these errors, people are appointed bishops of whom it is generally known that they are deeply immersed in Pabstism. And not a single bishop in the United States has raised his voice against it, or departed from the measures laid down in the Canon.

regulations. More than anything else, however, it has strengthened my opinion that the last General Assembly, on the 18th day of the session, decided that all these doctrines and usages, against which complaints had been made, should continue to exist unhindered in the Protestant Episcopal Church."

Lay Preaching. Recently the General Assembly of the American Presbyterian Church (in the South) adopted a resolution, according to which lay preaching is firmly condemned as contrary to the word of God, as disturbing the peace and harmony of the church, and as contrary to the regimen of the church.

Pharisaism. A Presbyterian preacher in Chicago was recently asked by a newspaper reporter, after the close of the service, to let him have the manuscript of his sermon for his paper. But the preacher refused, on the ground that he had come in the matter of his week-day profession - on the Lord's day. G.

Baptists. Dr. Hovey, president of the Baptist Newton theological seminary was moved by such passages as Apost. 2, 38. and 22, 16. to bring the act of baptism and the grace of forgiveness of sins into closer connection than is done by the Baptists, who find in baptism only a sign of the forgiveness of sins. Dr. Hovey now taught, on the basis of the above passages: "Baptism is here described as the earnest and objective petition of the person baptized for the forgiveness of his sins, which is promised to every one who has become a believer in Christ. By being baptized, the baptized person makes the prescribed and earnest confession of his faith, and is therefore declared to be one who "seeks and obtains that which faith seeks and obtains" (namely, forgiveness of sins). Now, although with Dr. Hovey baptism is at first not an act of God's grace, but a mere mode of confession on the part of man, and only in this respect is an effect of grace connected with the act of baptism, and even this explanation is still substantially modified, and even admits the expression "sign of the remission of sins, the *"Baptist Weekley"* nevertheless pillories him as a false teacher, who believes that "baptism works the remission of sins, against which doctrine the Baptists have always earnestly protested, and are astonished that Dr. Hovey professes and distributes the same. Hovey confesses and defends the same." - So reports the "Magazine." It is indeed incomprehensible that a sect, which has made the act of baptism its shibboleth, should regard it as nothing more than "an empty ceremony.

The Tabernacle Laymen's College of the Dutch Reformed Pastor Talmage in Brooklyn, New York, has entered a new stage. In it, outstanding men from all kinds of faiths are to give lectures to those who want to become so-called evangelists or preachers as soon as possible. What superficially educated people must come out of it is evident from the fact that within several years since Moody's appearance, over eleven hundred so-called evangelists have received their training in this institution without regular instruction, mostly through prayer meetings. (L. Ztschr.)

The Oneida Community, a Communist society, which not only wants to be Christian, but even considers itself perfect and has taken the name "Perfectionists", although it holds not only community of goods, but also community of women, - is close to its decay. Men and women step out to be legally married, and henceforth to live in matrimony. The founder's son is at the head of the dissatisfied. Especially is there discontent among the female members, who feel more and more what a disgraceful position they occupy, and also see their health endangered. G.

The local Iowa Synod is blamed for its **"centralized position and lack of uniform doctrinal direction"** by Missionary Inspector Deinzer in Neuendettelsau. On the occasion of the General Assembly of the Society for Inner Mission, which was held in Aha on July 17 of this year, the aforementioned reported, as we learn from the "Kirchl. Mittheilungen", among other things, the following: "As far as our American field of work is concerned, our present relationship with the Iowa Synod can first be described as a satisfactory one. A sufficient understanding has been reached between us, and thus a basis of trust and cooperation in the common work has again been won. It has become clear that the Synod, as a synod, can no longer and does not want to take over the representation of the Neuendettelsau direction with all that characterizes it, but wants to regard it as an equal in its midst with other directions that are likewise on the ground of the Lutheran confessions. Thus the Synod, as a synod, occupies a position of neutrality between the various confessional tendencies which at present exist within the Lutheran Church. We can confidently accept this situation, which is a necessary consequence of the composition and historical development of Synod Iowa, without compromising our fundamental views. In this way, the Synod represents a more broad-minded, ecumenical Lutheranism than the narrow-minded, exclusive Missouri Lutheranism, which is certainly to be welcomed. Of course, this lack of a unified doctrinal direction also has its drawbacks, as recent events within the Synod, initiated by some of the Melsungen students, prove. Next year the Iowa Synod will celebrate its 25th anniversary." - To take up a position of "neutrality" between the various "confessional directions" without a "uniform doctrinal direction" and yet still present a true Lutheranism is an art yet to be invented, and one of which one boasts only in the unchurched church. W.

"The Iowa Misconceptions and Bemoanments." Under this heading a series of articles appeared in the "Lutheran" in 1874 and 75, in which Prof. F. A. Schmidt proved the dishonesty of the leaders of the Iowa Synod in such an "irrefutable" manner that even the attempt at a refutation seemed incredible. Professors Fritschel, those leaders, were really so wise as to remain silent for a long time, and only to let the tremendous impression which the articles, which had also appeared in pamphlet form, had produced on all readers, and especially on Iowaites, fade away and the evidence presented be forgotten, until they finally dared to come forward with their alleged refutation. But it appeared in their synodical organ, and has now been issued and sent out in pamphlet form. The "Kirchenblatt für die ev.-luth. Gemeinden in Preußen" of August 15 displays the pamphlet and testifies that the same is "written with great sagacity." And in this the "Kirchenblatt" is indeed right, when it understands by it that "perspicacity" which is capable of turning yes - no, black - white, sour - sweet, darkness - light. As far as this perspicacity is concerned, the professors Fritschel are looking in vain for their master; they are really born jurists, who are capable of the art of giving a rotten thing the most splendid coat of paint and apparently destroying a good thing. That such productions are received with great joy in Germany, of course without first comparing the counterstatement, when they are directed against Missouri, can be of no surprise to anyone; in America, where one has already become better acquainted with and is accustomed to this genre of astuteness in advocates and politicians, the impression that such self-defence makes, especially if one otherwise knows the inculcate well, is a very slight one. W

Secte? Münkkel writes in his N. Zeitbl. of August 1: "From his (Pastor Frank's in Wietzendorf) congregation 50 adults and 21 children have so far fallen away to the neighboring Harms' sect." - Münkkel would hardly declare Pastor Harms' congregation to be a sect for the sake of his false teaching. It must therefore be the apostasy from his national church that, according to Münkkel, makes Harms a sect, and therefore a heretic. It is lamentable to see where a man like Münkkel, who once strengthened the faith of so many in the Lutheran truth, has gone in his enthusiasm for the national church. W.

Hanover. The following, among others, is written to the Berlin "Reichsbote" from Hanover: "In any case, according to human judgment, it seems as if the future of the Hanoverian regional church belongs to the 'middle party': Falk is not stingy with his recognition of it and pours out his gifts especially on the leader of the 'middle party', Superintendent Guden in Uslar, whom he has appointed conventual of Loccum Monastery. Falk is not stingy in his appreciation of it and pours out the cornucopia of his gifts, especially on the leader of the 'middle party,' Superintendent Guden in Uslar, whom he has appointed Conventual of the Loccum Monastery; in the Landesconsistorium, a benevolent attitude for the party is breaking through more and more." - Nothing is needed for the Hanoverian Landeskirche to be counted among the united Landeskirchen, except the official laying aside of the Lutheran name and the adoption of the united name; the thing is already there. W.

Immanuel Synod and Missouri. Pastor S. Meeske in Luzine, a member of the Immanuel Synod, writes in his "Concordia" of August 1 of this year: "Was it necessary that the Saxon brethren proceeded against the Immanuel Synod as they did, although, which I do not deny, many harsh, exaggerated, and unjustified judgments were made by some in our Immanuel Synod about the Missourians?" - We accept this admission of our dear Pastor Meeske with great thanks; but we ask him: What would be a church and altar fellowship between two ecclesiastical bodies, one of which attacks the other through its leaders and in its public organs in such a way, as has been done to the Missouri Synod, especially by Pastor Diedrich in his "Dorfkirchenreitung" almost in every number, and continues to be done to this hour? - An external fellowship with such an internal antagonism would evidently be the most miserable unionism under a Lutheran name, a true comedy. If we are Missourians, as their leader represents us in regard to doctrine, belief, tendency, practice, life, and disposition, on and on, the Immanuel Synod ought to spit out before ours, rather than extend to it the hand of brotherhood. W.

Free Church Union. It is strange how people are now sometimes agitating for Free Church union. Pastor Rocholl published in the Creuzblatt the letter of a Hessian Separate, in which it says: "I do not need to complain to you about the disunity in the Lutheran Free Church! You certainly sigh with many, and will also have said to yourself that only the certainty that it is nevertheless God's work can comfort you. You, too, will often have thought with great pain of how this very disunity, indeed this disunion of the individual Lutheran Free Churches, is the obstacle for many dear souls in the State Church that they do not fight and live with us, just as for our own members in this lies the great temptation to fall away again." By way of example, it is added that there must be a greater inclination "to abandon many an ecclesiastical order, no matter how dear, but still human. But this is not true, of course, when Hesse continues: "Fight, writes Hesse, against all independentism. You have got rid of the spiritual secular regiment by God's grace; do not fall into disorderly freedom, into pastoral rule, where every pastor thinks he is sovereign." (Muenkel interjects: This is probably aimed at Immanuel Free Church.) "No house, no country can exist without regiment, still less a church, But only no democracy" (Muenkel adds: the Missourian).

"Away with all choosing! Here Christ rules by his offices; and if there is order in one's own house, one can also enter into union with others." Here, Münkler concludes, shines through the enthusiasm of the (Vilmar) office and regimental teachers, which the Hanoverian Separation is to join by brandishing the sword against the other Separations.

Mission to Leipzig. On the occasion of the annual celebration of this mission on June 12, Hardeland made the following announcement in his festive report: "We have tried in every way to advertise and finally sent out a public appeal to Lutheran candidates and students to join the East Indian missionary service. But the answer has not been forthcoming, and the question has become imperative whether we should not depart from the present method of training our missionaries and again establish a missionary seminary. The case is so urgent that the general assembly of the deputies of our aid societies must decide on it today. If they do not know any other help, we will have to proceed with the implementation in the course of this year. In the meeting it was stated: "We are very reluctant to abandon the principle of university education that we have up to now advocated. But necessity compels us to ask your advice today. We cannot take upon ourselves the responsibility of waiting any longer. How,' if several more of our missionaries would become temporarily or even permanently incapacitated? And we have several of the older and nearly worn out brethren. We know by experience what the training in the mission house means; many pass through the house, but few can be sent out. It is by no means *Principreiteret* if we wish to persist in what we have hitherto done. We have experienced what we fear. We all, and I in particular, approach the new with trembling and trepidation. But need we not? But if we have to begin again with training in the house, then let it not be again a grammar school course in the house and an academic training afterwards, but an actual missionary seminary, in which the entire training is given. As a rule, craftsmen are not able to cope with high school and university properly. A thorough theological education, however, should be given, and we cannot dispense with this. The aim of teaching is therefore to be set as high as possible, as in the best of the existing mission seminaries. But much can be done without the mere technicalities of today's scientific training. Only yes no superficial illumination.... Dr. Frank desired to know in more detail the plan of the seminary to be built. Director Hardeland went into the how, so far as it cannot be separated from the whether. We shall hardly be able to take more than two teachers in the beginning, and form two classes, one for the theological, the other for the preparatory subjects. The course of instruction of each class is to be calculated at three years. Thus, as a rule, new admissions only every three years, at first only twelve pupils. That would be about the core of the institution, which can then develop and expand as needed. The first main thing is to provide for capable teachers who are not only there temporarily. The advice of one deputy to begin with one class was countered by the fact that a couple of prospective young men had already advanced too far for the lowest class. A South German delegate liked the seminary because it was more popular; but he regretted that our missionaries would not be full theologians in the future at home, and therefore advised that a seminary be established, but that instruction be given outside the house at the Gymnasium and the University. Against the latter Dir. Hardeland declared himself decidedly against the latter, because the advantage of a uniform education would be lost. They would not warm to it in the home, and a different spirit would now prevail in the grammar schools. The fact that the previous education was not uniform enough has become apparent in many cases. Dr. Besser believed that the new path

The Collegium declared that it could no longer be held responsible for waiting. As an authority for the seminary, he pointed out the state of the universities, where Lutheran theological scholarship seemed to be in decline and was only considered a 'Lutheran direction'. As much as he wished to find Lutheran candidates and theologians, he had to say: do not grieve too much about it. The chairman (Dr. Luthardt!) warned not to let fears determine the future. It was a matter of the present. Finally, Prof. Dr. Frank made the motion: The General Assembly declares its consent to the plan that, in the event that studied men do not come forward for missionary service in the near future, the beginning of a missionary seminaar will be made, using the utmost cautions, especially a novitiate. The motion was unanimously accepted by the assembly. Accordingly, if the teachers can be found, the seminary can probably be opened in the course of this year."

Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. In the Sächsisches Kirchen- und Schulblatt of August 15 there is an article from which one can see how faithful students of Dr. Luthardt believe and teach from the Holy Scriptures. It says among other things: "Luthardt says somewhere: We have not yet found the formula according to which the position of Scripture is to be judged. The revered teacher of our Lutheran Church can only have been prompted to this confession by the consideration that the mechanical inspiration of words and letters is nothing, because the existing imperfections, inaccuracies, contradictions, and thus errors cannot be denied. (?! Red.) These, however, would be a complete impossibility if the holy authors had only been styluses in God's hand and the Holy Spirit had written through them as we do with our pens, and I am just now using mine. But there can never be the slightest imperfection in the Word of God. It would then have to be perfect to the last point. But the holy Scriptures are not so. On the other hand, it is also the Word of God, because it must be. For God had to reveal Himself to us in the Word.... We must indeed regard the whole of Scripture (in the Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung, this expression is called a fortunate grasp) as God's Word, which presents to us the truth of salvation necessary for salvation; but not each individual work and each individual sentence." In what follows, the writer now sets about to solve the unfortunate task of showing how often error is found in Scripture. To be sure, he does much to credit himself with the finding that the sacred Scriptures are "only corrected by the Scriptures. But this is reminiscent of the Koran, in which Muhamed excuses himself in a similar way because of his errors. In the second sura he lets write: "If we abolish or forget verses (in the Koran), then we give better or yet equally good ones for them." (Der Koran. Uebers. von Ullmann. Crefeld, 1840. p. 11.) It is to be noted, by the way, that the editors of the paper make known their disagreement. The right thing, of course, would have been not to include such an essay desecrating God's Word at all. W.

Sulze versus Social Democracy. The notorious Saxon rationalist has recently engaged in a public tournament with the Social Democrats. The unbelievers give him the praise that he has understood better how to fight with these spirits than court preacher Stöcker, and that therefore in Sulze's debates with the Socialists things went along peacefully at all. No wonder! The following, for example, occurred in Sulze's lecture: "Christ was once asked by a rich man: what must I do to become blessed (we would say: to become a good man)? To this he replied: keep the commandments, namely these: thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not kill, etc. He therefore that is chaste, merciful, honest, true, and at the same time reverent to father and mother, is, according to

Christ, as he ought to be. Note that these are simply the virtues which man's own person and his intercourse with others demand of him, and without which man ceases to be man. Religion is not mentioned at all. This is precisely my conviction." Of course, educated Socialists will not publicly condemn such a kind of Christianity, at least not by throwing muck at it. In this way, however, it is not the Socialists who have approached Mr. Sulze, but he who has approached them.

W.

Bavaria. The following will shed a glaring light on the state church conditions in Bavaria, which happened in Uffenheim some time ago. - An instrument maker tailor, known in wider circles through his speeches at marksmen's, singers' and similar festivals, who was devoted during his lifetime to the unbelieving and rational principles of the so-called "free church," died there. And behold, his well-known unbelief did not prevent him from being buried with all ecclesiastical honors. Yes, in a resolution passed for this purpose, the church council declared that "a wrong view" in his life should not be avenged on the deceased.

K. M.

Religion in the country! We read the following in the Nördlingen "Freimund" of July 25: "Get religion back into the country, but get the hell out of it! Thus, about a hundred years ago, the Prussian King Frederick II cried out to his minister. - "It is especially important that the people should not lose religion; to prevent this is now the most important task!" So said the present Prussian king to his ministers, when they congratulated him on account of his salvation from the hand of the murderer Hödel!-"Religion into the land!" So also cried some time ago in the Evangelical Association at Berlin the well-known court preacher Stöcker. Why is it missing? Because one fetters the Church. "Because," says he, "a power of religiosity no longer develops under the spiritual current of to-day in a dependent church. As our (i.e., the royal Prussian) church stands newly formed in the life of the people, it can inspire no one, neither from the right nor from the left, nor from the center. In principle, its relationship to the State is one of bondage. Down to the appointment of each superintendent, down to the catechisms and hymnals, the church is under the control of the minister in every expression of life, quite apart from the fact that the education of its ministers is almost entirely in the hands of the state. Our church is sick, and its sickness lies in its social form; its basic evil is state ecclesiasticism. If the church is to be reborn and exercise the influence that is its due, it must become an independent community of faith. Everyone can see that state ecclesiasticism has taken root. State ecclesiasticism is a petrefact of past times. Only a lack of thought or of ecclesiastical spirit can still maintain it." To this debate the "kirchliche Volksblatt aus Niedersachsen" makes the remark: "Quite excellent! So all that remains is to move from talk to action, from word to deed, and to no longer let the church be used for foreign purposes." - So much for the "Freimund." If the Lutherans, separated from the State Church, were to say the same, how one would clamor! What, then, are such fine-sounding testimonies? *Verba, praeterea nihil!* But they prove so much that the sting of truth sticks in the conscience of many and presses down, while he reviles those who take it seriously as fanatics.

W.

Alsace. Even the liberal Oberconsistorium in Strasbourg, in its minutes certified and published by the government, made the following complaint about the civil servants who had come to Alsace from Germany: "The vast majority of civil servants in all branches of the administration show at least a complete indifference to all religious life and activity; they never attend church, not even the otherwise church-going women,

which causes offence and annoyance everywhere. They properly display their unchristianity, and preach the vilest atheism and materialism in wine and beer houses, showering the church, the Bible, and the cult with scorn and ridicule of noble superiority. Are these the Protestants that the Protestant Alsace had a right to expect from Germany?"

The handling of the Civil Status Law in Prussia is an exceedingly strange one. Berlin papers report: "The police headquarters has issued a decree asking those officials who have neglected to have their children baptized to state the reasons for this omission. Inquiries in this direction are being made not only at the Presidium, but also at other authorities." Sad as the fact is that even officials no longer wish to have their children baptized, the pressure exerted on officials in this respect shows that the legislators are ashamed of their own laws. W.

Christoph Hoffmann, whom we have not thought of for some time now, is progressing more and more decisively on the path of the future Christians. The richness of his gifts and knowledge he formerly unfolded in a paper that worked towards the revival of Christianity and illuminated world events in the light of the Word of God, especially the prophetic Word. He was a Württemberg Pietist and a Chiliast, and as a Chiliast he became engrossed or lost in the future plans of the Kingdom of God, the gathering of God's people in the Promised Land, the establishment of the New Temple and the Law of Moses, and the kingship of David in the restored Kingdom of God. After a vain attempt to enlist the cooperation of the former Covenant Council in his work, it became clear to him that the time had come when he himself would have to lend a hand to the work and prepare the way for King David. With a considerable group of believers in the future, he emigrated to the promised land and, as its bishop, established the new temple congregation according to the statutes that were to apply in the millennial kingdom. It was still a little difficult, because King David did not want to be seen and the Turk remained the ruler of the land. However, all beginnings are difficult, and Chr. Hoffmann did not let these challenges alienate him. There is power in the man, he does not leave it at the spiritual snooping, for which many fantasies of the future serve, he attacks and carries out what he has given himself. If a millennial kingdom does not come out of it, something else will. The other day Hoffmann published a pamphlet in which he discusses his temple, but to the astonishment of the faithful rejects the doctrines of the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, the atonement together with baptism and the Lord's Supper, and declares that he will preside over the new temple in this sense and assert this against any opposition of his own. Where the worldly thing, the earthly hopes, and the lawlessness connected with it, have become the heart-leaf, there the heart must become empty of the gospel of the Spirit. This is the relapse of Christianity into Judaism. Besides this, the Jews are busy using the large capital that Sir Moses Montefiore, the benefactor of the Palestinian Jews, has set aside for the purchase of land, which is to be distributed among the Jews to help them regain their prosperity through cultivation. The Jews in the Promised Land are waiting for the appearance of their Messiah, the Son of David, or at least want to be buried in holy ground, in order to be immediately at hand at the appearance of the same. After Hoffmann has thus diminished the Christian faith and brought it closer to the Judaism, in the opinion that he will thereby gain it more entrance and victories, he will be able to make his experiments with the Jews, if they do not prefer to have their special King David and to be the right people of God alone....

(N. Ztbl.)

Restoration of the Jewish people. Until now we have not believed that the "Pilgrim from Saxony" also labored in the hope of the restoration of the Jewish people. That this is so, however, is evident from the following note in the "Pilgrim" of August 25: "The greatest increase of Jews is in Palestine, so that in Jerusalem they now exceed Christians and Turks in number. The city contains 13,500 Jews, but only 7000 Turks and 5000 Christians. For 1500 years the increase of the Jewish population has never been so great as now. Only 30 years ago the Turks did not allow more than 300 Jews to live there. This increase is also one of the signs of the times, that the promise of their restoration is being fulfilled and that we are rapidly approaching the fulfillment. But the LORD saith, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be accomplished."

Church Tax. Under this heading Dr. Münkler brings the following note: "The budget of the Scottish Free Church is at present increased to the sum of 11,514,300 marks, by 1,600,000 marks more than ten years ago, a fabulous sum; and this is a Free Church, which expends so much on parishes, missions, and the like. In Germany one immediately resigns the church for 50 pennies because of insignificant taxes."

Papist Prophets. In Dr. Münkler's "Neues Zeitblatt" of August 8 we read: "The ultramontane Germania wrote the other day at the mention of the Luther monument which was to be erected at Eisleben on November 10, 1883: 'That would be too late; on November 10, 1883, the Lutheran Church is no longer alive.' Now the -Westfälische Merkur writes: One can see that German Protestantism is going more and more into decline; only the Catholic Church will finally be able to put the chaos in order. Some of our readers will still have the good fortune to attend the celebration of the first Holy Mass in Berlin Cathedral. That will be the end, and the Mass will be the death knell of the Kulturkampf.'" - As is well known, the Jesuits prophesied something similar more than 200 years ago; namely, they said that with the Lutheran Church it would be Matthew at the last, because this Gospel closes with the word "end"; but these Christians did not consider that the whole conclusion reads: "Behold, I am with you always, even to the end of the world"; and in this sense, however, with our dear Church it is always Matthew at the last. Praise and thanks be to God for this! W.

