


# Juergen Neve

## A Brief History of the Lutheran Church in America

LutheranLibrary.org ● 370



# A Brief History of the Lutheran Church in America

## Also Available from [LutheranLibrary.org](http://LutheranLibrary.org)

- *Churches And Sects Of Christendom* by J. L. Neve.
- *The Reformation and the Lutheran Church: Sermons and Addresses by American Lutheran Pastors.*

## About The Lutheran Library



The Lutheran Library is a non-profit publisher of good Christian books. All are available in a variety of formats for use by anyone for free or at very little cost. There are never any licensing fees.

We are Bible believing Christians who subscribe wholeheartedly to the Augsburg Confession as an accurate summary of Scripture, the chief article of which is Justification by Faith. Our purpose is to make available solid and encouraging material to strengthen believers in Christ.

Prayers are requested for the next generation, that the Lord will plant in them a love of the truth, such that the hard-learned lessons of the past will not be forgotten.

Please let others know of these books and this completely volunteer endeavor. May God bless you and keep you, help you, defend you, and lead you to know the depths of His kindness and love.

# A Brief History of the Lutheran Church in America

By Juergen L. Neve.

PROFESSOR OF SYMBOLICS AND HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINES IN WITTENBERG  
SEMINARY, SPRINGFIELD, OHIO.

Burlington, Iowa  
THE GERMAN LITERARY BOARD  
© 1916 / 2020  
(CC BY 4.0)

[LutheranLibrary.org](https://LutheranLibrary.org)

# Contents

Also Available from [LutheranLibrary.org](http://LutheranLibrary.org)

[About The Lutheran Library](#)

[Contents](#)

[Preface by Lutheran Librarian](#)

[Literature.](#)

[Important Sources.](#)

[Presentations of the History of the Luth. Church in America as a Whole:](#)

[Histories of Individual Synods:](#)

[Biographies:](#)

[With Reference to Doctrinal Differences:](#)

[With Reference to the Discussion on Predestination:](#)

[Foreword.](#)

[Introductory. Mode of Treatment.](#)

[The First Period. Origin Of Individual Congregations.](#)

[1. Preliminary History Of The Lutheran Synods Of America.](#)

[§ 1. The Dutch Lutherans.](#)

[§ 2. The Swedish Lutherans.](#)

[§ 3. The German Lutherans.](#)

[The Second Period. Congregations Organized Into Synods.](#)

[2. Muhlenberg And The Founding Of The First Lutheran Synod.](#)

[§ 4. Muhlenberg and His Work.](#)

[3. Further Development Of Muhlenberg's Organization.](#)

[§ 5. Origin of Other Synods.](#)

[§ 6. Characteristics of This Period.](#)

[The Third Period. Synods Organized Into Larger Bodies.](#)

[4. The General Synod.](#)

[§ 7. The Founding of the General Synod.](#)

[§ 8. The Significance of the General Synod for the Lutheran Church of that Period.](#)

- § 9. Aberrations.
- § 10. Disruption of the General Synod and Origin of the General Council.
- § 11. The Character of the General Synod.
- § 12. The Work of the General Synod.
- § 13. Observations on Statistics.
- 5. The United Synod Of The South.
  - § 14. The Origin of the Synod.
  - § 15. Characterization.
  - § 16. Institutions and Work.
- 6. The General Council.
  - § 17. Organization.
  - § 18. Character of the Council.
  - § 19. Present Status.
  - § 20. Institutions and Missions.
- 7. The Synodical Conference.
  - § 21. Introductory.
  - § 22. How It Came Into Existence.
  - § 23. Doctrinal Controversies of Missouri.
  - § 24. Its Work.
  - The Other Parts Of The Synodical Conference.
  - § 25. The General Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan and Other States
  - § 26. The Slovak Synod.
  - § 27. Practice of the Synodical Conference.
- 8. Independent Synods.
  - § 28. The Joint Synod of Ohio.
  - § 29. The Iowa Synod.
  - § 30. The Buffalo Synod.
- 9. The Norwegians And Danes.
  - § 31. The Norwegians.
  - § 32. Danish Lutherans in America.
- 10. Small Synods of Different Languages.
  - § 33. Small Synods of Different Languages.
- 11. Constitutional Forms of the Lutheran Church in America.
  - § 34. Constitutional Forms of the Lutheran Church in America.
- 12. General Review.

§ 35. A Discussion of the Development of the Lutheran Church in America.

§ 36. Review of the Extension of the Lutheran Church in America.

37. Appendices.

Copyright Notice

How Can You Find Peace With God?

Benediction

Basic Biblical Christianity | Books to Download

Essential Theology | Books to Download

Devotional Classics | Books to Download



# **Preface by Lutheran Librarian**

In republishing this book, we seek to introduce this author to a new generation of those seeking authentic spirituality.

The Lutheran Library Publishing Ministry finds, restores and republishes good, readable books from Lutheran authors and those of other sound Christian traditions. All titles are available at little to no cost in proofread and freshly typeset editions. Many free e-books are available at our website [LutheranLibrary.org](http://LutheranLibrary.org). Please enjoy this book and let others know about this completely volunteer service to God's people. May the Lord bless you and bring you peace.

## **A Note about Typos [Typographical Errors]**

Please have patience with us when you come across typos. Over time we are revising the books to make them better and better. If you would like to send the errors you come across to us, we'll make sure they are corrected.

# Literature.

## Important Sources.

- Hallesche Nachrichten. Halle, 1744. 1750. 1778. English edition, Philadelphia, 1894.
- Muehlenberg's eigene Lebensbeschreibung, herausgegeben von W. Germann, Allentown, Pa., 1881.
- Urisperger, S., Sammlung ausfuehrlicher Nachrichten von den Salsburger Emigranten. Halle, 1735-1746.
- Kirchliche Mitteilungen aus and ueber Nordamerika 1843-1866 (being documentary material for the origin of Missouri and Iowa synods).
- Ochsenford, S. E., Documentary History of the General Council. Philadelphia, 1912.
- Documentary History of the Ev. Luth. Ministerium of the General Council. Philadelphia, 1898.
- Fritschel, Geo. J., Quellen und Dokumente zur Geschichte und Lehrstellung der Iowa Synode. Chicago, 1916.
- Sachse, J. F., German Pietists of Provincial Pennsylvania (1694-1708), 1895.
- Finck, W. J., Lutheran Landmarks and Pioneers in America. Philadelphia. 1913.

## Presentations of the History of the Luth. Church in America as a Whole:

- Jacobs, H. E., History of the Ev. Luth. Church in the U. S. Philadelphia, 1893.
- Fritschel, Geo. J., Geschichte der lutherischen Kirche in Amerika auf grund von Jacobs' History (translated and enlarged) Guetersloh, 1896.

- Wolf, E. J., *The Lutherans in America* (out of print; new edition under consideration). New York, 1891. Graebner, A., *Geschichte der luth. Kirche Amerikas (up to 1820)* St. Louis, 1892.

## **Histories of Individual Synods:**

- Nicum, J., *Geschichte des New York Ministeriums*. Reading, Pa., 1888.
- Hochstetter, C, *Geschichte der Missouri-Synode*. Dresden, 1885.
- Deindoerfer, J., *Geschichte der Iowa-Synode*. Chicago, 1897.
- Peter-Schmidt, *Geschichte der Ohio-Synode*. Columbus, 1900.
- Bergh, J. A., *Den Norsk Luterske Kirke i Nordamerika*. Minneapolis, 1914.
- Trabert, G. H., *English Lutheranism in the Northwest*. Philadelphia, 1914.
- Bernheim, G. D., *German Settlements and the Luth. Church in the Carolinas*. Philadelphia, 1872.
- Schmauk, Theo. E., *History of the Luth. Church in Pennsylvania (1638-1820)*, Philadelphia. 1903.

## **Biographies:**

- Sachse, J. F.. *Justus Falckner*.
- Mann, W J.. *Life and Times of Muehlenberg*. Philadelphia, 1888.
- Mann, W. J., *Heinrich Melchior Muehlenberg*.
- Spaeth, A., *Dr. W. J. Mann — In Memoriam*.
- Spaeth, A., *Dr. Chas. Porterfield Krauth*. Philadelphia. 1898-1909.
- Spaeth, A., *Memorial of B. M. Schmucker*.
- Gerberding, G. H., *Wm. A. Passavant*. Greenville, 1911.
- Sihler, W., *Autobiographic*. St. Louis.
- Wyneken, Friedrich. St. Louis.
- Guenther, M., *Ein Lebensbild von Dr. Walther*. St. Louis.
- Fuerbringer, L., *Briefe Dr. Walthers*. St. Louis, 1915.

## **With Reference to Doctrinal Differences:**

- Distinctive Doctrines and Usages of the Synods of the Lutheran Church. Philadelphia, 1914.
- Schmidt, F. A., Die lowaschen Missverstaendnisse uiui Bemaentelungen. St. Louis. (Also the reply to this: Fritschel, S. & G. Iowa and Missouri. Mendota, Ill., 1878).
- Neve, J. L., Die wichtigsteii Unterscheiduiigsinerkmale der Luth. Synodten Amerikas. Second enlarged edition. Burlington. 1915.
- Grosse, J., Unterscheidungslehren. St. Louis, 1909. (The replies to this: Nicum. J.. Notgedrungene Abwehr. Rochester. 1890. Fritschel. S.. Unterscheidungslehren. Chicago. 1893. Neve, J. L.. Thoughts on Confessional Questions. Burlington, 1911.)

## **With Reference to the Discussion on Predestination:**

- Zorn, C. M.. Bekehrung & Gnadenwahl.
- Tressel, E. L. S., The Error of Modern Missouri. (Contributions by Dr. F. W. Stellhorn. Dr. F. A. Schmidt and others). Columbus, 1897.
- Pieper, E.. Conversion and Election. St. Louis, 1915.
- Fritschel, Geo. J., Zur Einigung der lutherischen Kirche. Dubuque, 1914.
- Keyser, L. S.. Election and Conversion. Burlington, 1914.
- Schuette. C. H. L.. Testimonies in Furtherance of a Union and Peace in the Truth. Columbus. 1914.
- Jacobs-Haas. Lutheran Cyclopedia. New York, 1899.

# Foreword.

THE “Brief History of the Lutheran Church in America,” published in 1903, which has been kindly admitted as a textbook in almost all theological seminaries of the Lutheran Church in this country, herewith makes its appearance in a second edition. It is double the size of the original volume. It has been thought best to omit the statistics, which occupied thirteen pages of the first edition.<sup>1</sup> Yet, although we present a larger book, we have held fast to the original title, “Brief History,” because a complete, or even an approximately complete, history of the Lutheran Church in America would require at least three volumes of the size of this one.

As in the previous edition, so in this one, it has been our aim to furnish a textbook that would serve as a guide for instruction in theological seminaries. Students and teachers alike prefer a book that is easily read. Even a seeming confusion of facts tries their patience. For this reason our “Brief History” views the material from the viewpoint of extension and organization rather than from that of confessional development.<sup>2</sup> The numerous divisions and the use of heavy type even in the body of the text have been made in the interest of perspicuity, and to aid the teacher and student alike readily to catch the leading thoughts. QUI BENE DISTINGUIT, BENE DOCET. [ He who distinguishes well, teaches well.]

In presenting the history of the different synods, the author has sincerely aimed at impartiality. He has not intentionally magnified the work of one synod or minimized the merits of another. In presenting the history of his own synod, he has not tried to cover up the short-comings of the past. True, the confessional history of the General Synod has been treated very extensively, but it must not be overlooked that this is the common history of a number of synods.<sup>3</sup>

In the case of the doctrinal controversies between the synods of Missouri, Buffalo, Iowa and Ohio the task was especially difficult. In the first edition the author himself wrote this chapter. Considering the fact, however, that neither the Missouri Synod nor its opponents have a documentary his-

tory and that it is impossible for an outsider correctly to interpret the controversies in all their phases, he invited Prof. Geo. J. Fritschel, who has made these matters a special study, to furnish the chapter in question. He endeavored to secure a representative of the Missouri Synod to agree with Prof. Fritschel on what must be regarded as incontestable historical facts, or at least to add corrections, if such were needed, in order to put before students the *ALTERA PARS*; but he did not succeed. Every synod should publish a documentary history. The General Council has such a work, compiled by Dr. S. E. Ochsenford. The General Synod took a step in this direction at its last convention at Akron, Ohio (1915). Prof. Geo. J. Fritschel is now at work preparing one of the Iowa Synod.

A suggestion of Dr. O. Zoekler, who reviewed the German edition of this work in the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, caused the author to add biographical notes of men still living, who by special initiative have contributed to the progress of the Lutheran Church in this country. In the former editions these notes were restricted to the great men who had passed to their reward.

A special feature of the present volume is the more reliable presentation of the history of the Norwegians and Danes. The Rev. Theo. Eggen, editor of "Lutheraneren," the official organ of the United Norwegian Church, kindly arranged for outlines of the history of the several Norwegian bodies to be written by representative men as follows: Prof. E. Hove for the Norwegian Lutheran Synod, the Rev. J. A. Bergh for the United Norwegian Church. Prof. G. M. Bruce for Hauge's Synod, Prof. Geo. Sverdrup for the Norwegian Free Church. These outlines were developed into a whole, and then again submitted to leading churchmen of the Norwegians for approval. Those of us who are unable to read Norwegian can feel that in this chapter we have something that may be depended on for accuracy. Prof. P. S. Vig has furnished the history of the Danish Lutheran Church.

The Rev. O. Engel, of the Wisconsin Synod, sent us such an excellently written review of the history of the Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan and Nebraska that we did not hesitate to incorporate it verbatim in the book. The special history of the German Iowa Synod was furnished by Prof. Geo. J. Fritschel.

For valuable suggestions and contributions of which we have made more or less use, we are indebted to the following well-known scholars: Prof. O. Lincke and Dr. H. Offermann (General Council), Dr. A. G. Voigt (United

Synod of the South), Prof. L. Fuerbringer (Missouri Synod), Dr. G. A. Schodde (Joint Synod of Ohio), Dr. J. K. Nikander (Suomi Synod), Dr. B. E. Jonsson (Icelandic Synod).

Much valuable service has been rendered by Prof. Geo. J. Fritschel, of the Wartburg Seminary at Dubuque, Ia. While using the “Brief History” in his classes he made, at our special request, various revisions and additions, which have been used to great advantage in the preparation of this second edition.

The indexes at the end of the book were prepared by the Rev. G. Bessler, of Spencer, South Dakota.

May it please God to use this “Brief History” as an inspiration among Lutherans in America, especially to increase their loyalty to their Church! The Lutheran Church has a mission in America.

At the time of the World-War, 1916.

J. L. NEVE.

- 
1. Aside from the fact that statistics are subject to change, they are found in the yearbooks of the various synods up-to-date. Brief reviews of the statistical status of synods are given in connection with their history.↩
  2. See introductory remarks on page 17↩
  3. Compare remarks on page 88. [Section: Synods Organized Into Larger Bodies.]↩

# Introductory. Mode of Treatment.

REVIEWING the 250 years of Lutheran history in America, the historian faces the question: HOW IS THE MATERIAL TO BE TREATED? Shall he simply enumerate the leading events, and by coordinating them sacrifice the real historical character of the work? This was too much the case in the first attempt that was made in our country, in Dr. E. J. Wolf's "Lutherans in America." Or shall we (like Jacobs and Fritschel) trace the development chiefly from the viewpoint of confessional progress? This plan would certainly be interesting; but it is easily confusing for the beginner, and this book is to be a handbook of the history of the Lutheran Church in America for students who first want to find their bearings before they investigate more extensively. So we purpose to present the history here simply from the viewpoint of organization and growth. Following this plan, we shall divide the material into three parts:

1. Origin of individual congregations;
2. Congregations organized into synods;
3. Synods organized into large bodies.

Of these three parts, the last is not only the most extensive, but also the most complicated, because the history of the three leading Lutheran bodies runs parallel to the history of the smaller synods. We have tried to overcome this difficulty by some introductory remarks viewing the subject as a whole and by some closing statements pointing to common ground held by these apparently disjointed elements.



# The First Period. Origin Of Individual Congregations.

THE BEGINNING of the Lutheran Church can be traced in the organization of independent Dutch and Swedish congregations. The Germans who first immigrated to New York founded churches along the Hudson and in the Schoharie Valley. Afterwards we hear of German Lutheran organizations in Pennsylvania and all along the coast as far south as Ebenezer in Georgia. The Dutch congregations were absorbed by the German and English churches, while the Swedish Lutherans eventually united with the Episcopal Church. It is characteristic of this epoch that (excepting the Swedes) we can find no trace of synodical connection whatever among these scattered congregations.

## 1. Preliminary History Of The Lutheran Synods Of America.

### § 1. The Dutch Lutherans.

After 1583 Lutheranism in Holland was pushed into the background by Calvinism. New Netherland owes its origin to an expedition of HENRY HUDSON (1619), an Englishman, who, in the service of Holland, tried to discover the North-west passage. Encouraged by his reports, some Amsterdam speculators sent fur-trading ships to the Hudson and organized the West India Company. Thus originated the first permanent settlement (1623) in the neighborhood of Albany (then called Ft. Orange), consisting of some forty families. In 1625 followed the founding of New Amsterdam by a settlement of two hundred persons. The first two governors, May and Verhulst, soon lost courage and returned home. But PETER MINEWIT (Minuit), a German,

looked into the future. On May 4, 1626, he purchased Manhattan Island from the Indians for a trade consideration of some \$24.00, and then proceeded to erect for the protection of settlers the stone fort of Amsterdam. Fur-trading soon assumed large proportions. To induce immigrants to come to this colony, a system of patronage was worked out (1629); whoever secured fifty settlers was entitled to a feudal domain 16 miles long and 8 miles deep (later only one-half of this area) fronting a navigable river. This measure proved very profitable to wealthy speculators, but it caused dissatisfaction in the colony. The governor, who was merely acting in obedience to instructions, was held responsible for this political error, and was recalled from his congenial sphere of activity.<sup>1</sup> But he had laid his foundation for a growing Commonwealth. However, we must not think of Manhattan as a large city; it contained only 30 houses and 270 people.

Minewit was succeeded by Wm. Kieft and afterwards (1644-64) by PETER STUYVESANT, an energetic veteran, who too largely figures in the history of Lutheranism in New Netherland. There may have been some Lutherans among the earliest settlers. But they are first mentioned by Joques, the Jesuit father, who came to New Amsterdam as a fugitive in 1643.<sup>2</sup> However, there was no trace of organization. As far as organizations were concerned, the Swedes, who practically immigrated as congregations, antedated the Dutch. It was long after the Reformed Church, assisted by the government and by contributions from their native land, had erected buildings and secured clergymen, before the Lutherans thought they were strong enough to erect their own place of worship and to call a minister. They, therefore, sent a petition to the governor and also to the West India Company in Amsterdam, asking permission to call a Lutheran pastor. This petition was renewed in 1653. But Stuyvesant, being a strong Calvinist and being pledged by his oath of office to tolerate no religion but the Reformed, also influenced by two Reformed ministers (Megapolensis and Drisius), refused to grant the request, and insisted that only those of Calvin's creed should be tolerated in the new colonies. Similar protests were stirred up by Megapolensis and Drisius among the Reformed authorities in Holland, who in turn prevailed upon the directors of the company to reject this application. Thus the petition of the Lutherans was rejected. The Lutherans had to take their children to the Reformed ministers to be baptized. This, to be sure, had been a custom in Holland wherever a Lutheran clergyman could not be secured. But now Stuyvesant and his clerical advisers insisted that Lutheran parents and

god-parents must promise to train their children in the Christian faith as interpreted by the Dort Confession. It was this innovation especially that violated the conscience of the Lutherans. But their desire to become independent as a church was only met with harsh measures and a general oppression. Stuyvesant even interfered with private services. Whoever dared to read a sermon at such a private service was fined one hundred pounds of Flemish gold, and whoever listened to it, twenty-five pounds. In certain instances the offender was cast into prison. Such tyranny caused the Lutherans to appeal to the authorities in Amsterdam, but while Stuyvesant was re-proved for his severe methods, he did not consider the situation serious enough to discontinue his persecutions altogether.

On June 6, 1657, the REV. JOHN ERNEST GUTWASSER arrived, being an emissary of the Lutheran Consistory of Amsterdam. He was gratefully received by the Dutch Lutherans among whom he was to do his work. But the Reformed element hastened to interfere. Immediately after his arrival he was summoned to court, and was instructed under penalty not to perform any ministerial acts. The government of Holland, while advising that religious toleration was desirable from a political point of view, did not wish to encourage Lutheranism, and, after all, approved of Stuyvesant's methods. Gutwasser was ordered to return home on the first vessel leaving the colonies. But this order had to be given repeatedly before it was finally (after a quiet activity for two years) obeyed.<sup>3</sup> Thus the unwelcome Lutheran preacher was gotten out of the way. Not until the year 1663 was religious tolerance effected. A Quaker, punished by Stuyvesant, brought this about by demonstrating to the governor that any other policy would seriously interfere with financial developments.

AS TO NATIONAL COMPOSITION in this congregation, we offer the following quotation: "The first Dutch congregation in the new world was truly cosmopolitan: it consisted of a number of Dutch families, but the majority of the members were Danish, Swedish, Norwegian and German people. The leading man of this congregation was a German, Paulus Schrick, of Nuremberg (Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York, 1901, p. 425): and the man who was suspected by the Reformed preachers of Amsterdam as sheltering during the whole winter the first Dutch Lutheran minister of the new world, John Gutwasser, was a Norwegian, Laurence Noorman (1 c. 430)." Evjen, in Hauck R. E., XXIV, 539.

In 1664 New Amsterdam, having a population of fifteen hundred people, fell into the hands of ENGLAND and was named New York in honor of its new proprietor, the Duke of York (later James II of England). Colonel Nicolls, the conqueror, became governor. This event secured Lutheran freedom, inasmuch as, according to the rules of the new government, no person was to be molested, punished or imprisoned on account of religious preferences. The Lutherans appealed to the governor for the right of calling a pastor. This was cheerfully granted, but only after an interim of several years did they secure one in the person of Magister JACOB FABRICIUS. Their choice was unfortunate. The new minister proved so despotic and hot-headed that he was compelled to give up his work first in Albany and afterwards in New York, where the first church was in construction.<sup>4</sup> (Later he took up work among the Swedes).

He was succeeded by BERNHARD ARENSIUS (1671-1691), a gentle personality with a pleasing presence, who worked faithfully during a period of unrest (war between Holland and England, rebellions against unpopular governors, and against the Catholic king).<sup>5</sup> After his death the two congregations of Albany and New York had to prove their stability by being without a pastor for ten years. The New York congregation in 1695 consisted of about thirty families; the Albany congregation of about twelve, while the Reformed church had twenty-nine buildings and seventeen hundred and fifty-four members. Finally Magister RUDMAN, who had been in the service of the Swedes, accepted a call (1702), and although his pastorate was short, he proved to be a man of constructive and organizing talents. In 1703 he entrusted the parish, now largely German, to JUSTUS FALCKNER. At this junction the history of the Dutch Lutherans merges into the beginning of German Lutheranism. We, therefore, interrupt our narrative at this place.

## § 2. The Swedish Lutherans.

Correctly estimating the commercial possibilities of America and interested in the project of Usselink, a Dutchman, GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS conceived the plan of establishing colonies on this continent. All classes of the Swedish people were enthusiastic. On June 14, 1626, a charter for the "South Company" was signed at Stockholm, one feature of which was the propagation of the true Gospel. However, the plan did not mature until after the death of the great king. In the year 1638, under the command of Peter Minuit, for-

mer Director General of New Amsterdam, two Swedish vessels, the "Grypen" and the "Kahnar Nykel," dropped anchor, after a six months' journey, at LEWES in the State of DELAWARE. Among the passengers of the second expedition (1639) was REORUS TORKILLUS, the first Lutheran minister who set foot upon American soil.<sup>6</sup> These immigrants, many of whom were Germans, purchased land from the Indians which was ceded to the Swedish crown "for all time." On a certain site of the present Wilmington, Del., they erected Fort Christina, where they also conducted their services.<sup>7</sup> The first churches they built with the view of using them as possible fortifications against the Indians. However, this precaution proved unnecessary, since, by treating the Indians kindly, they gave no occasion for any hostilities. The Rev. JOHN CAMPANIUS, who arrived with a third expedition in 1643, even conducted a mission among the Indians and translated Luther's Catechism into their native tongue. He also consecrated the first Lutheran church of the new world (1646), which was built on the island of Tinicum not far from the present site of Philadelphia. The population comprised some five hundred and fifty people.

However, the neighboring DUTCH COLONY resented the Swedish enterprise, which offered serious competition to their trade with the Indians. Seventeen years afterwards hostilities began because of difference with respect to the boundary line. The Swedish army — consisting of twenty men — went to war, and conquered without bloodshed the Dutch fort.<sup>8</sup> But the wooden-legged Stuyvesant revenged his countrymen by mobilizing seven hundred men who embarked on five vessels and QUICKLY TERMINATED SWEDISH RULE on American soil. Thus in 1655 this flourishing colony fell into the hands of the Dutch who held it for nine years. After the surrender of Tinicum the Swedes were permitted to retain the Augsburg Confession, but the immigration from Sweden ceased and the Lutheran ministers, with the exception of the REV. LARS LOCK, returned to their native land. Only with the greatest difficulty could this sole remaining pastor carry on his work among the scattered settlements. He went up and down the river in an improvised canoe, risking his life in woods that swarmed with hostile Indian tribes. The REV. JACOB FABRICIUS came to his assistance in 1677, but when this worthy clergyman grew totally blind, after five years of useful work, the ministerial services rendered to the Swedes became altogether insufficient.

Lars Lock died in 1688, Fabricius in 1696, and the Swedish Lutherans found themselves in a DESPERATE SITUATION. Their applications for preachers addressed to the Consistories of Amsterdam and of their home country (of which they knew only by hearsay) were of no avail. They had nothing with which to nourish their spiritual life, with the exception of a few Bibles and books of worship. These volumes were so constantly used that they threatened to fall to pieces. But in God's wise providence one of their appeals fell into the hands of CHARLES XI., king of Sweden. It contained the request of one hundred and eighty-eight families, representing nine hundred and forty-two souls, for a minister, twelve Bibles, three sermon books, forty-two books of worship, one hundred hymnals and two hundred catechisms. This letter greatly impressed the king. In many copies he circulated it among the ecclesiastical authorities and the aristocracy of the country, and finally (1696) EQUIPPED A SAILING VESSEL on which the books, as well as Pastors Rudman, Bjoerk and Auren started on the journey to their anxiously waiting countrymen in Delaware with the books which were desired.<sup>9</sup> Rudman became minister of a congregation at WICACO (the present Philadelphia), where he built the old Gloria Dei Church (36x66, 20 ft. high, at a cost of eight hundred pounds). The German hermits of the Kissahikon valley took part in the dedication, rendering a musical program of choral and instrumental selections. Bjoerk took charge of the congregation at WILMINGTON where he built Holy Trinity Church (today known as the Old Swede Church). It is to be regretted that these two historic churches, made sacred to us by the pure teaching of those old, true, Swedish Lutheran preachers, in which several of these Lutheran pioneers are buried, should now be in the hands of the Episcopalians.

Henceforth we notice a continued influx of Swedish Lutheran ministers, who soon made their influence felt, not only because of their thorough education, but also because of the literary attainments on the part of quite a few. Among the most influential we mention John Dylander, the Provost Acrelius (author of a valuable history of "Swedes in America"), and Provost DR. WRANGEL, a most eminent divine, who also sustained close relationship with Muhlenberg and the Germans. But the fact that these clergymen remained under the supervision and control of the Swedish government, which would often recall them at the time when they were most needed, proved fatal to the development of the struggling congregations.<sup>10</sup> Some of the Swedish pastors had acquired the English language (the use of which

was demanded more and more by the young people), and their place could not easily be filled. The recall of Dr. Wrangel, who had done a great work and whose presence could not be spared, caused bitter resentment among the congregations. They demanded more consideration from the authorities abroad and called for English-speaking ministers. This resulted in the refusal of the Swedish government to send any more clergymen and the subsequent affiliation of these Lutheran congregations with the Episcopal church.<sup>11</sup> Here then we have the explanation why the old historic church buildings mentioned above are no longer a part of the Lutheran Church.

---

Having briefly reviewed the history of the Swedish Lutherans from the time of their settlement in Delaware (1638) to the end of the 18th century, when they entered the Episcopal denomination, we must add a few remarks relative to certain features in their development which we previously omitted for reasons of perspicuity.

Among the ministers supplying these congregations there was always a Pastor Superior (Provost) who presided, visited the churches and sent reports to the church authorities in Sweden. The fact that the Swedish ministers recognized the spiritual supremacy of their king and had to submit the affairs of their parishes to his judgment, produced not only extraordinary, but detrimental effects. 1) The congregation did not sufficiently partake in the responsibilities of church work. The pastors bore the whole burden, not only in a spiritual sense, but also in the administration of the church property. Since the congregations were seldom consulted, they became lax in the financial support of the pastor. 2) This again resulted in short pastorates. Theological candidates considered their parishes as temporary stepping-stones to something better at home, while others who might have liked to remain and who could have secured the consent of the Swedish king for a permanent stay, felt that the meager salary and their increasing families did not justify them in following their inclinations. Certain it is that ministers who looked upon the charge of these churches as a temporary engagement lacked zeal and inspiration to do their work well. 3) Perhaps this is the reason why even the ablest of the Swedish pastors never suggested an independent development of the Lutheran Church in America. Such a possibility seemed too remote even to be thought of.

The question of the language also presented a difficult problem. Most Swedish pastors have always officiated in two languages, the English and the Swedish. The Provost Dylander held three services every Sunday, preaching in German at the early morning service, in Swedish at the main service and in English in the afternoon. Provost Acrelius, whose book on “The History of New Sweden” gives us a clear picture of the situation, says (page 361): “There are times when the church council decides that there shall be no more English services in the future, and that no more funerals shall be conducted in the English language. This results in a general denunciation of the church officers, who are accused of considering all English people as heathen. They are told that it is a serious disregard of duty to look after one part of the vineyard and to neglect the other. Thus the decision is reversed. One person wants to have the child baptized in English, another in Swedish, and both to have it done in the same church and at the same time. Some refuse to serve as god-parents if the children are not baptized in Swedish, while other god-parents do not even understand this language. One woman wishes to be churched<sup>12</sup> in Swedish, another in English, and both want the service at the same time. During the funerals we have an English-speaking congregation of a mixed character, yet our people are not sure whether they want English or Swedish services, even while the pastor is entering the building.” (Relative to the language problem in the Lutheran church of America see § 6, 2).

The close relationship between the Swedes and other nationalities, and especially their way of cooperating with the Dutch and Germans, offer a most attractive picture. During their time of need the Swedes had been served by Fabricius, the German minister sent to the Dutch. Justus Falckner, a German, was ordained for work among the Dutch by Swedish pastors (Rudman, Bjoerk and Sandel). Rudman, the Swede, had served this Dutch congregation before Falckner. We have already mentioned the friendly relationship between Wrangel and the patriarch Muhlenberg. The Swedish provost Sandin took part in the organization of the Pennsylvania Synod (§ 4, 5). From this we gather that in those days of small beginnings one depended upon the other, and each was willing to contribute his services to the general welfare.

### **§ 3. The German Lutherans.**



## 1. First Traces of German Lutherans in America.

Not until the beginning of the 18th century were there sufficient Germans in this country to justify the idea of organization. The chief reason for this late immigration is to be sought in the deplorable condition in which Germany found herself following the Thirty Years' War. Without a united government and utterly devastated, this country could entertain no thoughts of colonization. Individuals and small expeditions which eventually found their way to America were not Lutherans but Quakers, Mennonites, mystics of every description, who sought refuge from the persecutions of the German State Church in the colonies of William Penn.

It is to be noted, however, that among these elements which in Germany had leaned toward sectarianism, Lutheran tendencies were not altogether extinguished. Having attained absolute freedom of worship, they helped in the founding of Lutheran churches. Dr. Julius Sachse was the first to describe in his volume on "German Pietists" and other historical writings the religious life of these early settlers, and Dr. Theodore E. Schmauk, on the basis of this information, is publishing a very excellent history on "The Lutheran Church in America," of which the first volume has appeared (585 pages). We shall use this volume as an authority at a number of places in the succeeding paragraphs.

On a visit to Germany WILLIAM PENN had caused the organization of the Frankfort Land Company. To this corporation he sold large tracts of land in the vicinity of the present Germantown, where in 1683 the Frankfort jurist, FRANZ DANIEL PASTORIUS, arriving with twenty German families, founded "German Township" (Germantown).

In a letter written by Pastorius to his father (1686) we are told that a house of worship had been built in Germantown. Hitherto it has been believed that this church was a Lutheran structure, but considering that Pastorius and his fellow-settlers had shown sectarian tendencies in Germany, from which country they had emigrated for the purpose of starting a Quaker colony and that Pastorius as a personal friend of William Penn had ever used his influence for the benefit of Quakerism, we are forced to the conclusion that this church was nothing else than a Quaker meeting house.

The FIRST GERMAN LUTHERAN SERVICE in Germantown, in fact, in America, was conducted by the Rev. Heinrich Bernhard KOESTER in 1694. It took place in the home of a Mennonite by the name of Van Bebber. Koester, the

first German Lutheran minister, had arrived with forty immigrants, six of whom were theological students (Daniel Falckner, one of them), for the purpose of awaiting the end of the world in the quiet of the Wissahikon Valley. This event was expected in 1697. Although opposed by Pastorius, the Lutherans continued to hold services in Van Bebber's home. Koester combined with mystical tendencies strong Lutheran convictions. He always carried with him a copy of the Augsburg Confession, and while crossing the ocean, he cautioned his companions against the heresies of the Quakers. As a preacher he attained such high repute that even English speaking people flocked to hear him.

He soon decided to preach in English, left the hermits and moved to Philadelphia. The result of his labors in this city, however, was the founding of the FIRST EPISCOPAL CHURCH on American soil, known as Christ Church.

Soon afterwards (1700) Koester returned to Germany. His chief merit was his strong Lutheran position regarding the person of Christ and the means of grace which he powerfully emphasized against the rationalizing influences of Quakerism. Thus he sowed the seed of truth in the soil of Pennsylvania and counteracted in a measure the supremacy of the Quakers in the province of Pennsylvania. A biography of this eccentric character, who died in Hannover in 1749, is found in Rathlef's book, "Geschichte jetzt lebender Gelehrter" (History of Present Day Scholars), 6th Part (Hannover, 1743). J. F. Sachse, in his volume on "German Pietists," treats his activity very fully, and Th. E. Schmauk, in the fourth chapter on "The Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania" (pages 79 to 101), gives a complete description of both the man and his work.

Before going further, we should add that, while Koester held the first German Lutheran service on American soil, he did not found any Lutheran Church. The FIRST LUTHERAN CONGREGATION was organized by Caspar Stoeber, and the FIRST LUTHERAN CHURCH BUILDING WAS ERECTED by Muhlenberg.

One of those who immigrated with Koester was DANIEL FALCKNER, whom we just mentioned, the oldest brother of Justus Falckner (compare § 1 at the close), and to whom we shall refer later on. These two Falckners were the sons of a Lutheran pastor in Langen-Reinsdorf near Zwickau, Saxony, which parish had also been served by their grandfather.

Daniel (born 1666), as also his brothers Christian and Justus (born 1672), had studied theology and was ordained either before his emigration to America or, what seems more likely, during a later visit in Germany,

1698-1700. When he was a Licentiate to the University of Erfurt, we find him in the Pietistic circle which gathered around August Hermann Francke, taking an active part in the COLLEGIA PIETATIS. While in Germantown, he sided with Koester against Quakerism, and protested against the maladministration of the affairs of the Frankfort Land Company under Pastorius. On account of his executive abilities and his fearless attitude, he attained such a reputation in the colony that he was sent to Europe on a mission of high importance: he was to inform the directors of the Land Company of the mismanagement of their affairs and also to call attention to the spiritual neglect of the province. For this purpose he visited Holland, England and Germany, and by his vivid descriptions of Pennsylvania encouraged large numbers to cross the sea. Accompanied by his brother Justus and several theological students, he returned to Germantown in 1700. In his possession he had a document, signed by every director of the Land Company, discharging Pastorius and conferring upon himself the agency of the colony. This order naturally led to a bitter campaign between Pastorius and Falckner, which resulted in varying successes. But eventually (1708) Falckner, who had bought some 22,000 acres of land (Manatawny, the present Montgomery County), became a victim of the intrigues of his own business partners. He was imprisoned and lost all he had. Broken in spirit, he left Pennsylvania, and went to his brother in New Jersey, serving several congregations along the Raritan River where his name is frequently mentioned in connection with the work of Berkenmeyer (§ 3, 4). He survived Kocherthal, also his own brother, and carried on, as far as his age permitted, the work so faithfully begun by these two missionaries. He was still living in 1741, but the time of his death and his final resting place are unknown.

After thus learning of the first German settlement in connection with the names of Pastorius, Falckner and Koester, let us get a brief view of Falckner's Swamp (New Hanover, Pa.). This locality is noteworthy because here we find the FIRST GERMAN LUTHERAN CHURCH and the FIRST GERMAN LUTHERAN CONGREGATION.

It is generally believed that the largest part of the settlers of the Manatawny district immigrated with Daniel Falckner in 1700, were organized by him into a congregation and received until 1708 his pastoral services. We have not the exact date of the erection of the first church, which according to Sandel (§ 2) was in existence in 1704. It was no doubt a log church, which had to be replaced by another log building in 1721. The present

church of this historical congregation, although completely remodeled, was built in 1767. From 1717-1728 it was in charge of the Rev. Gerhard Henkel (see § 3, 6). Later it was served by the Rev. Johann Casper Stoeber (§ 3, 6), who in 1742 was succeeded by Muhlenberg (§ 4, 1 and 2).

True to our purpose to treat of the first German Lutherans in America, we must not forget that there were some Germans in the Dutch congregations of New York, who were constantly increasing their numbers through influx of immigration. This congregation, as we said before (§ 1, at the close), had called the REV. JUSTUS FALCKNER (1703), and we take this opportunity to add a few remarks concerning this eminent divine. We have spoken about his parentage. He was one of the students who went to Halle with Professor Thomasius after this noted teacher had been expelled from Leipzig (1690). He sat at the feet of August Hermann Francke. As a student he composed the hymn well known in both German and English, "Auf, ihr Christen, Christi Glieder" (Rise, ye children of salvation). Dreading the responsibilities of the ministerial office, he settled with his brother Daniel in the quiet woods of Germantown as a land agent of William Penn. But he was called out of his seclusion by Pastor Rudman, and became minister of the Dutch congregation in New York. In 1701 he was ordained in the Gloria Dei Church of Wicaco by Swedish clergymen (*the first Lutheran ordination in America*). His parish comprised some two hundred miles, including all the territory on the banks of the Hudson from New York to Albany, also Long Island. He retained his vigor until he died (1723). As we read the short but soulful prayers which he used to add to entries of official acts in his parish records<sup>13</sup> we can heartily endorse the words of Graebner: "In his activity of twenty years, the Rev. Justus Falckner impresses us as a man of charming and captivating personality. Richly endowed, highly cultured, devout in spirit, energetic and tactful, combining with strong Lutheran convictions a soul of unusual tenderness, he was an ideal pastor."

## **2. New Stage of German Immigration.**

Before the first decade of the century had passed, we notice a new stage of German immigration.

No part of Germany had suffered as much as THE PALATINATE of the Rhine. It had to pay the penalty for the ambitions of its Elector, who by accepting the crown of Bohemia caused the Thirty Years' War. This territory

was first invaded by Spinola (1620), afterwards by the Lutheran Mansfield and finally by the Bavarian Tilly. What one left untouched, the other destroyed. Says Riesdorf, the statesman: "The Palatinate resembles an Arabian desert." Famine and pestilence followed the devastating armies. Not even for the length of a human life could peace be secured. As early as 1673 Louis XIV. began his war of conquest. The third invasion (1688-97) aimed to place a vast desert between the German and French borders. The campaign of Melac and Montelas has not been surpassed in vandalism since the days of the Huns and Mongols.<sup>14</sup> Louis XIV., realizing that he could not retain this province, decided to ravage it with fire and sword. His General informed its inhabitants, numbering 500,000, that they were to leave within three days if they desired to escape death. Thus in mid-winter the snow-clad hills were black with fugitives who, looking back, discovered their possessions, their cities, villages, their orchards and vineyards in smoke and ruins.

Some of these fugitives found a temporary refuge in England, where QUEEN ANNE arranged for their emigration to America. They were joined by large numbers who emigrated from Wurtemberg, Baden, and Hesse. Led by their pastors, these war-stricken Germans left the shores of Europe to partake in the greatest spectacle of emigration the world has ever witnessed.

### **3. German Lutheran settlements in New York.**

German Lutheran settlements in the State of New York followed as a result of this gigantic expedition arranged by the English Crown. On New Year's day of the year 1701 one of the first immigrant trains arrived in New York under the leadership of the REV. JOSHUA KOCHERTHAL, a Lutheran minister from Landau in the Lower Palatinate. By an order of Queen Anne this congregation, consisting of sixty-one people, settled on the western banks of the Hudson (near Newburgh). The Queen granted them two thousand acres of land, and promised to pay twenty pounds annually for the support of their pastor, who was also to have the use of five hundred acres. The contract was made "for all time." How completely this program has been changed!

But German immigration had now properly begun. On July 10, 1710, there arrived in New York ELEVEN SHIPS carrying 3,000 immigrants, 700 of whom had died during the stormy voyage or while placed under quarantine. The survivors settled in the Catskill hills on the banks of the HUDSON. Here

they were to pay heavily with the hardest kind of labor for the benefits they had received from the English crown. Avaricious governors took advantage of them and used them for purposes of getting rich quick. The settlers soon suffered from hunger and want. They went westward into the SCHOHARIE VALLEY, where they purchased land from the Indians at the price of \$300. Immigrants who arrived later settled all along the Hudson. This meant a number of new congregations (Rhinebeck one of them). In all of these parishes KOCHERTHAL WAS THE PASTOR. Unceasingly, until his death, he bore the temporal and spiritual welfare of his scattered flock on faithful shoulders. On one occasion he went to England to plead with the government for better conditions for his maltreated countrymen.<sup>15</sup> His burial place is in West Camp. There on a plain tomb-stone you can read the following inscription:

"Know thou, O wanderer,  
 'Neath this stone there sleeps  
 Beside his Sibylla Charlotte  
 A pilgrim true.  
 For the High-Germans in America;  
 A Joshua:  
 And for those East and West  
 Of the Hudson River  
 A true Lutheran Pastor:  
 He first arrived on the L'd Lovelace  
 1707 — 8, January 1  
 And again with Col. Hunter  
 1710 June 14.  
 His trip to England interrupted  
 By the soul's journey to Heaven  
 St. John's Day. 1719;  
 And would'st thou know more  
 Inquire at the home of Melanchthon  
 Who Kocherthal was  
 Who Harschias and  
 Who Winchenbach.

B. Berkenmayer, S. Heurtien, L. Brevort  
 MDCCXLII

Rev. Geo. J. Ketner, the present pastor of the old congregation of Kocherthal at West Camp, writes in a historical sketch of St. Paul's church: "Tenderly his beloved people laid his weary frame to rest beside the re-

mains of Sibylla Charlotte, his devoted wife. ...But in the year 1898 their remains were exhumed and placed in a crypt in the church, and the tablet containing its quaint inscription which once rested on his grave was placed in the vestibule of the church over their remains.”

After the departure of Pastor Kocherthal in 1719 Justus Falckner served them up to the time of his death in 1723. He was followed by Daniel Falckner in 1724. Then came Berkenmeyer, the son-in-law of Kocherthal, who visited them until his death in 1751. Rev. M. C. Knoll also served for a time. He visited them three times a year and received as salary thirty bushels of wheat.

Rev. Ketner writes: “St. Paul’s Ev. Lutheran Church at West Camp is one of the oldest Lutheran churches in America. It antedates every Lutheran body in this country. It is 38 years older than the Ministerium of Pennsylvania. Its people worshipped in their little log church before Muhlenberg, the patriarch of the Lutheran Church in America, was born. It is 66 years older than the Declaration of Independence, and 110 years older than the General Synod to which it belongs.”

NOTE: Among the emigrants of the Rhenish Palatinate who arrived from England in 1710 was JOHN CONRAD WEISER, SEN., formerly a magistrate of Gross-Aspach, Wurtemberg, who soon distinguished himself by looking after the welfare of his suffering countrymen. To protect property rights of the new settlement in the Schoharie Valley he journeyed to England, but was robbed by pirates, imprisoned in England and returned home broken in health. He died in 1746.

Even better known and closely connected with, the history of the country is his son JOHN CONRAD WEISER, JUN. Born 1696, he arrived with his father in New York. When seventeen years old he followed an Indian chief who had been visiting in his father’s house and whom he greatly admired. He was with the Indians eight months and later fifteen years, acquiring their language and studying their customs. This enabled him to render most useful services to his countrymen at the time when he became head of the Indian bureau of the English government of Pennsylvania, serving from 1732 to the year of his death 1760. During the Indian war and at the conclusion of peace he looked after the interests of the German colony. His daughter, Anna Maria, became the wife of the patriarch Muhlenberg. See § 4, 2, annotation.

#### **4. Pastor Berkenmeyer and his Circle.**

After the death of Falckner, the first Dutch congregation of New York (among whom were many Germans) petitioned the Lutheran Consistory of Amsterdam for a pastor. Thus a call was extended to Wilhelm Christoph BERKENMEYER, then a theological candidate in Hamburg, who, after some hesitation, accepted. In 1725 he was ordained in Amsterdam, and immediately left for New York. He was a man of thorough culture, strict Lutheran convictions and of a pleasing presence. He soon had the confidence of his people. This was evidenced by a spirit of enterprise which resulted in the building of a NEW CHURCH, In June, 1739, it was consecrated, and was known as Holy Trinity (“Dreieinigkeitskirche”) of New York. Later, however, Berkenmeyer made LUNENBURG the headquarters of his work. He was succeeded by Pastor Chr. KNOLL, a native of Holstein, who on the strength of some recommendations from Hamburg was called by the Consistory of London (see foot notes § 3, 7). He was soon followed by Magister WOLFF, a native of Hamburg, who, after a brief pastorate, had to be disciplined on account of charges of improper conduct. The Rev. Peter Nic. SOMMER, also a native of Hamburg, was chiefly engaged in work in the Schoharie Valley. He was an able, yet modest man. Though blind for twenty years, he performed his duties faithfully to the end. In this circle of ministers Berkenmeyer (who died in 1753) was not only the oldest but the most talented. The period of their activity runs parallel with that of Muhlenberg and his co-workers in Pennsylvania; also with that of the Salzburg missionaries along the Savannah River in Georgia (§ 3, 5). But Berkenmeyer and his circle persistently refused to have fellowship with the circle that had come from Halle, owing, no doubt, to the Pietistic controversies which at that time agitated the theological world of Germany and in which controversy Berkenmeyer took a strong position on the side of stricter Lutheranism.

#### **5. The Salzburgers.**

Among the early Lutheran settlers of the Southern States the Salzburg immigrants of Georgia play a prominent part. The fanatical archbishop, Leopold Anton of Salzburg (Baron von Firmian), having tried in vain to exterminate the Lutheran Church in his diocese, resorted to measures of intrigue. He claimed to be tolerant, and asked every one to put their confes-



sional preferences on record. Thus he discovered that there were twenty thousand “Evangelicals” who had delivered themselves into his hands. Realizing that they had been trapped, three hundred of them formed the “Salzbund” (Salt-Confederacy), vowing that, though they were forced to a diet of salt and bread, they would not prove untrue to their religious convictions. This action furnished the foundation for the charge that the Evangelicals had decided upon the overthrow of the Catholic Church. On October 31, 1731, there was issued a decree of emigration: all those refusing to become Catholics were ordered to emigrate and to leave at home their children not of age. In vain the Salzburger appealed to the Emperor and to the Protestant princes. Only Frederick William of Prussia pleaded their cause and invited 20,000 of them to settle in Lithuania. The King of England ordered a collection for them which amounted to some \$200,000. The majority of rulers were fanatical and merciless. Thus these persecuted Evangelicals had to leave their children to be educated in Catholic institutions. With wounded hearts, but with hymns of praise on their lips, they wandered through the cities and villages of Germany singing the song composed by Schaitberger, the leader of a former exile:

"I bin ein armer Exulant,  
A so thu i mi schreiba, —  
Ma thuet mi aus dem Vaterland  
Um Gottes Wort vertreiba.

Des was i wohl, Herr Jesu mein,  
Es ist dir a so ganga,  
Jetzt will i dein Nachfolger sein,  
Herr! mach's na dein Verlanga.

So muss i heut von meinem Haus,  
Die Kindel muss i losa,  
Mei Gott, es treibt mir Zählrel aus,  
Zu wandern fremde Strossa.

Mein Gott, führ mi in ane Stadt  
Wo i dein Wort kann hoba,  
Darin i di will früh und spat  
In meinem Herzen loba."

"An exile poor, and nothing more,  
This is my sole profession;  
Banished from home, of God's pure word  
To make a clear confession.

O Jesus mine, I know full well  
This is the way Thou wentest.  
Thy steps we'll follow, dearest Lord,  
And bear what Thou hast sent us.

So forth I go from my dear home.  
Lord, the tears are starting;  
As through strange streets I press my way  
I think of the sad parting.

A country, Lord, I ask of Thee,  
Where I Thy Word may cherish.  
Where, day and night, within my heart  
The fruits of faith may flourish."

A large number of these Salzburg exiles immigrated to America. The REV. DR. SAMUEL URLSPERGER, of Augsburg, interceding for them at London, prevailed on the English government to give them free passage to Georgia, to take care of them for a year, to let them and their children have free use of certain lands for a period of ten years (after that at a nominal rental), and to confer on them the rights of English citizenship and also freedom to worship God. All of these promises have been faithfully kept. The ocean voyage of the Salzburgers and their arrival in Georgia have been charmingly described by the American historian BANCROFT in his third volume on the "History of the United States" (22 ed. 1873, p. 424):

“In January, 1734, they set sail for their new homes. The majesty of the ocean quickened their sense of God’s omnipotence and wisdom; and as they lost sight of land, they broke out into a hymn to His glory. The setting sun, after a calm, so kindled the sea and sky, that words could not express their rapture, and they cried out, ‘How lovely the creation! How infinitely lovely the Creator!’ When the wind was adverse they prayed; and, as it changed, one opened his mind to the other on the power of prayer, even the prayer ‘of a man subject to like passions as we are.’ A devout listener confessed himself to be an unconverted man; and they reminded him of the promise to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at the Word. As they sailed pleasantly with a favoring breeze, at the hour of evening prayer they made a covenant with each other, like Jacob of old, and resolved by the grace of Christ to cast all strange gods into the depth of the sea. In February a storm grew so high that not a sail could be set; and they raised their voices in prayer and song amid the tempest; for to love the Lord Jesus as a brother gave consolation. AT CHARLESTON, OGLETHORPE ON THE 18TH OF MARCH, 1734, BADE THEM WELCOME: AND IN FIVE DAYS MORE the wayfarers, whose home was beyond the skies, pitched their tents near Savannah.”

Gratefully recognizing God’s gracious guidance, they called the place of their settlement EBENEZER. Three other ships, loaded chiefly with Salzburgers,<sup>16</sup> arrived during the following year, thus increasing the population of the colony to 1200.

It was not difficult to foresee that these people would prosper in their new home. Under their thrifty hands the virgin forest became a blossoming garden. The four churches, Jerusalem, Zion, Bethany and Goshen, served their spiritual wants, and their ministers, BOLTZIUS and GRONAU, who had been trained in Halle and had accompanied them across the sea, were pastors in the true sense of the word. Every Sunday they held three services, and every evening, their tasks done and supper over, the people gathered in their churches to receive some religious instruction, the children in the Catechism, the grown-ups in the Bible. During the first baptism all the children of the congregation were called to the altar to have this sacrament explained to them. From the ministerial reports sent to Halle we gather that everywhere in this settlement Biblical teaching produced glorious results. The people freely forgave those who had wronged them; scenes of death were transfigured with rays of triumph, and even young children fought the good fight of faith. No secular authority was needed. All controversies were settled by their spiritual leaders, who were universally recognized as fathers. The community of Ebenezer remained free from the polluting influences of the outside world. It was truly ruled by the Christ.

The DESCENDANTS OF THE SALZBURGERS are still in that vicinity. In Savannah they have a flourishing English Lutheran church, a large percentage of whose members are Germans. In Effingham County they represent the vital

element of the eight churches of the Georgia Synod, which at present is a part of the United Synod of the South (§ 14).

OTHER LUTHERANS IN THE SOUTH. Besides this congregation we discover a number of other colonies all along the coast. While these Lutherans did not play a very prominent part in the history of that time, we should mention them, because from these settlements emerged those synods and congregations which today form the United Synod of the South: Newberry, N. C, near Perrysburg, S. C, Charleston, St. Simon Island, Congress (Saxe-Gotha), Rowan and Cabarrass County (Pastor Nuessman), S. C, and Spottsylvania Co., Va. (Pastor Klug 1736-61).

## **6. Lutheran Settlements in Pennsylvania.**

We have mentioned the congregations of GERMANTOWN, of FALCKNER'S SWAMP and of PHILADELPHIA (§ 3, 1).

ANOTHER LUTHERAN ORGANIZATION was effected, when the immigrants from the Rhenish Palatinate moved out of the Schoharie Valley (§ 3, 3). As soon as these thrifty settlers, after escaping from the extortions of the New York governors, had cultivated their new possessions and made the wilderness blossom like the rose, they were informed that the CONTRACTS they had made with the Indians concerning the transfer of land were null and void. The government would not recognize the ownership of the Indians. Unscrupulous speculators of New York had fraudulently acquired title to these lands, and the helpless settlers were forced either to rent from the land-sharks or to seek other quarters. Many of them decided to emigrate again and to accept the invitation of Governor Keith of Pennsylvania. Led by friendly Indians, they journeyed three hundred miles along the Susquehanna River, and settled in the vicinity of Reading, Pa. (TULPEHOKEN, the place where Mill Creek flows into the Tulpehoken). News of their experience reaching Germany caused the great stream of emigration from that country to be diverted from New York to Pennsylvania. This is said to account for the fact that Pennsylvania is a stronger Lutheran state than New York.

At this particular time German immigration had reached a high water mark. It was largely caused by men called "NEWLANDERS" who had been in America and made it a business by glowing descriptions and golden promises to induce others to start for the new country. They were generally employed by Dutch financiers who made money out of emigration. The emi-

grants arriving in Holland by the river route had generally spent all their money on the trip. Penniless and friendless, they had to sign contracts printed in English (therefore unintelligible to them) which placed them altogether into the hands of these slave-dealers. Thus they embarked on ships which first made for British ports, where their papers were made out and freight was taken aboard. In crowded vessels and after a long journey, they arrived at Philadelphia. But no one was allowed to go ashore. They were landed in small groups and had to swear allegiance to the British Crown. After that only they who had paid for their passage were permitted to leave the ship. Those unable to do this were hired out (practically sold) to Dutch, English or German land-sharks, and had to work out their debt in long years of toil. This white slavery was instrumental in breaking up families. Some were forced into conditions of hardship, others found good positions. Eventually the law regulated these transactions, which, however, were not prohibited until 1817. The people sold were known as "Redemptioners."<sup>17</sup>

In the year 1750, according to Zinzendorf, there were about SIXTY THOUSAND GERMANS in Pennsylvania, the Lutherans outnumbering the Reformed two to one. We hear of the following CONGREGATIONS (preaching places): Philadelphia, Falckner's Swamp or New Hanover, Providence or Trappe, Germantown, Lancaster, New Holland or Earltown, Tulpehoken, Indianfield, Old Goshopen, Orange County.

This large territory was served by but FEW MINISTERS, of whom we mention Gerhard Henkel, Daniel Falckner (brother of Justus, § 3, 1) and Johann Caspar Stoever, Jun. No wonder RELIGIOUS DEGENERATION was soon in evidence. Zinzendorf tells us that blasphemers were accused of having "the Pennsylvania religion."

THE TWO STOEVERS, father and son, came to America in 1728. They were close relatives of Johann Philipp Fresenius, who took a warm interest in the founding of the Lutheran church of America.

JOHANN CASPAR STOEVER, SEN., who is supposed to have organized the noted St. Michael's congregation of Philadelphia (see § 3, 7; 4, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6; 6, 2), was ordained in 1732 as Lutheran pastor of Spottsylvania, Virginia (Madison County), where Henkel had preached before him. Stoever's annual salary consisted of three thousand pounds of tobacco. In 1734 the congregation sent him on a fund raising trip to Germany. He collected three thousand pounds of sterling for church building purposes and induced a theological student, by name of Klug, to be ordained for the ministry in Amer-

ica. On his way back to America Stoever died (1738). His body was buried in the sea.

Of greater interest is the name of his son, JOHANN CASPAR STOEVER. He was only twenty-one years old when he arrived in America (1728). Though not ordained, he performed many ministerial acts simply because at that time there was a scarcity of ordained ministers. In the year 1731 he went to Raritan, N. J., and asked the aging Daniel Falckner (§3,1) to ordain him. Falckner declined. Two years later he was ordained by Pastor Schulze, of Philadelphia, whose congregation he was to serve during the latter's trip to Germany. This was the SECOND LUTHERAN ORDINATION ON AMERICAN SOIL and took place in Providence in a stable which was part of the congregational property. Stoever traveled through the length and breadth of Pennsylvania, and wherever he found any scattered Lutherans, he organized them into congregations. Almost all the preaching places mentioned above were established by him, and whenever he performed any ministerial acts he recorded them in church registers, so that the historian of today has no difficulty in tracing his unceasing activity. He did not stand on good terms with Muhlenberg and his followers. Not until 1768 did he join the synod they organized (§ 4, 5). Although devoted to his work and a loyal Lutheran and in spite of his self-denying missionary trips, we discern in him a somewhat mercenary view of the ministerial office. He lacked the deep devotion, the passion for souls and the far-seeing eye of Muhlenberg, who ever urged beyond a mere local activity the greater goal of Lutheran organization (§ 4, 9). He was pastor at Lebanon, Pa., when he died suddenly in 1779 during a service of confirmation at the age of seventy-five years. His life was eventful, and revealed the strong features of the Lutheran pioneer. (See Dr. Schmauk, "The Luth. Church of Pennsylvania," I, p. 244-275.)

## **7. An Eventful Step.**

While thus the ministerial supply was at a very low ebb, THREE CONGREGATIONS JOINED in an enterprise which in God's wise Providence resulted in the immigration of a man whose personality has meant innumerable blessings for the Lutheran church of America. A DELEGATION was sent from PHILADELPHIA, PROVIDENCE (Trappe) and NEW HANOVER (Falckner's Swamp) to Pastor ZIEGENHAGEN, court-preacher at London,<sup>18</sup> and to Prof. Dr. A. G. Francke (son of August Hermann Francke) of Halle, for the purpose of raising

church building funds. More particularly they were to secure an able clergyman (1734). These negotiations extended over a long period. Francke and Ziegenhagen insisted that the question of SALARY would have to be settled; the delegates explained that this could not be done until the minister had entered the field. The case was argued for several years. But finally the authorities of Halle decided to act. They sent the very man needed for the work among the Lutherans of Pennsylvania, the Reverend HEINRICH MELCHIOR MUHLENBERG. This man was destined to become the real founder of the Lutheran Church of America. The reason why this sudden action was taken is partly due to the appearance on American soil of a spiritual leader who had accomplished great good in Germany, but whose work wrought confusion among the Lutherans of Pennsylvania.

### **8. This was Count Von Zinzendorf.**

Having been exiled from Saxony, he had decided to use the time of his expatriation to do missionary work among the Indians of America. Thus engaged, he heard of the spiritual needs of the Pennsylvania Lutherans. He made Germantown his head-quarters, and thence he traversed the country in every direction. He met in a conference (1742) with four Seventh-day Baptists (of Ephrata), some other Baptists and Mennonites, some Lutherans and Reformed. His aim was to unite them all. He attracted the attention of the Philadelphia Lutherans. They called him and he accepted. He preached for them, administered the sacraments, and accepting their call he became their pastor. He gave up his title as a Count, called himself Herr von Thuernstein (after one of his estates), and assumed the title "Evangelical Lutheran Inspector and Pastor of Philadelphia." At the same time he looked after the Reformed, ordained a pastor and prepared a catechism for them just as he had previously published Luther's Catechism for the Lutherans. Altogether he held eight CONFERENCES FOR THE PURPOSE OF UNITING THE VARIOUS CHURCHES. But the more he labored, the worse the confusion. The Reformed Pastor Boehme warned against him in a special pamphlet of some ninety pages. Zinzendorf finally realized that in order to attain results he would have to organize his followers. He founded the Moravian Brotherhood. Even today in certain parts of Pennsylvania — Bethlehem, for instance — we can find Moravian congregations whose origin can be traced back to the work of Zinzendorf.

The theologians of Halle were determined opponents of Zinzendorf. While they recognized the fact that he was the god-child of Spener, the pupil of Francke, educated in the school of Pietism, the Halle School of theology, though not ultra-conservatively Lutheran, feared Zinzendorf's way of confusing earnest souls. Moreover, they did not wish to be held responsible by their opponents (during the Pietistic controversies) for the eccentricities of their pupil. Not without apprehension they had seen him enter upon his foreign mission, and when they heard that, instead of preaching to the Indians, he was assuming leadership among the Pennsylvania Germans, they hastened to comply with the wishes of the American delegation and sent Muhlenberg.

## 9. Review.

Looking back over the history of Lutheranism thus far recorded, we notice one outstanding fact — that, while scattered congregations were starting here and there, there was no sign, excepting among the Swedes, of a general organization.

The mission of this period was to GATHER LUTHERAN FAMILIES INTO CONGREGATIONS, and this mission had been partly accomplished. In the affairs of the Swedes the home church took an active interest from the beginning. In the case of the emigrants of the Palatinate, Kocherthal, aided by England, had done this work. The Salzburgers were taken care of by the German Lutherans and the English government. But a great number had to help themselves. Individuals got together, and appealing to their native land, tried to secure ministers. Since clergymen were scarce, spiritual vagabonds and men of the lowest character took advantage of the situation.

A small number of congregations came into existence (50 or more in the year 1740). But there was no thought of incorporating them into a larger body. The TENDENCY WAS TOWARD DISPERSION AND CM EVENTUAL ABSORPTION OF THESE SCATTERED FLOCKS BY DENOMINATIONAL CHURCHES. Zinzendorf, though personally devout, saw a chance of building up his own church over the ruins of Lutheranism.

It was most essential for the Lutheran Church that the scattered congregations should be gathered into a larger organization, that they should rally around the banner of the Lutheran faith, and that they should be supplied with worthy and reliable ministers. The time had come for the ORGANIZATION



OF THE CHURCH. This supreme duty of the second period of Lutheran development was clearly recognized and admirably performed by — Heinrich Melchior Muhlenberg.