The Allgemeine Kz. Luthardt of August 23 writes about **the Kissingen meeting**: "The intercourse between the Reich Chancellor and the Nuncio, which took place in the most binding forms, did not lead to any results, not even to negotiations; views were mutually exchanged and further matters left to the future. The next consequence will be that the Centrum in the forthcoming session will preserve its outright oppositional attitude toward the government, as the Germania' already announces toward the Socialist law." - A preacher from the Prussian Diaspora, viz, from a region in which so-called Protestant congregations dwell in the midst of Roman ones, after having attempted to prove in the same church paper in what respect the State could and should yield to the Romans without going "to Canossa," continues thus: "If we have indicated by what has been said what concessions to Rome would not be a misfortune and would not be similar to going to Canossa, it is now also incumbent upon us to express what we would reckon there and therefore deeply lament. It would be a walk to Canossa if the state would amnesty without further ado and without exception all Roman Catholic clergymen convicted as a result of the May laws. Only with damage to his reputation could such an amnesty take place uninvited. What does not exclude does not include, and what does not resist does not support. Differences would at least have to be made among the convicted according to the situation of the acts. It would be a misfortune, moreover, if the State were to abandon its demand that the bishop's appointees be appointed to it.

The state wanted to refrain under all circumstances from presenting priests for confirmation. For this demand lies in the state's instinct for self-preservation, since it exerts no influence on the authorities that examine the conditions for the election of priests. If it were to drop this demand without further ado, it would not only give up a sovereign right to which it is entitled, but would also impress upon the parishes, which have already been without a priest for several years, the inescapable consciousness of having been unlawfully persecuted by the Protestant Emperor. And what then should we in the Diaspora expect from the future? The most unpleasant collisions would certainly be in store for us if the Curia were entitled to employ the most fanatical clerics among us without hindrance. We would be forced to allow only 'tolerant' parish priests who are agreeable to the state to be in regions of the Catholic diaspora, and where our co-religionists are in the minority, we would have to put up with the most ill-willed pressure. Finally, it would be a misfortune if the State allowed the expelled religious, especially the Jesuits, to return. It is impossible to say how interconfessional conditions had changed since that time when the Prussian State permitted the settlement of ecclesiastical orders and especially of the Jesuits. These disadvantages were felt by the Catholic clergy of all levels as well as by the Protestants. We have already indicated above how detrimental the school sisters were to children of mixed marriages, and we would be in a position to tell many a story about the Sisters of Mercy, who are so praised among us. The return of the former conditions would therefore indeed be a hike to Kanossa. If the above-mentioned eventualities were to be deplored, they would not be as bad as if, as the clerical papers hope, the Maigeseye were to be allowed to exist quietly and only a tacit return to the *modus vivendi* that existed before its enactment. The result would be a profound damage to the legal consciousness of the people and an indescribable exaltation on the part of the Roman Catholics. With true scorn one has already seen the clergy return to their congregations with the highest honors upon their release from prison. What would we experience if the clergy in question, under the eyes of the public prosecutors who accused them and had them sentenced, were allowed, with the laws still in force, to repeat calmly what they have been punished for ever since. Whoever has been allowed to be once in ultramontane company in these days knows how one arms oneself out of exploitation of the victory which one had certainly hoped for, and how drunkenly one talks of the certainty of now having in one's hands the direction of the Imperial Diet and the government." **Pope Leo XIII** The "Political Correspondence" is written from Italy that one of the greatest concerns of his unholiness is the propaganda of the A Catholic sects in Rome. This will probably be so; for the more the A Catholics establish themselves in Rome, the less can the Pope hope for the return of Rome to the old conditions; even in the event of the Italian kingdom again falling into ruins. "For the past eight years," the newspaper reports, "four Protestant sects have established themselves there and have made about 2000 proselytes among the native population of Rome. Each of these sects already has its own cult houses and schools, and on Sundays the temples of the Protestants, as the Protestants are called throughout Italy, are quite full. His Holiness is holding conferences with his Vicar General, Cardinal Lavaletta, to discuss the measures to be taken against the spread of Protestantism in Rome and in Italy." Good counsel will be expensive. With what wistfulness will the (un)holy Father now think back to those beautiful times, in which, for example, under Louis XIV those kinds of conversions took place which bore the name "dragoons," and when in the Thirty Years' War the Jesuits called the Lichtenstein dragoons the "beatifics"!

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 24 November 1878.

No. 11.

(Sent in by resolution of the Southeastern Conference of the Western District by E. W. K.)

Disposition of Luther's writing *de servo arbitrio*.

Preliminary note.-The book breaks up into four main sections, earthen Luther of Erasmus's "*de libero arbitrio διατριβή*" in order.

refutes and sets forth the pure biblical doctrine: namely, into an introduction and three parts designated by himself in more detail.

Introduction.

Page 6-89. *)

A. General Introduction, pp. 6-11 Luther explains: 1. why he had not answered Erasmus' book until then, 2. what moved him to finally come forward with his answer.

B. Special Introduction, pp. 11-59. Luther refutes the false propositions in the preface of Erasmus' *Diatribes*, viz:

1. that he (Erasmus) had so little pleasure in Luther's assertions and defenses of certain doctrines (*assertiones*), which were expressed with such great confidence, that he rather held with the skeptics, namely, as long as the authority of Scripture and the decrees of the church permitted this, to which, however, he gladly submitted, whether he understood them or not, pp. 11-16. It is unchristian and contrary to God's word, in matters of faith, to want to assert and defend nothing certain and not confident;

b. No Christian is pleased with the opinion of the skeptics, but rather despises and hates them so much that he desires to be as certain as possible of his opinion even in things not revealed in Scripture;

*) The page numbers are given according to the Milwaukee edition. However, I usually quote from the Latin original. I hope to be able to publish a revision of Jonas's translation in the near future. K.

- c. it is contrary to Scripture to equate God's Word and the decisions of the church ;
 - d. No one may submit to any authority unless he knows for certain that what it teaches is truth;
 - e. consequently Erasmus proves himself to be a godless Epicurean in the above sentences.
- 2 Erasmus asserts that some doctrines are necessary, others unnecessary to know, some dark and hidden, others clear and evident, pp. 16-20, - Luther, on the other hand, shows that a distinction is to be made:
- a. Between God and the Scriptures,
 - b. between the things revealed in Scripture, and the words of Scripture,
 - c. between the outer and inner clarity and darkness of Scripture.
- 3 Erasmus counts the doctrine of free will among those which are supposed to be useless and unnecessary for a Christian to know, pp. 20-34, - for
- He calls it ungodly, rash, and superfluous to inquire whether our will is able to do anything in the things that pertain to blessedness, or whether our will alone is led and guided by grace, pp. 20-26:
- ^a. that Erasmus is guilty of a gross contradiction, since he himself teaches that the Christian should exert himself with all his strength, and that the will cannot be effective without God's mercy;
 - ^b. that research into the relationship of the human will to divine activity is absolutely necessary;
 - c. that this problem is a part of the whole sum of Christian knowledge, without which one can neither know oneself nor God, nor know how to praise and thank God rightly; - b. Erasmus calls it ungodly, rash, and superfluous to inquire whether God's presence is changeable and whether we must do everything with necessity (*an Deus contingenter aliquid praesciat, et an omnia faciamus necessitate*). S. 26-34. - Luther, on the other hand, shows:
 - ^a. that one cannot discuss free will at all without discussing this question;
 - ^b. that the doctrine that God's presence is unchangeable (*Deus nihil praescit contingenter*) is true, - because
 - x. as justice and goodness, so also "foreknowing will and willing foreknowledge" belong to God's nature; but what belongs to God's nature is unchangeable: *ergo*;

x2. It follows that everything that happens is necessarily and unchangeably so, if one considers God's will (the accidental in human action is called accidental only in so far as it appears accidental to us; it is not so called in relation to God's will and active omnipotence);

this necessity is not what one calls compulsion, not something that would be opposed to the will strict, but only *lsoessitLS jwwutadilitatis*;

x3. Only that which has a necessary essence, that is, only God, is absolutely necessary - I for myself am accidental and changeable; but since God's actions have necessity, everything, without having to be necessary according to its own essence, nevertheless happens with necessity; hence the difference between *ueosssitss* (absolute necessity)

and *neoessitas* (conditional necessity) only
is playing badly with words;

x4. That everything happens with necessity is already taught by reason and confirmed by daily experience; - Luther further shows:

c. That the assertion that God's presence and will are immutable and certain is necessary and useful to know; for "the immutability of the divine foreknowledge and will is the ground of the firmness with which faith may trust the divine promises;

2. All true Christians, therefore, set their highest consolation on this point; -

5. that therefore this part of Erasmus' book is unchristian, even blasphemous.

-

4. Erasmus teaches that it is not advisable to allow certain doctrines, even if based on truth, to come among the people, pp. 34-46, - e. g. the doctrines:

a. God, by his nature, is present everywhere, therefore also in an unclean place; - on the other hand, Luther shows that intelligent preachers can also speak of such doctrines to the people without danger, if they only use honorable, skillful words; -

b. no one may be forced to confess; even if this were true, it should not be taught before the people, since they would abuse such doctrine; - on the other hand, Luther shows:

a. that Erasmus shows by this assertion how worldly peace and carnal tranquillity were higher to him than faith, conscience, Christ's honour, even God Himself;

b. that his (Luther's) doctrine of the freedom of confession and satisfaction is clearly revealed in God's Word;

- c. that in this one must by no means yield to the pope for the sake of love and peace;
 - d. That because of the abuse which the ungodly make of the word of God, the word itself ought not to be abandoned;
 - e. that God's Word is not bound to certain times, places, and persons, but must be preached always, everywhere, and to everyone; f. that human statutes cannot be kept with and apart from God's Word. -
- (5) Erasmus says that it is dangerous and harmful to teach everyone that everything we do is not done of our own free will but out of necessity, that God works good and evil in us, etc., pp. 46-58:
- a. that this doctrine ought, however, to be preached unreservedly in the ears of all the world, pp. 47-52; - for:
 - a. God Himself wants these pieces to be taught and preached publicly;
 - b. Erasmus' objections: who wants to improve his life finely, who wants to believe that God loves him, what door does one open to ungodliness if one teaches this, - these objections are null and void; c. besides the fact that God wants it this way, there are two other reasons why one should teach this publicly:
 - x1. The humbling of our pride and the knowledge of divine grace,
 - x2. the nature of faith itself, which is a faith in what one does not stand; -Luther further shows:
 - b. That the proposition, Everything we do, we do not of our own free will, but by necessity, - cannot be dangerous at all, pp. 52-58; - for:
 - a. It is undeniable that if we are controlled by the devil, we **can** only **want** what the devil wants; but if we are God's own, we **must willingly** do God's will;
 - b. Erasmus himself must admit that free will cannot do good without God's mercy: - but it follows that we do everything we do by necessity, not by free will;
 - c. the name: "*liberum arbitrium*," ought not therefore to be applied to man at all, unless with reference to that which is under him, committed to his use at his pleasure. -
- C. Conclusion of the Introduction, p. 59. ff. Luther refutes the false propositions of Erasmus, which are found in the transition of the Diatribe to the main matter:

1. Erasmus says that the freedom of the will is taught by so many fathers and famous men, all of whom have distinguished themselves by showing miracles, holiness and spirit, - on Luther's side, on the other hand, there are only a few little people, pp. 59-71.- On the other hand, Luther shows:

- a. that he too would be moved by the reputation of the fathers, if conscience, Scripture, and experience did not compel him to the contrary;
- b. That it is a false conclusion: because the fathers (which is still unproven) did miracles, proved holiness and the Spirit, therefore all this was done for the confirmation of free will; - this is a false conclusion, because:
 - ^a. by miracles, holiness, and the spirit of the fathers, (not free will, but) the doctrine of Christ has been confirmed;
 - ^b. the papists cannot prove:
 - x1. That in virtue of free will (which Scripture calls vanity and falsehood) miracles were ever wrought;
 - x2. That by free will anyone has attained to true holiness (repentance, faith, etc.);
 - x3. That by virtue of free will any man hath done truly spiritual works;
 - ^c. the holy fathers, in temptation and mortal need, always took refuge in free grace from free will (which they taught publicly, perhaps out of weakness); - Luther further shows:
- c. that Erasmus, notwithstanding the great number of fathers, the learning of theologians, the age of his church, etc., was not able to give either an example of some work, etc., which free will was capable of, or an explanation of what free will actually was;
- d. that it is therefore very wrong of Erasmus to adorn with the authority of the Fathers a dogma of which neither the former nor the latter have defined anything certain;
- e. that therefore he (Luther) will remain with his negation of free will in spite of the authority of the fathers, as they have often erred. - With this Luther leads over to the refutation of the following proposition:

2. Erasmus says it is incredible that in what the Lutherans call the Summa of Christian truth, God allowed his Church to err so long, and revealed the same to none of his saints, pp. 71-75. - Against this Luther shows:

- a. that the church as such cannot, or at least cannot persistently, err,
- b. but that a distinction must be made between what is often called church and what church really is,

c. That therefore, since a man can only be called holy according to love, and not with certainty of faith, a doctrine cannot be founded on anyone's holiness, That therefore it is best to follow those of the fathers who spoke against free will and praised God's grace alone. -

(3) Erasmus says: Since the Scriptures themselves are dark, everything depends on the interpretation of the Scriptures in order to be able to test the spirits. But now it is evident that neither the Papists nor the Lutherans can definitely decide on the correctness of an interpretation. Consequently, it is best to leave the matter in *dubio*, to search for the truth, and, until one finds it, to keep on the side of those who teach free will, pp. 75-87. - On the other hand, Luther shows: a. that he has nothing in common with those who tie the interpretation to their own swarming spirit or to the papal see;

b. That spirits may be tested in two ways, whether they be of God, viz:

a. by an inward judgment, which every Christian has through the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit;

b. by an outward judgment bound to the office of the word; -

c. That therefore the Scriptures must be clear and plain, which is proved:

a. from the Old Testament, p. 77...;

b. from the New Testament, p. 78...;

c. from daily experience, p. 79. f.,

d. from reason, p. 80.; -

d. That therefore also the doctrine of free will must be so clearly revealed in Holy Scripture that the opponent can no longer raise anything against it, pp. 81-84;

e. that finally, when, notwithstanding the clearness of Scripture, so many Fathers, Conciliar, etc., have erred, this is a new proof of the bondage of the will.

Luther convicts Erasmus that he is in constant contradiction with his own premises, pp. 87-89.

Subject:

Whether the will of man do anything or nothing in the things which pertain to eternal blessedness.*)

Luther points to the answer to this question:

*) "An voluntas aliquid vel nihil agat in iis, quae pertinent ad salutem; . . hic est cardo nostrae disputationis, hic versatur status causae hujus."

- I. that the arguments put forward by Erasmus in **favour of** free will are null and void;
- II. that the arguments advanced **against** free will, and disputed by Erasmus, are irrefutable; and
- III. that he (Luther) argues against free will for grace, page 89.

I.

Erasmus's arguments for free will, pp. 90-150.

- 1. Refutation of the definition of free will given by Erasmus, pp. 90-97. - Luther shows:
 - a. the defined word and the definition do not coincide;
 - b. the definition excludes the Holy Spirit with all his effect as superfluous and unnecessary.
- 2. Refutation of Erasmus' arguments from the Old Testament: a. **Sir. 15, 14-18**. According to Erasmus, this saying is supposed to show that free will is by no means an empty word, that God works everything in everything, and that everything that happens happens by necessity, as Luther teaches, pp. 97-113. 97-113; - Luther, on the other hand, states:^a . that the doctrine advocated and approved by Erasmus: "man cannot have a desire for good without the special grace of God" - basically says exactly the same thing as the above sentences attacked by Erasmus, pp. 99-104;
 - ^b. that the above saying (Sir. 15,14-18.) proves nothing at all against him (Luther); for
 - x1. The free decision, which according to this saying has been given to man concerning creation, refers only to the things that are under him;
 - x2. With the promise: If thou wilt keep the commandments, they will preserve thee again, it is by no means attributed to man that he can keep the commandments, rather God wants to bring him thereby to the realization of his powerlessness.
- b. **Gen. 4, 7. Deut. 30, 15. 19. Deut. 30, 2. Isa. 1, 19. 45, 22. 52, 2. Jerem. 15, 19. Zech. 1, 3. etc.** With these sayings Erasmus wants to prove that consequently man of his own free will can overcome the desire for evil, choose the good and convert, p. 113 -124. - On the other hand Luther shows:
 - ^a. that God has not given his commandments in the sense that we can keep them, but that he wants to admonish us with them to recognize our inability and to long for grace;

- ^b. that it is the same with the promises that God makes conditionally;
 - ^c. that the word "convert" is used in the Scriptures in a twofold sense, viz.
 - x1. in law,
 - x2. in the evangelical sense.

o. Ezek. 18, 23, from which saying Erasmus wants to prove that God would not deplore the death of the sinner if he wanted it; but if God does not want death, it is to be attributed to our will: but that is impossible if we ourselves are not able to do anything, pp. 124-130; - on the other hand, Luther shows:^a. that this saying is an evangelical word of comfort for shattered consciences - a proof that these cannot get rid of fear by virtue of free will;

- ^b. that a distinction must be made between the God and divine will which is preached to us in the revealed word, - and the God who is not preached and not revealed, 2 Thess. 2, 4. that is, between God himself in his hidden majesty, and his word;
that we have to do only with the preached God, who indeed mourns over the death of the sinner, not with the hidden God, who indeed neither mourns over death nor takes it away, - and that we must be content with knowing that there is a hidden will in God.

d. Deuteronomy 30:11-14, which saying, according to Erasmus, is supposed to prove that we can not only keep God's commandments, but that this is even easy, pp. 130-133. - On the other hand, Luther shows:^a. that with this assertion Erasmus makes Christ's and the Holy Spirit's work entirely superfluous;

- ^b. that Moses does not want to say anything else with the quoted saying than this, no one can excuse himself, he does not know God's commandments.

3. Refutation of Erasmus' Arguments from the New Testament, pp. 133-150.

a. **Matth. 23, 37**. Here Erasmus asks: If everything happens with necessity, could the Jews not have answered the Lord, why he sent them prophets, if he did not want them to hear them? why he added to them what had happened according to his will as something necessary for them? To this Luther replies, p. 133-136:

- ^a. that this saying either proves the whole of free will, or else argues equally strongly against Erasmus himself;

- b. That in this matter we should deal with the incarnate God, who weeps over the ruin of men, and **not** with the hidden will of the Majesty, who according to his own counsel rejects some so that they perish, Rom. 9, 19-21.

b. **Matth. 19, 17.** and other sayings, from which Erasmus wants to prove that they would have to be spoken in vain, if the human will were not able to do anything, p. 136-138. - In contrast, Luther shows:

- a. That these sayings are intended to convince us, on the contrary, that free will is powerless;

/§. That what the commandments require may be accomplished by virtue of grace, and shall indeed be done once in the elect. c. **Matth. 5, 12.** and similar sayings, speaking of good and evil works, and of their rewards. Erasmus says that he cannot see how there can be talk of reward, if everything must be done by necessity; where everything must be done, there is no reward, p. 138-145:

- a. Erasmus understood these sayings to mean that Christ and the Holy Spirit are nothing;

- b. Christ did not admonish the free will but the apostles who were already in grace;

As to the promised reward in particular, let it be observed, x1. That it doth not follow from the promise of the reward, that we may do works worthy of the reward;

(x2) That the works of men done by will and by air are necessarily **followed by the** corresponding reward, but that therefore the reward of the pious need by no means be the consequence of their merit and worthiness;

x3. that the Scriptures provide such rewards to terrify men, and on the other hand to comfort them; x4. that while the latter is only done by the inwardly moving Spirit, it is God's good pleasure to give his Spirit only through the outward word.

d. **Matth. 7, 20.** Erasmus says: Here the fruits are called ours. But they cannot be ours, if they must be done by necessity, and we have no free will, p. 145. f.; on the other hand, Luther shows:

- a. that because the fruits are called ours, they are not therefore given to us;

- b. that in Erasmus' interpretation of this saying, again, spirit and grace have no more room.

- e. **Luc. 23, 34.** Erasmus asks: According to Luther's theory, should not Christ rather have excused the Jews by saying that they had no free will, and, even if they wanted to, could not do otherwise? P. 146. f.

Luther, on the other hand, shows that this saying testifies powerfully against free will, since, according to him, free will "is so nothing that it not only cannot will the good, but does not even know how full of wickedness it is".

- f. **Joh. 1, 12.** Erasmus asks, How can God give power to become his children, if free will, as Luther says, has no power? P. 147. f.

Luther answers that this saying also crushes the free will, since it speaks of regeneration. **Rom. 2, 4.** Erasmus asks, How can the contempt of divine word be imputed to man, if the will is unfree? How can God invite repentance, when he is the author of impenitence? How is damnation just, when the Judge himself compels damnable works? S. 149.

Luther, on the other hand, shows that these are quite ridiculous, useless questions, since the apostle, by his words, wants to lead sinners to the knowledge of their sin and to grace.

- h. **The remaining arguments from Paul**, by which Erasmus wants to show that free will without grace is able to do all that Paul exhorts pardoned Christians to do, p. 150.

Luther, on the other hand, points to Rom. 8, 14.

II.

The arguments brought against free will.

S. 150 - 240.

1. Defence of the arguments which, as allegedly only apparently contending against free will, are adduced by Erasmus himself, pp. 150-204.