---

1. He then entered the service of Sweden, and until his death (1641) was the first governor of New Sweden. Here he made use of his experience (acquired in New Netherland) of dealing with the Indians, and secured a large percentage of the fur trade for the Swedes, much to the irritation of the avaricious Dutch.↵
2. Isaac Joques, or Jogues, was a French missionary of the province of Quebec. Two years after his visit to New Amsterdam he was killed by the Indians.↵
3. An entry in the records of Albany, dated May 20, 1658, reads as follows: "Lutheran pastor and some bad women were deported to Holland." Ecclesiastical Records of New York, I, 423. Colonial Record of N. Y., XIV, 417. But according to a letter in the Ecclesiastical Records (I, p. 433) we know that Gutwasser managed to get around this deportation. In the spring of the following year (1659) he was still there. Afterwards, however, he was arrested and sent home on the "Bruynvisch" (the Brown Fish) sailing for Amsterdam.↵
4. The church was erected on the present site of Battery Park.↵
5. About his work, Dr. Nicum has discovered valuable material in the archives of Holland. When these archives are published, we may get some new light on this period, hitherto obscured.↵
6. We are speaking of pastors who came for purposes of permanent activity; otherwise we should have to mention the Rev. Rasmus Jensen, who arrived 1619 in the Hudson Bay as chaplain of a Danish expedition, which under command of Captain Munk took charge of the land for the Danish crown (Schmauk, "Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania," I, 17).↵
7. The Rev. John Campanius, whom we shall shortly mention, informs us that German immigrants, consisting of fifty colonists, arrived on the ship "Der Vogel Greif" to take part in the founding of the Delaware colony. Gustavus Adolphus, even a few days before his death at Luetzen, characterized his American project as the "pearl of his kingdom"

- and begged the Protestant rulers to permit their subjects to take part in it. Governor Printz, who was later commissioned for that purpose, was a German nobleman himself, a native of Holstein, who induced some fifty-four German families, mostly Pomeranians, to follow him across the sea. (See L. P. Henninghausen, “The first Immigrants to North America,” pp. 160-1&2).↵
8. See the humorous description of this event in Washington Irving, “Knickerbocker’s History of New York.”↵
  9. Thirty Bibles, six books of sermons, one hundred books of worship, one hundred hymnals, two books on Ministerial Acts, one hundred Larger and Smaller Catechisms, four hundred primers, five hundred Indian Catechisms by Campanius arrived as presents from the king.↵
  10. We should note, however, that the Swedish and Dutch Lutheran churches looked after their immigrant countrymen, while the German Lutheran State churches left this care in charge of charitable societies.↵
  11. See also § 4, 9.↵
  12. The churching of women was a service to which the Swedes adhered with great tenacity.↵
  13. The following prayer is added to the record of a baptism: “O Lord God, let the name of this infant be inscribed in the book of life and never be erased therefrom! Through Jesus Christ. Amen!” After baptizing a black child, he comments: “O Lord, merciful Father, who art no respecter of persons, but considerest acceptable among all people those who do right and fear Thee, clothe this child with the white robe of righteousness, and keep it in the same through Jesus Christ, the Redeemer and Savior of all mankind. Amen.” How appropriate, too, the baptismal prayer for five infants born on mid-ocean to immigrant mothers from the Rhenish Palatinate (§ 3, 3): “O Lord, Almighty God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, whose wondrous power has safely called these children into life even amid the storms of the sea and has guided them safely to the shore, lead them also through the tempestuous sea of this world until they safely arrive in the harbor of the new heavenly Jerusalem where all tyranny and all false and tyrannical mercy shall have an end, through Jesus Christ, Amen.”↵
  14. Add to this the horrible mismanagement of princes who imitated the extravagant life of the French court — at the expense of the country. A

disastrous failure of crops and a winter (1709) of such unusual severity that birds froze in the air filled the measure of misery to overflowing.↵

15. From this journey he returned in 1710. Rev. Geo. J. M. Ketner writes at the bicentennial anniversary of St. Paul's Luth. Church at West Camp: "Unwillingly they bound themselves for years to the British Governor, Robt. Hunter, to pay for their voyage by making tar for the British navy. Persecuted by Hunter and fleeced by Livingstone, their sufferings from 1710-1712 were indescribable. The pine trees at West Camp were not the kind for making naval stores. The governor kept clamoring for tar, and the Palatines said,"Give us the right kind of trees." It was making brick without straw. In a howling wilderness, in log cabins and bark huts, with scant clothes and little food, they suffered and shivered in the winter's cold, and struggled to keep soul and body together. The cries of their little ones, the tears of their wives made the strong men weep. Governor Hunter disputed the titles to their homes and persecuted them incessantly. So neglected were they at one time by the man who was sworn to be their protector that much against their wills they had to throw themselves on the mercy of the Indians, or starve. Some, weary of this intolerable slavery, cut their way to Schoharie (of. § 3, 6). Others forged their way to the head-waters of the Susquehanna. The majority, however, remained at West Camp. It was not until 1717 that the awful traces of poverty began to disappear among them. The orphan children and those of surviving widows, whose husbands died in that awful voyage of 1710, were by the inexorable Hunter apprenticed among strangers. Some were never seen again. Think what this means! No wonder they complained and started a mutiny. The only place where for the time being they forgot their sorrows and wrongs, was in the little log church where pastor Kocherthal comforted them with such consolations which the holy religion of Jesus Christ alone could give."↵
16. In this second edition we will have to deny ourselves the telling of the charming story which Strobel relates regarding the influence of the Salzburgers on the Wesleys. The historicity of the beautiful story is doubtful. Strobel admits that Wesley mentions only "Moravians," but claims that this is due to the fact that Wesley did not know the difference between the Moravians and the Salzburgers. Dr. A. G. Voigt,

President of the Seminary of the United Synod of the South in Columbia, S. C, wrote us: “I once made a careful comparison of Urlsperger’s *Nachrichten* and Wesley’s *Journal*, and found no evidence that there were Salzburgers on the ship on which Wesley was.”↩

17. See *Hallische Nachrichten*: Friederich Kapp, *Gesch. der Deutschen in New York*.↩

18. See Germann’s *Autobiography*, pages 37-104.↩

# The Second Period. Congregations Organized Into Synods.

DURING THE PERIOD which we are now to study the scattered flocks were gathered into organic unity. A part of the Lutheran Church became organized under Muhlenberg. It furnished the foundation for ultimate success. It absorbed the Dutch church and later the congregations of Berkenmeyer. It would have assimilated the Swedish churches, if the organizing forces had been large enough. With the advent of the Pennsylvania Ministerium, the Lutheran Church steps out of the stage of scattered congregations into the stage of a systematized ecclesiastical body. This organization, in its final analysis, was the work of the German mother-church. She supplied the largest number of men and also their financial support. Without her assistance the Lutheran Church of America would have been lost beyond redemption. It is to be regretted that the War of Independence terminated this relation with the mother-church before the American offspring had grown strong enough to look entirely after its own interests. The new development created new problems which were only partially solved in this period. We refer to the question of language, the looking after new territory and the training of competent ministers.

## 2. Muhlenberg And The Founding Of The First Lutheran Synod.

### § 4. Muhlenberg and His Work.

#### 1. Muhlenberg's Call and Arrival.

Heinrich Melchior Muhlenberg (born at EIMBECK, Hanover, Sept. 6, 1711), descended from a family which had lost title and estate during the Thirty Years' War. Under such disadvantages he had received his preparatory education, struggling all along the line. As a student of theology, he entered the University of GOETTINGEN, where he graduated in 1738. Having come in contact with the influences of Halle which decided his future career, he intended to be sent as missionary to East India. But for the time being this plan did not seem to be feasible, and he accepted (August, 1739) a call to Grosshennersdorf, not far from Herrnhut, the estate of Zinzendorf. On Sept 6, 1741, he paid a VISIT TO FRANCKE, who asked him whether he would accept a call to the three congregations of Pennsylvania: Philadelphia. Providence and New Hanover (§ 3, 7). Muhlenberg, considering this a divine call, accepted. "The dear spouse of Dr. Francke was so elated that she made a present to the poor deacon in the form of a Schlafrock" (a long, loose coat used in Europe for comfort at home). On Dec. 17th he went to London, where he prepared himself for his new work by taking a two months' course in English. During his ocean trip, lasting 110 days, passengers and crew were transformed into a congregation, which Muhlenberg served with wonderful zeal both as pastor and preacher. He LANDED AT CHARLESTON Sept. 23, 1742, and thence visited Ebenezer, the home of the Salzburgers (§ 3, 5). After a short stay of eight days, he proceeded to Pennsylvania. Taking leave, he sang: "So lasst uns denn dem lieben Herrn mit Leib und Seel' nachgehen; und wohlgemut, getrost und gern bei Ihm in Leiden stehen." ("We offer, O beloved Lord, body and soul to Thee; made strong by Thy assuring word, e'en in Gethsemane").

After a journey of the most intense hardship, his clothes soaked with water, while he lay ill among cursing fellow-patients, he ARRIVED AT PHILADELPHIA, Nov. 25, 1742. Here Zinzendorf claimed to be pastor of the congrega-

tion (§ 3, 8), but no welcome was given to the arriving minister. A meeting was called with Zinzendorf as chairman, during which Muhlenberg was questioned, in a manner very humiliating to him as to the legitimacy of the call which had been extended to him through Ziegenhagen in London. But the calm dignity of the new minister, who convinced his hearers that he was the called pastor, soon indicated that the time of Zinzendorf's control of the situation was terminated. Shortly afterwards (about New Year, 1743) Zinzendorf returned to Europe.<sup>1</sup>

## **2. Muhlenberg as a Missionary.**

We can only touch upon his self-sacrificing and far-reaching activity as a missionary. The matter has been treated more fully by Jacobs and Graebner. There was not much of a salary. One congregation contributed a horse, another nothing;, and a third barely enough to pay rent. MUHLENBERG'S MEETING PLACE at Philadelphia was a carpenter shop, at Providence a barn, and at New Hanover a half-finished church. Journeying over almost impassable roads, broken in places by rivers without bridges, he was not infrequently in danger of death. For Muhlenberg did not confine, himself to the three congregations. Sympathy with the orphaned Lutherans caused him to make missionary journeys in every direction. In this way he came to GERMANTOWN, TULPEHOKEN, LANCASTER, FREDERICKS, YORK, etc. At these places he gathered those hungering for the Word in open fields. The services were usually of long duration. First the children were catechised; baptisms followed; these were succeeded by a sermon and finally by the Lord's Supper. Muhlenberg's zeal was indefatigable. Outside of the work mentioned he undertook the building of churches, visited the scattered families, settled controversies, reconciled contending parties and made his influence felt in every direction. Wherever he went, doors were opened to him. He possessed in an extraordinary degree the grace of finding "favor with men." With a bearing marked by a combination of natural dignity and genuine Christian humility, there was united a character to which learning, executive ability, and deep piety lent an irresistible charm, so that he was gladly received on all sides as leader.

**Annotation.**

The congregation of Tulpehoken, mentioned above and in previous chapters (§ 3, 6), had been handicapped since 1734, by internal confusion, which was not terminated until under the guiding hand of Muhlenberg it resulted in a solution favorable to the Lutheran Church. While it is not our intention to give detailed accounts of any one congregation, we wish to make an exception of this church, because its history gives a vivid picture of the Lutheran situation at the time of Muhlenberg's arrival. In his work, "The Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania", Dr. Schmauk, beginning with page 485, devotes no less than 90 pages to the description of this picture. The story is characteristic of American church life and typical of many localities where it has been repeated with more or less variation.

Conrad Weiser, Jun. (§ 3, 4), who came into this vicinity from the Schoharie Valley (1729), was serving as "reader" in a church recently (1727) built by the settlers. He had received his religious tendencies through the literature of Spener and Francke, and for that reason did not readily assimilate the formal churchmanship of Johann Caspar Stoeber (§ 3, 6), who also had come into the neighborhood. In behalf of the congregation Weiser tried to secure a minister from Halle by appealing to Ziegenhagen (§ 3, 8) and Francke. This call was entrusted to the care of a man by the name of Leutbecker, a school teacher and formerly a tailor, who had been converted under Boehme, Courtpreacher at London, and had been sent to America for missionary purposes. This "worthy" brother soon informed the people that the delegated pastor had died at sea, and he succeeded in getting himself elected. Weiser suspected fraud, but the majority of the church members sided with Leutbecker. This caused Weiser to withdraw (1732) from the congregation.

Now he came in contact with Peter Miller, the talented but fanatical Reformed pastor of the locality, together with whom he fell under the spell of the eccentric Sabbatarian Baptist preachers of Ephrata. He was rebaptized by Beissel, moved into seclusion, burned Luther's Catechism and other religious books that had hitherto been his guide, and became religiously unbalanced. Meanwhile the Lutheran congregation of Tulpehoken was contaminated by the influence of Ephrata. Soon, however, a reaction set in among the Lutheran converts. Weiser emerged from his seclusion and entered upon his well known political career (§ 3, 4).

The opponents of Leutbecker now extended a call to Johann Caspar Stoeber, who had gained a certain influence in this neighborhood by perform-



ing ministerial acts which Leutbecker had declined. Thus the name of Stoever is closely interwoven with the troubles in Tulpehocken, which extended from 1735 to 1743. Stoever first tried to get possession of the church building. But the opposition put a lock on the door. Stoever's followers broke the lock, and eventually forced the Leutbecker faction to hold services in the parsonage. The question of property rights overshadowed all others. Discovering that the transaction of business, dating back to the Indians, did not convey a clear title to his people, Leutbecker legalized his claims, and attached to the church door a legally protected lock. But Stoever's followers sawed a hole through the wooden wall of the building, and went in and held a communion service. Leutbecker's life was threatened, and so his parsonage was guarded day and night. He died in 1739. The funeral service was conducted by the Moravian Bishop Spangenberg, who had been in Pennsylvania for two years and had occasionally visited at Tulpehocken.

At this juncture Conrad Weiser stepped into the foreground. He had outgrown his Ephrata follies, and was now not only engaged in practical work, but was an officeholder of some importance. He aimed to unite the warring factions. He went to Germantown and induced Zinzendorf, who had just arrived and was holding his first conference (1742; § 3, 8), to come to Tulpehocken. The Count preached a sermon on the second Article of the Apostles' Creed, in which he proved that he was a good Lutheran. Upon leaving, he promised to secure for them a pastor from Halle, and received from the congregation papers containing a formal call. It was agreed that Pastor Buettner, who had just been ordained by Zinzendorf, should serve in the interim and without any salary. Buettner preached his first sermon on the subject of "Peace", but six weeks had hardly elapsed, when he wrote a letter to Stoever asking him who had ordained him, before whom he had passed his examinations, whether those who ordained him had authority to do so and whether he had any right to organize a church council. Soon thereafter Zinzendorf held "a religious conference of the children of God" at Philadelphia, appointing himself, Buettner, Pyrlaeus and Bryzelius as "the consistory of the Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania". The first action taken by this body was the suspension of Johann Caspar Stoever, who, however, continued his work without interruption. Stoever's followers, in fact, built a new church that was to be Lutheran in principle, and called it Christ Church (1743). For some unknown reason, Stoever did not lay the cornerstone, but

it was done by a certain Valentin Kraft. The latter was not a success, and stayed but a short time.

Not long after this cornerstone laying, Muhlenberg entered the field and exerted his helpful and organizing influence. He came to Tulpehocken in 1743, visiting at the home of Weiser, whose daughter he married two years later. At Muhlenberg's suggestion the congregation called Tobias Wagner, who proved a failure, and afterwards Nicholas Kurtz, under whom all storms subsided.

The Leutbecker faction, served by Zinzendorf's followers, also built a new church (1744), and called a number of ministers in rapid succession. But its membership diminished. It finally died when their Pastor (Brueckner) declined to officiate at the funeral of one of the church members, and would not open the doors of the church to Pastor Kurtz. This action caused another split among the members, some justifying their pastor, others condemning him.

A great majority remembered that they were Lutherans and not Moravians. Conrad Weiser informed them that the property had been conveyed to the Lutheran Church, that Zinzendorf had only acquired it by fraudulently representing himself as a Lutheran and that whatever part of the members would adhere to Lutheranism were entitled to the possession of the building. He demanded that the keys of the church be handed over to the Lutheran element, and when his request was refused, changed the old lock for a new one. This ended Moravian activity in Tulpehocken. Kurtz preached in both churches, which were about two miles apart.

This is an interesting bit of local church history. Dr. Schmauk, in his "History of the Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania from 1638-1820," has written it up in a most interesting manner with the aid of much historical material in the form of letters that have been preserved. They show us in a touching way all the particulars of these troubles, the movings of the human heart in its struggle for the right, and also its errors and failings.

We also gather from it the fact that Conrad Weiser, after temporary lapses, returned to Lutheranism. Those are in error who have claimed that this eminent man of affairs, the father-in-law of Muhlenberg, died as a member of some non-Lutheran church.

### **3. The Halle Reports.**

The "HALLISCHE NACHRICHTEN" (Halle Reports), which Muhlenberg and his associates sent regularly to the fathers in Halle, give a very clear view of their activity. These reports were printed from time to time, and created such a general interest that a second edition was soon called for. It was published, together with valuable geographical and historical details, by Dr. W. J. Mann, Dr. B. M. Schmucker and Dr. W. Germann.

This volume was not finished, however. Dr. F. Wischan editing the unfinished part without annotations. Dr. C. W. Schaefer's English translation has not been published on account of financial difficulties.

On reading Muhlenberg's articles in these Halle Reports, many clergymen in the Fatherland were moved to cross the sea to become missionaries among the Lutherans. How important this was may be gathered from the statistics on the rapid increase of immigration; in 1749 twelve thousand German emigrants arrived at Philadelphia. The supervision over the congregations up to the time of the War of Independence was in the hands of the Francke Institute at Halle and of Dr. Ziegenhagen of London. They endorsed Muhlenberg's propositions and gave general advice.

#### **4. Additional Workers from Halle.**

Additional workers arrived from Halle, notably Rev. Peter Brunnholtz and the two catechists, Johann Nic. Kurtz and Joh. H. Schaum. An agreement was made according to which Brunnholtz with Schaum took charge of the congregations in Philadelphia and Germantown, while Muhlenberg, with Kurtz as his assistant, confined their labors to the congregations in Providence and New Hanover. Other helpers sent from Halle were Pastors Handschuh and Hartwig. Later we find the names of Gerok (from Wuertemberg), Eager (ancestor to Professor Baugher of Gettysburg), Heinzelmann, Schultze, Helmuth, Schmidt, Voigt, Krug, Weygardt, Krauss, Schrenk, etc.

#### **5. The Origin of the Pennsylvania Synod.**

To counteract the influence of Zinzendorf and his followers and also to get rid of unworthy ministers, who sought to force themselves upon the congregations, the founding of an ecclesiastical organization was becoming more and more necessary. As early as 1644 TWO INFLUENTIAL LAYMEN OF PHILADELPHIA, Kock of the Swedish and Schleidorn of the German congregation, thought of organizing a Swedish-German synod; but this attempt failed be-

cause the Swedish Pastor Nyberg insisted that such an organization should include the followers of Zinzendorf. To this Muhlenberg objected. However, Aug. 26, 1748, on the occasion of a DOUBLE CELEBRATION (the dedication of the newly built St. Michael's Church and the ordination of Candidate Kurtz) six clergymen (Muhlenberg, Hartwig, of New York, Brunnholtz, Handschuh, Kurtz and the Swedish Provost, Sandin) and twenty-four laymen, representing ten Philadelphia congregations, organized the Pennsylvania Synod.<sup>2</sup> We find, indeed, as yet no formal organization and no constitution, but from this time on those who composed the synod were regarded as "United Pastors" and their parishes as "United Congregations"<sup>3</sup> who held seven conferences up to the year 1754. After that we notice a LULL in the synodical activity, no convention being recorded between 1754 and 1760. One reason for this was probably the fact that Muhlenberg, who was the soul of all these enterprises, was engaged in work around New York (Raritan and New-York), where his organizing talents were required.<sup>4</sup> It also seems that the founders had gotten somewhat DISCOURAGED. Their vision grew dim in the presence of towering tides of immigration for whose spiritual welfare Germany did but little and whose future was endangered by ministerial frauds.

Provost Dr. Wrangel (§ 2) caused the RESUMPTION OF SYNODICAL WORK. He called on Muhlenberg, and invited him to take part in a Swedish conference. Muhlenberg accepted, and received so many helpful suggestions at this meeting that he wrote to the different ministers (Sept. 24, 1760), inviting them to attend a PASTORAL CONFERENCE to be held at Providence, Oct. 19th and 20th. We should not underestimate this conference, for it signifies the revival of synodical interests after a period of inactivity. Even here we do not discover any kind of a constitution; but we note that a President is chosen from year to year. We find the name "The Annual Ministerial Conference of the United Swedish and Lutheran Ministers." Indeed, in 1781, in a minute-book of that date, we find the text of a CONSTITUTION, which had no doubt existed for several years. This constitution, which has served as a prototype for so many synodical constitutions of later times, is printed by Jacobs on p, 261. Here the name of the synod is given as "The Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of North America." Later the name was changed into "The German Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjoining States." Not before 1882 was the word German dropped.

## **6. First Congregational Constitution.**

The first congregational constitution of the Lutheran Church of America is also the gift of Muhlenberg. The framing of this constitution was, in fact, a matter of far-reaching importance. Dr. Mann avers that if Muhlenberg had done nothing but compose this constitution, he would be entitled to the lasting gratitude of the Lutheran Church. It was used by the ministers who organized churches in Pennsylvania and adjacent states; it served as a foundation for the congregational constitution of the General Synod, and was thus the basis for the congregational constitutions of all synods until 1840 (cf. § 35). In this constitution (see Graebner. 484- 493) we have the finished PRODUCT of twenty-eight years' (1734-1762) experience. It was written to meet the needs of St. Michael's Church, Philadelphia, and bore the marks of mature study and observation. Muhlenberg incorporated into it, not only what he had personally observed as a guide and adviser of various congregations, but also the EXPERIENCES OF THE SWEDISH AND DUTCH LUTHERANS. During a solemn service and after fervent prayer it was submitted to the people.

## **7. A Common Liturgy.**

A COMMON LITURGY to be used by all ministers had already been thought of by Muhlenberg and his coworkers during the founding of the first synod (1748). This order of service was submitted to the synod in 1754 and forwarded to Halle for approval. It seems to have been drawn from a number of Saxon and North-German liturgies which were used in those parts of Germany where Muhlenberg had lived and worked.<sup>5</sup> The REVISED EDITION of this liturgy, A. D. 1786 (See Fritschel. I. 178-187). is to be considered a deterioration from the standpoint of Lutheran liturgies.

## **8. Doctrinal Views of Muhlenberg and his Coworkers.**

Dr. Jacobs has correctly stated the case when he says that the pietistic tendencies of these men gave a certain color to their Lutheranism, but did not displace it. They were TRUE LUTHERANS in preaching and practice. Says Dr. Mann: "Their Lutheranism did not differ from the Lutheran orthodoxy of the preceding period, in the matter of doctrine, but to an extent in the manner of applying it. It was orthodoxy practically vitalized. They were less polemical and theoretical. They actualized their own Lutheran convic-

tions through a noble, exemplary life and service. Their pietism was truly Lutheran piety, a warm-hearted, devout, active, practical Lutheranism.” (Dr. W. J. Mann’s “Theses on the Lutheranism of the Fathers of the Church in this Country,” First Free Lutheran Diet, p. 281-283). There was no departing from Lutheran standards. That is proved by their whole activity as recorded in the “Hallische Nachrichten.” To his accusers Muhlenberg truthfully replied: “I ask Satan and all his lying spirits to prove anything against me which is not in harmony with the teaching of the apostles or of our Symbolical Books. I have stated frequently that there is neither fault nor error nor any kind of defect in our evangelical doctrines, founded on the teaching of the prophets and the apostles, and set forth in our Symbolical Books.”

It is true that they exchanged pulpits with ministers of the denominations. Muhlenberg at times preached for the Episcopalians, and in turn invited the Episcopal pastor Peters, Whitefield, the evangelist, and the Reformed Pastor Schlatter to occupy his pulpit. At Philadelphia, he preached the funeral sermon for the Reformed Pastor Steiner. Whitefield was invited to the assembled Ministerium of Philadelphia (1763) and took part in their service. At the consecration of Zion’s Lutheran Church of Philadelphia the whole non-Lutheran clergy of that city was invited. Episcopal ministers delivered addresses, and Muhlenberg thanked them publicly for the part they had taken. But all of this, says Jacobs, is no evidence that these men had unionistic tendencies. Their uncompromising attitude toward Zinzendorf and his followers clearly shows their fundamental opposition to a church union based on doctrinal indifferentism. They disliked Zinzendorf, not merely on account of his church politics, but also because of the unionistic principles which he openly proclaimed, if they associated with members of other churches, they did so because they admired loyalty of each to their respective Confessions and wished to emphasize the fundamental truths they held in common. “However, they never denied their confessional point of view. Everywhere and at all times they taught and preached as true Lutherans. They never for friendship’s sake would be silent concerning a Lutheran doctrine or deny the full consequences of the teachings of their confessions.”<sup>6</sup>

A UNION WITH THE EPISCOPALIANS seems, it is true, to have been considered. Not only Swedish and German Lutherans, but the Episcopalians sought such a union. Muhlenberg and Wrangel believed that there were no serious differences of doctrine. We cannot account for this strange delusion,

but it is partly explained by the cordial relationship that had been sustained by the Episcopalians and partly by the fact that the royal family of England was Lutheran (§ 3, 7) and that the only two recognized churches of England were the Lutheran and the Episcopalian. These considerations probably clouded the view of Muhlenberg and his coworkers concerning the Episcopal Church.<sup>7</sup>

It must be remembered also that Lutheran ministers frequently went to London to receive the Episcopal ordination (for instance Peter, oldest son of Muhlenberg, who later was Major General of the army). This, however, was not done because the Episcopal ordination was regarded by them as the only true ordination, but because they were doing work in the Southern States where only the Episcopal ordination was recognized by the law.

## **9. The Death of Muhlenberg.**

At the time of Muhlenberg's Death the Pennsylvania Synod included in round numbers forty ministers. As he was kept confined to his house at the Trappe (Providence) on account of physical weakness, he held a service in his own house every Sunday with his family. His sickness developed into dropsy, and during the last weeks he had days of great suffering. He died on Oct. 7, 1787, with this prayer on his lips: "Mach End, O Herr, mach Ende," etc. All the congregations of the synod held memorial services in his honor, and called to mind the blessings which the Lutheran Church of America had received from God through this prince in Israel. A sermon was delivered in New York by Dr. Kunze, which was printed by order of the church council and distributed among the members of the congregation. The same was done with a sermon delivered at Philadelphia by Dr. Helmuth in memory of the deceased. The GRAVE OF MUHLENBERG is near the historic church of New Providence (Trappe).

At the conclusion of this chapter we ask: Why was Muhlenberg superior to his co-workers and why is he generally named the PATRIARCH OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH OF AMERICA? The answer is found in his favorite motto: "Ecclesia plantanda" (a church must be planted). While other ministers were pre-eminently parochial clergymen and specialized in work for the narrower circle, Muhlenberg's eye took in the whole Lutheran mission field of America, and he was conscious of laying the foundations for a great future. In this sense he created the first congregational constitution and the

first liturgy. For this task he was well endowed and singularly fitted. He possessed a thorough education, was a man of large horizons, eminently practical, a man of fine tact. With all his energy he was moderate, and possessed talents for organization such as are only found in great men. And all these natural gifts were consecrated by a living faith in Jesus Christ, a faith that was sound to the core.

To sum up: Muhlenberg was a born leader; the gift of Almighty God to the Lutheran Church of America at a time when organization was the supreme need of the hour and the Church was in need of such a leader. History bears witness that he nobly fulfilled his mission — the organization of individual congregations into the larger Church. The further development of his work and the task of extending his plan, together with the problems arising from such a task, pertain to another period of this history.

- 
1. In Dr. W. Germann's "Autobiography" we have the questioning of Muhlenberg before Zinzendorf and his followers. These questions and replies explain to us the decided antagonism of Muhlenberg to Zinzendorf and his adherents.↵
  2. The protocol contains an explanation why other ministers supposed to be Lutherans (Tob. Wagner and J. Caspar Stoeber) were not invited. They were accused of having called the ministers of the synod pietists, of not having been properly called, of having refused to accept the common liturgy, and of not being responsible to any authority for their conduct in the ministry.↵
  3. Not until 1792 did the congregational delegates receive the right to vote. Up to that time the clergymen simply received reports and applications from the lay delegates, but reserved the final decision for themselves. At this the laymen took no offense.↵
  4. In New York City he served an old Dutch church, which, on account of the language question, was in danger of disruption. Muhlenberg preached here in Dutch, German and English. At this time he also came in contact with Berkenmeyer, who, however, was not desirous of having fellowship with a minister from Halle (§ 3, 4).↵
  5. The Lueneburg Liturgy (1643) which was used at his home in Eimbeck; the Calenberg service (1569) which he knew at Goettingen dur-



- ing his university days; the Brandenburg-Magdeburg arrangement of 1739 with which he became familiar in Halle; and the Saxon order of service of 1712 which he used as pastor in Grosshennersdorf.↵
6. See Gottfried Fritschel, “Die Praxis der Vaeter und Gruender der Lutherischen Kirche Amerikas bei der Verwaltung des heiligen Abendmahls,” Brobst’s Monatshefte, XI, 12. Muhlenberg had solemnly pledged himself in his ordination vow before the theological faculty of the university of Leipzig, Aug. 24, 1739, which committed to him the office of “teaching the Gospel and administering the Sacraments according to the rule given in the writings of the Prophets and Apostles, the sum of which is contained in these three symbols, the Apostolic, Nicene and Athanasian, in the Augsburg Confession laid before Emperor Charles V., A. D. 1530, in the Apology of the same, in Dr. Luther’s Large and Small Catechisms, in the Articles subscribed to in the Smalcald Convention, and in the Formula of Concord. He solemnly promised that he would propose to his hearers what would be conformed and consentient to these writings and that he would never depart from the sense which they give.” (Dr. W. J. Mann, “The Conservatism of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg” in Lutheran Church Review, January, 1888.)↵
  7. Rudman, the Swede, of whom we read in §§ 1 and 2 and who was considered a more consistent Lutheran, served the Episcopalians in Philadelphia. Bjoerk and Sandel, Swedish ministers, exchanged pulpits with the Episcopalians. An explanation of this is offered by Provost Sandel (see Graebner, p. 118): “Although there is a slight difference between them and us regarding the Lord’s Supper, the Bishop would not allow this difference to interfere with the general peace. We cannot be drawn into any argument. Neither do we touch upon these matters when we preach to them, nor do they try to convert our people to their belief. We call each other brethren and live peaceably together. They control the government; we are under them; it is sufficient that they are such pleasant associates, and that they make no attempt to proselyte among our people. They call our church ‘the sister Church of the Church of England.’ So we live fraternally together. May God continue to grant this.”↵

### **3. Further Development Of Muhlenberg's Organization.**

#### **§ 5. Origin of Other Synods.**

##### **1. The New York Ministerium.**

Not until the Dutch congregations located on the banks of the Hudson were a hundred years old and the Palatinate churches had existed for half a century, do we hear of any synod in the territory of New York. This may be partly accounted for by the fact that the stream of German immigration had been diverted from New York to Pennsylvania (§ 3, 6), and partly by the exclusive tendencies of the Berkenmeyer circle, which would not enter into fellowship with the missionaries from Halle (§ 3, 4). At last, in the year 1763. the Rev. F. A. C. Muhlenberg, a son of the patriarch, invited a number of clergymen and representatives of different congregations to attend a meeting in the German Lutheran Christ Church of New York for the purpose of organizing a second synod. The matter, however, does not seem to have succeeded, for no synodical gathering is on record until 1786. when, at the instance of the Rev. Dr. Kunze,<sup>1</sup> and the occasion of a Lutheran Church dedication at Albany, the FIRST CONFERENCE attended by three ministers and their CONGREGATIONAL DELEGATES was held. Eight pastors who were engaged in work in this territory did not come. Before another meeting was called six years elapsed. But after that, developments were more noticeable. Another decade gives us a synod consisting of thirteen ministers. Dr. Kunze, in whom survived the spirit of Muhlenberg, died in 1807, and the New York Ministerium was controlled for twenty years by the eminently gifted, though rationalistic DR. QUITMAN (§ 6, 3), under whose leadership it took part in the founding of the General Synod.

##### **2. The North Carolina Synod.**

The North Carolina Synod, mother of all the Southern synods, was organized by four clergymen (C. A. G. Storch and Paul Henkel among them) and fourteen lay delegates at Salisbury, N. C, in 1803. Other congregations

of North Carolina soon united with them. Three came in 1810, nine from Tennessee in 1811, and five from Virginia in 1812. From 1810 on, this synod appointed yearly a missionary who was to look after newly arriving immigrants. These missionaries visited North Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, South Carolina and even came to Ohio. All this took place before the rupture which resulted in the organization of the Synod of Tennessee (§ 5, 5).

### **3. The Joint Synod of Ohio.**

The Joint Synod of Ohio, which already existed in 1820 when the question of a General Synod was being agitated, had its beginning as far back as 1812. In that year we hear of a number of Ohio pastors who were then still members of the Pennsylvania Synod. (Rev. Paul Henkel had traversed, as itinerant preacher, the whole Ohio territory in a two-wheeled cart.) Without receiving the requested permission from the mother-synod, these fourteen ministers organized the Joint Synod of Ohio, which is today so influential, on the 14th of September. 1818. at SOMERSET, OHIO. (See also § 28.)

### **4. The Synod of Maryland and Virginia.**

The Synod of Maryland and Virginia was organized Oct. 11, 1820, with the consent of the mother-synod of Pennsylvania. Among the ten clergymen of which it consisted we mention Drs. Dan. Kurtz, D. F. Schaeffer and Chas. P. Krauth, Sen.

### **5. The Tennessee Synod**

The Tennessee Synod was founded at Cove Creek, Tenn., July 17, 1820. It was a branch of the Synod of North Carolina. The founders of this organization (among whom were Philip and Daniel Henkel, sons of Paul Henkel), could not agree with their synodical brethren concerning the question of THE LICENSING OF CLERGYMEN. They also objected strenuously to the forming of a General Synod, a plan which was warmly advocated by the Synod of North Carolina. For a long time afterwards the synod of Tennessee was ANTAGONISTIC TO THE GENERAL SYNOD. It distinguished itself by being the only synod at that time which stood squarely on the Augsburg Confession. Among its prominent members were the Henkels, the Stierwalds and the Foxes.

## Annotation.

As branch synods of the Synod of Tennessee, which was never large, we should name: 1. The SYNOD OF INDIANA (now known as the Chicago Synod of the General Council, § 17, 7); 2. The HOLSTON SYNOD (§ 14, 1, 3); 3. The ENGLISH CONFERENCE OF THE MISSOURI SYNOD. The Tennessee Synod is now a part of the United Synod of the South, together with its former antagonist, the synod of North Carolina.

When in October, 1820, the matter of a General Synod was being discussed, there existed only the Pennsylvania Synod (Ministerium of Pennsylvania) and those just mentioned, six altogether. At that time the Lutheran Church of America had one hundred and seventy-five clergymen and nine hundred congregations, divided as follows:

### Clergymen. Communicants.

Pennsylvania	74 (278 Congs.)	24,794
New York	20	3,114
Maryland, Va.	22	4,935
North Carolina	19	1,358

Ohio had twenty-six clergymen, Tennessee six pastors and four deacons. Since these two synods were not a part of the General Synod (Ev. Rev. V, 245),<sup>2</sup> we have no further statistics.

## § 6. Characteristics of This Period.

### 1. Lack of Clergymen.

The demand for theological seminaries was keenly felt. Dr. Kunze and his successor Dr. Helmuth, pastors of St. Michael's, served as professors of the UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, and in this way prepared some young men for the ministry, notably G. Lochman, Chr. Endress, Dav. F. Schaeffer and S. S. Schmucker. — FRANKLIN COLLEGE of Lancaster, Pa., was founded at the suggestion of Benjamin Franklin in 1787. Here Reformed and Lutheran clergymen collaborated, each trying to secure candidates for the ministry. The Lutheran Church, however, succeeded in getting but few, among whom we mention H. A. Muhlenberg and Ben. Keller.<sup>3</sup> Quite a number of Lutheran students attended the seminaries of other denominations. PRINCETON (Re-

formed) was particularly popular. — HARTWICK SEMINARY, in the State of New York, the cornerstone of which was laid in 1815. was founded by Hartwick, a Lutheran pastor who, being unmarried, left his large estate (consisting in valuable lands) to this institution. Its first president was DR. E. HAZELIUS, under whom many able Lutheran ministers received their training. These men, however, from the viewpoint of their grasp of the Lutheran confessions, were children of the age.

PROF. ERNST LUDWIG HAZELIUS (born at Neusalz in 1777, died in 1853) was a descendant of the court-preacher of the same name. His father was a Moravian, and he received his training at Barby and Niesky. In 1800 he was called to the Moravian seminary of Nazareth, Pa. But his Lutheran tendencies prevailed, and he accepted the pastorate of the Lutheran Church of New Jersey. He became professor at Hartwick Seminary (1815); professor of church history at Gettysburg (1830); professor in the seminary of the Synod of South Carolina (1833). See the article of Dr. F. G. Gotwald in January issue of Lutheran Quarterly, 1916.

## 2. The language question.

The language question (for the first time in the history of American Lutheranism) reached a critical stage during this period. Muhlenberg, Berkenmeyer and other German and Swedish pastors had hitherto preached in the English tongue without meeting serious opposition, but now the situation had changed. The Church of St. Michael's, Philadelphia, furnished the ARENA for the combatants. Led by General Peter Muhlenberg, the English part of the congregation demanded that an English speaking pastor be called to supplement the work of the two German ministers (Helmuth and Schmidt). However, at the annual meeting in 1806, at which fourteen hundred votes were cast, THE GERMAN PARTY WON, with a plurality of one hundred and thirty votes. The English party left and founded ST. JOHN'S CHURCH. Ten years afterwards another controversy on the same subject, which was even carried into the secular courts, caused another emigration of members and the subsequent founding of the English Lutheran ST. MATTHEW'S CONGREGATION. Similar controversies took place in other churches, especially in New York. During this time in congregational meetings such statements as the following were put on record: "As long as the grass grows green and as long as the water will not run up hill, this is to re-

main a German speaking congregation.” And again: “Even in Paradise the Lord spoke to Adam in German, for do we not read in the third chapter of Genesis: ‘The Lord God called unto Adam and said unto him, “Wo bist du?” (Where art thou?).’” While such remarks are not to be taken too seriously, they indicate the BLIND FANATICISM displayed during the discussion. The Germans were still in the majority and they generally carried their point, but hundreds of young people drifted into the churches of the surrounding denominations, a fact which explains the origin of some of the strongest Methodist, Presbyterian and Episcopal congregations of present times.

### **3. Rationalistic Influences.**

Says Dr. Spaeth (Hauck’s R. E. XIV, 191): “The religious life of America, like that of Europe, was in a stage of decadence at the end of the 18th and at the beginning of the 19th century. The French Revolution and the American War of Independence had the immediate effect of shattering religious and political ideals. The close alliance between France and the new American republic opened the door for a vast influx of French infidel literature, and the complaint of decaying faith was heard on all sides.” Muhlenberg and his coworkers had feared this development. They had watched the theological discussions at Halle, and drew the ominous conclusion that Rationalism would sooner or later degrade the pulpits of America. Their fear was justified. At the end of the 18th century Unitarian congregations were founded at Boston by Socinian fugitives from England. Their influence was soon extended, particularly among the Congregationalists. Germany, too, contributed its share of Rationalism. Ministers arriving from Halle had been trained by professors of the new school of theology. After the death of Dr. Kunze (1807) DR. F. H. QUITMAN, of Rhinebeck, N. Y., a disciple of Semler, was made president of the New York Ministerium, and held that office for twenty-one years. A man of commanding personality, equally eloquent in English and German, and intellectually superior to his colleagues, he was bound to have a far-reaching influence. In behalf of the synod he wrote a CATECHISM full of rationalistic doctrines (1812) and an English LITURGY and HYMNAL in which God was addressed as “the great Father of the universe.” All were based upon the speech of the older Rationalism (Rationalismus Vulgaris), in which the “higher reason of Christianity” was substi-

tuted for the Holy Spirit; the “laxity of modern life” for the sinful heart; “the beginning of nobler impulses” for regeneration; “the elevation of humanity” for Christ’s ascension, and “corporate immortality” for personal immortality. It should be stated, however, that the influences of German Rationalism were mostly confined to English speaking congregations. German churches adhering to Luther’s catechism generally escaped. Those who would form a fair judgment of the linguistic controversies mentioned above must not lose sight of the fact that many church-members of the Pennsylvania Synod fought as they did because to them the GERMAN LANGUAGE WAS THE BULWARK behind which they sought refuge against the dangers of Rationalism.

#### **4. Shattering of confessional convictions.**

These controlling rationalistic influences were bound to shatter confessional convictions. Some do not understand why so much emphasis is placed in the history of the Lutheran Church of America on firm adherence to the confession of faith, and why from this viewpoint we measure success and failure; but it must ever be remembered that the American Lutheran Church is a FREE CHURCH, i.e., not under State authority. “As a free church she must be preeminently a CONFESSIONAL CHURCH. For those who unite with a congregation without compulsion or enter into any relationship with synods, must first of all have a very clear idea what is the common basis of their faith.” Confessional convictions grew dim, and the foundation laid by Muhlenberg began to crumble. In 1792 the constitution of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania was changed, and all references to the Lutheran Confession eliminated. We notice a tendency to obscure points of difference between Lutheranism and Episcopalianism. When this tendency was previously recorded (§ 4, 8; § 5, 2), it appeared in a more or less harmless character, but a resolution passed by the New York Ministerium in 1797 bodes ill for the Lutheran Church: “Because of the close relation between the Episcopal and Lutheran churches and because of the similarity of doctrine and discipline, the consistory will not recognize any newly organized English Lutheran church in places where the members can commune in the Episcopal fold.” Fortunately this resolution was canceled in 1804. The Pennsylvania Synod attempted a union with the Reformed Church. In this connection we call attention to § 6.

1: also to Franklin College, which was supported by Lutherans and Reformed, and to the many churches built by and used by both.

It was a time when the very existence of Lutheranism was at stake. The general confusion threatened to lead its members into other denominations. Far-seeing men recognized that these dangers could be met only by special efforts. Lutheran literature and a thoroughly trained ministry — these were the immediate needs of the hour. To face the crisis successfully the different synods would have to cooperate.

- 
1. Dr. Joh. Christoph Kunze studied theology at Leipzig, and taught for several years in a school of higher learning; together with two sons of Muhlenberg who had been trained at Halle, he came to America in 1770. He married Muhlenberg's daughter, became a second preacher of St. Michael's, Philadelphia, and also Professor of Oriental languages in the newly founded university of Pennsylvania. In 1783 he accepted a call to a Lutheran Church in New York in the hope that he might arrange a course for theological students in connection with Columbia College. This hope failed on account of the war.↵
  2. According to statistics submitted to the second convention of the General Synod at Fredericksburg, Md., in 1823.↵
  3. Franklin College and the many churches erected by the common enterprise of both Reformed and Lutheran people furnish an illustration of the unionistic tendencies then prevalent. Plain church members had an idea that there was really no difference except that some opened the Lord's prayer with "Unser Vater," others with "Vater unser." Neve, *Kurzgefasste Geschichte*.↵



# The Third Period. Synods Organized Into Larger Bodies.

THE FOUNDING OF THE CHURCH (“ecclesia plantanda”) was Muhlenberg’s great aim. When he closed his eyes, he had reached the goal. Speaking humanly, he had established the Lutheran Church. He had been a chosen instrument in the hand of God. But NEW PROBLEMS had now arisen. The transplanted seed required care in order to produce fruit. An ever extending territory and a gradual growth necessitated the founding of NEW SYNODS. Now there was danger that the church formed by Muhlenberg would be SPLIT UP into conferences and associations, with no bond of union among them. The transition of a large part of the Lutheran Church into the English and many movements of that day in the social and religious life of the American people, put the Lutheran Church to a severe test. It was essential that there should be a BOND OF UNION for the purpose of gathering the scattered threads of the Church. Such a bond of union was to be definite enough to insure organic connection, but also elastic enough to admit of a certain freedom of movement for its different units. In brief, A BASIS was to be found for the cooperation of Lutheran synods. The attempt to bring this about will be historically presented in the picture of this period.

We should DIRECT OUR ATTENTION, 1) to territorial expansion; 2) to the problem of ministerial education; 3) to the organization of synods into larger bodies.

[1] AS IMMIGRATION PROCEEDED westward, the Lutheran Church reached the shores of the Pacific. Moreover, A VAST STREAM OF EUROPEAN IMMIGRATION flooded all parts of the country. The care for these multitudes would have been impossible, had not the churches of Germany and Scandinavia faithfully cooperated with the Lutherans of America. Independent of American traditions and influences, A LARGE NUMBER OF SYNODS sprang up in the West.

[2] As the church grew stronger, educational institutions (seminaries, colleges and academies) were founded for the purpose of training ministers,

so that the Church of this country would not be dependent upon the Fatherland.

[3] The organization of a united American Lutheran Church was prevented by the separation of the mother-synod from the General Synod, her own offspring, (cf. §35). The origin of the FOUR “GENERAL SYNODS” is closely associated with the confessional development which we shall trace through the book and review in the closing pages. We shall notice the successive organizations of the General Synod, the General Synod of the South (later United Synod of the South), the General Council and the Synodical Conference. As we review their development, we shall also consider individual synods whose history runs parallel with that of the larger bodies.

AUTHOR’S NOTE: The reader will probably discover that we have dealt very fully with the records of the General Synod. At times it would seem that we have in this respect proven untrue to our announced purpose of presenting only “A BRIEF HISTORY.” However, this was not done to favor this synod — surely our way of showing the many mistakes in its earlier development will testify to that — but because the evolution of this synod (which often appears rather as a reversion) includes the common history of a large number of other synods. The inner growth of the General Synod is prehistorical to the records of the General Council and also to those of the United Synod of the South. The history of the Joint Synod of Ohio comes repeatedly in contact with it. And many a position taken by the Synodical Conference becomes intelligible only when seen in contrast with that of the General Synod.

## **4. The General Synod.**

### **§ 7. The Founding of the General Synod.**

#### **1. First suggested.**

The matter was first suggested by two pastors of the Synod of North Carolina, the Revs. C. A. G. Storch and Gottlieb Schober, who spoke of the desirability of forming a General Synod as early as 1811. They proposed that their synod should confer with the “mother synod” of Pennsylvania to this end. At its convention in Harrisburg (1818) the Ministerium of Pennsylva-

nia placed itself on record as favoring this movement. When in 1819 the synod met at Baltimore, Md., the Rev. G. Schober submitted A PROPOSED PLAN (Planentwurf) for the constitution of such a general body.

## 2. The Idea Takes Shape.

In many respects Schober's proposed constitution was modeled after that of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. The mother synod appointed a committee to make further suggestions, which resulted in the elimination of some objectionable features and the adding of other elements, chiefly of a congregational character. Thus in its altered form the proposed plan<sup>1</sup> was adopted, it being understood that, if three-fourths of the existing synods would adopt it in its fundamental features. Dr. J. G. Schmucker, then president of the Pennsylvania Synod,<sup>2</sup> should call a convention of delegates.<sup>3</sup> This most important convention was held in HAGERSTOWN, MD., Oct. 22, 1820. The Pennsylvania Ministerium, the New York Ministerium, the North Carolina Synod and the Synods of Maryland and Virginia were represented. The Tennessee Synod, just founded, and the Joint Synod of Ohio did not attend. The TENNESSEE SYNOD objected on doctrinal grounds, asserting that the proposed plan made no mention of either the Bible or the Augsburg Confession;<sup>4</sup> also that synods should not be ruled by majorities. Moreover Christ, had never said anything about a church government.<sup>5</sup> The JOINT SYNOD OF OHIO rejected the plan for a number of practical reasons.<sup>6</sup>

PASTOR J. G. SCHMUCKER, D. D., born at Michaelsstadt, Germany, in 1771, immigrated to this country with his parents (1785), who settled near Woodstock, Va. The religious atmosphere of his home bore fruit in the talented youth who prepared himself for the ministry. When eighteen years old, he studied theology under Pastor Paul Henckel. He went to the University of Pennsylvania, and, after taking a two years' course in the classics, continued his theological studies under Drs. Helmuth and Schmidt. He became a member of the Pennsylvania Synod (1792), and served the congregations of Hagerstown, York and vicinity. He died in 1854. He was a man of untiring diligence in study, and published a number of books, mostly in German. He left a manuscript on a practical exegesis of the epistles to the Hebrews. He was frequently elected president of his synod, which found in him an enthusiastic advocate of missionary activity. He had a large family.

Four of his daughters married Lutheran clergymen, and one of his sons, Dr. S. S. Schmucker, was for many years professor at Gettysburg.

### **3. Discouragements.**

The condition that at least three synods would have to adopt the proposed constitution before a general body could be recognized was barely fulfilled. The NEW YORK MINISTERIUM withdrew, declaring the plan “impractical.”<sup>7</sup> At the second convention even the PENNSYLVANIA SYNOD, hitherto leading the movement, refused to cooperate. This was due not to doctrinal dissensions or to disagreement of the leaders, but to certain prejudices that had arisen among the congregations. Political demagogues, inspired by motives of self-interest, men antagonistic to the Church, Germans dreading authority, circulated reports that the General Synod, Bible societies and theological seminaries were part of a secret scheme to establish a union between the State and the Church and to introduce the compulsory religion of the old country. A Reformed teacher, Carl Gock, had by his writings aroused a storm of opposition.<sup>8</sup> So strong was this prejudice that the pastors considered it policy to yield to it, hoping that eventually they might overcome it. But not until 1853 did the Pennsylvania Synod retrace this step.<sup>9</sup>

### **4. Growth.**

The prejudice just mentioned did not, however, extend to those congregations of the Pennsylvania Ministerium which were located west of the Susquehanna River. These separated from the mother synod, and in 1823 joined the General Synod as the WEST PENNSYLVANIA SYNOD. The man who saved the General Synod at this critical point of its development was a young man of twenty-five, just ordained, the REV. S. S. SCHMUCKER, of New Market, Va. According to Dr. Diehl and Dr. Beal M. Schmucker (the son) this energetic clergyman by correspondence or personal calls inspired the discouraged and prevailed on them to send delegates to the synod. He saw to it that the West Pennsylvania Synod was organized early enough to be represented as the third synod at Frederick, Md., in 1823.<sup>10</sup> And NOW THE GENERAL SYNOD MADE SOME RAPID STRIDES. New synods were founded and affiliated with the General Synod: the Hartwick Synod in 1831 (a synod founded in opposition to the New York Ministerium and now dissolved into the New York Synod which was formed in 1908); 1835 the South Carolina Synod; 1837 the New

York Ministerium; 1842 the English-speaking district of the Joint Synod of Ohio (the present East Ohio Synod, which was instrumental in founding Wittenberg College); the East Pennsylvania Synod and the Alleghany Synod in the same year; in 1845 the Miami Synod; in 1848 the Illinois Synod<sup>11</sup> and the Wittenberg Synod; in 1850 the Olive Branch Synod; in 1853 the Pennsylvania Ministerium (after an independent existence for thirty years); in the same year the Texas Synod<sup>12</sup> and the Synod of Northern Illinois; the Pittsburgh Synod (§ 19, 3); in 1857 the Synod of Northern Indiana; also the Synod of Southern Illinois and the English-speaking Synod of Iowa; in 1859 the Melancthon Synod;<sup>13</sup> in 1864 the Franckean Synod.<sup>14</sup> Further districts which united with the General Synod will be mentioned later (§ 10, 3, Annotation). It should be borne in mind, however, that those enumerated above only include synods now in existence or historically prominent. (Some of these synods were branches of other synods, a fact which accounts for the smallness of certain district synods belonging to the General Synod). In course of time other synods united with the General Synod, notably the Synod of the Southwest, the Synod of Kentucky, the Central Synod of Pennsylvania, etc., which were later merged into other districts.<sup>15</sup>

## **5. The First Seminary of the General Synod.**

The General Synod realized at an early date the necessity of theological training schools. While Hartwick Seminary in the State of New York offered a theological course, it furnished few candidates for the ministry. Nor did Hartwick Synod join the General Synod until 1831. During the third convention, held at Frederick, Md., resolutions were passed for the founding of a theological seminary at Gettysburg, Pa. REV. S. S. SCHMUCKER was elected professor. Like Dr. Lochman, Dr. D. F. Schaeffer and others, this clergyman, when only twenty-six, had been preparing young men for the ministry, one of whom was the Rev. G. J. Morris. We shall later see what kind of a confessional obligation was required of the professor for the new seminary (§ 11, 1). In September, 1826, the Gettysburg institution was opened with an enrollment of ten students. Commissioned by the synod, Dr. Benjamin Kurtz, on a two years' trip through Germany, collected some \$8,000 and a large number of books with which to start a library. On his journey Kurtz suggested immigration to the noted Pastor Stephan of Dres-

den, who later became prominent in connection with the Missouri Synod (§ 22, 3). Professor Schmucker collected \$17,500 (a year's work) in Philadelphia. Rev. E. L. Hazelius (§6, 1) in 1830 became the second professor. He was succeeded (1833) by Charles Philip Krauth.<sup>16</sup>

## 6. The First Church Papers.

As our source of information we mention the valuable contribution to the Lutheran Quarterly, Gettysburg, Pa. (April, 1912), Vol. XLII, No. 2, by Dr. F. G. Gotwald, General Secretary of the Board of Education of the General Synod and editor of Lutheran Church Work, entitled "Pioneer American Lutheran Journalism, 1812-1850."

Even before 1812 the Mosheim Society of Zion's and St. Michael's Philadelphia, had published a little German paper full of missionary news. In 1812, by a resolution of the Pennsylvania Synod, passed at its 64th convention, "Das Evangelische Magazin" (THE EVANGELICAL MAGAZINE), a quarterly of two hundred and fifty pages (annually), was published, with Dr. Helmuth as editor-in-chief. But in 1817 it was discontinued, having appeared merely as a year-book during the preceding three years. The next attempt of this character was an English monthly comprising some twenty-eight pages, called "THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN INTELLIGENCER." It was published by the Synod of Maryland and Virginia, and appeared for the first time in 1826. It contained an important letter (written in English) by Professor Planck of Goettingen, addressed to the General Synod.<sup>17</sup> During its brief career of five years it was edited by the Rev. D. F. Schaeffer of Frederick, Md., who found an able collaborator in the Rev. Charles Philip Krauth. Both men are known as fathers of the General Synod, and distinguished themselves by their consistent Lutheranism. It was this Dr. Schaeffer who, in the installation of Prof. S. S. Schmucker as teacher of Gettysburg Seminary, used the following language: "Because the faith of our Lutheran Church is based on the Bible and its strongest enemies have been unable to prove any incongruity to speak of between its teaching and that of the Scriptures, just as the foes of truth at the Diet of Worms were unable to detect any errors in the writings of the immortal Luther: therefore this church, entrusting you with the training of its ministers (and in its name I demand this solemn vow) obligates you to instruct them in the doctrines which distinguish this church from all others." It is a matter of regret that the ably edited "LUTHERAN INTELLIGENCER" was discontinued in 1831; the enterprise

closed with a deficit of \$500, which was paid by the synods of Maryland and Virginia. "THE LUTHERAN MAGAZINE," also an English monthly, was published by a committee of the Western Conference of the New York Ministerium, and edited by the Rev. Dr. G. A. Lintener, pastor at Schoharie, N. Y. The first number appeared in February, 1827, the last in April, 1831. This was followed by the "EVANGELISCHES MAGAZIN," a monthly of thirty-two pages. It was edited in the interest of the West Pennsylvania Synod by the Rev. John Herbst of Gettysburg and supervised by the Revs. J. G. Schmucker, J. F. Heyer and W. Yeager. Its life was short. It was discontinued in April, 1829. After the second year of its existence it was edited by the faculty of the Gettysburg seminary, Profs. Schmucker and Hazelius. Characteristic of the theological tendencies then prevailing at Gettysburg is the following sentence taken from an article of the year 1830: "No one, though he be a layman or a clergyman in the Church, is entitled to the name Lutheran, unless he stands squarely on the fundamental teachings of the Holy Scriptures as contained in our Confessions." With an appeal to the subscribers to pay an accumulated debt of \$500, this publication, too, had to be discontinued. Limited receipts and heavy printing expenses accounted for the short life of all these enterprises. From February until August, 1831, the Church in the East, although largely English-speaking, had no English publication. But in 1832 THE LUTHERAN OBSERVER was founded by the Rev. J. G. Morris and published in Baltimore, Md. A year later, the Rev. Benjamin Kurtz was made editor-in-chief and devoted his entire time to it. At first it appeared once in two weeks, but soon became a weekly publication. Until 1861, i.e., for twenty-eight years, Dr. Kurtz retained the editorship. He was a brilliant writer, and prominently impressed upon the paper his strong personality. It is to be regretted that he lacked appreciation of historical Lutheranism — a matter we shall refer to later.<sup>18</sup> Says Dr. Gotwald: "No editor, certainly not in the Church of the East, has exerted as strong and lasting an influence as Dr. Benjamin Kurtz."

## **7. Relations to the Lutheran Church Outside of the General Synod.**

Because the general organization of 1820 sincerely aimed to serve as a connecting link among all Lutheran synods, it KEPT ITS EYE ON EXISTING AND RISING SYNODS, inviting them to join the alliance. Thus for four years the Gen-

eral Synod conferred with the Joint Synod of Ohio. In 1839 the Pennsylvania Synod considered reunion with the General Synod, but the time did not seem to be ripe for such a movement. (See footnote 36.) At the tenth convention, held at Chambersburg, Pa., 1839, Drs. C. F. Schaeffer, S. S. Schmucker and B. Kurtz were appointed "to enter into correspondence with Lutheran societies of recent immigration and represented by the Rev. Mr. Stephan."<sup>19</sup> This meant the arrivals from Saxony, now the Missourians. At the fourteenth convention, held at New York City (1848), the General Synod got in touch with isolated Lutherans in Nova Scotia and Canada. It also invited the Evangelical Synod of the West, hoping, no doubt, that this body would adopt a Lutheran platform.<sup>20</sup> At its second convention (Frederick, Md.) it named a committee of CORRESPONDENCE WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES. This committee was authorized to communicate with the Lutheran Church of Germany, Denmark, Sweden, also with the Orphans' Home of Halle and with the Rector of the University of Goettingen. The purpose was to convey to these countries an impression of Lutheran progress in America and to stimulate cooperation for the growth of Christ's kingdom.<sup>21</sup> Such a "COMMITTEE OF FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE," communicating with eminent churchmen abroad, especially in Germany, occupies even now a place on the program of the General Synod.

### **8. Wittenberg College.**

Important for the inner development of the General Synod was the founding at Springfield, Ohio, of WITTENBERG COLLEGE (1845), which also offered a theological course. Its first president was DR. EZRA KELLER (see biographical sketch). He was succeeded by DR. SAMUEL SPRECHER, a man of frail physique but of great ability and far-reaching influence (§ 12, 1). Keller and Sprecher had been trained by Dr. S. S. Schmucker. While Sprecher adopted the theological and confessional position of his teacher, he lived long enough to realize that the future of the Lutheran Church in this country was not to be found in the ideals which were then prevalent at Gettysburg and Springfield.<sup>22</sup>

### **§ 8. The Significance of the General Synod for the Lutheran Church of that Period.**



## 1. Irenic Tendencies.

We have previously stated that the confessional position of the Lutheran Church in America, and so also that of the General Synod, during this period was not what it should have been. The founding of the General Synod was contemporaneous with the founding of the Prussian Union. In Germany there was a reapproachment of the Reformed and the Lutheran parties and a general setting aside of confessional distinctions. It is only natural that under such influences from the Fatherland, the General Synod also failed to appreciate sufficiently the distinguishing doctrines of the Lutherans and the Reformed. Muhlenberg had clearly discerned the necessity of adhering to historical Lutheranism, which can never be sacrificed, especially in America, without serious consequences (cf. § 6, 4). He had, however, shown his Pietistic training by occasionally practicing pulpit fellowship with the Reformed denominations. His successors went even further, not hesitating to make a regular practice of it. From this practice to a general confessional confusion was but a single step (cf. § 9, 3).

## 2. Opposed to Union with the Reformed.

But THE GENERAL SYNOD WAS FUNDAMENTALLY OPPOSED TO ORGANIC UNION WITH THE REFORMED. The joint Synod of Ohio in 1839 did not object to such a union.<sup>23</sup> The pastors of the PENNSYLVANIA MINISTERIUM looked upon it as a cherished hope,<sup>24</sup> though not yet practical because of opposition on the part of the laity, who suspected in every movement toward synodical concentration hierarchical ambitions.<sup>25</sup> One reason why many pastors of the Pennsylvania Synod wished to withdraw from the General Synod was the fact that they preferred to give their support to a Reformed-Lutheran seminary at Lancaster rather than to that at Gettysburg, projected by the General Synod.<sup>26</sup> To all attempts at organic union with the Reformed the General Synod was radically opposed. Says Dr. Jacobs: "The General Synod must be regarded as a very important forward movement, and its influence as beneficial... The General Synod was a protest against the schemes of a union with the Reformed in Pennsylvania (see § 6, 3) and with the Episcopalians in North Carolina (see § 6, 1). It stood for the independent existence of the Lutheran Church in America and the clear and unequivocal confession of a positive faith."<sup>27</sup> Organic union with other churches was consis-

tently opposed by the General Synod, strikingly so at the seventh convention, held at Baltimore, 1833.<sup>28</sup> At the convention at Dayton, Ohio, in 1855, resolutions were adopted condemning the practice, then popular in Pennsylvania, of building churches for the common worship of the Lutherans and the Reformed.<sup>29</sup>

### **3. Protest against Socinianizing Tendencies.**

The General Synod was also A PROTEST AGAINST THE SOCINIANIZING TENDENCIES which endangered Lutheranism in New York. Says Dr. Jacobs: "The General Synod saved the Church, as it became anglicised, from the calamity of the type of doctrine which, within the New York Ministerium, had been introduced into the English language."<sup>30</sup> The majority of ministers belonging to the New York Ministerium preached rationalistic sermons. None but men of this type were permitted to fill the pulpit of Dr. Quitman, president of this body.<sup>31</sup> Rationalism and latitudinarism were in the air. Among the cultured this tendency found expression in Tom Paine's "Age of Reason." Thus the General Synod, with its strong position against those Socinianizing elements which had been imported from Europe to New York, became a source of blessing for the Lutheran Church of America.

### **4. The General Synod's Influence.**

The influence of the General Synod on this period is thus characterized by Dr. Spaeth: "With this powerful influx of rationalism, and with the tendency of the remaining positive elements of our church to assimilate and to unite themselves with the surrounding 'Evangelical denominations,' there was evident danger for the Lutheran Church in America of losing the historical connection with the fathers, and surrendering the distinctive features for which they contended, and as a religious society, becoming simply a member of the Reformed family. At this point of threatening disintegration and dilapidation, the first steps were taken toward the establishment of the General Synod, which was certainly an honest effort to improve the state of affairs, to gather the scattered members of our Lutheran Church, and to preserve her as such on this Western continent." In this sense Dr. Krauth calls the General Synod "the offspring of reviving Lutheranism."<sup>32</sup> It watched jealously over the independence of the Lutheran Church from other denominations. Church papers to be published had to be Lutheran papers (§ 7, 5;

cf. § 9, 1, on Lutheran Observer), while the Pennsylvania Synod, even as late as 1838, looked with favor on a paper officially to be published in common by the Reformed and the Lutherans.<sup>33</sup> Equally important is the stand taken by the General Synod against Socinianizing influences, of which not even the Pennsylvania Synod, though less affected by it than New York, had remained free. In “Lutheran and Missionary” (May 3, 1866) Dr. Krauth writes concerning the Pennsylvania Synod: “It felt the latitudinarian tendency of the day; some of its clergy and an immense proportion of its people were averse to the General Synod on the ground of its growing Lutheran character.”<sup>34</sup>

## **5. Could not go beyond the Age.**

And still the General Synod did not succeed in finding the confessional position on which it might, as a leading organization, have been sure of a development without inner dissensions. The fact was simply this that the GENERAL SYNOD COULD NOT GO BEYOND ITSELF AND ITS AGE. After characterizing the existence of the General Synod as “a very important forward movement”<sup>35</sup> and praising “its influence as beneficial,” Dr. Jacobs continues: “It necessarily was not without the weaknesses that characterized the Lutheran Church in America at that time. One who ignores the entire historical development will find much to criticize and condemn, when examined from the standpoint of what is demanded by consistency with accurate theological definitions and clear conceptions of church polity. But he will find just as much that incurs the same judgment in the proceedings of the synods that united to form it. The faults peculiar to each synod were lost, while only the common faults of them all remained.” As we proceed in the following chapter) to view the mistakes of the English part of the Lutheran Church in America, we shall try to account also for them in the light of the age and its general tendencies.

## **§ 9. Aberrations.**

### **1. Introductory Remarks.**

That the General Synod did not develop along the lines of consistent Lutheranism, to which it swung back only after a series of conflicts and

controversies, is best explained by the circumstances surrounding its history.

THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE reached ever widening circles at a time when there was not yet an EngUsh literature breathing the Lutheran spirit. English speaking Lutheran laymen had to resort to a devotional literature full of Methodistic and Puritanic suggestions;<sup>36</sup> while ministers, barely familiar with the German tongue, filled the shelves of their library with books of Reformed authorship and assimilated erroneous viewpoints. Thus many lost the sense of consistent Lutheranism. They recognized as fundamental those features which all denominations held in common, and considered as non-fundamental the special heritage from the Church of Luther.

In the popular DISTINCTION BETWEEN FUNDAMENTAL AND NON-FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES with reference to the differences between the denominations, there is frequently an undetected fallacy. The Reformed Church believes with us in justification by faith, but — apart from other distinctions — it fails to assign to this dogma the central position which it occupies in the Lutheran view. It obscures its comforting features with suggestions of a religious legalism. Again, both the Lutheran and Reformed churches believe in the work of the Holy Spirit; but an entirely different idea of this work is conveyed when seen in the light of predestination as taught by the Reformed. It is impossible to separate the teachings, held in common by all churches, from those which separate the different denominations by classifying the former as essential and the latter as non-essential. The distinctive doctrines often — and especially in case of the great fundamentals — materially affect the whole system of thought. That there are fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines is not denied, but the mistake consisted in the wrong application of this distinction. The mistake usually begins with asking: What is fundamental for salvation? The question should be formulated in this way: What is fundamental for Lutheranism in its work of saving souls? Then it will be found that the special heritage of the Lutheran Church has everything to do with the success of this church in its practical work of winning souls for Christ.