- a. Ex. **9, 12. cf. Rom. 9, 17. ff:** Of the hardening of Pharaoh, p. 151 -187.
- a. Luther refutes Erasmus' interpretation of these sayings, pp. 151-173, - for Erasmus wants to make a trope of the word "obdurate" in defense of free will:
- x1. One must nowhere assume a trope where the circumstances of the text itself do not compel it, which is not the case in the above sayings, p. 151 -156.;
 - x2. The adoption of the tropes which Erasmus favours would lead to the greatest absurdities, pp. 157 -160...;

- x3. Even the tropical declaration must affirm that everything happens only according to God's will, and according to it it must likewise seem as if God were cruel, p. 160. f.;
- x4. From the explanation adopted by Erasmus it would follow that in God there is no "*virtus et sapientia eligendi*," nay, naked paganism would finally follow, pp. 161 - 163.
- x5. The reasons Erasmus gives for his opinion that the words of Moses and Paul are not actually to be understood are not valid;
- x6. To the question in what sense one can say: God works evil in us, as: Hardening, etc., is to be answered:
 - aa. because God cannot refrain from his effective omnipotence, but the ungodly does not change his evil condition, so consequently the good God must work evil with the evil instrument;
 - bb. The hardening is like this: while before the wicked man, unconcerned about God, sought only his own, now, through God's visitation, he meets resistance and hindrance in the enjoyment of his own, and there he cannot help raging against it; he can no more leave off this raging than he can leave off that seeking and desiring of his own;
 - cc. but from all this it does not follow that God creates evil anew in the ungodly, pp. 166-172; -
- x7. To the questions: Why does God not desist from his almighty activity? why does he not change the evil will in man? why has he finally let Adam fall? is to be answered:
 - aa. that God would otherwise cease to be God;
 - bb. that we are not to inquire into divine mysteries, cc. that we are not to prescribe a law to God's will, p. 172. f.; -
- ^b. Exposition of the right understanding of these sayings, pp. 175 -187., x1. of the saying 2 Mos. 9, 12. The right interpretation of the same shows:
 - aa. that the hardening of Pharaoh should indicate God's goodness and truth, Ex. 3, 9. 19, 16. 12.;
 - bb. that therefore this saying is very strongly against free will, because God, who promised it, cannot lie: and consequently it could not happen otherwise than that Pharaoh was hardened; -

x2. of the saying Rom. 9, 17. ff. The correct interpretation of the same shows:

- aa. That it follows from God's Prescence that everything that happens must happen absolutely, pp. 176 -178...;
- bb. That we should worship with fear and trembling the divine will and power, and not speculate on it, page 179. f.
- cc. that God's eternal presence and omnipotence completely annuls free will;
- dd. that reason itself must acknowledge this, p. 182...;
- ee. that this is also confirmed by other sayings (Rom. 9, 20. f. 31.), p. 183...;
- ff. that this is not cancelled by the distinction between *voluntas consequentis* and *consequentiae*, pp. 184 - 187.

b. **Gen. 25, 23. Mal. 1, 2. 3. comp. Rom. 9, 12. 13.:** Of the election of Jacob and the rejection of Esau, p. 187 - 194.

- a. Luther proves that the Old Testament sayings must be understood exactly as St. Paul interprets them, and that they entirely destroy free will, since Jacob and Esau, before they could do good or evil, were chosen by divine judgment, the one to be master, the other to be servant, pp. 187-190.
- b. Regarding the saying Mal. 1, 2. 3. cf. Rom. 9, 13. Luther defends it against the distortions of Erasmus and proves it:
 - x1. That free-will can be nothing, since God's hatred and love are unchangeable and eternal, p. 190. f.;
 - x2. That free will can be nothing, since the punishment is inflicted on Esau from God's hatred alone, p. 191. f.;
 - x3. That free-will is nothing, since belief or non-belief is in no one's power, p. 193. f.;

c. **Isa. 45, 9. Jerem. 18, 6. cf. Rom. 9, 20. 2 Tim. 2, 21.**

The Parables of the Potter and Thon, pp. 194 - 204.

- a. Luther shows that the Pauline saying Rom. 9, 20. was not taken from the prophets.
- b. Against the bogus evidence of Erasmus that the words of St. Paul do not exclude free will, Luther shows: x1n. that there is no contradiction between Rom. 9, 20. and 2 Tim. 2, 21.
 - takes place, but it follows from both sayings that free-will is nothing in the sight of God, p. 196. f.;

- x2. That blind reason has nothing to conclude in these matters, and that if it did, it would lead to blasphemous doctrines, pp. 197-200;
- x3. That no saying from Scripture can be adduced for free will, pp. 200-204. ;
- 2. defense of the arguments brought by Luther (in the *assertio*) against free will and attacked by Erasmus, pp. 204 - 238.
 - a. **Genesis 6:3** Luther proves from this saying: Because all men are "flesh," free will is therefore capable of nothing but sinning, p. 204 - 207;
 - b. **Genesis 8, 21.** cf. 6, 5. Luther shows: Since according to this the heart of man is not only inclined to evil, but is altogether evil, this saying also stands unconquered against free will, p. 208.
 - c. **Is. 40, 2.** Luther shows that this saying proves that grace is not given to us because of our merit nor because of our striving for free will, and that free will can do nothing of its own strength but sin, p. 209 - 213;
 - d. **Is. 40, 6.** p. 213-222. Luther proves:
 - a. That the whole human race, body and soul, with all its powers, works, virtues and vices, wisdom and foolishness, righteousness and unrighteousness, is flesh, Joh. 3, 6. Rom. 3, 23. pp. 209 - 217...;
 - b. That therefore the heathen could not truly strive for respectability, when they knew not what respectability was, p. 218. f.;
 - c. That all that is flesh is ungodly, under God's wrath, and in Satan's kingdom, p. 219. f.;
 - d. That if all things were not flesh in man, Christ's redemption would be void and superfluous, p. 220;
 - e. That there is a vast difference between the flesh and the spirit, p. 221. f.
 - e. **Jerem. 10, 23.** This saying proves that no preaching helps if God does not teach inwardly in the heart, and that it is not in man's hand to will what is good, p. 222-224;
 - f. **Proverbs 16:1** This saying shows that we do not know the coming events in advance, but that they will inevitably occur. Necessity makes us fear God, uncertainty makes us not despair, p. 224. f.
 - g. **Proverbs 16, 3. 4.** Here it does not speak of the creation, but of the constant, almighty effect of God in the creatures, p. 225.
 - h. **Sprüchw. 21, 1.** Same as g. S. 225. f.

1. **John 15:5**, pp. 230-238. In defending this saying at length against the distortions of Erasmus, Luther proves by the same mainly the following propositions:
 - a. "Free will is nothing but a horse ridden by the devil, which cannot be got rid of, unless by the finger of God the devil be cast out."-p. 230;
 - b. "Man, being outside of grace, remains nevertheless under the almighty effect of God, who moves, moves, creates, and does all things, so that all things are driven and must follow his eternal inevitable effect." p. 233;
 - c. all the works of man may be good, if God's Spirit and grace help. S. 237.
3. Conclusion of the second part. Luther defends himself against the fact that he only allowed himself to be carried away to his assertions by the heat of the battle; only the truth drove him to the same, p. 238. f.

III.

Proof that everything is done by God's grace and not by free will. P. 240. ff.

1. Evidence from St. Paul's, pp. 240-271...:
 - a. from the first four chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, the essential content of which Luther presents: namely, the experiential testimony of the state of sin and wrath in which all men find themselves, pp. 240-266, by showing:^a especially from Rom. 1, 17. 21. 22. 2, 29. 3, 9. 11. 12. that all men, Jews and Gentiles, even the wisest and best, have absolutely no power to do good, but rather want only evil, and do not even possess an inclination or striving for good, pp. 240-250;
 - b. especially from Rom. 3, 19. 20 a., that all who by their own strength labor under the law are condemned, p. 250 - 255.;^c especially from Rom. 3, 20 b., that the free will is blind, that it cannot even recognize its wretchedness and sin, p. 255 - 257.;
 - d. namely from Rom. 3, 21-25. 4, 2. 3. that one can obtain forgiveness without merit and free will, only by God's grace and through faith, pp. 257 - 266...;
 - b. from the Pauline arguments of eternal purpose, of divine promise, of power of the law, of original sin, of election, which Luther, however, mentions here only in passing, pp. 266 - 268;
 - c. from Rom. 8. 9. 14, 22. 23. u. a. St., pp. 268 - 271.

2. Evidence from St. John, pp. 271 - 282.

- a. from Joh. 1, 5. 10. 11. u. a. St., from which the terrible blindness of the "free will" is proved, pp. 271 f;
- b. from Joh. 1, 12. 13. where it is shown that no man of his own free will becomes a child of God, p. 272. f.;
- c. from John 1:16. where it is proved that free-will is nothing, since we obtain God's grace only by strange grace and merit, p. 273. f.;
- d. from Joh. 3, 1. ff. where Nicodemus' example shows that no man can know the way to salvation by nature;
- e. from Joh. 3, 18. 14, 16. and others, which show that apart from Christ there is nothing but Satan, apart from grace there is nothing but wrath, apart from light there is nothing but darkness, apart from the way there is nothing but error, apart from truth there is nothing but lies, apart from life there is nothing but death, p. 276-280;
- f. from Joh. 3, 27. where it is proved that free will, since it did not come from heaven, must be earthly minded, p. 280;
- g. from Joh. 6, 44. 45. where Luther proves that the word of the gospel is heard in vain if the Father does not teach, speak and testify within, p. 280. f.;
- h. from John 16, p., where he shows that free-will is imprisoned in sin, guilty and condemned before God, p. 281;

III. In summa of all the sayings which deal with Christ, all of which nullify free will, p. 282.

3. Proof from the experience of all pious Christians, when they know that their own running and racing does not make a happy conscience, but only the consciousness that their blessedness stands alone in God's grace, pp. 282 - 284.

4. Conclusion. Here Luther shows that one should not doubt that God is merciful and just, even if he condemns many or even most people. The darkness, which for the light of nature lies over the rule of the righteous God in this world, is already illuminated by the light of grace over the hereafter with its retribution; although the question of how God condemns one ungodly person and saves another who is perhaps even more ungodly is now also insoluble under this light, the third light, the light of glory, will also reveal this as the highest justice, p. 284 ff.

(Translated by Prof. A. Crämer.)

Compendium of the Theology of the Father

From

M . Heinrich Eckhardt.

(Continued.)

V. I. Description.

So who is Christ?

Augustin: "Christ Jesus is the Son of God, God and man. God before all time, man in our time. God, because he was the Word of God; man, because into the unity of the person to the Word came the flesh and the rational soul." 1) The same, "Who is this Christ that cometh of the Jews according to the flesh? Answer: who is God, blessed for ever and ever. God before the flesh, God in the flesh, God with the flesh." 2)

VI. His divine nature.

Of how many natures is our Savior made?

Damascenus: "Christ is not One Nature, but One Person, having two natures; one having no beginning, another having a beginning; the one uncreated, the other created." 3) Irenaeus: "As He was man, that He might be tried; so the Word, that He might be glorified." 4) Leo: "The Catholic Church lives and grows of this faith, that neither humanity without true Deity, nor Deity without true humanity, is believed." 5)

Prove the divinity of the Savior:

1. Alexander: "Because our Lord is by nature the Son of the Father, he is worshipped by all. The others are worshipped by the spirit of filiation through the good deeds of this natural Son.

Christus Jesus Dei filius est, Deus et homo. Deus ante omnia secula, homo in nostro seculo. Deus, quia Dei Verbum; homo, quia in unitatem personae accessit verbo caro et anima rationalis. Aug. in Enchir. c. 35.

Quis iste Christus, qui ex Judaeis est secundum carnem? Et respondet: Qui est Deus benedictus in secula. Deus ante carnem, Deus in carne, Deus cum carne. Aug. in ps. 46.

Non una natura Christus, sed una hypostasis, duas naturas habens; unam inprincipiatam, aliam principiatam; unam in creatam, aliam creatam. Dam. 1. de duab. volunt, c. 11.

Sicut homo erat, ut tentaretur, ita Verbum, ut glorificaretur. Iren. 1. 3. c. 21.

Catholica Ecclesia hac fide vivit ac proficit, ut in Christo Jesu nec sine vera divinitate humanitas, nec sine vera credatur humanitate divinitas. Leo ep. 10. decret. ad Flav. c. 5.

Son himself also adopted sons. But Paul called his true, peculiar, natural, and exquisite sonship, saying of God, Who spared not even his **own Son**. For in order that the difference from the improper sons might be emphasized, he called him his own. But in the Gospel it is said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And in the Psalms David saith, The Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee: wherewith the true Son is signified, signifying that there were none besides. And what meaneth this, Out of my womb have I begotten thee before the morning star? Does it not clearly indicate the natural sonship of the father's seed? From which it may be seen that the sonship of our Saviour has by no means any fellowship with the sonship of others." 1)

2. Epiphanius: "If he were a creature, what would he help us to blessedness? If he were a creature, he would ever not be presented to us for worship." 2)

3. Faustus: "And, if the only begotten Son be a creature, how shall he that believeth on him be not lost, but have everlasting life? since to believe on a creature is an offence against the Godhead." 3)

4. That Christ is not a creature or a mere man, Jerome proves against Photin with the following argument: "The apostle sent to preach denies that he was sent by a man, and says that his gospel is not of a man. If, then, Paul's gospel is not of man, he neither received it from man nor learned it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ:

Quia natura Filius est patris. Dominus noster, ideoque ab omnibus adoratur. Eeliqui per Spiritum adoptionis beneficio naturalis hujus Filii efficiuntur et ipsi filii adoptivi. Ipsius autem germanam,

*peculiarem, naturalem et eximiam filietatem Paulus ita demonstravit, de Deo loquens: Qui **proprio***

Filio non pepercit. Ut enim differentia notaretur inter non proprios filios, ipsum proprium appellavit. In evangelio vero sic: Hic est filius meus dilectus, in quo est complacentia mea. In psalmis autem ait David:

*Dominus dixit ad me: **Filius meus** es tu, ego hodie genui te, quo verus filius significatur, cum praeterea nullos esse indicetur. Et quid illud: Ex utero an te Lu cifer um genui te? Ann<m plane indicat naturalem filietatem paternae generationis? Unde licet intelligere filietatem Salvatoris nostri nullam penitus habere cum aliorum filietate communitatem. Alex., Episc. Alex. apud Socrat. 1. 1. c. 6.*

Si creatura esset, quid nobis prodesset ad salutem? Si creatura esset, non utique proponeretur ad adorandum. Epiph. haeres. 69.

Et, si creatura est Filius unigenitus, quomodo, qui credit in eum, non perit, sed habet vitam aeternam: cum credere in creaturam sit divinitatis offensio? Faust. 1. de fide contra Arian.

Jesus Christ, who revealed the gospel to Paul, is not a man. If then he is not a man, he is consequently God." 1)

5 Albinus: "And if none of the creatures were made without him, it is evident indeed that he himself, through whom all creatures were made, is not a creature."

The Arians object:

1. That he is called Col. 1. the firstborn before all creatures.

Athanasius: "But he did not say, He is the firstborn of all other creatures, that he might be held to be one of the creatures because of the relationship; but of the whole creation, that he might be understood to be something distinct from the creatures." 3)

2. That the Son himself Joh. 17. says of the Father: "That they may know thee, who alone are true God.

Nazianzenus: "This, that they know thee to be the only true God, is to exclude those who, while they are called gods, are not. Otherwise, if it were spoken in opposition to Christ, it would not be added: And whom thou hast sent, Jesum Christum." 4)

Athanasius: "For this is connected by the connective and with the first words, and that which follows must not be separated from it. But hear also the written declaration, lest thou err. The apostle John said thus, But we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us a mind to know him that is true, and to be in him that is true, in his Son Jesus Christ. He is the true God and the eternal life. Do you see, then, that the same words are spoken of the Father and of the Son, which likewise impute deity to the Father and to the Son? 5)

Apostolus ad praedicationem missus negat se missum ab homine, et ait, evangelium suum non esse secundum hominem. Si igitur evangelium Pauli non est secundum hominem, neque ab homine accepit aut didicit illud, sed per revelationem Jesu Christi: non est utique homo Jesus Christus, qui Paulo evangelium revelavit. Quod si non est homo, consequenter Deus. Hieron[^] in 1. c. Galat.

Et, si nihil creaturarum sine ipso factum est, patet profecto, quia ipse creatura non est, per quem omnis creatura facta est. Albin. 1. 1. in Job.

At non dixit: primogenitus est omnium aliarum creaturarum, ne veluti unus ex creaturis per cognationem haberetur, sed universae creationis, ut diversum quiddam esse a creaturis intelligeretur. Athan, orat. 3. c. Arian.

Illud: cognoscant te solum verum Deum, ad eos qui, cum Dii dicantur tamen non sunt, tollendos valet. Alioqui si Christo ex adverso responderit, adjectum non esset, Et quem misisti Jesum Christum. Nazianz. 1. 4. de Theol-

Ista enim cum primis verbis per conjunctionem Et cohaerent, neque, quae sequuntur, inde dirimenda sunt. Sed audi et scriptam demonstrationem,

Athanasius: "By the little word alone, therefore, the word or the Son is not excluded, but is co-narrated and co-understood." 1)

3. That Christ says: "The Father is greater than I.

Leo: "Since the only-begotten Son of God confesses that He is less than the Father, of whom nevertheless He also says that He is like Him, He shows the truthfulness of His two natures, that both inequality proves the human, and equality declares the divine." 2)

4. The Felicians interject that in the prophet he is called the servant of **God**.

Adrianus: He answers, "that he was so called by the prophets because of a mystery, because of the form of a servant, and not because of a servant nature." And proves "that none of the evangelists and apostles call Christ a servant, but Lord. And nowhere does Christ call **God** his Lord, but his Father; therefore let him not be a servant." 3)

5. The Arians also attract this, that it is said in 1 Cor. 15. that the Son delivered up the kingdom to the Father.

Hilarius: "The relinquishment of the kingdom is not a loss, which is evident from Christ's own words, for he says, 'All things are delivered unto me of my Father: all power is given unto me. If therefore 'to have given' were to lack, the Father also would have lacked that which he gave. But the Father, by delivering up that which he gave, did not lack: therefore neither can the Son be understood to lack that which he delivers up to the Father." 4)

ut non erres. Johannes Apostolus ita locutus est: Scimus, quod Filius Dei venit et dedit nobis intellectum, ut cognoscamus verum Deum, et simus in vero ejus Filio Jesu Christo. Hic est verus Deus et vita aeterna. Jamne animadvertitis, easdem voces de Patre et Filio proferri, aequaliter Patri et Filio Deitatem imputantes? Athan., in disp. contra Arian.

Particula igitur Solus Verbum seu Filius non excluditur, sed consignificatur et conintelligitur. Athan. Serm. 4. contra Arian.

Cum unigenitus Dei in minorem se Patre confitetur, cui se dicit aequalem, veritatem in se formae utriusque demonstrat: ut et humanam probet imparilitas et divinam declaret aequalitas. Leo serm. 7. de Nativ.

Respondet, quod a Prophetis per mysterium sic sit dictus, propter formam servi et non propter naturam servilem. Ac probat, neminem ex Evangelistis vel Apostolis Christum servum appellare, sed Dominum; et nullibi Christum Deum appellare Dominum suum, sed Patrem, ideoque non esse servum. Adrian, in ep. ad Hispan.

Traditio regni non est amissio, quod ex ipsius Christi verbis apparet, ait enim: Omnia mihi tradita sunt a patre; data est mihi omnis potestas. Ergo, si dedisse caruisse est, Pater his quoque caruit, quae dedit. Sed Pater tradendo non caruit; igitur nec Filius intelligi potest cariturus his, quae Patri tradit. Hilar. 1. 11. de Trin.

(6) In particular, they also make use of the 'same essence', which is not found in the Holy Scriptures.

AnselmuS: "Against the ungodliness of the Arians the Fathers added the new name "same being;" but by this name they did not signify a new thing. For this is called of the same essence, which signifies, I and the Father are one; that is, of one and the same essence." 1)

(To be continued.)

Miscellany.

To the Pabstacy. The man of sin, as his name implies, commits the greatest sins, those against the first table, and seduces them, as he sets up false worship, abusing and desecrating God's name, that is, his holy nature, majesty, goodness, works, honor, and glory. He will also make the sins against the second table low. For it is the devil's way, as a Lutheran preacher says, to make sin small. So the Antichrist will also have this way about him, contrary to Christ, who makes sins, even of the second table, very great, so that he calls coveting adultery, anger death, that is, worthy of condemnation. And behold! - Even today the pope makes sin small. His friends report (Vienna N. Fr. Presse) with evident pleasure in this kind of holiness: the pope demanded money for certain purposes; Antonelli (the equally unchaste as money-hungry cardinal) found the sum too high and modestly opposed it. This always annoyed the pope; he called Antonelli a little miser, or he took revenge by teasing the Cardinal about his - whore children, which the pope knew only too well. - Now let it be proved to us that Peter, for instance, whose successor the pope calls himself, also teased Paul because of his persecution of Christians, or Paul teased Peter because of his denial, or Jerome teased Augustine, of whom the papacy also boasts so often, because of his early life, known enough to Jerome and to us! They, like all true Christians, have not done such things. For Christianity punishes unrepented sins, but is silent about those that have been penitently acknowledged and forgiven, least of all does it joke about mortal sins; this is an antichristic way. - A. G. D.

1) Adversus impietatem Arianorum novum nomen Patres addiderunt Homousion, sed non rem novam tali nomine significaverunt. Hoc enim vocatur ὁμοουσιον, quod est: Ego et Pater unum sumus; unius videlicet ejus- demque substantiae. Ansh. in 1 Timoth. 6.

Dr. Franz Thieremin, French Reformed preacher in Berlin since 1810, died in 1846 as Consistorialrath, professor, court and cathedral preacher, writes in his work: *Adalberts Bekenntnisse* 1828, as follows: "Calvin has said that, as Christ promised, we become partakers of His body in the Lord's Supper, when we lift up our souls to heaven, where He is. Could I not be content with this spiritual presence of Christ, which is only for the believing recipient, not the unbelieving recipient? I believed it at first, but I could not. That we are made partakers of the body of Christ at the Lord's Supper, in so far as we lift up our souls to heaven, where He is, seems to me a forced notion, and an attempt to nullify the meaning of the words of institution by apparently retaining it. The soul is to be lifted up to heaven. Yes, indeed! But I always find that when the Lord desires to fill us and lift us up to Himself, He first comes down to us. This coming down to us is also perfectly in keeping with the nature of the Lord's Supper, which is to be a continuation of his walk on earth. First, in it he comes down to us; then, through it, he lifts us up to heaven. And this presence of Christ disappears before the unworthy communion companion? Can it be supposed, in the reverence due to the Lord's words, that he would once fulfil his promise to give his body and blood, and once not? No, what he has said he will do; what he has promised he will give, whatever the mind of the recipient may be. The believer will enjoy it to his salvation, the unbeliever to his condemnation. I must therefore declare myself in favor of Luther's opinion, and with him I believe: The sacrament of the altar is the true body and the true blood of Christ, in, with, and under the bread and wine, appointed and commanded for us to eat and drink. Thus I give due reverence to the words of Christ. He hath said, This is my body; and it behooves me to believe that he giveth me that which, according to the plainest sense of his words, he hath promised me."