THE FOUNDERS OF THE GENERAL SYNOD, while eager to preserve the integrity of the Lutheran Church, were very cordial with other denominations. Patriarch Muhlenberg himself, as we have observed, exchanged pulpits with the Reformed and the Episcopalians.<sup>37</sup> After that a friendly relation with other churches became a traditional Lutheran policy. The exclusive attitude

of Berkenmeyer, who would not cooperate with Muhlenberg, in whom he saw nothing but a Pietist from Halle (§ 3, 4), had thus far affected only the Synod of Tennessee. The practice of fellowship was further strengthened by the fact that the English Lutheran Church was weak and had a tendency to lean on other denominations whose work had begun in English and which had now attained a measure of success. This is strikingly illustrated by an incident related by Dr. J. G. Morris, the first editor of "The Lutheran Observer." This paper was to be published at Gettysburg and to be edited by the faculty of Gettysburg seminary, but fearing that the name Lutheran might offend the Presbyterians residing there, who had supported the Lutherans in building a church, yet desirous of retaining this name, the committee decided to transfer the editorship to Dr. Morris and the place of publication to Baltimore, Md., where the Presbyterians would not have to be considered.<sup>38</sup>

The question of CHURCH FELLOWSHIP between Lutherans and non-Lutherans has been much discussed. The principle that fellowship at the Lord's table should be permitted only where there is fellowship of faith was proclaimed by Luther, Melancthon, the other Lutheran reformers, also by Spener, and is generally adhered to throughout the Lutheran Church. The same principle applies to pulpit fellowship in the REGULAR CHURCH SERVICE.<sup>39</sup> On other occasions, side meetings, or semi-religious gatherings of an interdenominational character, ministers should be at liberty to use their discretion. Those who are strong in Lutheran convictions can make use of such liberty with less detriment to the Lutheran cause than those who are not thoroughly grounded in the Lutheran faith. A chief consideration, however, should always be the possible influence on the community of such union meetings. Truth should not make concession to error, and our practice should testify to the faithfulness in standing for our convictions. Even in cases where our participation in a union meeting as such may be defensible, the question may have to be considered whether our action does not promote and encourage a unionism that cannot be defended by a faithful minister of the Word.

Certain it is that the intimate relations between the General Synod, then becoming anglicized, and other denominations PROVED DETRIMENTAL to Lutheranism. It was a time when the Church was in danger of losing its special heritage. The Lutheran view of the Sacraments became obscured. People grew suspicious of the spirit of the Lutheran Church, its teachers, its

confessions and its history. Church ideals that had sprung from the soil of the Reformed Church and had matured in an atmosphere of legalism, clouded the Lutheran viewpoint. There was as yet, as we have remarked, no Lutheran literature in the English language. The leading ministers of the General Synod had been largely educated in non-Lutheran schools (preferably Princeton). While a reaction had been felt in Germany against the Prussian Union, the English speaking Lutherans of America were unable (on account of the language) to study this theological movement. In short, the ZEITGEIST was interconfessional. Revivals found their way into the Lutheran Church. In the General Synod a school of men grew up whose aim it was to create for the “American Lutheran Church,” a platform so broadly evangelical that the essentials of Lutheranism were lost sight of.

## **2. Visiting with the Methodists.**

The first of the great revivals to which we have just referred took place between 1727 and 1750. It followed a period of gross infidelity. Atheism had come from the Old World and dominated large circles of society. The New England States replaced their Puritanism with unbelief and frivolity. But the religious wants of the human soul caused a reaction in the form of revivals. Whole sections of the country, especially in the East, recorded a tidal wave of “conversions.” But when the War of Independence followed (1776-83), the country became demoralized. Rank unbelief and a shocking atheism — imported from France — swayed the multitude. Says Graebner:

“This infidelity was inscribed in books that were sold; it was cultivated in schools and societies, carved into marble, painted on canvas, sung in popular airs, practiced in life and clung to in death. ... Washington was idolized, but God blasphemed, the Church and its services scorned, the ministerial office despised, all things sacred traduced. ... But in striking contrast with this general infidelity there arose, during the last decade of the century, a fire of religious fervor which, flaming through the spiritual wilderness, took hold of thousands with violent force. ... Almost simultaneously it sprang up in different sections of the country. One great wave came from the Southwest, from the further side of the Cumberland mountains where in Kentucky and Tennessee infidelity had reached the acme of defiance. ... A number of Presbyterian and Methodist preachers went from place to place impressing thousands with their religious eloquence. Meanwhile things were stirring in New England. The pendulum swung hither and thither.”

This was the time when Wesley’s Methodism formed itself into an independent church, and soon became a power throughout the land. Camp-meetings

were the craze of the day. They took possession of large parts of the country. The harvest was neglected. Whole settlements were deserted, their inhabitants traveling fifty miles to take part in the revival. At Cane Ridge fifty thousand people, gathered out of all churches, attended such a meeting. "They preached, prayed and sang by day and by night when innumerable torches, candles and lanterns, attached to wagons and trees, would light up the darkness. Holy communion was administered on a large scale. Amid the mingled sounds of sighing, groaning and lamenting, the preachers impressed their audiences." (Graebner.) The strangest practices were looked upon without surprise. Little children preached sermons. Men and women dropped from their seats and lay unconscious on the ground. Says McMaster: "At no time was less than half the floor covered. Some were lying still, unable to move or speak, others kicked the floor with their heels, still others screamed in agony and squirmed like fishes pulled out of the water. Many were lying on the ground rolling around for hours at a time. Others jumped wildly over the stumps of trees and rushed into the woods crying: 'Lost, lost!'"

The purpose of it all was the new birth. This being accomplished, singing and rejoicing were in order. The "holy laughter" and the "jumping-fit" revealed an extraordinary state of grace and were attributed to a special activity of the Holy Spirit.

The central figures in the revivals of 1827-32 were the evangelists Finney and Nettleton. But the mightiest spectacle of this character was offered in 1858 when again, after a period of moral degeneration which had affected all classes of people, a wave of revivalism, starting at New York, swept the whole country. These movements were invariably preceded by periods of religious indifference and moral decay. But revivals, in turn, were usually followed by spiritual apathy. People who had been converted in a violent way were no longer impressed with the plain preaching of the Word. They required the same high-pressure methods over and over again. Thus we read that Finney's revival took place after a fifty year period of spiritual decay "which followed in the wake of the awakening."<sup>40</sup> Of a certain locality, visited by Finney where revival tires had burned frequently, we are told that the preacher found it "so blistered by constant revival flame that no sprout, no blade of spiritual life, could be caused to grow. Only the apples of Sodom flourished in the form of ignorance, intolerance, a boasted sinlessness and a tendency to free love and spiritual affinities." Even today

people speak of “burnt districts,” meaning those localities where by frequent revivals religious indifference has taken the place of unnatural fervor and where simple preaching fails to make an appeal. A book entitled “The Anxious Bench,” written by the Reformed professor. Dr. J. W. Nevin, vigorously attacked the methods of revivalism. This practice, however, found a champion in “The Lutheran Observer,” edited by Dr. B. Kurtz. In the November issue of 1834, he says: “Whatever Prof. Nevin may have written in the abstraction of his study, I am nevertheless strongly convinced, as a pastor, that the so-called ‘anxious bench’ is the lever of Archimedes, which by the blessing of God can raise our German churches to that degree of respectability in the religious world which they ought to enjoy.”

We must admit, therefore, that the LUTHERAN CHURCH DID NOT REMAIN UNTOUCHED. This was unfortunate. For surely the method of the revivalist is not in harmony with Lutheran teaching. Says Dr. Nevin: “A low Pelagianizing theory runs through it from beginning to the end.” It is Arminian, and is based on the denial of the Scriptural truth that it is God who converts the human heart. (Article V. of the Augsburg Confession.) By artificial means (sensational sermons, enraptured prayers, hysterical songs and stirring appeals) the revival preacher aims to replace the work of the Holy Spirit and to force the new birth.<sup>41</sup> Naturally enough, religious instruction lost its importance. The Catechism was neglected. People spoke with more or less scorn of “head Christians,” “memory Christians” and “Catechism Christians.” Since many Lutheran congregations took part in these revivals and since Lutheran ministers often acted as revival preachers, the tendency of the movement was toward unionization of the churches. The books of Baxter, Bunyan, Wesley, Edwards, Howe and Dwight replaced Lutheran literature, and created a taste which could be satisfied only when the sermon harmonized with the ideals of Methodism.

The English Lutheran Church was caught in this current. THE GERMAN LUTHERANS were not so greatly affected. It is natural that the majority of the English Lutherans were members of the General Synod, simply because the larger number of English Lutherans belonged to this body. However, it should be borne in mind that the men who later founded the General Council were no exceptions. Even a man like Dr. Passavant in that day carried “the new measures” to an extreme.<sup>42</sup> For many years the synodical reports spoke of congregational awakenings and of “ingatherings from the world.”



A very vivid picture of such a revival (1839) is given by Dr. S. L. Harkey, himself an ardent advocate of this method. He says:

“One of the most remarkable demonstrations of which I have ever heard occurred at this synodical convention... In an instant every soul in the house was upon the knees, and remained there weeping and praying for mercy.” Again we read in the protocol of the synod: “Silence reigned through the house, save the speaker’s voice only, and here and there a half suppressed sigh or groan, which burst involuntarily forth from the breasts of deeply convicted sinners. The whole congregation became more or less moved. The place became truly awful and glorious, and it seemed that the time had come when a decided effort must be made upon the kingdom of darkness, and that under such circumstances to shrink from the task and through fear of producing a little temporary disorder, to refuse to go heartily into the work would have been nothing short of downright spiritual murder. This meeting continued until it was necessary to give place for the transaction of synodical business. But the tardy movements of the people, and especially of the distressed, and their lingering looks as they withdrew, clearly indicated that they felt themselves still unwilling to leave the house of the Lord.” Another writer adds: “At one time during the meeting it was found necessary to invite the mourners to withdraw from the church and remove to the parsonage that the synod might have an opportunity to proceed to its close with the transaction of the business before it.”

It cannot be denied that by the methods of revivalism the General Synod received many new members who afterwards acquired an appreciation of Lutheran teaching. But the end does not always justify the means. As a whole, the movement proved detrimental to the development of the English Lutheran Church of America.<sup>43</sup>

### **3. “A Lutheranism modified by the Puritan element.”**

We now come to another misstep recorded in the annals of the General Synod. The two extremes with which the General Synod (rapidly becoming anglicized) came in constant contact were American Puritanism and German indifferentism.<sup>44</sup> That of these two extremes it preferred the former is readily understood when we consider the religious earnestness of the Puritans, on the one hand, and the worldly, unchurchly attitude of cultured Germans, on the other. For the great goal of the founders of the General Synod

had been personal piety and the propagation of a positive theology. This goal had been consistently kept in view. Thus when the abuse of alcoholic drinks, which characterized the life of anti-religious circles, was opposed by temperance movements,<sup>45</sup> it is not difficult to foresee on which side of the struggle the General Synod would take its stand. Also regarding the observance of the Sunday,<sup>46</sup> it joined hands with the Puritans. In both cases it opposed the Germans. Thus it gradually leaned toward Puritanism, with which it also shared the English language. A Lutheranism modified by Puritan elements was looked upon as being desirable for America. In this sense we speak of an "AMERICAN LUTHERANISM."

We now arrive at a period when the intimate relations of the General Synod to the other denominations were to bear fruit. The distinctive doctrines of Lutheranism had become obscured. The development might be traced in the doctrinal evolution of a man like Dr. S. S. Schmucker. At the time of the founding of the General Synod, then quite a young man, he belonged to the most conservative class of his contemporaries.<sup>47</sup> But eventually we find him not only an enthusiastic advocate of the "Evangelical Alliance," but author of an elaborate and comprehensive scheme of an "Apostolic Protestant Union," with the following features: "Unity of name; unity in fundamental doctrines,<sup>48</sup> while diversity in nonessentials (sic) was conceded; mutual acknowledgment of each other's acts of discipline; sacramental and ministerial inter-communion; convention of the different churches of the land in synod or council for mutual consultation or ecclesiastical regulation." This was endorsed by the General Synod at its meeting in New York, 1848.

The worst blunder of this kind, however, is contained in a letter forwarded (1845) by a committee of the General Synod to the Church in Germany. The letter says: "In most of our church principles we stand on common ground with the Union Church of Germany. The distinctive doctrines which separate the Lutheran and the Reformed churches we do not consider essential. The tendency of the so called old Lutheran party seems to us to be behind the times. Luther's peculiar views concerning the presence of the Lord's body in the communion have long been abandoned by the majority of our ministers." (Spaeth, C. P. Krauth I, 333.) While this letter was forwarded without the sanction of the General Synod, it was signed by the following representative men: S. S. Schmucker, J. G. Morris, H. J. Schmidt, H. N. Pohlman, B. Kurtz. Who would think it possible that these men would

all sign so radical a letter? Dr. Schmidt, then a member of the New York Ministerium, author of a volume on “The Doctrine of the Lord’s Supper” and of valuable contributions to the “Evangelical Review,” was soon a most pronounced opponent of the Definite Synodical Platform, and wrote to Dr. C. P. Krauth, Sen., as follows: “The Lutheran doctrine of the Sacraments is so completely interwoven with our whole view of the scheme of salvation and redemption; that concerning the Eucharist grows so directly and necessarily out of the great doctrine of Christ’s person that for me to give up those doctrinal points, alleged to be non-essential, is to give up all, to give up the whole Gospel.”<sup>49</sup> Nor did Dr. Morris share the view of the Lord’s Supper as stated in that letter to Germany.<sup>50</sup> He characterized it as “the greatest blunder ever committed.” Only Drs. Schmucker and Kurtz really agreed with the tenets of that circular; the others must have signed their names thoughtlessly. Furthermore, since the letter before sending it was never submitted to the General Synod, but was the expression merely of a committee, this body cannot seriously be held responsible for its contents.<sup>51</sup> But together with other documents of a similar nature, that circular reveals the fact that there were men in the General Synod who aimed at “a Lutheranism modified by the Puritan element.”

We have tried to show (§ 9, 1) WHAT CAUSED THIS DEVELOPMENT. We referred to the lack of an English Lutheran literature; to the influence on American thought of the Prussian Union; to the fellow-feeling with non-Lutheran churches; to the Methodist revivals; to the anti-religious character of Germans controlled by the immigrants of 1848, which, by way of reaction, caused the men of the General Synod to choose this Puritan type of religion. But to all these causes we must add another — the reaction against a movement.

A whole series of circumstances, which we shall presently enumerate, worked together toward the originating within the General Synod of a party which in its confessional rigidity exceeded indeed the Lutheranism on which the General Synod had been founded. The Tennessee Synod had always, although at times not in the most tactful manner, insisted on the importance of a confessional Lutheranism (§ 7, 2). The Henkels translated the Book of Concord into English. The Buffalo Synod (§ 30) was founded in 1845, the Missouri Synod (§ 21) in 1847. Walther edited the “Lutheraner,” the contents of which were made the subject of general discussion causing many to realize that the historical platform of Lutheranism had been aban-

done. From 1842 until 1866 Pastor Loehe of Neuendettelsau published the “Kirchliche Mitteilungen aus und ueber Nord-Amerika.” This monthly not only contained news about mission work in Ohio and the work of men like Wyneken, but undertook to criticize the un-Lutheran character of the General Synod and to laud the rising party of conservative Lutherans. Says Dr. Jacobs:<sup>52</sup> “Even though this journal sometimes was misled in its polemics, and fell into error from the natural tendency of those imperfectly acquainted with the field to give accurate reports, it could not fail to influence the progress of events in this country.” The writings of Charles Porterfield Krauth, later compiled in the “Conservative Reformation.” stirred the Lutheran world (see biographical note). Important was also the translation of Schmid’s Doctrinal Theology. The reaction against the Prussian Union, originating in Breslau (Prof. Scheibel), inspired thousands of pens and greatly affected American Lutheran ministers who were able to read German. The writings of Hengstenberg, Sartorius, Rudelbach, Guericke, Thomasius, Harless and Kliefoth were eagerly read and republished in the Evangelical Review. Some young theologians, trained in this school, arrived from Germany and assumed leadership even in the synods of the General Synod. One benefit resulting from the close alliance between the Lutherans and the Reformed of that time was the strong stand taken by the Reformed against Methodistic revivalism, which had caused such a commotion in Pennsylvania (the “Mercerburg theology”).<sup>53</sup> An instreaming immigration filled the emptied churches with sound Lutheran stock. Dr. Phil. Schaff, though himself Reformed, spoke during a course of lectures, delivered at a convention in Frankfort (1845), of a left wing in the General Synod and also of salutary influences exerted by the Lutheran ministers of the Eastern States who had studied German theology. This remark about “a left wing in the General Synod” made a painful impression in America on those who had hitherto considered Dr. Schaff an advocate of American Lutheranism. The “Deutscher Kirchenfreund,” edited by Schaff (1848) and continued by Rev. W. J. Mann, although an organ for German-American churches, proved a valuable support to the Evangelical Review,<sup>54</sup> and a mighty stronghold against the extravagances which threatened to demoralize the Lutherans as well as the Reformed. All these factors contributed toward creating and strengthening a conservative Lutheran party within the General Synod.

The leading spirits in the General Synod REACTED AGAINST THIS MOVEMENT. Under influences which we have previously described, these had developed in an opposite direction. Reared in the atmosphere of revivalism and closely associating with Puritan circles, their ideal of piety had gradually become different from that of the Lutheran Church. Nor was it in harmony with that of Muhlenberg. His piety was that of the finest types of German Pietism (§ 4, 8), while the new liberals were drawing their inspiration from English models like Baxter, Bunyan, Wesley, Edwards, Howe and Dwight. The vigorous polemics of the rising Missouri Synod, which were prototyped by those of the Tennessee Synod and now carried on in the "Lutheraner," edited by Prof. Walther, served the party of "American Lutheranism" as a constant warning against an ultra conservatism. They frequently referred to the "Symbolists" within and without the General Synod and pictured them as extremists of the most dangerous sort. They persuaded themselves that the Lutheranism imported from Germany was largely colored with local peculiarities which should be abandoned on American soil. Their ideal was the establishment of a homemade product. Thus they presented a program to the General Synod which insisted on a Lutheranism seasoned with the leading views of the surrounding denominations. The leaders in this movement were particularly Schmucker, Sprecher and Kurtz, with their great influence upon the Lutheran Church of that day.<sup>55</sup>

"AMERICAN LUTHERANISM" AND ITS CRITICS. Says Dr. W. J. Mann in the "Deutscher Kirchenfreund:" "Gradually a desire manifested itself to gain popularity for the Lutheran Church in this country. The hard dogmatical knots of the old Lutheran oak were to give way under the Puritan plane. The body was deprived of its bones and its heart, and the empty skin might be filled with whatever was most pleasing, if only the Lutheran name was retained. The statement of the seventh article of the Augsburg Confession, that 'unto the true unity of the Church it is not necessary that human traditions, rites or ceremonies, instituted by men should be everywhere alike,' was most extensively used, and in the desire to make the Lutheran Church as much as possible like others, her leaders were much more ready to adopt foreign elements than to retain her own distinctive features. Thus the liturgy, the ancient lessons of the Gospels and Epistles, the festivals of the Church Year, the gown and other usages were given up, in order that as little as possible might be seen of these Lutheran peculiarities. Hoping to gain others, they lost themselves. The Lutheran Church had given away her own

spirit, her own original life and character.”<sup>56</sup> Prof. W. M. Reynolds, writing to Dr. Krauth, characterizes “American Lutheranism” as a “kind of mongrel Methodist Presbyterianism.”<sup>57</sup> Such harsh criticisms were plentiful during this period.

Yet we feel that there should be a word of apology for the fathers of the General Synod. It is not fair to speak contemptuously of those men, as has become the custom in many quarters, for they were absolutely sincere. They had convictions which were perfectly in harmony with their training,<sup>58</sup> their time and their environment. The question how Lutheranism can have a national development on American soil and how it can adjust itself to its environment, is even today a problem for our English speaking Lutherans.<sup>59</sup> It was certainly not surprising that the leaders of the General Synod at a time when large parts of the Lutheran Church became English, considered the question, especially at the time of unionism in the Fatherland, whether it was not the sacred duty of the Lutheran Church of this country to accommodate itself to the American spirit by making some concessions to the teaching of the surrounding denominations.

THEY MADE A MISSTEP by discarding historical Lutheranism. But if Schmucker and his colleagues had succeeded in avoiding their mistake, their very policy would have been tried by others some time in the history of our Church, because of a real problem present. In this sense these men have done a service to the Church. We have learned from their mistake. This opinion is also shared by Dr. Mann, whose article in the “Kirchenfreund” continues thus: “The more we study the history of Lutheranism in this country the more natural appear the different stages of its development. No one is particularly to blame. The age and its tendencies fully explain it. Least of all should we belittle the merit of those men who, by establishing educational institutions for the Lutheran Church, tried to make sure of its future progress. It was a beginning such as circumstances permitted. But whosoever will at this time refuse to unite with the change for the better which has taken place or oppose the recovered self-respect of Lutheranism, its God-given individuality — he is guilty indeed.”<sup>60</sup>

THE DEFINITE PLATFORM. In September, 1855, a document was published entitled, “*Definite Synodical Platform*,” which, when closely viewed, was a recension of the Augsburg Confession. In its preface the ministers of different synods were requested to accept this “Platform” as their confessional basis. Though published anonymously, it was soon known that the three

men mentioned above, especially the first professor at Gettysburg, were its authors. This revised edition of the Augustana, in connection with the preface given, presented an appeal to adopt the platform of an “American Lutheranism” that had ridded itself of some errors said to be contained in the old historical document. The sanction of ceremonies during the Mass is struck from the 24th article of the Augustana. This was absurd, because by Mass in that article Melancthon simply meant the Communion service purified from the Roman abuses. Eliminated from Article II was the sentence stating that the new birth takes place through Baptism and the Holy Ghost; from Article VIII the declaration that the blessings of the Lord’s Supper are not dependent on the worthiness of the officiating minister; from Article IX the statement that through Baptism grace is offered. Article X reads in its revised edition: “In regard to the Lord’s Supper they teach that Christ is present with the communicants in the Lord’s Supper, ‘under the emblem of bread and wine.’” (A footnote called attention to the last phrase as being the German reading, but the German has also the truly present, “wahrhaftiglich... gegenwaertig,” and it says of the true body and blood that they are distributed and received). Article XI had been dropped entirely because it commended private confession.

THE ORIGIN OF THE DEFINITE PLATFORM. Even ten years previous to the publication of this document influential men in the General Synod had thought of a condensed platform on which American Lutheranism could build its future. During a convention of the Maryland Synod, 1814, Prof. H. L. Baugher, Dr. B. Kurtz and Rev. S. W. Harkey were appointed a committee of three for the purpose of forming an “*Abstract of the Doctrines and Practice of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Maryland.*” The essential points were presented in fourteen articles. All distinctive Lutheran teachings were omitted or repudiated. The report was returned to the committee and laid on the table.<sup>61</sup>

The matter was submitted to the convention of the General Synod at Philadelphia, 1845. Says “The Evangelical Review:” “At this meeting Drs. Schmucker, Morris, Schmidt, Pohlman and Kurtz were appointed to prepare and report to the next convention a clear and concise view of the doctrines and practice of the American Lutheran Church. The committee had the subject under consideration until the meeting held in Charleston, S. C, in 1850. The report presented by them was laid on the table, and they were discharged from further duty. The opinion prevailed among the committee and

in the convention that this was a subject upon which it was inexpedient to legislate. Differences on unimportant points, it was acknowledged, did exist in the Church, but it was not the province of the General Synod to adopt a platform or establish any test, which would necessarily exclude from its connection many whose recognition as Lutherans could not be questioned.”<sup>62</sup>

Drs. Schmucker, Kurtz and Sprecher had a particularly vital interest in this confessional “Abstract.” The committee, even before the document had been disposed of by the Charleston convention, had sent a printed copy of it to every pastor of the General Synod, inviting them to express their opinion by annotations and marginal notes. After the copies were returned, a revised edition, embodying different suggestions, was sent the second time for the purpose of further consideration.<sup>63</sup> Says Dr. Kurtz: “The want of it has long been felt and expressed. From the North and the South, the East and the West we have been asked for something of this nature... We find no difficulty in subscribing the document and presenting it as a fair, honest exhibition of Lutheran doctrine and practice as understood in the latitude in which we reside; and if we are not greatly mistaken, the great mass of our American ministers throughout the land would not make any material objection to it.”<sup>64</sup> Dr. S. S. Schmucker was so pleased with the “Abstract” that he referred to it again and again in his lectures and articles, and even made his students commit to memory its principles and statements setting forth the exact tenets of American Lutheranism.<sup>65</sup>

Also Dr. S. Sprecher urged the necessity of making a bold and an honest statement, in a writing of 1853 he underscored the words “a creed we must have” and wrote: “I hope that this unhappy condition of the Church will not continue long, and that the churches of the General Synod will do as the churches of the Augsburg Confession did in 1580 — exercise their right to declare what they regard as the doctrines of the Sacred Scriptures in regard to all the points in dispute in the Church. I do not believe that the present position of the General Synod can long be maintained; it will either result in the Old Lutheran men and synods gaining the control of the General Synod, and introducing the doctrines and practices of the symbols which the churches in this country ought to abandon... or the friends of the American Lutheran Church must define the doctrines which they do hold and what they reject, and refuse to fraternize with and to make themselves responsible for, and to give their influence as a church in favor of men and doctrines



and practices which they hold to be anti-scriptural and injurious to the spiritual kingdom of Christ. I do not see how we can do otherwise than to adopt the Symbols of the Church or form a new symbol which shall embrace all that is fundamental to Christianity in them, rejecting what is unscriptural and supplying what is defective.”<sup>66</sup>

These were the discussions and considerations of the men representing American Lutheranism at the time of the preparation of the Definite Platform. Dr. S. S. Schmucker, its real author, with his facile pen for such work, gave to it the finished form. The document appeared anonymously, but according to Schmucker’s own admission (made ten years later) he had written every sentence himself and had merely submitted it for approval to his friend, Dr. Kurtz, immediately before its publication.<sup>67</sup>

THE RECEPTION OF THE DEFINITE PLATFORM. The document found little response. Only three small district synods in the Ohio territory accepted it temporarily (East Ohio, Olive Branch and Wittenberg Synods). Everywhere else it was vigorously rejected, not only by men and synods which afterwards formed the General Council, but also by others who remained with the General Synod. Only now it became evident that the advocates of American Lutheranism were few in number. Dr. Schmucker and his associates experienced a disappointment from which they (with the exception of Dr. Sprecher, cf. biographical sketch) did not readily recover. Men who every one expected to affiliate with American Lutheranism condemned the movement in strongest language. They saw in it not only an attempt to mutilate the venerable Augsburg Confession, but also a plan of excluding the stricter Lutherans (the “Symbolists”) from the General Synod.

The strongest literary refutation was written by J. W. Mann, pastor of the German Lutheran Church of Philadelphia. It was entitled, “A Plea for the Augsburg Confession,” and was published by the General Synod’s Lutheran Board of Publication. Dr. Schmucker opposed to it his “American Lutheranism Vindicated,” a book of two hundred pages, which the Publication Society of the General Synod refused to publish and for which he had to find a private publisher. We have already stated that the General Synod would not permit the committee to proceed further with the “Abstract.” One of the chief objections persistently urged was the charge that the Definite Platform, once adopted, would drive from the General Synod a number of Lutherans now connected with it.<sup>68</sup>

Among the refutations of individual synods we mention that of the East Pennsylvania Synod, which at its convention in Lebanon, Pa., passed the following resolution on motion of Dr. J. A. Brown: "Resolved that we hereby express our unqualified disapprobation of this most dangerous attempt to change the doctrinal basis and revolutionize the existing character of the Lutheran Churches now united in the General Synod and that we hereby most solemnly warn our sister synods," etc. The mover of this resolution eventually went so far as to formulate charges against S. S. Schmucker for heretical teaching (later also against Dr. Sprecher). And it was through the influence of Dr. C. P. Krauth, Jun., that these charges were not taken up by the Board of Directors at the Gettysburg Seminary. When Dr. Schmucker resigned his professor's chair in the seminary in 1864, Dr. Brown was elected as his successor (see below footnote 116).

All of this proves that the General Synod, as a body, cannot be held responsible for the "Definite Platform." It is true that the mistake was made by prominent members of the General Synod, but it is also a fact that the popularity of these men suffered greatly after the publication of the Platform. Dr. Krauth wrote that this error consisted in the fact that they "mistook a tendency, half developed, for a final result." [^hC] [^hC]: Dr. Krauth's necrological comment on Dr. Kurtz as editor of the Lutheran Observer. Spaeth, 11, 85.

ANNOTATION. Continued from Chapter IV, § 7, 6. THE FIRST CHURCH PAPERS. The "EVANGELICAL REVIEW" was founded in 1849 by Professor William M. Reynolds (of the faculty of the Pennsylvania College in Gettysburg). The aim of this paper was to oppose the "Lutheran Observer" edited by Dr. Kurtz, and at that time serving as the chief organ of the American Lutheranism. Soon, however, Reynolds was called to the presidency of Capital University, Columbus, O., and now Dr. Charles Philip Krauth, of the Gettysburg Seminary, became his successor. For many years Dr. Charles Philip Krauth impressed upon the Evangelical Review his superior personality. This Quarterly was a repository of articles of permanent value. Indeed the articles in that Review seem to be as important today as they were when the first numbers were issued, at least for the American student of Lutheran Theology. It served this period as a bridge between the Lutheran theology of Germany and the Lutheran Church of America, so much in need of sound theology at this critical period of transition to the English language.<sup>69</sup> In 1871 the Ev. Review became the Quarterly Review of the

Evangelical Lutheran Church and in 1878 the present "Lutheran Quarterly". Dr. W. A. Passavant started the "MISSIONARY," and, while his chief interest was that of missions, yet, through the cooperation of Dr. Krauth, Jun., it received quite a theological character. Dr. Jacobs says that while his theological articles were at the time heavy reading for a weekly, they had a powerful and permanent influence upon the educated ministry.<sup>70</sup> The "LUTHERAN STANDARD", edited by Dr. Greenwald, had been with all mildness but firmness pleading for fidelity to the confessions." THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN", edited by Rev. L. W. Conrad represented the interests of Springfield, O., and the "OLIVE BRANCH" published by Dr. S. W. Harkey, the interests of the institution at Springfield, Ill.

### **Biographical Notes.**

PROF. S. S. SCHMUCKER, D. D., son of Dr. J. G. Schmucker, a Pietist of the Spener school and chief founder of the General Synod, began his studies at the Pennsylvania University and finished them at the Presbyterian seminary at Princeton. When only twenty-six years old, he was called to the newly founded seminary at Gettysburg, where he remained for forty years. He was never an attractive preacher because he was too didactical. But he was admired for his tremendous capacity for work. His literary activity was unceasing. He wrote forty-four books and pamphlets. And never did the Lutheran Church of America have greater executive talents at its disposal. With clear eye he could look through the most complicated situations and bring order out of chaos. He was unexcelled in working out constitutions for synods, congregations and institutions. To all of this he added a genuine piety. He composed the 356th hymn in the "Wollenwebers Gesangbuch": "Come ye sorrowing, heavy laden, with the burden of your sins." Through one of his writings (1831) he gave the impulse for the founding of the Evangelical Alliance. At the first convention in London (1846) Dr. King of Ireland called him the father of the Alliance. During the first part of his pastorate he was more Lutheran than the majority of his contemporaries. This is illustrated in a letter which at the end of his student days at Princeton he wrote on a vacation trip to his father.<sup>71</sup> As an antidote against the reign of Rationalism in the New York Ministerium, he demanded that the Augsburg Confession be resurrected and its articles be subscribed to with a QUIA. Later, however, when confessional Lutheranism came into its own, he was

one of its strongest opponents, fighting the "Symbolists" with speech and pen.

DR. BENJAMIN KURTZ, D. D., grandson of Pastor J. N. Kurtz (Muhlenberg's assistant), born in 1775, was editor of the *Lutheran Observer* (1833-61); he studied theology under Dr. G. Lochmann. He was a man of extraordinary talents and a zealous advocate of "American Lutheranism", the "New Measures" and the "Definite Platform". As editor he exerted a tremendous influence on a large portion of the American Lutheran Church. All of his work was manly. His pen was feared. He never wrote better than when replying to an attack or when challenging the opposition. He sharply attacked the "Symbolists" and Dr. Krauth. He founded the Melancthon Synod (§ 10, 3). For a short time he was professor at Selinsgrove.

PROF. S. SPRECHER, D. D., LL.D., was born at Williamsport, Md., in 1810. He studied under Dr. S. S. Schmucker at Gettysburg, and ministered to the congregations at Harrisburg, Martinsburg and Chambersburg, Pa. From 1849 to 1884 he was president of Wittenberg College. He was a teacher of great ability, having special talent for work of a philosophic and systematic character. "The Groundwork of a System of Evangelical Lutheran Theology", though written from the viewpoint of the "Definite Synodical Platform", is his most important contribution to Lutheran literature. Later, after years of retirement and physical suffering in San Diego, Cal., he revoked, to a large extent, his former position. In the "Lutheran Evangelist" he says: "It is true that I did once think the Definite Synodical Platform — that modification of Lutheranism which perhaps has been properly called the culmination of Melancthonianism — desirable and practical, and that I now regard all such modification of our creed as hopeless. In the meantime an increased knowledge of the spirit, methods and literature of the Missouri Synod has convinced me that such alterations are undesirable; that the elements of true Pietism — that a sense of the necessity of personal religion and the importance of personal assurance of salvation — can be maintained in connection with a Lutheranism unmodified by the Puritan element." (See "Lutheran Evangelist," May 1, 1891. Also, *Trial of L. A. Gotwald*, p. 72.) Dr. Sprecher combined with a frail body a very great mind. He died in 1906, having reached the age of ninety-five years.

PROF. CHAS. PHILLIP KRAUTH, D. D., born in 1797, was the father of a still greater son, the Rev. Chas. Porterfield Krauth. His fine talents he placed in the service of the Church, partly as editor of the *Evangelical Review* and

partly as Professor at Gettysburg. In 1834 he was elected president of Pennsylvania College. After 1850 he devoted himself exclusively (though continuing as editor of the *Ev. Review*) to his work in the seminary. Theologically he was classed among the conservative Lutherans. He held, however, that a united Lutheran Church of America could be hoped for only on the basis of the Augsburg Confession, leaving freedom to all to accept of the rest of symbolical writings what they pleased. An aristocratic style characterizes his literary activity. He died May 30, 1867.

PROF. CHARLES PORTERFIELD KRAUTH, D. D., L.L.D., son of the former, was born in 1823 and died in 1883. He was educated for the ministry at Pennsylvania College and at the theological seminary at Gettysburg. A careful study of church history and dogmatics gave him a fine appreciation of historical Lutheranism. While the battle was raging about the "Definite Synodical Platform", he was in the midst of his theological development, which cannot be considered finished before 1865. He fought "American Lutheranism," and his critical contributions to the "Missionary", to the "Evangelical Review" and afterwards to the "Lutheran and Missionary" greatly helped to clear the theological atmosphere and strengthen the cause of conservative Lutheranism. After reading one of these fine literary productions, his opponent, Dr. Kurtz exclaimed, in the "Lutheran Observer": "How many such articles would it take to convert a soul? Poor Charley! What a prostitution of talent!"<sup>72</sup> In 1861 he became editor of the "Lutheran and Missionary", and in 1864 Professor of theology at the newly founded seminary of the Pennsylvania Synod in Philadelphia (§ 20, 1; § 9, 3). He was one of those who, with the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, left the General Synod (§ 10, 3). Dr. Spaeth has written his biography in two volumes entitled "Charles Porterfield Krauth" (General Council Publication House, Philadelphia, 1909). Krauth was a voluminous writer. His mental activity was indefatigable. Noteworthy among his writings are Fleming's "Vocabulary of Philosophy" edited with Introduction, etc. (Philadelphia, 1860; New York, Sheldon & Co., 1878); Berkeley's "Principles, Prolegomena", etc. (Philadelphia, 1874). We should also mention his "Augsburg Confession, translated with Introduction, Notes, and Index" (Philadelphia, 1868). Of highest importance is his work, "The Conservative Reformation and its Theology" (Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1872), which, in spite of its imperfect form — it consists of a series of articles — will influence Lutheran thought in America for years to come.

PROF. J. A. BROWN, D. D., was born in Lancaster Co., Pa., in 1821. Descending from the Quakers, as an unbaptized youth, he came to Gettysburg (1841), where he entered the senior class of the college. He was baptized in the Presbyterian Church. His mental gifts were extraordinary. He graduated from college in 1842, and became a teacher. He continued his studies, and served the congregations of Baltimore, York and Reading. In 1859 he was called to Newberry College, S. C., as professor of theology. He left there during the Civil War, his sympathies being with the North. In 1864 he became Dr. S. S. Schmucker's successor at Gettysburg. He was an able preacher, an enthusiastic teacher, a discerning writer and a strong public debater. In 1879 he had a paralytic stroke, and died in 1882.

## **§ 10. Disruption of the General Synod and Origin of the General Council.**

### **Introductory Review.**

The publication of the Definite Platform was a serious blow to American Lutheranism. Its advocates did not win the applause they had looked for. Dr. S. S. Schmucker especially lost much of his former prestige. The conservative wing, on the other hand, felt encouraged, and saw in the events that had taken place an indication that the Lutheranism of the future would increasingly adhere to historical traditions. But the "Definite Platform" theology had been stimulated for more than a decade by cooperation of pulpit, press and seminary, and by many measures that had been passed at synodical conventions. Externally viewed, the situation seemed to take a favorable turn. Dr. Kurtz resigned the editorship of the "Lutheran Observer" (1861). In 1864 Dr. Schmucker resigned his professorship at Gettysburg, and Dr. Brown, his strong opponent, became his successor.

But in reality things were little improved. A glance at the articles published in the Lutheran Observer of this period will make this painfully clear. While the Definite Platform had been rejected, its spirit continued to permeate theology. Liberals played fast and loose with essentials and non-essentials, and carried this old method of shifting issues into the heart of the Augustana. It was left to the individual to decide which doctrines were fundamental and which non-fundamental. Only those features in the Augustana were retained which were held in common by all denominations. The aim

was to unite all Lutherans in America on a basis of sufficient breadth. The word “Unaltered,” as applied to the Augsburg Confession, was not tolerated because it seemed to clip the wings of a liberalizing Melancthonianism. The Formula of Concord and all other Lutheran symbols, with the possible exception of Luther’s Small Catechism, were excluded from theological consideration. To show that the acceptance of the whole Book of Concord did not settle controversies, the Liberals pointed to the contentions of the Old Lutherans (Missouri, Buffalo, Iowa Synods), who had not arrived at the much-sought harmony, although adopting all the symbolical writings. A broad basis was demanded on the ground that not only would Liberals find it satisfactory, but the Symbolists also would find room for their views on such a platform. It would, of course, be required of them that they should not enter upon controversy with their more liberal brethren. The Lutheran Observer (August 4, 1865), demanding a Lutheranism broad enough to embrace both parties, would have each vitalize and bless the other and supply mutual defects.

But such a policy is not practical under free church conditions. It might work in a country like Germany, where State and Church are united and where contrary currents are held in the same channel by the strong arm of the government, although even there the attempted amalgamation of heterogeneous elements has only produced separate societies existing alongside of each other. But surely in the land of free churches water and oil would not mix. To demand that the “Symbolist” should not form a party with men of congenial mind in defense of his convictions is not only impossible, but unjust and unchristian.<sup>73</sup>

It was, therefore, the most natural thing in the world that a smaller confessional party formed itself within the General Synod, which stood opposed to the majority. Stimulated by outside influences and strengthened by its victory over the Definite Platform, it employed the brainiest theologians to plead its cause. Its greatest leader was Dr. Charles Porterfield Krauth. In 1865 this brilliant thinker, an outspoken opponent of the Definite Platform theology, abandoned the last remnants of the confessional views under which he had grown up, and the controversy between the two parties of the General Synod assumed the proportions of a final and decisive conflict.<sup>74</sup> This great conflict was preceded by two other ruptures which we will now describe.

## **1. The Exodus of the Swedes.**

In the Synod of Northern Illinois, a District Synod of the General Synod, there were a large number of Swedes. In 1859 they formed about one-half of the whole synod. They were divided into three conferences: Chicago, Mississippi and Minnesota. At Springfield, Ill., they cooperated with the English part of their synod in the management of the Illinois State University. There W. M. Reynolds was president and Dr. S. W. Harkey professor of theology. In 1856 Prof. L. P. Esbjoern took charge of its Scandinavian department. These Scandinavians did not really agree doctrinally with their English-speaking brethren, but they did not know where else to turn for the education of a ministry. They, however, had the satisfaction, of causing the Northern Illinois Synod to speak of the Augsburg Confession as “a correct and true summary of the teachings of the Christian religion.”<sup>75</sup> But soon they came to the parting of the ways. In the Jubilee edition of the Augustana Synod, we read the following remark: “During subsequent years a number of ‘new Lutherans’ were received who recognized no standards of doctrine and who did all in their power to tear down every barrier which might hinder the instream of free thought.” Esbjoern and Hasselquist, as delegates to the General Synod at Pittsburg (1857), returned with sore hearts over the reception of the Melancthon Synod (§ 10, 3, a). The plan to withdraw was maturing among the Scandinavians, when troubles arose between Esbjoern and some professors at Springfield, Ill. Esbjoern resigned suddenly April, 1860, and moved to Chicago. The Scandinavian students, with the exception of two, went with him.<sup>76</sup> At a gathering in Chicago this step was justified by the Scandinavians who, dissolving their connection with the Synod of Northern Illinois, formed the Augustana Synod, then largely composed of Swedes, Danes and Norwegians. (Comp. § 19, 5, b; § 32, III 3; § 33, 3.) The new body eventually united with the General Council (§ 19, 5). The Springfield school ceased to serve the General Synod and was purchased (1868) by the Missourians, who use it today as their practical seminary (§ 24, 1).

## **2. The Exodus of the Southern Lutherans (1863).**

This was the beginning of a larger secession which shall presently be mentioned. From 1861 to 1864 the North and the South were rent apart by the



terrible CIVIL WAR. The hatred thus caused extended into the circles of the Church. It culminated in the exodus of FOUR SYNODS from the General Synod, viz., the synods of North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia. They formed a new general organization known today as THE UNITED SYNOD OF THE SOUTH (Chapter V).

### **3. The Disruption Leading to the Founding of the General Council.**

#### **A. Preliminary.**

[a] Under the leadership of Dr. B. Kurtz the MELANCHTHON SYNOD was formed in Maryland (1857).<sup>77</sup> The existence of a new district synod of the General Synod in the territory of the Maryland Synod was justified on the principle of “elective affinity”. Everybody should have the liberty of belonging to an organization that was congenial. The advanced American Lutheranism of this synod was heralded as its chief attraction. It had been closely modeled after the doctrinal standards of the Evangelical Alliance. While accepting the Augsburg Confession, it repudiated certain errors which were said by some (sic) to be contained in said confession: “1. The approval of the ceremonies of the Mass; 2. Private confession and absolution; 3. Denial of the divine obligation of the Christian Sabbath; 4. Baptismal regeneration; 5. The real presence of the body and blood of the Savior in the Sacrament of the Altar.” At the meeting at Pittsburg (1857) the Melanchthon Synod asked to be received into the General Synod. A conflict seemed imminent. The liberal party, numerically superior, was vigorously opposed by a conservative element. Dr. Krauth, Jun., served as a mediator. He favored the reception of the synod, but “affectionately requested” the brethren of that body to erase the implied charges against the Augsburg Confession. The votes stood 98 to 26 in favor of admission. The delegates of the Pennsylvania Synod, also the Scandinavians of the Synod of Northern Illinois,<sup>78</sup> were recorded in the negative. This controversy helped (as we have just seen. § 10, 1) to cause the separation of the Swedes from the General Synod, 1860.

[b] At the convention of the General Synod at York, Pa. (1864). the FRANCKEAN SYNOD applied for admission. This body, founded in 1837 as a branch of the Hartwick Synod, had never accepted the Augsburg Confession. It had adopted a few general principles,<sup>79</sup> and had issued a “Declara-

tion” in which the Lord’s Supper is spoken of “as a token of faith in the atonement of Christ, and of brotherly love.”<sup>80</sup> A resolution of the General Synod, passed as early as 1839, had mentioned the Tennessee Synod and the Franckean Synod as two extremes endangering the unity of Lutheranism. But in 1857 the General Synod, wishing to retract this resolution regarding the Tennessee Synod, found it difficult to decline similar action concerning the Franckean Synod. This caused the Franckean Synod to seek admission into the General Synod, hoping, no doubt, that since the Melancthon Synod had encountered no obstacles in the way of such a step, it might be equally successful.

At the 21st convention of the General Synod (York, Pa., May 5, 1864) the admission of the Franckean Synod was argued on the very first day. A committee under the chairmanship of Dr. H. N. Pohlman reported as follows: “That the Franckean Synod be admitted as an integral portion of the General Synod, as soon as it shall give formal expression to its adoption of the Augsburg Confession as received by the General Synod.” This was satisfactory to the Conservatives, who were contending for the principle that no synod should become a part of the General Synod which did not accept formally the Augsburg Confession. They held that if this rule was not to be applied, the districts of the general body would be kept in a feeling of uncertainty as to the future security of their confessional position. But the adoption of the resolution was not the end of the affair. The delegates of the Franckean Synod, on the following day, asked for its reconsideration, declaring that by accepting the constitution of the General Synod, they thought that they had also accepted its confession of faith. After a lengthy and earnest debate, the Franckean Synod was accepted with the understanding that it should, at its next convention, adopt the Augsburg Confession as its doctrinal basis. The votes stood 97 to 40. This was taken to mean that a synod might enter the General Synod, even though it had not yet accepted the Augustana, but had merely indicated its intention to do so.

Matters were even more complicated because the Franckean Synod had already adopted, in place of the Augsburg Confession, an independent declaration of faith, excluding several features of Lutheranism. And why did it not adopt the Augsburg Confession at the same meeting at which it sought admission into the General Synod? This was the contention of the Conservatives. The Liberals, on the other hand, and those who had been won over to their viewpoint, argued that the Franckean Synod, while not formally

complying with conditions of admission, had done so to all intents and purposes; that other synods had been received under similar circumstances; that the constitution admitted of varied interpretations.

As a matter of fact, the General Synod, at the time of its organization (1820), had not dared to be too rigid in its doctrinal demands. Particularly the New York Ministerium and also the Ministerium of Pennsylvania would, at that time, have been opposed to incorporating a confessional paragraph, such as the General Synod gave to its district synods (1829). into the constitution of the general body (§ 11. 1, a). At that time the separate synods were too jealous of their rights. In 1835 the General Synod finally took courage to declare that only those synods should be accepted which believed in the fundamental doctrines of the Bible “as taught by our Church.”

Upon this remark, and also upon the statement of the constitution that “all regularly constituted *Lutheran* synods can be admitted if they accept the constitution and send delegates, etc.,” the Conservatives, now chiefly led by the Pennsylvania Synod, based their arguments. The chairman of the committee of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania read a protest against the admission of the Franckean Synod. He called it a violation of the constitution, which speaks of only “Lutheran” synods to be admitted. Lutheran synods were those which accepted the fundamental doctrines of the Bible “as taught by our church.” This meant the Augustana. But at no time in its history had the Franckean Synod adopted the Augsburg Confession. For this reason it could not be regarded as a properly constituted Lutheran synod. By admitting it, violence was being done to the constitution of the General Synod. This protest was signed by the entire delegation of the Pennsylvania Synod, and also by delegates of the following synods: Pittsburg (4), New York (4), Illinois (3), Maryland (2), East Pennsylvania (1), Olive Branch (1), Northern Illinois (1), Iowa (1), numbering twenty-eight signatures.

At the same time another document was submitted in which the Pennsylvania Synod declared its withdrawal from the sessions of the General Synod on the ground that the conditions of affiliation originally agreed upon (1853) had been broken. Among the resolutions passed at the time of the reunion of the Pennsylvania Synod with the General Synod, it was clearly stated “that, should the General Synod violate its constitution, and require of our synod, or of any synod, as a condition of admission or continuance of membership, assent to anything conflicting with the old and long-established faith of the Lutheran Evangelical Church, then our delegates are

hereby required to protest against such action, to withdraw from its sessions and to report to this body.”<sup>81</sup>

ANNOTATION. Under similar conditions the Pittsburg Synod had united with the General Synod,<sup>82</sup> and its delegates were in perfect accord with those of the Pennsylvania Synod in this matter. A minority in both synods had opposed the proposed union with the General Synod. In the Ministerium of Pennsylvania the votes stood 217 clerical and 15 laymen for and 14 clerical and 14 laymen against the resolution. In the Pittsburg Synod 10 ministers and 7 laymen voted for it, 9 pastors and 3 laymen against it.

A spirit different from that of the General Synod pervaded the Ministerium of Pennsylvania.

In 1853, the year of its admission into the General Synod, the Pennsylvania Synod acknowledged “the collective body of the Symbolical Books as the confessional writings of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and accorded to the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and Luther’s Small Catechism an especial importance among the symbolical books generally”<sup>83</sup> Considering further the cautious language used in connection with its step into the General Synod, we get some idea how doctrinal matters had changed in the Pennsylvania Synod (§ 8, 2). We read in a resolution preceding the contemplated affiliation: “That this synod regards the General Synod as an association of Evangelical Lutheran synods, entertaining the same views of the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel as these are expressed in the confessional writings of our Evangelical Lutheran Church and especially in the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, and that we advert to the fact that the General Synod is denied the right by its constitution of making any innovations or alteration of this faith. See Article 3, Section 2, 3.”

The surprising change of view in the Pennsylvania Synod, formerly so conspicuous for its willingness to make common cause with the Reformed (§ 6, 4; § 8, 2, 3; § 11, 1, a), is a historical phenomenon that calls for an interpretation. In our judgment the explanation is contained in the following considerations: 1) The Ministerium of Pennsylvania was predominantly German, and as such would have a natural aversion against the revival movements which did so much to obliterate the spirit of Lutheranism in the English parts of the Lutheran Church. Here the Ministerium was on common ground with the Reformed. Note that the strongest protest against revivalism came from the Mercersburg Seminary (Dr. Nevin).<sup>84</sup> 2) When the Lutheran Church in Germany experienced its great reaction against the

Prussian Union in the rising of men like Claus Harms, Scheibel, Stahl, Guericke, Rudelbach, Ludwig Harms, Loehe, Besser, Wangemann and many others, a great literature sprang up, which revived Lutheran consciousness in the Fatherland. Such influences must have been felt more in a German body like the Ministerium of Pennsylvania than in the more Anglicized districts of the General Synod. Also the ministers who came over from Germany during this period under the influence of a revived Lutheran consciousness would naturally go into the bodies where the German language was especially used. So gradually the ministerial body of the Pennsylvania Synod began to grow in Lutheran convictions, and became opposed to the formerly cherished idea of a future union with the Reformed. 3) And then it must be remembered that in the Pennsylvania Synod there had always been the use of Luther's catechism and the thoroughly evangelical hymns of the Lutheran Church, while in the English synods the catechism went partly out of use, or was greatly depreciated, and the strong German hymns were replaced by the sentiments of Methodism and Puritanism. Here all the German synods (Tennessee, Joint Ohio and Pennsylvania Synods) had an advantage over the rapidly Anglicizing parts of the Lutheran Church. 4) In addition to all this, we must remember the strong organizing influence of such great men as Drs. C. F. Schaeffer, W. J. Mann, G. F. Krotel, C. P. Krauth, Jun., W. A. Passavant, Beale M. Schmucker and others.

ANNOTATION. While the withdrawal of the Pennsylvania delegation was keenly felt, it had a salutary effect on the future of the General Synod. At the very convention which caused this rupture, resolutions were passed for a clearer definition of the confessional basis to be recognized by synods desiring to unite with the General Synod. Article III, § 3, was made more explicit (cf. § 11, 1, b). In its original form it stated that "all regularly constituted Lutheran synods holding the fundamental doctrines of the Bible as taught by our church, not now in connection with the General Synod, may at any time become associated with it, by adopting this constitution and sending delegates," etc.; but the amended version went much further: "All regularly constituted Lutheran synods, not now in connection with the General Synod, receiving and holding, with the Evangelical Lutheran church of our fathers, the Word of God as contained in the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine Word, and of the faith of our church, founded upon

the Word, may, at any time," etc. This amendment was sent to the different district synods, and having been adopted by them was made a part of the constitution of the General Synod.<sup>85</sup> Another declaration was accepted at this time (1864) known as the York Resolution. This was one of a number of propositions made by Dr. Charles Porterfield Krauth at the convention of the Pittsburg Synod at Zelenople (1856), and was directed against the Definite Platform. It aimed to meet current prejudices against the Augsburg Confession. (See "York Resolution," § 11, 1, c.) It was never more than a resolution, lacking the sanction of the district synods which is required by the constitution, and was therefore incorporated in the new confessional formula recommended at Washington and reported at Atchison as having been adopted by all the district synods.

[c] THE FOUNDING OF THE SEMINARY AT PHILADELPHIA was another link in the chain of events which were working towards the disruption of the General Synod. At the 117th convention of the Pennsylvania Synod, held at Pottstown, Pa., May 25, 1864 (a few days after the return of the York delegates who had withdrawn from the sessions of the General Synod), it was decided to establish a separate Theological Seminary of the Pennsylvania Synod. This was no new idea. As early as 1846 Dr. C. R. Demme, a Philadelphia clergyman, had been delegated by the synod to collect a library and to educate young men for the ministry. This was done to counteract Dr. Schmucker's influence at Gettysburg. While the Germans (Pastor S. K. Brobst, editor of *Theologische Monatshefte*) had been urging the movement, the English Lutherans delayed action, hoping that things might become more hopeful at Gettysburg.

Dr. Schmucker resigned in February, 1864. The Conservatives wanted Dr. C. P. Krauth as his successor. This, however, seemed out of the question, especially after the conflict at York.<sup>86</sup>

A schism seemed imminent in the General Synod. Dr. C. W. Schaeffer, in his opening speech as President of the Pennsylvania Synod (May 25, 1864), urged the founding of a separate seminary. His proposition was unanimously adopted. In a special meeting at Allentown (July 26th and 27th) the details were worked out. Drs. C. P. Krauth, W. J. Mann and C. F. Schaeffer were elected professors *ordinarii*, and C. W. Schaeffer and G. F. Krotel as professors *extraordinarii*. The seminary was to be founded on the unconditional acceptance of all the symbols of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. It was opened on October 5th. Several Gettysburg students went to

Philadelphia. Prof. C. F. Schaeffer of Gettysburg (the professor of the Pennsylvania Synod) accepted a chair in Philadelphia. The relations between the two institutions became strained. A literary war was carried on between Dr. Krauth and Dr. Brown. When Dr. Charles Philip Krauth, father of Charles Porterfield Krauth, heard of the founding of the new seminary, he is said to have exclaimed with a heavy heart: "Now a division of the church cannot be avoided."<sup>87</sup> In the light of this action the withdrawal of the delegates of the Pennsylvania Synod at York appeared as the climax of a long contemplated movement on the part of that body to oppose a new confessional tendency to the doctrinal basis of the General Synod. The question was asked: Is the Pennsylvania Synod still a part of the General Synod? When, at the meeting of the board of directors of the Gettysburg Seminary, the representatives of the Pennsylvania Synod wished to take part, they were not recognized because their synod had ceased, by its action at York, to be a part of the General Synod. This point of view was not shared by the Pennsylvania delegates, who asserted that a break from the General Synod had not been intended. Dr. Spaeth says: "It must be admitted that the clearer judgment and more consistent logic was on the side of the radical wing of the General Synod. They showed a thorough appreciation of the real situation," etc. (C. P. K. II, 154).

ANNOTATION. Not all of the men of the General Synod who failed to justify the action of the Pennsylvania Synod should be classed among the Radicals. There were some, to be sure, who might have sacrificed every distinctive feature of Lutheranism. But men like Chas. Phil. Krauth, Chas. A. Hay, J. G. Morris, J. A. Brown, H. N. Pohlman, T. Storck and many others, whose powerful influence became apparent in their successful opposition to the Definite Platform, were far from being radical. Neither can we dispose of them as "middle-of-the-road" men after the witty words of Dr. Krauth: "Moral weaklings who deem themselves miracles of gentleness, prudence and moderation, snaky doves, or dove-like serpents, refusing to be reduced to a class. ... They now go with the one side, now with the other, but take a path exactly midway between them, assuming that wherever the extremes of opinion are due North and South, the precise line of truth is exactly due East or West; and that, supposing what claims to be true one yard off from the alleged error, you infallibly keep the golden mean by holding yourself eighteen inches aloof from both." (Spaeth II, 136). Men thus described no doubt existed then as ever. But the men in the middle-of-the-road in the

General Synod were of a different type. They had not yet reached the end of their theological development, and eventually became successful leaders together with others who followed them (Professors E. J. Wolf, H. L. Baugher, S. P. Breckenridge, L. A. Gotwald, S. A. Ort, D. H. Bauslin, et al.). Their early training fell in the period of "American Lutheranism" and Methodistic tendencies. They were not yet prepared to discard the past. They loved the General Synod, and saw in the exodus of the Pennsylvanians and in the founding of the new seminary an attempt to disrupt the organization. While they repudiated the Definite Platform, they were accustomed to distinguishing between fundamentals and non-fundamentals in the Augsburg Confession. They feared the Formula of Concord against which they had been prejudiced. The polemical methods of the Concordia-Lutherans in those years deterred them from the tendencies of the "Symbolists". And yet they were not without appreciation of the position which men like Dr. Krauth and others were taking in confessional respects.

### **Biographical Notes.**

PASTOR C. R. DEMME, D. D. (born in 1795, died in 1863) was the son of the General Superintendent of Altenburg in Germany. He came with a full classical and theological education from Germany and became pastor in Philadelphia. He was among the most eminent preachers and the profoundest scholars of his time, somewhat mediating in his theological position. He was a born leader, a man of imposing presence and altogether the most influential member of the Pennsylvania Synod. As a hymnologist and an authority in liturgical matters he ranks very high. The hymnal of the Pennsylvania Synod (1849) and its ritual (1849) are largely his work.

PROF. C. F. SCHAEFFER, D. D., born 1807 in Germantown, Pa., educated in the University of Pennsylvania (in theology by his father Dr. F. D. Schaeffer and Dr. Demme), became Pastor at Carlisle, Pa., Hagerstown, Md., Lancaster, O., Red Hook, N. Y., and Easton, Pa. He was Professor of theology in the seminary of the Joint Synod of Ohio in Columbus (1840-46, see § 28), in Gettysburg, Pa. (1857-64), in Philadelphia (1864-79). He was active as a writer, having translated the treatise on the Book of Acts by Lange, the Sacred History of Kurtz and Arndt's True Christianity. He was also author of a commentary on Matthew and of important contributions to the Evangelical Review. He died in 1898.



PROF. C. W. SCHAEFFER. D. D., LL.D., born in Hagerstown, Md., in 1813, educated at the University of Pennsylvania and at Gettysburg. He served the congregation of Barren Hill (1834-40), Harrisburg (1840-49) and Germantown, Pa., (1849-64), became professor at the seminary of Philadelphia (1864) and was for many years president of synod. He distinguished himself as an author ("Early History of the Lutheran Church in America", 1857, and many articles in the Evangelical Review) and as a leader in the Church. He died in 1898.

#### **B. The Convention at Fort Wayne, 1866.**

[a] INTRODUCTORY. The twenty-second convention of the General Synod was opened at Ft. Wayne, Ind., on the morning of May 17, 1866. At that time this body comprised two-thirds of the Lutherans in America. Those who had followed developments during the preceding two years had reason to look forward to this notable gathering with a feeling of fear that something serious might take place. After the convention at York, "The Lutheran Observer" had viewed the situation from every point of the compass. In the edition of October 21, 1864, it published an article on the "Coming Theological Conflict," in which the fear is expressed that the Church might be increasingly dominated by the minority. It would not be the first time in history that the few would sway the many. The ultra-conservatives would now operate under the sanction of the Pennsylvania Synod, and drive home their claims by means of "The Lutheran and Missionary," the new seminary and a number of liturgical publications. Should the Liberals cease their activity and display less sagacity and zeal in advocating their side of the question, the result could be easily foreseen.

Intense bitterness was felt against the Pennsylvania Synod on account of the withdrawal of its delegation and the founding of the Philadelphia Seminary. Dr. Krauth, Jun., had exposed the shallowness of "American Lutheranism" in many able articles in the "Lutheran and Missionary," of which he was editor from 1861 to 1867.<sup>88</sup> The extreme Liberalists in the General Synod, who, however, had not such a majority of votes that they could carry any measure without the aid of others with whom they were often at swords' points, aimed to exclude the Pennsylvania Synod at this convention, if it could be done. The "Lutheran Observer" presented the view that since the Pennsylvania Synod had withdrawn from the General Synod, it would have to be regularly reinstated before it could be recognized. It ar-

gued that the delegates from this synod would have to pay their own expenses to Fort Wayne, that their credentials would be laid on the table until after organization and that their case would be submitted to a committee which, at the close of the convention, would report that, if the delegates of the Pennsylvania Synod were to attend on the same basis as the delegates of other synods, they would be admitted, but not otherwise.<sup>89</sup> The “Lutheran” knew<sup>90</sup> (through a note directed by Dr. S. S. Schmucker to his son, Beal M. Schmucker, a delegate to synod) that an extensive correspondence had been carried on between prominent men of the General Synod, many of whom were delegates to the Fort Wayne convention, to the effect that the Pennsylvania Synod should no longer be regarded as a part of the General Synod.

But in order to speak impartially, we should add to these statements which Dr. Spaeth has collected in his “Life of Krauth,” the following: Dr. S. K. Brobst, in the “Lutherische Zeitschrift,” published at Allentown, Pa., replied to the papers of Columbus and St. Louis, which expressed regret that the Pennsylvania Synod had not, immediately after the experience in York (at its meeting in Pottstown, Pa.), withdrawn from the General Synod: that the mother-synod should be given time to proceed slowly. He added that the Pennsylvania Synod would have separated from the General Synod years ago if it had not been for its investments and rights at Gettysburg. This had been the real crux of the matter at Pottstown, and had caused the delay which the western brethren had failed to understand. The problem would soon be solved, however, by the establishment of a new educational institution. “Therefore, dear brethren, have patience a little longer.”<sup>91</sup> Dr. Brown, in a speech lasting an hour, which he delivered at Fort Wayne in reply to Dr. Passavant, declared that negotiations had taken place and that “noses had been counted” by the opposition, resulting in the information that fourteen synods were ready to secede and to build over the ruins of the General Synod a new organization.

We want to tell both sides of the story. *Inter arma silent leges*, i.e., laws are silent in the din of battle. Synodical politics played a prominent part all around.

At all events, the Pennsylvania Synod elected regular delegates to the convention at Fort Wayne. Its clerical representatives were J. A. Seiss, chairman,<sup>92</sup> C. P. Krauth, G. F. Krotel, C. W. Schaeffer, S. K. Brobst, B. M. Schmucker. The leading editorial in the Lutheran Observer (May 11), published in connection with the convention, gave a general review of the

whole situation. It stated that the founding of a new seminary, close to Gettysburg, yet doctrinally antagonistic to it, practically amounted to a schism. It called attention to the fact that the Pennsylvania Synod demanded its own hymnal, liturgy and catechism, contrary to the rights accorded other district synods belonging to the General Synod. Furthermore, the special privilege by which the Pennsylvania delegates assumed authority to judge the constitutionality of the General Synod's proceedings and to withdraw from its sessions without losing membership was altogether untenable.<sup>93</sup> The article closes by saying it would be fair for the General Synod to declare that if the Pennsylvania Ministerium would come like any other delegation, willing to cooperate and to construct the future policy of all concerned, it would be heartily welcomed; but should it come as a foe or even in a spirit of antagonism to the fundamental ideals of the General Synod and determined to overthrow its doctrinal basis, to replace its literature and to disturb its institutions, then it should be refused admission. Apart from the question whether the General Synod had the formal right of rejecting the Pennsylvania Synod, since it had been admitted with that objectionable privilege (1853), we cannot help agreeing with "The Lutheran Observer." The Pennsylvania Synod, on the other hand, could not very well recede from its position. It stood for a great principle: the principle of committing the Lutheran Church of America to historical foundations, whence it had been shifted by the actions of the advocates of American Lutheranism.

The question has been asked: Why did the Pennsylvania Synod send delegates to Fort Wayne? Dr. Spaeth quotes Dr. Chas. Philip Krauth as having declared that the Pennsylvania Synod was right in withdrawing at York, but wrong in again sending delegates to Fort Wayne.<sup>94</sup> Indeed its action is difficult to understand. It stated that it was encouraged by the intention of the General Synod, expressed at York, to embody in its constitution a confessional paragraph which would be binding upon all synods belonging to it (com. § 10, 3, a, page 145). But the opponents suspected that a delegation had been sent to Fort Wayne to place the odium of schism on the General Synod.<sup>95</sup> When there is mutual distrust there is easily a lack of charity in interpreting the motives for an action. We do not believe that there was entire unity of view in the Pennsylvania Synod. The Germans, to be sure, were united in their determination to separate, but many of the English, like Dr. Krauth himself,<sup>96</sup> felt attached to the General Synod with many tender ties and did not want to leave it unless the step was absolutely necessary.

[b] Let us try to describe THE PROCEEDINGS AT FORT WAYNE. Dr. Samuel Sprecher, head of the College and Seminary at Springfield, O., presided. Eleven synods had handed in credentials for their delegations and had been recognized, when the Pennsylvania Synod was refused admission. Dr. Sprecher, after stating that he was fulfilling a painful duty, offered the following reason: Since the delegates of the Pennsylvania Synod had severed their connection with the General Synod at York, he was forced to rule that by such action the Pennsylvania Synod had withdrawn from the partnership of the synods in the governing functions of the General Synod, and therefore forfeited its right of taking part in the election of officers; he added that he would not ask for credentials from its delegates nor give recognition to them until after the credentials of synods whose standing was not questioned had been passed upon; at that time an opportunity would be given for any appeal against the decision of the chair.<sup>97</sup> Dr. Seiss persistently submitted the credentials of his delegation, but Dr. Sprecher, with the same persistency, refused to consider them. Dr. Krauth wished to know on what authority the president was basing his decision. Dr. Sprecher replied that it was not a question of authority by which he could exclude the Pennsylvania Synod, but a question of lack of authority for admitting it.<sup>98</sup> Delegates of other synods, favoring the Pennsylvania Synod, asked to be heard, but were ruled out of order. The convention adjourned. At the opening of the afternoon session. Dr. Sprecher gave his decision, which is on record, as follows: "The chair regards the acts of the delegates of the Pennsylvania Synod, by which they severed their practical relations with the General Synod, and withdrew from the partnership of the synods in the governing functions of the General Synod, as the act of the Synod of Pennsylvania, and that consequently that synod was out of practical union with the General Synod up to the adjournment of the last convention, and we cannot know officially what the action of that synod has been since; so she must be considered as in that state of practical withdrawal from the governing functions of the General Synod, until the General Synod can receive the report of an act restoring her practical relations to the General Synod; and as no such report can be received until said synod is organized, the chair cannot recognize any paper offered at this stage of the proceedings of the synod, as a certificate of delegation to this body."<sup>99</sup> No discussion was permitted at this point. After the roll call of the synods and before the election of officers, the chairman of the Pennsylvania Synod once more submitted the cre-

dentials of his delegation, but without success. The delegate of another synod appealed from the decision of the chair. The vote taken on this appeal sustained the president by 17 to 24. Officers were elected.

Dr. J. A. Brown, the successor to Dr. S. S. Schmucker at Gettysburg, was elected president. The delegation of the Pennsylvania Synod had withdrawn, and was determined not to make another attempt at recognition. They held that the withdrawal of their delegation at York (1864) did not affect their right to be represented in the organization of the General Synod.

A committee which, at the close of the convention, was instructed to draw up a reply to a “protest from delegates of other synods” (see Dr. Ochsenford, *Documentary History*, p. 84), declared on this point: “In the exercise of their ordinary and legitimate rights, the integral members of such a body may speak against the passage of any resolution,<sup>100</sup> may vote against it, when the question is put, and by calling for the ayes and noes may have their votes recorded; but if they find themselves in the minority, loyalty still requires them to submit to the will of the majority. If they regard the adoption of a resolution as involving a violation of the constitution of the body, they have still another right — that of protest. They may demand that a respectful protest against the resolution be recorded in the minutes; thus exonerating themselves from all responsibility for the passage of the resolution; but loyalty requires them still to submit. These are all the rights of the integral parts of any organized body which may be exercised consistently with full and complete membership. If the members of a body feel that they cannot submit even under protest to its action, they may withdraw from it, but this act is the beginning of a revolution, which in its very incipiency severs the practical relations of the revolutionists, and forfeits their share in the governing power or functions of the body; in its completion, it severs all their relations to the body and all their rights in it.”<sup>101</sup> This expressed the view of the majority in the General Synod.

But the delegates of the Pennsylvania Synod emphasized the fact that, when it united with the General Synod in 1853, it had been done with the reservation of having the right to withdraw from sessions and to report to the synod, should the General Synod at any time do anything contrary to the faith of the Lutheran Church, be it in the matter of admission of new synods or of the preservation of membership. They furthermore<sup>102</sup> declared that the Pennsylvania Synod was entirely justified in specifying this condition. Says the reply: “There were those, however, in the Synod of Pennsylvania who,

although a minority, constituted an earnest and influential minority, had resisted the resumption of an active connection with the General Synod, principally on the ground of doctrinal difficulties, and who were unwilling to reenter without some guarantees that this union should not endanger the faith and oppress their conscience. To remove all doubts and difficulties, and to give all the brethren, especially those who were dissatisfied with the doctrinal position of portions of the General Synod, some security for the future, the Synod adopted the instructions which appear to be offensive to many on this floor.”<sup>103</sup>

It is of interest to know whether the General Synod was familiar with this attitude of the Pennsylvania Synod at the time of affiliation. The delegates assert that these resolutions were published even before the meeting at Winchester, Va., in 1853,<sup>104</sup> The Pennsylvania Synod<sup>105</sup> recorded the following report of its committee: “For whether they (the General Synod) gladly received the delegates of our synod at the convention of the General Synod at Winchester, in 1853, from motives of Christian forbearance, as they allege, or from whatever other cause, we were received upon these terms, and they were never repealed, and until that has been done in a legitimate way our right to representation cannot be justly questioned.”<sup>106</sup> Before the convention at Fort Wayne, Dr. Sprecher wrote to Dr. S. S. Schmucker: “While other synods whose delegates appeared at Winchester had to make regular application before their delegates could take their seats, those of the Pennsylvania Synod were received without such application, and treated as if their synod had never left the General Synod.”<sup>107</sup> Says Dr. Spaeth;”Most cordially were the delegates of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania received by the General Synod, and requested to hand in their credentials before the body proceeded to the election of officers.”<sup>108</sup> It seems that any irregularities in the proceedings had been purposely overlooked, because a particular reverence was felt for the oldest Lutheran Synod in America, founded by Muhlenberg. It was known as the”mother synod,” and had been instrumental in forming the General Synod (§ 7, 2). After its withdrawal (§ 7, 3) repeated attempts had been made to win it back. In this connection it is significant that, in the minutes of the convention at Winchester (1853), there is no record of those resolutions of the Pennsylvania Synod, although at the time they were publicly read. What did the General Synod say concerning the right claimed by the Pennsylvania Synod for its action at York? The committee reports as follows: “If such right was conceded upon their re-admis-

sion at Winchester, the retiring President, in organizing the present convention, could not officially know the fact, for it is not recorded in the minutes of this body, and the General Synod cannot now officially know it, for she can know that only as her official action which is recorded in her minutes. If the Pennsylvania Synod believed she had the right to which she has attached so much importance, and which she has exercised at the risk of destroying this body, and yet did not care to have it recorded, that is the fault of the Synod of Pennsylvania, and she has no right to hold the retiring President of the General Synod responsible for the consequences to herself. In the absence of any official evidence of any such concession to the Pennsylvania Synod on the part of the General Synod, and having already shown that the right claimed is essentially revolutionary, we conclude that the General Synod could not be understood to have conceded it even tacitly as of any other character than revolutionary, and consequently that she meant to treat the Pennsylvania Synod, in case she exercised that right, as being in a state of revolution — that is, out of practical relations with the General Synod.”<sup>109</sup> After the election of officers and the exodus of the Pennsylvania delegation, the case of the Pennsylvania Synod was thoroughly discussed. Arguments, lasting two days and a half, were presented and the following resolutions forwarded through Secretary M. Sheeleigh to the delegates of the Pennsylvania Synod, still in the city: “1) That this synod regards the condition annexed by the Synod of Pennsylvania to the appointment of their delegates<sup>110</sup> as contrary to that equality among the synods composing this body, provided for by the Constitution of this Synod. 2) That whatever motives of Christian forbearance may have induced this synod to receive the Pennsylvania delegates, in 1853, with this condition, the unfavorable influence since exerted by it render it very desirable that the said condition be rescinded by the Synod of Pennsylvania. 3) That the synod hereby expresses its entire willingness to receive the delegates of the Synod of Pennsylvania. 4) That the delegates from the Pennsylvania Synod be requested to waive what may seem to them an irregular organization of this body and to acquiesce in the present organization.” (Documentary History, p. 83. The fourth point was added later).

After a lengthy discussion of this proposition the delegates of the Pennsylvania Synod appeared for the first time, after their withdrawal, on the floor of the convention to read their reply.<sup>111</sup> They were asked to present their credentials. This they refused, but they handed in a copy of their syn-

odical protocol containing a list of delegates. They refused, on principle, to hand in their real credentials because these had been previously rejected by the organization. At the conclusion of their explicit reply, they declared: “Whatever impression our course may have made upon some minds, and whatever rumors may have been circulated in reference to factious and schismatic movements of the Synod of Pennsylvania, we can say with a good conscience that we have not sought division, but have waited for union and are ready to cooperate in the General Synod — provided: That this body shall now declare that the Synod of Pennsylvania had, as it claimed to have, the constitutional right to be represented before the election of officers and take part in it and might now justly claim the right of casting its vote. If the convention will so declare, we are perfectly willing to waive the right of voting, will acquiesce in the present organization, and will take our seats in this body, equals among equals.”<sup>112</sup>

It is interesting to know that after discussing this reply the chairman, Dr. Brown, left the chair and offered this resolution: “RESOLVED, That, having heard the statement and explanation of the delegation of the Synod of Pennsylvania, we recognize said synod as a constitutional part of this body and direct the names of the delegates to be entered upon the roll.” After discussing this resolution the convention adjourned till the next morning. Says Dr. Jacobs: “The purpose of the majority was not to exclude the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, but to compel its delegates to apply for re-admission, and then to readmit the Ministerium, with the condition which the Ministerium attached to its admission in 1853 annulled, or the request made that the Ministerium should itself annul it. The right of delegates to withdraw and report to their synod when an act which seemed to them unconstitutional was passed, was no longer to be admitted. This was the point of contention during the days of debate that followed.”<sup>113</sup>

It should be added that the delegates of the Pennsylvania Synod were elected at Easton, in 1865, with the understanding “that this synod has in no sense ceased to approve of the protest and the withdrawal of its delegates from the convention at York;” and that it “still reserves the privilege (expressed in the resolutions passed on the occasion of the election of delegates to the General Synod, in 1853) which prompted the action of its delegation at the convention of York, in 1864.” Such strong emphasis, showing the unyielding spirit of the Pennsylvania Synod in this respect, caused alarm among the majority party of the General Synod. It was regarded as



exceedingly dangerous at this time of restlessness in the General Synod to leave such a dynamite box under the delicate structure of the organization. The Rev. Joel Schwartz finally offered the following amendment:

“RESOLVED, That, after hearing the response of the delegates of the Pennsylvania Synod, we cannot conscientiously recede from the action taken by this body, believing, after full and careful deliberation, said action to have been regular and constitutional: but that we reaffirm our readiness to receive the delegates of said synod as soon as they present their credentials in due form.”

We shall close the recital of this epoch-making struggle by quoting from the pamphlet, “The Pennsylvania Synod”: “The resolution (of Rev. J. Schwartz) was brought before the house, and on motion it was agreed to vote without debate. The yeas and nays were called, and there were seventy-six who voted for the resolution and thirty-two who voted against it, while seven declined to vote. After the adoption of the resolution, a motion was made to reconsider the vote just taken, followed by another to lay this motion to reconsider on the table, the effect of which was, and was proclaimed to be, to prevent the convention from again considering the subject. Thus did the majority firmly and positively burn the bridge behind them.”<sup>114</sup>

The chairman of the Pennsylvania Synod arose and declared that he considered the decision of the convention as final, and that there was nothing left for his delegation but to withdraw and report to their synod. He added, however, that in accord with the position originally taken, such a step had no bearing on the relation of the Pennsylvania Synod to the General Synod. Dr. J. A. Brown, the President of the General Synod, replied that the General Synod by no means considered the Pennsylvania Synod as being out of the organization (Documentary History, p. 84). But the rupture had been made, and, as the sequel proved, could not be healed.

The Pennsylvania Synod had many friends among other synods, with whom they had held various meetings regarding possible steps that might have to be taken should the Pennsylvania Synod secede. It was agreed first to issue a protest against the action of the General Synod. This protest, read by Dr. W. A. Passavant, was signed by twenty-two delegates of different synods: New York (4), Pittsburg (5), Engl. Synod of Ohio (4), Iowa (3), Northern Illinois (3), Northern Indiana (3), Minnesota (1), Hartwick (1), Illinois (1). The protest closed with these words: “Its inevitable conse-

quences will be felt in the future, and will make a deep impression upon the character and development of the church.”<sup>115</sup>

[c] A REVIEW OF THE PROCEEDINGS AT FORT WAYNE. The General Synod was no doubt justified in its desire not to have affiliated with it a synod claiming for its delegation the prerogative of withdrawing without therewith forfeiting its membership. Nowadays no synod would be admitted on that basis, neither to the General Synod nor to any other large body. The reservation with which the Ministerium of Pennsylvania had entered was more hurtful to the General Synod than it was needed as a protection for the Pennsylvania Synod. At any time in the future the Pennsylvania Synod might withdraw from the General Synod, just as later a number of synods left the General Council when they found their ideals unrealized. The reservation of the Pennsylvania Synod left it to the collective wisdom of just a delegation to introduce the consideration of a far-reaching schism; the synod then might decide either to secede or to remain in the General Synod until it had collected enough sympathizers to effect the organization of a new general body. Such proceedings might eventually dynamite the whole organization. Fairness demands that the difficult and critical position of the General Synod at Fort Wayne be fully appreciated. Ever after the convention at York separation had been in the air: and when immediately afterwards the Philadelphia Seminary was founded, even the men in the middle of the road, who would not have been averse to receiving theological inspiration from the men of the Pennsylvania Synod, were justly alarmed. It must further be admitted that the Pennsylvania Synod, especially in its instruction to the delegation elected at Easton (1865), used language not calculated to prevent the possibility of a rupture.

But was the General Synod altogether right? Its mistake of 1853 was not to be denied. The Pennsylvania Synod had been admitted with that reservation. It was true, and it may serve to explain the ruling of Dr. Sprecher, that there was no record of it in the protocol of 1853. Still it remains doubtful that the exclusion of the delegates of the Pennsylvania Synod was a justifiable act.<sup>116</sup> It should have been borne in mind that the convention was a religious one and that parliamentary tactics were clearly out of place at a moment when it was the great problem how English Lutheranism could be kept from being rent into two hostile camps. The Pennsylvania Synod should have been admitted, and the arguments on the objectionable clause reserved for later discussion.

Much has been said as to whether or not the conflict at Fort Wayne was of a confessional character at all. This is both asserted and denied.<sup>117</sup> What are the facts in the case?

Considering the long-drawn-out conflicts with “American Lutheranism,” the correspondence carried on by the leading men of that period (Charles Philip Krauth’s letters to his son; Schmucker’s to Sprecher; Passavant’s to C. W. Schaeffer); also the editorials and contributions in the “Lutheran Observer” and the “Lutheran and Missionary,” and reviewing the controversial interim between the York and Fort Wayne conventions (1864-66), we cannot but admit that confessional differences were at the bottom of this whole struggle. This was the crux of the matter always and everywhere.

But another issue crept into the discussion. The old Pennsylvania Synod had ever been jealous of its independence. Fearing the loss of it, she had left the General Synod in 1823, and not without apprehension that her individuality might be absorbed by the larger body, had she returned in 1853. At Fort Wayne two dissenting views of church government stood opposed to each other. The majority wanted a general church authority whose decisions were to regulate the district synods. But the Pennsylvania Synod would concede nothing but advisory functions to the General Synod. The founding of seminaries, the definition of doctrinal standards and the editing of hymnals and rituals were to remain the business of the district synods. The old mother synod refused to lose its autonomy.<sup>118</sup>

The problem of polity then became aggravated by that of the confessional question. The Pennsylvania Synod demanded a seminary whose faculty was pledged to all the Symbolical Books, because the history of Gettysburg had proved that the recognition of the Augustana and of the Catechism was not sufficient guarantee for Lutheran teaching. Moreover, she was not satisfied with the liturgy of the General Synod, which at that time was by no means as clearly Lutheran as we find it in the “Ministerial Acts” of today.<sup>119</sup> It is true that at the time of the convention at Fort Wayne the Pennsylvania Synod was still satisfied with only the Augustana as the doctrinal basis of the general body.<sup>120</sup> And yet it is also true that at the convention in Fort Wayne, Dr. Krauth was already of a different turn of mind. In the “Lutheran and Missionary” (July 13, 1865,) he attacked the position (held by the General Synod and formerly also by himself) which differentiates between fundamentals and non-fundamentals in the Augustana. Dr. Spaeth explains this change of front as the result of conscientious study,

and says that Dr. Krauth had learned to see through the utter inconsistency and shallowness of the “American Lutheranism.”<sup>121</sup> Yet there were men in the General Synod who even then had not outgrown the “Definite Platform.” This we see when we read the Lutheran Observer about the time of the convention at Fort Wayne.<sup>122</sup> And while the majority in that body did not approve of the attacks on the venerable document of the Reformation, they were not ready to consider all parts of the Augustana of fundamental value. But which parts are essential and which non-essential? Would not everybody accept or reject whatever he pleased? This would have been the burden of argument at Fort Wayne had the convention proceeded far enough.

But parliamentary rules and matters of church government overshadowed this issue to such an extent that the meeting at Fort Wayne appears unnatural, forced and altogether unsatisfactory. Nor should we attribute too much importance to the votes cast at this convention. Some voted against the Pennsylvania Synod for treasons of doctrine, but others were merely concerned about the governmental feature of the question. The final decision by no means signified a victory for “American Lutheranism.” The Conservatives of the General Synod soon again began to gain influence. They continued the development in the right direction, and thus rendered services to the Lutheran Church of America which future historians will be forced to recognize.

[d] FURTHER RUPTURES (THE FORMING OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL). The vote cast by the convention at Fort Wayne meant disruption. A few weeks afterwards, at its 119th annual meeting, the Ministerium of Pennsylvania severed its connection with the General Synod and sent out an invitation to all Lutheran synods to participate in the organization of a new general body. In the following year (1867), at Fort Wayne, Ind., the new organization known as the General Council<sup>123</sup> came into existence. The new York Ministerium, the Pittsburg Synod, the English Synod of Ohio, the Illinois Synod and the Minnesota Synod also left the General Synod and took part in the new organization. Some of these synods suffered a disruption. The New York Ministerium lost seventeen ministers and ten congregations, which in turn formed the New York Synod and as such joined the General Synod. Seven ministers had left the New York Ministerium already in 1859, and formed the New Jersey Synod.<sup>124</sup> This small organization united with the New York Synod in 1872. After that the whole synod was known as the Synod of New York

and New Jersey. But when it was joined by the Hartwick and Franckean Synods (1908), it adopted the general name of New York Synod, which today is one of the largest district synods of the General Synod.<sup>125</sup> A disruption also occurred in the Illinois Synod. At its meeting at Mount Pulaski, Ill., a minority refused to abide by the decision of the majority, and remained with the General Synod as the Synod of Central Illinois.<sup>126</sup> Ten ministers left the Pittsburg Synod, and, retaining the name of the synod, remained with the General Synod. Even congregations were rent asunder. Their pastors would choose one way or the other, and in subsequent litigations, violent and expensive, church properties were variously disposed of, notably in Pittsburg, Leechburg, Williamsport and Allentown. The General Council faction would generally contend that the General Synod did not recognize without reservation the Augustana nor the other confessional writings of the Lutheran Church, and that, therefore, the General Synod faction was not Lutheran. But such arguments did not carry in court. Although the position of the General Synod was based on the principle that there were essential and non-essential elements in the Augustana (see § 11, 1, b), yet no court could be moved to declare the General Synod non-Lutheran on that account. This is a question of *esse* and *bene esse*, and a secular court can decide only in regard to the *esse*. The General Synod invariably won the contest wherever confessional issues were at stake.<sup>127</sup> The testimony on both sides, usually given by theologians of eminence, always offered a great display of scholarship and sagacity. Dr. J. A. Brown mostly represented the General Synod and Dr. C. P. Krauth the General Council. In the case of the Leechburg Church, Dr. Brown was on the witness stand for five days, half a day on direct examination and four days and a half on cross-examination. Noteworthy is also the case of Allentown, reported by Master (Quarterly Review, vol. VIII.). Krauth, Schaeffer and Brobst represented the minority claiming the church property; Hay, Brown and Baum the General Synod. The minority lost. While we must not attribute too much importance to the decision of secular courts in matters of a religious character, because in things spiritual there is more to be taken account of than the letter of the law, yet we find in the jurist's viewpoint, which at times was confirmed by the highest authorities, an additional evidence for our assertion that the difference between the Lutheranism of the two sides was, with regard to the form of confessional obligation a question of *esse* and *bene esse*.

The losses of the General Synod between 1860 and 1870 were enormous. Counting the withdrawal of the Swedes and of the southern Lutherans, they amounted to two hundred and seventeen clergymen and seventy-six thousand one hundred and forty-nine communicants. In 1860 the General Synod comprised two-thirds of the Lutherans in America, and at this period of our history only one-fourth. But that it retained its vitality may be gathered from the fact that today (1915) it represents one thousand three hundred and sixty-six ministers, one thousand, eight hundred and thirty-one congregations and three hundred and twenty-nine thousand six hundred and ninety-nine communicants.

ANNOTATION. In late years the following synods have united with the General Synod: 1867 the Susquehanna Synod, 1868 the Kansas Synod, 1861 the (English) Nebraska Synod, 1877 the Wartburg Synod, 1891 the Synod of California, the Rocky Mountain Synod and the German Nebraska Synod. The last named synod was formed by German ministers of the increasingly English Nebraska Synod, and comprises, according to its latest reports, eighty-three ministers and one hundred fifteen congregations. In the territories of Kansas, Oklahoma, Nebraska and the two Dakotas the Germans of the General Synod seem to have good prospects. The first ministerial supply for Nebraska was furnished by the Chicago seminary (Dr. J. D. Severinghaus); later the work was chiefly carried on by the Western Theological Seminary (Dr. J. L. Neve, Dean of the German Department), whence whole classes of candidates went into the Nebraska field. In 1913 the synod founded its own seminary in Lincoln, Neb. The New York Synod joined the General Synod in 1908, but this was merely a case where synods which formerly had belonged to the General Synod (Hartwick, Franckean, New York and New Jersey) now formed a larger organization.

## **§ 11. The Character of the General Synod.**

### **1. General Review of Doctrinal Development.**

To arrive at a proper perspective we have to refer to some facts which have been previously mentioned.

[a] The first constitution of the General Synod (given in detail by Fritschel, Vol. II, p. 40) contained NO EXPLICIT DECLARATION OF ADHERENCE TO THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

This defect is explained by the tendency of that period, which was one in which the necessity of a clearly stated doctrinal basis was not yet realized. Consideration, especially for the New York Ministerium and the Pennsylvania Synod, prevailed upon the General Synod at its formation to refrain from incorporating doctrinal declarations, even regarding the Augustana, in its constitution.

As early as 1792 the Ministerium of Pennsylvania had adopted a new constitution in which every reference to the Lutheran confessions had been carefully avoided (§ 6, 4). The gates were to be left open for a union with the Reformed. In 1819 it was decided to found a theological seminary together with the Reformed, and in 1822 the desire was expressed to unite with that denomination. (For a historical interpretation of the situation in the Pennsylvania Synod see § 10, 3, b, page 144 sq.) Socinianism was rampant in the New York Ministerium, whose president, Dr. Quitman, was one of the founders of the General Synod. This explains why the General Synod could not mention the Augsburg Confession in its constitution of 1820. At that time Dr. S. S. Schmucker was a more positive theologian than the majority of his contemporaries. In view of the rationalistic tendencies in the New York Ministerium, he demanded that the Augsburg Confession be raised from the dust and that every clergyman sign the twenty-one articles of faith, and declare before God that they were in harmony with the Bible, not *quatenus*, but *quia*.<sup>128</sup>

Not until 1835 was A PARAGRAPH ADDED TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE GENERAL SYNOD, requiring that synods desiring to unite with it should accept the fundamental doctrines of the Bible as taught by our Church.

But this fact does not authorize us to say that the General Synod remained all those years without a confessional obligation. For in 1829 it adopted a CONSTITUTION FOR ITS DISTRICT SYNODS, which in its formula for ordination required an affirmative answer to the following questions:

1. Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the Word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice?
2. Do you believe that the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God are taught in a manner substantially correct in the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession?

Even earlier than this, in 1825, the confessional basis of the THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AT GETTYSBURG was expressed as follows:

In this Seminary the fundamental doctrines of the Holy Scriptures, as found in the Augsburg Confession, shall be taught in the German and English languages:

When the professors were inducted into office they were required to affirm:

I believe that the Augsburg Confession and the Catechisms of Luther are a summary and correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of God's Word.

A closer examination of these confessional obligations, particularly that contained in the formula of ordination, reveals a lack of the necessary clearness and definiteness. The expression "SUBSTANTIALLY CORRECT" was interpreted by the representatives of the so-called "American Lutheranism" to mean that the Augustana was not throughout in accordance with the Scriptures, and that they had the right, therefore, to reject such articles as they chose.

[b] At the convention at YORK, PA. (1864), the very one from which the delegates of the Pennsylvania Ministerium had withdrawn in consequence of the reception of the Franckean Synod (§ 10, 3), the General Synod recommended to its district synods the incorporation of the following paragraph in the constitution of the general body:<sup>129</sup>

"All regularly constituted Lutheran synods, not now in connection with the General Synod, receiving and holding, with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of our fathers, the Word of God as contained in the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine Word, and of the faith of our Church founded upon that Word, may at any time become associated with the General Synod by complying with the requisitions of this constitution and sending delegates," etc.

It is to be noted that, instead of "substantially correct," we here read "a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine Word." This clause was taken from the constitution of the New York Ministerium.

[c] At the SAME CONVENTION (York, 1864), in order to interpret disputed points of the Augsburg Confession and to bear testimony to its unequivocal adherence to that symbol, the General Synod resolved:



“This synod, resting on the Word of God as the sole authority in matters of faith, on its infallible warrant rejects the Romish doctrines of the real presence of transubstantiation, and with it the doctrine of consubstantiation; rejects the mass, and all ceremonies distinctive of the mass; denies any power in the Sacrament as an opus operatum, or that the blessings of baptism and of the Lord’s Supper can be received without faith; rejects auricular confession and priestly absolution; holds that there is no priesthood on earth except that of all believers, and that God only can forgive sins; and maintains the sacred obligation of the Lord’s Day; and while we would with our whole heart reject any part of any confession which taught doctrines in conflict with this our testimony, nevertheless, before God and His Church, we declare that, in our judgment, the Augsburg Confession, properly interpreted, is in perfect consistence with this our testimony and with Holy Scripture as regards the errors specified.”

This declaration was originally prepared by Dr. Charles Porterfield Krauth (see § 9, 2, biographical sketches), and adopted by the Pittsburg Synod, which now belongs to the General Council, in 1856 at Zelienople. Pa., in connection with resolutions directed against the “Definite Platform.” (Compare § 10, 3, b, annotation.) On motion of Dr. Passavant, who was an active member of the General Council from its inception, it was adopted by the General Synod at York. This so-called “York Resolution,” as belonging to a period which had not as yet arrived at confessional clearness, was not repeated, when in 1913 the present doctrinal basis of the General Synod was being defined (see § 11, 1, f).

[d] At HAGERSTOWN, MD (1895), the General Synod adopted another resolution which must be taken into consideration in judging of its confessional standpoint. It will be necessary to go back a few years in order to understand the motive underlying that resolution. The result of the rupture which led to the formation of the General Council was BY NO MEANS A CLEAR CLEAVAGE between the confessional and the non-confessional elements (§ 10, 3, c, close). Many men who remained in the General Synod had combated the Definite Platform with as much determination as those who left it. For them the difficulty with the Pennsylvania Ministerium resolved itself chiefly into a question of polity. These men of a confessional tendency constantly increased in numbers and influence, and the RELATIONS between them and the men of the opposite party grew more and more STRAINED.<sup>130</sup> The former, the so-called “CONSERVATIVES,” complained that many men on the other side wrongly interpreted the clause of the constitution which reads, “the Augsburg Confession is a correct exhibition of the FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES of the divine Word,” interpreting it as binding them only on those points of doctrine in which the Augustana exhibits fundamental truths of the Bible,

but not binding them on non-fundamental doctrines. The latter class of persons who, with an unmistakable leaning toward the Definite Platform, aimed at an American Lutheranism severed from its historical past, accused the most influential men on the conservatively Lutheran side of seeking to change the confessional basis of the General Synod and to make, not the Augsburg Confession alone, but all the other confessions of the Book of Concord, the doctrinal basis of the General Synod. The General Synod, therefore, at its convention at Hagerstown, Md. (1895), passed the following resolution as an interpretation of its constitution:

“This convention of the General Synod expresses its entire satisfaction with the present form of doctrinal basis and confessional subscription, which is the Word of God, as the infallible rule of faith and practice, and the Unaltered Augsburg Confession as throughout in perfect consistence with it — nothing more, nothing less.”

Here for the first time the “UNALTERED” Augsburg Confession is mentioned, although no other than this was meant at York in 1864. Then, too, this resolution expressly declares that the Augustana is throughout in perfect consistence with God’s Word.

[e] But the friction between these two parties did not cease. Of this fact the minutes of the convention at DES MOINES, IA. (1901), bear witness. For there we read:

“We re-affirm our unreserved allegiance to the present basis of the General Synod, and we hold that to make any distinction between fundamental and so-called non-fundamental doctrines in the Augsburg Confession is contrary to that basis as set forth in our formula of confessional subscription.”

These were the years when Dr. J. G. Butler of Washington, D. C, edited “The Lutheran Evangelist.” He and men of a similar viewpoint persistently declared that the General Synod had purposely demanded nothing but fidelity to the fundamentals of the Augustana. The Conservatives objected to this, because it left every one to decide for himself what is fundamental, and so the General Synod passed the above mentioned resolution.

[f] But the resolutions of Hagerstown and Des Moines were NOT REALLY CONSTITUTIONAL. They had not been submitted to the District Synods for approval, but were unexpectedly brought to the attention of the General Synod and thus unanimously adopted. In order to become constitutional certain

recommendations would have to be sent to the District Synods in advance, and only after two-thirds of these District Synods had considered them favorably, could they be incorporated in the constitution.

Meanwhile a CONVENTION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL was held at Buffalo, N. Y. (1907). Here, on motion of the Canada Synod and on the basis of certain theses written by Dr. H. E. Jacobs, the question of exchange of delegates with the General Synod was under discussion. Objections were raised on the ground that the General Synod was still standing on an ambiguous confessional basis. In reference to this certain RESOLUTIONS WERE ADOPTED at the convention of the General Synod at Richmond, Ind. (1909). These resolutions had been carefully worked out by Dr. L. S. Keyser, with the assistance of the faculty of Wittenberg Seminary. He had been the General Synod's official delegate at the Buffalo meeting of the General Council; hence his special interest in the confessional issues. (Minutes of the General Synod for 1909, pp. 53-61.) The statements reiterated in a vigorous way the declarations at Hagerstown and Des Moines, emphasizing the fact that the General Synod did recognize the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, and that, as far as confessional obligation was concerned, it made no distinction between points essential and non-essential in the sense of rejecting anything of confessional substance. Surely this was some progress since 1866! At that time even the most conservative would have refused to accept this position. The Richmond convention went even further. It expressed its appreciation also of the other Lutheran symbols, characterizing them as "a most valuable body of Lutheran belief, explaining and unfolding the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession."<sup>131</sup>

These important resolutions were followed by a motion by Dr. J. A. Clutz, of Gettysburg, that a COMMITTEE BE APPOINTED for the purpose of gathering into concise form the various doctrinal statements of the General Synod in the past and to make these part of the constitution. Two years afterwards, in the very church of which Dr. Butler had been pastor for many years, Washington, D. C., the new doctrinal basis was defined and referred to the District Synods. In another two years, at the CONVENTION AT ATCHISON, KAN. (1913), the Secretary of the General Synod reported that all the District Synods had declared in favor of this resolution, thus making it part of the constitution. The revised articles are as follows:

#### ARTICLE II. DOCTRINAL BASIS.

“With the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Fathers, the General Synod receives and holds the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New^ Testaments as the Word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice; and it receives and holds the Unaltered Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the faith and doctrine of our church as founded upon that Word.”

#### ARTICLE III. THE SECONDARY SYMBOLS.

“While the General Synod regards the Augsburg Confession as a sufficient and altogether adequate doctrinal basis for the cooperation of Lutheran Synods, it also recognizes the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalkald Articles, the Small Catechism of Luther, the Large Catechism of Luther, and the Formula of Concord as expositions of Lutheran doctrine of great historical and interpretative value, and especially commends the Small Catechism as a book of instruction.”

This was a splendid forward movement in regard to doctrinal precision. The naming of the “Unaltered” Augsburg Confession meant an open protest against Melancthonianism and the theology of the Definite Platform known as “American Lutheranism.”<sup>132</sup> The omission of the old phrase “fundamental.” which had wrought such havoc in the General Synod, cleared the confessional atmosphere.<sup>133</sup>

[2] ITS PRACTICE. The admission of a certain amount of fellowship with other denominations has always been a practice in the General Synod. It had the example of Muhlenberg (cf. § 4, 8). In the days when “American Lutheranism” had the dominating influence it was carried so far that it became a menace to the character of the Lutheran Church in America (§ 9). But great changes have taken place in this direction.

The old PRACTICE OF EXCHANGING DELEGATES at synodical conventions with practically all evangelical denominations has gradually reduced itself to a merely occasional exchange of greetings with the Presbyterians and the Reformed.<sup>134</sup> The General Synod refused to exchange delegates with denominations of a proselyting character. Quite a number of years ago it was customary also to receive a delegate from the United Brethren; but at the convention of the synod at Mansfield, Ohio (1897), the delegate from that body was so unfortunate as to refer to the fact that his church was sending missionaries to Germany. This gave offense, and the General Synod passed a resolution to discontinue the exchange of delegates.

Also as regards pulpit and altar fellowship the General Synod has more and more committed itself to an elimination of abuses.

The practice with respect to EXCHANGE OF PULPITS is far from being uniform. But the leading ministers of the General Synod have been settling down more and more upon the principle that the regular services of the sanctuary in the Lutheran Church are to be conducted by ministers who have taken their confessional vow in that church.<sup>135</sup> Even the customary union meetings on National Thanksgiving days are less and less participated in by the ministers of the General Synod for the simple reason that a service in the Lutheran Church is always better attended. At the dedication of churches, at cornerstone-laying, etc., there is frequently an exchange of good wishes, but always in side-meetings.<sup>136</sup>

Regarding ALTAR FELLOWSHIP the General Synod used to extend an invitation to all present to commune, provided they were in good standing in their own churches. But this general invitation, which was an exceedingly objectionable expression of indifferentism as to the objective faith concerning the Lord's Supper, was eliminated from the Ministerial Acts of the General Synod at the convention at York in 1899.<sup>137</sup> The Germans of the General Synod (Wartburg and German Nebraska Synods) have by special resolutions adopted a position equal to the so-called Akron Resolutions (see § 18).

At this place, the author may be permitted to insert the following from a tract ("Thoughts on Confessional Questions," German Literary Board, Burlington, Ia.) which he published a few years ago (as a reprint from the Lutheran Quarterly, January, 1909):

Here in the Lord's Supper where we have the culmination of divine service, the Lutheran Church has always been especially careful that such only as can agree in the doctrine of the sacrament should commune together; and she would not admit such from other churches who consciously reject the Lutheran conception. When Luther and Melancthon at Marburg were in conference with Zwingli and his adherents, the Swiss reformers suggested the celebration of the communion before parting. But Luther and Melancthon both regretted that they could not. Because of Luther's remark: "You have another spirit than we," it has often been thought that it must have been a stormy conference. But it was not. In recent investigations (comp. Schubert in the *Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte*, 1908, p. 354) it has been pointed out in what a peaceful mood especially Luther was. In all his letters, for instance, to his wife, he is full of hope for a perfect union. Yet his conscience forbids him the celebration of the communion, because an agreement has not yet been reached. The mild Melancthon takes the same position, and wonders in his correspondence and cannot explain it to his own satisfaction, why the Zwinglians wanted a celebration of the communion in spite of the failure to reach an agreement on this very doctrine (*Realencyclopaedie*, 3rd ed., XII, 254. Corp. Ref. II, 1108). I quote this simply to show historically that this conviction, on which there has been so much discussion, existed in our Church from the beginning. This was in 1529. And in 1536 there was another occasion when Luther showed exactly the same attitude. Not before an agreement had been reached with Bucer and the others from Strassburg, in the Wittenberg Concord, did Luther celebrate with them the Lord's Supper. And turning some leaves of history, let me point to another man whom we will be inclined to regard as an authority on this question, because we know that he was not narrow, but had a wide and warm heart for all children of God. I mean Spener. These are his words; "Because the communion with a congregation includes that one approves of the doctrine of this same congregation, especially in the article of such sacrament ... therefore I cannot see how we can take the communion in those churches whose doctrine of the communion we ourselves believe and profess not to be correct, thus giving one testimony with our mouth and another with our act ... Therefore is this doctrine the most manifest partition-wall between the two churches. How can we then have a communion (*gemeines Mahl*) together?" (*Letzte theologische Bedenken*, II, 43 seq.. III, 81. 83 seq.) Of course, it must be admitted, that even regarding the Lord's Supper (do not overlook that Spener speaks of Lutherans seeking the communion in other churches) cases must be considered individually. There may be good Lutherans outside of the Lutheran Church who happen to be in other churches, but who are one with us in faith, and who, even if they cannot give a clear definition of our doctrine, yet do not object to the Real Presence and positively regard the Lord's Supper as a means of grace. But the conscientious minister feels that there is something wrong if some of the communicants believe in the Real Presence of the glorified God-Man and his body be given to the penitent and believing soul for the forgiveness of sins, and others positively reject such doctrine, holding that the elements are nothing but remembrances of an absent Savior and symbols of a grace received before, or that may be received some time in the future. Such would be no real communion. And I am glad that the General Synod, in the adoption of her "Ministerial Acts" in 1899 at York, omitted that general invitation to all members of other churches in good standing or to all who love the Lord Jesus, which marked our old formulas as expressions of indifferentism on so important a doctrine.

[3] ITS POLITY. The General Synod, like all the synods of America, rests on THE EQUALITY OF ALL ORDAINED MINISTERS AND THE COOPERATION OF PASTORS AND LAYMEN in church-work. The delegates to the General Synod, which meets

biennially, consist of pastors and laymen in the proportion of one pastor and one laymen for every ten pastors of the district synods.

The AUTHORITY of the General Synod over its district synods is largely of an advisory character. The executive and jurisdictional power rests in the hands of the district synods. The latter, however, must not pass any ordinances that are in conflict with the "Formula for the Government and Discipline of the Evangelical Lutheran Church."<sup>138</sup>

Among the SPECIAL PREROGATIVES OF THE GENERAL SYNOD is that of providing the books and literature to be used in the public services (agendas, hymnbooks, catechisms). The missionary and benevolent operations of the synod are also under the direct supervision of the general body. This is constitutional.

There may be some truth in the assertion that since the convention at Fort Wayne (1866) the rights of the District Synods, at least in practice, have been diminished and the rights of the General Synod increased. While according to the letter of the law the deliberations of the general body are merely advisory, they are held in such esteem as to be equivalent to a decision. The Boards of Home and Foreign Missions, the Board of Education and the Board of Publication, all appointed by the General Synod, have much influence.<sup>139</sup>

[4] THE LANGUAGE SITUATION. Among all the Lutheran ecclesiastical bodies of this country, the General Synod is THE MOST AMERICANIZED, and therefore the most English. The first official organ (English) of the General Synod was "Lutheran Church Work," founded by the convention of the General Synod at Washington, D. C. (1911), and already (1916) numbering thirteen thousand subscribers. The "Lutheran Observer" was controlled by a corporation and therefore not responsible to the General Synod. On Oct. 23, 1915, however, the "Lutheran Observer" was merged with the General Synod's official organ, which now appears under the name "Lutheran Church Work and Observer."

About one-eighth of its pastors and congregations (more correctly one-seventh) uses THE GERMAN LANGUAGE. The Germans of the General Synod are found largely in the almost exclusively German districts of the Wartburg Synod (42 pastors) and the German Nebraska Synod (84 pastors). The Synod of New York has also a German Conference, and there are some Germans in almost all the districts of the General Synod. Their official

church paper is the "Lutherischer Zionsbote," with some four thousand subscribers.

## § 12. The Work of the General Synod.

### 1. Theological Seminaries and Colleges.

The oldest of the theological seminaries of the General Synod is HARTWICK SEMINARY in New York State. Dr. J. G. Travers, Pres. — The largest seminary of the General Synod is located at GETTYSBURG, PA. Founded in 1826 (§ 7, 5), it has sent forth more than one thousand pastors. At the present time the institution has five well endowed professorships. It possesses a library which is extremely valuable for the history of the Lutheran Church in America. The value of its property aggregates \$160,000. For a long period of years, until 1903, its president was Dr. M. Valentine; now it is Dr. J. A. Singmaster. The other professors are: Dr. M. Coover, Dr. L. Kuhlman. Dr. J. A. Clutz, Dr. H. C. Alleman. — The Hamma Divinity School at SPRINGFIELD, O., was founded in 1845, and stands in close connection with a largely attended college (about one thousand students) founded at the same time and place. Dr. Charles G. Heckert is president. The Dean of the theological seminary is Dr. D. H. Bauslin. The other professors of the seminary are: Dr. V. G. A. Tressler, Dr. L. H. Larimer, Dr. J. L. Neve, Dr. L. S. Keyser. — Susquehanna University at SELINGSGROVE, PA., was founded in 1858 by Dr. B. Kurtz. It was intended at first as a sort of missionary institution, in which older men, who could not obtain a classical education, might be given an opportunity to prepare themselves for work in the kingdom of God, especially in the foreign missionary field. But since 1894, having received very considerable endowments and increased its faculty, it has established itself as a full college, with a theological seminary in connection with it, and has assumed the name given above. The head of this institute for many years was Dr. H. Ziegler. Now it is Dr. C. T. Aikens. The chief professor in theology is Dr. F. P. Manhart. — The "Western Theological Seminary" at ATCHISON, KANS., was founded in 1893 and opened in the rooms of Midland College, with Dr. F. D. Altman as its first president. It is now a department of Midland College, Rev. Dr. R. B. Peery is President. The Dean is Dr. Holmes W. Dysinger. This institution became especially important to the Germans by reason of the fact that the German theological seminary,



founded in Chicago by Dr. J. D. Severinghaus and conducted by him for thirteen years amid many difficulties, was discontinued in 1898 and combined with this English institution as a German department under the care of Prof. J. L. Neve (1892-1909). He was succeeded by Dr. J. F. Krueger. — The youngest seminary in the General Synod is the Martin Luther (Osterloh) Seminary of the German Nebraska Synod, founded in 1913 by the German Nebraska Synod at LINCOLN, NEBR. Its president is Dr. F. Wupper, who is assisted by the professors E. Klotsche and Dr. H. Wellhausen. All seminaries of the General Synod receive students from the seminary at Breklum, Germany, a school under control of the General Synod and supported by its Board of Education as well as by the district synods.

The General Synod has six Colleges: PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE at Gettysburg, Pa. (Dr. W. A. Granville); WITTENBERG COLLEGE at Springfield, O. (Dr. C. G. Heckert); SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY at Selinsgrove, Pa. (Dr. C. T. Aikens), whose chief work is collegiate; HARTWICK, N. Y. (Dr. J. G. Travers), which in part gives education in the classics; CARTHAGE COLLEGE at Carthage, Ill. (Dr. H. D. Hoover); and MIDLAND COLLEGE at Atchison, Kans. (Dr. R. B. Peery).

In order to assist its younger and weaker educational institutions, the General Synod has organized a BOARD OF EDUCATION. From benevolent contributions raised on the so-called apportionment plan, this Board assists in the payment of debts incurred by its institutions or of deficiencies of salary for the professors. — The PARENT EDUCATION SOCIETY has for its object the giving of financial aid to such students for the ministry as are in need of help, by means of funds derived from benevolent contributions or interest-bearing investments. At present, however, the support of beneficiary students of theology lies more in the hands of the individual synods, which annually appoint a BENEFICIARY COMMITTEE, authorizing it to receive contributions, and to apportion certain sums among worthy students.

## **2. Missionary Enterprises.**

[a] FOREIGN MISSIONS. Although the General Synod at the time of its organization at Hagerstown already purposed to do missionary work among the heathen, the plan was not put into practical operation till 1842, when Missionary C. G. HEYER was sent by the Ministerium of Pennsylvania to GUNTUR, INDIA, north of Madras. The General Synod supplied him with assis-

tants, and assumed the responsibility for this work begun by the Pennsylvania Ministerium (comp. § 20, 3). In the year 1903 the Guntur Mission contained twenty American missionaries, male and female (not counting the wives of the missionaries), 506 native workers, and 28,862 baptized members. WATTS MEMORIAL COLLEGE in Madras (founded by means of a donation of \$10,000, to which the English government in India added \$11,250) is an institution meant for the training of helpers, and furnishes at the same time a Christian education to other students in India. A WOMAN'S MISSIONARY HOSPITAL exists under the direction of Dr. Anna Kugler.

In LIBERIA, on the west coast of Africa, the General Synod has another mission, known as MUHLENBERG MISSION. On account of the deadly climate, however, the missionaries have all been able to remain there only a short time, and many of the missionaries and their wives have died there after a brief period. The name of DR. DAVID A. DAY will always remain closely associated with the history of this mission. He and his wife survived the climate longer than any others; but at last, after laboring for twenty years, and burying his wife and three children, he was carried off by the African fever. His influence over the heathen was so great that for a hundred miles around the tribes came to him to decide their disputes. Dr. Day was certainly the greatest foreign missionary of the Lutheran Church of America.

In 1913 the General Synod had received during the preceding biennium the sum of \$246,953.80 for foreign missions.

[b] THE HOME MISSION WORK of the General Synod falls into two divisions: "Home Missions" proper and "Church Extension." By the HOME MISSION WORK the General Synod understands the providing of a pastor for young and weak congregations, and the payment of his salary in whole or in part from the Home Mission treasury. The CHURCH EXTENSION society has to do chiefly with the church property of young and poor congregations. From its treasury a certain amount is donated or loaned without interest to a needy congregation for the erection of a church. For its Church Extension work the General Synod had in 1913 a fund of \$804,573.00. These departments are in charge of a special Board appointed by the General Synod (Dr. H. L. Yarger, Supt.) The former has three and the latter two traveling missionaries in the field. For these two branches of home missionary work the receipts for the biennium ending in 1913 were \$294,860.

[c] INSTITUTIONS OF MERCY. While it is generally conceded that among all the Lutheran ecclesiastical bodies of America the General Synod possesses

the best organization for missionary work, it must be admitted that its institutions of mercy cannot bear a comparison with those of the other general bodies. Yet it now possesses four Orphanages (at Loysville, Pa., Nachusa, Ill., Springfield, O., and Lincoln, Nebr.). The General Synod has a DEACONESS INSTITUTION in Baltimore, Md. Its provision for the support of SUPER-ANNUATED MINISTERS and widows of ministers through the "Pastors' Fund Society" and the "Home for the Aged" in Washington, is a work of importance.

### **§ 13. Observations on Statistics.**

The General Synod numbers 1,366 pastors, 1,831 congregations and preaching-points, and 329,690 communicants, according to the statistics for 1915. In connection with the number of communicants, which, compared with that of other general bodies, is strikingly small, it must be borne in mind that in the General Synod not only the head of the family, but every communicant member is expected to give a certain sum for synodical and benevolent purposes (apportionment system), and that consequently there is a disposition on the part of congregations and pastors to report the number of communicants as low as possible, in order to make sure of raising the amount apportioned to them. Accordingly the number of communicants given above must be understood as meaning contributing communicants. On the other hand, in the Synodical Conference, for example, with its proportionally greater number of members reported, all the continued members are counted, as they rightly should be.

Another statistical phenomenon needs explanation. It appears from the parochial reports of the purely English districts that the baptisms of adults are often as numerous as the baptisms of children. From this fact some have drawn the conclusion that INFANT BAPTISM is neglected in the General Synod. But here the difference between the work in English and in German congregations is to be borne in mind. The majority of the other Lutheran bodies have to do largely with immigrants, who have nearly all been baptized, and who, as a rule, have their children baptized, even if they themselves are not members of the Church. Thus it happens that among the Germans of the General Synod there are scarcely any adult baptisms. But the General Synod is seven-eighths English, and in its missionary work has to deal largely with such persons as have, in the course of their Americanization,

cast aside the customs of their fathers, and have let their children grow up unbaptized. Indeed, it has to deal with such persons as have been under the influence of denominations which reject or make light of infant baptism. If such persons are to become members of the Lutheran Church, they must be baptized as adults. Consequently THE LARGER THE NUMBER OF ADULT BAPTISMS IN AN ENGLISH LUTHERAN SYNOD, THE STRONGER THIS FACT BEARS WITNESS TO ITS MISSIONARY AND EVANGELIZING SPIRIT. And if in some of the eastern synods the number of infant baptisms is actually very small, it is to be borne in mind, 1) that among the English large families are unfortunately (!) rare, and 2) that in the Eastern States many of the young people, when grown, obey the advice, "Young man, go West."

### **Biographical Notes.**

PASTOR J. G. MORRIS, D. D., LL. D, born in York, Pa., 1803, died in 1895. He received his preparatory education at Princeton, studied theology under S. S. Schmucker (before Schmucker was called to Gettysburg), afterwards at Nazareth (Moravian), Princeton and Gettysburg. For thirty-three years he served the First Lutheran Church of Baltimore, and for a few years preceding his death the church of Lutherville, Md. He was the founder of the "Lutheran Observer", a prolific writer and repeatedly president of the General Synod, in whose development he took a prominent part. His best known literary products are "Fifty years in the Lutheran Ministry" and "Life Reminiscences of an old Lutheran Minister". In the latter volume we find a list of his many writings.

PASTOR F. W. CONRAD, D. D. (1816-1898), was born in Pinegrove, Pa., studied theology at Gettysburg and was ordained in 1840. He served the congregations of Waynesboro, Pa., and Hagerstown, Md. In 1855 he was professor of modern languages and Homiletics at Wittenberg College, Springfield, O. In 1855 he was called by the First Lutheran Church of Dayton, O., in 1864 by Trinity Church, Lancaster, Pa., and in 1864 by the congregation of Chambersburg, Pa. At that time he was a zealous revivalist. In 1863 he became part owner of the Lutheran Observer and its editor in chief. He held this position until he died. He took part in all the greater movements of the General Synod (educational work, missionary enterprises). He was a contributor to the Evangelical Review and the Lutheran Quarterly.

His catechism had a large circulation. Noteworthy is also his "Lutheran Manual and Guide".

PROF. L. A. GOTWALD, D. D., son of Pastor D. Gotwald, was born January 31, 1833, in York Springs, Pa. He attended Wittenberg College and afterwards the Pennsylvania College at Gettysburg, Pa., where he graduated in 1857. In the Gettysburg Seminary he finished his theological studies (1859). He served the following congregations: Shippensburg, Pa. (1859-63), Lebanon, Pa. (1863-65), Dayton, O. (1865- 69), Chambersburg, Pa. (1870-74), St. Paul's, York, Pa. (1874- 85), and the Second Lutheran Church, Springfield, O. (1885- 1888). Afterwards he was called to the chair of Practical Theology in Wittenberg Seminary. Here he was active until he was disabled by a paralytic stroke in 1895. He lived five years longer. His trial before the directors of Wittenberg College (1893), on the charge of having departed from the doctrinal basis of the General Synod, resulted in his complete exoneration, and greatly helped to establish conservative Lutheranism more firmly at Wittenberg College and in the synods connected therewith. (A result of this experience was his book: "Trial of L. A. Gotwald.") Dr. Gotwald was a frequent contributor to the "Lutheran Quarterly" and other church periodicals, and published two volumes of sermons ("Sermons for Festival Days" and "Joy in the Divine Government", German Literary Board, Burlington, Ia.).

PROF. E. J. WOLF, D. D., LL. D., born in Center Co., Pa., studied at Gettysburg (College and Seminary), and continued his studies in Tuebingen and Erlangen. After a pastorate in Baltimore he was called to the chair of Church History and New Testament Exegesis at Gettysburg (1873). This was done at the suggestion of Dr. Brown, who recognized his extraordinary talents. He held this position until his death. Being an earnest student of the doctrinal literature of the Lutheran Church, he helped to establish sound doctrinal foundations for the General Synod after the disruption at Fort Wayne. His trumpet sounded a clear note at all conventions of the General Synod, and his literary contributions were marked by strong convictions. He published a history of the Lutheran Church in America, and translated three volumes of Nebe's "Sermons on the Pericopes" into a condensed English edition. He died January 10, 1905.

PROF. M. VALENTINE, D. D., LL. D., was born January 1, 1825, at Uniontown, Md. He entered Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg (1844), whence he graduated with honors in 1850, delivering on that occasion the Greek ora-

tion. He served congregations at Winchester, Va., Pittsburg, Pa., and Reading, Pa., until 1866. When only forty-one years old, he was called to the chair of Church History and New Testament Exegesis at Gettysburg. Soon afterwards, at the death of Dr. H. L. Baugher, Sen., he was made president of Pennsylvania College, and held this position for sixteen years. Here he distinguished himself by his thoroughness as a teacher in philosophy. He was an author of works of philosophy, and was lucid in expressing his thoughts. He published three volumes: "Theoretical Ethics," "Natural Theology" and "Christian Faith and Life". His baccalaureate addresses (published) are masterpieces of mature thought. After the death of Dr. C. A. Stork (successor to Dr. Brown) Dr. Valentine became professor of Systematic Theology in the seminary (1884). He was a positive theologian, with a leaning, however, to a Melanchthonian type of Lutheranism, and consequently refusing to accept certain features of the Formula of Concord. He vigorously protested against the doctrinal course of the General Council. His conception of "What the General Synod has to stand for" was ably set forth in his contribution to the little volume on "Distinctive Doctrines and Usages", etc. (first edition). His "Christian Theology", published in two volumes: immediately after his death, shows us a theologian highly endowed as a philosophic thinker, who has put upon a work of Dogmatics the stamp of his own individuality.

PROF. J. W. RICHARD, D. D., LL. D., was born February 14, 1843, near Winchester, Va., received his preparatory education at Roanoke College, entered Pennsylvania College in 1865, and graduated from the theological seminary at Gettysburg in 1871. He became professor at Carthage College (Carthage, Ill.) in 1873 and secretary of the Board of Church Extension in 1883. In 1885 he was called as professor of theology to Wittenberg Seminary. In 1889 he accepted a chair at Gettysburg, where he died March 7, 1909. He was especially interested in historical researches and centered his attention upon the confessional questions of the Lutheran Church. He wrote a biography of Melanchthon. From 1898 to 1909 (the year of his death) he was editor of the "Lutheran Quarterly", to which he made many contributions. In its issue of Oct., 1909, was given a list of his writings. He leaned toward Melanchthonianism and in opposition to the tendencies of the General Council, he aimed to crystallize into a permanent platform the unsettled confessional condition of the General Synod between 1864 (York, Pa.) and 1908 (Richmond Resolutions). See in this connection his "Confessional

History of the General Synod” (Luth. Quarterly, Oct. 1895), “Melanchthon and the Augsb. Conf.” (Articles in Lutheran Quarterly, Oct. 1899, also January, July and October 1900). His articles concerning the Augsburg Confession, together with other doctrinal contributions, are found in his most noteworthy book on “The Confessional History of the Lutheran Church” (1909).

PROF. J. D. SEVERINGHAUS, D. D., born July 22, 1834, near Severinghausen, Hannover (Germany), emigrated when sixteen years old and came to Cincinnati, O. He entered the College of Springfield, O., and graduated from the theological seminary in 1861. His first charge was at St. Paris, O. He afterwards served congregations at Urbana, O., Wakefield, O., Richmond, Ind., and Oswego, N. Y. In 1873 he went to Chicago where he was engaged in extensive labors for the Church for a quarter of a century. In 1869, immediately preceding his transfer from Richmond to Oswego, he founded the “Lutherischer Kirchenfreund”. This was shortly after the rupture at Fort Wayne, when the German elements of the General Synod were also in a state of confusion. Around the “Kirchenfreund” he gathered the Germans of the General Synod. Through his German work he became known far and wide. He also entered into negotiations with Pastor Jensen of Breklum (1878) and made arrangements whereby the students of Breklum entered the field of the Wartburg and German Nebraska Synods, just as he had formerly arranged with Inspector Rappard of the St. Chrischona-Institute near Basel to send graduates of that school into the Western fields of the General Synod. In 1883 he founded a seminary in Chicago which he conducted under great difficulties for thirteen years. All of this covers a period of important history (recorded in the “Lutherischer Kirchenfreund”, at one time named “Lutherischer Hausfreund”) which we can barely mention here. The German work of Dr. Severinghaus was much criticized outside of the General Synod and within. Finally the Wartburg Synod, together with the German Nebraska Synod (founded in 1891), took hold of the situation, edited the “Lutherischer Zionsbote” (which eventually absorbed the “Lutherischer Kirchenfreund”), established the German Literary Board in Burlington, Iowa, and caused the General Synod to transfer the Chicago seminary to Atchison, Kans. Dr. Severinghaus did much valuable work for the Germans of the General Synod. Two of his books deserve mentioning: “Denkschrift der General-Synode,” 1875; and “Das Formelbuch fuer die Deutschen der General-Synode”, 1870, 81, 94. In Chicago he was pastor of Trinity Church (now connected with the Iowa Synod) and afterwards of

St. Mark's. But his real work was outside of the pastorate. He died Oct. 14, 1905, at the age of 71.

PROF. S. A. ORT, D. D., LL. D., born in Lewistown, Pa., in 1843, was educated at Wittenberg College, from which he graduated with highest honors. He finished his theological studies at Wittenberg Seminary in 1863. Almost his entire work (until 1911) was done in Wittenberg College, where he was first teacher of Mathematics in the College and afterwards professor of Philosophy and Systematic Theology in the seminary. From 1882 to 1900 he was president of this school. He was a man of fine mentality, keen perception and an orator of note. To his students he was an inspiring teacher. He took part in the work of the larger Church. But he did not write much. However, some idea of the kind of theology for which he stood, which was conservatively Lutheran, may be gathered from a volume published after his death: "Selected Sermons and Addresses" (German Literary Board, Burlington, Ia.)

PASTOR M. W. HAMMA, D. D., LL. D., born in Richland County, O., 1836, graduated from Wittenberg College, 1861, and from the seminary in 1862. He served the congregations of Euphemia, O., Bucyrus, O., Reading, Pa., Springfield, O., and Altoona, Pa. He was an eminent preacher. Being a man of means he donated \$200,000 to Hamma Divinity School, thus becoming its greatest benefactor. Through his many travels he acquired a many-sided education. While living at Baltimore, he was for several years president of the Board of Home Missions. He died in Springfield, O., in 1913.

PROF. D. H. BAUSLIN, D. D., born in Winchester, Va., January 21, 1854, studied in Wittenberg College and Seminary and entered the ministry in 1878. He served the congregations of Tippecanoe City, O. (1878-81); Bucyrus, O. (1881-9), Springfield, O. (1889-93 and Canton, O. (1893-95). He became professor of Practical Theology and Church History at Wittenberg Seminary, succeeding Dr. L. A. Gotwald. In 1901 he became editor of "The Lutheran World", and continued in this work until 1912 when this conservative organ of the General Synod was merged into "Lutheran Church Work" (official organ of the General Synod). Dr. Bauslin ranks first among the leading ministers of the General Synod. He has written valuable articles, mostly published in the "Lutheran Quarterly". Very popular is his little volume: "Is the Ministry an attractive Vocation?"

REV. GEO. U. WENNER, D. D., born at Bethlehem, Pa., May 17th, 1844, studied at Yale, Gettysburg and graduated from Union Theol. Seminary



1868. From that time on he has been pastor of Christ Church in New York. Since 1883 he served as chairman of the liturgical committee of the General Synod, and has done valuable work in the creation of the “Common Service” and the “Ministerial Acts”. He has been a frequent contributor to the church papers (especially Lutheran Quarterly) on liturgical subjects. He wrote a book, “Religious Education and the Public School” (1907), in which he proposed that Wednesdays should be given free for religious instruction.

PROF. JOHN A. SINGMASTER, D. D., who at the time of this writing is president of the General Synod, was born in Macungie, Lehigh Co., Pa., Aug. 31, 1852, and graduated from College (1873) and Seminary (1876) at Gettysburg. He served congregations at Schuylkill Haven, Pa. (1876-82), Macungie, Pa. (1882-6), Brooklyn, N. Y. (1887-90), AUentown, Pa. (1890-1900). Since 1900 he has been Professor of Systematic Theology and since 1906 (after the retirement of Dr. Valentine) President of the General Synod’s theological seminary at Gettysburg. He is editor in chief of the “Lutheran Quarterly;” also author of the article on the General Synod in the fourth edition of “Distinctive Doctrines and Usages of the General Bodies of the Ev. Luth. Church in the United States” (cf. Literature, p. 4).