The majority of inhabited worlds. We read the following in Dr. Munkel's *N. Zeitblatt* of July 18: "Since astronomy has extended the view of the universe so immeasurably, and discovered so many immense suns and world bodies that our earth, in comparison, disappears like a grain of sand against a mountain range or like a drop against the sea, the astonished contemplation, lost in the immensity, has occupied itself with the question of what this world army is there for. If this little grain of earth is the scene of so many creatures and wonders of nature, especially of man, then, they concluded, this must be much more the case with the other bodies of the world. Of course, no creature had ever fallen down to us from there, and nothing had been seen of it. Nevertheless, numerous

works written about the "majority of inhabited worlds", from which one could learn at least so much with certainty that the poetic imagination was fertile enough to populate the unknown worlds. Why does one not want to allow the imagination this harmless game? But it was not quite harmless. If the earth is but a grain among the vast bodies of the world, they said, how can you imagine that it will be the destined scene of God's deeds, the centre of his supreme revelations, the goal of his Son's mission, and the final place of the world's consummation? Some, perplexed, helped themselves with strange excuses; for it would be conceivable that the redemption of Christ on earth, with its effects, might reach out into distant worlds, and what is more. One could only populate the bodies of the world with spirits, angels, and devils, and that would help, that is, with imagination against imagination. But why the fantasists? - The "Gartenlaube" still continues in its old way under its new editor Ziel. But we want to let them speak in this matter. An article "Kriegesplanet," signed by Carus Sterne, deals with the planet Mars and its two newly discovered moons, describes its nature, and finds it habitable. "With new sympathy," says Sterne, "we shall from now on be allowed to look at Mars. For as far as my judgment goes, all the observations made in the past year can only strengthen our confidence that beings of a similar nature to ourselves could dwell there." The same could at most be assumed of the planet Venus, although we know much less of its nature. "The great outer planets, as much as we know of them, could only serve as dwelling-places for beings of whom we can by no means form a concept, for they are still hot, perhaps dissolved in steam. But since the discovery of spectral analysis, the suns and fixed stars have been completely removed from the list of inhabited worlds, because they are in the strongest heat. Of the moon (our earth) we assume with considerable certainty that it lacks air and water, the first conditions of a living world. Thus, of the worlds we can see, almost only Mars remains to us as a field which we can fertilize with our fantasies and dreams without coming into conflict with science." Of the countless worlds, only Mars remains habitable for fantasies and dreams. But since the imagination has had to make such a tremendous retreat, it is to be feared that even on Mars it will find no abode for sympathetic hearts; and the philosopher Hegel would be right in saying that only the earth bears men in whom God's revelations come to stand and be. Another of those soap bubbles has burst with which a supposed enlightenment has bombed revelation.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

New York Ministry. The following is taken from the preface to the second volume of the "Witness of Truth" concerning the position of the protest party in the aforementioned Synod: "By the mutual reconciliation which took place at the Synodal Assembly in Utica, 'all personal attacks and all bitterness' were to be kept away from the two papers published in the Synodal circle, and 'no mutual fighting' was to take place in their columns. We have faithfully and honestly fulfilled these obligations, and would also be heartily pleased if the management of the 'Herold' were done in such a way that a fusion of the two papers into one could take place quite soon. Unfortunately, however, with every number of the 'Herold' published since the Synodal Assembly, this hope has been lowered more. - The 'Witness' is not a representative of the Missouri Synod or Synodical Conference, nor do we contend for the same, as such, - but we are convinced that their doctrine of church and ministry is the only correct and scriptural one. The synods united in the Synodal Conference now comprise far more than a third of all Lutheran pastors and congregations in this country, and the blessing of this fellowship, and especially of the Missouri Synod, is so great and incalculable that we are justified in asking: What would have become of the Lutheran Church in this country, and how would it stand today, if the Lord had not, through it, exerted such a blessed and tremendous influence on its entire development? - Now the Herald not only bitterly opposed the Missouri Synod and others before the settlement in Utica, but also continues in this sad activity, which only too clearly shows personal irritation, before and after each number, and that most or actually all such attacks are directed at the 'witness' and its representatives is an open secret long known. At the first joint pastoral conference we lodged a public complaint about this point, and also obtained a promise from the editor of the 'Herald' to revoke an unjust announcement in No. 14 of the 'Herold'. The retraction, however, appeared in the form of a new spiteful attack and an unfounded slander. - In short: The 'Herald' is proving to be a fighter against Missouri and its blessed influence here in the East, and that in a very sad way. We deeply regret this proceeding, as we would so gladly build the kingdom of God in peace, with those who keep the peace. If, however, the 'Herald' proceeds to take any occasion whatsoever to insult and calumniate the Synodical Conference and the Missouri Synod, and the friends of the Editor cannot restrain him from this sad and pernicious proceeding, the 'Herald' and his Editor will only too soon perceive how thoroughly they are succeeding in trampling down again the peace which has just been joyfully welcomed. We expressly call attention to this, so that we may not later again be unjustly accused of 'breaking the peace'."

The Iowans, that is, the vocal leaders of the Iowa Synod, also recognize a "Swiss, a French, and an English Reformation," in the same sense in which they speak of a "German Reformation" by Dr. M. Luther. S. Kirchenblatt of November 1.

The Presbyterian paper, "Christian Observer," of Louisville, contains an article bitterly reproving the bad habit of preachers of kissing "sisters" of the congregation.

Presbyterians. Some time ago the Presbyterian congregation of Dr. Sankey in Rochester, New York, decided that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper might be administered in their church parlors, and that they need no longer go to the "Lord's Table. Some protested against this very inappropriate innovation. The Presbytery of Caledonia, as well as the Synod of New York, however, approved and confirmed the resolution of the said congregation. (Chr. Botsch.)

Power of the Jesuits. A Roman priest reports in his correspondence to the "Echo" that the notorious Jesuit Father Weninger had been forbidden by an American bishop to enter his diocese, but that he had nevertheless, after obtaining permission from Rome, been up to his mischief in the diocese, and that the bishop had kept silent about it.

II. Abroad.

The "Breslauers", as they are called for short, held their General Synod of this year in September. In the August issue of this magazine, p. 253, we spoke of symptoms of a change of direction on the part of the aforementioned from the errors contained in their "Public Declaration" concerning the doctrine of church government, based on reports in the "Concordia" of Pastor Meeske; unfortunately, the hopes associated with this have not been fulfilled. The following is written about the proceedings of this year's General Synod in the Kirchen-Blatt Past. Nagel's of October 1, among other things: "As is known, the previous General Synod, prompted by the Wagner case, recognized the necessity of taking a clearer position than before on the so-called 'public declaration on the disputed questions of church, church government and church order'. For when in 1864 the public declaration was accepted by the Synod with great, but not sufficient unanimity, and thus finally not accepted, the O.-K.-C. had declared that it understood the Scriptures and the symbols in the disputed questions in the same way as the public declaration, but the Synod had said nothing at all about it. This could easily give the impression that the O.C.C. was alone in its views, while the rest of the church held completely different views. The previous synod therefore decided that it should be investigated to what extent we were in agreement on these matters, and that all those who had something to object to the public statement should bring it up with the O.-K.-C.; but if agreement was found, the public statement should then be included in the synodal resolutions. At the present Synod it now appeared that very few objections had been received. In a very detailed explanation, one brother had spoken out against the reasoning which the public declaration contains for the divine right of the church government, and meant that the divine right of the church government, which he did not doubt, as well as the obedience to be rendered to the church government according to God's commandment, must be developed and derived differently. Some others had briefly objected to some other sentences of the public statement and desired their better formulation. Thus a doctrinal commission was formed, which was to examine these objections already received, and to receive and discuss those which had not yet been submitted by the brethren concerned. But finally it could be reported to the assembled Synod that the differences of opinion were very insignificant, that in all main matters there was a great unanimity. Voices were therefore raised that the Public Declaration should not only be included among the synodal resolutions, but, after the necessary changes, should even be elevated to a "doctrinal regulation" for the Breslau church fellowship! The main sentences, so Nagel writes, of the finally adopted resolution

read, however, as follows: "The Synod has re-examined the Public Declaration and, after careful consideration of all the objections and reservations raised against its form and content, declares that, although there remain many differences of opinion concerning the formulation and development of the doctrines in detail (e.g., whether the divine right of church government is to be derived from the apostolate or otherwise, or from which commandment of God obedience to the Church is to be derived), it considers the view and interpretation of the relevant Scripture and symbolic doctrines set forth in the Public Declaration to be correct in all the main points. Rrg., but that it, by the way, considers the view and interpretation of the relevant scriptural and symbolic doctrines laid down in the public declaration to be correct in all main matters, and therefore now expressly accedes to the previously mentioned declaration made by the O.-K. C. for this reason already in 1864? On the other hand, the Synod has not been able to decide to include the public declaration, as further envisaged by the previous Synod, among the Synodal resolutions and thus to give it the status and authority of a public doctrinal regulation in our Church. Therefore, the previously expressed approval of the public declaration cannot have the meaning that it should henceforth be added to the public doctrinal and confessional documents of our church, or that it should be used as a source of decision in disputes that arise, or that membership in the Lutheran church should be made dependent on approval of the declaration, or that it should prevent further discussion and research of the questions dealt with in the declaration, and that the understanding set forth in the declaration should be given a significance that is conclusive for all time. Rather, with this approval, the Synod only wanted to testify to that unanimous understanding of Scripture and symbols to which we have worked our way through heated struggles and according to the measure of our knowledge with God's help, and thus have settled the dispute in a Christian manner? These sentences were unanimously accepted by the Synod; only a few brethren voted against them, for whom this seemed too little, who would rather have attached a binding meaning to the public declaration." Nagel adds: "There is a great consensus among us on the questions at issue, and this consensus is generally expressed by the public declaration. There may, after all, be many a difference of opinion in detail: in the fundamental views which the public declaration represents, we are of one mind; in the direction which is indicated by the public declaration, we walk in harmony with one another. But the higher we may praise the Lord for this, the more we are willing to work further on all these questions, and the less we wish to impose our understanding on anyone as one already concluded." This sounds indeed as if one heard a voice from the Union camp. - The General Synod also discussed the question concerning the regional churches; unfortunately in the same latitudinarian sense. Nagel writes about this: "According to the resolutions of the previous synod, the O.-K.-C. had repeatedly been in a position to pass judgment on whether this or that church was still to be considered a Lutheran one. It had described the churches in Lower Hesse, Upper Hesse, Hesse-Darmstadt and Saxony-Weimar as those which could no longer be recognized by us as Lutheran, and in this the entire Synod could only unanimously agree with it. On the other hand, the O.-K.-C. had repeatedly been asked to declare the regional churches in Saxony, Hanover, Gotha and Saxony-Meiningen to have fallen away from the Lutheran confession. This, however, the O.-K.-C. had rejected (in regard to the latter, the verdict was still reserved), based on the sentence adopted by the previous synod: "A Lutheran church is to be recognized as still existing where it is not evident beyond doubt, after thorough consideration of all relevant facts and circumstances, that the Lutheran confession has ceased to be *publica doctrina* and as such (in accordance with

Article 7 of the Augsburg Confession) to be **exclusively** authoritative for the entire ecclesiastical organism. In particular, a cancellation of the Lutheran character of a church can also be seen when the 10th article of the Augsburg Confession is annulled by the fundamental admission of non-Lutherans to Holy Communion. The reason for the O.-K.-C. to deal with these questions was given by the fact that individual members of various Lutheran regional churches had turned to us with the request for admission and ecclesiastical service. They had declared that they could no longer stand it in their national churches: open unbelief was being preached to them, union ruled at the altars, and the like, and the 'truth of these statements could unfortunately not be doubted. Even if the O.-K.-C. had had misgivings about denying the Lutheran character of the entire churches for the sake of such confessional irregularities, since in them the Lutheran confession was still public doctrine and as such exclusively authoritative for them (even though many of their authorities, ministers and members no longer allowed the confession to be authoritative), the O.-K.-C. had nevertheless also shied away from denying the Lutheran character of the churches. K. C. had also shied away from summarily turning away frightened people who sought help and peace from us out of real distress of conscience. And so, in various cases, the O.-K.-C. had granted permission to members of the Hanoverian and Gothaic Churches to receive church service in our congregations. The Synod was convinced that under the present circumstances there is no other procedure left for us..... In any case, the O.-K.-C., whose decisions in this matter were approved by the Synod with special thanks, was authorized to expressly pronounce such a suspension of church fellowship in those cases in which our church position cannot be preserved in any other way. Incidentally, the Synod repeatedly affirmed the principle adopted by the previous Synod, as stated above. A special resolution was passed concerning the Church of Hanover. In general, the situation here is the same as in other regional churches; perhaps in some respects it is better than elsewhere. For our church, however, the position which the Landesconsistorium has recently taken in the matter of the Lord's Supper is extremely threatening, even downright negative. Not only is the 'guest' admission of Uniate and Reformed to the Lutheran Lord's Supper ordered and generally in practice, not only is the Union free in the military congregations; the Landesconsistorium has also declared itself in principle in favor of the Lutheran-minded within the Prussian Landeskirche as fully entitled members. The Landesconsistorium has also declared in principle that the Lutheran-minded within the Prussian Landeskirche are to be regarded and treated as full members and communion companions in the Hann. church. With this - not explicitly but in fact - our entire ecclesiastical position is condemned as an unjustified one. Now the Landessynode has not formally approved these principles of its authority, but much less disapproved of them. And it seems that in the entire church there, the principles of the L.-C. are followed. The Synod recognized that it was not possible to pass by in silence this palpable denial of the Old Lutheran principles we hold, this declaration of war (however unintentional) against our ecclesiastical position. We are, after all, accustomed to being beaten and cannot listen to every scolding word. But the fact that an entire Lutheran church, through the mouth of its regiment, pronounces principles and orders measures which, in their presuppositions and consequences, virtually deny us the right to exist, is something that has never happened before. The Synod has therefore requested the O.-K.-C. to contact the Hann. Landes-Consistorium in a brotherly manner regarding this matter. May it be possible for the latter to give us reasonably satisfactory explanations. - Incidentally, the Synod has adhered to the resolution passed in 1873, according to which the verdict

The fact that the O.-K.-C. is entitled to decide on the confessional status of other churches does not change anything, so that in this case, too, the Lutheran regulation of our relations with the Hann. Landeskirche is left to the O.-K.-C.. Finally, the communication of one of the brethren who live on the borders of the Regional Church and thus have frequent opportunity to communicate with Lutherans of the Regional Church gained special significance. He remarked that many simple-minded souls, who see the corrupt state of their national church before their eyes every day, cannot understand why we still allow them to be considered Lutheran; this would give the impression that we measure the Lutheran national churches with a different yardstick than the unreformed ones; consciences would be confused, and many would go astray in our church. This could not cause the Synod to change its well-considered assessment of this question, but it did request the O.-K.-C. to write or have written a document in which the principles followed by our church in regard to the Lutheran regional churches would be explained and defended as popularly as possible. It is hereby evident that this year's Breslau Synod is not even willing to take the resolution of the previous Synod seriously. This would, of course, bring it the same loneliness and the same odium and creed which other Free Churches have to bear because of it; but also the same blessing of which it has now perhaps deprived itself forever. W.

As is well known, it is an almost unheard-of thing in Germany to subject **books containing much good, in which at the same time the leaven of false doctrine is found**, to serious criticism and, if they are schoolbooks, to protest against their introduction. Therefore, an article in the "Pastoral-Correspondenz" of August 31 shines from over there like a light of hope, in which the new Hanoverian Catechism, which is distinguished in many respects and in comparison with most of the other new catechisms, and for which years ago almost everything that believed went into battle in contrast to the miserable old Hanoverian Catechism, is subjected to criticism and a protest is raised against its introduction. The article is by Pastor Beer in Heiligenrode and contains, among other things, the following: "Once again I raise my finger in admonition and warning against some of the brethren of our national church who stand by the Pentecostal Conference and the Pastoral Correspondence. I am motivated to do this by a heartfelt love for the Hanoverian Regional Church and the feeling of common faith in which I know myself to be united with them in many important ways. However, the article signed by O. Hasselbring in the last Past.-Corresp. gives me new cause for this with his proposal to place a monument to King George on his grave by introducing - at least facultatively - the so-called new catechism, which seems to the sender without further ado to be a good Lutheran one in all respects. ... The opinion that the 'new' Catechism fully and purely expresses Luther's doctrine and in every respect bears a genuinely Lutheran stamp, I oppose with doubts, in that I think that - with all recognition in many, great main points - the opposite is the case in some points which are especially important for our time and which will be indicated in the following.... In the detailed explanation of the fourth commandment it is stated that, for its sake, one owes obedience to those who rule in the church (naturally in accordance with canon law) in the same measure and sense as to the secular authorities in the civil sphere, even more so than to the latter. There, quite differently from Luther's great catechism, it is wholly concealed in the third commandment, that the Christian Sunday is an ordinance of the church, but the Jewish Sabbath is abjured. The scriptural passage Col. 2:16 is missing, and the word of God comes up short in the capacity according to which the office and ordinances of the church are to serve it as the main thing.

(cf. Br. 60). There the church is essentially understood as the assembly of the called (Fr. 115), and the addition 'congregation of the saints' is not synonymous with the church, but only adds a closer explanation to this closed concept to the effect that the unbelievers who also belong to the church are not actually members of the church (Fr. 119), just as faith is not a condition for membership in the essential church, but rather the object and goal of the educational activity of the same (Fr. 115). Further, in connection with this, the forgiveness of sins (cf. 120-124), confession and absolution (Addition 4, cf. 3, 13, 156 ff.), also private confession (ibid. cf. 4-8), and finally preaching and the office of preaching (cf. 56 and 60) are taught in such a way that it remains unclear whether the clergy does not nevertheless represent an *ecclesia repraesentativa* in the unevangelical sense of the word. In general, the difference between what church and ecclesiastical action essentially is or should be, and what church and ecclesiastical action really is or represents, remains too much undisclosed. The humanly 'called' or 'ordained' ministers come strongly to the fore, while only once in passing (Encore 4, fr. 2) is there a hint of the fact that every Christian is or may be innately called to wait upon the 'office' of the means of grace. The language of the Catechism may be said to be not only consecratory and unctuous, but also cautious, especially in certain directions. This, however, is connected with the disadvantage that, in the same direction, it often acts more on mood and feeling than on knowledge, will, and conscience, and leads pious minds to a satisfied rest rather than wavering, searching, struggling souls to clarity and decision in all the above-mentioned and other points, in which it is primarily a matter of a dispute with the Roman Church. In sum, the new Catechism, which is so excellent in many and main points, suffers from the defect that it, which is so resolutely opposed to the enemy on the left, does not make the genuine Lutheran position stand out sharply enough against the serpent on the right, and that its language is designed to reassure many, and not the worst, in a false way, or at least to leave them unconcerned about the danger it conceals. .. Neither opposition to the foolish enmity of unbelief, nor reverence for a deceased, pious king, should lead us to close our eyes to the fact that the so-called new Catechism needs revision, a clarification of its language, and an elimination of Romanizing leaven, which has also begun on other sides to dull the bright shine of the true confession in our midst. - It is reported that in some schools within the Synodal Conference the catechism of Caspari, as well as that of Herford, has been introduced. Of these two the same is true in some respects what Pastor Beer says of the new Hanoverian. Would that it were taken to heart! "A little leaven leaveneth the whole dough. " W.

Hermannsburg. Dr. Münkler writes: Pastor Beck, born in Bavaria, was last pastor on an island on the west coast of Schleswig, where he got into a fight with the Kiel Consistory and intended to found a separate congregation. The separation fell through, and he submitted his dismissal to the Kiel Consistory.

Hanoverian Separation. The "Pastoral-Correspondenz" of September 14 reports the following: "Sup. Rocholl will, as we have certainly heard, give up his present position as pastor of the small separated congregation in Hanover in the near future and follow a call to the community of the Breslau Synod. Differences in the understanding of some questions between him and the others

Leaders of the Separation may have given rise to this. The pastor out of service Grote will not return to Hanover, but will choose his residence outside the German Empire, probably in Geneva."

Rocholl. In the "Kirchen- Blatt für die ev.-luth. Gemeinden in Preußen", edited by Pastor J. Nagel in Rothenburg a. O., of October 1, we read the following: "Superintendent Rudolf Rocholl, formerly in Göttingen, now pastor of the small congregation in Hanover which has left the Hanoverian Landeskirche, has been elected pastor of the Lutheran Martini congregation in Radevormwald and his appointment confirmed by the Ober-Kirchen-Collegium on September 20. With joy our congregations will welcome the author of the soul-winning book "Christophorus" in their midst and thank the Lord for His gift. Superintendent Rocholl was formerly pastor in Sachsenberg (in Waldeck) and sowed the seeds from which our congregation there has grown, and he has long since proven himself to be a warm friend of our church. The joy over his intended entry into our church, however, would have been almost spoiled by misgivings, caused by his book published four years ago under the title "The Real Presence", in which he, although only with the intention of exploring and substantiating the mystery of the majesty of the exalted God-Man and His presence with His own theologically and only as an attempt in a new way, came upon assertions which more or less clearly deviated from the teachings of our church, especially in the Concordia formula. After the prescribed colloquium held with him, however, he made statements about his present position on this writing, which calmed those misgivings. The most important of these is published here below with his consent, since the book that had caused offence had also appeared in public: 'However, I must acknowledge that in my Realprä'senz some doctrinal points are presented in a way that obviously still violates the teaching of the Church. I mean here especially that of the unity of the two natures in Christ. Here, however, lies an approximation to Nestorianism, which I myself now object to. Also the hypothesis of restitution (cf. Gen. 1:2) I would not teach in this way today, although in general the assistance of philosophical research, which is customary in the church, as well as the freedom for open questions, may not be rejected. Other doctrinal points, I mean here especially that of salvation, appear in a one-sided and doubtful light because of the structure of the whole. I want this doctrine to be understood as the Confessions understand it. In some points I am misunderstood, in all I will let the confessions of the church, always under the standard of holy Scripture, be the judge. With this declaration I believe that I have at the same time given sufficient guarantee for the nature of my official and also my possible future scientific activity. I have always been of one mind. I have always been of the mind to drop everything that the church could not appropriate for itself, and I will have to take this seriously in the Free Church, which does not exist without doctrinal discipline. Rocholl.' On the basis of this declaration, the Ober-Kirchen-Collegium has confirmed the appointment of Superintendent Rocholl to our church ministry with good confidence." - With these negotiations, too, unfortunately, a new proof has been furnished how miserably the so-called Breslauers are doing with their faithful concern for pure doctrine. An ecclesiastical community which reassures itself with a declaration such as that given by Superintendent Rocholl, according to the Mitgetheilten, has evidently abandoned the principle that the church must be "united in doctrine and all the articles thereof" (see Concordia Book, Repetition, Art. X, p. 703). The doctrinal position of Breslau in particular is the more to be deplored, as it is the main cause that the Lutheran Free Church in Germany is so divided; for if Breslau, as the first Lutheran separation, had been equally

If we had initially returned to the pure doctrine of our church, all subsequent Lutheran separations would undoubtedly have sought refuge there, and a Lutheran Free Church of Germany would have been formed.

Combating Separation. According to Münkels N. Zeitblatt of September 5, this was the topic of this year's pastoral conference in Erlangen, which was attended by about 150 people. The lecture was given by Pastor Heydner from Ansbach, who answered the question: "What can and should we clergy do to prevent separatism (?) in our congregations when it occurs?" The Bavarian Landeskirche, Münkels notes, "is most directly affected by the efforts of Hörger, who seeks to found Lutheran congregations essentially in the Missouri sense, but, according to his statement, "has not yet gotten beyond the number of 50 separatists" (i.e., separated). Of this separation, said Rev. Baum of St. Georgen, there was not too much to fear, "because the Franconian congregations were not very amenable to separatist influences, given the lack of Christian life." Very naive! If this is the reason that the Bavarian regional church does not have too much to fear from separation, then it must look sad enough in it and it must be high time to separate from it. Heydner reported of Löhe: "I once heard him tell how a long procession of men approached his house in order to make the declaration before him that they would leave the Landeskirche with him as soon as he wanted to leave. But it was he and the noble measure he knew how to keep that prevented the separation." According to Heydner, one of the things Münkels reports about how separation is to be fought is as follows: "He completely refuses to call the police and state authorities to his aid. In particular, however, Heydner recommends gathering the accessible or awakened souls in Bible studies and other associations, and discussing with them precisely what can protect them against separatism before they fall into the hands of the separatists. He said that public worship and the pulpit should be used less for this purpose, since this would cause a stir that would drive the simple-minded and curious to the separatists. For the same reason, he does not want the press to be used, so that the counter-pamphlets do not attach too much importance to the matter and do not spread the errors among the people. For there are always people who like to deal with pointed questions and want something outlandish. Finally, but not least, zealous pastoral care is recommended, as practiced in the care of the individual, in confession, instruction, and especially in the proper manner of preaching, so that a refreshing breath may go forth from above for renewal by the Spirit." Münkels himself remarks: "Where the press is already working successfully in the service of separatism and has penetrated the people, mere deathly silence is no longer appropriate; the press must be opposed to the press, especially in order to reach those places where no sufficient spiritual power can take over the leadership. In Hanover Heydner could make entirely new studies.... The separatist spirit, rooted in the Christianity of Hermannsburg, is already widespread in many congregations before separation, nourished at mission festivals and pilgrimages to Hermannsburg, and promoted by many clergymen, who in small part have themselves converted to separation, and in large part, partly following the pressure of their congregations, partly from an inner inclination, hang over to Hermannsburg and encourage separatism. There the ordinary means are not sufficient, which are faithfully applied by several clergymen." What "unusual" means Münkels has in mind here, he unfortunately does not say. It would be interesting to learn about them. Possibly, they are an X term to him himself.

As is well known, 50 years ago the **Wupperthal** was the area of Germany in which, around the year 1817, after a long period of the rule of rationalism, the **"Wupperthal" became the most important** region in the world.

The life of the faith, which was again awakening in Germany, burst forth with power before other regions. Here the return to the faith of the fathers seemed to be preparing itself. But what has happened? The present religious conditions in the Wupperthal are described in the *Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung* of September 6 as follows. September, among other things, as follows: "At present one feels everywhere that the time of the first love has long since passed; the current of the spirit is dull and weakened by elements foreign to it; the Christian life has withdrawn more from the public sphere into silence; the loud noise of rapidly developed large-scale industry has drowned out the voice of the quiet ones in the country. Large masses of workers, especially those who have streamed in from outside, have remained untouched by the leavening power of the Gospel; under the endeavor to mediate with the modern spirit of the times, a half-worldly Christianity has emerged even in circles that formerly stood faithful to the Church, which expects no less moral vitality from the theater than from the Gospel sermon. The last decade with its rapid development has visibly accelerated the decline, and the day seems near when the otherwise beneficial difference between Elberfeld-Barmen and other large cities will be completely blurred. In the long Wupper valley with its 170,000 inhabitants, a still numerous people of God, which in confident faith does not tire of casting its net even in the night and always seeks new ways of love to the hearts of the alienated, is now confronted with a well-organized social democracy, and between the two is the mass of half, indifferent, even hostile nominal Christians, who cannot quite be contained." - Such is the state of the prospects for the preservation and renewal of the German so-called *Volkskirche*! W.

Necrological. On September 27, the professor of theology Dr. Julius Müller, without doubt the most important theologian in the unit-evangelical church, died in Halle. He has made himself especially known through his writing, "Doctrine of Sin," and through his advocacy of the so-called Consensus Union. Born in Brieg (Silesia) in 1801, he was professor in Halle since 1839.

Old Catholic. In Luthardt's church newspaper of August 30 we read: Finally, as an Old Catholic curiosity, it should be mentioned that the well-known Erpater Hyacinthe, Ch. Loyson, has been appointed by the Orthodox Apostolic Archbishop Holly in Haiti as representative of the Orthodox Apostolic Church in Haiti and has been invested with this dignity by a delegation sent to him. This Church is said to hold fast the Apostolic, Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds, as well as the Episcopate, Presbyterate, and Diaconate, and has an earnest resolution to remain "steadfast" in the Catholic communion. It rejects the abuses which the Middle Ages introduced into the Church, namely the "abuse of confession" as incompatible with Genesis 3:12-15 and the obligation of celibacy. On the other hand, it recognizes the five ancient patriarchates: Rome, Constantinople, Jerusalem, Antioch and Alexandria. However, before moving the scene of his deeds to the very western Haiti, Mr. Loyson gave a series of religious-philosophical lectures in Paris at the beginning of June.

The lack of theologians is also evident in the Catholic Church in France. In a recently published work by the Abbe Emil Bougaud, Vicar General of the Diocese of Orleans, on "the conditions of the Catholic Church in France", remarkable information is given about this. "It is a question," writes this ecclesiastical dignitary, "of whether there is enough new blood for the ecclesiastical priesthood, in other words, whether we will find as many priests as are necessary to care for those souls who remain faithful to the Church. There can be no question of recovering those souls who have renounced the Church, of France holding on to them as it withdraws more and more from the Roman Church. Even the country people, otherwise so zealously Catholic, are abandoning the paths to the sanctuary. The wound

is deepening daily, threatening the French Church with a kind of anaemia." The great seminary of Nîmes used to have 80, now 34 pupils. In the diocese of Troyes 91 priests are lacking, in the diocese of Orleans 120, in the diocese of Evreux 112, in that of Meaux 62, and so on. In the diocese of Sens, 62 parishes are vacant, and in the seminary there are only 50 students instead of 120. The seminary in Rheims has fallen from 230 students to 150, etc.

Resolutions of the Protestant Association. The meeting of the Protestant Association called to Hildesheim was attended by a large number of people from all parts of Germany. After lengthy negotiations, the following five theses were finally adopted unanimously: I. The limits of ecclesiastical freedom of doctrine are determined: 1) by the duty of the pastorate to preach the Gospel of JEsu to the Christian congregation; 2) by the principle of our Protestant Church, that the Gospel of JEsu alone is safely attested in the Holy Scriptures. II. The historical confessions of the ancient church, as well as of the Reformation, are testimonies of Christian doctrine from the knowledge of their time, therefore venerable monuments of the historical development of the church, but not obligatory norms for the faith of the present. Protestant synods do not have the authority to change the foundations of doctrinal freedom (Thesis I) which were established by the Reformation. Any attempt, after three hundred years of development of our Protestant Church, to impose by majority vote a compulsory confession would probably break up the Church and the congregations. IV. The exercise of the right of supervision within the designated limits is due to church bodies. In the case in question, the congregation has the right to be heard first in its appointed representatives. In matters of doctrine, the sovereigns are not entitled to make a decision. Teachers of theological science are not subject to ecclesiastical supervision. The ecclesiastical bodies appointed to exercise the right of supervision must openly acknowledge the equality of the various directions which have grown up on the ground of the Gospel, and must also in their turn cultivate unity of spirit between them. V. It is a pernicious abuse of the ecclesiastical right of veto to judge faith and conscience by the letter of the confessions, to stunt the free suffrage of the congregation, and to disturb peace where clergy and congregational bodies are united.

Strange jubilee celebration. Dr. Münkel writes: Inventive, very inventive one is in this jubilee. Soon this one soon that one has found a commemorative day that perhaps no soul would have thought of. But we find something very special in the two periodicals for Judaism. To the Mainz "Israelite" seems to be due the honor of leading the way. The paper discovered in Lessing's records that he had begun his play Nathan the Wise on November 15, 1778. The conjoined paper then discovered that the play was completed in April, 1779. Germany thus has the choice of celebrating the anniversary of the play either on November 15 or April 1. - In Geneva, at the end of June and the beginning of July, the centenary of the death of J. J. Rousseau was also celebrated.

Social Democracy. Dr. Münkel writes: The Christian Social Party at Berlin was assembled after the Reichstag election under the presidency of the court preacher Stöcker. The liberal papers report with satisfaction from Stöcker's speech: He was deeply shocked by the failure of the elections; Tuesday evening, when the election results were compiled, was the most shattering moment of his life. The party had hardly collected one and a half thousand votes for its candidate, whereas the Social Democrats had gained 25,000 votes in one year alone.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 24.

December 1878.

No. 12.

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

(Continued.)

XIV Of election by grace or predestination.

A. Thetic 1.

Hülsemann: "Predestination is the eternal and purely gracious act of God, who, for the sake of universal merit and the intercession of JEsu Christ, chose some men out of the corrupt masses to eternal glory, of whom he foresaw, namely, that they would not wantonly reject the grace of calling, justification, sanctification, and permanence, which was to be offered them by him in time, to the praise of his grace and glory." *)

Adam Osiander: "Predestination is not a mere council, the execution of which takes place in time, like the council of calling and glorification; but it is the actual and eternal separation of certain individual men from the multitude of those who are not to be saved, before their existence." **)

Quenstedt: "A distinction must be made between the purpose of making men blessed, i.e., of offering and bestowing upon them the means of salvation, and between election according to that purpose. The pre

*) „,Praedestinatio est actus aeternus et mere gratuitus Dei, eligentis propter commune meritum et intercessionem Jesu Christi quosdam homines ex massa corrupta ad aeternam gloriam, quos videl. praevidit non esse petulanter rejecturos gratiam vocationis, justificationis, sanctificationis et perseverantiae, a sese in tempore ipsis offerendam, ad laudem gratiae et gloriae suae." (Breviar. c. 15. §4.)

**) „,Praedestinatio non est nudum decretum, cujus executio in tempore fit, quale est decretum vocationis et glorificationis; sed est actualis et aeterna separatio singularium quorundam hominum a coetu non salvandorum, antequam in rerum natura existunt." (Colleg. theologic. systemat. P. VI. p. 72.)

The election which is made according to this purpose refers not only to the means of salvation ordered and offered by God, but also to the persons who make use of these means, and therefore it becomes particular." *)

B. Antithetical. 1.

v. Hofmann: "The object of this eternal will of God, according to Scripture, is not men as individuals, but it is man, or, which is to say the same thing, mankind. ... It will now be decidedly wrong to say of .being chosen' ($\lambda\acute{\iota}\chi\epsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$) that it denotes the eternal destiny of certain individuals to blessedness..., since it is rather first of all the congregation, and that the whole congregation of Christ, or an individual as a member of it, of which it is said that he has chosen them. Of individual Christians it is said, because and inasmuch as they are members of the church." (Proof of Scripture, I, 193. 199. 201.)

Luthardt: "The basic error" (of the Lutheran doctrine of the election of grace) "is from the beginning the too direct relationship to the individual, instead of to humanity as God wills it in Christ, into whose community then only the individuals enter through faith. These individual believers, however, are not the object of a special and particular predestination, but in them only the one and general counsel of God's love is historically realized". (Compendium. 3rd ed. p. 95.)

Vilmar: "More fruitful . the Lutheran dogmatists could without question have developed the doctrine of the Formula Concordia (!), if they had posed the question whether there was not reason in the Apology to conceive of election as a representation of the foundation of the Christian church as an institution of salvation in the whole, i.e., to completely eliminate election as referring to individual persons, i.e., to assert election for individuals only in so far as these individuals were included in the separation of the Christian community from the world among the saints." (Dogmatics, 1874. p. 16. f.)

Thomasius: "Considered in itself, the divine purpose has no relation to single individuals; it is not a council concerning the election of individuals (no *decretum de singulis eligendis*), but it is ordered love (*voluntas ordinata*). In other words, God's love rests on Christ, the Beloved, and in him on all who unite with him in faith and become one person with him through faith.

*) Disting, inter propositum de salvandis hominibus i. e. de offerendis et conferendis salutis mediis et inter electionem juxta illud propositum. Propositum est universale, sed electio, facta juxta illud propositum, respicit non solum media salutis a Deo ordinata et oblatu, sed etiam personas (eorum), qui hisce mediis utuntur, et inde fit particularis." (Th. did.-pol. P. III. c. 2. s. 2. q. 6. f. 73.)

What these are, that is not the content, not a determination, which that council resolution has in itself - it is therefore not concluded on this side, and that is not because it is aimed at the behavior (!) of men. And so it is fulfilled, if I may say so, only gradually with the single individuals; which these are, God certainly knows in advance by virtue of his presence, but that is not the content, not the determination of that general resolution about men who are to become blessed." (Christ's Person and Work. 1853. I, 400 f.)

The same: "The eternal purpose ... is not an individual choice, but a universal will of grace, embracing the whole lost human race, yet not a bad universal one, but decided and conceived in Christ, Ephes. 1:4; for it consists precisely in this, that God wills to save mankind in Christ, the object of his love and the acquirer of our salvation, and only in Christ, i.e., in so far as they surrender themselves to him in faith, not without and apart from him." (The Confession of the Lutheran Church, etc. 1848. p. 219.)

A. Thetical. 2.

Concordia: "The eternal election of God does not only see and know beforehand the blessedness of the elect, but is also of God's gracious will and good pleasure in Christ Jesus a **cause**, so that our blessedness, and that which belongs to it, creates, works, helps, and promotes; on which also our blessedness is thus founded, that the gates of hell shall not be able to oppose it; as it is written: 'No one will snatch my sheep out of my hand'; and again, 'And as many as were ordained to eternal life believed.'" (p. 705 f.)

Arcularius: "It is said that they believed as many as were ordained to eternal life (Apost. 13, 48.), by which the cause is indicated of what Luke had said immediately before, both of the joy and the praise of the divine word, namely, the faith flowing from the eternal predestination of God as its source. ... Herein lies the doctrine of predestination or election, as the source and cause of our faith and blessedness." *)

Jakob Heerbrand: "The divine election or predestination is the cause of our blessedness, in which it is also founded. As the apostle says: 'He hath chosen us in him (Christ).'

*) „Credidisse dicuntur, quotquot ordinati erant ad vitam aeternam, quo causa notatur eorum, quae tum de gaudio, tum celebratione sermonis divini paulo ante dixerat Lucas, nempe fides ex aeterna Dei praedestinatione seu fonte dimanans. . . . Loci communes: ... 2. de praedestinatione seu electione, fidei atque salutis nostrae fonte et causa." (Acta apost., triumphali commentario illustrata, cum praefat. J. Fechtii. p. 319. 321.)

that we should be holy and blameless before Him/ (Ephes. 1, 4.) And Christ: 'No one will snatch my sheep out of my hand' (Joh. 10, 28.) And: 'As many as were ordained to eternal life believed' (Apost. 13, 48.) ***).

B. Antithetical. 2.

Luthardt: "It is true that the presentation of the Concordia formula often reads as if God alone works everything. (*Hominis conversionem non tantum ex parte, sed totam prorsus esse operationem, donum et opus solius Sp. Sancti*, p. 687, 89.) But these statements receive their closer determination from that *potest apprehendere* and the *quam primum inchoavit* discussed earlier." (674, 65.) "It must, however, be acknowledged that the exposition of the Concordia formula does not keep itself carefully enough within the limits of what is necessary. This may well be an after-effect of the manner of the controversial literature of the time, which placed decisiveness in the strongest possible and most exaggerated manner of speaking, with which one represented and advocated the opposites. It is even more alarming, however, when the Concordia formula once says: *Deus, quem convertere decrevit*. (673, 60.) According to this, (!) the counsel of God seems to be a decision about the individuals, and to precede their conduct not only temporally, but also causally. Then, however, absolute (!) and particular predestination would be unavoidable. But that it is not meant (?) in this way, we understand from the other exposition. . . . The expression, however, is apt to lead to predestinarian errors. ***" (The Doctrine of Free Will. 1863. p. 276. f.)

A. Thetic. 3.

Concordia formula: "By this doctrine and declaration of the eternal and beatific election of the elect children of God, God is given his glory wholly and completely, that out of pure mercy in Christ, without any merit or good of ours, he will give us the salvation of the world".

*) Electio vero divina vel praedestinatio causa est nostrae salutis, in qua etiam haec fundata est. Sicut apostolus inquit: 'Elegit NOS in ipso (Christo), ut essemus sancti et immaculati coram ipso.' (Ephes. 1.) Et Christus: 'Nemo rapiet < ves meas de manu mea.' (Joh. 10.) Et: 'Crediderunt, quotquot erant praeordinati ad vitam.' (Act. 13-)" (Compend. th. 1582. p. 519)

**Luthardt here uses the Calvinist doctrine of absolute predestination to salvation and damnation as a bogeyman, by which he wants to frighten off belief in any predestination, even in the beatific predestination of individuals, as taught in the Scriptures. This is the reason why decided Calvinists scoff at our, i.e., the Lutherans, as Pelagians with a great appearance of justification, as E. W. Krummacker actually did years ago (1863). W. Krummacker really did. Cf. "Lehre und Wehre" Jahrg. IX, p. 257 ff.

The work that saves us, according to the purpose of his will, as it is written in Ephesians. 1: 'He hath ordained us to filial piety toward himself, through JESUS Christ, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of his glory and grace, whereby he hath made us acceptable in the Beloved? Wherefore it is false and unjust, when it is taught, that not only the mercy of God, and most holy merit of Christ, but **also in us, is a cause of God's election**, for which God hath **chosen** us unto eternal life. For not only before we have done any good, but also before we are born, hath he chosen us in Christ, yea, before the foundation of the world was laid: and that the providence of God might be according to election, it was said unto him, not of the merit of works, but of the grace of the caller; that he that is greatest should be servant to him that is least: as it is written: "I loved Jacob, but I hated Esau. Rom. 9, 11. ff. Gen. 25, 23. Malach. 1, 2. f. Likewise this doctrine gives no one cause either for pusillanimity or for an insolent, wild life, when men are taught to seek eternal election in Christ and his holy gospel, as in the book of life, which excludes no penitent sinner, but entices and calls to repentance and knowledge of their sins, and to faith in Christ, all poor, afflicted, and afflicted sinners, and burns up the Holy Spirit for cleansing and regeneration, and thus gives the most constant consolation to afflicted, controverted men, that they may know that their salvation is not in their hands;*Otherwise they would lose it much more easily than Adam and Eve did in paradise, even every hour and moment; but in the gracious election of God, which he hath revealed unto us in Christ, out of whose hand no man shall pluck us. Joh. 10, 28. 2 Tim. 2, 19." (Müller, p. 723 f.)

Johann Olearius: "Is the Lutheran doctrine of election related to Pelagianism? We deny this, because it ascribes everything to God, and nothing to man, since the latter alone gives the willing and the accomplishing. Phil. 2. . . . To this is not opposed: 1. The outward hearing of the word; because the pedagogical acts are quite distinct from conversion itself and salutary hearing. **) . . . (2) Nor faith, which is by no means ours, but God's gift, nor a condition to be fulfilled by us, but a requirement bestowed by God out of grace through the means of salvation. ... (3) Neither is the desire for blessedness; because even

1) Of such a doctrine of predestination, which is comforting to the believer, nothing is to be found in the writings of modern Lutheran theologians; for either they deny individual election altogether, that is, an *electio*, or they seek the cause of it in man's conduct.

2)) Nor does both man come to the means of grace, and these to him.

This is not natural, but supernatural, given by the Holy Spirit, and springing from the Word. (4) Nor the non-resistance ascribed to man above; because even this is a gift of the Holy Spirit, who removes and restrains the resistance which is of ourselves alone, by the proper means of salvation. . . . For non-resistance is by no means a causative influence, but only a non-obstruction of the activity of a doer; as both the leper, Matt. 8, and Lazarus, John 11, by not resisting, were by no means a cause either of the miraculous healing or of the raising from the dead. 005 Neither is prayer and holding fast to the same in the throes of death; for the Holy Ghost also raiseth up in us. Rom. 8." *)

John Gerhard: "We confess with a loud voice that we hold that God found nothing good in the man to be chosen to eternal life, that he had no such regard either to good works, or to the use of free will, or even to faith, that, being moved thereby, or for the sake thereof, he chose some." **)

The same: "We do not say that predestination has its ground in the foreknowledge of faith, but that the regard of faith belongs to the counsel of election. But between these propositions there is a great difference; the former expresses the meritorious or inducing cause, the latter denotes only the order." †)

*) „An doctrina Luth eranorum de electione affinis sit pelagianismo? Neg.; quia Deo tribuit omnia, homini nihil; cum ille solus det velle et perficere, Phil. 2. . . . Neque obstat: 1. auditus verbi externus; quia actiones paedagogi- cae ab ipsa conversione et auditu salutari sunt distinctissimae. ... Neque 2. fides, quae minime nostrum opus, sed Dei donum est, nee conditio a nobis implenda, sed requisitum divinitus ex gratia per media salutis ordinaria collatum. . . . Neque 3. salutis desiderium ; quia et illud non est naturale, sed supernaturale, a Sp. Sancto donatum et ex verbo ortum. Nec 4. non-resistentia homini supra assignata; quia et haec ipsa Sp. Sancti donum est, resistantiam, quae sola ex nobis est, per media salutis ordinaria tollentis et inhihentis. . . . Nam tō non- resistere nequaquam est causaliter influere, sed solum agentis operationem non impedire, quemadmodum et leprosus Matth. 8. et Lazarus Joh. 11. Christo non resistens nequaquam miraculosae vel sanationis vel resurrectionis causa fuit. Neque 5. preces, earumque in agone continuatio; nam et illas Sp. S. in nobis excitat, Rom. 8." (Isag. J. Ben. Carpzovii a J. Oleario continuat, p. 1684. s.)