- 
1. See Documentary History of the Pennsylvania Synod, pp. 541-44; also Lutheran Church Review, XI, 46.↩
  2. This synod had at that time seventy-four ministers and two hundred and seventy-eight congregations.↩
  3. See Evangelical Review, V, 240 sq. P. Anstadt, Life and Times of Schmucker, 118 sq.↩
  4. This was true. On account of the many tendencies then prevalent in the New York Ministerium and in the Pennsylvania Synod, it was difficult to arrive at a common confessional basis. The problem was to be solved later by recommendations for a confession which was to be incorporated in a constitution for the district synods. This took place in 1829. (See § 11, 1, a.)↩
  5. Anstadt, Life and Times, etc., p. 154.↩
  6. Dr. Jacobs, ut supra, 358; Anstadt, as quoted, 153; Peter and Schmidt, Geschichte der Synode von Ohio, pp. 23-27.↩

7. It joined nine years afterwards, 1837.↵
8. Dr. A. Spaeth, C. P. Krauth. I, 325; Anstadt ut supra, 149; Dr. Jacobs, History, etc., p. 360.↵
9. An attempt made in 1839 to cause the reunion of the Pennsylvania Synod with the General Synod failed on account of the opposition of certain congregations (Reading among them). Jacob Miller, History of Trinity Church, Reading, Pa.↵
10. Anstadt, pp. 124, 132 sq.↵
11. It seceded at the time of the rupture in the General Synod which caused the origin of the General Council (1867). It passed from the Council into the Missouri Synod where it lost its identity (§ 22, 7, d).↵
12. United with the General Council in 1868, but afterwards became the Texas district of the Iowa Synod.↵
13. No longer in existence. See § 10, 3, a.↵
14. The Franckean Synod, which, like the Hartwick Synod, opposed the New York Ministerium, merged into the New York Synod (General Synod) in 1908. Comp. § 10, 3, b.↵
15. Evangelical Review, VII, 413.↵
16. See Spaeth, C. P. Krauth, I, 11. About the Gettysburg Seminary in general see § 12, 1.↵
17. Reprinted from minutes of synod, Frederick, Md., 1825.↵
18. See biographical note at the end of §9; also note on Evangelical Review, § 9, 2; 2nd annotation.↵
19. Ev. Review. V. 261.↵
20. Ev. Review, V, 271.↵
21. Ev. Review, V, 244.↵
22. See biographical note at the end of § 9.↵
23. History of the Joint Synod of Ohio (German) by Peter and Schmidt, p. 77. Compare §28, 2, a. What brought the Joint Synod of Ohio back into the right track and cured it of unionism was the struggle against the revival movement, which again and again threatened the existence of that body.↵
24. See the transactions of 1822.↵
25. Spaeth, C. P. Krauth, I, 325.↵
26. See transactions of 1819. Dr. Theodore E. Schmauk, a student of Lutheranism in Pennsylvania, writes us: "The leading temptation to

- union in the Ministerium were external and not internal, viz., the question of language and the making of common cause with the Reformed Church in the preservation of congregational schools, as over against the encroachments of the public school system.” As to the confessional side of judging the attitude of the Ministerium cf. § 10, 3, 1.↵
27. History, p. 362.↵
  28. Ev. Review, V, 255.↵
  29. Ev. Review, VII, 418.↵
  30. History, p. 362.↵
  31. See the letters of S. S. Schmucker to his father in Anstadt, Life and Times of S. S. Schmucker. p. 69.↵
  32. Spaeth, C. P. Krauth. I, 320.↵
  33. Prof. Frederick Schmidt of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., was editor. He kept the paper in existence until 1846. See F. G. Cotwald, ut supra, p. 193.↵
  34. Spaeth, ut supra, I, 328. However, we should not go too far in charging the Ministerium of Pennsylvania with Socinianism. The synod especially affected was the New York Ministerium. And since the denominations round about the Pennsylvania Synod were honeycombed with Rationalism and much of the literature from the Fatherland bore the same stamp, it was no wonder that Lutheranism in the Ministerium was also dragged down. Neither were the latitudinarian sentiments altogether absent in the districts of the General Synod, but the general body as such in its influential men was on its guard against this danger.↵
  35. History, p. 362.↵
  36. See what we said § 7, 5 about the first beginnings of the church press; note also Dr. Jacob’s comment (History, p. 340 sq.) on the first editions of hymnals and prayer books.↵
  37. See § 4, 8. There is in Muhlenberg’s history no evidence of altar fellowship with other denominations. His theological position would not have permitted this. As to his practice, compare G. Fritschel in an article in Brobst’s Monatshefte, Nov. and Dec, 1868.↵
  38. Dr. J. G. Morris, “Fifty Years in the Lutheran Ministry.”↵
  39. Galesburg Rule, § 18.↵

40. Our description is largely borrowed from Dr. D. H. Bauslin's excellent article (Lutheran Quarterly, July, 1910, "The Genesis of the New Measure Movement."↵
41. Most of these revival services display the driving method. Where they merely offered the Gospel, the Lord no doubt has blessed them with His Spirit.↵
42. So his biographer, Dr. G. H. Gerberding, says in "Life and Letters of W. A. Passavant," p. 99.↵
43. Dr. Bauslin, ut supra, p. 371.↵
44. "German immigration was greatly stimulated by the exodus from Germany of the Revolutionists of 1848. They had left Germany for political reasons, and now often combined with their political radicalism a revolutionary attitude to matters of religion, because in the Fatherland they had observed that the altars supported the thrones. The German press, which in many of the larger cities came under the influence of those highly educated forty-eighters, also carried on a campaign against living Christianity, in which they could see nothing but cant and hypocrisy, while German societies, such as "Turner" and "Gesangvereine" were generally anti-religious.↵
45. Minutes of Convention of General Synod, Baltimore, Md., 1833. See Ev. Review, p. 256.↵
46. Review, V, 266, 270. Minutes of Conventions of 1842, and 1845 at Baltimore and Philadelphia, etc.↵
47. See biographical notes, § 9.↵
48. Compare our remarks, § 9, 1.↵
49. Spaeth. C. P. K. I. 363.↵
50. See his book, "Fifty Years in the Lutheran Ministry."↵
51. Va. J. T. Grosse, "Unterscheidungslehren," St. Louis, 1909, p. 66. To quote this case, which has merely historical value, as an expression of the General Synod is absolutely unfair. It is merely the action of a committee, and the contents of that letter mean less than, for instance, the resolutions passed at one time by the Joint Synod of Ohio and Pennsylvania Synod regarding a union with the Reformed. Since these tendencies have changed, they admit of no polemical use. They are merely matters of record, of interest for the historian.↵
52. History, p. 419.↵

53. We have especially in mind Dr. Nevin's book on "The Anxious Bench," 1843. Says Dr. Jacobs: "The debt of gratitude which was due him for this and other efforts found a formal expression when Dr. C. P. Krauth, Jr., introduced him to the Ministerium of Pennsylvania in session at Lancaster, Pa., 1874."↵
54. Jacobs' History, p. 417.↵
55. The strong organ of the Liberals was the Lutheran Observer. The "Symbolists" spoke through the columns of the Ev. Review, edited for a long time by Dr. Charles Phillip Krauth, professor at Gettysburg; also through the Lutheran and Missionary, edited by his son, Charles Porterfield Krauth.↵
56. Kirchenfreund, VIII, p. 386 sq. Translation after Dr. Spaeth in C. P. K., I, 354 sq.↵
57. Spaeth, C. P. K., I, 179.↵
58. There being no Lutheran seminary, Dr. Schmucker received his theological training at Princeton.↵
59. See J. L. Neve, "Lutheranism in America and the Problem of its Accommodation to the Anglo-Saxon Spirit," in the second number of the American Lutheran Survey, Nov. 2, 1914.↵
60. In the "Deutscher Kirchenfreund," also in Spaeth's "W. J. Mann, Erinnerungsblaetter," 157.↵
61. Spaeth, I, Ill.↵
62. Ev. Review, V, 269.↵
63. Luth. Observer, Nov. 27, 1846.↵
64. Luth. Observer, ut supra.↵
65. See his article in Ev. Review II, 510.↵
66. Quoted by Dr. Spaeth in his Charles Port. Krauth, I, 347. A large part of the correspondence between Drs. Schmucker and Sprecher has gone into the possession of the Krauth Memorial Library at Mt. Airy Seminary. Among these letters is also the one quoted.↵
67. Luth. Observer, May 4, 1866. Lutheran and Missionary, May 10, 1886. Anstadt, "Life and Times of Schmucker," 315 sq. Spaeth ut supra, I, 357.↵
68. See H. J. Schmidt's letter to C. P. Krauth, Sen., published by Spaeth, C. P. K., I, 363.↵

69. A like service was rendered later to those who could read German by the *Theologische Monatshefte*, edited by Rev. S. K. Brobst, Allentown, Pa.↵
70. "Jacobs' History, p. 441.↵
71. Anstadt, *Life and Times of Schmucker*, p. 61 sq.↵
72. Spaeth, C. P. K., I, 179.↵
73. On the other hand, it was putting: a premium on indifferentism, which carries with itself the danger of developing into a negative liberalism, thus inviting disastrous developments for the future.↵
74. True it is that the Concordia Lutherans were engaged in violent controversies, but it must be admitted that they have settled their differences with the exception of a few points. These doctrinal controversies should not have been taken as a justification of the General Synod for keeping its doctrinal basis general and indefinite. It is in the very nature of Lutheranism to strive towards an expression of the principles embodied in its confession. This is the case especially in America where these principles become the flag which ministers and congregations must follow out of their own free choice. In a Lutheran body with a broad and indefinite doctrinal basis, one party to which the future belongs because of its adhering to the historically genuine thing will oppose itself to another more unionistic party. So the Synod has strife in its own camp. Verily, the altogether too broad doctrinal basis has been the dynamite box under the structure of the General Synod up to recent times. It will be found that the Richmond Resolutions, together with the new doctrinal basis (comp. § n, 1 f), in which the "unaltered" Augsburg Confession and the old limitations of the obligation to the "fundamental doctrines" was removed, has inaugurated a more peaceful period in the history of the General Synod.↵
75. See "The Augustana Synod, a brief Review of its History," 1860-1910, Rock Island, Ill., Augustana Book Concern, p. 31.↵
76. R. G. Linker's contribution to "The Lutheran Observer," Feb. 14. 1913.↵
77. *Lutheran Observer*, Dec. 11, 1857.↵
78. Esbjorn, Hasselquist, see § 10, 1.↵
79. Reprinted in *Jacobs' History*, p. 457.↵
80. An interesting case in court was the argument concerning property rights between the Hartwick and Franckean synods. The Rev. Philip

Wieting left the Hartwick Synod to unite with the Franckean Synod. He wished to take his congregations (St. Peter's, Rhinebeck, and St. John's. Sharon, both in Schoharie Co.) into the more liberal organization. But while the majority of the members were with him, a minority opposed the move. The case was complicated because the bequest of one hundred acres made by Pastor Sommer to these congregations stipulated that they should adhere to the Augsburg Confession. This raised the discussion into the sphere of theology. Since the Franckean Synod had not accepted the Augsburg Confession, Vice Chancellor L. H. Sandford ruled in favor of the minority which retained land, church and parsonage. (J. Nicum, New York Ministerium, p. 149.)↵

81. Jacobs' History, p. 421; Fritschel, II., 83.↵
82. There was, however, this difference that, while the Pittsburg Synod reserved to itself the right to secede, the Pennsylvania Ministerium conferred it in the form of a duty upon its delegates. See (Lutheran Observer, June 15, 1866) Buehler's address.↵
83. Jacobs, p. 422; Fritschel, II, 84.↵
84. §9, 2.↵
85. This paragraph was an encouraging improvement even on the ordination vow prescribed by the constitution for the district synods (§ 11, 1, a), which now accepted this paragraph of the General Synod's Constitution. Later, after the conventions at Richmond, 1909, and Washington, 1911, the phraseology was changed into the form now adopted (at Atchison, 1913).↵
86. Not until August did Dr. Brown become professor of systematic theology at Gettysburg. We have aimed to be accurate concerning above dates, because it is often said that if Dr. Krauth instead of Dr. Brown had become professor at Gettysburg, the break with the Pennsylvania Synod might have been prevented. But Dr. Krauth was elected to the professorship in the Philadelphia Seminary at a special meeting of the Ministerium at Allentown, July 26, 1864, while the directors of the Gettysburg Seminary did not meet until August for the purpose of selecting a successor to Dr. Schmucker. So then Dr. Krauth was no longer available for Gettysburg. See Spaeth, 11, 139 f; Dr. Anstadt. 336 ff.↵
87. Spaeth, II. 154.↵

88. To gain a clear impression of Dr. Krauth's activity in this respect, see Spaeth. C. P. K.. H, 28; also pp. 77 to 126.↩
89. Lutheran Observer, June 30, 1865.↩
90. 1884, Dec. 27.↩
91. English translation in Lutheran Observer, July 21, 1865.↩
92. The East Pennsylvania Synod and the Pennsylvania Synod were storm centers at this time. Dr. Seiss had been a member of the East Pennsylvania Synod, but had sought admission into the Pennsylvania Synod against the protest of the president and without a letter dimissory from the East Pennsylvania Synod, which at its next meeting declared this action "irregular, violent, and in plain disregard of proper intersynodical order and comity" (Lutheran Observer, Oct. 13, 1865). We can imagine how it impressed the East Pennsylvania Synod that Dr. Seiss appeared as the chairman of the delegation of the Pennsylvania Synod. Since we have mentioned this incident the following may be added: The chief point on which the East Pennsylvania Synod had based its refusal to dismiss Dr. Seiss was that the congregation under his care was yet connected with that synod. The Ministerium of Pennsylvania, in session at Easton, Pa., June 11-16, 1865, defended itself by declaring that there was no "law upon this subject, either in the Constitution of the Synod of East Pennsylvania or in the Constitution of the congregation of which Dr. Seiss is pastor" (Engl. Minutes of the Minist. of Pa., Easton, Pa., 1865, p. 17).↩
93. While the Pittsburg Synod and the New York Ministerium had also reserved certain rights when joining the General Synod, these rights were not claimed for their delegations independent of the Synod's instruction.↩
94. C. P. K., II. 132.↩
95. Lutheran Observer, May 11, 1866.↩
96. It must be kept in mind that even as late as 1864 Dr. Chas. Porterfield Krauth defended the position of the General Synod regarding fundamentals and non-fundamentals in the Augsburg Confession, and also that the confessional obligation had reference only to fundamentals. See Lutheran and Missionary, March 31 and April 21, 1864. For an extensive discussion of Dr. Krauth's position, see J. L. Neve's Address of Inauguration, 1911: "The Formulation of the General Synod's Confessional Basis," p. 19. Not before the summer of 1865 did Dr. Krauth



- change his views relative to what is obligatory in the Augsburg Confession. See Lutheran and Missionary, July 13, 1865; also Spaeth, II, 115.↵
97. Quoted from a German pamphlet published by the Pennsylvania Synod entitled in translation, “The Synod of Pennsylvania and the last Convention of the General Synod at Fort Wayne, Indiana, 1866.” Philadelphia. 1866.↵
98. Spaeth, II, 160.↵
99. See “The Synod of Pennsylvania,” etc., p. 6; Minutes of General Synod, Fort Wayne, 1866, p. 4. Also Dr. S. E. Ochsenford, Documentary History, p. 81.↵
100. Like that concerning the admission of the Franckean Synod.↵
101. See Synod of Pennsylvania Synod, p. 31.↵
102. In a formal reply of which we shall speak later.↵
103. Synod of Pennsylvania, p. 14.↵
104. Synod of Pennsylvania, p. 16.↵
105. During the meeting at Lancaster, Pa., when receiving the report of its delegation.↵
106. Synod of Pennsylvania, p. 36.↵
107. Spaeth, II, 155. Other synods received at the same time were Pittsburg, Texas and Northern Illinois.↵
108. I. 352.↵
109. See minutes of convention at Fort Wayne; also minutes of Synod of Pennsylvania.↵
110. At the convention at Easton, Pa., 1865.↵
111. This report contains 11 pages and cannot be reprinted here. We have given extracts from it.↵
112. This “reply” is not found in the protocol of the convention but in the protocol of 119th annual convention of the Pennsylvania Synod at Lancaster, Pa. (1866). Reprinted also in Ochsenford’s Documentary History of the General Council, p. 117.↵
113. History, p. 464.↵
114. The Pennsylvania Synod, p. 23. See also minutes of General Synod.↵
115. The protest is to be found in the pamphlet, “The Pennsylvania Synod,” p. 29; also in the minutes of the Fort Wayne Convention, and in Dr. Ochsenford, “Documentary History,” p. 84 ff. ↵

116. This was also admitted by Dr. Brown in the address we have mentioned. ←
117. In the Allentown Church Case the view of the judge is given with reference to a pamphlet of which we have made frequent use, entitled “The Pennsylvania Synod and the last Convention of the General Synod at Fort Wayne,” which appeared as an appendix to the minutes of the Pennsylvania Synod of 1866 and from which we have quoted much: “This book coming from the Ministerium, would be expected to show the doctrinal character of the withdrawal from the General Synod; but it shows just the contrary. It shows that the dispute was a mixture of parliamentary law and dignity... From that point, when the delegates from the Ministerium were not recognized at Fort Wayne, on through all this controversy, not one word of doctrine appears. It is parliamentary law, the President’s ruling of the General Synod in sustaining, from beginning to end... On pp. 18 and 19 is ‘a clear and succinct statement’ of their grievances. This statement comprises nine heads, and there is not in them a line of complaint on matters of doctrine.” (See Quarterly Review, 1878, p. 15 sq.). Also the Missouri Synod at that time deplored that when the Pennsylvania Synod seceded, it did not make doctrinal difference the cause of the rupture. (See Denkschrift, published by the convention held at Fort Wayne, 1871, Nov. 14 to 16, representing members of the synods of Ohio, Missouri, Wisconsin, Illinois, Minnesota and also of the Norwegian Lutheran Synod, p. 19). Dr. Spaeth in his biography of Dr. Krauth put too much stress on the doctrinal side of the question, while Jacobs’ History presents a view more moderate. ←
118. See Jacobs’ History, p. 468, sq.; Geo. J. Fritschel, 2, 109 sq. ←
119. At that time bread and wine were called “outward symbols of His body and blood,” “memorials of our Saviour’s suffering and death.” Most objectionable phrases were mingled with those of sound Lutheran character. ←
120. Those who believe that the difference between the General Synod and the Pennsylvania Synod at the convention at Fort Wayne, consisted in the fact that the former recognized only the Augsburg Confession, while the latter accepted all the Symbolical Books, are much mistaken. The idea of making the acceptance of the whole Book of Concord obligatory for the Synod as such (with the Theological Seminary it is a

different thing) did not become a matter of serious consideration until after the separation from the General Synod had taken place and a new organization was thought of with Missouri and Ohio and other bodies as possible participants. Just a few weeks before the convention at York Dr. Krauth stated in the *Lutheran and Missionary*: “The Augsburg Confession is the symbol of Lutheran catholicity, all other parts of the Book of Concord are symbols of Lutheran particularity, confessions of the Lutheran faith, but not in the indisputable sense of the Lutheran church as such.” (*Lutheran and Missionary*, March 24, 1864.) He also defended the phrase “substantially correct” which formed the old doctrinal basis of the General Synod, but which was to be rejected by that body a few weeks later (*Lutheran and Missionary*, March 31, 1864). His father, Dr. C. Philip Krauth, had protested as early as 1850 against the old doctrinal obligation: “We object to the liberty allowed in that subscription... it is liable to great abuse... it is evident that a creed thus presented is no creed, that it is anything or nothing, that its subscription is a solemn farce.” (*Ev. Review*, H.) But in the *Lutheran and Missionary* (April 7, 1864) the son takes the position: “Let the old formula stand and be defined.” It is certain that if doctrinal matters would have been discussed at Fort Wayne, the delegation of the Pennsylvania Synod would have demanded nothing but fidelity to the Augustana.↵

121. Spaeth, II, 113.↵

122. *Lutheran Observer*, May 4, 1866. A close investigation of conditions at that time will reveal many un-Lutheran influences in the General Synod. Dr. H. A. Ott, in his “History of the Kansas Synod,” writes concerning the time when the founding of this synod was taken under consideration: “The Definite Synodical Platform had been before the Church for ten years and had pretty thoroughly leavened the West with its doctrines.” If it had not been for the protest of the venerable Rev. D. Earhardt, the Kansas Synod, even after the convention at Fort Wayne, would have accepted the Definite Platform as its doctrinal basis. The following resolution was passed: “Resolved, That we organize ourselves into a synod on the basis of the Definite Synodical Platform, provided Rev. Earhardt will unite with us, and if he does not, we do not” (p. 28, 29).↵

123. See founding of General Council, S 17, N.↵

124. See cause of this schism in T. Nictim's "History of the New York Ministerium," p. 254 sq.↵
125. Records of 1914 show 139 pastors, 151 congregations, 33,999 communicants.↵
126. The German Wartburg Synod sprang from the Synod of Central Illinois. At first the Germans of this synod formed a conference which eventually (1876) became the Wartburg Synod. (See biographical notes of Dr. Severinghaus, § 13). The Illinois Synod later left the General Council and became a part of the Missouri Synod in which it was dissolved.↵
127. The case of the Frauckean Synod in 1864 was different. There not even the Augustana was mentioned as a doctrinal basis.↵
128. See letter to his father in Anstadt, "Life and Times of Dr. S. S. Schmucker."↵
129. This paragraph was formally adopted at Washington in 1869, having been previously accepted by the district synods.↵
130. This strained relation reached its climax in the conflict over the Common Service. The United Synod of the South, the General Council, and the General Synod had, through a joint committee from the three bodies, prepared a common order of service on the basis of the Lutheran liturgies of the sixteenth century. The efforts to adopt this liturgy resulted in a conflict between the two tendencies in the General Synod, lasting for a number of years. The Common Service was finally adopted.↵
131. See minutes of General Synod, 1909, p. 57.↵
132. Dr. Sprecher at a later date, when he had receded from his old position, accurately described the Definite Platform as "that modification of Lutheranism which has perhaps been properly called the culmination of Melancthonianism." See letter to "The Lutheran Evangelist" (1891); cf. biographical sketch of Dr. Sprecher, p. 130.↵
133. "The Augsburg Confession, the correct interpretation of the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God" — these words of the old doctrinal basis might mean that the most important doctrines of the Bible have found an adequate expression in this Confession. Thus the Conservatives understood them. But they might also mean that the adoption of the Augustana is limited to the parts where it deals with fundamental doctrines. This was the version of the Liberals. See J. L. Neve (Inaugu-

- ral Address), “The Formulation of the General Synod’s Confessional Basis,” Burlington, (1911).↵
134. Other Lutheran bodies that are known for stricter conservatism exchange greetings with the representatives of non-Lutheran churches at occasions such as dedication, of theological seminaries, anniversaries of theological institutions, installation of professors, etc. Such practice, to which there should be no objection so long as it does not degenerate into a courteous expression of unionistic sentiment, is not essentially different from that of the General Synod in the point mentioned. The participants simply recognize each other as churches that have a right to exist.↵
135. It may be admitted that this is not yet the universal practice. But in the older, the larger and the more settled congregations the principle is more and more recognized. In the congregation in which the writer of this history has held his membership for a good many years one can hardly quote a single exception.↵
136. It was on such occasions that Muhlenberg practiced pulpit fellowship with the surrounding denominations (§ 4, 8).↵
137. There are ministers who at present extend the following invitation: “All those who believe with our church that in the Lord’s Supper the true Body and Blood of Christ are given for the forgiveness of sins, may now with the congregation come to the table of the Lord.” This proves that among English Lutherans of the General Synod there is an increasing conviction that the Biblical doctrine concerning the Lord’s Supper is inseparably connected with faith demanded for a proper preparation for receiving the Sacrament. The “improbant secus doctes” (they disapprove of those that teach otherwise) of the Augustana (Article X) cannot be ignored by those who claim to stand on the Unaltered Augsburg Confession.↵
138. This “Basis of Church Government” (Kirchenregimentliches Grundgesetz) is found in the “Formelbuch fuer die Deutschen in der Generalsynode” by Dr. J. D. Severinghaus. p. 81; also in the Book of Worship.↵
139. Dr. Jacobs’ History, p. 467, cf.; also Dr. Ochsenford. Documentary History of the General Council, p. 166 i.↵

## 5. The United Synod Of The South.

### § 14. The Origin of the Synod.

This general body, comprising the Lutheran synods of the Southern States, bears its present name only since the year 1886.

[1] An account of the origin of the Lutheran synods in the South has already been given in § 5, 2, 5. The NORTH CAROLINA SYNOD was organized in 1803. From this synod the TENNESSEE SYNOD went out in 1820, because the members of the latter were of a positive Lutheran tendency, and disapproved of the purpose of the North Carolina Synod to take part in the organization of the General Synod (§ 5, 5). The SOUTH CAROLINA SYNOD was formed in 1824, and united with the General Synod in 1835. The VIRGINIA SYNOD was organized in 1829. (From its midst came such men as Drs. S. S. Schmucker, J. G. Morris, C. P. Krauth). In 1841 a SOUTHWEST VIRGINIA SYNOD, and in 1846 the MISSISSIPPI SYNOD, which at present numbers only seven pastors and twelve churches, were formed. The SYNOD OF GEORGIA, embracing the States of Georgia and Florida, came into existence in 1860. In the same year the HOLSTON SYNOD (so called after the Holston River in Tennessee), an offshoot of the Tennessee Synod, was organized.

[2] Four of these synods, namely, the North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia, left the General Synod in 1863, and in the following year (in conjunction with the Synod of Georgia) at Concord, N. C., organized the General Synod of the Ev. Luth. Church in the Confederate States of America (§ 10, 2). The reason for this action was as follows : In 1861 the Southern States seceded, and the Civil War with its horrors began. The General Synod passed RESOLUTIONS condemning the originators and advocates of the war. The southern pastors and congregations regarded the resolutions as being aimed at them. They believed that the political separation between the South and the North would be permanent. They therefore resolved upon an ecclesiastical SEPARATION also. But when the newly formed body met again two years later, the war was over and the Union of the States restored. It was a question now whether the two synodical bodies should unite again. Since at this time the General Synod was distracted by the confessional controversies, and the Pennsylvania Synod had withdrawn

from it; and since the southern synods desired to place themselves upon a more positive confessional basis than that held by the General Synod, it was resolved to continue as a separate body, and simply to change the name to correspond with the change in political relations. The name adopted was, "The Evang. Luth. General Synod in North America," which was, however, soon changed to "The General Synod of the Evang. Luth. Church of the South." The reasons which induced it to assume the name which it now bears will be given in the following paragraph.

[3] Two of the synods enumerated above (§ 14, 1 ), namely, the TENNESSEE SYNOD and the HOLSTON SYNOD, had, as a matter of principle, refrained from joining the General Synod, and did not unite with this general body in the South.<sup>1</sup> Their confessional standpoint had caused them to hold themselves aloof. After their separation from the northern General Synod, the other synods of the South developed a more decided Lutheran consciousness. Their antithesis to the Tennessee Synod disappeared more and more. Moreover, the synods south of the Potomac became convinced, that, in order to enjoy the inestimable advantages of concentration, they must either unite in the organization of a body which should include the greatest possible number of southern synods, or else as individual synods seek union with the larger ecclesiastical bodies of the North. Since the confessional differences had almost entirely disappeared, the way was open for the former course. In 1867 the Tennessee Synod already sent a representative to the convention of the Southern General Synod, to enter into negotiations respecting a union. Although this approach was hailed with joy, nineteen years elapsed before a union actually took place. On November 12 and 13, 1884, delegates from all the Southern synods finally came together to a conference at Salisbury, N. C., in order to deliberate on the question of an organic union. This time there was a positive result. A DOCTRINAL BASIS was agreed upon, in accordance with which the Holy Scriptures were accepted as the only rule of faith and life, and the ecumenical symbols, together with the unaltered Augsburg Confession as a correct and faithful exhibition of the doctrines of Holy Scripture in matters of faith and practice. The other confessions of the Book of Concord were declared to be a correct and scriptural interpretation of the doctrines taught by the Augsburg Confession, and in full harmony with one and the same scriptural faith. After an understanding was reached on this important point, only the formalities remained to be arranged. This was done at the next meeting, June 23, 1886. From this time

on we have the “United Synod of the South,” this being the name which the new general body adopted. It numbers 274 pastors, with 488 congregations and preaching-points, and 52,188 communicants.

## **§ 15. Characterization.**

[1] In its DOCTRINAL TENDENCY this body stands about midway between the General Synod and the General Council. In 1878 it arranged for an exchange of delegates with the General Synod, after having assured itself by a formal inquiry that the resolutions passed at the time of the civil war (§ 14, 2) were not meant to question the Christian character of the southern pastors.

[2] In the matter of CHURCH POLITY the constitution of the General Synod of the South had decided that the general body should have legislative and judicial prerogatives. This was changed so as to read that in the INTERNAL AFFAIRS of the district synods the new general body, namely, the United Synod of the South, should have only advisory authority; but that on GENERAL MATTERS of the Church, such as providing its literature, conducting its theological seminaries and its foreign and home missionary work, it should have legislative power (comp. §§ 11, 3; 27, 1; 29. 3a).

[3] The United Synod of the South deserves special credit for the preparation of the COMMON SERVICE for the Lutheran Church of this country. The first action looking toward the preparation of such an order of service as a liturgical bond of union among the Lutheran synods of America, was taken by the General Synod of the South. Dr. Bachmann having, as early as 1870, referred to the importance of this matter for the English speaking Lutheran Church of America, the Synod in 1876 appointed a committee which, in conjunction with similar committees from the General Synod and the General Council, should, on the basis of the consensus of the pure Lutheran liturgies of the sixteenth century, prepare a uniform order of service for the three bodies. The final result of this action was the “Common Service.”

## **§ 16. Institutions and Work.**

### **1. Educational Institutions.**



[a] The THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY of the United Synod of the South is located at Mt. Pleasant, S. C, near Charleston. Although this institution is still in its formative period, it has behind it a long and somewhat complicated history. As early as 1830 the South Carolina Synod founded a theological seminary at Lexington, S. C, with Dr. Hazelius (§ 6, 1) at its head from 1833 till his death in 1853. Then the South Carolina Synod carried on the work in connection with its college at Newberry, S. C. (see below). In the year 1872 it combined the work of its theological seminary with that of the General Synod of the South at Salem, Va. When this seminary was abolished in 1884, the South Carolina Synod again inaugurated a theological department in connection with its college at Newberry. In 1892 it gave the work over into the hands of the United Synod of the South, which continued it for a while longer at Newberry, and then transferred it, in 1898, to MT. PLEASANT, near Charleston, thence to Columbia, S. C, where the seminary is conducted at the present time under the direction of Dr. A. G. Voigt, who has associated with him as fellow-professors. Dr. L. G. M. Miller and Dr. J. G. Seegers.

[b] COLLEGES. NEWBERRY COLLEGE, which was begun in 1832 at Lexington, S. C, by the South Carolina Synod, and opened as a regular college in 1859 at Newberry, S. C, suffered heavily during the civil war, its buildings being almost totally destroyed. In 1868 it was transferred to Walhalla, S. C, but was brought back to Newberry again in 1877. Congress granted the institution an indemnity of \$15,000 in 1878. It is attended by about 160 students. — ROANOKE COLLEGE was founded by the Virginia Synod in 1842 near Mt. Tabor, Va. In 1847 it was removed to Salem, Va. Dr. D. F. Bittle was president of the institution for twenty-three years. In 1878 Dr. J. D. Dreher became president, and in 1903 Dr. J. A. Morehead. It numbers 300 students. — LENOIR COLLEGE, founded in 1891, is meant chiefly to meet the wants of the Tennessee Synod. It has 250 students.

## **2. Mission Work.**

The HOME MISSIONARY WORK of the United Synod of the South is under the direction of a “Board of Missions and Church Extension.” Since 1893 a FOREIGN MISSION has been conducted by the United Synod in Japan (Saga), which is now extended to other cities on the island of Kiushiu.

## Biographical Sketches.

[1] THE HENKELS. GERHARD HENKEL, the head of the American branch of this family of pastors, was chaplain of Duke Maurice of Saxony, and was exiled when the Duke went over to the Roman Catholic Church. He was the first Lutheran preacher in Virginia, going from there to Pennsylvania (§ 3, 6). His grandson was PAUL HENKEL, whose immediate descendants constitute the well-known family of Lutheran ministers. He was ordained in 1792 by the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, and became pastor at New Market, Va. He took part in the organization of the North Carolina Synod (§ 5, 2), and the Ohio Synod (§ 5, 2). He was the author of some excellent books, both in German and in English, and died at New Market, Va., in 1825. The second and fourth of his sons, PHILIP and DAVID, took part in the organization of the Tennessee Synod (§ 5, 5). David was especially gifted, and wrote a number of valuable works. His third son, AMBROSIUS, also a minister, conducted the celebrated Lutheran publishing house in New Market. His fourth and sixth sons, ANDREW and CHARLES, were pastors in Ohio. The Henkels knew how to employ the press in the service of the Lutheran Church. The oldest son of Paul Henkel, Solomon, a physician of note, had already possessed a printing press, by means of which he placed Lutheran books on the market. His son, another physician, conceived the idea of translating and publishing the Book of Concord — a plan which was carried out under the direction of his uncle, the Rev. Ambrosius Henkel mentioned above. Up to 1903 the publishing house in New Market was in the hands of Dr. SOCRATES HENKEL, a son of the Rev. David Henkel previously mentioned. The majority of the sons of the Henkels that have been enumerated here also entered the ministry. Baptismal names like “Eusebius,” “Polycarp,” “Irenaeus,” “Ambrosius,” reveal the spirit of consecration to the service of the Church which must have prevailed in this honorable family for generations.

[2] DR. JOHN BACHMAN, distinguished for his learning and practical talent, was born in 1790 in Rhinebeck, N. Y. His theological studies were pursued under the direction of Dr. Quitman (§ 6, 3). But, unlike his teacher, he was a positive Lutheran. From the time of his ordination till his death in 1874, a period of fifty-six years, he was pastor of St. John’s Church in Charleston, S. C. In all important transactions of his time he took part as a leader. During the Civil War, in which he was an enthusiastic supporter of the South, his congregation became scattered. But he soon built it up again.

He was prominent in the field of natural science and wrote books on American birds and quadrupeds which secured for him the friendship of Humboldt and Agassiz, and the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the University of Berlin. A valuable scientific collection was destroyed and he himself maltreated during the war by some regiments of Sherman's army. He wrote a book on "The Unity of the Human Race," and, during the conflict over the Lutheran confession, a "Defense of Luther."

PROF. A. G. VOIGT, D. D., LL. D., was born in Philadelphia, January 22, 1850. He received his education at the University of Pennsylvania, also at Mount Airy, the seminary of the General Council, and at Erlangen. He entered the ministry in 1883, and served the congregations of Mt. Holly, N. J. (1883-85) and of Wilmington, N. C. (1898-1903). From 1885 to 1889, and also from 1891-98, he was theological professor at Newberry, S. C. He served as professor at Thiel College from 1889-91. Since 1906 he has been dean of the Seminary of the United Synod of the South, now located at Columbia, S. C. He is one of the authors of the "Lutheran Commentary".

PASTOR W. H. GREEVER, D. D., born December 18, 1870, in Burke's Garden, Va., studied in Roanoke College and in the seminary of the Council in Mount Airy, Pa. He was ordained in 1896, and served the congregations of Bluefield, W. Va. (1894-01) and Columbia, S. C. (1901-08). From 1904-1914 he was editor of "The Lutheran Visitor", the official organ of the United Synod of the South. Since 1914 he has been editor-in-chief of "American Lutheran Survey," a weekly magazine of intersynodical significance, the "Literary Digest" of the Lutheran church in America.

- 
1. The little Mississippi Synod also did not join till later, but this was not due to conscientious scruples.↩

## 6. The General Council.

### § 17. Organization.

[1] The WITHDRAWAL of the delegates of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania from the General Synod occurred in May, 1866, at Fort Wayne, Indiana (§ 19, 3). A few weeks later the Ministerium of Pennsylvania met at Lancaster, Pa., ratified the action of the delegates, and FORMALLY SEVERED ITS CONNECTION with the General Synod. At the same convention, the Ministerium authorized the issuing of a call to all synods which confess the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, for the purpose of organizing a new general body upon distinctively Lutheran principles. This CALL was prepared by Dr. C. P. Krauth.<sup>1</sup> In response to this call a convention was held at READING, PA., December 12-14, 1866, attended by delegates of thirteen synods.<sup>2</sup> Professor M. Loy, of the Joint Synod of Ohio, preached the opening sermon, which was published in the proceedings of this historical convention. It was based on the text, 1 Cor. 1:10. The theme was: "The Conditions of Christian Union." These are: 1. The same faith in the same truth. 2. The same confession of the same faith. 3. The same judgment under the same confession.<sup>3</sup>

[2] The principal work of this convention was the discussion and adoption of the Theses on "The Fundamental Principles of Faith and Church Polity," prepared by Dr. C. P. Krauth. These Theses were unanimously adopted, and it was resolved that, after ten of the participating synods had adopted these articles, in whole or in part, the President, Pastor G. Bassler, should issue a call for the first convention of the new body, under the title of the "General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of North America."

#### Fundamental Principles.

"We hold the following principles touching the faith of the Church and its polity<sup>4</sup> to be fundamental and of necessity presupposed in any genuine Union of Evangelical Lutheran Synods:

"I. There must be and abide through all time one holy Christian Church, which is the assembly of all believers, among whom the Gospel is purely preached, and the Holy Sacraments are administered, as the Gospel demands.

"To the true Unity of the Church it is sufficient that there be agreement touching the doctrine of the Gospel, that it be preached in one accord, in its pure sense, and that the Sacraments be administered conformably to God's Word.

"II. The true Unity of a particular Church, in virtue of which men are truly members of one and the same Church, and by which any Church abides in real identity, and is entitled to a continuation of her name, is unity in doctrine and faith and in the Sacraments, to wit: That she continue to teach and to set forth, and that her true members embrace from the heart and use the articles of faith and the Sacraments as they were held and administered when the Church came into distinctive being and received a distinctive name.

"III. The Unity of the Church is witnessed to, and made manifest in the solemn, public, and official Confessions which are set forth, to wit: The generic Unity of the Christian Church in the general Creeds, and the specific Unity of pure parts of the Christian Church in their specific Creeds, one chief object of both classes of which Creeds is, that Christians who are in the Unity of faith may know each other as such, and may have a visible bond of fellowship.

"IV. That Confessions may be such a testimony of Unity and bond of Union they must be accepted in every statement of doctrine in their own true, native, original and only sense. Those who set them forth and subscribe them must not only agree to use the same words, but must use and understand these words in one and the same sense.

"V. The Unity of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, as a portion of the holy Christian Church, depends upon her abiding in one and the same faith, in confessing which she obtained her distinctive being and name, her political recognition and her history.

"VI. The Unaltered Augsburg Confession is by preeminence the confession of that faith. The acceptance of its doctrines and the avowal of them without equivocation or mental reservation make, mark and identify that Church which alone in the true, original, historical, and honest sense of the term is the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

"VII. The only churches, therefore, of any land which are properly in the Unity of that Communion, and by consequence entitled to its name, Evangelical Lutheran, are those which sincerely hold and truthfully confess the doctrines of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession.

"VIII. We accept and acknowledge the doctrines of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession in its original sense as throughout in conformity with the pure truth of which God's Word is the only rule. We accept its statements of truth as in perfect accordance with the Canonical Scriptures: we reject the errors it condemns, and believe that all which it commits to the liberty of the Church of right belongs to that liberty.

"IX. In thus formally accepting and acknowledging the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, we declare our conviction that the other Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, inasmuch as they set forth none other than its system of doctrine and articles of faith, are of necessity pure and scriptural. Preeminent among such accordant pure and scriptural statements of doctrine, by their intrinsic excellence, by the great and necessary ends for which they were prepared, by their historical position, and by the general judgment of the Church, are these: The Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalcald Articles, the Catechisms of Luther, and the Formula of Concord, all of which are, with the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, in the perfect harmony of one and the same scriptural faith."

[3] The first convention of the General Council, temporarily organized at Reading, was held at FORT WAYNE, November, 1867, where, in the previous year, the breach had occurred, and where a few years later (1871) the members of the synods of Ohio, Missouri, Illinois, Minnesota, and of the Norwegians held the convention that resulted in the organization of the Synodical Conference. At this convention it was shown that the following synods had adopted the Confessional Basis of the Reading convention, and thereby acknowledged themselves as members of the General Council: 1. The Ministerium of Pennsylvania (three-fourths English); 2. The New York Ministerium (German); 3. The Pittsburgh Synod (three-fourths English); 4. The English Synod of Ohio; 5. The Synod of Wisconsin (German); 6. The English District Synod of Ohio; 7. The Michigan Synod (German); 8. The Swedish Augustana Synod; 9. The Minnesota Synod (German); 10. The Canada Synod (German); 11. The Synod of Illinois (German); 12. The Iowa Synod (German).<sup>5</sup> The MISSOURI SYNOD was not represented at this convention. Dr. Walther and Dr. Sihler, in a letter addressed to the convention at Reading (1866), had advised against the organization of a new General Body at that time.<sup>6</sup> They argued in favor of free conferences. The JOINT SYNOD OF OHIO had sent delegates, but was not prepared to unite fully with the new body, because they claimed that, despite the adoption of the Confessional Basis, there still existed un-Lutheran practices in various synods. The Synod asked the General Council for a declaration on the following "FOUR POINTS," namely: 1. Concerning Chiliasm. 2. Concerning altar fellowship ("Mixed Communion"). 3. Concerning pulpit fellowship. 4. Con-

cerning secret societies. Concerning the last three points, the SYNOD OF IOWA also desired a declaration.<sup>7</sup> Because the Council was not prepared to give a decisive answer to the question of pulpit and altar fellowship,<sup>8</sup> the delegates of the Joint Synod of Ohio declined to join the Council, and before the close of the convention the delegates of the Iowa Synod (Prof. Gottfr. Fritschel, the German secretary) also declared that their Synod could not fully unite with the body.<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless, this Synod, since it had accepted the Confessional Basis, was granted A SEAT AND VOICE in the General Council. A special difficulty in connection with the Joint Synod of Ohio existed in the fact that the English District Synod of Ohio was admitted into the Council against the wish of Ohio. After the next convention of the General Council, at Pittsburg, Pa., 1868, when the "Four Points" were again discussed and action taken, the WISCONSIN SYNOD WITHDREW (§§ 21 and 25, 1); after the convention at Akron, Ohio, 1871 (see below), the Synod of MINNESOTA (§§ 21 and 25, 2) and the ILLINOIS SYNOD withdrew. These synods were incorporated in the Missouri Synod (§ 10, 3). In the year 1887, the MICHIGAN SYNOD also severed its connection with the Council. The TEXAS SYNOD, admitted in 1868, became a District of the Iowa Synod in 1895. Concerning the other synods which have in later years united with the Council see § 19, 7-12.

ANNOTATION. An official correspondence between the General Council and the Missouri Synod was carried on until the year 1869. Missouri had desired free conferences as preparatory to the organization of a General Body. Thereupon the General Council adopted the following resolution at the Reading convention, in 1866: "That the synods represented in this convention, which prefer a Free Conference to an immediate organization, be and hereby are invited to send representatives to the next meeting, with the understanding that they have in it all the privileges of debate, and a fraternal comparison of views."<sup>10</sup> To this the Missouri Synod replied, at its convention in Chicago, 1867, that the position of delegates from the Missouri Synod at a regular convention of the General Council would be peculiarly liable to misconception, and that therefore it must insist on really free conferences."<sup>11</sup> The General Council, at the Pittsburg convention, 1868, repeated its former invitation. Missouri again replied (Fort Wayne, 1869), that it was not the desire of the Missouri Synod to deal with the General Council as such and during the sessions of the same, for the reason that it entertained the fear that, by such a side-dealing with the matter, justice would not be done. A Free Conference was desired, such as had been proposed before

the General Council was organized. But even in such a Free Conference, Missourians could participate only as individuals, not as representatives of the Synod.<sup>12</sup> The General Council (1869) expressed its regret, in a final reply, that the Missouri Synod saw fit to decline all official dealing with the General Council and even all non-official dealing with it in connection with its regular conventions. It declared itself willing to receive further proposals, looking toward an organic union of all true Lutherans in this country.<sup>13</sup> Since then there have been no official communications between the two bodies.

## § 18. Character of the Council.

[1] The “Four Points,” concerning which the synods of Ohio and of Iowa desired a declaration already at the first convention of the Council, occupied a prominent place in the subsequent history of the General Council, so that it may be said, that THE FIRST TEN YEARS OF THE BODY CONSTITUTED A HISTORY OF THESE “FOUR POINTS.” The Council’s answer to the petition of the Joint Synod for a declaration on the designated “Four Points” (§ 17, 3) sets forth the difference between the General Council, on the one hand, and such synods as Ohio and Missouri, on the other.<sup>14</sup> The aim of the General Council was to be gradually educational; the other synods desired thorough-going disciplinary regulations. It was no light matter for the newly organized body to find a way out of the difficulty. The desire was to build upon unequivocal Lutheran principles; but what the German synods of the West peremptorily demanded, the more Americanized synods of the East, whose congregations and ministers had an entirely different history back of them, could not carry out.<sup>15</sup>

The matter of the rule concerning pulpit and altar fellowship, or the so-called GALESBURG RULE, gave the General Council special concern. Briefly the history of this matter is as follows: At the convention at Lancaster, Ohio, in 1870, President Krauth, prompted by a question on the part of the Minnesota Synod, made the declaration: THE RULE IS: LUTHERAN PULPITS FOR LUTHERAN MINISTERS; LUTHERAN ALTARS FOR LUTHERAN COMMUNICANTS. At the next convention, at AKRON, OHIO, in 1872, the delegates of the Iowa Synod desired that this declaration should be made the official action of the Council. In reply the Council gave the following declaration:<sup>16</sup>



"1. The RULE is: Lutheran pulpits are for Lutheran ministers only. Lutheran altars are for Lutheran communicants only.

"2. The EXCEPTIONS to this rule belong to the sphere of privilege, not of right.

"3. The DETERMINATION of the EXCEPTIONS is to be made in consonance with these principles by the conscientious judgment of the pastors as the cases arise.

At GALESBURG, ILLINOIS (1875), the FIRST ARTICLE of the Akron declaration, due to resolutions of the Augustana Synod of a similar import,<sup>17</sup> was reaffirmed, but nothing was done in reference to points two and three.<sup>18</sup> The Galesburg declaration was severely criticized in the public press and caused considerable disturbance in the Church for a number of years, principally because points two and three appeared to have been set aside. Finally, the General Council declared (at the Pittsburg convention, 1889, in reply to a question presented by the New York Ministerium), "that at the time of the passage of the Galesburg Rule by the General Council, the distinct statement was made that all preceding action of the General Council on Pulpit and Altar Fellowship was unchanged." The formal action, taken at the Pittsburg convention, is as follows: "Inasmuch as the General Council has never annulled, rescinded or reconsidered the declarations made at Akron, Ohio, in the year 1872, they still remain in all their parts and provisions, the action and rule of the General Council."<sup>19</sup> It is therefore an error to say, as is generally done, that the General Council rests upon the Galesburg Rule; according to its final action it rests upon the Akron resolutions. Dr. Jacobs therefore says correctly in "Lutheran Cyclopaedia," under "Galesburg Rule:" "What is generally known as the Galesburg Rule is properly the Akron Rule of 1872." (p. 189). There were then and there are now TWO PARTIES in the Council. The one, to which belonged the Germans (especially the New York Ministerium and the Canada Synod) and largely also the Swedes, DEMAND THE EXCLUSIVE INTERPRETATION OF THE GALESBURG RULE. The other party, to which the English portion very generally belongs, insists that regard must be had to THE PRINCIPLES SET FORTH IN POINTS TWO AND THREE OF THE AKRON DECLARATION, and that stress must be laid on the fact that these were not rescinded by the Galesburg Rule.<sup>20</sup>

[2] Concerning the matter of "SECRET SOCIETIES," the General Council set forth the following declaration, in 1868: "Any and all societies for moral

and religious ends which do not rest on the supreme authority of God's Holy Word, as contained in the Old and New Testaments — which do not recognize our Lord Jesus Christ as the true God and the only Mediator between God and man — which teach doctrines or have usages or forms of worship condemned in God's Word and in the Confessions of His Church — which assume to themselves what God has given to His Church and its Ministers — which require undefined obligations to be assumed by oath, are unchristian, and we solemnly warn our members and ministers against all fellowship with or connivance at associations which have this character.” And further: “All connection with infidel and immoral associations we consider as requiring the exercise of prompt and decisive discipline, and after faithful and patient admonition and teaching from God's Word, the cutting off the persistent and obstinate offender from communion of the Church until he abandons them and shows a true repentance.”<sup>21</sup>

[3] CHILIASM. DR. J. A. SEISS, chairman of the delegation of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania in 1866, when the synod left the General Synod, prominent author and minister, was one of the leaders in the organization of the General Council. He was deeply interested in questions on the subject of the last things and was the author of a book entitled: “The Last Times.” He modified his views from time to time; but he was generally regarded as a chiliast. and this probably accounted for the fact that the JOINT SYNOD OF OHIO, at the first regular convention of the General Council, demanded, among other things, a DECLARATION of the Council as to the position it occupied regarding Chiliasm (§ 17, 3). In the year 1868, at the Pittsburg convention, the Council adopted the following declaration on this subject:<sup>22</sup>

"1. This Council holds firmly the doctrine of our Lord's coming and the associated Articles touching the Last Things, as they are set forth in the General Creeds and in the Augsburg Confession, in that sense of them which has been undisputed among all who have made a credible profession of unreserved acceptance of the Lutheran faith.

"2. The General Council has neither had, nor would consent to have, fellowship with any Synod which tolerates the 'Jewish opinions' or 'Chiliastic opinions' condemned in the XVII. Article of the Augsburg Confession.

“3. The points on which our Confession has not been explicit, or on which its testimony is not at present interpreted in precisely the same way by persons equally intelligent and honest, and equally unreserved and worthy of belief in the profession of adherence to the Confession, should continue to be the subject of calm, thorough, scriptural, and prayerful investigation, until we shall see perfectly eye to eye both as regards the teaching of God’s Word and the testimony of our Church.”

[4] WITH RESPECT TO LANGUAGE the General Council is a polyglot body. At the time of its organization the German and Swedish languages largely prevailed. But a large number especially of German synods (Wisconsin, Illinois, Minnesota, Michigan) gradually withdrew. Nevertheless, the German element is still strong in the General Council (especially through the New York Ministerium, which, on account of the withdrawal of the English element and the organization of a new district synod under the title of the Synod of New York and New England, has become again an entirely German body; through the Manitoba Synod and the Synod of Canada). The Augustana Synod is a large and influential synod in the Council. The Council also labors among the Slav nationalities in this country. But the use of the English language has constantly been gaining ground, because from the beginning the Ministerium of Pennsylvania and the Pittsburgh Synod exercised no small influence in Ohio and Indiana, especially since the most influential men (Krauth, Schaeffer, Krotel, Seiss, Mann, Schmucker, Roth, and others) wrote in English. It has in “The Lutheran” (for many years edited by Dr. G. F. Krotel, now by Dr. G. W. Sandt) a good English organ, which is read by many outside of the boundaries of the Council; also a well edited German organ in “DER DEUTSCHE LUTHERANER” (of which Dr. G. C. Berkemeier is editor-in-chief). Concerning periodicals published by the Augustana Synod, see § 19, 5. In the “Lutheran Church Review” (edited by Dr. Theodore E. Schmauk) the General Council has an excellent theological quarterly.

[5] WITH REGARD TO ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY the General Council is an organization which permits the individual synods a large freedom in the regulation of their own affairs. But the organization of synods on the territory of the Council, which in the interest of the whole body have been more and more established as district synods on geographical lines, and which have been directed in their various operations by the advice and help of the general body, has gradually given the General Council the character of a body with more or less centralized powers over the individual synods. This con-

dition of things has brought about the danger of a CONFLICT, ESPECIALLY WITH THE AUGUSTANA SYNOD, which on account of linguistic conditions that prevent all geographical limitations, has felt the need of preserving its freedom of movement. At the meeting of the General Council at Minneapolis, Minn. (1909), this matter came up in connection with resolutions offered by Dr. E. Norelius, which were ratified by the Augustana Synod;<sup>23</sup> and two years later (Lancaster, Pa., 1911) THE MATTER WAS SO ARRANGED that the functions of such bodies as the Augustana Synod shall be free from all outside interference. This declaration was not intended to touch the relation of those district synods whose activities are guided by the more direct aid on the part of the general body. At the same time, these resolutions were intended to facilitate the organic union of the Iowa Synod with the General Council, without any fear that it might thereby surrender its own identity.

## § 19. Present Status.

The General Council embraces the following FOURTEEN SYNODS: Ministerium of Pennsylvania, Ministerium of New York, Pittsburgh Synod, Texas Synod (admitted again, 1915), District Synod of Ohio, Augustana Synod, Synod of Canada, Chicago Synod, English Synod of the Northwest, Manitoba Synod, Pacific Synod, Synod of New York and New England, Nova Scotia Synod, and Synod of Central Canada.

[1] THE MINISTERIUM OF PENNSYLVANIA, also called Pennsylvania Synod, the “Mother Synod,” has been mentioned frequently (§§ 4:5, 8; 7:1, 2, 3; 8:2,; 9:2, 3; 19:3; 11:1a; 16:1), so that little more need be said in this connection. It is, except the Augustana Synod, the LARGEST of the synods connected with the Council. According to the statistics of 1915, it numbers 406 ministers, 575 congregations, and 159,137 communicants. It is divided into ten Conference districts, one of which is the Mission Conference in India. Only one of these Conferences is entirely German. The Synod maintains the Theological Seminary at Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, and Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.

[2] MINISTERIUM OF NEW YORK has also been so frequently mentioned (§§ 5:1; 8:3; 9:2, 3; 11:1a; 17:1 that little more need be said here. This synod has in many respects had a VARIED HISTORY. Under the long presidency of DR. QUITMANN it was influenced by Rationalism. Later, under the influence of Dr. Hazelius, the President of Hartwick Seminary, the synod returned to

the faith; yet because even he, who had come from the Moravians, failed to comprehend the teachings peculiar to the Lutheran Church, the tendency of the synod was towards METHODISTIC PRACTICES, which flourished among all denominations in the first half of the nineteenth century. The reaction against this tendency led the synod, in the sixth decade, upon a FIRM LUTHERAN BASIS. In 1859 the synod adopted the confessional basis which the General Synod, in 1869, in Washington, D. C. (§ 11, 1 b), made its own. Following the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, it withdrew from the General Synod in 1867, and since it then adopted the confessional basis of the General Council (§17, 2), it placed itself upon the collective writings of the Book of Concord. Equally varied has been the history of the New York Ministerium WITH REGARD TO LANGUAGE. At the time of its organization it was a GERMAN body, and remained so for twenty-five years. For fifty years afterwards the synodical business was transacted in THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. After 1867 it AGAIN BECAME A GERMAN BODY, for in that year the English-speaking members withdrew from it (§ 10, 3). But thanks to large immigration, many new German congregations were organized during the years immediately following this period. But soon English congregations again began to be organized, especially after 1888, which led finally to the formation of A STRONG ENGLISH CONFERENCE. In 1902 the English members separated peaceably from the German, and organized the "SYNOD OF NEW YORK AND NEW ENGLAND," and thus the New York Ministerium again became A PURELY GERMAN BODY. Since that time, however, the English language has again entered congregations, so that the number of congregations using both languages is today quite large. Besides the synod just mentioned, other synods have come into existence from this body: HARTWICK SYNOD, THE ENGLISH SYNOD OF NEW YORK, and the small SYNOD OF NEW JERSEY, which were later combined, and under the title of the Synod of New York and New Jersey united with the General Synod (§ 10:3 d). When the New York Ministerium withdrew from the General Synod, in 1867, HARTWICK Seminary (§§ 6:1; 12:1) remained in the possession of the seceding minority of English members. Since 1885, the synod has in Wagner College, Rochester, N. Y. (§ 201 b, 3), a classical school, most of whose graduates receive their theological training in the Seminary at Mt. Airy; others in the Seminary at Waterloo, Ontario. The Ministerium supports a German professor in the Mt. Airy Seminary.

[3] THE PITTSBURGH SYNOD (§§ 7:4; 10:B, d; 17:1, 3) was organized in 1845 by eight ministers, who were pastors of forty congregations. It entered the General Synod in 1853. In the years of the crisis at Fort Wayne, Indiana, 1866, the Pittsburgh Synod withdrew, and participated in the organization of the General Council, in consequence of which ten pastors severed their connection with it. Its present numerical strength (1915) is 152 ministers, 196 congregations, and 26,872 communicants. This synod, on account of its activity in mission work, which from the beginning it carried on very extensively, has been generally designated as "MISSIONARY SYNOD." It sent missionaries to Canada, Texas and Minnesota, and laid the foundation for the synods that have since been organized in these States. The leading spirit of this body was for many years DR. W. A. PASSAVANT (see Biographical Notes). With the name of this man are connected a number of INSTITUTIONS OF MERCY, which today are an ornament to the Lutheran Church in this country — the Orphans' Home at Rochester, Pa., the Deaconess Home and Hospital at Milwaukee, Wis., and a Hospital at Pittsburgh, Pa., etc. The classical school of this synod is Thiel College, Greenville, Pa.

[4] THE DISTRICT SYNOD OF OHIO, or, according to its earlier title, "English Evangelical Lutheran District Synod of Ohio and other States," was organized in 1857. Its entrance into the General Council became the cause of the position of the Joint Synod of Ohio against the Council, which is still felt. Dr. G. W. Mechling, an old member of the synod, writes: "Without opposition on the part of the Joint Synod of Ohio, this synod was represented at the Reading convention. But at the organization of the General Council the representative of the Joint Synod agitated the matter of the well known Four Points, with the result that Ohio failed to unite with the Council. Two members of the Joint Synod of Ohio protested against the reception of the English District Synod into the Council. But this protest was again withdrawn, and the District Synod became an integral part of the General Council, without, however, desiring to sever its connection with the Joint Synod of Ohio. The Joint Synod ended this anomalous condition by a resolution that the District Synod could no longer be regarded as a member of that Synod." According to the STATISTICS of 1915, the synod numbers 56 ministers, 89 congregations and 13,939 communicants. This synod would be stronger numerically, but it has from time to time dismissed a considerable number of its larger congregations to two of its sister synods (Pittsburgh and Indiana, now Chicago Synod), without thereby receiving any increase

from other sources. To the Pittsburgh Synod it dismissed large congregations in Westmoreland County, Pa. The hope was entertained that in return congregations of the Pittsburgh Synod in Ohio would connect themselves with the Ohio Synod, but this hope was not realized. The congregations in Indiana were dismissed to the Chicago Synod without receiving any benefits in return. This explains the present numerical condition of the synod.

[5] THE AUGUSTANA SYNOD was organized by Swedes and Norwegians at Clinton, Wisconsin, in 1860.

[a] The EARLY HISTORY of this synod contains many points of interest. In 1850, shortly after his arrival from Sweden in company with a band of his countrymen, PASTOR L. P. ESBJORN organized the Swedish Lutheran congregation at ANDOVER, Illinois, and in the same year also the congregation at GALESBURG, ILLINOIS, together with other congregations, which he served as pastor. He entered into relations with some Norwegians, and with these he participated in the formation of the Northern Illinois Synod in 1851, which united with the General Synod in 1853. Pastor T. N. HASSELQUIST arrived from Sweden in 1852, and took charge of the congregation at Galesburg, and in the following year Pastor E. CARLSSON arrived, and became pastor of a Swedish congregation in Chicago; both these were men who, with Esbjorn, were destined to exercise a far-reaching influence. The stream of Scandinavian immigration was extraordinarily strong in those years, especially to Minnesota, where today the Swedes constitute one-sixth of the population. The labors of these men grew rapidly, and the Scandinavians soon formed three conferences: Chicago, Mississippi and Minnesota. In the year 1857 a Scandinavian professorship was founded in the Illinois State University, at SPRINGFIELD, ILL., then under the control of the Northern Illinois Synod, the incumbent of which was Pastor Esbjorn. But already in 1860, during the confusion within the General Synod (§ 10, 2), Esbjorn severed his connection with the institution, and took his students with him, and on June 5th of the same year the Scandinavian Conference organized the "Scandinavian Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod of North America," at Clinton, Wisconsin, with Hasselquist as its first president, and with Esbjorn as professor in the Seminary in Chicago, which was then managed as an independent institution,

[b] The DEVELOPMENT of the Augustana Synod has been remarkable. In the year of its organization it numbered 27 ministers, 49 congregations, and 4,967 communicants, consisting of Swedes and Norwegians; and although

ten years later (1870) the Norwegians withdrew, in order to organize a synod of their own (§ 33), and although it was forced to pass through a bitter conflict, from 1872-1875, with the WALDENSTROMIAN tendency,<sup>24</sup> this synod now (1915) numbers 692 ministers, 1,204 congregations, and 184,056 communicants. In 1894 this synod was reorganized as a delegate body; and its eight conferences were given larger powers, without, however, giving the conferences authority to ordain ministers.

[c] Its INSTITUTIONS are numerous, at the head of which is AUGUSTANA COLLEGE AND SEMINARY at ROCK ISLAND, ILLINOIS. The Seminary in Chicago, already mentioned, was removed to Paxton, Ill., in 1863, and when Esbjorn returned to Sweden, Hasselquist became the head of the institution, a position he held until the end of his life (1891). The Seminary and College were removed to Rock Island in 1865, where they now exist as one of the most efficient institutions of the Lutheran Church in this country. The theological faculty at present (1916) consists of the following: Rev. Gustav Andreen, Ph. D., R. N. O., K. V. O., President — Conrad Emil Lindberg, D. D., LL. D., R. N. O. — Rev. Carl August Blomgren, Ph. D. — Rev. Carl Johannes Soedergren, A. M., Rev. Adolf Hult, B. D. BETHANY COLLEGE, Lindsborg, Kansas, was founded by Dr. C. A. Swensson in 1881. GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS COLLEGE, under the management of the Minnesota Conference, was founded in 1862, at Red Wing, Minn. At first it was known as the "Minnesota Elementary School;" in 1863 it was removed to Union, Minn., and called "Ansgar Academy;" finally, in 1876, it was removed to St. Peter, Minn., and received its present name. LUTHER ACADEMY, Wahoo, Nebraska, founded in 1883, belongs to the Nebraska Conference. Besides these, the Augustana Synod supports five additional ACADEMIES, twelve ORPHANS' HOMES, and five HOSPITALS, in connection with which the Deaconess Motherhouse, Omaha, Neb., deserves special mention.

### **Biographical Notes.**

PROF. LARS PAUL ESBJORN, the venerable pioneer and pastor of the Augustana Synod, was born in the Delsboro congregation, Helsingland Province, Sweden, October 16, 1808. He was educated in the schools at Hudiksvall and Gefle, studied theology at Upsala, and was ordained at that place in 1832. After his ordination he served as assistant pastor at Ostra Wahla, Osttattsfors and Hille, in the archdiocese of Upsala. In his early years he took



an active part in the temperance agitation of northern Sweden. Supported by the Swedish Missionary Society of Stockholm, he came to America in 1849, and at once began his earnest and active labors among the newly arrived immigrants at Andover, Henry County, Illinois. He organized the Swedish Lutheran congregations at Andover and Moline (1850), Galesburg (1851), and Princeton (1856). Then followed his activity as theological professor at Springfield, Ill., as already stated. After his withdrawal from this institution, he served the Augustana Synod as theological professor until 1863, when he returned to Sweden, where he labored as pastor at Ostra Wahla, and where he died, July 2, 1870.

PROF. TUVE NILSSON HASSELQUIST, D. D. (Muhlenberg College, 1871), patriarch of the Augustana Synod, was born March 2, 1816, at Onsby, Diocese of Lund, Sweden. He was educated at Lund and ordained in 1839. He served a number of congregations in Sweden, and was known as an earnest evangelical preacher. In 1852 he received a call from the recently organized Swedish Lutheran congregation at Galesburg, Ill., which he accepted and became its pastor in the same year. Under many self-denials, but with great zeal he served this congregation for eleven years. In addition, he made many missionary journeys to numerous places. In 1855 he began the publication of "Hemlandet," the first Swedish political paper in America, and also "Ratta Hemlandet," the first Swedish church paper in this country, which in 1869, under the title "Augustana," became the official organ of the Augustana Synod. He continued as editor of this paper until his death. He prepared an excellent commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians. He became President of Augustana College, and at the same time was a professor in the Theological Seminary, where in the later years of his life he taught Practical Theology. In addition to his activity as a teacher, he was pastor of the Swedish Lutheran congregation, first at Paxton, and afterwards at Rock Island, in which capacity he served until his death, February 4, 1891. Dr. Hasselquist was a model of deep personal piety and had an earnest zeal for Christianity and for his Church. As a theologian he belonged to the conservative and Biblical school of Bengel. He is properly regarded as the most distinguished preacher and Bible expositor which the Augustana Synod has had.

[6] THE CANADA SYNOD was until recently an entirely German Synod, although in later years several city congregations have introduced the English language. Although there were isolated German congregations in Canada

— as early as 1789 a German Lutheran Church was consecrated at Williamsburg — yet the organization of a synod came only as a result of the missionary activity of the Pittsburgh Synod (§ 19:3), which first sent to Canada Pastor G. BASSLER, and afterwards, as traveling missionary, Pastor C. F. DIEHL. In 1859 a Conference of the Pittsburgh Synod was formed in Canada, and in 1861 this Conference was organized as the “Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Canada.” The Synod’s pastors have largely been supplied by KROPP Seminary, Germany (§ 20); yet since the year 1911 this source of supply has been largely withdrawn. In the latter year the synod founded its OWN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY at Waterloo, which it supports in conjunction with the “Synod of Central Canada.” The Canada Synod numbers 43 ministers, 74 congregations, and 14,050 communicants.

[7] THE CHICAGO SYNOD is the present title of a small synod, which in 1871 was organized as the Indiana Synod. Several pastors of the Tennessee Synod (§ 5:5), stationed in Indiana, as early as 1835 organized a Synod of Indiana; but in consequence of doctrinal difficulties and personal differences it ceased to exist in 1859, and was reorganized as “Union Synod,” with the hope that all the Lutherans in the State could be led to unite with it. This hope was never realized. When the General Council was organized the synod applied for admission to this body; but doctrinal and practical difficulties were in the way. Fearing that other congregations of the Council, which until then had belonged to the English District Synod of Ohio (see above), might unite with the congregations of the Union Synod, this synod was disbanded in 1871, and in the same year the earlier “INDIANA SYNOD” was reorganized. In later years the name of the synod was changed to “CHICAGO SYNOD.” The synod numbers 46 ministers, 55 congregations and 8,284 communicants.