**) „Sonora voce profitemur, nos statuere, quod Deus nihil boni in homine ad vitam aeternam eligendo invenerit, quod nee bona opera, nec liberi arbitrii usum, neque adeo ipsam etiam fidem ita respexerit, ut hisce motus vel propter ea quosdam elegerit." (Loc. de elect. § 161.)

f) „Non dicimus, ex praevisione fidei esse praedestinationem, sed intuitum fidei ingredi electionis decretum; inter quas propositiones magna est differentia; prior causam meritoriam vel προκαταρκτικήν exprimit, posterior saltem ordinem denotat."(L.c. § 175.) From this it will be seen that Gerhard has not understood the misconstrued.

We say that the merit of Christ is the only merit, whose worthiness God has considered, and who has made the decision of election by grace alone. Since, however, Christ's merit only takes place in men through faith, we teach that election was made in view of Christ's merit, which is to be grasped through faith. We say, therefore, that all those, and those only, have been chosen of God from eternity unto salvation, of whom God foreknew that they would truly believe in Christ the Saviour through the operation of the Holy Spirit, by means of the ministry of the gospel, and that they would continue in the faith unto the end of their lives." *)

B. Antithetical. 3.

Philippi: "We shall be able to base the predestination to life, as well as to death, on the divine foreknowledge of human conduct, looking not only to the exclusive efficacy of divine grace in the work of conversion, but rather to the possibility, founded in human freedom, that grace, precisely because it is not obligatory grace, may attain its end." (Ecclesiastical Doctrine of Faith. IV, 15. f.) **)

Kahnis: "It depends essentially on the human being whether he remains in the state of salvation until the end.... If only he will be blessed who remains to the end...

The theologians of the 16th century used the expression "*intuitu fidei*" in a thoroughly orthodox sense and that therefore those who want to have this expression held on like a treasure in Pelagian: or yet semi-Pelagian and synergistic: interest now want to know held and emphasized like a jewel, cannot coincide with Gerhard and other orthodox dogmatists of the 17th century.

*) *Unicum et solum Christi meritum illud esse dicimus, cujus dignitatem Deus respexerit et ex mera gratia decretum electionis fecerit. Quia tamen Christi meritum non nisi per fidem in hominibus locum habet, ideo docemus, electionem factam intuitu meriti Christi per fidem apprehendendi. Illos ergo omnes et solos ab aeterno a Deo ad salutem electos esse dicimus, quos efficacia Sp. Sancti per ministerium evangelii in Christum redemptorem vere credituros et in fide usque ad vitae finem permansuros praevidit.*" (L. c. § 161.) Gerhard teaches, then, that only those are elect of whom God foresaw that they would believe to the end, but by no means because he foresaw this, which *toto coelo* are different doctrines.

**Thomasius, on the other hand, writes: "Precisely with this we have arrived at one of the greatest difficulties, which perhaps cannot be solved at all: on the one hand, God's eternal will of love in Christ, that all without exception be helped; on the other hand, the fact that this will is not attained in all. This problem is, of course, easily solved, either by accepting, with Augustine and Calvin, a twofold absolute decree of election and reprobation, or by allowing, with "Pelagius" (and modern "Lutheran" theology), "the eternal counsel of grace to be conditioned by the divine foreknowledge of the good pleasure of human freedom" (whether before or after conversion). Both are as simple and easy-as contrary to Scripture." (Christ's Person and Work. 1875. I, 426. f.)

but that perseverance depends on the will of man, it follows irrefutably that blessedness has its ground not only in grace, but also in the will of man." (Die luth. [!] Dogm. Lpz. 1875. H, 25t.)

The same: "Accordingly, predestination is conditioned by prescient, prescient by man's decision †)." (Op. cit. p. 250.)

Mecklenburgisches Kirchen- und Zeitblatt.

In this sheet, No. 18. and 19. of this year, there is a lecture by H. O. Köhler, Prepositus and Pastor at Picher: "What is the justification for the demands made on the Lutheran Church by the Missouri Synod?" The author, long known for his many critical contributions to the "Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche," speaks of the blessing that extends from the Missouri Synod, to which he gives much praise, to Germany, and of the mischief and dangers that threaten the German state churches from the same Synod. The honored author seems to have held the lecture especially for the latter circumstance as a warning, for in view of the practical action of the Missourian preachers in Saxony and of the writings of Brunn and Ruhland, he is oppressed by "the uncanny feeling as if the outposts of a hostile power were already standing in our borders, or as if torpedoes were being laid by which the whole rotten edifice of the state churches was to be blown up into lust. Although it is to be regretted that the author has such a sinister feeling, it is nevertheless gratifying to learn from it that Missouri's word and work do not remain fruitless, all the more gratifying because, if the Lord will give further blessing to our endeavors, the sinister feeling may become joy and applause, the enemies may become the most faithful friends, and the torpedoes may become excellent building blocks for Zion, even for the honored author. Then, with the accusation of over-stretching doctrinal differences, the accusation of the practical action of the Missourians in Germany will also no longer be brought. On the charge of the practical action of the Missourians in Germany, "so far as it works toward separation," the lecture lays the main emphasis, and "let not Hezekiah deceive you" (Isa. 36, 14. ff.) he calls, *mutatis mutandis*, with great earnestness to the hearers. That he thereby does injustice to hearers and readers and Missouri, I will try to show. It

†) This synergistic self-decision theory will later confront us in the doctrine of conversion in all modern-Luvian theologians, so we refrain from registering more antitheses here.

says: "Missouri cannot wait for the time to come and is already counting the days that our German national churches will topple over the heap. It is true, we wish that "the whole rotten building of the national churches" would fall over. What else can and should one wish for a rotten building? We still want to support it and patch it up and stay in it, and we see that it will and must collapse in spite of the supports and patches, and slay those who do not let themselves be warned and called out at the proper time. Now there are many excellent people, pastors and laymen, in the rotten building, whom we would heartily like to entice out to move into a solid, good house, the Free Church, independent of the State. Must not love urge us to cry out, "Go forth!" But whoever does not want to separate, says the author, is considered to have fallen away from Lutheranism. Where then is this said? The author has not yet separated, so we do not yet consider him to have fallen away from Lutheranism. However, we do not approve of the false ideas of separation and free church, and the spasmodic adherence to the "rotten edifice" of the state churches, and if, as with Münkler, these poisonous attacks are added to it, this harshness, which he himself has never shown against the Union and Unionist and un-Irish church regiment, and the almost malicious way in which he fires up the Separation in Hanover, not for the sake of the mistakes that are being made, but for their own sake, out of hatred against the Free Church, then we cannot praise this; And if by such harmful vocal leaders others are also led into the sinister path of waiting and into a cowardly fear of some powerful word and deed for the good of the Free Church, we should not blame that! While in the State Churches the Lutheran Church is attacked with blows of the club and a rough fist, or even with cunning, secret plots and tricks, in order to blow out its last spark of life, the vocal leaders have mostly only very tame words or even ominous silence, and have never yet shown a strong deed, a decided, confessing course of action, but the slightest progress of separation is opposed with the greatest determination, as if it were a worse enemy than unbelief, Rome, and the Union. Shall we call this confession and fidelity against the Lutheran Church? In the author's opinion, Missouri should refrain from all favoritism of separation in Germany, and only fraternally help that the confession be strengthened and defended, that the State churches retain the Lutheran confession "which they have." Does a single state church still have the Lutheran confession? Individual pastors, individual congregations, perhaps, but the state churches? It would be the worst self-deception to assert that. What percentage of all the members of the state churches would, if asked, profess the symbolic books with sincerity and determination? One or two per cent? But where it stands thus, one can no longer say that they still have Lutheran confession.

We can no longer help them to keep what they no longer have, but we would like to help the individuals to keep what they still have in their hearts with faithful confession. So we can no longer help them to keep what they no longer have, but we would like to help the individuals to keep what they still have in their hearts with faithful confession, and that is only possible by leaving the state church, in which, mixed with the apostates, they give the oil from their lamps more and more, so that in the end they themselves have nothing left.

We do not blame anyone if he clings with love to the good old traditions, but to cling to the "historically developed, centuries-old state churches" that have been deprived of their confession by Caesareopapism and consistories through the promotion of false doctrine, the introduction of non-Lutheran catechisms, lectionaries and hymnals, to want to remain in the "rotten building," and even to consider the churches obligated to thank the church regiments for many years of eradication of Lutheran doctrine, we cannot consider that to be loyalty and true love for the old. Whether we also no longer live in the dear German fatherland, and, thank God, no longer in the state church, should we therefore no longer be able to judge the conditions there? Many of our congregation members come from there as witnesses of the conditions there, many pastors know them from their own experience, I have been in the pastorate there many a year, and should we, because we celebrated the 25th anniversary of the Missouri Synod only a few years ago, be incapable of forming an opinion about the conditions that have become historical, as the author thinks? Had Luther so held to the old-established, historically grown-up, millennial national or even universal church, would he ever have become the man he is? It is a pernicious sentimentality, a morbid adherence to the rotten, a soft timidity and fear of the new, which is the very oldest and most original, of the Free Church. Nor is it of any use to reproach us for not sufficiently appreciating the existing good elements; we do appreciate them, for we attach to them our hopes for a better time. But to expect us to believe that the better elements must not separate themselves, but as members of the state churches can reform them, is too much. Even the faithful pastors can no more keep the congregations to God's Word than right Lutheran churches, for they are no longer there, with very, very few exceptions. There is no longer the poor to whom the Gospel is to be preached; the masses are rich and full and reject the Gospel, and they make good use of the right they have in the State Church, contrary to the efforts of the most faithful pastors, not only to trample the Gospel, the pure doctrine, underfoot themselves, but also to wither it away from those who would still like to have it. It is a mistake on the part of the author to think that things are still going well where some are still complaining about the unhealthy state of affairs, and where

The Lutheran Church has not yet achieved anything with it, no advance of the good elements, but rather a constant compromise, covering up, bearing and tolerating "in a spirit of moderation and mildness," the abandonment of one outpost after the other, in order, as they say, to concentrate all forces on the defense of the main fortress; where it still goes best, the formation of miserable middle parties, limping on both sides, the worst and most dangerous enemies of the Lutheran Church. In this, there is no fresh, cheerful courage, no good conscience, but anxiety and insecurity, fear of what is to come, especially a resistance and opposition to separation and the Free Church that is intended and cultivated from above, where these hearts and ears are directed more than to the Most High and His word and will.

"Now, much as we admire and praise Missouri for his pure doctrine, we must equally forbid this interference with the German national churches as not wholesome." Yes, the author's fear is great, it is about that of the people of Israel before Moses, who wished to lead them out of the state service of Egypt; in such fear he does not himself shrink from reminding us of 1 Pet. 4, 15. that no man should be *ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος*. This is a grievous charge, and an accusation which cannot be corroborated, unless a profession be no profession without a consistorial seal; it is contrary to the eighth commandment, and does not honour the author. We consider it our sacred duty, and our love for the German fatherland, the land of the Reformation, and for the Lutheran Church, drives us to warn where we see danger for souls, whether the danger comes from the state church, from the sumpiscopate, or elsewhere, and whoever has ears to hear, let him hear our word and our warning of love, whether this lecture and a thousand other voices also cry: "Do not let Missouri touch you!" There is great danger and need for souls, for there are shameful, horrible conditions in the state churches, where the pure doctrine finds no protection, at most toleration, but the false doctrine and the lying prophets are protected, even if now and then one takes the initiative to oppose the gross outbreaks of unbelief; These are shameful and atrocious conditions, where almost everything is permitted against God's Word and the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, but where the slightest rebellion against an ecclesiastical or consistorial decree is punished as *summum crimen laesae majestatis* with the utmost severity, no matter how justified it may be, and no matter whether the greatest distress of conscience of the heart bound in God's Word is the cause of it. The "good elements" also feel this, even if they never dare to speak out and confess it publicly. These are conditions without hope, for in the school, the church's hope for the future, the church is at most still tolerated here and there; in the church it must submit to decrees and rescripts that drive a dagger into its heart.

The pastors must take a hand in the undermining of their own beneficial activity on rescripts; they must help to promote the contempt of their office among the people through their civil servant bondage and submissiveness in matters where one should obey God more than men. The noblest and best members of the church and the pastors must confess this, they also sigh before God, I know this and have experienced it; and now they could escape from such dreadful, shameful conditions and by separating in the Free Church with all that still wants to be saved, gather into right congregations, and we are not to advise the Free Church, in which we ourselves live, in which the Lord has blessed us and blesses us, in which we escape from all these evils! Love urges us to show the dear brethren in faith who want to hear the mountains on which they can escape from the "rotten building," the place where in these last, evil times the Lutheran Church alone still has a refuge, and now the author cries out to his hearers above us: "Do not let Missouri deceive you!" in order to keep them back in the rotten building of the state churches without benefit and blessing for the apostate masses, to the certain, ever greater harm of those who are still to be won and of those who are still faithful. "Yes," thinks the author, "if the state-church conditions develop so unfavorably, and the people do not repent, then separation would come of itself." Then, I fear, the forces that now still exist will be slackened, devoured by middle parties, and even the good elements will be rendered incapable of freedom by such delay in the necessary act of faith and confession, and buried under the ruins of the rotten building.

Only not in Mecklenburg! For "especially in Mecklenburg every reason to make propaganda for a Missourian Free Church is invalid". For there, on the part of the university and the church regiment, Lutheran character is cultivated, according to the author (he says nothing of the congregations, of which, after all, the church alone consists). If the church of Mecklenburg alone were thus helped for all time, we would rejoice and no longer plague it in Mecklenburg with propaganda for the Missourian Free Church. But whether church government and universities are in better shape, they cannot and will not remedy the damage, the main damage to the church. For will ever a. For will a sumpiscopus and his consistory or university ever approve and promote the necessary separation that is necessary for the preservation of the orthodox church? In the regency of the country, the sumpiscopus, even if he sees in the most favorable case how the right church suffers most through the pernicious, God-opposing mixture, will probably always be inferior to the sovereign, and his consistory and his university will presumably be inferior to the sovereign, despite all defenses.

of the pure doctrine, nevertheless prove docile in this and wish to see the old, as rotten as it is, preserved, so that in no way the supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs and the influence on the whole country are lost through rescripts and decrees concerning ecclesiastical life. They will have no desire to lay hands on themselves. The Free Church needs no sumpiscopos, no consistory, no university dependent on princes or other powers; it governs itself under the highest sumpiscopos, the archpastor; its university is a university of the congregations, founded, staffed, and supervised by orthodox congregations. Nor does it demand any other protection from governments than that which is accorded to all unions which do not violate the laws; it does not rely on the cane, which always sooner or later passes through the hand of him who relies on it. Those can hardly be enthusiastic about such a church, the Free Church, who, apart from it, are rulers, in it only members. But Hegel and Rothe have become dangerous teachers and false prophets for the German people; their principles are unfortunately too well taken to heart by the governments and their consistories and satellites; their preaching is the best *pro aris focisque* of the state church, the Union. According to them, the Church is to be absorbed into the State, as among the heathen of old and new times. This is what the world powers, with the exception of a few pious princes, have always striven for, and this is what they are striving for today, to exploit the religious sense among the people first and foremost for their authority. Now, as the masses of the people are going more and more toward paganism, the governments, too, are relying more and more on this pagan principle, in which they seem to find the only and certain salvation of their power, because the principle, followed by the Chinese, the Japanese, etc., seems to have preserved regiments for millennia. Many excellent people today demand this state-church direction, who do not know it and do not want it, in their enmity against the Free Church, in which alone, after all, we could escape this endeavor, to which the heathen people's monkeys are justly addicted; for how long, is with the Lord; I fear, even there, not long. -

As far as the congregations of Mecklenburg are concerned, Rector Schall, who gives the regional church a very sad report and leaves it without hope, must not have judged quite wrongly, even if the lecture casts doubt on it. Not entirely wrongly, I say, on the basis of the first article entitled "Christlich tod!" and signed by H., shoulder to shoulder with the lecture, in the same paper (No. 19). 8. says there: "But when strangers themselves look around in our country, such phantoms (of papal and other popes) only fester to make way for the conviction that, in spite of all the energy of the church regiment, church life in Mecklenburg is = 0." H. also confesses poor church attendance, but according to him Lutheran Christianity from the beginning was that of the ten commandments, and these, according to his intimation, are to be kept in

still find in the houses of Mecklenburg. That is now true, if the Lutheran regional church is satisfied with the fact that Christian life appears to be zero, the churches are no longer attended, but the Ten Commandments are still followed somewhat (surely they will not keep them perfectly!) in the homes, then there is little hope for propaganda for the Lutheran Free Church and Mr. Prepositus Köhler need not be afraid of it. But I believe that there is still material for the right Lutheran Free Church, we even know it, we have here some congregations consisting almost entirely of Mecklenburgers, we also know that there are still excellent pastors there, I also count the author among them, and the material should be rescued from the swamp of the state church and let itself be rescued, so that it does not sink into it and perish. For must not the great unbelieving mass, which no longer asks anything about the church, always hinder the little believing group from developing church life, and would not, when first the little group of faithful Lutherans from the mass of apostates, when first the faithful Lutheran preachers and the false prophets, ecclesiastically strictly separated and divorced, stand opposite each other in spiritual combat, and would not many hearts, when they then see the naked and exposed apostasy, completely turn away from it and turn to the right church, which now, not only through their fault, are limping on both sides, because in one church right and wrong doctrine is going on. Therefore, before everything collapses and before the Rector's prophecy comes true, one should escape the danger in the right way in Mecklenburg and prepare to save from it what can be saved, and for this purpose a Lutheran sumpiscoate and a Lutheran consistory and a true Lutheran university should of course themselves lend a hand; and if, as is to be expected, they do not do so, those should attack the cause in the name of God who recognize the situation of things, who are set as watchmen in Zion. This would be right faithfulness against the dear Lutheran Church, against the poor, forsaken souls; but to pray and be faithful without arming oneself for the fight, without fighting in the place where one stands, against the undeniable evils and dangers, will that be prayer and faithfulness sufficient to the cause of the Lord and the Lord? Under the governmental regiment of the church, mixed with the unbelieving masses, the number of the New Lucherans stand completely unself-reliant, with their hands tied, without sufficient weapons to protect and defend them, without proper unity and common cooperation, facing the enemy, whom they will indeed overcome according to God's promise and with God's help, no matter how little they may have, but only if they step onto the battlefield to which they have been called. Even if they break a sinful church fellowship and are expelled from all church property, they will remain in the true church, the Lord's people, a free church,

right Lutheran church. The emergence and flourishing of such a church would be Missouri's joy, and is Missouri's wish; Therefore we urge separation, the Free Church, as the only help and hope also for the Lutheran Church of Germany, yes, for the dear German country itself, and the honored author of the lecture does not do right to warn against us, and since we urge the people of God to gather behind the walls of Jerusalem in the Free Church, to reject and suspect us with a lecture that opposes the best-meant, most wholesome efforts with the warning: "Don't let Missouri talk you into it!" O. Kolbe.

(Translated by Prof. A. Crämer.)

Compendium of the Theology of the Father

From

M . Heinrich Eckhardt.

(Continued.)

V. His human nature.

Is our Savior, as a perfect God, so also a perfect man?

CyrrilluS: "One Christ it is who has clothed the whole man, consisting of soul and body, like a royal covering." 1) Isychius: "It must be known that in Christ a perfect Godhead and a perfect humanity are mated, i.e., come together into one, through that compassion which he has with us." 2)

Why is that?

Theophilus Alexandrinus: "Assembling to himself a whole body and a 'whole soul, he represented in himself a perfect man, that in himself and through himself he might bestow a perfect salvation on all men." 3) Damascenus: "Whole he, the whole, hath accepted me, and whole he hath united himself with the whole, that he might bestow salvation on the whole." 4)

But Joh. 1. happens alone the mention of the flesh?

Sedulius: "The Word became flesh because the eyes of man-

Unus est Christus, totum hominem, ex anima videlicet atque corpore compositum, sicut regia stragula indutus. Cyrill. 1. 3. comm. in Joh.

Oportet scire perfectam divinitatem et perfectam humanitatem contemperare, h. e. in unum convenire in Christo, per eam, quam circa nos habet compassionem. Isych. in 23. c. Levit.

Totum corpus, totamque animam sibi socians, perfectum in se hominem demonstravit, ut perfectam cunctis hominibus in se et per se largiretur salutem. Theoph. Alex. 1. 1. pa.

Totum totus assumpsit me, et totus toti unitus est, ut toti salutem largiretur, Dam. 1. 3. c, 3.

shy, for whose sake that assumption was made, the flesh alone could show itself." 1)

But what and what kind of meat is meant here?

Chrysostom: "Christ had not a sinful flesh, yet, as to nature, the same as ours."

2)

Why then is he called 'sent in the likeness of the flesh'?

Cyril: "Because Christ's body was not a sinful body, but only a form of sinful flesh." 3) Theodoret: "Now that he says: 'in the likeness,' this refers not to the flesh, but to the sins of the flesh." 4) Cassianus: "And so 'likeness' is not, according to the perverse sense of certain heretics, to be related to the veracity of the flesh, but to the image of sin." 5)

Likewise it seems to be contrary to the truthfulness of his flesh or humanity, and to speak in favor of the Marcionite appearance, that it is said in Phil. 2. that he "became like" another man: that is, he was, as it were, a man.

Chrysostom: "He is wooed like another man, not to darken and blind our eyes with fancies and spectres, but to train us to humility of mind." 6)

They also object that it is unseemly for the supreme divine majesty to unite with the corruptible and earthly human mass, and that this should be done in the form of a "one" of the person.

Cyprian: "It is not a reproach, but a grace of God, when that which seems inferior is joined to a worthier one, since the inferior nature entails no dishonor or reproach of sin; is neither a diminution of majesty, nor an increase of poverty; nor does the homely lowliness in any one degrade God's majesty." 7)

Verbum caro factum est, quia hominum oculis, propter quos facta est susceptio illa, caro sola potuit apparere. Sedul. in 1. c. Rom.

Non peccatricem carnem Christus habuit, tamen quod ad naturam attinet, eandem cum nostra. Chrys. in c. 8. Rom.

Quia corpus Christi non erat peccati corpus, sed similitudo carnis peccati. Cyril. 1. 15. adv. Jul.

Quod igitur ait, in similitudine, non ad carnale respicit; verum ad peccata carnis. Theod.

Et sic similitudo non ad carnis veritatem, secundum pravum quorundam haereticorum sensum, sed ad peccati imaginem est referenda. Joh. Cass. coll. 22.

U t homo apparuit, non phantasiis ac spectris nos praestringens et obtundens, sed ad animi humilitatem erudiens. Chrys. in 2. Phil.

Non injuria est, sed gratia Dei, si, quod minus videtur, digniori jungatur, cum inferior natura contumeliam probrumque peccati non contrahat, nec est minoratio Majestatis, provectio paupertatis, nec altitudinem Dei in aliquo humilitas dispensatoria dehonestat. Cypr. serm. de Bapt. Chr.

If he really took on human flesh, did he also take on human emotions?

Cyril "Christ accepted the natural emotions for the confirmation of the true human nature, so that he would not appear to have accepted humanity only in the fancy, apparently for the sake of appearances; but with the exclusion of the purely sinful affections or even lusts, which tend to sprinkle and defile the purity of our life with their filth, for he spurned them as unworthy of the Godhead "1).

Is he therefore in no way unlike us?

Theophilus: "Out of as many and such things as we are all made, he took mankind, and lacked no part of our likeness except sin." 2) Damascenus: "As he hath all that the Father hath, excepting the lot of birth, so he hath all that Adam had, excepting only sinfulness. "3)

Why is sin exempt?

Damascenus: "Because sin is not something natural, nor implanted in us by the workmaster, but something injected by the devil, lying in the free choice of our free power." 4)

(To be continued.)

Miscellany.

Zwingli. In Luthardts Kirchenzeitung of August 2nd the following important item can be found: Luther's word to Zwingli: "You have a different spirit" has found a blatant justification from the Swiss side in the writing of the cantonal school teacher E. Lüthi "Die bernische Politik in den Kappelerkriegen" (Bern 1878, Jent und Reinert Christum naturales affectus suscepit ad confirmationem verae naturae humanae, ne videretur apparenter in specie per imaginationem dumtaxat hominem induisse, repulsis tamen affectionibus adeoque cupiditatibus plane vitiosis, quae vitae nostrae puritatem sordibus conspergere defoedareque solent. Has enim ut indignas Deitate rejecit, ^Jyrrill. 1. 15- adv. Jul. Ex tantis et talibus assumsit hominem, ex quantis ac qualibus nos omnes creati sumus, nulloque, quod nostrae similitudinis est, caruit, nisi solo peccato. Theoph. Alex. 1. 1. pasch. Quemadmodum omnia habet, quae pater habet praeter ignascentiam: ita omnia habet, quae Adam, sola excepta peccantia. Dam. 1. 3. c. 13. Quia peccatum non est naturale, nec ab opifice nobis inditum, sed ex Diabolo respersum, in nostrae liberae potestatis electione spontanea positum. Dam. 1. 3. c. 20.

[58 S. 4.) 1.20). Zwingli, so often celebrated as a martyr for religious freedom, appears here in a completely different light. The author's only concern is to prove, on the basis of newly printed documents, that Bern, as zealous as it was for the Reformation, decisively rejected the religious war, especially since it cherished the then certainly justified hope of carrying out the Reformation peacefully, while preserving the religious as well as the political unity of Switzerland; but that Zurich bore complete responsibility for the misfortune of that defeat at Kappel (October 11, 1531) and its consequences. October 1531) and its consequences, since it was provoked to war, disregarded Bern's warnings, and therefore had as little right to count on God's help as on that of the Bernese. Zwingli, who is considered the most liberal and enlightened, in a sense the most modern, the most humanist of the Reformers, is accused of intolerance and excessive terrorism, whose tempestuous nature endangered the continuation of the Confederation in the deepest way, permanently divided Switzerland, and prevented the realization of the Bernese ideal. Apart from his precarious religious-political negotiations with Francis I and other princes, the "other spirit" also shows itself in the sophistry and the equally strong fanaticism with which he asserted a right to suppress those who were opposed to the Word of God. This is easily explained to us when we consider that Luther's work arose from a much deeper cause, from a much more powerful struggle than Zwingli's work.

Guericke about Tholuck. In a review of the writing: "D. Aug. Tholuck, in memory of his death for his friends", which contains 4 eulogies at Tholuck's death, Guericke writes: "Also Ref, who, without being a client or pupil of the deceased, has seen his long Hallian work from the beginning and even before its beginning, is full of admiration for the rich gifts and the restless zeal of the deceased and rejoices especially for him in the promise that the teachers will shine like the radiance of heaven. Nevertheless, if truth befits the Christian, he can only lament in the most wistful and heartfelt way, as the peacefully departed even now will lament, that next to bright light there was also dark shadow; Lament that despite all the immense strength and gift of stimulation, the gift and will of consolidation was lacking, that on the basis of pure faith, the longer the more, as far as men were able to see and the eye of the heart's rescuer did not illuminate the depths of the agonies of death in a transforming way, theological disruption and unjust antagonism, even childish mockery against unreserved confession and firm confessors (even if not both in the distance and in the immediate vicinity) unabashedly took hold, and that a poor, sinful human heart was allowed to form an image of the most rigid selfhood at the same time as a transfiguration in the image of Christ; and most deeply moved and seized by the still fresh

In the face of the appearance of the heavy beaten cross bearers and cross bearers who, under many years of misery, uninterruptedly persevered until their last breath, quietly, cheerfully, simply, in the gift of grace of the most self-confident knowledge of faith and testimony of faith and the most loving participation in everything, he is not able - bending before the unsearchable ways of God at deathbeds, also of his own, to perorir four so lightly with the grave orators without fear and trembling: "Which end look upon and follow their faith." To the words: "Mockery against unreserved confession and firm confessors, even if not both in the distance" Guericke makes the marginal remark: "However, also - as Ref. already publicly expressed it more than a decade ago - his literary representation of older Lutheran theological luminaries often appears only almost like the report of a menagerie of wild animals."

Literary.

Joh. Guilielmi Baieri Compendium Theologiae Positivae. Denuo edendum curavit C. F. W. Walther. Editio quarta decima emendatior et auctior. In Urbe Sancti Ludovici ex officina Synodi Missouriensis Lutheranae (Concordia Publishers). MDCCCLXXIX.

Under the above title, God willing, a work will appear in booklets in the course of the next year, the first sheets of which have just left the press. Professor Dr. Walther, especially in view of the needs of our theological seminary (in order to be relieved of the time-consuming dictation), has allowed himself to be induced to publish this work, which has long been desired from various sides. - The following remarks may serve as a general characterization of it. It does not contain the editor's own explanations, but has the most outstanding orthodox teachers of the Church, especially of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, appear to expound, establish, and defend divine truth. The original plan was to print only these testimonies, as they were given by Dr. Walther during the dogmatic lectures as explanations to Baier's *Compendium*. However, it was then considered more expedient to print Baier's entire *Compendium*, first, in order to obtain a more correct print of the latter work than Schlawitz's; second, in order to be able to insert the explanatory quotations at the appropriate places. One may well say that this work will give us a complete insight into the dogmatic work of our Church. Especially the explanations in the *loci* or parts of *loci* are very detailed, which in our time are partly not clearly understood, partly completely distorted. Also must be-

It should be noted that Baier's sentences, which are exposed to misunderstanding, receive their justification from other old dogmatists. Because Baier's Compendium treats theology only thetically, the citations also contain the antitheses against old and new false teachers. From more recent times, however, only the best-known dogmatists are considered here who still claim the predicate "Lutheran" for themselves.

Although this work is intended first and foremost as an aid for teaching dogmatics at the local theological seminary, it will also be welcomed with pleasure by every pastor who has retained an interest in the more detailed study of Lutheran theology. - The external arrangement of the work is an excellent one. In the format of "Lehre und Wehre" it brings the paragraphs of Baier in large print, in ordinary the Baier's notes, in somewhat smaller print the citations of Dr. Walther. The latter are also indented so that they can be distinguished at first glance. In order to give the reader an idea of the relationship between the explanatory quotations and Baier's text, it should be noted that the first chapter of the Prolegomena, which in Schlawitz's edition ("kl. 8") comprises 42 pages, in the present work occupies pages 1-79. The first issue will be ready for dispatch in a few days. The price of an issue of 96 pages has been fixed at 50 Cts. Orders should be sent immediately to the "Lutheran Concordia Publishing House," St. Louis, Mo.

F. P.

The four Gospels in chronological-synoptic compilation. With chronological and historical explanations. Edited by E. Sitzmann, Lutheran pastor at Terre Haute, Ind. Reading, Pa. Pilgrim Bookstore Publishers. 1878.

Of this work the first delivery is present. The same appears in 4 deliveries, typographically excellently equipped by the publishing house.

As far as the form and layout of this work, which testifies to great diligence, is concerned, the author explains himself in the preface thus: 1. The complete text of the Gospels in Luther's translation has been compiled synoptically and chronologically. Whoever thought that he could not subscribe to the chronology, would still have the synopsis and the chronological order of the individual stories, both of which are of value and importance in themselves. 2. (2) Whatever can serve the understanding of Protestant history, as far as it does not concern dogmatics, be it chronological, or historical, or geographical, or other explanations belonging to it, which otherwise can only be found with much effort by looking it up in dictionaries and other works, is here placed in its proper place, i.e., in the same way as the synopsis.

under the text where the reader needs and looks for it. The author's work has been published in the form of a book, which has been published in the form of a book, which has been published in the form of a book, which has been published in the form of a book. At the end, the whole thing has been presented in a tabular overview, which, due to its partition and unusually clear form, can be easily memorized. However, it must be noted that it was necessary, precisely for the sake of clarity, not to divide the text down to the smallest detail.

We will return to the manuscript later when it is complete. The first delivery contains 80 pages 8". Price 45 Cts.

G.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

A second so-called Lutheran Church Congress, in which members of the General Council, the Northern and Southern General Synods participated, opened on November 5. The papers of the synods involved call the meeting a "*success*," but with the best will in the world we cannot see or imagine any such thing. How can one expect salvation for the Church from the reading of a learned or supposedly learned treatise by a speaker and some remarks made on it!

G.

A new Misfion Seminary has been founded by Pastor Severinghaus in Chicago. It will serve the so-called General Synod. The teaching staff consists of two pastors (one German and one Norwegian), 1 lawyer and 2 school teachers. Among the subjects taught is jurisprudence!

The Methodists of the Rock River Conference, Illinois, are now in quite an uproar over the question concerning the foregoing Aelteste office. The elder has a salary considerably higher than many think he should have, and the way it is brought together is to tax all the churches in the district according to their supposed financial strength. These collections, however, are not popular among the Methodists, and it is usually with difficulty that the sum allotted to them is collected from among the small congregations. On the other hand, the preacher in his position depends very much on the goodwill of the senior elder, and he knows that the best way to secure the goodwill of his superior is a "good collection" for his salary. The preacher is therefore compelled, as it were, to add from his own pocket whatever is lacking in the allotted sum, and is thus often compelled to add \$10.00 to \$20.00 from his salary, which may be less than \$1000, in order to make the salary of \$3500 full for the senior elder. In known cases, preachers have had to add half the amount expected by the congregation.

(Sendb.)

Scholarship. The Methodists, who years ago did not want to know anything about scientifically educated preachers, thinking that the "Gaischt" must drive them, are gradually coming to a different conviction. Thus we read in the "Happy Messenger", a journal of the "United Brethren", a Methodist community, in the issue of October 15, an article entitled "Scholarship". From it we extract the following: "Scholarship is objective, the epitome of scientific knowledge; subjective, the possession of it. Scholarship (*erudition*) is ge-

homely a fruit of education (*education*). The word erudition usually refers to acquired and possessing sciences. It may therefore be small or great; one may be learned and more learned. One who can read, write, and calculate is learned; one who is well versed in languages, philosophy, astronomy, phrenology, geology, theology, and other sciences is usually called a scholar. One says of such a person that he is classically educated. That scholarship in general is highly esteemed nowadays is also evident from the fact that schools and educational institutions are being set up all over the world, especially to give the growing generation an opportunity to educate itself. ... A preacher should therefore be a learned man; and this he should be according as the generation in which he lives and has to teach makes progress in general science..... The church of the future will be a scientifically educated one, more than before, and a preacher must not and cannot 'afford' that he is inferior in scholarship to the people in general. He who neglects to acquire such will only regret it too late. A preacher should at least be able to speak and write his own mother tongue correctly, to read and spell correctly. He should be able to read the Bible in the basic language and translate it into his mother tongue. The 'future preacher' will find that these points will not only be useful to him, but necessary." - As commendable as Mr. Mittendorf's zeal is, it would be advisable for him first of all to study the German language at the beginning. G.

Methodists. The General Conference of the Canadian Methodist Church, which met last Monday at Montreal, considered at length the question of lay delegation. The prospects are that laymen will be admitted. Within the last ten years the various Methodist churches have made significant progress in this direction. Lay representation now exists in the Episc. Meth. church, in the Southern Episc. Meth. church, and in the British Wesleyan Meth. church. There are few Meth. churches now which have not recognized the right of the laity to representation and participation in the ecclesiastical concilia. (Apol.)

Dr. Thomas of Chicago also stood as a defendant **before a Methodist conference**. The conference dropped the case after he had declared, among other things, the following: "As to the final lot of the wicked, I have never doubted, and do not doubt, the fact of a future and after-death punishment. Whatever may be the condition of the lost, or the nature of their suffering, I cannot, in the government of a just God, conceive of that condition as worse than non-existence. As to the duration and success of that punishment, whether it will be eternal or ameliorative, whether it will result in improvement or end in destruction, I have not yet come to any firm conviction about it. The matter has caused me a great deal of grief in my soul, and I find that as the years go by I gain more and more hope for humanity. In the matter of the inspiration of the Scriptures, I would find difficulty in accepting the view of a literal inspiration, but I fully believe that the men who wrote the Scriptures were inspired, and that these Scriptures contain in substance the word of God." - Truly the Methodists are conscienceless people, that they should allow such men to continue in their church. How they are not at all afraid of God's word! Another case also testifies to this. In another Methodist conference (in Iowa) a preacher was accused of preaching universalism. Here they spoke of disfellowshipping him, but, as he voluntarily resigned, they did not condemn his heresy, but rather passed the following resolution: "Resolved, That we hereby express our friendly regard for Brother Briggs, as a man, and

express our entire confidence in his Christian character, and assure him that, though he may depart from our rubs, he will not depart from our hearts, but that our warmest congratulations for his personal welfare will always accompany him. " G.

The Methodists are true Zwinglians, who share the same unbelief with Zwingli, both in the rejection of the means of grace and in the acceptance of the blessedness of the Gentiles. Thus writes the "Happy Messenger" in the number of October 29: "The apostle Paul also teaches us here that an uncircumcised man can keep the law; not so, we suppose, that he is not deficient, but that he also needs the grace of Christ, which, however, does not happen to him inwardly, because it is not revealed to him, but it is imputed to him, because God is a discernor of the heart and knows the hunger and longing of the soul. This is also evident in the many noble characters that manifest themselves among the Gentiles. God has not left himself unwitnessed in them either, and has given them men who were more or less taught by the Spirit of God, and who awakened in men a longing and hunger for immortality and blessedness, and were thereby preparers of the way for the Gospel, and we really find that the Gospel found a better entrance among the educated Greeks than among the Jews. As" the ground was prepared, and shall we suppose that such over-prepared ground, because it did not receive the seed through unfavorable circumstances, is to be rejected? I say no! on the contrary, I believe, according to the scriptures above cited, that even men who lack the Bible will be saved according to the measure of the light in which they walked in this world."

The Baptists and Presbyterians, both large ecclesiastical communities, no longer know how to accommodate the delegates at their church meetings. The latter, the Presbyterians, have two proposals before them: one that the delegates cover their own expenses, the other that the size and number of their meetings be reduced. The majority have declared that one commissioner each should be elected for 2500 communicants. G.

Rev. Talmage of New York, in order to be able to preach right-wing sensational sermons, has allowed himself to be led around the dens of vice in the city under police cover.

The Reformed Episcopal Church considered it necessary to state especially from its last synod that it believes in the eternity of the punishments of hell. It resolved to put certain questions to those who would accept a preaching ministry in its midst, including this one: "whether they believe that the punishment of the wicked will be eternal and conscious. Two voices were raised against this. The Vice-President of Synod, Ex-Governor St. L. Woodfort, supported by a preacher, declared that he found no foundation in Scripture for the eternity of the punishments of hell. Mr. W. resigned his office, as his conscience would not permit him to hold his official position in a body which entertained views so utterly different from his own. In spite of the avowed confession, the resignation was not accepted. O what a wretched thing it is to please men! G.

The Prophetic Conference. This is the name given in the papers to an assembly of sectarian preachers, which met in the church of Dr. Tyng, an Episcopal preacher, in New York, on the 30th of October. The subjects of the proceedings were: the millennial kingdom, the revelation of the Antichrist, the gathering of the Jews and their return to the promised land, etc. The reader will not expect us to give him any details from the rapturous speeches delivered on the above subjects. The Fritschelians in the Iowa Synod will, of course, call this rapturous conference a most important joyous event. G.

The Seventh-day Adventists are very zealous in spreading their false doctrine. Their secretary reported at their last convention that during the past year, besides 162,198 periodicals, more than 13 million pages of tracts and other reading matter have been distributed in America, and nearly 80,000 in Europe. 25,000 missionary visits have been made. The profit of their publishing house was \$19,536. \$19,000 was collected for the circulation of tracts. - Shall we Lutherans, who have God's Word pure and unadulterated, be put to shame by these zealots? G.

The Chicago "**Warte**" wants to be a political paper edited according to "Christian principles". Thus one should expect that all immoral things would be kept out of the columns. This is also what it has declared itself to be. "From the very beginning," says No. 30, "our paper has made it a strict rule to proceed with caution, especially with regard to advertisements; up to the present day we have in principle not included anything that could in any way exert a detrimental, let alone pernicious, influence on the morals of our readers and families." And now - what does the reader say to the following advertisement of a translation of the Song of Songs by Dr. K. Köhler: "The translation of the Song of Songs is kept in very fluent and noble language and all expressions not corresponding to modern taste are avoided in the best way, so that the reading can be given into the hands of every child without offence, which, as is well known, is not the case with the ordinary Bible text." - Is not this atrocious blasphemy?

Abroad.

Lic. Stöckhardt. Even the Sächsische Kirchen- und Schulblatt (Saxon Church and School Gazette) of October 17 dedicates the following obituary to him: "He has left the fatherland as a defendant. He, like the printer Hermann-Zwickau (likewise Pastor Große-Chemnitz has been sentenced to a significant fine for the same reasons), is to be prosecuted for blasphemy, as the "Free Church" writes, on the basis of § 166, 185, 187 and 196 of the Reich Criminal Code in 8 cases, for insulting and offending the State Consistory in 5 cases, and for insulting the Board of St. Johanniskirche in Dresden, as well as for insulting the Church in Dresden. Johanniskirche in Dresden, as well as the pastors Sulze, Graue and Peter in 1 and 2 cases respectively, at the request of the Royal Public Prosecutor's Office in Zwickau (at the District Court there). The charge of blasphemy brings wonderful thoughts to mind, and in view of the soul-destroying Confirmand instruction of which we recently reported from Chemnitz, we would like to say, without approving of Stöckhardt's immoderate zeal: It is only good that in the end another judge will judge, how much heavier will his accusation weigh against those who do this.""

Hermannsburg. The Missionary Society of Hadeln has taken a firm stand against the Hermannsburg Mission by sending its gifts to Leipzig and expressly renouncing it because of the separatist agitation practiced by Pastor Harms. The other missionary associations in the Hanoverian regional church want to wait and see whether Pastor Harms will cease his outbursts against the regional church in his missionary bulletin and forbid his missionary disciples to engage in agitational proceedings. (Allg. Kz.)

A correspondent of the Pastoral-Correspondenz of October 26 tries to justify the **new Hanoverian** Catechism against Pastor Beer's attacks. (Cf. previous issue of "Lehre und Wehre" p. 347 f.) The justification, however, turned out badly. To mention only one thing, the advocate of the Catechism writes: "Therefore these ministers" (in the new Catechism) "are also expressly called called ministers; but they are called by the Church, and thus have the office not according to divine, but according to human right." Has then the dear man

not Act. 20, 28. read? This is all the more surprising, since the correspondent writes: "I do not think I am mistaken if, behind Beer's words, a perspective on the Missourian theory of transmission opens up to my eyes." The writer does not seem to realize hereafter that he himself goes beyond this alleged Missourian theory and pays homage to Höflingian views. W.