[8] THE ENGLISH SYNOD OF THE NORTHWEST was organized September 23, 1891, at St. Paul, Minnesota. At strategical points in the Northwest the General Council had established missions — in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Dakota, Utah and Washington. This synod was organized in order to establish a common center for these missions. The synod’s active operations caused considerable offense in the Augustana Synod, especially in the Minnesota Conference, since the Augustana Synod considered that it could take care of its congregations desiring English, while the Synod of the Northwest regarded itself specially called to engage in work among English-speaking Lutherans. In later years this matter has been satisfactorily adjusted, and all

differences have been laid aside. The synod numbers 40 ministers, 46 congregations, and 10,921 communicants. One of the chief aims of the two last named synods is the maintenance and support of the Chicago Seminary, from which it draws its ministerial supplies.

[9] THE MANITOBA SYNOD was organized in 1897 by the pastors and congregations of the German Mission Board of the General Council, established in the Canadian Northwest, and in the same year it was admitted into the Council. It numbers 31 ministers, 62 congregations and numerous preaching stations, and 4,981 communicants. Since 1912 the synod maintains a college at Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, which is particularly engaged in preparing young men for the study of theology.

[10] THE PACIFIC SYNOD was organized in 1901, and numbers 21 ministers, 23 congregations, and 1,906 communicants, scattered over the west coast. The synod is bi-lingual, and is divided into a German and an English Conference. In the year 1910 it founded a Theological Seminary at Portland, Oregon, which has since been removed to Seattle, Washington.

[11] THE SYNOD OF NEW YORK AND NEW ENGLAND is the title of the new synod which was organized by former members of the New York Ministerium at Utica, N. Y., September 24, 1902 (cf. § 19, 2). Although in the year 1909 a number of pastors and congregations were dismissed for the purpose of uniting with the newly organized "Synod of Central Canada" (cf. § 19, 13), the synod has enjoyed an unusually rapid growth. It numbers at present 62 ministers, 55 congregations, and 14,479 communicants.

[12] NOVA SCOTIA SYNOD. At its 75th annual convention, July 3, 1903, the Nova Scotia Conference of the Pittsburgh Synod was organized as the Nova Scotia Synod, with 6 ministers, 24 congregations, and 2,439 communicants. Unfavorable conditions have prevented the synod from enjoying a rapid growth. The synod now numbers 7 ministers, 28 congregations, and 2,918 communicants.

[13] THE SYNOD OF CENTRAL CANADA, the youngest in the Council, is the result of English missionary activities in Canada, which the Board of English Missions of the General Council began in the year 1904. The synod was organized in 1909, in Toronto, and now numbers 9 ministers, 16 congregations, and 1,781 communicants. It supports, in conjunction with the German Canada Synod (§ 19:6), the Theological Seminary at Waterloo, Ontario.

[14] THE FIRST EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SYNOD OF TEXAS was organized November 8, 1851, became a member of the General Council in 1868; in 1895 it withdrew in order to become a district of the Iowa Synod, but in 1915 it re-entered the Council. It numbers 8 ministers, 14 congregations, and 3,000 communicants.

## § 20. Institutions and Missions.

Note: This section has been revised on the basis of the first edition with great care by Prof. Dr. H. Offermann.

### 1. Theological Seminaries.

[a] THE PHILADELPHIA SEMINARY, at Mt. Airy, Philadelphia (property of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania), a *pium desiderium* of Muhlenberg, was opened in 1864, in the rooms of the Publication House, Philadelphia, and later occupied its own building on Franklin street. In 1889 it was removed to Mt. Airy. The first professors were Doctors C. F. Schaeffer, Mann, Krauth, C. W. Schaefer, and Krotel. Dr. Spaeth became a member of the faculty in 1873, and Dr. Jacobs in 1883. For a short time (1892-1896) the famous Assyriologist, Dr. Hilprecht, was connected with the institution. Dr. G. F. Spieker was professor of Church History, 1894-1913. The present faculty consists of the Dean, Dr. H. E. Jacobs, and Doctors J. Fry, H. Offermann, T. E. Schmauk, L. D. Reed, C. M. Jacobs, and C. T. Benze. About 850 pastors have gone forth from this seminary. In one year it had 92 students. The institution possesses a valuable property, with commodious buildings, endowment amounting to nearly \$350,000, and one of the most valuable libraries in the Lutheran Church in America, housed in a magnificent building, erected in memory of Dr. Krauth. The President of the Board of Directors is Dr. Schmauk.

[b] THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SEMINARY AT MAYWOOD, ILLINOIS, founded through the activity of Dr. Passavant, was opened in 1891. In the year 1910 it was removed from Lake View, Chicago, to Maywood, a suburb of the city. Largely supported by the Chicago Synod and the English Synod of the Northwest (see above), its aim is to supply this territory with English Lutheran pastors. Nevertheless, among its students are those who prepare for the ministry in other Lutheran synods. About 250 pastors have obtained

their theological training here. Dr. R. F. Weidner. Dr. Passavant's choice for this position, remained at the head of the institution until his death (1915). Besides the present head of the institution. Dr. E. F. Krauss, the members of the faculty are Doctors G. F. Gerberding. A. Ramsay, and T. Stump.

[c] THE AUGUSTANA SEMINARY of the Swedes at Rock Island (cf. above) was founded in Chicago in 1860, and removed to Rock Island in 1875. The President is Dr. G. A. Andreen. It has trained more than 700 ministers.

[d] THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AT WATERLOO, Canada, is the youngest of the Council's theological institutions. It was opened in 1911, and is supported by the two Canada synods, the German and English, and is intended to supply ministers for service on the territory of these bodies. Besides the two regular Professors, C. Linke and P. A. Laury, D. D., the latter of whom is the Director, a number of neighboring pastors render assistance as teachers.

## 2. Classical Institutions.

[a] MUHLENBERG COLLEGE, Allentown, Pa. (belonging to the Pennsylvania Ministerium), was founded in 1867. It grew out of the "Allentown Seminary," which has existed since the year 1848. Its first President was Dr. F. A. Muhlenberg, who, after an administration of ten years, was followed by Doctors Sadler and Seip. Under the present President, Dr. John A. W. Haas, who began his labors in 1904, the college has made most gratifying progress.

[b] WAGNER COLLEGE, Rochester, N. Y. (founded in 1883 by the Rev. Alexander Richter, as a Pro-Seminary after the model of a German gymnasium, with special reference to American conditions), is carried on in the interest of the New York Ministerium. Dr. J. Steinhäuser was its President for a number of years, who was succeeded by Dr. J. Nicum. In the year 1904 Pastor H. D. Kraeling became Director. After a successful service of ten years he was succeeded by the present Director, Pastor J. A. W. Kirsch.

[c] THIEL COLLEGE, Greenville, Pa., is the institution of the Pittsburgh Synod, and after small beginnings (Dr. H. E. Giese first President), was finally established, under its present title, in 1870. In the early years of the present century there arose differences of opinion in the synod concerning the change of the location of the institution, from Greenville to some other place. The result of this was that the institution was closed for four years,

and only in 1907 reopened, under the presidency of Dr. C. Theodore Benze, who has since been called to Mt. Airy.

[d] Concerning the COLLEGES OF THE SWEDES (Bethany at Lindsborg, Kansas; Gustavus Adolphus at St. Peter, Minn.; Luther Academy at Wahoo, Neb., and others), see § 19, 5 c.

### **3. Institutions of Mercy — Inner Mission Institutions.**

Within the General Council 18 ORPHANS' HOMES are maintained, which are partly in direct connection with individual synods, and partly have the character of private institutions. Homes for the Aged are connected with a number of these institutions. The most important institutions of this kind are WARTBURG ORPHANS' HOME at Mt. Vernon, near New York, a widely known institution for the training of orphans, which, under the model administration of its Director for many years. Dr. G. C. Berkemeier, has attained great prosperity; the Orphans' Home and Asylum for the Aged, Philadelphia, and another at Topton, Pa., both supported by the Pennsylvania Ministerium; the Orphans' Home at Zelienople, Pa.; St. John's Orphans' Home at Buffalo, N. Y., as also the Swedish Orphans' Homes at Jamestown, N. Y.; Joliet, Ill.; Stanton, Ia.; Vasa, Minn.; Andover. 111.; Omaha, Neb.; Cleburne, Kans.; Avon, Mass.; Stromberg, Neb. Through Dr. Passavant, the General Council has taken a prominent place in THE WORK OF DEACONESSES. He founded hospitals at Pittsburgh, Milwaukee, Chicago and Jacksonville, Ill. For the churchly direction and the future development of the female diaconate. Dr. A. Spaeth rendered valuable services. Chiefly through his influence, a German-American, a native of Bremen, John Diedrich Lankenau, established in 1888, in Philadelphia, THE MARY J. DREXEL MOTHERHOUSE, in memory of his deceased wife, as the first Deaconess Motherhouse, the largest and most magnificent institution of its kind in the Lutheran Church in America. The first Director was Pastor A. Cordes (now superintendent and city pastor in Leipzig) who, after three years' activity, returned to Germany. He was succeeded by Pastor C. Godel (now in Montreux, Switzerland). The present rector, for more than eight years, is Dr. E. F. Bachmann. In connection with the Motherhouse there are a home for the aged, a children's hospital, and the Lankenau School for Girls. The splendidly equipped German HospitaT in Philadelphia is also under the care of deaconesses. Judge William H. Staake is President of the Board of Directors. The Augustana

Synod has a Deaconess Motherhouse at Omaha, Neb. THE LUTHERAN EMI-GRANT HOUSE in New York, whose founder and director until his death (1899) was Pastor W. Berkemeier, serving it for twenty-five years, rendered until recently valuable services to thousands of German immigrants. A short time ago the house was sold, but missionary activity among immigrants is to be continued in the future. A German SEAMEN'S HOME, whose pastor is appointed by the Pennsylvania Ministerium, has existed for a number of years in Philadelphia, and is supported by a local society, whilst a similar undertaking, the German Seaman's Home in Hoboken, is connected with the German Lutheran Union for the care of seamen in Hannover. The General Council has developed helpful activity in the sphere of Inner Mission, in order to render aid to social and spiritual needs in the large cities of New York and Philadelphia. In Philadelphia CITY MISSION work has been carried on for years, under the direction of the Rev. Dr. J. F. Ohl, in connection with the Pennsylvania Ministerium. The Rev. Dr. F. F. Buermeier labors as city missionary in New York City. In both cities CHRISTIAN HOSPICES for young men are maintained, and efforts in various directions are made in the service of the Church.

#### **4. Foreign Mission Work.**

The history of the Foreign Mission work of the Council is closely connected with that of the General Synod (§ 12:2). In consequence of the separation at Fort Wayne in 1866, and the subsequent organization of the General Council, the General Synod found it impossible to continue the work in India to the same extent as it had been begun. It decided, therefore, to transfer a part of the territory (Rajahmundry and Samulkot Districts) to the Church Missionary Society (Episcopal) of England. When FATHER HEYER, a returned missionary, heard of the contemplated transfer while on a visit to Germany, he returned hastily to America, went to the Pennsylvania Ministerium, then in session at Lancaster (spring of 1866), and influenced the Ministerium, which was then engaged in arranging for the issuing of a call looking to the formation of the General Council, to take over these mission stations and save them for the Lutheran Church. Although sixty-seven years of age, he declared himself ready to return to India and to organize the work. He went. He had brought with him to America a young man educated for mission work, H. C. SCHMIDT, of Flensburg, Schleswig, who followed

him to Rajahmundry in 1870. In the following year, after having completed the work of organization, Father Heyer returned to America. Schmidt remained at the head of the mission until 1902, when he resigned his position, and in recent years died in India. DR. HARPSTER, of the General Synod, succeeded him. Despite many difficulties, which at times threatened the welfare of the mission, the work has enjoyed a steady growth. In 1913 eleven missionaries were on the field, in addition to nine Zenana Sisters and many native helpers. The number of Christians were 19,377. The contributions for Foreign Missions in the last biennium amounted to \$159,743. In addition to the work among the Telugus, work was begun in Japan in 1911, which the General Council supports in common with the United Synod of the South, although the latter work is still in its incipient stage. The entire Foreign Mission operations of the General Council are conducted by a central board, which has its place of meeting in Philadelphia, and of which the Rev. G. Drach is the General Secretary.

## **5. Home Missions.**

While all parts of the General Council are in common engaged in prosecuting Foreign Missions, the management of Home Mission work rests on a somewhat different basis. Until 1888 each synod managed the mission work on its own territory; but then efforts began to be made to CENTRALIZE THE WORK to the extent that the Council appointed separate committees, respectively, for the ENGLISH, the German, and the Swedish work. The Board of English Missions, under the energetic Superintendent, Dr. Kunzman, has been exceptionally active and has been very successful, and has expended large sums of money for the establishment of mission congregations, especially in the West and Northwest (the income during the last biennium amounted to more than \$83,000). A Church Extension Society, which has at its disposal a considerable amount of money and which it loans to poor congregations without interest for the erection of churches, is an essential aid to this work. The Board of GERMAN Missions, the soul of which for many years was the extraordinarily active and farseeing PASTOR F. WISCHAN (d. 1905), entered into relations with PASTOR J. PAULSEN, Kropp, Schleswig, encouraged him, in 1882, to establish a Theological Seminary for the preparation of men for this work, and received from him many capable men. The Council, however, soon demanded that the students coming from Kropp



should spend the last year of their course in the Philadelphia Seminary. Pastor Paulsen refused to comply with this demand. This led to a spirited conflict, which was intensified by personal differences between individuals in the Council, and resulted, in 1888, in the action of the Council that it was inexpedient to continue the official connection with the institution at Kropp, and all relations with it ceased. Pastor Paulsen, however, continued to prepare men for the German synods of the Council. Despite many financial difficulties, his Seminary continued to exist, and received financial support from many German congregations and pastors. In 1909 the interrupted relations between Kropp and the Council were again restored, and the mutual relations re-established under the supervision of a special commission, of which the President, Dr. Schmauk, is the chairman. The Theological Seminary at Kropp receives annually a definite sum of money from the Council, and in return places its graduates at the disposal of the Board of German Missions. The Rev. A. Hellwege is the treasurer of the Kropp Commission. From 1913 to 1915 the Council has placed an American professor (the Rev. Dr. C. T. Benze) at Kropp. The Board of German Missions, with limited means at its command (income for 1911-1913 amounted to \$18,625), has accomplished much. The German Manitoba Synod, which was organized in 1897, and now (1916) numbers 31 ministers, 62 congregations, and 4,981 communicants, is one of the fruits of its labors. The monthly paper, "Siloah," seeks to keep alive the missionary interest in the German congregations. New York is the seat of the Board. The Board of SWEDISH Missions reports to the Council, but carries on its extended missionary operations independently and apparently with much success. A part of the Home Mission activity of the Council is the work among the SLAV and HUNGARIAN and allied nationalities, as also the mission work in PORTO RICO, which was begun after the cessation of the Spanish-American war. The Rev. Dr. A. L. Ramer is the Superintendent of the Slav mission work. He spent two years in Hungary before he entered upon his labors at home. The lack of suitable laborers is particularly felt in this work, and explains why the work has not yet gone beyond the boundary of promising beginnings. In Porto Rico there are now eight missions, with nine congregations and six preaching stations. Even here the work is still in its beginning, but it has splendid prospects for future success.

### **Biographical Notes.**

PROF. W. J. MANN, D. D., born, May 29, 1819, at Stuttgart. Wuertemberg. equipped with an excellent theological training, came to America in 1845, through the influence of his intimate friend, Dr. Philip Schaff. At first he was pastor of a Reformed congregation, cooperated with Dr. Schaff in editing the "Deutsche Kirchenfreund," later becoming editor-in-chief. In 1850 he joined the Lutheran Church, was received into the Pennsylvania Ministerium, served Zion's congregation in Philadelphia, and in 1864 became German professor in the Philadelphia Seminary. He also took part in combating "American Lutheranism," through two excellent books, "A Plea for the Augsburg Confession" (1856) and "Lutheranism in America" (1859). He was a very prolific writer, and published, among other things, a biography of Muhlenberg in German and English. He rendered the Church an exceptionally valuable service in editing a new edition of the "Hallesche Nachrichten." This noted German-American theologian, with his rich theological idealism, is represented to us in a pleasing manner by Dr. A. Spaeth in his "Erinnerungsblaetter." He died in 1892.

REV. W. A. PASAAVANT, D. D., of Huguenot ancestry, was born at Zelenople. Pa.. October 9, 1821, received his theological training at Gettysburg, and while yet a student he published the first Lutheran Almanac issued in America: served congregations in Baltimore and Pittsburg; published "The Missionary," which was merged into "The Lutheran and Missionary" in 1861; founded the "Workman" in 1880, the editor of which he remained until his death. In cooperation with Fliedner of Kaiserswerth, he established the deaconess work in the Lutheran Church in America (§20:2); founded orphanages, and hospitals; was instrumental in founding Thiel College and the Chicago Seminary. He died in 1894.

REV. B. M. SCHMUCKER, D. D., son of Dr. S. S. Schmucker, received his training at Gettysburg College and Seminary. Through the influence of Dr. Krauth he was led to become identified with the conservative party in the Lutheran Church, and became a member of the General Council. He was the foremost liturgical scholar of the Lutheran Church in America, and the Church Book of the General Council, the English as well as the German, is primarily the product of his eminent liturgical and hymnological studies. He was a member of the Joint Committee for the preparation of the Common Service, and the preface is the work of his facile pen. He died in 1888.

REV. G. F. KROTEL, D. D., LL. D., born February 4, 1826, in Alsfeld, Wuerttemberg, came with his parents to Philadelphia in 1830. For a number of years he attended an academy in Philadelphia connected with the parochial school of St. Michael's and Zion's congregations. In 1842 he entered the University of Pennsylvania and graduated in 1846. He studied theology under Dr. Demme, and entered the office of the ministry in 1850. He served congregations in Philadelphia, Lebanon, Lancaster, Pa., again in Philadelphia, 1861, at the same time serving as a member of the faculty of the Philadelphia Seminary. He was frequently elected to the presidency of the Pennsylvania Ministerium, and was President of the General Council in 1869. He was widely known as a pulpit orator. After Dr. Krauth's resignation he became editor of the "Lutheran," a position in which he manifested excellent gifts. He was a prolific writer, and was one of the most influential men of the General Council. He died in 1907.

REV. J. A. SEISS, D. D., LL. D., born in Frederick County, Maryland, educated at Gettysburg College, studied theology and entered the office of the ministry in 1842. He served congregations in Martinsburg and Shepherdstown, W. Va., Cumberland, Md., Frederick, Md., and Baltimore. In 1858 he became pastor of St. John's English Lutheran Church, Philadelphia, which he served for sixteen years, when out of this congregation the Church of the Holy Communion was organized, which he served until his death in 1904. Dr. Seiss exercised a strong influence as a member of the Pennsylvania Ministerium, whose president he was for many years, and as a member of the General Council, whose president he also was. As a pulpit orator and a writer he was widely known. Particularly well known are his writings on the Last Things (The Last Times; Lectures on the Apocalypse, 3 volumes), which caused him to be charged with the introduction of chiliastic errors. He published many books, most of which are expositions of Scripture and discussions of various ecclesiastical questions.

PROF. A. SPAETH, D. D., LL. D., born December 29, 1839, in Esslingen, Wuerttemberg, was educated in the Latin School of his native place, in the Pro-Seminary at Blaubeuren, and in the University of Tuebingen. He was assistant pastor and was ordained in 1861; private tutor in Italy, France, and Scotland, until 1864, when he followed a call as associate pastor, with Dr. W. J. Mann, of Zion's Lutheran congregation in Philadelphia. In 1867 he became pastor of the newly organized St. Johannis congregation in Philadelphia. In 1873 he became professor in the Philadelphia Seminary. He

was President of the General Council (1880-1888), and of the Pennsylvania Ministerium (1892- 1895). He remained pastor of St. Johannis congregation until his death, serving that congregation in addition to his labors in the Seminary. He was a fine liturgical and hymnological scholar, as well as in the province of church music. He also approved himself as a historian (Biography of Dr. W. J. Mann; especially of Charles Porterfield Krauth. in 2 volumes). He is the author of the article on the Lutheran Church in America in Hauck, Realencyclopediae. He also published a number of homiletical works: Sermons for Children, Gospels of the Church Year, Seed Thoughts. He had special gifts as a pulpit orator. He took a deep interest in the deaconess work, and to his efforts it is due that the German Hospital in Philadelphia was brought into the existing relation with the Philadelphia Motherhouse for Deaconesses, and that the entire work has attained its present churchly foundation. He died June 25, 1910.

PROF. R. F. WEIDNER, D. D., LL. D., was born in Center Valley, Lehigh County, Pa., November 22, 1851, and was educated at Muhlenberg College, Allentown, and the Theological Seminary at Philadelphia. He was ordained in 1873, and became pastor of Grace Church, Phillipsburg, N. J., in connection with which he served as professor of English and Logics in Muhlenberg College until 1877. From 1878- 1882 he was professor of Dogmatics and Exegesis in the Theological Seminary of the Augustana Synod, Rock Island. He was pastor of St. Luke's Church, Philadelphia, and assistant pastor of the Church of the Holy Communion, Philadelphia, for a number of years. In the year 1891 he was elected President of the newly founded Theological Seminary of the General Council in Chicago, and at the same time as professor of Dogmatics and Hebrew. All his energies were directed towards the building up of the Seminary, which through his leadership has attained an influential position in the Church. He was a prolific writer and published numerous books, many of which were valuable works of German theologians, freely elaborated by him in English. Zockler, on this account, once properly called him a pontifex, i.e., a builder of bridges for the transfer of German theology into the garb of the English language. He published: Commentary on the Gospel of Mark, 1881; Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology (3 vols.), 1885-1891; Biblical Theology of the Old Testament, 1886; Introduction to Dogmatic Theology, 1888; An Introductory New Testament Greek Method, 1889; Studies in the Book, — New Testament (3 vols.), 1890; Old Testament, Genesis (1 vol.), 1892; Biblical Theology of

the New Testament, 1891; Christian Ethics, 1891; Examination Questions in Church History and Christian Archaeology, 1893; Annotations on the General Epistles, 1897; Commentary on Revelation, 1898 (Vols. XI and XII of Lutheran Commentary); Theologia, or Doctrine of God, 1903; Ecclesiology, or the Doctrine of the Church, 1903; The Doctrine of the Ministry, 1907; The Doctrine of Man, 1912; Christology, or the Doctrine of the Person of Christ, 1913; Soteriology, 1914; Pneumatology, 1915. While engaged in writing this note, the report has reached us of the death of this untiring laborer. Untiring activity, remarkable devotion to his life-work (the building up of the Seminary), firm adherence to the principles of the Lutheran Church (inspiration of the Bible and justification by faith alone), fine mental gifts coupled with personal magnetism, through which he drew students to himself and influenced them, — all these, together with a living faith, constituted the principal characteristics of this great man in Israel. For a number of years he had been physically weakened by paralysis, but he lost no time in his lectures, and his vast literary labors continued unabated, so that at the time of his death (January 6, 1915) two of his books were passing through the press.

PROF. E. T. HORN, D. D., was born in Easton, Pa., June 10, 1850. He graduated from Pennsylvania College at Gettysburg in 1869 and from the Seminary in 1872. He served as pastor in Philadelphia (1872-96), in Charleston, S. C. (1876-97), in Reading, Pa. (1897-1911). Then he was called as Professor of Ethics and of Theory and Practice of Missions at the Lutheran Theological Seminary of the General Council in Philadelphia, where he died in 1915. He was author of a number of works: The Christian Year, 1876; Old Matin and Vesper Services of the Lutheran Church, 1882; The Evangelical Pastor, 1887; Outline of Liturgies, 1890; Lutheran Sources of the Common Service, 1890; Translation of Loehe's Catechism, 1893; Commentary on Philippians, Colossians, I and II Thessalonians and Philemon, 1896; The Application of Lutheran Principles to the Church Building, 1905; Summer Sermons, 1908; Translation of Loehe's Three Books on the Church, 1908.

PROF. G. H. GERBERDING, D. D., was born, August 21, 1847. Pittsburg, Pa. He received his classical training at Thiel College, Greenville, and Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa., and his theological training at the Philadelphia Seminary. He was ordained in 1876, and served congregations in Allegheny City, Pa., 1876-1881; Jewett, Ohio, 1881-1887; Fargo, N.

Dak., 1887-1894, from which he was called to Chicago Seminary as professor of Practical Theology. He is the author of the following valuable works: *The Way of Salvation in the Lutheran Church*, 1887 (a book that has passed through many editions and enjoys a wide circulation); *New Testament Conversions*, 1889; *The Lutheran Pastor*, 1902; *Life and Letters of Passavant*, 1906; *The Lutheran Catechist*, 1910; *Problems and Possibilities, Serious Considerations for all Lutherans*, 1914.

PROF. J. A. W. HAAS, D. D., was born in Philadelphia, August 31, 1862. Having received his training in the University of Pennsylvania, the Philadelphia Seminary, and in Leipzig, he was ordained in 1888. He served congregations in New York until 1904, when he accepted a call as President of Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa., and as professor of Philosophy, a position which he holds at present. He is the author of *Commentary on the Gospel of Mark*, in *Lutheran Commentary*, 1895; *Bible Literature*, 1903; *Biblical Criticism*, 1903; with Dr. Jacobs, editor of the *Lutheran Cyclopaedia*, 1899; *Trends of Thought and Christian Truth*, 1915.

PROF. H. E. JACOBS, D. D., LL. D., S. T. D., was born at Gettysburg, Pa., November 10, 1844. He received his training in the College and Seminary at Gettysburg, graduating from the Seminary in 1865, and was professor in the College at Gettysburg, 1864-1867. He served a mission congregation in Pittsburg, 1867-1868. He was recalled to Gettysburg as professor of Latin and History, 1870-1880; from 1880-1883, he taught exclusively the ancient languages. In the latter year he accepted a call as professor of Systematic Theology in the Philadelphia Seminary, a position he still holds. From 1882-1896, he was also editor of the *Lutheran Church Review*. Under his editorial supervision the *Lutheran Commentary* became a possibility, 1895-1898, as also the *Lutheran Cyclopaedia*, 1899. He is the author of the following works: *The Lutheran Movement in England*, 1899; *History of the Lutheran Church in America*, 1893; *Elements of Religion*, 1894; *Commentary on Romans*, 1896; *Commentary on First Corinthians*, 1897; *Life of Martin Luther*, 1898; *The German Emigration to America, 1709-1740*, 1899; *Summary of the Christian Faith*, 1905.

PROF. THEODORE E. SCHMAUK, D. D., LL. D., was born at Lancaster, Pa., 1860, educated at the University of Pennsylvania and the Philadelphia Seminary, and was ordained in 1882. Since 1895 he has been the editor of the *Lutheran Church Review*; since 1896, editor of the graded Sunday-School Lessons of the General Council; and since 1911 professor of Apologetics in

the Philadelphia Seminary. In addition, he serves his congregation at Lebanon, Pa. Since 1903, he has been President of the General Council. He is the author of the following works: *The Negative Criticism of the O. T.* 1894; *Catechetical Outlines*. 1892; *History of Old Salem and Lebanon*. 1898; *The Early History of the Lebanon Valley*, 1902; *History of the Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania*. 1903; *The Confessions and the Confessional Principle of the Lutheran Church*, 1909; *Annotated Edition of Benjamin Rush's Account of the German Inhabitants of Pennsylvania*, 1910; *Christianity and Christian Union*, 1913.

---

1. Reprinted in *Documentary History of the General Council*, by Dr. S. E. Ochsenford, General Council Publication Board, Philadelphia, 1912, p. 128 ff. ↩
2. The following synods were represented: The Ministerium of Pennsylvania, New York Ministerium, Pittsburgh Synod, Minnesota Synod, and the English Synod of Ohio. Besides these, all of which had previously belonged to the General Synod, delegates were present from the Joint Synod of Ohio, English District Synod of Ohio, Synod of Wisconsin, Synod of Michigan, Iowa, Canada, Norwegian, and even from the Missouri Synod. These synods represented 891 ministers, 1,612 congregations and 209,707 communicants. These statistics indicate how strong numerically Lutheranism then was outside of the General Synod. If only these could have been united into one body. Hope was entertained that this would be possible, but it was shown shortly afterwards that this aim could not be attained. ↩
3. See *Documentary History*, p. 131. A German translation of the sermon is also found in the *German Minutes*, pp. 22-33. ↩
4. The paragraphs referring to "Ecclesiastical Power and Church Polity" are not reprinted in this connection. They are found in *Fritschel II*, 313-319; in English in *Dr. Jacobs' History*, p. 474 f; and in *Documentary History of the General Council*, p. 136 ff. ↩
5. The Texas Synod (German) was admitted the following year. ↩
6. *Lutherische Herold*, 29 December, 1866. ↩
7. Why not also concerning the first point? See §23, IL, 5. ↩
8. For the reasons, see § 18. ↩

9. The Iowa Synod demanded that the General Council should expressly condemn “all church fellowship with such as are not Lutherans; for example, ministers serving congregations that are mixed and not purely Lutheran, receiving such congregations and their pastors into synodical connection, the admission of those of a different faith to the privilege of communion, the permission of those not Lutheran to occupy our pulpits,” etc. The Council was asked to declare that “according to the Word of (lod, church discipline be exercised, especially at the celebration of the Holy Communion, and be likewise exercised towards those who are members of secret societies.” See German Minutes, p. 13. Documentary History, p. 161. The following official answer was given by the Council: “That the General Council is not prepared to endorse the declaration of the Synod of Iowa, as a correct logical deduction and application of the negative part of our Confessional Books, and that we refer the matter to the District Synoils. until such time as by the blessings of God’s Holy Spirit, and the leadings of His Providence, we shall be enabled throughout the whole General Council and all its churches, to see eye to eye in all the details of practice and usage, towards the consummation of which we will direct our unceasing prayers.” Ibidem.↵
10. German Minutes, p. 20. Documentary History, p. 157.↵
11. Ibidem.↵
12. Cf. Documentary History, p. 158.↵
13. Documentary History, p. 160.↵
14. The matter referred to here is presented in the following paragraphs: “That this Council is aware of nothing in its ‘Fundamental Principles of Faith and Church Polity’ and Constitution, nor in the relation it sustains to the four questions raised, which justifies a doubt whether its decisions on them all, when they are brought up in the manner prescribed in the Constitution, will be in harmony with Holy Scripture and the Confessions of the Church.” “That as soon as official evidence shall be presented to this body, in the manner prescribed in the Constitution, that un-Lutheran doctrines or practices are authorized by the action of any of its synods, or by their refusal to act, it will weigh that evidence, and, if it finds they exist, use all its constitutional power to convince the minds of men in regard to them, and as speedily as possible to remove them.” Documentary History, p. 156.↵



15. Dr. Spaeth, "General Council," p. 25. Documentary History, p. 163 ff. ↩
16. Documentary History, p. 216. ↩
17. See Fritschel, 3:326. ↩
18. Documentary History, p. 217. ↩
19. Documentary History, p. 219. See also Lutheran Cyclopaedia, p. 189. ↩
20. The most thorough treatment of this whole matter, in its historical and dogmatic bearings, is the work of Dr. C. P. Krauth, and was presented at the First Free Lutheran Diet in America, held at Pittsburg, Pa., 1877, and participated in by large numbers of members of the General Council and General Synod. Reprinted in Proceedings of the "First Free Lutheran Diet in America," pp. 27-69. ↩
21. These are sections 2 and 3 of the declaration on this subject. See Documentary History, p. 208. ↩
22. See German Minutes, p. 16. Documentary History, p. 207. The reading of this report by the Chairman of the Committee, Dr. C. P. Krauth, was followed by a minority report, signed by J. Bading, R. Adelberg, and S. Klingman, in which they say: "We reject each and every form of Chiliasm, as contrary to the Scriptures and the Confessions." Cf. German Minutes, p. 30; English Minutes, p. 25. Pastor Bading was a delegate of the Wisconsin Synod, Pastor Adelberg of the New York Ministerium, and Pastor Klingmann of the Michigan Synod. It should be stated, in this connection, that Pastor J. Grosse, in his book, "Unterscheidungslehren," etc., in his reference to the characteristics of the General Council, quotes numerous passages from the above named book of Dr. Seiss, but fails altogether to refer to the declarations of the General Council itself. Since the death of Dr. Seiss nothing at all is heard of Chiliasm in the General Council. ↩
23. See Minutes of Aug. Synod of 1909, p. 197. ↩
24. Waldenstrom, head-master of the Latin School at Gefle, Sweden, violently attacked the churchly doctrines of the atonement and justification, especially Christ's vicarious death, and further ignored the ministerial call, inasmuch as he permitted laymen to administer the sacraments. While on a visit to America, as in Sweden, he created a great sensation through his writings and addresses, so much so that the Congregationalists, who especially fraternized with him, gave him the title

of Doctor of Divinity. His followers are called “Mission Friends,” but they are not increasing rapidly in numbers.↩

## 7. The Synodical Conference.

### § 21. Introductory.

The Synodical Conference, the largest body of Lutherans in America,<sup>1</sup> was ORGANIZED in 1872 at Milwaukee, Wis., by the union of the Missouri, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, Norwegian and Ohio Synods. The Joint Synod of Ohio withdrew in 1881 on account of the PREDESTINATION CONTROVERSY (§ 28, 2, c). The NORWEGIANS (§ 32, III, 2) withdrew in 1883, hoping to settle the same controversy by being independent. The Illinois Synod (§ 7, 4; 10, 3, A. d; 17, 1, 3; 22, 7, d) was absorbed by the Missouri Synod in 1880. Since the WISCONSIN (§ 25, 1) and the MINNESOTA SYNODS (§25, 11), together with the MICHIGAN Synod, (§25), which had left the General Council, were merged into one body (§ 25, III, 4, 5; 17, 3); since the DISTRICT of NEBRASKA became an independent synod (§ 25, IV), and since the SLOVAK Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Pennsylvania and other States (§ 26) has united with the Synodical Conference, it is now COMPOSED of the following synods: 1. The Missouri Synod;<sup>2</sup> 2. The Synods of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan and Nebraska; 3. The Slovak Evangelical Synod of Pennsylvania and other States.

### § 22. How It Came Into Existence.

#### The Missouri Synod.

##### 1. The Saxons.

The Rev. MARTIN STEPHAN, pastor of St. John's Church, Pirna (a suburb near Dresden, Germany), from 1810 to 1837, was the man whose strange personality was to become a factor in the early history of the Missouri Synod. Born of poor Christian parents at Stramberg, Moravia, in 1777. he came, while in Breslau. under the influence of Scheibel, a Lutheran professor of strong convictions. Stephan finished his theological studies at Halle and Leipzig, and, as a minister who preached Christ crucified in an age of rationalism, he exerted a remarkable influence on all with whom he came in contact. Out of the depth of his spiritual experiences and on account of his

thorough familiarity with the workings of the human heart, he had a peculiar gift of combating doubts and inner conflicts with timely and appropriate advice. He cared little for mere oratorical effects, but stated, in the plainest speech he could command, the gospel of grace. His hearers, unless contaminated with the spirit of the scoffer, were invariably greatly affected. Hungering souls sought his counsel.

Among those who were attracted to him was CARL FERDINAND WILHELM WALTHER, then (1829) a theological student at Leipzig, whose influence on the Missouri Synod was to be fraught with such great blessings. He was born in Langenchursdorf, Saxony, Oct. 25, 1811, and was the son of a minister. Having graduated from the Gymnasium, he intended to study music, but owing to his father's objections, he abandoned this idea. When he became a student at Leipzig, he was utterly ignorant of spiritual matters, but his mind was a-thirst for knowledge. The ministers and professors at Leipzig were all representatives of rationalism, and could not satisfy the hunger of the young man's heart. Walther spent his last penny for the purchase of a Bible, not knowing where he was to get his next meal. He took part in the religious meetings of groups of students who assembled for common prayer and the study of the Bible and the writings of Arndt, Francke, Scriver, Bogatzki, etc. These students had found Christ through the guidance of a shoemaker and a retired old candidate of theology by the name of Kuehn. The latter was the leader of this circle. Other Saxon emigrants who participated in the meetings were Brohm, Buenger and Fuerbringer. Franz Delitsch, too, belonged to this circle. In his book, "Concerning the House of God and the Church," he refers to these devotional meetings with deep emotion. It is only natural that at a time of such spiritual dearth, Walther and his friends should have heard of Pastor Stephan. In his great perplexity Walther addressed a letter to the Pirna pastor, the reply to which, as well as the words of the wife of a Leipzig tax-collector, helped him to find the peace of God in the forgiveness of his sins.

But on account of these inner conflicts, which were accompanied by constant privation, his health gave way. Suffering with an affection of the lungs, he had to leave the university and return home. But this was evidently a part of God's plan for him; for in his father's library he found the works of Luther, and studied them with unwearied application, and thus laid the basis for that thorough acquaintance with the writings of Luther and the old dogmaticians which afterwards distinguished him. In 1834 he com-

pleted his studies, became a private teacher until 1836, and was ordained as pastor at BRAEUNSDORF. Saxony, in 1837. For more than forty years the word of the cross had not been proclaimed in this place. Religious and moral indifference reigned. The order of service, the hymn-book and the catechism were rationalistic. The superintendent, who was placed over him and the school-master who was placed under him, both were rationalists. His efforts to introduce Lutheran doctrine and practice met with determined opposition. Other members of the circle of Bible students at Leipzig, who had meanwhile entered the ministry, met with a like experience. These therefore, as well as Walther, gladly signified their consent when Stephan called on them to leave Germany with him in order to found an ideal Church in America.

The DETERMINATION TO EMIGRATE had grown stronger in the mind of Stephan ever since Dr. Kurtz visited Germany in the interest of the Seminary at Gettysburg (§ 7. 4). The immediate occasion for carrying out this determination was as follows: By his earnest activity in Dresden, Stephan had gained an ever-increasing following. But the love of those to whom he had been the guide to the Savior partook more and more of the nature of idolatry. He did not resist the temptations which this fact involved. He gradually began to imagine that he was infallible; he became imperious; at last his unexcelled gifts for pastoral ministration became a snare of the flesh.

All sorts of rumors touching his character began to be circulated. More than once they were investigated; but as these efforts failed to prove him guilty, the charges were looked upon as attempts to blackmail the representative of positive Lutheranism. While this may have been partly true, it must be admitted that Stephan's way of doing things justified certain suspicions. He made provision for promenades on summer evenings for his followers of both sexes, and these usually lasted until morning. In spite of the warnings of his superiors; indeed, in spite of the express prohibition of the civil authorities, he continued them until at last he was arrested by the police under suspicious circumstances.

At the same time the Bohemian congregation complained of gross neglect. Although an offense against morality could not be clearly proved against him, he was DEPOSED FROM HIS OFFICE. His followers regarded this as persecution endured for Christ's sake, and consequently waited only for a word from him to emigrate. A common fund, to which \$125,000 had been contributed, was entrusted to his care. Then when the emigrants, 750 in

number, had departed in several groups, Stephan secretly left Dresden in the middle of the night, without taking leave of his wife and children, and joined his followers at Bremen. On FIVE VESSELS the emigrants, including six ministers, ten candidates of theology and four school-teachers, set out for America. One of the ships, the "Amalie," went down; the others reached New Orleans. On February 19, 1839, the last of the immigrants arrived at the appointed station, St. Louis.

On the way over Stephan had already permitted himself to be elected by his followers, both men and women, as their BISHOP, to whom they swore unconditional obedience. At the command of the bishop, who all the while dealt with the funds of the company in the most irresponsible way, and of course greatly depleted them, they removed to PERRY COUNTY, 110 miles south of St. Louis. Stephan ruled like a pasha. The plans were already under way for the erection of an episcopal palace for him, when the colonists were scandalized by a shocking discovery. Among the emigrants who had remained behind in St. Louis were several girls, who confessed that, during the voyage across the ocean Stephan had, by an abuse of God's holy name and Word, led them from the path of virtue. Walther came to the settlement from St. Louis, arriving in the dead of night, and bringing with him the proofs of Stephan's guilt. Speaking in the Latin language, he made known to a candidate of theology, who reclined beside him on the straw in the sleeping apartment, what he expected to make known to the whole company on the morrow, namely, that Stephan, under the mask of a pastor, had been leading a life of sin.

A formal court was convened, and Stephan was deposed from his office. He was transported across the Mississippi River in a boat, supplied with sufficient provisions, and set ashore near the "Devil's Bake Oven," a fantastically shaped rock. This was in 1839. Not far from there, a few miles from Red Bud, Randolph County, Ill., he soon found a small congregation. A few years later he died at the age of 69, without giving any signs of real repentance.

The colonists now suffered great WANT. The GENERAL TREASURY, as they now discovered, was empty, owing to Stephan's extravagance. As the land had to be made arable before any crops could be raised, the direst poverty stared the colony in the face. Still more serious was the SPIRITUAL CONFUSION that resulted from their sad experience with their once trusted leader. They now recognized that they had done wrong in following him so blindly; that

they had been guilty of making an idol of him, and that they had become the occasion of giving offense in the eyes of the world. Indeed, it now seemed to them that they had committed a great sin in thus following their own ways and dissolving their connection with the Church at home. The pastors themselves imagined that their official acts were invalid, because they had forsaken their calling in the Fatherland. Consciences were confused and distressed. Divisions began to appear. Some openly renounced the public services. Pastor Buenger resigned his office from conscientious scruples. The confusion lasted through the entire summer. The matter finally resolved itself into the crucial QUESTION: "Does the true Christian Church really exist or not among those who emigrated with Stephan?" To this question some answered yes, others no. (Fritschel, Vol. II, p. 172.)

IT WAS WALTHER<sup>3</sup> whom God used to console the tempted ones and to save them from despair.[^k7] Through continued study of the works of Luther and the Lutheran fathers, he recognized the errors of Stephan in respect to the Church and the ministry. At the same time he became convinced that, according to the seventh article of the Augsburg Confession, THE CHURCH CONSISTED OF THE INVISIBLE COMMUNION OF SAINTS; that where two or three are gathered together in Christ's name, there is the Church; that, consequently, these congregations of the colonists were to be regarded as a part of the true Church of Christ, with full authority to call pastors. These convictions Walther successfully maintained in a disputation in 1841. In this way he quieted the minds of the colonists, and brought about the organization of congregations which called their pastors. Meanwhile the outward condition of the settlers had also improved, and a number of flourishing villages rose in the wilderness. A log cabin, which was the humble beginning of CONCORDIA SEMINARY, was erected to serve as a boys' training school. This occurred in 1839. Walther accepted a call to the congregation in St. Louis. There he began in 1844 to publish "DER LUTHERANER. The seminary was also soon afterwards transferred to St. Louis, where it was destined to play so prominent a part in the upbuilding and guiding of the Missouri Synod.

## **2. Wyneken and His Appeal For Help.**

Frederick Conrad Diedrich Wyneken was a man whose name will always be mentioned with respect in any history of the Lutheran Church of America. Six months before the "Saxons" had reached the Mississippi Valley he had

landed in BALTIMORE as a candidate of theology. He might appropriately be named the Muhlenberg of the western synods — at least, so far as regards missionary work. There are many points of resemblance between him and his great fellow countryman who labored a century before him. Like Muhlenberg, he came from Hanover, and studied in Goettingen and Halle. At Halle he was powerfully impressed by Tholuck, whose influence, combined with that of pious families in which he was afterwards engaged as private tutor, led him to the acceptance of Christ as his personal Savior. As the tutor of wealthy young men, he traveled through France and Italy, and acquired the use of the English language. For a time he was principal of the Latin School in Bremervoerde. Here he read a missionary report telling of the spiritual needs of Western America; so he determined to serve the Lord in the New World.

In his second examination before a rationalistic prelate he made such an impression by his emphatic testimony for the Holy Scriptures that he received, in spite of his orthodox position, the very highest mark. The pious Captain Stuerje took him to Baltimore free of charge. Here he looked for Lutherans, but happened to get into the circle of the “Otterbeinarians,” and in this way made acquaintance with the ways of Methodism. Finally, however, he found a Lutheran congregation served by Pastor Haesbart.<sup>4</sup> At the suggestion of this pastor, the Pennsylvania Ministerium sent him to INDIANA for the purpose of gathering into congregations the scattered “Protestants.” He started on this trip in September, traveling to Pittsburgh by boat and rail, and through Ohio on horseback. In Ohio he found large settlements that had no pastor for years. He baptized and confirmed many persons. But, much as he cherished the people there, he would not remain. In Adams County he discovered a deserted congregation and began his missionary labors there. In every respect he was an IDEAL MISSIONARY. This was his main work, especially during the first part of his American labors. At FORT WAYNE he found a handful of Lutherans whose minister had recently died. They did not even have a church. These people urged him to become their pastor. He referred them to the mission board that had sent him. The board agreed, but insisted that he give part of his time to the duties of a traveling missionary.

Thus he extended his work even into central Michigan. He was indefatigable, and, like Muhlenberg, had an extraordinary constitution. But amid unnumbered hardships, traveling through woods and swamps, he contracted an affection of the throat. He would not seek medical aid from the poor doc-



tors of that vicinity, but decided to RETURN TO EUROPE, hoping to have his health restored, and earnestly desiring to arouse the Church of Germany to greater missionary zeal. Having been relieved by a substitute from Germany in 1841, he returned to his native land to interest the friends of missions in his work in America. He traveled through all parts of Germany, and was everywhere cordially received, and entered into negotiations with representative men. But it was no easy task to get the right kind of laborers for the distant vineyard. In accordance with a cherished desire, he went to Bavaria to meet LOEHE, who, having read his reports, had become deeply interested in the American missionary enterprise. There he met the first two helpers instructed by Loehe. At Erlangen he was welcomed by Pastor Raumer. He visited Dresden, Leipzig and the vicinity. His addresses resulted in the formation of SOCIETIES which promised help. Especially effective was his PAMPHLET entitled, "The Destitution of the German Lutherans in North America,"<sup>5</sup> in the preparation of which he was assisted by Raumer and Loehe.<sup>6</sup>

All this shows the great importance of Wyneken's efforts in both America and Germany. His value to the immigrants of that time can hardly be overestimated. When he returned to America in 1843, the DAWN OF A BETTER TIME was breaking. That this came about was the result, in a large measure, of his earnest and well directed appeals for aid. Missionary zeal had been kindled; the Mother Church was willing to do her duty to her emigrating children. The only task now was to keep the fire burning. Ways and means had to be found to deserve by good deeds the good will that had been created. The continuation of this task fell to the lot of WILLIAM LOEHE, who came into the foreground as Wyneken retired into the background; for the latter was not eminently fitted for leadership, but for solid and enduring, though humble, work. Wyneken also soon left the mission held and became pastor of Haesbart's congregation.

### 3. Loehe and His Institutions.

In the "Noerdlinger Sonntagsblatt" Loehe<sup>7</sup> had published an APPEAL for funds to relieve the great dearth of ministers in America; and in a short time he received 700 florins. At the same time two young mechanics announced their willingness to be trained for the work. Other organizations promised their support, and accordingly Loehe undertook, in a very modest way at first, the work of training men. In September, 1842, his FIRST MISSIONARIES (Burger and Ernst) arrived in New York. Their instructions were to seek po-

sitions as lay readers and teachers. In New York they met the REV. MR. WINKLER, who had been called as professor in the Theological Seminary of the Ohio Synod at Columbus, Ohio, and was on his way there. He induced both of them to go with him to Columbus to prepare themselves for the ministry. They accompanied him, and this fact was the occasion of the TEMPORARY UNION BETWEEN LOEHE AND THE OHIO SYNOD.

The synod requested him to send more students who had received a preliminary training. Such men were sent in rapid succession, among them some who had received a university education. One of the latter was DR. SIHLER, who afterwards became the successor of Dr. Wyneken as pastor in FORT WAYNE, INDIANA, and around whom the other men sent by Loehe grouped themselves as their leader.

At that time TWO TENDENCIES were striving for the upper hand in the Ohio Synod: an ENGLISH tendency, which desired to make the English the prevalent language in the Seminary at Columbus, and which represented the laxer form of Lutheranism; and a GERMAN tendency, which insisted on the supremacy of the German language in the Seminary, because, for the present at least, the German language was essential to the maintenance of a positive Lutheranism. Both parties were represented in the Seminary, the German by Professor Winkler, the English by Professor C. F. Schaeffer.<sup>8</sup> In the outcome the ENGLISH PREVAILED, and all the Loehe men, ten in number, left the synod.

LOEHE SEVERED HIS RELATIONS WITH THE OHIO SYNOD, and decided to bring about the organization of a new synod on a strictly Lutheran basis.

Some other men whom Loehe had sent to America had gone to MICHIGAN, in company with a considerable number of immigrants after 1845. Here a Michigan Synod had existed since 1840, but as early as 1846 the conservative element had withdrawn from it. Here the PVanconian colonies, "Frankenmut," "Frankentrost," "Frankenlust," and "Frankenhilf," were established in Saginaw County, and here Loehe founded a seminary for the education of teachers. Among the pastors who came to this colony was A. CRAEMER, who had been ordained by Dr. Kliefoth in the cathedral in Schwerin, and who, later, was president for many years of the Practical Seminary of the Missouri Synod at Springfield, Ill. Besides him may be mentioned Pastors SIEVERS and GRAEBNER; Baierlein, a missionary;<sup>9</sup> and later pastors Deindoerfer and Grossmann.<sup>10</sup>

#### **4. Organization and Growth of the Missouri Synod.**

All the men whom we have mentioned in the preceding passages were men of the same kind — the “SAXONS”; WYNEKEN, who in 1845 withdrew from the General Synod after protesting against its non- Lutheran features at the Philadelphia convention, and the FOLLOWERS OF LOEHE, who did not feel at home in the Ohio and Michigan Synods. These groups — the small one in the West and the large one in the East — merely needed combination. In September, 1845, the adherents of Loehe met at CLEVELAND, OHIO, and withdrew from the Ohio Synod. At the same time they sent a delegation, headed by Dr. Sihler, to the “Saxons” in St. Louis for the purpose of discussing closer affiliation (1846). Walther outlined a constitution, which the Loehe people declared satisfactory. In the month of July of the same year representatives of both sides convened at Fort Wayne, Ind. Here the constitution was again discussed, and a resolution was passed for the calling of the first convention of the “Synod of Missouri, Ohio and other States,” to be held at CHICAGO in April, 1847.<sup>11</sup> Meanwhile Loehe had already founded a SEMINARY at FORT WAYNE, IND., where students, trained in Germany, were to finish their studies for the American ministry. Dr. Sihler was made the head of this institution, which became a school of the synod. “DER LUTHERANER,” edited by Walther, was made the synodical paper. The exceedingly RAPID GROWTH of the new synod — from 1847 to 1851 it increased from 15 ministers and 12 congregations to 81 ministers and 95 congregations — is due to a series of fortunate circumstances. The FOLLOWERS OF LOEHE, who almost without exception had united with it, represented a goodly number. At the Fort Wayne convention (1846) 24 of the Loehe people were present, and more were constantly arriving, until the contribution of ministers from Neuendettelsau to the Missouri Synod amounted to 84. The synod furthermore had two Theological Seminaries (Fort Wayne and St. Louis), which were soon filled with students sent from all parts of Germany,<sup>12</sup> where the Missouri Synod was regarded as the only German and Lutheran Synod of America. The Seminary at Fort Wayne alone graduated forty-eight ministers between 1846 and 1854. It must also be borne in mind that at this time GERMAN IMMIGRATION WAS VERY LARGE. Among the ministers, a number of GERMAN UNIVERSITY MEN<sup>13</sup> were actively engaged with Walther in the missionary activities of this rising synod in the ever-widening territory of the West. These circumstances explain the phenomenal growth of this body.<sup>14</sup>

**5. Walther’s eminence, especially at the founding of the Missouri Synod, is very apparent.**

Says Professor L. Fuerbringer: "All the factors, namely, Saxons, Loehe and Wyneken, must be emphasized. I am far from under-estimating the merit of Wyneken and Loehe. Wyneken, to be sure, was the first on the ground, but was isolated. Moreover, he was not especially gifted as an organizer. He was a missionary. The historian must not overlook or under-estimate the founding of 'Der Lutheraner.' Its first number was published when Loehe's followers were still in the Ohio and Michigan Synods (Sept. 7, 1844). Wyneken, upon receiving this number, exclaimed: 'Thank God, there are still real Lutherans in the country!'"

Sihler, in his autobiography, comments as follows: "It was a great joy to me when the first number of the 'Lutheraner' was published in 1844, and after receiving subsequent numbers, I did not hesitate to commend it to my congregations and to circulate them. Wyneken, too, was highly elated; both of us hoped for the sound enlivening and strengthening of our Church from the Saxon brethren, for we both readily saw that greater clearness and precision of doctrinal teaching than we had must be present with them." For this very reason Sihler, Lochner and Ernst went for consultation concerning the new synod to St. Louis. Certain it is that Loehe, by establishing a practical seminary, etc., rendered the most eminent services. But the preeminence of Walther cannot be denied. Says Sihler concerning the conference with the Saxons: "The most potent impression was made upon us beyond doubt by Walther. He was also, above all others, the vitalizing and organizing genius in outlining the principles for an orthodox (i.e., Lutheran) union of congregations or a synod," etc. The prominence of the man can be discerned throughout the development of the Missouri Synod. Spaeth gives a correct estimate of his talents when he says: "Continued doctrinal discussions at synods and conferences, yes, even at the congregational meetings, regular parish visitations, careful establishment of parochial schools, cooperated, not only toward the creation of a common synodical spirit, but also toward its powerful propagation in new territory. Walther's wise and steady leadership had a magnetic effect, conquering, winning and assimilating antagonistic elements."<sup>15</sup>

More than most other men in the history of the Church. Walther knew how to impress his mind upon his followers. The imposing unity of the Missouri Synod, together with its size (for it soon grew to be the largest Lutheran synod), exerted a mighty influence everywhere, and especially in

the Eastern synods strengthened the confessional consciousness which had already awakened from its slumber.

#### **6. Rupture With Loehe.**

Soon after the founding of the Missouri Synod, disagreement with Loehe became more and more apparent. Loehe considered the organization too DEMOCRATIC. He desired a greater influence of the ministers in church matters than seemed to be provided for. The experiences of his followers among the unruly congregations of Ohio and Indiana filled him with fear, lest unworthy laymen might gain control by means of a majority of votes on all questions. WALTHER'S THEORY OF THE MINISTERIAL OFFICE, derived from the principle of the universal priesthood, was criticized by him. Finally, upon the urgent request of the Franconian congregations, it was decided that President Wyneken and Professor Walther should go to Germany (1857), to settle these differences by a PERSONAL INTERVIEW. Walther stated to Loehe that he was perfectly satisfied with his explanations; he hoped, however, to convince his protagonist by his book, then being published, on the church and the ministry. Loehe, to show his agreement in essentials, decided to establish a teachers' training school at Saginaw (^by sending Grossmann and a number of students) in the interest of the synod, as he had done with the theological seminary at Fort Wayne, Ind. But he continued to disagree with Walther's doctrine of the ministry, even after the publication of Walther's book, and thus at length the RUPTURE took place. In 1853, after a conference in Michigan, Loehe was asked by Wyneken, then president of the synod, to give up his work at Saginaw. As harmonious cooperation had become impossible, Loehe was forced to seek for himself and his followers a new field of work. Only two of his disciples (Grossmann and Deindoerfer) remained with him. They formed the IOWA SYNOD (§ 29).

#### **7. Relations to Other Synods.**

[a] THE IOWA SYNOD. The conflict with Loehe and the exodus of Grossmann and Deindoerfer created an early antagonism between the Missouri and Iowa Synods. See history of Iowa Synod (§ 29). Soon a doctrinal controversy arose which has not been settled even at the present date. We shall speak of it further in § 23, II.

[b] THE BUFFALO SYNOD. The principles of Grabau, founder of the Buffalo Synod, proposed in a "pastoral letter" (§ 23, 30), were vigorously op-

posed by Walther, who had become aware of their dangerous consequences by the Stephanist confusion. Of this controversy we shall speak in § 23. The Missouri Synod gained much in the contention, for, after a public discussion in 1866 with the Grabau party, twelve pastors<sup>16</sup> of the Buffalo Synod joined Missouri. See also history of the Buffalo Synod, § 30.

[c] THE GENERAL COUNCIL. In 1866 the Pennsylvania Synod, after separating from the General Synod, called a conference at Reading, Pa., to discuss a possible union of all true Lutherans. To this meeting Missouri also sent delegates, who advised that an organization should not immediately be effected, but that free conferences should be arranged for the purpose of ascertaining points of difference and agreement among the various synods. Their advice not being heeded, the Missouri delegates withdrew, and no representatives of Missouri appeared at the next convention at Fort Wayne in 1867 (see § 17. 3).

In this connection we might add a word concerning the PARTY OF PROTEST in the New York Ministerium. Says Professor L. Fuerbringer: "Several pastors and congregations of New York and vicinity (between 1875 and 1880) protested against synodical rule as applied to congregations. This was the time when Sieker was called to St. Matthew's Church of New York, and, with A. E. Frey of Brooklyn, assumed leadership in this revolt. The party founded a paper, 'Zeuge der Wahrheit,' which existed for some time. The matter ended with the secession of several ministers: Frey, Halfman (not Sieker, who never belonged), and later their congregations, St. Matthew's, Frey's, etc. These ministers and their congregations had been influential."

[d] THE ABSORPTION OF THE ILLINOIS SYNOD. The Illinois Synod, at first a part of the General Synod (§ 7, 4) and later of the General Council (§ 17, 1, 3), left the Council in 1870, and united with the Synodical Conference. Eventually (1880) it was absorbed by the Missouri Synod. This gave Missouri a stronghold in Illinois, where it has today a Northern, a Southern and a Central Synod, with more than 300 pastors.

[e] ORGANIZATION OF THE SYNODICAL CONFERENCE. As has been said, the Missouri Synod declined to take part in the organization of the General Council (§ 17, 3). Ohio had also withdrawn. In 1868 the Wisconsin Synod also stepped out. The Minnesota Synod seemed to be ready to do the same. All of them wanted a declaration on the subject of church-fellowship, which the General Council, on account of its Eastern composition, was not prepared to give (see § 18). These synods, therefore, opened negotiations with

Missouri. In 1871 a convention took place at CHICAGO, to which Missouri, Wisconsin, Ohio and the Norwegian Synods (§ 32, III, 2) sent delegates. At this time the organization of a Synodical Conference was suggested. At a later conference at Fort Wayne, to which the Minnesota and Illinois Synods also sent delegates, the matter was further discussed, culminating in the formation of the Synodical Conference, the largest body of Lutherans in America. Its FIRST REGULAR CONVENTION took place at Milwaukee in 1872. Every synod of less than 80 pastors is represented by two pastors and two laymen; for every additional 40 pastors there is one clerical and one lay delegate. From 1872 to 1879 it held annual conventions. Since 1879 it has been meeting every two years. It is merely an advisory body, and is chiefly concerned with questions of doctrine.<sup>17</sup>

Dr. Walther planned that STATE SYNODS should be formed out of all synods, which were expected to maintain their own colleges, and also to support one grand central seminary with a tri-linguistic (German, English, Norwegian) faculty and one teachers' seminary. Ohio was prepared to give up its seminary, even though the organization of state synods was not carried out; Minnesota also consented. But Wisconsin was radically opposed to the plan, called its students from St. Louis, and founded its own seminary at Milwaukee, Wis. (now in Wauwatosa, near Milwaukee). In 1914 the plan was again considered by the Synods of Missouri and Wisconsin.

[f] WITHDRAWAL OF THE OHIO AND NORWEGIAN SYNODS. In 1881 the OHIO SYNOD withdrew from the Synodical Conference. The question of predestination having arisen, the delegates of Missouri to the Synodical Conference were instructed not to cooperate with Stellanor and the Ohio delegates. See the history of the Ohio Synod and the biography of Allwardt (§ 28, conclusion). Pastors A. Allwardt and H. Ernst, with a small number of adherents, finally left Missouri and joined Ohio. The NORWEGIANS, too, whose ministers were divided on the doctrine of predestination, separated in 1883 from the Synodical Conference, hoping in this way to reach a solution of the problem more quickly.<sup>18</sup> But in spite of these withdrawals, the Synodical Conference, and especially the Missouri Synod, grew rapidly, almost doubling its membership from 1878 to 1888.

NOTE 1. The statistics of 1914 give to the Missouri Synod 2282 pastors, 1746 congregations directly connected with it, and 1232 independents; a total of 1,283,720 communicants. These are comprised in 15 districts scattered throughout the country. Missouri has done work in Brazil since 1870,

and lately also in Argentine. In 1904 this district formed a special South American organization.

NOTE 2. In Germany (since 1876) there exists the “Evangelisch=Lutherische Freikirche von Sachsen;” there is also a Missouri Synod in Australia. But neither of them is organically connected with the Missouri Synod of America.

## § 23. Doctrinal Controversies of Missouri.

This section is a contribution by the Rev. Prof. Geo. J. Fritschel. See our remarks in the preface of this book.

### I. Missouri And Buffalo.

In undertaking to describe the doctrinal positions and consequent struggles between the Buffalo and Missouri Synods, we are confronted by a number of difficulties. In order to arrive at a fair judgment we must consider four important facts: 1) that Grabau modified his views and reduced his claims; 2) that, while Grabau as “Senior Ministerii” had almost unlimited influence and spoke in an authoritative manner, not every word he said is to be charged to the synod; 3) that a development has taken place within the Buffalo Synod, as Dr. Stelhorn has pointed out, so that today it is closely related in its positions to other synods; 4) that many statements, attributed to the dogmatic position of the Buffalo Synod, must be looked upon as controversial quibbles or incomplete quotations.

It is no easy task to portray a development of fifty years in a few statements. Regarding these doctrinal controversies we can consider only the period when the Buffalo Synod held a prominent place in the American Lutheran Church, that is. until 1866. We have in mind the position of Grabau as opposed by the Missouri Synod.

THE CAUSE of this struggle was a “Pastoral Letter,” written by Grabau, in which pastorless congregations were warned against itinerant preachers (of whom there were many at that time), since they were not “properly called.” This letter, written in 1840, five years before the organization of the Missouri Synod, together with writings of a later date, explicitly expresses the views of Grabau concerning the Church and the ministry. His ideas were as follows: By the grace of God we have come to this country as a part of the



true Church. It is essential that a free Church should not degenerate into a condition of ecclesiastical anarchy through a misinterpretation of the fourteenth article of the Augsburg Confession. It is required of a properly called minister that he should have sufficient training for this office; that he have received the Holy Spirit, so that he can successfully use his training; that he be examined and recommended by worthy and experienced ministers; that he be publicly ordained and installed in the congregations which he is to serve. The necessity of a regular call is attested by the words of the apostles, the example of Christ, and the consideration that the Church should have evidence of the worthy character of the laborers in its service. Men who arbitrarily pose as ministers have no real call, and cannot properly absolve from sin; and when they administer the Lord's Supper, they are merely distributing bread and wine, because Christ will recognize only his institution and not human perversions of his established order.

[1] THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.

GRABAU'S DOCTRINE of the Church is peculiar. He over-emphasizes its visibility. The only holy Christian Church spoken of in the Apostle's Creed is, according to Grabau, the visible congregation of those who have the pure Word and Sacraments. This can be said only of the Lutheran Church, which for that reason is God's true Church. Outside of it there are only mobs and sects, but no church. In these masses there are, no doubt, true believers who, according to their inner life, belong to the Lutheran Church; but these would unite with the Lutheran Church, if they would come in contact with it. But none can be assured of salvation unless actually connected with the true Church. Says Grabau:

“Our symbols teach and confess that there will always be and remain on earth a holy Christian Church, consisting of the visible congregation of believers, with whom the Word is preached in its purity and among whom the sacraments are administered according to Christ's institution.”<sup>19</sup> He rejects the doctrine that “even where the Word and the Sacraments are not altogether pure, a holy Church of the elect is gathered, as long as the Word and Sacraments, though obscured, are not altogether denied, but remain in essence.”<sup>20</sup>

His interpretation of the seventh article of the Augsburg Confession is as follows: “The Church is that (visible) congregation of the saints (over against other congregations) in which (over against other congregations) the gospel is correctly taught,” etc. That the interpretation of the relative “in

which," so essential to Grabau's theory, is insufficient appears in the amplification of the article as contained in the Apology, in which the subordinate clause is altogether lacking. There it is stated that the true Church consists of all those who truly believe the gospel and have received the Holy Ghost.<sup>21</sup> The relative clause in question might be paraphrased (as is done in the Latin relative sentence of Article XII and in other places) as meaning, "and among whom (the saints) the gospel is correctly taught," etc.