Hanoverian Regional Church. At the synod of Groß-Berkel in September, Pastor Meyer von Hemeringen moved: "The synod, in repeating its testimony against the Protestant Association of the previous synod, expresses its deep regret about the behavior of Pastor Grütter" (who, despite the synod's request to leave the Protestant Association, had declared his intention to remain in it) "and publicly declares his participation in the negotiations of a Lutheran synod to be a lasting annoyance. The motion does not say whether the annoyance was given by Pastor Grütter or rather by the "Lutheran" Synod. President Lichtenberg did ask the proposer to modify his motion so that not Grütter's participation in the Synod, but in the Protestant Association would be considered a lasting annoyance; however, Pastor Meyer did not understand the desired modification, and the motion was finally accepted against 8 of 30 votes. Among these 8 votes was none of a preacher, except that of Pastor Grütter himself. District Governor Meyer very intelligently motivated his vote against the motion by saying, "that since the church government sees no reason for the removal of a pastor in his participation in the Protestant Association, he must also be a member of the synod according to the synodal order." The report on this is found in the "Pastoral - Correspondenz" of October 12. The reporter writes in it: "Some will have wished that the accusation of false doctrine would again be brought against Grütter. But no public documents were available from which the same could have been proven. The newspaper reports had been given by Past. Gr. had declared at the previous synod that they were inaccurate and not true. What he said against the ecclesiastical doctrine of original sin could be considered as directed only against some expressions of the F. C.; his assertion that the sentence, 'Christ was truly born of God from the Father in eternity' was a theological speculation, was included in the minutes only with regard to the second part of the sentence (but probably at the instigation of Past. Gr. himself). He also spoke at this synod in such a way that he could not be accused of any deviation from church doctrine; he professed to believe in the crucified Savior and Redeemer, he claimed never to have denied the resurrection; he said he would immediately resign from the Protestant Association if it considered faith and unbelief equal in the church." Indeed a pitiful excuse against the charge that in the Synod the "Lutherans" sit on the same bench with scoffers (Ps. 1:1.)! Had the old orthodox church wished to act on these Hanoverian-landesian principles, it would have had to retain an Arius in its fellowship, and some heretic would scarcely ever have been excluded from church fellowship. According to the report, there was not a breath of Lutheran spirit in the Synod. Luther's judgment on communion with false teachers is well known. "He who," he says, "holds his doctrine, faith, and confession to be true, right, and certain, cannot stand in the same stall with others who lead false doctrine or are attached to it." (XVII, 1477.) The good Lutheran Hülsemann, however, writes: "It is neither proper nor useful to set up concurrent courts in a council of orthodox and heterodox, who are such according to the judgment of the latter, and who, by outward confession, have renounced the fellowship and confession of the orthodox church. Such must be interrogated, instructed, and punished, but not admitted to the judgment of orthodoxy or orthodox. Therefore

Even the conventions and colloquia between Orthodox and Heterodox, which are held in matters of religion, do not have the character of so-called ecclesiastical congregations. ... To deny ecclesiastical communion to the heterodox (of which the communion of a conciliar court is a species), it is sufficient if the orthodox are certain, by the use of the proper means of interpreting the Word of God and by the inward testimony of the Holy Spirit, that the heterodox do not agree with God's word, though they may desire to be tolerated in the outward communion of the church, and also think that they have not departed from the sense of the divine word, nor from the public teaching of the general church." (*Breviar.* p. 313. sqq.) - The tamer, by the way, the Synod behaved towards a hypocritical denier of Christ, the more decidedly did it act against those who separated themselves from the national church. In his report, Superintendent Sievers had refuted all 10 reasons with which some of those who had transferred from the Aerzen congregation to separation had motivated their departure. How conclusive the refutation was cannot be reported, since the report does not say anything about it. W.

The "Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche", founded by Dr. A. G. Rudelbach and Dr. H. E. F. Guericke, continued by the latter after the former's death with Dr. Fr. Delitzsch, ceases to appear with the conclusion of its present thirty-ninth year. For a long series of years, the "Zeitschrift" had a reformatory effect, but unfortunately, already in the later years of Rudelbach's editorship, it was no longer what it had been in the earlier years; after Rudelbach's death, it became, under the motto "Ecumenical Lutheranism," a place of speech for all kinds of spirits who have no proof of their Lutheranism other than that they themselves want to be counted among the Lutherans; In the last quarter of its existence, the "Zeitschrift" had finally become an organ more of the enemies than of the friends of the few remaining, even now not capitulating, confessors of the doctrine of the Reformation, who, formerly protected by the "Zeitschrift," were now not infrequently attacked in it in the most bitter and bitter manner, throwing them away, even with venomous scorn and derision. Since Guericke's claim that he communicated within the united church, a true doggedness against the faithful Lutherans took possession of him, which found its expression in almost every issue of his "Zeitschrift". If the "Zeitschrift" had a mission, it had long since been fulfilled. Its present departure from the scene is not its death, but its burial. W.

The Nördlingen "Freimund" of September 12 revealed **how the Chiliast read the Bible**. He writes: "Wonderful is what the Scriptures say; but almost more wonderful (!) what they conceal." One would think that the writer would now continue: what the Scriptures conceal, man should not know, and therefore should not inquire into it, but rather firmly believe that to know what is concealed would not be necessary for his salvation, but rather harmful. Far from it! Rather, it goes on to say, "But learn to read between the lines!" Dangerous advice indeed! Woe to him who reads "between the lines" in God's Word; he reads out what is not in it, and then takes his own thoughts for God's thoughts. W.

Waldenström. The fanatical movement that started in Sweden by the lecturer Waldenström at the Latin School in Umeå became highly dangerous for the Lutheran Church there because of the falsification of the doctrine of reconciliation and justification that it introduced. As long as Waldenström was in contact with K. Olaf Rosenius, who exercised great influence through his widely circulated paper, "The Pietist," he was still completely on the ground of the Confession. Even when he came to

Rosenius' death, he edited the "Pietist" for a while in the same spirit. In 1872, however, he published a sermon in the paper in which he unreservedly attacked and rejected the church's doctrine of reconciliation and justification, and the next year he published a paper, "On the Meaning of Reconciliation," in which he denies the substitution of Christ and the reconciliation of God brought about by it. God, he says, loves the world, not because Christ died, but because he loves the world, therefore Christ died. The doctrine of a wrath of God which must first be satisfied, he declares to be a heathen doctrine, because there is no reconciliation of God, but only of man. Christ is not the substitute of man, but of God. There is no need of reconciling divine love and divine justice. Christ bore the sins of men, but only as one bends in compassion to the sick and sympathizes with his pain and distress. For Waldenström, then, the confession, "God forgives us our sins for Christ's sake," is no longer valid. As of justification, Waldenström now teaches falsely of sanctification. He asserts that justifying faith and sonship with God can be found even where sin of even the lowest kind is still unbroken and even reigns, thus quite contrary to the saying that the grace of Christ continually chastens us to deny the ungodly nature and to live chastely, righteously, and godly in this world. This so-called new evangelical doctrine is spread by colporteurs who hold religious lectures everywhere; it also has a very strong and lively representation within numerous missionary associations, especially in the Lutheran mission house at Upsala. There Waldenström holds services and communion with his followers, and has thus already placed himself outside the church; the general formal withdrawal of the people is thus only a question of time. The Waldenstroms are also to be found in America, namely the Swedish Ansgari Synod (20 pastors and 15 congregations), which belongs to the General Synod, is said to consist of such. Waldenström's book "der HErr ist pm" (the Lord is pious), which is widely distributed, is a writing that must be warned against. (Pilgrim ret.)

Berlin. If it continues in the present manner, one will soon be able to calculate the time by which Protestant-associated or Protestant-association-friendly clergy will be standing in all Berlin pulpits. No sooner is Pastor Bahnsen confirmed at St. Philip the Apostle than Pastor Lau from Nirderswildungen in the Principality of Waldeck, who had been recommended by the Protestant Association, is elected deacon at St. Elisabeth. - The Berlin City Mission is without doubt one of the most important and outstanding works of Christian charity in recent times. The pastoral care conditions of Berlin are sufficiently well known in their paucity and poverty. If, for example, among the 600,000 Protestants living in the suburbs of Berlin, only 24 permanent and 13 assistant preachers are active, these numbers speak for themselves, and it is not surprising that the religious interests of the capital city suffer most severely. If proof were needed in this respect, the unabashed spread of socialism and atheism, the declarations of resignation from the church, the serious crimes that occur almost daily, among them the repeated, terrible assassinations against the sacred head of the emperor, the contempt for baptism and marriage, the abuse of the church institutions, are already sufficient proof of how far things have already come in this respect. In 1874, the Berlin City Mission came into being to provide a remedy for the existing emergency, the purpose of which is to supplement the lack of spiritual forces in Berlin as much as possible by appointing, under the supervision of several clergymen, pious and proven laymen who have been specially trained for this purpose, to exercise the so urgently needed pastoral care to the best of their ability. For this

important work, in which 16 city missionaries have worked up to now, a seventeenth has been appointed as of September 1, and the appointment of an eighteenth is imminent for the next few months. (Allg. Kz.)

From Silesia one writes to the Allgem. Kirchenzeitung: "Church life is creeping along dully and sluggishly here, too, and even if it may be true that, compared to other areas and landscapes of northern Germany, our home province still stands out for its ecclesiastical sense, for its more active church attendance, there is still a lack of real life on the whole; there is more habitual Christianity than Christian consciousness, and everywhere the complaint is raised that the good old custom of going to church on Sundays is dwindling more and more, even in the rural parishes. So one tries this or that to shake the congregations out of their slumber; one organizes church festivities to arouse interest in the affairs, worries and needs of church life; one wins over acknowledged speakers as festival preachers; one holds after-celebrations in the open air, in the garden or in the woods after the festive hours in the house of God, with a series of speeches and stories from the mouths of foreign clergymen who are present as guests: In short, it cannot be denied that every effort is made to captivate, awaken and warm hearts and minds. Of course, it seems to us that at all such church festivals, apart from the clergy, only a few participants are put into a festive mood; the congregations calmly put up with this expenditure of church work and spiritual activity, listen patiently and gladly to the four or five sermons and speeches that such a day brings, but for the rest everything remains the same, the old sluggishness and sleepiness, the old self-sufficiency and self-righteousness. At best, a few souls are touched and stirred, and a little circle gathers to go on working and caring for this or that Christian and ecclesiastical purpose in silence.

The Gustav-Adolfs-Verein held its 32nd general meeting on September 18 and 19 in Hamburg. The sermon was held by Oberconsistorialrath Dr. Brückner from Berlin. Dr. Münkel writes of it: "After the brief report, he described the abyss which has opened up at our feet at the same time when Germany seemed to have reached the height of its history. We are walking on volcanic ground, he said; and in addition to this, after centuries we have come no further with the church than that a large number are pushing it away completely. He sees the dissolution of the national churches coming, it seems, with equanimity. Our church, he says, has never benefited from secular power; the Landeskirchentum, too, has dulled its vitality." Surprisingly, Dr. Brückner added: "Should the Landeskirchentum dissolve, then the Gustav-Adolfs-Verein can once again become the neutral ground on which those who would otherwise divide can come together. It is precisely in the works of love and in the material things, which have been said to be its weakness, that its great strength and importance lie." Even Dr. Münkel does not want to believe this. He writes: "Shouldn't Dr. Brückner expect too much from the association? The association is a good country church; it includes all kinds of ways of thinking from faith to reason and supports all kinds of congregations, Lutheran, Reformed, Uniate, liberal. As soon as free churches are formed, however, the diverse will come into tension with each other, as the nature of church separation brings with it."

J. Chr. K. v. Hofmann. In the General Evangelical Lutheran Gazette of October 4, the first part of a characterization of the aforementioned is found. In it it says among other things: "With us many will not hesitate to call him perhaps the most outstanding Lutheran theologian of the present day and one of the greatest Scripture scholars of all time.

draw." As is known, v. Hofmann himself later no longer acknowledged that writing, and also corrected it himself many times, which first established his reputation as the founder of a new theological school. In the characterization of the *Kirchenzeitung*, however, it says: "The concept of the organic, which only came to modern times, which was first established by Kant, then elevated by Schelling to the concept of the universe and from there became common property of science in general: this concept was asserted by Hofmann in a universal and thoroughgoing way in theology. For the first time, in 'Weissagung und Erfüllung im alten und im neuen Testament' (2 vols., Nördlingen 1841-44), the newly won principle came to fruition. The Bible, here sacred history, of which it is a monument, the word of prophecy in its historical unfolding from the Gospel of the Protector to the prophet Malachi and to the Revelation of St. John, and likewise the history of fulfillment, of fulfillment that has already happened and of fulfillment that is still to come: all of this appears here as an organic structure in which link to link fits together and builds itself into a living whole. The prophecy, then, is not in the first place the prophetic word, but history itself is the prophecy, and not history in individual types and models, but sacred history as such by virtue of its organic nature, as the germ prophesies to the fruit, as the Roman triumphator forms the prophecy to the Roman emperor. The word of prophecy, however, is only the prophesying history itself, put into words; it is only the interpretation of the respective stage of development of history on the side of its future content. It is the same Spirit of God who, in the unity with the human spirit into which he enters here, i. e. in the living presence of God in man which takes place here, works first the sacred history, then the statement of the prophesying content of history and its fulfillment. This is the basis of the unity of history and prophecy as well as of prophecy and fulfillment. This view put an end to the randomness with which one could find almost everything prophesied in everything, and showed a firm law of prophecy: prophecy has its law in the fact that in it every moment reveals the future that lies in it. This work was the first attempt to present Hofmann's theological views, and not a few will always consider it the most beloved of his works and the freshest product of his spirit. Here, directly creative powers of cognition still spring up, which become less prominent in the later work of reflection and understanding. Even if the application of the concept of the organic has surpassed and taken over itself: the basic idea that prophecy stands in the closest connection with organically developing history is an advance in biblical research that will never be reversed." That v. Hofmann, by his prophetic theology, has deleted all direct prophecies in the Old Testament as such, and has represented the apostolic interpretation of them as an untenable one, does not, of course, amuse the *Kirchenzeitung*. May God preserve the church in grace from such progress in biblical foresight! - Of the "Proof of Scripture," Hofmann's dogmatics and ethics, the "*Kirchenzeitung*" of October 11 judges: "With this work Hofmann has expressed and scientifically carried out views that are of Reformation significance, both for the system and for the proof of Scripture. In a truly magnificent way, the entire doctrinal content of the Holy Scriptures is developed here. Scripture is developed. The understanding of the Holy Scriptures has thereby gained the richest and most in-depth understanding. The understanding of the Holy Scriptures has thereby received the richest and most far-reaching support, and always in such a way that the emphasis is not placed on the understanding of Scripture as such, but on the use that it contains for the theological system. Thus a firm law is laid down for the proof of Scripture, which no dogmatist and ethicist will be able to evade.

if he does not want to fall short of his task." Of Hofmann's exegetical works it is said: "Here we are offered an exegesis of consummate mastery, such as has not been seen before, and such as would not have been possible in an earlier time. Finally, Leonhard Stählin writes: "Hofmann's lasting importance for theology and the church is by no means a sum of individual insights that have been gained through him. The advancement he brought to theology is not at all merely a material advancement, not merely a material advancement. It consists above all in the fact that he has given ecclesiastical theology a strictly scientific form, a form in which it accomplishes what it should accomplish in the present. He would be gravely mistaken who would think that this is to be regarded as unessential and unimportant in relation to the results obtained. For it is precisely the new method by means of which the new results have been brought to light, and this method will have to be held fast, even in so far as one is unable to accept the results." - Only a Hofmannian can write thus; for it was precisely Hofmann's method that must necessarily lead him to his remelting of the Christian religion into a Hofmannian philosophy of religion. It is true that Stählin says: "One has raised the reproach of philosophical construction against Hofmann. One could not have raised a more unjust reproach." But as Schleiermacher pretended to want to keep philosophy out of his theology and through it, while his theology was nothing but philosophy with Christian terminology, so Hofmann.

W.

Neo-Protestantism and Faith Criticism in the Present. In an article on the "religious reform efforts of the present", the "Ausland", a magazine in the service of liberal cultural progress, speaks quite sensibly about both, among other things as follows: "Liberal Protestantism is, after all, only a transitional field that completely detaches some from the church more quickly, others more slowly. A church life is not conceivable at all without an objectively given religion. In the countries where the Protestant-unionist trend is dominant, as in Baden, Rhine Bavaria, Thuringia, people are already beginning to tremble before the consequences of their own deeds; for the churches are even more desolate than they were under the rule of orthodoxy.- When, finally - which must happen sooner or later - the State gives the church complete freedom, and grants no special protection to any of the various parties, then the unnatural union of old-believing and new-believing Protestants will certainly cease. The former will found their particular church, and will still find a large, though steadily diminishing, audience among the country people and women. The latter will perhaps have the majority at first, but will very soon sink to single educational societies." - Is it not shameful that the faithful should have to be told in a free-spirited paper that their union with the unbelievers has its reason only in the protection of the state and is an unnatural one?

W.

The peace of the church is now again being stalled in front of a number of turnpikes. The fact that in golden Mainz the ultramontanes have joined forces with the red Socialists in the Reichstag election is said to be the reason that Prince Bismarck is demanding better guarantees from the pope. On the other hand, it is claimed that the Pope has in his hands the evidence of a great Jesuit conspiracy to thwart the planned peace. It is certain that Falk had a meeting with Bismarck in Gastein, which is interpreted to mean that Falk, the leader of the church quarrel, is once more taking action. More detailed information is expected from the Reichstag when the ultramontane Centrum has taken a stand.

(N. Ztbl.)

The Presbyterian Scottish regard church music (organ) as a remnant of the papacy, which in their fanaticism they believe they must fight as much as the papacy itself. An antipapist! Association has been formed, which, among other things, declares in an appeal: "Shall the music of the lips, ordered by God, or the devilish music of machinery, prevail in the churches of Scotland? If the latter happens, the nation will become so drunk with Pabstry that a Papist may then ascend the throne. To fight this battle, funds are needed." G.

Fight against Social Democracy. The government of Kassel has issued a decree instructing teachers how they can effectively combat the false teachings of social democracy, for example, in religion lessons on the seventh and ninth commandments, in German language lessons, and even in arithmetic lessons, when capital and interest are discussed, to put both in the right light. The correct interpretation of the seventh and ninth commandments is, of course, an effective antidote against communism, but to then want to demonstrate to communism the lawfulness of usury is the best means of thoroughly expelling again that which the correct interpretation of the seventh and ninth commandments has wrought in the conscience of the children.

W.

Spread of Social Democracy in Germany. In the Allgemeine Kircheng. of October 4, a correspondent of the same writes: "It seems to us the most significant thing that Social Democracy is penetrating for all to see into social strata which one thought were separated from it by an insurmountable gulf. In former times, and in many cases even now under the superficial liberal educational philistinism, people were pleased to assert that Social Democracy was gaining ground only among the working masses, among the proletarians of the lowest level, among the "dispossessed. Henceforth one will not be allowed to hold on to this delusion. The recent elections have given proof that Social Democracy is also represented to a not insignificant extent among the artisans, the petty officials, and in Saxony and Holstein even among the peasants. Even in the Maingau, which has been overgrown by the Jews, Social Democracy is making progress among the peasants. At many a Social-Democratic victory feast the civil service uniform has been quite openly displayed. Social Democracy has its supporters even among the "propertied classes," as the large contributions of individuals to the election fund prove. The same is true of the so-called educated. It is penetrating more and more into these circles, too, whose "education," according to liberal theory, is supposed to be the surest weapon and the best protection against Social Democratic inclinations. This is still more true of youth; in the educational institutions of every order Social-Democracy has its adherents and pupils, and conscious pupils at that. Unfortunately, in the wake of the two assassinations, insults to the majesty have also been registered by grammar school pupils. Associations of students with social-democratic tendencies and views have been discovered, and the Prussian Minister of Education has seen fit to issue a circular to this effect to the governments and provincial school colleges, in order to eliminate such outrages by "cultivating the ideal sense. Action has also had to be taken against grammar school teachers who were associated with the Social Democracy. In Berlin and Leipzig there is a Social Democratic association among the academic youth; but also in Vienna, Graz, Munich, Tübingen, Königsberg, Social Democracy has supporters among the students and is apparently gaining more and more of them. Last year, students at the Academy of Münster even sent an address to the Social Democratic Committee of the election festival for the Offenbach-Dieburg district, in which they expressed their sympathy with the Social Democratic movement and the opinion that "science and art, too, should be supported by the social democratic movement.

must be redeemed from the service of the golden calf. Now one consoles oneself with the fact that "the majority of the students are still loyal to the state," which is true; but what does this genuinely mechanical consolation mean? Those students who are already openly expressing their views are often enthusiastic and fanatical supporters and agitators of the Social Democratic Party, and their influence will grow when they later hold state office. Most of them belong to the faculties of law and philosophy, and will presumably one day work as judges and teachers. In the course of Dühring's quarrels, it was also announced by Dühring (during the later disputes and differences between Dr. Dühring and the Social Democrats) that "a rich man or even a millionaire had placed considerable sums at the disposal of the Social Democrats, first for a journal, but then offering what was necessary for the founding of a so-called free university. From this, too, one sees that even the rich and the educated are in touch with Social Democracy and support it. At any rate, so much is clear that liberalism can hardly rely with any certainty on the well-known "cudgel" of the "propertied and educated bourgeoisie." But it still has the army to console itself in its anxiety and the uncomfortable feeling that now seems to be haunting it. But even this comfort is to be shaken. "Socialism in the army and in the barracks" has also become a column in the newspapers for some time.

Socialist Murder. Widespread in Russia are the Nihilists, who believe nothing and stake their cause on nothing, a dangerous party bent on outrage and conspiracy, and defying the strictest police procedure. The murder of Adjutant-General Mesenzeff is still fresh in the memory; his murderers have not been caught. Then a pamphlet entitled "Death for Death," published by the Socialist Revolutionary Committee in Russia to glorify the murder, appears, and what may well be noted is that the Social-Democratic Berlin "Freie Presse" holds this pamphlet up to its readers at the very moment when the Reichstag is busy with the law against Social-Democracy, and reports from it

some appalling passages. "In order to avoid any misunderstanding," declares the Russian paper, "we herewith bring to public knowledge that the head of the Gensdarmarie, General-Adjutant Mesenzeff, has really been slain by us Social Revolutionaries. We further announce that this murder, as it was not the first event of a similar nature, will not be the last, should the Government continue to stubbornly maintain the system now in force. The Russian Government has brought us Socialists to the point where we have decided to commit a whole series of murders, and to bring them into a system. By being placed by the Russian government outside the law, deprived of all the guarantees which form the bond of society, we had to take self-help for our human rights, on the basis of the higher rights of every man to self-defence, similar to what a man or a whole group of men do who live in a wild neighborhood. We have now established our own court over the guilty and their principals, a court of justice as terrible as the regulations under which the government has placed us."

(N. Ztbl.)

Social Democratic Calendar. In the Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung we read: In the latest calendar of this party there is a whole Social Democratic philosophy of history interspersed in the form of remarks on the individual days, e. g. r December 25 Christ, half if not quite mythical founder of Christendom; November 10 Luther, reformer of the church more in the sense of the princes than of the people, whose cause he betrayed in the Peasants' War. Bebel famously called him the hero of the bourgeoisie.