WALTHER, on the other hand, insisted that the Church is essentially invisible, and consists of all the faithful in whatsoever denomination. Fellowship with the Church invisible is necessary to salvation. The declaration that the Word and Sacrament are the sole criteria of the Church and do not pertain to the essence thereof, Walther abandoned during his colloquium with the Buffalo pastors (1866).

[2] THE DOCTRINE OF THE MINISTERIAL OFFICE.

As appears from the "Pastoral Letter" just mentioned, GRABAU put great emphasis on being in accord with the old church rules of Prussia. Those who are not called according to the rules of the Church, have neither right nor power to officiate; the Lord's Supper, given by them, is mere bread and wine.<sup>22</sup> Essential to the ministerial office is not only an examination, but a proper call (under the auspices, or, at least, with the consent of the clergy) by the congregation, and finally, according to the divine rule, an ordination, which can only be performed by the ministry. Wherever there is willful opposition to the ministers, the legitimacy of the pastoral office becomes doubtful.

WALTHER'S VIEW. Walther originally shared Grabau's views. But having seen their fatal consequences in the confusion caused by Stephan, and having been convinced, especially by the lawyer Vehse, from Luther's writings, that they were erroneous, he defended his new position against Grabau so much more emphatically. He says: "Every Christian as a priest of God has: a) the office of the Word, b) to baptize, c) to bless and consecrate the holy bread and wine, d) to retain sins and to remit them, e) to offer sacrifice, f) to pray for others, g) to pass judgment on doctrines. But as all Christians cannot simultaneously discharge these offices, God has commanded that the many spiritual priests choose one among them as pastor, who, as a representative of the whole congregation, performs the ministerial rites. The ministerial office is therefore the spiritual priesthood of all members transferred to an individual. This transfer takes place in the call of the congregation.

Ordination is merely an ecclesiastical rite; it is altogether a human institution, and serves only as a public confirmation of the transference by the congregational call.”<sup>23</sup>

[3] OTHER DIFFERENCES.

Further disagreements between Grabau and Missouri were the natural outgrowth of this fundamental difference. According to GRABAU, the congregation has merely the right to exhort the sinner; the pastor alone has authority to excommunicate. According to MISSOURI, the office of the keys belongs to the congregation as such, but is administered by it through the pastor. GRABAU found the ideal form of the Church in the State Church, which means the innermost union and interrelation of both. In a Free Church he assigns ultimate authority, not to the congregation, but to the synod. MISSOURI considers the Free Church the ideal form and the congregation the highest tribunal and the final judicial authority within the Church. The congregation must examine the doctrine, and it alone must depose a pastor whose life or doctrine is contrary to the Word of God. GRABAU holds that the congregations must be obedient to the ministers in all demands not contrary to the Word of God. MISSOURI grants power to the minister only in matters directly demanded by the Word of God. All other things are *adiaphora*, in which the pastor can merely advise, but not demand.

## **II. Missouri, Loehe And The Iowa Synod.**

The controversy between Missouri and Loehe and the Iowa Synod extends through many years and pertains to quite a number of questions more or less inter-related. Their chronological order was as follows: 1. the Church and the ministerial office (Walther and Loehe); 2. Chiliasm and Anti-Christ; 3. the Confessions and “open questions;” 4. Sunday; 5. usury and universal justification; 6. finally, predestination and conversion. The principal difference regards the matter of the confessions and “open questions”. Both Iowa and Missouri have modified their views during this long struggle; we shall point out these modifications at the proper places. We shall deal with the above-named topics in the order given.

### **1. Attitude Toward the Scriptures and the Confessions.**

When the Iowa Synod was organized, its position was thus defined: “The synod accepts all the confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.” This

brief sentence contains in substance everything which, later on, was stated in the confessional paragraph enumerating by name the different confessional books. It continues: "It does so BECAUSE it considers all the symbolical decisions concerning controversies preceding the time of the Reformation and coincident with it as being in harmony with the Word of God." With this must be compared the form of obligation used from the very beginning at ordination, both in the Missouri Synod and in that of Iowa, and which was afterwards substituted for the above phrase, viz.: "as the pure and adulterated declaration and interpretation of the divine Word and will." By this declaration the ambiguous "quatenus" was rejected and the "quia" was confessed.

The opposition to other synods becomes evident in the next clause: "Since there are, however, various tendencies within the Lutheran Church, it takes its position with that tendency which strives for a greater perfection of the Lutheran Church on the way of the confessions and guided by the Word of God." By this declaration the Iowa Synod, on the one hand, declared its opposition to the General Synod, in which at that time the un-Lutheran elements had the upper hand. On the other hand, it also declared its opposition to Missouri, which rejected an appeal from the confessions to the Word of God. MISSOURI had declared in an official letter: "Lutherans as such must not interpret the confessions in the light of the Bible, but must interpret the Bible according to the confessions."<sup>24</sup> IOWA considered the position of Missouri as a "dogmatizing" tendency, and declared that it represented "the exegetical tendency" held by Loehe and other European scholars of the confessional side. It was the intention to lay greater stress upon immediate proof from the Scripture than was done by Missouri. The character of the controverted questions was the reason why Iowa always appealed to the Bible, because the confessions contained no decision in regard to these questions. MISSOURI, on the other hand, tried to ascribe its views (which had been gleaned eclectically from the great teachers of former ages) to the confessions. To this Iowa objected, claiming that the Confessions must be understood in their historical sense. Soon the discussion turned to the LIMITS OF CONFESSIONAL AUTHORITY.

The position of Missouri at that time is described very correctly by theologians of the Wisconsin Synod in this way:

"When Dr. Walther took charge of church affairs in America, it was of supreme importance that true Lutheranism should be defined against

‘American Lutheranism’ and confessional unionism. It was necessary that as large a number of ministers as possible be trained in true loyalty to the Lutheran confessions. Lutheran pastors and congregations everywhere needed to be strengthened in their Lutheranism. This could be done in no other way than by proving with absolute clearness from the writings of Lutheran dogmaticians, 1) what the true Lutheran doctrine is; 2) it is contained in our confessions. To this task Walther devoted his whole genius, strength and labor. This explains why the old magazines on every question are filled with proofs from the sources, and why the synodical reports are almost entirely made up of compilations of quotations from the fathers. Walther pursued this method (at that time the only practical one), but his pupils also adhered to it. It was considered the proper treatment of a question, even after the fight against false Lutheranism had long been decided, to refer to the declarations of ancient scholars. They stood, indeed, upon scriptural ground in representing this ‘dogmatic tendency,’ into which they had drifted under the stress of time. But it can be denied just as little that the Scripture proof was taken not directly from the source, but from the writings of the fathers. Thus (without being aware of it) they got into a rut; a kind of intellectual crystallization developed, for such is always the consequence of traditionalistic dogmatics. This does not necessarily mean intellectual stagnation. Quite contrariwise! But one could not tolerate it that a matter was presented in a way which in any respect differed from the customary method. Those pursuing original methods were suspected of heretical tendencies. A number of forms, phrases, arguments and methods were becoming stereotyped. A certain legalistic type of orthodoxy was developed, which very easily became unjust over against opponents. And there was an absence of that spirit of love and patience which considers only the matter, even if the form is not perfect. In this peculiar spirit several generations grew up. But in the controversy concerning predestination Hoenecke and Stoeckhardt blazed a new trail. An”exegetical tendency” asserted itself, which, while revering the fathers of the Church, goes back directly to the Scriptures. And this immediate investigation of the Scriptures creates another, a milder, more charitable, more tolerant spirit.”<sup>25</sup>

Later on Missouri indeed abandoned this line of attack against Iowa, and declared that by the “open questions” the latter had transferred authority belonging to the Bible alone to the Church. Iowa vigorously denied this charge.<sup>26</sup>

## 2. Altitude Towards the Confessions.

GRABAU asserted in his discussions with Iowa that the confessional obligations covered every detail in the confessions (including even etymological explanations, e.g., that the word “God” is derived from “good”). WALTHER did not go that far. He declared that “all doctrinal developments, contained in the confessions, by their very insertion into the confessions, had become a part of the Church’s confession,” and that the confessional obligation included all doctrines contained in any way in the symbols, no matter whether they are assertions given *EX PROFESSO* or casual references.<sup>27</sup> Over against this theory IOWA made two claims: In the first place we must distinguish between that which is binding and that which is not binding in the Symbolical Books; in the second place, as the dogmaticians have already declared, only those statements are binding which were meant to be of symbolical significance, and not those statements which are merely introduced to amplify, to prove or to interpret. Here we find with Iowa, then, two widely different factors: 1) The principle and the rule are laid down, THAT a distinction must be made between parts that are obligatory and those that are not obligatory; 2) a theory (borrowed from the orthodox dogmaticians) is approved HOW this distinction is to be made. The distinction between the former principle and the latter theory must be understood in order to do justice to Iowa.

Influenced by opinions obtained by request from European Lutherans (especially those of Muenkel and Dorpat). the synod at its Toledo meeting (1867) corrected the assertions in such a way as still to maintain the distinction in the symbols between that which is binding and that which is not. But it here expressly repudiated the theory how this is to be done, on the ground that a synod has no business to propose theories. However, it was considered proper that the synod should pass judgment, whenever a particular case was submitted to it for adjudication, to declare whether this was an essential or non-essential part. At the colloquy held soon afterwards at Milwaukee, an agreement was reached whereby ALL DOCTRINES OF FAITH IN THE CONFESSIONS, but not the “theologumena” were declared obligatory. In spite of this agreement in principle, no unity was attained, as the question remained unsettled into which class the controverted points had to be placed.

## 3. “Open Questions.”

IOWA, from the very beginning, acted according to the principle that in matters of faith it is essential to agree in case church-fellowship is to take place,

but that doctrinal points, which are not doctrines of faith, must not affect fellowship of faith and church fellowship. They must be considered “open questions.” By this not a theory but a general principle concerning the treatment of differences within the Church in regard to church-fellowship is laid down. MISSOURI rejected this distinction, and demanded complete agreement and unity concerning every doctrine taken from the Scriptures. Such unity was declared to be an absolute prerequisite for church-fellowship. One and only one interpretation could be permitted by the Church, lest she prove disloyal to the Word of God by tolerating two interpretations at the same time. The principle that there are such “open questions” was described “as a most dangerous (because a most subtle and most disguised) unionistic poison, driving congregations into the grasp of skepticism and infidelity.” IOWA, however, insisted that this principle had always been a confessional declaration of the Lutheran Church,<sup>28</sup> and that the Lutheran Church had always acted according to this principle. Another practice would end in sectarianism, and would be un-Lutheran, since it was just as wrong to add to the confessions as it was to detract from them.<sup>29</sup>

Since the opponents tried to connect ideas rejected by Iowa with the phrase “open questions,” Iowa declared at MILWAUKEE: “By open questions we do not mean such doctrines as concern the foundation of faith, or such as are plainly and unmistakably taught in the Scriptures, but such doctrines as are either not taught at all or are not decided in a clear and unmistakable manner in the Scriptures and concerning which therefore no consensus has developed within the Church. In case a difference of opinions is found in regard to the latter they do not interfere with consistent churchmanship, as long as these differences do not affect the analogy of faith.” (See Davenport Theses, 17-19.)

Because Missouri rejected Iowa’s distinction between binding and non-binding doctrines in the confessions, and denied the existence of “open questions” (that is, questions not leading to schism), it is natural that this difference became dominant in the treatment of the various controverted points at that time. We mention the following:

#### **4. The Church and the Ministry.**

While Walther emphasized the invisibility of the true Church, LOEHE maintained that, according to the Augsburg Confession, the Church is the visible assembly of those who have the pure Word and Sacraments, no distinction

being made there between the visible and invisible Church. For this reason the definition of the Church should include the means of grace, so that the Church was defined as the invisible fellowship of faith made visible.

Loehe was also unable to approve WALTHER'S "DOCTRINE OF TRANSFERENCE,"<sup>30</sup> according to which the ministry was MERELY THE EXERCISE OF THE SPIRITUAL PRIESTHOOD OF ALL BELIEVERS. He sided with Walther against Grabau in declaring that the office of the ministry was only to feed and lead with the Word and Sacraments, and had no right to set up as ordinances things not expressly commanded in the Word of God. But, according to his views, the ministerial office had not been committed to the spiritual priesthood of individual Christians, but to the Church as a whole. Not every individual Christian can therefore transmit his personal share, but the church, as an entirety, must transfer the office instituted by Christ.<sup>31</sup>

The DIFFERENCE between Walther and Loehe did not lie in the question: "Was the office of the ministry directly transmitted to the Church?" but in the next question: "How does the Church possess this office, and in what way does she transfer it?" Loehe saw in the ordination more than merely a confirmation of the previous transference through the call, viz., the historically and liturgically prescribed form of transference of the office. Since both parties agreed concerning the fact that the sacred office had been given to the Church as a whole, Loehe (and with him the Iowa Synod) held that the differences might remain an "open question," and not disturb ecclesiastical fellowship. But Missouri, on account of this difference, asked Loehe to discontinue his labors in Michigan, denied him the fellowship of faith, and shortly afterwards applied these measures to the whole Iowa Synod.

NOTE: It may be well to compare the various theories concerning the ministerial office:

ROME: The office has been conferred by Christ upon his substitute, the Pope, who in turn transfers it to the bishops, by whom, in the interest of individual communicants, it is transferred to the priests.

EPISCOPAL: The office has been transferred by Christ upon the bishops, the successors of the apostles, and by them is transferred to the presbyters in the interest of individual communicants.

BUFFALO: The office has been conferred by Christ upon the whole Church through the ministry, and is passed on by the ministers in the interest of the congregation by ordination.



LOEHE: The office has been conferred by Christ upon the Church as such, and is given to individual ministers by the call of the congregation and by the ordination, which is the liturgical form of its transference.

WALTHER: The office has been conferred upon the Church in the spiritual priesthood of all the members, and is transferred upon an individual by the individual members; the ordination is merely the confirmation of the congregational call.

HOEFLING: The office is an institution of the Christian Church in the interest of orderliness.

## **5. Chiliasm.**

LOEHE had expressed himself as holding views in agreement with the “Biblical Chiliasts” (Hoffman and others). In consequence of this fact, the IOWA SYNOD, which received its ministerial supply from Neuendettelsau, at once was suspected of chiliastic views. In order to reply to such charges of Missouri, the president of the synod ordered an essay on these matters to be prepared for the synodical meeting of 1858, so that a clear view might be gained “as to the kind of chiliasm represented by us.” This essay was published in the synodical minutes as an evidence against false accusations. The mere fact that a strong antichiliasm (Rohrlack) was received as a member of the Iowa Synod at that very meeting should prove conclusively that the synod did not wish to be identified with Chiliasm, but considered the issue as an “open question,” that is, one not productive of schism. But as the accusation of teaching gross Chiliasm was continually made against it, the synod in 1864 adopted a series of declarations, in which its position on this question is given in detail.<sup>32</sup> These declarations express a more decided, more vital and more fundamental antithesis to all chiliastic fanaticism than can be found in any other resolutions touching this question. Muenkel (one of Germany’s strongest opponents of Chiliasm) offers the following opinion: “These resolutions are veritable arsenic for chiliastic fanaticism of any kind, and no real Chiliast will accept them.”<sup>33</sup>

At the MILWAUKEE COLLOQUIUM (1867) Iowa explained and modified some of the expressions contained in this report of 1858, and Walther dropped the assertion that every form of Chiliasm was contrary to the Scriptures and the Confessions. He declared that such a Chiliasm as had been submitted to him was tolerable, though he did not accept it. Later he is said

to have declared that the controversy with Iowa had been prematurely interrupted.

AN AGREEMENT WAS PREVENTED, however, by the different interpretations of Rev. 20:4, 5: "They lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection." WALTHER declared that whoever interpreted these words as referring to a bodily resurrection thereby rejected the doctrine of the general resurrection, and that a difference of views concerning this point meant a division in the Church. The representatives of IOWA denied this by stating that belief in the resurrection of the saints on Good Friday was not a denial of the general resurrection. They asserted that the acceptance or rejection of such an exegetical explanation (providing there existed harmony in other things) should not cause a schism in the Church. The issue was classified by them, not as a doctrine of faith, but as an "open question," The synod as such did not approve the one or the other exegetical interpretation.

#### **6. The Anti-Christ.**

Being strictly traditional in its position, MISSOURI placed great emphasis on the assertion of Luther and other dogmaticians that the Pope is the Antichrist. Since Article IV of the second part of the Smalcald Articles declares that the Roman Pope is the Antichrist predicted in 2 Thess. 2, in whom all such prophecies find their fulfillment, this statement was declared to be a doctrine from which no consistent Lutheran can deviate. Whoever refused to confess this or denied it had abandoned the Lutheran confessions.

IOWA'S SPOKESMEN replied to this as follows: 1) The views of Luther on this point must be considered together with his other eschatological ideas. He confidently expected the end of the world before the close of the sixteenth century. Such a view naturally involved the fulfillment of this prophecy in the person of the Pope.<sup>34</sup> 2) Neither Luther nor the Confessions declare that the Scriptures say: "The Pope is the Antichrist," but state this as their personal inference from the comparison of history and prophecy.<sup>35</sup> 3) Luther has nowhere treated this question as a doctrine of faith.<sup>36</sup> 4) That article does not discuss the question: "Who is the Antichrist?" but the question: "What is the papacy?" 5) The sentence passes judgment on the anti-Christian nature of the papacy, and asserts that the papacy is through and through anti-Christian; but the eschatological statement, viz., that the Pope

is the last Antichrist, cannot be proven from the Scriptures; hence it is merely a human conviction. It was further argued that, according to the Bible, the Antichrist is to be an individual. To interpret the prophecies in such a manner as to expect the appearance of a particular person as the Antichrist does not conflict with the confessions, providing that which the confessions say about the anti-Christian nature of the papacy is retained.

Both sides agreed in characterizing the papacy as anti-Christian, but whether or not in the last days an intensification of the anti-Christian elements shall be embodied in an individual was a point of difference. Iowa looked upon this difference as an "open question," not necessitating a cessation of ecclesiastical fellowship.

Missouri eventually, in fact, abandoned its position. When Theodore Harms, in 1876, characterized it as "a whim of Missouri," Prof. Brauer and Pastor Koesterling demanded that the synod should suspend fellowship with him. During a whole forenoon session at the meeting of the Western District, Prof. F. A. Schmidt, who opposed this motion, was made a target of the "mud batteries" ("Graeupelwetter") of his opponents, who denounced his assertion that to view the Pope as the Antichrist was not an *ARTICULUM FIDEI*. Walther finally declared himself in favor of Schmidt, and thus a schism with Harms was avoided. Missouri treated this difference as an "open question."

### **7. The Sunday Controversy.**

The difference between Iowa and Missouri concerning Sunday became all the more apparent, because in regard to the doctrine itself there was perfect and absolute agreement. This question had been strongly argued in Germany, but Missouri and Iowa held exactly the same views. *BOTH DECLARED* that, while the seventh day had been set apart in the Old Testament, no such rule applied to the New Testament, in which every day is considered holy. However, since the days of the apostles, and in connection with Easter and Whitsunday, the Church has made use of Sunday as a time for religious instruction and devotion. Thus Sunday has become a Christian Holy Day. *GERHARD*, on the other hand (and a number of others), had gone a step further, and had taught that the Church had to set apart one day in seven, because God had rested one day in seven. This assertion was not presented as an express doctrine of the Scriptures, but as an inference from the order of creation. *BOTH* Iowa and Missouri held to Luther's view as against Ger-

hard's, but they DIFFERED in their ecclesiastical treatment of Gerhard's error. Missouri wanted the disciples of Gerhard excluded from church-fellowship; Iowa declared that it could tolerate them.

#### **8. The Question of Usury.**

Dr. Walther, influenced by Luther's writings, had come to the conclusion that the acceptance of any kind of interest on money loaned constituted the usury which is forbidden in the Scriptures. As usual, a large number of the pastors sided with him, and the synod was on the point of promulgating this as a clear Bible doctrine. But the opposition of no small portion of the pastors and congregations showed that such a step would precipitate a tremendous rupture in the synod. Walther prevented the rupture by declaring ("Lutheraner," May 2, 1871, vol. 27, p. 131) that a distinction must be made between such doctrines of Scripture as are doctrines of faith, and such as are not, and that there was no intention of suspending church fellowship on account of the latter.

In doing this Walther accepted the principle which he had so vigorously opposed in his controversy with Iowa. Even today Missouri treats the question of usury as an "open question," but steadfastly refuses to apply this principle to any other issue.

#### **9. Other Differences.**

Besides the divergent views just mentioned, there were a number of differences not so generally argued as the preceding. The question as to whether a man might marry the sister of his dead wife was answered by Iowa in the affirmative, while Missouri, on the basis of certain opinions expressed by Luther, condemned such a relation as incestuous. In the early seventies Prof. Gottfried Fritschel discussed the doctrine of "general justification" with the Norwegians and Missourians, forcing his opponents to return to the true Lutheran position. On the question of slavery Walther's sympathies were with the South, and he permitted the rebel flag to be hoisted on the St. Louis Seminary. This caused the seminary to be closed for a time. The form of oath after the war was quite a problem for Walther (see Letters, vol. I, p. 223 ff.). In the controversy concerning States rights and the principle of slavery the Norwegians, too, were involved. Fire and life insurance were considered forbidden in the Missouri Synod, while Iowa declared them to be matters of indifference (adiaphora). However, no serious discus-

sions were caused by these differences; we mention them merely to complete the record.

### **III. The Controversy Concerning Predestination.**

#### **1. Its Historical Development.**

It is an undecided question just at what time Walther adopted the theory of predestination which he later propounded. But it is certain that he arrived at his conclusions, not through the study of the Scriptures, but rather through the study of the old dogmaticians. This he himself admitted later on. The matter was not presented publicly until in 1868, when, at the meeting of the Wisconsin District. Pastor Huegli set forth Walther's doctrine. On that occasion Walther expressed himself much more strongly than is indicated in the minutes of the synod. The slight objections referred to in the minutes were made by Prof. J. A. Schmidt, the Norwegian professor, a colleague of Walther at St. Louis. Prof. S. Fritschel, passing through the city, attended the meeting, and reported the details of this doctrinal discussion to his brother, who continually observed the development. In a note added to the articles touching the question of usury he warned against deviation from the Lutheran doctrine. "Lehre und Wehre" soon published a series of articles, reiterating those selfsame teachings. This caused PROF. GOTTFRIED FRITSCHEL to write those articles in "Brobst's Monatshette," of which his brother said that they (in 1872) contained everything which in later discussions has been brought forth in arguments. "Lehre und Wehre" and also "Brobst's Monatshefte" replied. Prof. F. W. Stellohorn, at this time professor of Missouri (signing himself "Interpres"), in the "Monatshefte" attacked the admissibility of the term "Selbstentscheidung" (free decision) in a gentlemanly manner. A Missouri minister (Huegli) and a certain "Gottlieb Gnadenkind" (Walther?) also entered the lists. Walther, in "Lehre und Wehre," expressly declared his agreement with the old dogmaticians, and asserted the scripturalness of their position. He merely characterized as ambiguous the term "intuitu fidei" (Lehre und Wehre, May, 1872). After this concession of Walther, there followed a period of quiet. But in 1877 at the meeting of the Western District Walther reiterated his construction of the dogma. In various places doubts arose as to this new construction. One of the first to put his objections on record was the Norwegian, Prof. Asperheim, who had for some time questioned Missouri's position, and suspected, in the rejection of

the phrase “intuitu fidei,” an un-Lutheran tendency (Kirchliche Zeitschrift, 1878). Being attacked for his stand by his colleague, Prof. F. A. Schmidt (at that time at Madison, Wis.), he handed in his resignation. But Schmidt soon afterwards realized from the minutes of 1877 that the deviation from the traditional doctrine was more serious than he had thought. President Strasen induced him personally to approach his former colleague (January, 1879). Private discussions of the subject took place in other parts of the synod. Schmidt, by request, summed up his views in a series of theses. PASTOR H. A. ALLWARDT, too, addressed Walther personally. At the annual meeting of the Synodical Conference at Columbus, Ohio, Schmidt and Walther argued privately without reaching any conclusion. It was agreed that the discussions should be resumed the following year, and that, meanwhile, Schmidt should not bring the difference to public notice. However, at the meeting of the Western District (1879) Walther publicly attacked “certain people” of his own synod who had not approved of his doctrines. He discussed their arguments, and it soon became an open secret that he referred to Allwardt and Schmidt. Now Schmidt, too, broke silence, and sounded an alarm by publishing a monthly, “ALTES UND NEUES,” Jan., 1880, for the express purpose of opposing Walther’s new construction. The sources made accessible by it are certainly of permanent value.<sup>37</sup> Instantly universal attention was drawn to the controversy between Schmidt and Walther. Within the Norwegian Synod, whose ministers had been trained largely by Schmidt and Walther, a division took place. In almost every Norwegian congregation the issue was taken up and vigorously debated. The president of the Synodical Conference refused to call a meeting, but ordered a conference of all the FACULTIES OF THE SYNODICAL CONFERENCE AT MILWAUKEE (Jan. 5-10, 1881), without attaining any results. The Missouri Synod held a GENERAL MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE AT CHICAGO (Sept. 29- Oct. 5), and a second one during the following year at Fort Wayne, Ind. Walther here was chiefly opposed by Allwardt and Stelhorn (at that time Professor at Fort Wayne College). The Missouri delegates (1881), after a brief discussion, adopted the thirteen theses of Walther, only five voting against them. This caused Walther’s opponents to call a meeting at Blue Island, Ill., where they organized a separate conference and left the Missouri Synod. They united with Ohio as the Northwestern District. The MINNESOTA AND WISCONSIN SYNODS took sides with Missouri, but lost several ministers to Ohio. OHIO separated from Missouri at its next convention (1881), because the Missouri delegates had re-

ceived instructions not to unite in a session with Stellhorn and Loy. The Norwegians meanwhile sent Prof. F. A. Schmidt as a delegate to the convention (Chicago, Oct.. 1882), but the Missouri representatives protested against his admission at the organization, unless he would repent for having participated in meetings of congregations which had left these synods. Scenes were enacted at this conference over which the synod afterwards expressed regret, especially the behavior of some of its delegates. Schmidt was not admitted, nor was he afforded any opportunity to justify his position. The NORWEGIAN SYNOD, hoping to reach unity within its own circle, left the Synodical Conference. But after a number of years Schmidt's followers withdrew, starting an independent organization and establishing their own seminary. Afterwards negotiations were entered into between different Norwegian synods, which together formed the United Norwegian Synod (see paragraph referring to the Norwegians).

Among the chief opponents of the "new Missouri doctrine," besides Schmidt, were the REPRESENTATIVES OF OHIO — Stellhorn, Loy, Allwardt and Ernst. At the convention at Wheeling, W. Va., in 1881, this synod declared its allegiance to the old Lutheran doctrine of the "intuitu fidei," and entering a protest against Missouri's heresy, withdrew from the Synodical Conference. — Iowa also declared against Missouri in the theses of St. Sebald (1881, see first edition of Neve, p. 177-181) and in the resolutions of Dubuque (1882). — The faculty of Philadelphia, too, although with some hesitation, took issue with Missouri. The faculty of Rostock, having been requested by the congregation of Columbus, Wis., to give an opinion, expressed its disapproval of Walther's theory. This caused a controversy between Prof. A. Graebner and Dr. Dieckhoff. As was natural, the periodicals (1880-1890) published a number of articles on this subject, and quite a literature in the form of brochures has also arisen.

In the early nineties the battle somewhat subsided, but from 1903 to 1907 a series of INTER-SYNODICAL CONFERENCES (Watertown, Milwaukee, Detroit, Fort Wayne) were arranged, and the issue was revived. The first phase of the controversy centered in the question, "What is the Lutheran doctrine of predestination?" The second period revolved around the question, "What do the Scriptures teach concerning predestination?" Finally the Missourians terminated the discussion. Meanwhile the NORWEGIANS in their discussion of the subject had arrived at some results. They reached common ground, first concerning conversion and afterwards concerning predestination, based

upon the catechism of Pantoppidan which was revered by the laity almost as a symbol. The Synodical Conference warned the Norwegian Synod against the adoption of the theses. For this purpose Dr. F. Pieper published a brochure on the subject, which was sent to every Lutheran minister of America. The Iowa Synod, on the other hand, in 1913 offered the synods, especially Missouri and Wisconsin, open and general conferences for the discussion of their differences. This concludes the doctrinal controversy in its historical aspect.

## **2. The Controversy Itself.**

While the discussion started with the doctrine of predestination, it soon developed into the question of conversion. Nowadays it is generally conceded that, within the Lutheran Church, there are two modes or forms of presentation. Missouri at first denied, but later admitted, this.<sup>38</sup> So far there has not been a sufficiently clear discussion of these two modes of presentation. Prof. Geo. J. Fritschel has given us a very explicit delineation of them in his "Schriftlehre." According to this view there is no real difference of doctrine between these two modes; the only difference between Luther and Calovius consists in a theological construction and in the manner of presentation; hence the terms, "Lehrweisen," "Tropen." It is stated that: 1) The Formula of Concord (formulating the first mode) presents the matter "a posteriori," i.e., from the viewpoint of the believing Christians, while the dogmaticians treat it "a priori," i.e., from the viewpoint of eternity. 2) The Formula of Concord, in opposition to synergism, discusses the question, "Whence does my state of grace of which I am conscious, originate?" while the dogmaticians answer the question: "Who will with Christ enter Paradise?" 3) The Formula of Concord is merely concerned about the converted, while the dogmaticians speak of those who at the end of their lives are in the state of grace. 4) Both doctrines are presentations of the same eternal divine decree of grace, but they offer different aspects of the subject, in one case considering the present realization of grace for the comfort of the converted; in the second, its complete execution for the purpose of an apologetical refutation of any construction which would charge God with particularism.

Missouri's opponents assert (and the charge has never been disproved) that Missouri, unlike Iowa and Ohio, having refused to recognize these two aspects of the question, has construed out of both of them an entirely new doctrine — a fact which appears from the indiscriminate use of older and



newer dogmaticians.<sup>39</sup> From this it can be readily seen how the Norwegians found no difficulty in uniting on common ground, seeing no reason why this doctrine should cause a schism as long as both Calvinistic and Synergistic extremes were avoided. To them the controversy is an “open question.”

The DOCTRINE OF CONVERSION soon became a part of the controversy. This is natural enough, when we consider that predestination is the eternal decree concerning, first, the preparation of salvation, second, the imparting of it, and, third, its completion. Differences concerning the eternal decree are thus bound to appear in the doctrine pertaining to the imparting of salvation. All parties agree in regard to total depravity and in the rejection of Synergism. But they differ in regard to the doctrinal construction. One of the main questions, ever extant, which remains still unsettled is the following: Is conversion like a point in a line, a momentary event (Missouri), or is it a gradual process, consisting of a number of moments as all the points that constitute a line (Ohio and Iowa). Here again Missouri construed its own doctrine, which, while based upon statements of both the confessions and the dogmaticians, does not coincide with either of them. According to the confessions the word “conversion” signifies the process of repentance, composed of contrition and faith; according to the dogmaticians, conversion means a change of personal attitude toward God (the last point of the line), preceded by contrition and historical faith. As this difference in principle is being evolved, other differences resulting therefrom become apparent.

To illustrate, we mention a number of characteristic statements issued by Missouri. They reveal the “a priori” view:

Predestination is the actual eternal separation of certain individual souls from the multitude of those who, even before their existence, were not meant to be saved. When God created man, He foreknew that he would fall; that the devil would destroy his work. Then He considered what should be done in order that the work of salvation should not be ruined. Well, he thought, to speak humanly, the devil shall not do with this work as he has done with the work of creation. I shall see to it that a very large number of people shall most certainly be saved. And this is election.

First God therefore counseled, then elected, then predestined. Yes, God has chosen some people from eternity; He has decreed that these must and shall be saved; aye, as sure as God is God, these shall be saved, and none other; this is taught in the Bible, and is also our faith, our doctrine and our confession. That some attain faith and others are hardened is the result of His free election.

A temporary faith may be the result of the grace of the Word, but not of election. Election is only the cause of the faith of the elect. Yesterday we heard it said: God demands many things of man which he does not do. But we say, if God proposes anything to Himself, He sees that it is done in spite of all the devils in hell. The general decree of salvation may be undone by Satan, but not so election. Not the general decree of salvation, but the special decree of election is the cause of a persistent faith. The fact that God has decreed to save a number of people is the sole cause that they are saved; if that were not so, none would be saved, with the possible exception of little children. That which must forever remain for us an unfathomable mystery is the question. Why did not God elect all men to be His children, since He certainly had the power to remove even the most willful resistance of all sinners, just as He actually does in the case of the elect?

Humanly speaking, God thought thus: "I will decree from eternity: this one and that one shall be saved, and all the devils of hell shall not tear them out of my hand. Not only will I lead them to faith, but I will keep them in it, and in this way save them. I defy the creature that intends to revolt against my decree." Now this glorious comfort modern theologians try to snatch away from us. The pure doctrine of predestination is such that reason is horrified, and driven to the conclusion that God is a terrible tyrant.

NOTE: *The verba ipsissima*, with sources, are given in the German edition of this work. These sentiments represent a contraction of the quotations in German.

## § 24. Its Work.

### 1. Educational Institutions.

[a] COLLEGES. Concordia College at FORT WAYNE, IND. In 1861 the classical department, which had been founded at Altenburg, Perry Comity, Mo., in 1839, and transferred along with the theological seminary to St. Louis in 1849, was transferred to Fort Wayne; and the theological seminary, which had existed at Fort Wayne, was united with the classical course of the seminary at St. Louis. Number of professors, 10; of students, 278. Concordia College, at MILWAUKEE, WIS., is an institution of the Missouri Synod. Professors, 8; students, 232. Concordia College at ST. PAUL, MINN. — professors, 8; students, 178. Two pro-gymnasia, one at CONCORDIA, MO. — professors, 7; students, 140; the other at BRONXVILLE, N. Y. — professors, 7; students, 170. Also at WINFIELD, KAN. — 6 professors and 72 students; and at CONOVER, N. C. — 7 professors and 65 students. All of these are synodical institutions. Besides these, Missouri has three pro-gymnasia connected with different districts: at Oakland, Cal., Portland, Ore., and New Orleans, La.; also a number of private institutions: Walther College, St. Louis, Mo.;

Luther High School, Milwaukee, Wis.; Luther Institute, Chicago; Bethany Ladies' College, Mankato, Minn., and Lutheran High School, Deshler, Neb.

[b] NORMAL SCHOOLS. The largest one is at River Forest, a suburb of Chicago, having been transferred from Addison, Ill., 7 professors and 192 students. Also the school at Seward, Neb., 7 professors and 137 students.

[c] THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES. The theoretical Concordia Seminary at St. Louis, Mo. It was founded in 1839 in Perry County, Mo., and removed in 1849 to St. Louis, where the practical seminary of Fort Wayne was also united with it. At this seminary Dr. Walther labored as professor of Systematic Theology. With him the following men labored at different times: Dr. E. Preuss, who, together with Baumstark, became an apostate to Rome; Prof. F. A. Schmidt (see predestinarian controversy and history of the Norwegians); also Prof. M. Guenther, author of the well known "Symbolik"; Dr. G. C. Stoeckhardt, noted as an exegetical scholar, and Dr. A. L. Graebner, author of a history of the Lutheran Church in America. After the death of Walther, Dr. F. Pieper became his successor, and holds this position at the present time. Associated with him is the following faculty: L. Fuerbringer, F. Bente, G. Metzger, W. H. T. Dau, E. A. W. Krauss, K. Pardieck, Theo. Graebner. The Practical Concordia Seminary at SPRINGFIELD, ILL, originated from the practical department of the seminary at St. Louis, which, under the direction of Prof. Craemer, was transferred to Springfield in 1875, occupying the seminary building (formerly called the State University of Illinois), which was purchased from the Northern Illinois Synod. After the death of Craemer, Prof. R. Pieper became president of the institution. At present Prof. R. D. Biedermann is its president. The faculty is represented by L. Wessel, Fr. Streckfuss, O. Boeckler, Theo. Engelder, E. Gross. As the seminary has a two years' preliminary course, the entire course of study occupies five years. There are 6 professors and 230 students. The Missouri Synod also has a school at Porto Alegre, Brazil.

## **2. Missionary Operations.**

[a] The FOREIGN MISSIONARY WORK of the Missouri Synod is carried on among the Tamils of East India. It has 7 stations, 41 localities, and 15 missionaries. Up to the present time there have been 675 converts. In 1913 the synod raised \$38,750 for the support of this field.

[b] Since 1898 it has also maintained a mission among the Stockbridge INDIANS.

[c] The mission among the NEGROES, which is very successful, is carried on in Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana, Illinois, Virginia, and North Carolina. It has 39 congregations and preaching stations, 50 missionaries and assistants, 2434 colored Christians, and contributions in 1913 amounting to \$34,624.

[d] Pastor A. Reinke established in Chicago a mission for the DEAF AND DUMB, which comprises 8 congregations and a number of preaching places.

[3] An IMMIGRANT mission work is being done by the Missouri Synod through the Lutheran Pilgerhaus (Pastor O. H. Restin) in New York and through similar agencies in Philadelphia and Baltimore.

[f] Among the Poles, Slovaks, Letts, Persians, Esthonians, etc.

[g] The HOME MISSION work, that is, the establishment and support of new organizations, is carried on by the district synods, which place surplus funds needed for this work into the general mission treasury of the synod. From this fund those districts which have more missions to sustain than the money they collect from their own congregations will enable them to support, receive assistance. The Missouri Synod has relations with Germany, supporting missions of the Saxony Free Church. At London, England, it has a missionary station with which it is organically connected. In 1913, \$386,161 were raised for these purposes.

[h] INSTITUTIONS OF MERCY under the direction of the Missouri Synod: Its ORPHANAGES are located as follows: Addison, Ill., Baltimore, Md., West Roxbury (Boston), Mass., College Point, N. Y., Des Peres, Mo. (St. Louis), Indianapolis, Ind., Warwood, Pa., New Orleans, La. It also has societies for the care of abandoned children. — HOMES FOR THE AGED at Arlington Heights, Ill., Brooklyn, N. Y., Monroe, Mich., St. Louis, Mo., Wauwatosa, Wis. — HOME FOR EPILEPTICS at Watertown, Wis. — HOSPITALS at Beatrice, Neb., Cleveland, O., East New York, N. Y., Fort Wayne, Ind., Sioux City, Ia., Springfield, Ill., St. Louis, Mo. — HOSPICES at Buffalo, N. Y., Chicago, Milwaukee, New York. — A SANATORIUM for consumptives at Denver, Col. — An institution for the DEAF AND DUMB at Detroit, Mich. — Total receipts for this work in 1913, \$99,803.

### 3. Publishing Interests.

The CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE at St. Louis, Mo., whose business it is to publish works and pamphlets of a strictly Lutheran character, turns large profits over to the synodical treasury (\$95,000 in 1913). The best known of the Missouri PERIODICALS are the "Lutheraner" and "The Lutheran Witness" (papers for congregational reading) and the theological magazines, "Theological Quarterly," "Lehre und Wehre" and the "Homiletische Magazin" (in German and English). All of these are edited by the theological faculty of the Concordia Seminary at St. Louis.

### **Biographical Notes.**

KARL FERDINAND WILHELM WALTHER, D. D. The history of the founder of the Missouri Synod has been touched upon so frequently in preceding chapters that we need to add only a few facts. It is especially important to mention his writings. Besides the book already referred to ("Die Stimme der Kirche in der Frage von Kirche und Amt" (1852), he published. "Die rechte Gestalt einer vom Staat unabhaengigen evangelisch-lutherischen Ortsgemeinde 1863), a much-used volume on pastoral theology ("Pastorale"); sermons on the Gospels of the year (1871), and another volume of sermons, entitled "Brosamen" (1876). Noteworthy, because characteristic of his theology centering in sola gratia, are the thirty-nine evening lectures before his students (stenographically reported), on the "Rechte Unterscheidung von Gesetz und Evangelium" (published after his death). In 1878 he received his Doctor of Divinity from Capital University, Columbus, O. (Ohio Synod). At synodical gatherings Walther generally acted as essayist. As a leader in debate he was unexcelled. His last lectures were delivered at the meeting of the Western District of the Missouri Synod at St. Louis, in 1886. Here Walther realized that his vitality was ebbing out and that his days were numbered. He died May 7, 1887. Prof. L. Fuerbringer has just published the first volume of Walther's letters, which is to have two sequels. On page 99 of the first volume we read that the university of Goettingen inquired of Walther in 1855, if he would accept the degree of Doctor of Divinity. Walther writes, "Very politely, but most certainly, I refused." He suspected Goettingen's Lutheranism.

PASTOR F. C. D. WYNEKEN, born May 13, 1810. We simply add to previous statements that he came to St. Louis in 1850, and was made president of the Missouri Synod. He became also official visitor to all congregations. In

this latter position his rare gifts as adviser of ministers and congregations were very apparent. In 1864 he was called to Cleveland, O., where he was active until 1875, when he retired. His death occurred in San Francisco, Cal., May 4, 1876.

DR. W. SIHLER, born November 12, 1801, received a classical education, chose a military career, and in 1823 attended the military academy at Berlin, where he was a classmate of Von Moltke. Weary of the military life, he entered the University of Berlin in 1826 to attend lecture courses on philology, philosophy and theology. After occupying a number of positions as teacher, he experienced genuine conversion, which resulted in his becoming a thorough student of the Bible and the Confessions. Thus engaged, he was roused by Wyneken's call for missionaries. He came under the influence of Loehe, who sent him to America. Arriving in 1843, he took charge of the congregation at Pomeroy, Ohio. In 1845 he was made successor to Wyneken at Fort Wayne, Ind., and remained there until his death, which occurred October 21, 1885. During the years of the founding of the Missouri Synod he became a leader of the Loehe party. For fifteen years he served as professor in the theological department of the college founded by Loehe at Fort Wayne. He was an able preacher and a prolific writer, having published several volumes of sermons, an autobiography, and numerous articles.

PROF. F. A. CRAEMER, born May 26, 1812, in Franconia, studied theology and philosophy at Erlangen, became tutor in England, arrived in America in 1845, and was pastor of a Michigan congregation founded by Loehe. He organized the first Franconian colony, which was called Frankenmuth. He was engaged in this work for five years, and was also active for a time among the Indians, and then was called to the professorship of theology in the seminary at Ft. Wayne. This position he held until his death, which took place May 3, 1891. He moved with the seminary when it was transferred to St. Louis in 1861, and thence to Springfield, Ill., in 1875.

PASTOR O. FUERBRINGER was born June 3, 1810, at Gera (Reuss), studied theology in company with Walther at Leipzig, and was also a member of the famous Bible circle which has been mentioned. With Saxon emigrants he came to America in 1839, took part in the founding of Concordia College in Perry County, Mo., and also of the Missouri Synod itself. He served congregations at Elkhorn Prairie, Ill. (1840), at Freistadt, Wis. (1851) and Frankenmuth, Mich. (1858). For twenty-five years he was president of the Northern District of the Missouri Synod, and, in the words of Graebner,

“was the profoundest thinker among the fathers of the Missouri Synod.” He died in 1858.

PROF. A. L. GRAEBNER, D. D., was born at Frankentrost, Mich., July 10, 1849, and studied in Concordia College at Fort Wayne and the Concordia Seminary at St. Louis. From 1872 to 1875 he was teacher of the Lutheran High School at St. Louis; from 1875 to 1878 professor at the Northwestern College of the Wisconsin Synod at Watertown, Wis.; from 1878 to 1887 theological professor at the seminary of this synod in Milwaukee, Wis.; from 1878 until his death professor in the Concordia Seminary at St. Louis. He died December 7, 1904. His specialty was church history; his principal literary product was a history of the Lutheran Church in America up to the founding of the General Synod; he also published a book on Martin Luther, a work on Doctrinal Theology, the life of J. S. Bach, and many articles in various magazines. Graebner was a profound scholar and a particularly gifted historian. His early death, viewed from the human standpoint, was a great loss to the Lutheran Church.

PROF. G. C. STOECKHARDT, D. D., born in Chemnitz, Saxony, February 17, 1842, was educated at Meissen (Fuerstenschule) from 1857 to 1862, and studied theology at Erlangen and Leipzig (1862-66). He was teacher in the girls' school of Tharandt, Saxony; assistant preacher of the German Lutheran congregation of Paris (1870); chaplain in the Franco-German war; licentiate of Old and New Testament exegesis at Erlangen (1871); religious instructor in the gymnasium of that city, and pastor at Plaunitz, Saxony. In 1876 he left the State Church, and became pastor of the Free Church congregation of Plaunitz. In 1878 he came to America, served as pastor in St. Louis from 1878 to 1887 and as lecturer on exegesis in the seminary. In 1887 he was elected regular professor of exegesis. He died January 9, 1913. He was a master of exegesis. His writings are: Commentaries on Romans, Ephesians, I. Peter, Isaiah (Chapter I-XII), Biblical History of the Old and New Testaments, Sermons on the Passion of our Lord and the Gospels for the Advent Season, and various contributions to periodicals.

PROF. F. PIEPER, D. D., born at Carwitz, Pomerania, June 27, 1852, was educated at the Northwestern University at Watertown, Wis., and Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. He was ordained in 1875. became pastor of a congregation at Manitowoc, Wis., and in 1878 was appointed the successor of Dr. Walther in the chair of Systematic Theology at St. Louis. From 1899 to 1911 he served as president of the Missouri Synod. He is the author of the

following books: Das Grundbekenntnis der Lutherischen Kirche, 1880; Lehre von der Rechtfertigung, 1889; Die Evangelisch Lutherische Kirche die wahre Sichtbare Kirche auf Erden, 1890; Distinctive Doctrines of the Lutheran Church (1892); Das Geistliche Leben der Christen, 1893; Unsere Stellung in Lehre und Praxis, 1896; Lehrstellung der Missouri Synode, 1897; Christ's Work, 1898; Das Wesen des Christentums, 1903; Die Grunddifferenz, 1904; Conversion and Election, 1913.

## **The Other Parts Of The Synodical Conference.**

### **§ 25. The General Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan and Other States**

Contributed by the Rev. O. Engel.

The General Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan and Other States was formed in 1892 for the purpose of attaining practical results by means of concerted action. Its constituent parts are related to the general body like districts to a synod, all rights (with the exception of those expressly conceded to the general organization) being retained by the districts. In this respect the General Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan and Other States is unlike Missouri, Ohio and Iowa, which place jurisdictional powers upon the synod. It takes a middle ground between a synod and a synodical union.<sup>40</sup> In 1905 the Nebraska District Synod was received into membership. Such a step is made contingent on synchronal membership in the Synodical Conference. The theological seminary at Wauwatosa, Wis., the gymnasium at Watertown, Wis., the teachers' institute at New Ulm, Minn., and the preparatory school at Saginaw, Mich., are being jointly supported. In the summer of 1915 a plan was carried out according to which the individual synods united into ONE synod by transferring their rights to the new General Synod, then in course of formation, which in turn is divided into different districts. Latest statistics: 453 pastors; 142 teachers; 548 congregations; 143 preaching stations; 23,250 voters, and 104,100 communicants.

#### **I. The Wisconsin Synod.**

[1] Its Origin and Confessional Character.



In the middle of the past century, when the stream of German emigration was directed to America, Wisconsin was considered a German Eldorado.<sup>41</sup> This State with its mighty forests, numerous lakes and imposing rivers, particularly interested the Northern Germans: Pomeranians, Mecklenburgers, Hannoverians and West-Prussians. Since the bulk of these immigrants were Lutherans, a wonderful field was thus opened for Lutheran mission work.

The BUFFALO SYNOD<sup>42</sup> was the first on the ground to gather scattered Lutherans into congregations; trouble in one of their Milwaukee churches gave MISSOURI the opportunity to gain a foothold on Wisconsin territory. The Rev. C. Fricke, a Missouri "visitator" on the adjoining field of northern Illinois, had been active there before. The FRANCKEAN SYNOD, too, supplied some preaching stations west of Lake Michigan prior to 1850.<sup>43</sup> Soon, however, emissaries of missionary societies from Germany appeared on the scene and formed the nucleus of the present Wisconsin Synod.

In 1836 a certain Ehrenfried Seebach of Oakwood, near Milwaukee, made application to the LANGENBERG SOCIETY for a ministerial supply.<sup>44</sup> A similar request came into the hands of Pastor F. W. Schmidt, West Leydon, N. Y., who meanwhile had met a candidate from the Rhenish Mission House (J. Weinmann), and sent him on to the petitioning congregation at Kilbourn-Road.

On June 27, 1848, the REV. J. MUEHLHAEUSER, a theological candidate from the Barmen Mission and an emissary of the Langenberg Society, arrived at Milwaukee, coming from Rochester, N. Y., in behalf of the New York Tract Society, and founded Trinity Church (of moderate confessionality), later known as Grace Church (Gnadenkirche). He was succeeded by W. Wrede, who had come to America together with Weinmann. Wrede took charge of the congregation at Granville.

Recognizing the necessity of synodical cooperation, the three emissaries of the Langenberg Society (Weinmann, Wrede, Muehlhaeuser) FORMED, together with Paul Meiss and C. Pluess (licensed candidates), the Synod of Wisconsin and Adjoining States, known at that time as the Ev. Luth. Ministerium of Wisconsin.<sup>45</sup> Muehlhaeuser was made president, Weinmann secretary, and Wrede treasurer. Beginning as a tiny seed, the synodical plant soon expanded into a mighty tree whose foliage is at present covering nine great states. In 1863 the number of pastors had been increased from 5 to 32, and that of the congregations from 18 to 59.

The first synodical constitution, modelled by President Muchlhaeuser after that of the New York Ministerium, characterized its CONFSSIONAL POSITION merely as being Evangelical Lutheran. But as early as 1863 we notice a more explicit doctrinal statement: "This body acknowledges the entire canonical writings of the Old and New Testaments as the sole standard of faith, and also the Symbolical Books as the proper interpretation of the Word of God." Congregations desirous of uniting with this synodical alliance must accept "the pure confessions of the Ev. Luth. Church as the rule and standard of faith and life". From a "mild and conciliatory" attitude the Lutheranism of this synod has developed into one of uncompromising fidelity to the Lutheran confessions.

[2] Relations With Germany.

[a] Since Berlin and Langenberg supplied the Wisconsin Synod with ministers, it was but natural that an AMICABLE RELATIONSHIP existed between them. On the occasion of an Elberfeld Missionsfest (July 27, 1837) the Evangelical Alliance for the Protestant Germans of North America was organized by several devoted Christians, after its necessity had been emphasized at the General Convention of the Rhenish Mission, June 7, 1837.<sup>46</sup> While this alliance was a part of the Prussian Union, permitting its pastors to decide for either the Reformed or Lutheran versions of faith, it announced as its sole purpose in sending missionaries to America, "the protection against infidelity of brothers and sisters in distant lands, the guiding into paths of truth of the erring, their instruction in the Word of Life and their organization into churches guarding the jewel of faith for future generations"<sup>47</sup> In 1852 the Langenberg-Elberfeld and the Berlin societies united for this foreign work, and in order to encourage young men to enter the field they prevailed upon the government to permit missionaries, who had served in foreign fields for a period of five years, to return to the fatherland and there to continue their ministerial career. This decision has materially aided the Wisconsin Synod in securing German university men for many of its parishes.

[b] FUND RAISING TRIP OF PASTOR BADING. Since the few ministers sent from Germany could not possibly serve the ever increasing number of immigrants, it became necessary that American seminaries should be founded for the training of pastors. To raise funds for such a purpose President Bading was sent to Europe to interest wealthy friends of the Lutheran cause in foreign lands. In June, 1863, while the Watertown seminary was in course

of construction, Bading started for Germany, and after pleading for funds in Westphalia, Hanover, Pomerania and parts of Russia, he started for the return journey at Nishnij-Novgorod, 60 miles east of Moscow, with a total fund of 3,500 silver rubels. Passing through Bremen, Berlin, Hamburg and places in Switzerland, he increased this sum to 11,721 Taler, which, after a trip of six months' duration, he placed at the disposal of the building committee of the new seminary. Considering that this contribution was made during the Civil War, its importance can hardly be overestimated.

[c] **THE PRO-SEMINARY.** Believing that there was a decided tendency among the young men of America toward materialistic ideals, the leaders of synod soon felt the need of a German pro-seminary where youth might be inspired by the call of the Gospel. They applied successively and vainly to Pastor Lohmann, Glowitz, Pomerania, who could not comply with their wishes on account of complications arising from the Danish-Prussian war; to Wichern of the Rauhe Haus, Hamburg, who refused for doctrinal reasons, and to Polstorff of Mecklenburg, who could not see his way clear. The Berlin Society promised assistance, but though the work was begun and two able theologians secured as instructors, a hitch on account of doctrinal considerations prevented its successful outcome. The project was definitely abandoned, but the Wisconsin Synod by this correspondence attained a position of prominence which induced Germany to supply the Watertown seminary with theological students.

[d] **WISCONSIN AND THE PRUSSIAN UNION.** As soon as Pastor A. HOENECKE became a member of the seminary faculty, a decided change toward conservative Lutheranism was felt throughout the synod. It manifested itself in the stand taken by the synod against the use of a ("unionized") CATECHISM in vogue in the Prussian State-Church and the ADMISSION TO LUTHERAN COMMUNIONS of Reformed communicants. Although suspected of Prussian Unionism on account of past negotiations, the synod did not hesitate openly to DECLARE AGAINST UNIONISTIC PRINCIPLES. As a result of this action, Langenberg and Berlin not only refused to cooperate in the establishment of a pro-seminary, but influenced the Prussian Consistory to withdraw the money (7,500 Taler) pledged toward the support of the synod. Two candidates of the Prussian State-Church, being advised by the Consistory, left the Wisconsin Synod, while others severed their connection with the mother church abroad. This rupture between Germany and the Wisconsin Synod resulted in

the desire on the part of Wisconsin for closer RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER AMERICAN SYNODS.

[3] RELATION WITH OTHER SYNODS.

[a] THE PENNSYLVANIA SYNOD. For almost two decades the Pennsylvania Synod, through its Board of Domestic Missions, sent from \$200 to \$400 annually for the support of underpaid pastors of the Wisconsin Synod. All it required in return for this generosity was an occasional report. When Wisconsin sent its first aspirant for the ministerial office to be educated in a seminary of the Pennsylvania Synod, he received not only his tuition but his board, lodging and general expenses from that body. Wisconsin eventually separated from the General Council (largely the creation of the Pennsylvania Synod), and these friendly relations ceased.

[b] IOWA SYNOD. With the increasing tendency among individual synods toward union with general bodies, Iowa and Wisconsin got closer together. To effect a union SPECIAL CONFERENCES were arranged in 1866 by representatives of both synods. But their doctrinal differences were so marked that harmony seemed to be out of the question. The two Fritschels and Inspector Grossmann appeared at a subsequent annual convention of the Wisconsin Synod and argued the matter of "OPEN QUESTIONS" on the basis of the Dorpat opinion. But Prof. Hoenecke, equipped with fine theological scholarship, ably disputed the opinion of the Dorpat faculty, and caused his synod to express itself against the Iowa theory. Though at the forming of the General Council Wisconsin sided with Iowa in regards to the FOUR POINTS, a union of the two synods was not brought about. Wisconsin, as a matter of fact, strove to unite with Missouri.

[c] MINNESOTA SYNOD. That Minnesota and Wisconsin were not far apart appeared from the fact that they interchanged delegates at their synodical meetings. This pleasant relationship was further stimulated by the call to Minnesota of PASTOR J. H. SIEKER, who as president of synod worked unceasingly in the interest of union, and by the mission trip (with the consent of his synod) of PROFESSOR E. F. MOLDEHNKE through the Northeastern part of that State for the benefit of the Minnesota brethren. The Wisconsin Synod was gradually severing its relation with Eastern synods, and through Bading and Hoenecke approached the Minnesota Synod in regard to a union. At the COLLOQUIUM at La Crosse, Wis., Sept. 25, 1869, it became evident that their doctrinal positions were identical. But inasmuch as Minnesota was still organically linked to the General Council, a formal union was

temporarily given up. In 1871 Minnesota was permitted to send students to the Wisconsin SEMINARY, and also to make use of the "Gemeindeblatt" as the synodical organ. Since both Wisconsin and Minnesota are members of their General Synod and also of the Synodical Conference, they are bound together with DOUBLE TIES. (See history of Minnesota Synod.)

[d] THE MISSOURI SYNOD. After its failure to unite with synods in the East, Wisconsin tried to get into fraternal relations with Missouri. On the occasion of a COLLOQUIUM, held at Milwaukee, Oct. 21 and 22, 1868, and participated in by ten representatives of both synods, it was found that doctrinal standards were identical. As a practical result of this fact an agreement was reached regarding EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION. Missouri was to send an instructor to Watertown, and Wisconsin to supply a theological Professor for St. Louis and to abandon its own theological institution. After a period of eight years Wisconsin, unable to comply with this arrangement, asked to have it set aside. Meanwhile the Synodical Conference came into existence, uniting Missouri and Wisconsin as its chief constituents.

[4] PARTICIPATION IN THE FORMING OF LARGER BODIES.

[a] GENERAL COUNCIL. Wisconsin was greatly interested in the organization of the General Council. It realized that the getting together of Lutherans would strengthen the faithful and extend the sphere of Lutheran usefulness; and so it cherished the hope that union with Eastern synods would arouse Eastern enthusiasm for Western missions and expedite the use of a common hymnal and ritual. For these reasons the adoption of the Augsburg Confession was declared a sufficient basis of unity, and the Wisconsin Synod through its President, W. Streissguth, and Professor A. Martin applied for membership in the General Council. At the synodical meeting of 1867 the doctrinal basis adopted at Reading was discussed, and point 9 changed to convey that all the Lutheran confessional writings were equally binding. At the convention of 1867, held at Fort Wayne, the matter of the FOUR POINTS appeared in the foreground. These four points pertaining to chiliasm, secret societies, altar fellowship and exchange of pulpits had been referred by the General Council to the district synods, and Wisconsin felt bound to declare for a proper statement of its position. The question of altar fellowship caused a violent debate which resulted in the following resolution: "This synod, together with the true Lutheran church, rejects as incompatible with the principles of the church, every kind of fellowship of altar or pulpit with men of different faith." Since the General Council would not

take a definite stand along these lines, the Wisconsin Synod withdrew from its organization (see history of Gen. Coun., § 17, 3).

[b] SYNODICAL CONFERENCE. Wisconsin maintained fraternal relations with Missouri, and opened NEGOTIATIONS for union which led to the founding of the Synodical Conference. On Jan. ii, 1871, REPRESENTATIVES of Missouri, Ohio, Wisconsin and the Norwegians met at Chicago to formulate a constitution on the basis of which all Lutheran synods of America might form an American Lutheran Church. In 1872 this Synodical Conference held its FIRST OFFICIAL CONVENTION at St. John's. Milwaukee. Soon afterwards Prof. A. Schmidt of the Norwegian Synod advocated the organization of all Lutherans residing in a State into STATE SYNODS. But the plan, having been submitted to the Synodical Conference at its convention at St. Paul (1876), was vigorously opposed by the Wisconsin Synod and eventually dropped. Belonging to the Synodical Conference, the Wisconsin Synod took an active part in the famous controversy on PREDESTINATION. When a faction in the Norwegian Synod and Ohio characterized Walther's doctrine (propounded in the synodical reports of the Western District of the Missouri Synod) as Calvinistic, doctrinal discussions followed which shook the very foundations of the American Lutheran church. A colloquium, held at the seminary of the Wisconsin Synod and participated in by the theological faculties of all synods, led to a RUPTURE, and Ohio and a number of the Norwegians withdrew from the Synodical Conference. At the annual convention at La Crosse, Wis. (1882) the Wisconsin Synod declared its position in this matter, losing thereby a number of pastors and congregations. During the controversy DR. HOENECKE by gentle and conciliatory speech took the sting out of Missouri's offensive phraseology, and accomplished much in the interest of the peace of the church.

[5] EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

[a] THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. On account of the large influx of German immigration the synod grew so rapidly that it became necessary to consider steps for the training of theological students within the bounds of the synod. This matter was agitated as early as 1859. But a definite decision was not arrived at until 1863, when Pastor Moldehnke was recalled from his missionary journeys and made director of a prospective institution, which began its activity in a building at WATERTOWN, Wis., rented for this purpose and attended by two students. MOLDEHNKE held his position three years, and then accepted a call to a congregation in Germany. Pastor Hoenecke was

chosen as his successor. With the assistance of the Berlin Society and as a result of a special trip of Pastor G. Vorberg to Germany, a number of young men from Germany immigrated to this country and arranged for a theological education. Having maintained (together with Missouri) a GENERAL SEMINARY AT ST. LOUIS from 1870-1878, the synod reopened a SEMINARY OF ITS OWN at Milwaukee with an enrollment of 6 students. On Sept. 17, 1893, a new institution was dedicated at WAUWATOSA, a suburb of Milwaukee. It has a faculty of four: J. P. Koehler (1900), A. Pieper (1902), J. Schaller (1908), H. Meyer (1915). Number of students, 65.

[b] NORTHWESTERN COLLEGE. While the seminary was opened in 1863, the college opening was postponed to 1865, when the new buildings were completed.<sup>48</sup> Prof. Martin, of Hartwick Seminary, was made PRINCIPAL. During the following year the number of students increased from 8 to 66. When FUNDS RAN SHORT, Pastor Sieker sold scholarships, and thus helped to raise some \$64,000 in a very short time. In the fall of 1869, after the transfer of the theological department to St. Louis, the preparatory school was transformed into an UP-TO-DATE GYMNASIUM modelled after the German ideal. In accordance with certain agreements the Missouri Synod sent students of the Western District to W<sup>^</sup>atertown, and engaged PROF. F. W. STELLHORN as their instructor. But the joint enterprise did not prove satisfactory to Wisconsin, and by mutual consent Stellhorn and the Missouri students were transferred to Fort Wayne, his place at Watertown having been filled by DR. F. W. A. NOTZ, of Muehlenberg College. DR. A. F. ERNST is at present president of the institution, which is attended by some 230 students.

[6] CONCERNING MISSIONS AND GENERAL STATISTICS.

[a] HOME MISSIONS. During one decade, 1850 to 1860, 915,667 German immigrants arrived in this country, 69% of whom settled in Wisconsin. To serve these scattered people the Wisconsin Synod decided to send ITINERANT PREACHERS. Pastor G. Fachtmann traveled from Horicon and Beaver Dam as far as Green Bay, and his successor, Pastor Moldehnke, to the boundary line of Iowa and Minnesota. Wherever the latter went he arranged for Sunday-schools and lay services. Personally he served 22 preaching stations. In 1867 Pastor Thiele was engaged for a brief period. Even today many congregations bear witness to the blessed work done by these itinerant ministers. At present the Wisconsin Synod is doing some work in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Arizona.

[b] FOREIGN MISSIONS.

AMONG THE INDIANS. Since 1893 the synod has been doing missionary work among the Apaches of the White Mountain Reservation (Arizona), employing 4 missionaries, three interpreters and an instructress, all being engaged in work at Globe, San Carlos, Fort Apache and Cibecue, It has four mission schools in which dinner is served free. For this mission the synod raised \$16,189 from 1911 to 1913. Pastor G. Harders is superintendent.

AMONG THE NEGROES: Together with Missouri, the Wisconsin Synod since 1879 has been supporting a mission among negroes extending over Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Mississippi, Missouri, Illinois and Arkansas. In Greensboro, N. C, it helps to maintain a seminary with 55 students and at New Orleans a college with 26 scholars.

[c] STATISTICS. According to latest reports (1914), Wisconsin has 319 pastors, 365 congregations, 85 preaching stations, 153,521 communicants, 118 teachers, 80 women teachers; 310 parish schools, 36,112 scholars. In the higher institutions of learning there are 300 students and 15 teachers. Its collections for missions amounted to \$48,187, for congregational purposes \$215,413. Its church property is worth \$1,500,000. Synodical periodicals: "Gemeindeblatt". "Theologische Quartalschrift" and "Northwestern Lutheran". The Northwestern Publishing House is located at Milwaukee, Wis.

#### **Biographical Notes.**

PRESIDENT J. F. BADING was born November 24, 1824, at Rixdorf, near Berlin. As a youth he read the words of the divine command to preach and baptize inscribed over the door of a house. This caused him to become a minister. Received in Berlin as a student of the Mission House, he later went to Hermannsburg, Hanover, on account of revolutionary conditions in the capitol. He came in contact with the Rhenish Missionary Society, and was sent to America by the Langenberg Society. Welcomed by President Muehlhaeuser, he received his ordination October 6, 1853. He raised the doctrinal standards of the synod, and became one of the founders of the Watertown seminary in the interest of which he started on a fund-raising trip through Europe. He was pastor at Calumet, Wis., 1853-1854; Theresa, Wis., 1854-1860; Watertown, Wis., 1860-1868; Milwaukee, Wis., 1868-1908; President of Wisconsin Synod, 1860-1864 and 1866-1889; President of the Synodical Conference, 1882-1912. He died May 24, 1913, aged 88.



PROF. A. HOENECKE, D. D., son of a superintendent of a hospital at Brandenburg, Prussia, was born February 25, 1835. At the suggestion of an unchurchly music master, he studied theology at Halle under Tholuck, Mueller and Hupfeld, being engaged at the same time as instructor in the Franckean Institute. After having passed his examination pro candidatura, he became private tutor in the home of Von Wattenwyl, near Bern in Switzerland. In September, 1862, he placed his services at the disposal of the Berlin Missionary Society, his attention having been called to the spiritual needs of Lutherans in America. He was ordained in the Magdeburg Cathedral, and left Europe November 18, 1862. In Wisconsin he temporarily filled the place of President Bading, and accepted a call to Farmington, Wis., in 1863. From 1866 to 1870 he was professor at the Watertown Seminary and afterwards pastor of St. Matthew's, Milwaukee. From 1878 until his death (January 3, 1908) he was professor of dogmatics in the Wauwatosa Seminary. On the 8th of September, 1903, he received, on the occasion of his 25th anniversary as theological professor, the D. D. degree. His main literary work on Lutheran Dogma is being edited by his sons. He was no doubt the most eminent personality in the history of the Wisconsin Synod.

## II. The Minnesota Synod.

### [1] ORIGIN AND ORGANIZATION.

After land values in Wisconsin had increased with the growing influx of population, the stream of German and Scandinavian immigration, largely Lutheran, began to turn to Minnesota, the attractive State of forests and lakes. It seemed natural that the Wisconsin Synod would take care of these people by establishing a district synod. But although Pastor MOLDEHNKE<sup>49</sup> by his missionary trips did a great deal toward relieving the religious situation, the Wisconsin Synod was handicapped in any organized effort by its many and pressing demands at home.<sup>50</sup>

The attention of Eastern synods was called to this promising field by DR. W. A. PASSAVANT, who, journeying from Chicago to St. Paul (1856) by way of La Crosse and Red Wing, aimed to establish an English Lutheran Church.<sup>51</sup> Finding the German Lutherans predominant, he caused REV. C. F. HEYER (§ 12, 2; § 20, 3), in spite of his advanced years, to become pioneer missionary of Minnesota.

The latter arrived in St. Paul July 25, 1855, as an emissary of the Home Mission Board of the General Synod. In this city a Lutheran church (Trinity) had been previously founded (July 25, 1855) by F. W. Wier, a pupil of Gossner. Heyer who had organizing talents gathered a number of clergymen (Thompson, Mallison, Wier, Blumer, Brandt) and founded at St. Paul in the summer of 1860 the Synod of Minnesota. The largest ministerial supply to this synod came from ST. CHRISCHONA near Basel, a pilgrims' mission conducted by C. F. Spittler.<sup>52</sup>

[2] CONFSSIONAL POSITION.

At first the synod adhered to the DOCTRINAL LAXITY OF THE GENERAL SYNOD, to which it belonged until 1866. By a formal recognition of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, it claimed the name of the great Reformer, while in reality it tolerated the widest possible inconsistency between theory and practice. However, when President J. H. SIEKER<sup>53</sup> was admitted into the synod, the doctrinal standard was greatly improved. Discussions with Missouri and a closer relationship with Wisconsin helped to clear the atmosphere. At a private conference, held at St. Paul, during which PROF. S. FRITSCHER assailed the doctrinal position of the General Synod, Minnesota changed its attitude. Today it is a member of the Synodical Conference, in the founding of which (1872) it took a prominent part.

[3] RELATION WITH THE GENERAL COUNCIL.

When in 1866 the Pennsylvania Synod called all truly Lutheran synods to a conference at Reading, Pa., the Minnesota Synod was one of those which helped to form the General Council. But it soon learned, to its disappointment, that the Council did not occupy a flawless doctrinal position. This became apparent, when President Sicker, upon the request of his synod, addressed some QUESTIONS TO THE COUNCIL which forced the latter to give an explicit account of the Pittsburg declaration (1869-1870). In the name of the Minnesota Synod Sieker requested, in view of disagreements within the Council concerning the Four Points, an explanation of the final decision accepted at Pittsburg. He wish to know:<sup>54</sup>

1. Whether heretics and fundamental errorists can be admitted to our altars as communicants and into our pulpits as teachers of congregations.

2. Since the so-called distinctive doctrines, by which doctrinal opposition between the Lutheran Church and other denominations is expressed, are fundamental, whether the General Council (in No. III, 1, and No. IV, 1, 2 of the declarations made at Pittsburg) understood by “fundamental errorists” those who, with regard to these distinctive doctrines, are not in harmony with the pure doctrine of the Word of God as it is confessed and taught in our Church.

The first question was answered in the affirmative, indicating that those dissenting from Lutheran teaching were not to have fellowship of altar and pulpit. Regarding the second question, however, the Council, while admitting that the “distinctive doctrines” were of fundamental value and that those not in accord with them were “fundamental errorists,” made a distinction between malicious, persistent and intentional offenders and others who were erring unconsciously and through weakness.<sup>55</sup> The Minnesota Synod, realizing that this lukewarm position would eventually lead to unionism, severed its relation with the General Council in 1871.

[4] STATE SYNODS.

Recognizing the disadvantage of different synods simultaneously working in the same state (though they be synods of the same doctrinal position), the question of state synods was under discussion for seven years. While a part of the synod favored a change which would make it a district synod of Missouri, the majority, disapproving of a number of synods in one State, decided for State synods. President Sieker, always working toward Missouri, was called to St. Matthew’s, New York, and President A. Kuhn, being of a different opinion, submitted a proposition, worked out in conjunction with the Wisconsin Synod, which prevented a MERGER WITH MISSOURI.<sup>56</sup> Minnesota was permitted to make use of the theological seminary maintained by the Synod of Wisconsin, and the two synods FORMED THE GENERAL SYNOD.

[5] CONCERNING PREDESTINATION.

The controversy concerning predestination, which shook the very foundations of American Lutheranism in the early eighties, also affected the Minnesota Synod. With the exception of three pastors and two congregations, who withdrew from the synod during the conference which was held with the Wisconsin Synod at LA CROSSE in 1882, the ministerium decided that Article XI of the Formula of Concord did not pertain to a predestination in the larger, but in the narrower sense of the term. Like other synods, Minnesota was strengthened in its doctrinal position by this controversy.

[6] DR. MARTIN LUTHER COLLEGE.

When the project of a General Seminary, closely allied with the idea of State synods, was finally abandoned, the synod looked favorably toward the establishment of its own educational institution. The name "Dr. Martin Luther College," dedicated Nov. 10, 1884. was given to the NEW ULM institution, because the plan for its erection had been conceived on the 400th anniversary of the birth of Luther. This institution, at first merely an academy and a pro-gymnasium, was later enlarged by the addition of a practical theological seminary. The theological department was abandoned, however, after the union of the synods of Minnesota and Wisconsin. The college, which is now a teachers' seminary for the General Synod, has 9 professors and 111 scholars.

CONCLUSION. The Minnesota Synod consists of 104 pastors and professors, 113 congregations, 50 preaching stations and 25,547 communicants.

### III. The Michigan Synod.

#### [1] PRELIMINARY HISTORY.

The settlement of Wuertemberg immigrants<sup>57</sup> in 1831, not far from the present Ann Arbor, meant the beginning of Lutheranism in the State of Michigan. Complying with a request addressed to them, the BASEL MISSION sent a young man, Friedrich Schmid, a native of Wuertemberg, to minister to these people. Schmid, having arrived in Detroit after a journey of eight weeks, held the first Lutheran service in Michigan<sup>58</sup> August 18, 1833. When later F. P. Schwabe and J. H. Mann arrived, the first Michigan synod, called the Mission Synod, was founded and organized.

#### [2] LOEHE'S MISSIONARIES.

Some missionaries sent out by Loehe united with this synod. Neuendetelsau justified such a step, because the Michigan Synod had already planned to extend its work to the Indians. Convinced that this was an opportunity for combining home and foreign missions, by having the Gospel preached to the heathen by congregations surrounding them, Loehe placed his Indian mission, founded by F. A. Craemer, under the control of the Michigan Synod.<sup>59</sup> But CONFESSIONAL CONTROVERSIES soon disturbed this relation. While the Michigan Synod recognized the Lutheran Symbols,<sup>60</sup> it permitted common services for Lutheran and Reformed congregations, and did not object to the communion formula of the Prussian Union, When Pastor Dumser, who rejected the Lutheran point of view, was made missionary to

the Indians over the protest of Loehe's disciples. Pastors Hattstaedt, Craemer, Lochner and Trautmann, by a solemn documentary statement,<sup>61</sup> withdrew from the Michigan Synod (June 25, 1846). which shortly afterwards ceased to exist (cf. § 22, 3).

[3] ORGANIZATION AND CONFSSIONAL POSITION.

With the growth of congregations Schmid conceived the plan of a new organization, and communicated with Inspector Josenhans of the Basel Mission relative to a synod of Michigan modeled after the doctrinal standards of Wuerttemberg. Thus on Dec. 10, 1860 the SECOND MICHIGAN SYNOD was founded at Detroit with eight pastors under the presidency of Schmid. Two emissaries from Basel, Stephan Klingmann and Christian L. Eberhardt, laid a solid DOCTRINAL FOUNDATION, the nature of which may be judged by the following statement: "The Ev. Luth. Synod of Michigan obligates itself to all the canonical books of both the Old and New Testaments, as the sole rule and standard of faith and life, and to all the books of our Ev. Luth. Church as the true interpretation of Holy Scripture."<sup>62</sup>

[4] UNION WITH THE GENERAL COUNCIL.

Hoping to secure a better ministerial supply by joining some larger church organization, the Michigan Synod united with the General Council in 1867. At that time there was no German theological seminary within this body, and the Council proposed to assist Michigan by encouraging the students from KROPP (§ 20, 1) to take up work in the Michigan Synod.<sup>63</sup> Michigan objected to the AKRON DECLARATION (§ 18, 1) adopted by the General Council, and preferred the simpler Galesburg Rule.<sup>64</sup> It remained in this attitude of protest until 1888, when the convention of the General Council was held at Zion's Church, MONROE (a parish connected with the Michigan Synod), where two of the Council's pastors occupied Presbyterian pulpits. Since all protests proved futile, the relation of the two synods, which had extended over a period of 20 years, was terminated.

[5] UNION WITH THE GENERAL SYNOD AND THE SYNODICAL CONFERENCE.

After withdrawing from the General Council, the Michigan Synod aimed to unite with the Synodical Conference. This plan was carried out in 1891, after Michigan, together with Minnesota and Wisconsin, had founded the General Synod. In 1891 President C. A. Lederer and Director F. Huber went to Minnesota in behalf of their synod to confer concerning a prospective field for missionary activity. On this occasion they met officers of the Minnesota Synod, who contemplated a new organization for concentrated ef-

forts in the Northern field. Michigan, desirous of strengthening its influence and feeling the need of a more thorough training of its ministers, participated in the movement. Delegates were sent to a convention, held at Milwaukee, April 21, 1891, where preliminaries were arranged for the prospective organization of the General Synod. Here it was agreed that before Michigan should unite with Wisconsin and Minnesota, it should first become a member of the Synodical Conference. This was done in the summer of 1892 at the regular convention of the Synodical Conference. During the following fall the General Synod was founded and organized.

[6] DIVISION AND FOUNDING OF THE MICHIGAN DISTRICT.

In consequence of this union with the General Synod, the seminary at Saginaw was transformed into a gymnasium. This caused a DIVISION in the synod. The majority, favoring the retention as a theological seminary of the Saginaw institution, suspended the minority of 10 opposing them. The latter organized the district-synod of Michigan and continued to fulfill their obligations toward the Synodical Conference and the General Synod.

[7] UNION WITH THE AUGSBURG SYNOD.

After withdrawing from the Synodical Conference, the Michigan Synod united with the Augsburg Synod in 1897. The latter was merely a Conference, extending over a number of States, of some independent congregations. It was soon discovered that the doctrinal position of these two bodies was altogether incompatible, and in 1900 their relationship ceased.

[8]. ADJUSTMENT OF DIFFERENCES AND PRESENT STATUS.

Thus isolated, the Michigan Synod considered a return to the Synodical Conference, and, after having withdrawn the suspension of the minority, decided for the REUNION. The synod has at present 43 pastors and professors, 51 congregations. 8,290 communicants and 2,670 voting members.

#### **IV. The District Synod Of Nebraska.**

Eleven pastors of the Wisconsin Synod, residing in Nebraska, met at St. John's Church, Firth, August 29, 1901, for the purpose of withdrawing from the mother synod and of forming an independent district. To avoid misunderstandings as to the power of the President relative to the new organization, the daughter-synod was advised to unite as an independent body with the Wisconsin, Minnesota and Michigan Synods. Thus the German Ev. Luth. District Synod of Nebraska was organized, Aug. 25, 1904. During the

following year it united with the Synodical Conference. It is particularly active in its missionary work, which extends to South Dakota. According to latest statistics it has 21 ministers, 3 teachers, 22 congregations, 14 preaching stations, 800 voting members and 1,600 communicants. During the past year it raised \$40,210 for current expenses and \$25,725 for synodical purposes.

## § 26. The Slovak Synod.

This is a small body consisting of 23 pastors, 59 congregations and 8,000 communicants. It was founded in 1906 by pastors who had arrived from Hungary and others who had been trained in Missouri institutions or had come out of the Missouri Synod. They served Slovak congregations, organized a district and united with the Synodical Conference. Additional ministers from Hungary arrived later, some of them taking a theological course in Missouri seminaries. The majority of the pastors are being trained in the seminary at Springfield, Ill., where for a time a Slovak professor was a member of the faculty.

NOTE: Here closes the contribution of the Rev. O. Engel.

## § 27. Practice of the Synodical Conference.

[1] In the matter of CHURCH POLITY the local congregation holds supreme authority. The synod, being a human and not a divine institution, and existing merely for practical reasons, is the voluntary conference of congregational representatives. Entitled to vote are only pastors and laymen who speak for a congregation. Pastors *emeriti*, professors and synodical officers have merely advisory power. But even the synod, properly constituted by representatives of congregations, is only an advisory organization.<sup>65</sup> “No synodical decree is binding... it becomes so only, after the individual congregation by a formal resolution has adopted and ratified it. Should a congregation find a synodical resolution incompatible with the Word of God or contrary to the principles of expediency, it has a right to ignore or reject it” (Grosse, *Distinctive Doctrines*, p. 131). Again: “The synod has no power to call ministers or to depose them. This is properly the function of the congregation. An individual congregation may transfer its right to a synodical president or to a theological faculty, in calling a pastor or in the trial of ministers,

but the decision of a possible deposition belongs to the jurisdiction of the local congregation” (Grosse, p. 132). However, a congregation, not respecting a synodical resolution pertaining to THE CONFESSION OF FAITH, would be excommunicated, because it is the criterion of the orthodox church, “to exercise rigid discipline against those who in doctrine and life deviate from the true faith” (Grosse, p. 126). Thus the independence of local congregations includes only non-essential points, such as ceremonies, management of property, offerings, congregational customs, etc. The same applies to the trial of a minister whose life and teaching do not harmonize with the Word of God. Should the congregation fail to act against him, both pastor and flock would be duly excommunicated.

[2] DOCTRINAL DISCIPLINE. Whoever disagrees with any doctrinal statement of the synod, whether pertaining to fundamental or peripheral issues, will be excluded from synodical fellowship.

[3] Equally consistent is its attitude toward UNIONISM. Absolute harmony in all matters of doctrine is required for organic cooperation. “Open questions” (§ 23) are not recognized, unless they be questions like this: “Was the world created on a Sunday or on a Monday?” Even apart from organic union, all pulpit and altar fellowship with those differing in the slightest detail, is not permissible. Because Loehe did not agree with Missouri concerning the doctrine of the ministry, he was forced to sever his relationship. How rigidly consistent Missouri’s attitude is appears from the fact that during any doctrinal conferences between Ohio and Missouri, a common prayer is considered sinful unionism, inasmuch as there are doctrinal differences concerning predestination and conversion.

[4] SECRET SOCIETIES. Against all lodges, and especially those with religious professions, Missouri takes an uncompromising stand. Grosse (p. 55) gives the reasons for this attitude, notably the following:

In the lodge it is required to fraternize with Jews, heathen, infidels and atheists.

It is a duty to bury all lodge members as if they were saved. No Christian can join in lodge prayers offered during the meetings or at funeral services, because they are not addressed to the triune God nor to Jesus Christ, but rather to a fancied idol.



While the lodges are no religious societies, they have religious tendencies. They would make men better without Christ. Their prayers, constitutions and speeches prove that they deny the total depravity of man. They only recognize morality and their morality in no sense exceeds that of the pagan.

There are lodge members in certain Missouri congregations, especially in larger cities, but whenever a conflict arises between them and other members of the congregation, they are invariably excommunicated.

[5] It is a praiseworthy practice of the Synodical Conference that it frowns on all WORLDLY AMUSEMENTS in connection with the church. It does not resort to fairs, bazars, entertainments and parties or other worldly means of raising church funds. It has no use for Santa Clans, nor any undevotional performances in the sanctuary.

[6] Care of PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS. Being convinced that the State has no business to teach religion, not even to encourage prayers or Bible readings in the schools and considering the Sunday-school utterly inadequate for religious instruction, 1) because of the limited time, 2) because of incompetent teachers, the Synodical Conference maintains parochial schools, which are conducted by the pastors or by trained instructors. A congregation in Chicago has nine regularly employed teachers and 929 scholars. The morning recitations are in German, the afternoon studies in English. The course provides for one hour daily of Biblical history and one hour of catechism.

- 
1. According to the statistics of 1914, it has 2,928 ministers, 4,634 congregations and preaching stations, and 765,598 communicants.↵
  2. From 1888 to 1911 the English Missouri Synod was a separate unit of the Synodical Conference, but has now been merged into the Missouri Synod.↵
  3. In order to understand how Walther had been able to join Stephan, it must be borne in mind that he, as well as the majority of the ministers and candidates, lived at so great a distance from Dresden that a just estimate of Stephan was hardly to be expected of them. In Walther's presence Stephan had always felt uncomfortable. He called Walther his Judas. The following incident may be added as bearing on the psychology of the case. Rudelbach proposed to suggest Walther's name for the position of private tutor, but made this offer conditional on

- Walther's renouncing Stephan. Walther replied: "Shall I desert a man who saved my soul?" Rudelbach responded: "No, dear Walther, you need not desert him; continue your association in the name of God; but guard against idolizing a man."↵
4. In this way the congregation learned to know him, and thus, later on, called him as the successor of Haesbart.↵
  5. It first appeared in the "Eriaiiger Zeitschrift fuer Protestantismus," and was afterward reprinted in pamphlet form.↵
  6. The substance of this pamphlet, which clearly reveals Wyneken's missionary zeal, is given by Fritschel, Vol. II, pp. 130-138. A number of characteristic anecdotes of Pastor Wyneken are recited on pages 620-630 of Dr. Morris's "Fifty Years in the Lutheran Ministry."↵
  7. To Fritschel helungs the credit of having clearly exhibited, on the basis of the reports which Loehe published in "Kirchliche Mitteilungen aus und ueber Amerika" for the years 1843-1847, the important part which Loehe took in the organization of the strict Lutheran synods of America, especially of the Missouri Synod, which hail such an unexampled growth.↵
  8. Dr. Schaeffer was also professor in the seminary of the General Synod at Gettysburg, Pa., from 1857 to 1864, and in that of the General Council at Philadelphia from 1864 to 1879.↵
  9. When Loehe founded the first of his colonies in Michigan, hi.i purpose was to work among the Indians. This mission, begun by Craemer and continued by Baierlein, is admirably described by the latter in his book entitled, "Im Urwald bci den Roten Indianern;" also in Fritschels "Die Indianer Mission in Michigan," a part of his German "History of the Lutheran Church in America," pp. 198-217.↵
  10. These last two names recall the rupture between the Missouri Synod and Loehe (§ 28, 2), and the subsequent founding of the Iowa Synod (§ 29. 1).↵
  11. See § 27, 1, concerning: the principles of this constitution.↵
  12. Students from Neuendettelsau were continually sent to Fort Wayne.↵
  13. Wyneken, Sihler, Fick, Sievers, Roebbelen, Craemer, Brohm. Buenger, Fuerbringer, Lochner, Kehl.↵
  14. We should mention two other schools which, between 1860 and 1870, supplied students for the Missouri Synod. Prof. Fuerbringer says: "Walther, at his second visit to Germany, conferred with Pastor Brunn

of Nassau concerning a German pro-seminary where students might be prepared for American institutions. Brunn agreed, and, though he had only limited means, produced astonishing results. The institution was opened in 1861 and closed in 1878. During this brief time it furnished our synod with 200 young men, who studied at Fort Wayne or at Addison or at the Practical Seminary and became pastors and teachers. Brunn did not terminate his activity along this line until the need ceased to be pressing. Read his 'Monthly' and the notes from his life. Theodore Harms has also helped in this respect. Since 1866 he has sent a number of young men who were either completely trained in his Mission House or graduated to our American institutions. On the other hand, help was sent from this country for the support of the Hermannsburg Mission. Harms helped different synods for fifteen years. On account of disagreements, especially concerning the doctrine of predestination, this relationship ceased. The three volumes of Haccius' 'History of Missions' give some facts bearing on this circumstance, which, however, are not always reliable."↵

15. Hauck, R. E. 14, 198↵
16. Among these, C. Hochstelter, who wrote a history of the Missouri Synod.↵
17. A mission among negroes is part of the practical work, undertaken in common.↵
18. An actual separation did not take place until 1887, when the opponents of the Missouri doctrine of predestination founded a seminary at Northfield, Minn., under the leadership of Prof. F. A. Schmidt, the vigorous protagonist of Dr. Walther.↵
19. Synodical Report, p. 17,↵
20. Idem, p. 20.↵
21. Mueller, p. 158, 28.↵
22. Later on this statement was expressly repudiated by the Buffalo Synod.↵
23. It is true, Luther, in writing to the Bohemians, advises them to choose and ordain their own ministers, conceding to them this right on the basis of the spiritual priesthood. He availed himself of this privilege when he claimed the right of ordination hitherto vested only in the bishops. But this method was necessitated by the circumstances of the time (see Smalcald Art., p. 341, 60-72, 79). That Luther's letter to the

- Bohemians presents only one side of his views may be seen from what he writes at other places concerning self-appointed spiritual advisers.↵
24. See “Lutheraner,” Vol. X, p. 193: “If you finally demand from us that we should interpret our noble confessions according to the Scriptures, we cannot as good Lutherans comply with such a demand: in fact, we are surprised that you as Lutherans should ask for such a thing: for as Lutherans we already possess in our confessions the pure sense and unadulterated interpretation of the divine Word. And we would have to refer to the Scriptures only in case of arguments with non-Lutherans, who still might doubt the absolute scripturalness of our confessions, or in case that any interpretation of the confessions were unintelligible; but this is not the case.”↵
25. This characteristic is found in the Wisconsin “Quartalschrift,” in a series of articles signed by Professors Koehler, Augustus Pieper and Director Schaller.↵
26. “Nothing is to be treated as an open question which God has clearly answered in His Word. Whether a doctrinal question has been treated by the Symbolical Books is not decisive, but whether the answer is clearly stated in the Scriptures. Matters not contained in the Bible have no place in the Church.” (See Central District, 13, p. 23; also Grosse, p. 24.) “It is a grave aberration of Lutheran theologians to substitute for the self-interpretative Scriptures the authority of the Church... The demand made by the defenders of open questions is sacrilegious; for it really means equal claims in the church for the contradiction of the heavenly truth as for the truth itself. Of doctrines, radically contradictory to each other, only one can be correct. The other must be false” (“Lehre und Wehre,” in Grosse, p 24).↵
27. “No matter what position any doctrine may hold in the doctrinal system of the Lutheran Church, no matter in what form it may be presented, whether treated ex professo or as a casual remark, it is part of the obligation incurred by the subscriber; nothing is exempted, nothing can be excluded” (“Lutheraner,” 1858, p. 201). Grossmann: “When you subscribe to the confessions, were you aware of the fact that they declared the permanent virginity of Mary?” Walther: “Yes, I can say so in the presence of God.” Grossman: “Do you still believe this to be true doctrine?” Walther: “Yes, I can say so in the presence of God.” Grossmann: “What are your reasons for considering this a true presen-

- tation?” Walther: “Pardon me, but you have no right to ask this question.” (Beyer, “Colloquium of Milwaukee,” p. 43 sq.)↵
28. Art. VII of the Augsburg Confession: “Satis est ad verani unitatem ecclesiae consentire de doctrina evangelii,” etc. “It is enough for the true unity of the Church that the Word be preached according to the true meaning of the gospel,” etc.↵
  29. See “Kirchliche Zeitschrift,” I, 1, on the question, “What is necessary for Church unity?”↵
  30. See Walther’s book on “Kirche und Amt,” Thesis 2.↵
  31. We might use this illustration: The church building belongs to the congregation as a corporation, not to the individual communicant. No one person can claim this particular chair or pew, or the altar. For a proper legal transfer of the property the individual members do not sign away their interests, but the congregation acts as a whole, as a unit, and in this manner the matter is transacted legally and according to regulation.↵
  32. Geo. J. Fritschel, *Geschichte*, pp. 288-290.↵
  33. Brobst, *Monatshefte*, 1868, p. 296.↵
  34. Gottfried Fritschel, “Luther und offene Fragen;” Rudelbach- Guericke, *Zeitschrift*, 1867, 487.↵
  35. “For the Pope, together with the Turk, is the Antichrist, I have no doubt. You may think as you choose.” *Erl. Ausg.*, 7, 184.↵
  36. See their translation in Tressel, “The Error of Missouri.”↵
  37. These are translated in Tressel, *The Error of Missouri*.↵
  38. See Iowa, Dubuque, 1882; Ohio, Wheeling, 1881; Norwegian Theses of Union; Pieper, *Concerning Unity*.↵
  39. Abundant material for a history of this dogma is found in Mees’s “Zur Dogmeneschichte der Lehre von der Gnadenwahl;” H. W. Harms, “Sammlungen einiger Zeugnisse,” 7 brochures, 1892- 1914.↵
  40. Kraushaar, C. O. “Verfassungsformen der Lutherischen Kirche Amerikas,” Guetersloh, 1911, p. 479.↵
  41. Wolf, E. J.: “Lutherans in America,” German edition by J. Nicum. pp. 391-400, “Die Wisconsin Synode,” by Dr. A. Ernst.↵
  42. Everest, Kate A.: “Early Lutheran Immigration to Wisconsin.” *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters*, Vol. 8. pp. 289-298.↵

43. Van Alstine, N.: "Historical Review of the Franckean Synod of New York," Philadelphia, 1893, p. 10.↵
44. Dritter Bericht der Evangelischen Gesellschaft fuer die protestantischen Deutschen in Nord-Amerika, Barmen, 1847, p. 19.↵
45. "Gemeindeblatt," 1900, No. 11-13; Geschichte der Synode von Wisconsin, by Prof. J. P. Koehler.↵
46. "Palmblaetter." Orran fuer christliche Mitteilungen. Unter Mitwirkung von Dr. F. W. Krummacher, edited by Pastor F. Sander. Elberfeld, 1847, p. 105.↵
47. Dedekind, M.: "75 Jahre deutsch-evangelischer Diasporaarbeit in Nord und Sued Amerika," Barmen, 1912, p. 6.↵
48. Hoermann, A.: "Unser Northwestern College," Milwaukee, 1915.↵
49. An attractive description of this missionary journey is found in a series of articles in "Ansiedler im Westen," a monthly edited by the Berlin Society for the propagation of German missions in North America, 1863, pp. 68, 79, 90. See also "Der Lutherische Herold," 1868, No. 18, sq.; Nine Weeks in Minnesota.↵
50. Jahresbericht der Berliner Gesellschaft fuer die deutsch-evangelische Mission in Amerika, 1865, p. 8.↵
51. Gerberding, G. H.: "Life and Letters of W. A. Passavant," Greenville, 1906, pp. 361-369. Also Trabert, G. H.: "English Lutheranism in the Northwest," Philadelphia, 1914, pp. 19-22.↵
52. Mgebhoff, J.: "Geschichte der Ersten Deutschen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Synode in Texas," Chicago, 1902, pp. 12-22; C. F. Spittler und die Pilgermission St. Chrischona.↵
53. Roesener, P.: "Ehrendenkmal," West Roxbury, 1905, p. 44.↵
54. Ochsenford, S. E.: "Documentary History," pp. 334-336.↵
55. Nicum, J.: "Geschichte des Ministeriums von New York," Reading, 1888, p. 280.↵
56. Kuhn, A.: "Geschichte der Minnesota Synode," St. Louis, 1910, pp. 31-32.↵
57. "Eikhoff, A.:" "In der neuen Heimat," New York, 1884, p. 376-378; see Kohl, Reisen im Nordwesten der Vereinigten Staaten, New York, 1857.↵
58. Deutsch Amerikanische Geschichtsblaetter, herausgegeben von der Deutsch-Amerikanischen Historischen Gesellschaft von Illinois, Vol.

- 9, No. 4, pp. 122-130; Das Leben und Wirken von Pastor Schmid.↵
59. Deindoerfer, J.: "Geschichte der Iowa Synode," Chicago, 1897, p. 11-12; See Mayer, C. A.: "Geschichte der St. Lorenz Gemeinde zu Frankenmuth, Mich.," St. Louis, 1895, p. 10.↵
60. Kirchliche Mitteilungen aus und ueber Nordaraerika, 1845, Nos. 1 and 5.↵
61. Hochstetter, C.: "Geschichte der Missouri Synode," Dresden, 1885, pp. 138-142.↵
62. "Geschichte der Michigan Synode," Saginaw. 1910, p. 6.↵
63. Fritschel, G. J.: "Geschichte der Lutherischen Kirche in Amerika," Guetersloh. 1897. Vol. II, p. 411.↵
64. Ochsenford: Documentary History, p. 342.↵
65. The General Synod, the General Council and the United Synod of the South have made a similar declaration, but it refers only to the General Body, not to the district synod, while, according to the Synodical Conference, even the district synod has merely advisory functions.↵

## 8. Independent Synods.

### § 28. The Joint Synod of Ohio.

#### I. Origin and Growth of the Ohio Synod.

The State of Ohio was admitted into the Union in 1802, and as early as 1805 itinerant preachers of the Pennsylvania Synod (§ 5, 3) began to gather the numerous Lutherans emigrating at that time from Pennsylvania and Virginia. The counties of Fairfield, Terry, Pickaway, Montgomery, Stark, and Jefferson especially were thickly settled with Germans. The first two preachers in the held were George Forster and Johannes Stauch. In October 1818, the Ohio Conference was reinforced by ten additional clergymen, of whom PAUL HENKEL, the great-grandson of Gerhard Henkel (§ 16), was the most eminent. The Ohio Conference, now a part of the Pennsylvania Synod, met annually. But as it had no right to ordain ministers, but merely to license them, and as the journey to the “Mother Synod” necessary for ordination was too long and expensive, it asked for permission to found a ministerium of its own. This request being granted, it ORGANIZED ITSELF into a SYNOD SEPT. 14, 1818, AT SOMERSET, OHIO, which at its eighth convention chose the name, “The Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Ohio and Adjoining States.” This synod adopted the “proposed plan” (§§ 7. 12) in 1819, but when, in 1820, it learned that the New York Ministerium and the Synod of North Carolina had refused to join in the movement, it decided to remain independent. It took the same stand in 1822. In the latter case its delegates to the General Synod, though elected, were not sent, because the Pennsylvania Synod had announced its withdrawal.

THE PASTORS engaged in the missionary held of Ohio were either supplied by the Pennsylvania Synod or had received their training under ministers in Ohio. Now and then a candidate arrived from Germany. As many Lutherans came from the Eastern States, a tendency toward a transition to the English was soon discernible. Every effort was made to retain the German by organizing German-English and English congregations. In 1828 plans were proposed for the founding of a THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY for Ohio. The lack of ministers was keenly felt, and the task of supplying vacant charges was



reaching dimensions beyond the possibilities of the small number of ministers. During this year Wilhelm Schmidt, a candidate from Halle, was sent to Ohio by the Pennsylvania Synod. He declared himself willing (1830) to start the new seminary, and submitted a course of studies which was approved. In the fall of 1830 the seminary was founded under his leadership in the parsonage at Canton, Ohio, and was attended by two students. In 1831 it was transferred to Columbus. The same year the synod was divided into an Eastern and a Western district, to which in 1836 an English district was added.

After the death of Schmidt in 1839 (at the age of 33), Dr. Demme, of Philadelphia, was chosen as his successor. As Demme declined, Pastor C. F. SCHAEFFER (Hagerstown, Md.) took charge of the English department and (in 1841) Pastor FRIED. WINKLER (Newark, N. J.) of the German department. The latter, while visiting with Pastor Stohlmann, of New York, met two young men who had just arrived from Germany (Ernst and Burger), and prevailed on them to go with him to Columbus. In this way a relationship was established with the Fatherland and the missionary enterprise of PASTOR W. LOEHE. Although in 1840 the English District of Ohio united with the General Synod, there still remained in the synod a large number of German and English-German congregations. The influx of German students and candidates increased the confessional party of the Ohio clergy. DR. W. SIHLER became the leader of the conservatives, who objected to the un-Lutheran method of licensing ministers, to the unionized communion service ("Christ says," etc) imported from the General Synod, and the fact that not all the Lutheran confessions were adopted. They demanded a change in these features. Says Pastor Lehmann later on: "They were right in their position; but we could have cooperated with them ten years sooner, had they acted differently in their demands." Their just demands were refused, and they withdrew from the synod.

This action, together with continued attacks on the part of champions of the so-called "American Lutheranism," caused the synod to place itself more and more uncompromisingly on a confessional basis. Pastors LEHMANN AND LOY, who had grown up with the synod and were held in great esteem, took a leading part in this matter. An ever-increasing immigration from Germany and the strong Lutheranism of its great rival, the MISSOURI SYNOD, also influenced Ohio to declare, two years after the withdrawal of the Loehe party, its unconditional adherence to all the Lutheran

Symbols (1847). With the growing usefulness of the seminary, the influx of theological candidates from Germany and the absorption of the little Indianapolis Synod, the Ohio Synod grew rapidly. In the early fifties (1855, 1856, 1857 and 1858) it held a number of conferences with Missouri, and thus the influence of Missouri increased.

When in 1866 the "Mother Synod" invited all synods subscribing to the Lutheran Symbols to form the GENERAL COUNCIL, Ohio approved of the projected constitution; but it charged its delegates not to unite with the new organization, unless that body would declare its attitude concerning the "FOUR POINTS," namely, altar fellowship, pulpit fellowship, secret societies and Chiliasm. As the General Council refused to do this and as, moreover, the ENGLISH OHIO DISTRICT was admitted to the new organization, Ohio declined to unite with it. Missouri meanwhile (1866) recognized Ohio as an orthodox body, and planned the founding of the SYNODICAL CONFERENCE in whose deliberations Ohio took part (1871). It is not difficult to trace Missouri's influence in Ohio's synodical discussions. Ohio stood ready to sacrifice its identity and its seminary to a general genuinely Lutheran synod. This FAVORITE PROJECT OF WALTHER might have succeeded, had it not been for the attitude of the Wisconsin Synod. In 1877 Ohio instructed the board of its college to confer the degree of D. D. on Walther, and in 1880 called Frank, a Missourian, in preference to Prof. F. W. Stellhorn, as successor to Lehman (suffering with cancer). When the controversy concerning PREDESTINATION resulted in Loy's siding with Prof. F. A. SCHMIDT, Frank resigned, and STELLHORN, who had vigorously opposed Walther at Chicago, was called in his place. At Wheeling (1881) the synod took a stand against Missouri, and withdrew from the Synodical Conference.

During the following years OHIO GREW very rapidly, largely because the controversy with Missouri had opened for it the Western and the Northwestern territory, where some men and churches had withdrawn from Missouri and had joined the Ohio Synod as a new district. Soon the practical department of the Columbus Seminary was transferred to Afton (later to St. Paul).

In the course of time, especially through neighboring spheres of work, Ohio and IOWA came into touch with each other. As early as 1883 Prof. Gottfried Fritschel arranged for a private conference between the leaders of these two synods, but apparently without result. In 1893 a colloquium took place in Michigan City, Ind., where certain theses were adopted relative to Iowa's doctrinal position. These theses, however, did not fully satisfy either

Ohio and Iowa; they led to a second colloquium (1908). held in Toledo, Ohio, where theses were adopted which proved acceptable to all concerned. Ohio and Iowa maintain church fellowship, although Iowa's relation to the General Council is not altogether to Ohio's liking.

[2] SYNODICAL CONTROVERSIES.

[a] AGAINST UNIONISM. The Ohio Synod, being a CHILD OF THE TIME, emerged only by a slow development from a lukewarm Lutheranism to a rigid confessionalism. It was a child of that time, and shared the doctrinal position of the "Mother-Synod" (§ 8, 2), whence it received its ministerial supply. While it did not take part in the forming of the General Synod, it refrained from doing so, not on account of the doctrinal scruples which deterred Tennessee, but because it did not feel the need of a general organization. Although the "proposed plan" was acceptable to Ohio, it did not join the movement because it learned that not all synods would join the new body. In 1823 resolutions were adopted in favor of such a union, but the matter was not consummated, because it was learned that the Pennsylvania Synod was about to withdraw. Ohio shared the ambiguity of the time. As late as 1839 it was willing to unite with the Reformed. But the doctrinal STRUGGLE between "American Lutheranism," advocating the NEW MEASURES, on the one hand, and a more positive wing, on the other, clarified the atmosphere for a healthier point of view. This conflict caused the WITHDRAWAL OF THE ENGLISH DISTRICT (§ 9, 1) and its subsequent union with the General Synod. Thus the English work had to be resumed by the conservative element. This was difficult, because the English speaking clergy were generally tainted with "American Lutheranism," while the German and the German-English congregations held to a more conservative position. The synodical records bear witness to this struggle which, in its confessional tendencies, was reinforced by the influences of Loehe and his followers. THE ENGLISH CLERGY WITHDREW AGAIN in 1855. and united with the General Synod as a separate district. This occurred a THIRD TIME, when the English District became a part of the General Council. But these repeated withdrawals of the English elements STRENGTHENED THE DOCTRINAL POSITION of the Ohio Synod. In opposition to the General Synod, it declared in 1848 for allegiance to all the Symbolical Books. It drew inspiration from conferences with Missouri (1854-1858). When the GENERAL COUNCIL was organized (1866). Ohio declared its approval of the doctrinal platform adopted by it. but insisted that theoretical correctness should be followed by a consistent

practice (the “FOUR POINTS”). The General Council’s unwillingness to comply with this request caused Ohio to drift toward Missouri, which synod recognized Ohio’s position as orthodox 1868).

[b] The opposition of the Ohio Synod against SECRET SOCIETIES is all the more noteworthy because this synod, being largely composed of members of Eastern synods who had moved to the West, was confronted with the problem of lodges much more seriously than synods dealing with immigrants from the old country. The matter was first discussed in 1852 by the conference of the Western District, and since that has been repeatedly dealt with<sup>1</sup>

[c] Against MISSOURI’S DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION. As has been said, with confessionalism in the Ohio Synod, came closer relations with Missouri. When the Synodical Conference was organized in 1872, Ohio participated in the movement, and was even willing to surrender its identity to this body in case other synods would do likewise. But ten years afterwards it withdrew from the Synodical Conference (Wheeling, W. Va., 1881), because it objected to Walther’s theory of election. 119 Ohio ministers voted for and 19 against withdrawal. While the majority of the latter joined Missouri, Ohio was strengthened by the opponents of the Missourian doctrine in Minnesota, Wisconsin and Missouri.<sup>2</sup>

The difference between Missouri and Ohio may be summarized in the following FOUR POINTS:

[1] Ohio teaches that God’s decree of election is none other than the universal counsel of grace revealed in the Gospel: “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” Missouri, on the contrary, asserts that there are two entirely distinct decrees, between which an analogy is not even to be looked for.

[2] Ohio teaches that the conversion of men and their preservation in the faith are the result of the general benevolent will, and not of the decree of election, if the latter word is taken in its narrowest sense; that election, in the foreknowledge of God, presupposes faith; and that God elected INTUITU FIDEI. Missouri, on the contrary, maintains that from the general benevolent will there could at best result only a temporary faith; that a steadfast and really saving faith can flow only from election; and that God elects UNTO faith.

[3] Missouri further maintains that the reason why God has not elected all men, or why He has elected some and not others, is an unfathomable mystery; and that therefore it is impossible to harmonize the doctrine of

predestination with the universal promises of the Gospel. Ohio, on the other hand, maintains that we have here not a theological, but an anthropological or psychological mystery; that the reason why God has chosen only a few is revealed, and is found in the fact that the majority of men willfully and persistently resist His Holy Spirit; but why among human beings who are all alike totally corrupt, some thus resist and others do not — this is something which we cannot explain.

[4] Missouri charges Ohio with holding a synergistic view of conversion, because the latter denies that God has decided by an absolute decree who and how many “shall and must believe,” and thus leaves the decision, whether he will believe or not to man. Ohio strenuously repels the charge on the ground that it teaches that conversion from beginning to end is the work of the Holy Spirit, and that man can do nothing to promote it, though he can hinder it. It claims that the contrary doctrine implies an irresistible grace in conversion.

It became clear at the intersynodical conferences (1903-4) that between the two parties there was a DIFFERENCE OF VIEW WITH REGARD TO THE ANALOGY OF FAITH. Ohio asserted that we dare teach nothing concerning the decree of election in the narrower sense which would conflict with the general benevolent will of God; that is, which would be contrary to the analogy of faith, and which would fail to harmonize with the other passages of Scripture which treat of our salvation. Missouri asserted that there need not be between the different doctrines of Scripture a harmony recognizable by the theologian, because the articles of faith are not something subjective, but something objective; and that, if the passages treating of the special decree of election state something which we cannot harmonize with those passages which treat of the general benevolent will, we must take our reason captive, accept the doctrine nevertheless, and say, “Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth.” The criterion for the correct interpretation of a Scripture passage treating of the special election is not the harmony of Scripture as a whole, but only the passages which are the “sedes doctrinae” for the election of particular persons. The third conference in April, 1904, at Detroit, Mich., also resulted in a failure to reach any agreement. Dr. Stellingma, in the name of the Ohio Synod and of the Iowa Synod declared: “The Christian doctrines form for the Christian, especially for the theologian, a recognizable harmonious whole or system, which is composed of doctrines drawn from perfectly clear passages of Holy Scripture. This organic whole is the highest

norm of Scriptural interpretation, and stands above even the parallelism or comparison of the passages which treat of the same doctrine." On the other hand. Dr. F. Pieper, as the representative of Missouri, declared: "Every doctrine which is not drawn solely from the Scripture passages which expressly treat of that doctrine is not a Scriptural doctrine, but a human opinion." He asserted that it is modern theology to attempt to bring together into a system doctrines (in this case those of the general and special benevolent will of God) whose connection is not shown by the Word of God itself. Toward the removal of this difference, which lies at the root of the others, no progress was made.

[3] CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES OF THE OHIO SYNOD.

[a] It has overcome the LANGUAGE difficulty (see the exodus of the English District thrice repeated), and is now progressing harmoniously. A third of its constituency is using the English language and another third both languages. Its periodicals are "Lutherische Kirchenzeitung" and "The Lutheran Standard;" the "Theologische Zeitlaetter," are half German and half English.

[b] In regard to its THEOLOGICAL POSITION, it differs from Missouri in the matter of ELECTION AND CONVERSION. Relative to the doctrines of the ministry (Synodical History, p. 192, 202), the Antichrist, Chiliasm and "Open questions," its old synodical resolutions are in existence (originally formulated in opposition to Iowa); but at the conferences at Michigan City 0893) and Toledo (1908, 1912) Iowa and Ohio joined hands in the Toledo Theses, given in Appendix III. at the end of this book.

[c] IN ITS PRACTICE pertaining to doctrinal discipline, unionism, secret societies, worldly methods in the church, and parochial schools, it shares the attitude of Missouri (§ 27), although it may be somewhat less rigid (§ 27, 3) in individual cases.

[4] ITS INSTITUTIONS AND MISSIONARY ACTIVITIES. [i] EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

[a] THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES. A. The seminary at COLUMBUS, OHIO (the theoretical seminary of the synod) shares the buildings of Capital University of that city. Faculty: Dr. F. W. Stellhorn, Dr. G. H. Schodde, Dr. K. Pfeiffer, Dr. Theo. Mees. Dr. R. C. H. Lenski. — B. The Practical Seminary at ST. PAUL was originally connected with Columbus, separated from it in 1885, transferred to Afton, Minn., and then permanently located at St. Paul in 1892. A pro-seminary, offering a four years course, is connected with it.

This institution is under the management of Prof. Dr. H. Ernst, assisted by a faculty of five professors.

[b] COLLEGES. A. CAPITAL UNIVERSITY, Columbus, was founded in 1850. The professors of the seminary, together with seven other professors, constitute its faculty. Prof. Otto Mees is president. A majority of the students prepare for the ministry. This institution conferred the degree of Doctor of Divinity on Dr. Walther at the suggestion of the synod (1877), a few years before the controversy with Missouri concerning election arose. Afterwards the same degree was conferred on Prof. F. A. Schmidt. — B. HEBRON ACADEMY, Hebron, Neb., founded 1911. It is a co-educational institution, with a faculty of three professors. — C. Melville Academy (founded in 1914), Melville, Saskatchewan, Canada, preparatory to the pro-seminary at St. Paul, has three teachers, 35 students (H. Schmidt, Principal).

- c. The Teachers' Seminary of the synod is located at Woodville, Ohio, and has six professors. Prof. K. Hemminghaus is president. The Ohio Synod has 135 parochial schools, which are being served by specially prepared teachers of both sexes.

## [2] MISSIONARY WORK.

[a] HOME MISSIONS. In this respect Ohio has been very active. After new congregations had been founded without any definite plan for several decades, a mission board of five members was organized in 1884, and was entrusted with the management of a fund contributed for this purpose. It considers applications and aids worthy enterprises. At its meetings of the District Synods missionaries from different fields present reports of their work. These furnish the basis for the president's recommendations concerning possible assistance to be rendered. During its existence of twenty-nine years the board has sent missionaries into half of the states of the Union. In 1914 it collected \$80,140 for this purpose. Besides this fund, it maintains a fund managed in the interest of poor congregations who borrow without paying interest for the building of new churches.

NOTE: Special mention should be made of the work done by Ohio in the northwestern section of Canada — Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. After an activity of ten years (see Almanac for 1915), it has a Canadian Synod consisting of 55 clergymen and 150 congregations

and preaching stations. The ministers for this field come from the practical seminary at St. Paul, Minn.

[b] FOREIGN MISSIONS. Up to 1912 the Ohio Synod sent its missionary contributions to Hermannsburg; but, after purchasing from that society a portion of its field and from the London Missionary Society the territory adjacent to it, this body now carries on its own work from the central station of Rajampt, India, with Pastor Jesse P. Pflueger as its representative.

[c] A mission among the NEGROES has been established at "Baltimore, Md.

[d] INNER MISSION work is being done by the congregations at Toledo, Pittsburgh and Columbus in these cities.

### **Biographical Notes.**

PROF. W. F. LEHMANN was for many years influential in the synod. After Dr. Winkler's resignation, he was for thirty-four years the head of the Columbus Seminary and also a member of the college faculty. In 1859 he became editor-in-chief of "Die Lutherische Kirchenzeitung," which position he held until his death. He was not a polemical, but rather an irenic writer, cautious and deliberate in his method. Born at Markkroningen, Wuerttemberg, in 1820, he came with his parents to Philadelphia as a mere lad of four. Pastor Demme took an interest in him, and sent him to Columbus, where he studied theology amid the privations of extreme poverty, living on 46 cents per week, sleeping on sacks filled with straw, and subsisting on corn-bread and potatoes. In 1840 he took charge of eight congregations in Fairfield County, Ohio, and later had a successful pastorate at Somerset, Ohio. In 1847 he began his long and honorable career as professor in the seminary at Columbus. His death occurred in 1880.

PROF. MATTHIAS LOY, D. D. Probably the strongest personal influence in the settlement of the doctrinal positions of the Joint Synod was that of Dr. Loy. Born in Pennsylvania March 17, 1828, of a Roman Catholic father and a Lutheran mother, and reared in lowly circumstances, he came as a young man to Ohio, graduating from the Columbus seminary in 1849. The only pastorate he served was at Delaware, Ohio. From 1866 until he became Professor Emeritus ten years ago, he was continuously a professor in both the college and seminary at Columbus. He was always the exponent of positive confessionalism, and in a practical way exercised his influence



chiefly as the editor of "The Lutheran Standard" from 1864 to 1891 and of the "Theological Magazine" from 1881 to 1888. He published a series of useful books, among them, "Sermons on the Gospels," "Sermons on the Epistles," "An Essay on the Ministry," "Christian Prayer," "The Augsburg Confession," "The Doctrine of Justification." The details of his career are recited in a graphic manner in his "Story of My Life" (1905). He died in 1915.

PROF. FREDERICK WILLIAM STELLHORN, D.D. The subject of this sketch was born in Hanover October 2, 1841, and was educated at Fort Wayne and St. Louis, the chief institutions of the Missouri Synod. After serving pastorates in St. Louis and Indiana, he became professor in the college of the Wisconsin Synod in 1869 and at Ft. Wayne in 1874. In 1881, as the result of the predestination controversy, he severed his connection with the Missouri Synod, and accepted a position in the college and seminary of the Ohio Synod at Columbus. For a number of years he was editor of "Die Lutherische Kirchenzeitung," and has been the sole editor of "Theologische Zeitblätter" since it was established in 1881. He is preeminently the scholar of the Joint Synod, and has published commentaries of the Gospels, the Acts, the Pastoral Epistles, and Romans. He also wrote a "Dictionary of N. T. Greek," a "Commentary on Biblical Proof passages in the Catechism," etc. He is professor of Dogmatics, Exegesis and Ethics in the seminary at Columbus.

PASTOR H. A. ALLWARDT, D. D., was born March 2, 1840, at Wachendorf, Mecklenburg-Schworin, and came to America in 1853. He studied in the practical seminary of the Missouri Synod (1858), the gymnasium at Ft. Wayne and the seminary at St. Louis. He was pastor at Crystal Lake, Wis. (1865-1873), and at Lebanon, Wis. (1874-1910). He protested against Walther's doctrine of predestination, at first privately (1878-79), then publicly, especially at the Chicago conference in 1880 and in "Altes und Neues" (1880), "Zeitblätter" and "Kirchenzeitung" (1885). He was suspended from synodical fellowship by the president of his synod, which action was ratified by the synod itself, after he had been warned that fraternal fellowship with him would cease, should he fail to retract his views. Then in November, 1881, Allwardt and a number of insurgent Missouri pastors founded their own conference. The Northwestern District was formed in May, 1883, Allwardt being its president until the division of 1890. He was president of the Wisconsin District until 1899. The degree of Doctor of Di-

vinity was conferred upon him by Capital University in 1898. He was president of the board of Ohio's practical seminary at Afton and St. Paul from 1884 to 1910. He continued his battle against Missouri, especially at inter-synodical conferences (1903-1906) until his death. Agreeing with Missouri in everything but the doctrine of election, he protested against the "Michigan Theses" (1893), which encouraged union with Iowa. He was one of the signers of the "Toledo Theses" of 1907. Convinced of the truth of Lutheranism, he took a firm and fearless stand, which made him the object alike of strong enmity and enthusiastic admiration. His death occurred in the midst of his labors April 9, 1910.

PRESIDENT C. H. SCHUETTE, D. D., was born in Vorrel, Hanover, June 17, 1843. He emigrated to America in 1854, and received his classical and theological training at Capital University (1859-72). From 1872 to 1894 he was professor of mathematics at this school, and became theological professor in the seminary in 1881. Since that date he has been General President of the Ohio Synod. In this capacity he has collected more than \$400,000 for educational work. He is the author of the following books: "Church Member's Manual," "State, Church and School," "Before the Altar" (a work on liturgies), and "Exercises unto Godliness," the last containing two brief sermons for each Sunday and Festival Day of the Church Year and also daily morning and evening devotions.

DR. GEORGE H. SCHODDE. Dr. Schodde was born in Pittsburg, Pa., April 15, 1854, and was educated at Columbus, Tuebingen and Leipzig (Ph. D.). Since 1882 he has been professor of Greek in the college at Columbus and since 1895 also a member of the seminary faculty. He has published a number of translations and other books, and has contributed to many philological and theological journals. For twenty years he was one of the editors of "The Lutheran Standard," and for ten years edited the Magazine. He is a trusted interpreter of the Scriptures.

## **§ 29. The Iowa Synod.**

Contributed by the Rev. Prof. Geo. J. Fritschel.

### **1. The Origin of the Iowa Synod.**

The attitude of the pastors near Saginaw, Mich., brought about a rupture between Loehe and the Missouri Synod. At the instance of Pastor Cloeter, of Saginaw, President Wyneken in 1853 came to Saginaw, and at a conference the two adherents of Loehe (Inspector GEO. GROSSMANN, of Saginaw, and JOHANNES DEINDOERFER, pastor at Frankenhilf) were given the alternative either to discontinue the seminary founded by Loehe, or to turn it over to the Missouri Synod. Failure to do so, would cause the institution to be considered "schismatical." The same demand was forwarded to Loehe in writing by Wyneken as president of the synod. At the same conference Wyneken expressed the idea that, should the adherents of Loehe emigrate to a territory not yet occupied by Missouri (Iowa for instance), conflict might be avoided. With the consent of Loehe, his adherents, a little party of 22, journeyed to Dubuque, Ia., in the fall of 1853 in order to establish a new mission in that state, which was just then being opened to immigration. On account of lack of funds only a part of these people, under the leadership of Deindoerfer, went sixty miles farther northwest and founded the colony of "St. Sebald at the Spring." Grossmann and the five students who had accompanied him (the others had become teachers in the Missouri Synod) found DUBUQUE a promising field for their activity. Shortly afterwards Sigmund Fritschel and M. Schueller arrived from Neuendettelsau, and in conjunction with Grossmann and Deindoerfer, organized the Iowa Synod at St. Sebald, Aug. 24. 1854. All persons who have described the beginning of this synod agree that no synod was ever founded under more discouraging circumstances. Deindoerfer lived at first in a small deserted log cabin, and afterwards, to avoid freezing, moved into the house of the first settler in St. Sebald, whose solitary room was divided into two parts by a board partition, so as to accommodate the two families. Repeatedly in the seminary the last dollar had been expended, and the last piece of bread eaten, while no one knew whence more was to be obtained. At one time the final payment of \$1,000, together with interest of \$100, became due, and there was no money in sight when the payment had to be made. Loehe, who was to send this sum, could not raise it. But somehow (from some unexpected source) the exact amount arrived two days before the debt became due. Many had turned away from Loehe; the treatment of the mission friends in Europe at the hands of Missouri ALIENATED Germany's INTEREST in the American field. Moreover, Loehe, by his strong confessional attitude, had offended many within the State Church. Hence less money was placed at Loehe's disposal

with which to carry on the work. Retrenchment became imperative. The Dubuque Seminary had to serve at the same time as a school, a church and the director's residence. Once it had to be temporarily closed for lack of funds, and S. Fritschel took charge of a mission that had formerly been supplied from Dubuque.

## 2. Growth of the Synod.

The new synod, realizing its lack of experience, did not at once attempt to formulate a CONSTITUTION. Instead of this, an explicit constitution for congregations gives expression to a clear confessional basis.

Pastor GRABAU came to DUBUQUE in September, 1855, to confer with the members of the Iowa Synod. As Walther and Wyneken had gone to see Loehe, he had done likewise in 1853. Iowa (like Loehe) was willing to make common cause with both Missouri and Buffalo, because the doctrinal differences (as they appeared at that time) did not seem to justify a schism. At Grabau's request Iowa took charge of the congregations (connected with Buffalo) around Madison, Wis., which Grabau was unable to supply with ministers. Thus Iowa gained MISSIONARY TERRITORY in southern Wisconsin.

But the synod's growth was slow. The seminary graduated one student in 1855 (C. Beckel). Loehe, having transferred his seminary to Neuendettelsau, whence FRIEDRICH BAUER, who devoted all his time to the instruction of the future missionaries, sent the following: Doerfler, 1855; J. J. Schmidt (Indian missionary), 1856; Burk, 1856; Gottfried Fritschel and J. List, 1857. On account of the high cost of living in the city, the seminary at Dubuque was transferred to St. Sebald, where a part of the provisions could be raised on the seminary farm. There Grossmann and some of the older students erected a simple frame house, which, until 1871 accommodated the students and the families of two professors. Prof. S. Fritschel had taken charge of the Buffalo Synod congregation at Detroit at the request of Grabau (1856), and Doerfler, under similar circumstances, of the church at Toledo, O. (1857). But when the first number of the "Kirchenblatt" was issued with the declaration of 1856 concerning the synod's attitude toward the Confessions, and when (in 1858) Iowa took a stand against Missouri's attitude concerning Chiliasm, BUFFALO, after some fruitless conferences, joined the opposition AGAINST IOWA. The synod now recalled S. Fritschel to the seminary, where he remained until his death. Doerfler and his congregation, having been tyr-

annized by Rev. Hochstetter of the Buffalo Synod, united with Iowa. The congregations founded by Iowa in the vicinity of Detroit by students of Iowa remained loyal to it, thus securing for that synod an eastern territory.

In spite of many obstacles and constant opposition on the part of Missouri, the synod grew, slowly at first, but eventually at a rapid pace. In 1875 it had more than a hundred ministers. During a boom the Dubuque property had risen in value, and it was generally supposed that its sale would furnish substantial initial payment for the purchase of a farm at St. Sebald. But one of those financial crises, which recur in this country with ominous regularity, foiled all these calculations. The house, in fact, could not be sold at all. Thus the synod was loaded with a debt of \$6,000, which, on account of small revenues, increased to \$7,000 in 1860. Professor S. FRITSCHEL was sent to Germany to RAISE FUNDS. He was cordially received, not only in Bavaria, but also in Hesse, Breslau, Pomerania, Mecklenburg and particularly at Dorpat, Riga, and St. Petersburg. Here Frau von Helffreich became a warm friend of Iowa's mission work, and a lady of nobility, Fraeulein von Schwarz ("Aunt Augusta"), volunteered to become matron of the Wartburg. When Fritschel returned in October, 1861, the debt had been lifted, and there was a nucleus on hand for an endowment fund.

Iowa had desired at all times to live harmoniously with Buffalo and Missouri. But both of these synods, representing the traditionalistic principle (§ 20, II, 1), continued to attack Iowa's doctrinal position. Iowa, on the other hand, recognized Missouri's Lutheranism, merely objecting to its narrowness of interpretation, which seemed incompatible with Article VII of the Augsburg Confession. Eventually some of Iowa's pastors began to doubt the correctness of their synod's position. This caused Prof. S. Fritschel to be sent to Germany, not only to represent the synod at the twenty-fifth anniversary of Neuendettelsau, but to CONFER WITH GERMAN THEOLOGIANs, still recognized by Missouri, regarding the differences between the synods. The University of Rostock refused to pass an opinion, but Christiani, Harless, Luthardt, Muenkel, Guericke and the University of Dorpat expressed their views and advised the synod. In a general way they agreed with Iowa, but criticized a few points. Their views were submitted to the synod, meeting at Toledo, Ohio, in 1866, together with a paper discussing the question: "What is essential to church unity?" See the thesis in Deindoerfer's *Geschichte*, p. 127. The Chronicles of the Iowa Synod offer this comment:

“Some of these opinions, especially those of Dr. Christiani, of Riga, and those of the Dorpat University, give an approving opinion concerning the confessional position of our synod; others, like Harless and Muenkel, especially criticized our method of making distinctions between the obligatory and nonobligatory doctrines of the Symbols, by the formal distinction of confessional and condemnatory declarations and theological amplification and interpretation. The synod, having considered these criticisms, decided to abandon this method, which was so likely to mislead and also to be misinterpreted. Dr. Muenkel insisted that all essential articles were to be considered obligatory; whatsoever is essential remains so, even though the Symbols mention it only casually. This remark of Muenkel was found to be complemented by the opinion of Dorpat that certain things, though not inherently essential in themselves, may become so by their connection with fundamental doctrines. Thus advised, the synod corrected its position in such a way that the formal distinctions hitherto recorded were given up in the generality, while the principle that a distinction between things obligatory and nonobligatory in the Symbols must be made was retained.”

In order to reach a state of fraternal cooperation, Iowa, at the same meeting, proposed to hold a colloquy with Missouri. This was held at Milwaukee, Wis., Nov. 13-18, 1867.

Iowa was represented by President Grossman, G. and S. Fritschel and Mr. Becker. The Missourians sent Prof. Walther, Pastors Sihler, Huegli and Hochstetter, and laymen Stutz, Wassermann, Bierlein and Koch. Much time was spent in the discussion of the order in which the topics should be presented. Finally it was agreed to begin with the question of the SYMBOLS. Iowa denied that it occupied the position imputed to it by the Missourians. When the question was reached whether every word of the Symbols was obligatory, Walther replied: “Everything pertaining to doctrines.” His attention was called to the dogma of Mary’s perpetual virginity. S. Fritschel proved from his Toledo Theses<sup>3</sup> that the old dogmaticians agreed with Iowa. Walther then agreed that there was a difference between fundamental and peripheral documents. This brought the two sides closer together; and this agreement was furthered by his distinction between doctrines of faith and problems. The two parties reached an agreement, by which both declared that all the obligatory doctrines of faith contained in the confessions must be considered.

Then the doctrine of the “LAST THINGS” came up for discussion. Iowa denied that it as a synod had established a definite doctrine concerning Chiliasm. The expression, “our Chiliasm,” had been used to designate the theory held by individuals concerning Rev. 20, which the synod did not consider contrary to the analogy of faith. This theory had been held by the majority in 1858, but was now (1867) held by probably only a small number. Gottfried Fritschel, who had presented the paper on this subject in 1858, declared that he would withdraw a number of arguments which he had used at that time, and that he would confine his views to the plain statements of Rev. 19 and 20. In this Scripture, he maintained, merely the “that” was essential to him, and he did not venture to express any opinion in regard to the “how.” Any interpretation which did not square with the analogy of faith must be rejected. For his part, he would not even assert that Christ’s appearance for the purpose of crushing the Anti-christ was to be visible; but should any hold that it would be visible, like Paul’s vision near Damascus, he would find no violation of the analogy of faith in that view. This satisfied Walther, who declared that, while he considered the subtle Chiliasm of Spener, Brenz, etc., erroneous, he would class it among things problematical. As long as the matter was submitted “problematic,” the case was not necessarily heretical. Thus there was a general rapprochement. But the interpretation of Rev. 20:4, 5 led them apart. They could not agree as to whether the resurrection mentioned there was of a physical or spiritual nature. As the delegates of Iowa had to attend the first convention of the General Council, the negotiations came to a close.

Iowa had entered into friendly relations with the neighboring synods of MINNESOTA, WISCONSIN and ILLINOIS. That these synods had gradually been receding from the unionistic basis to solid principles of Lutheranism was, to some extent, due to Iowa’s influence. But if even the pastors of the Iowa Synod were shaken in their convictions by the attacks of Missouri, it was only reasonable that these synods should begin to view Iowa’s moderate position as not “genuinely Lutheran,” and look for union with Missouri, which offered better advantages than the poor Synod of Iowa.

The Synod of Iowa had observed with satisfaction the growth of Lutheran consciousness in the districts of the General Synod. After the rupture of 1866, it had participated in the discussions at Reading, Pa., and at Ft. Wayne, Ind., approving, as did Ohio and Missouri, the confessional position of the General Council. It had even decided to join the General Council; but

because that body refused to draw the practical conclusions by declaring itself relative to the "Four Points," it subsequently reversed its decision. However, Iowa continued to sustain friendly relations with the Council, and retained an advisory voice in the deliberations of that body. This relation has led to increasingly cordial feelings between the two synods. Iowa, instead of publishing its own Hymnal, took part in the editing of the "Kirchenbuch." The two Fritschels contributed valuable articles on the problems of the day to the "Brobstsche Monatshefte."

In 1873 at Davenport, the synod was divided into the Eastern and Western Districts. At this meeting the differences between Iowa and Missouri were discussed, and Iowa formulated its position in the Davenport Theses (see Appendix). The constitution was revised,<sup>4</sup> the terminology of the formula of ordination being substituted for the so-called "Stiftungsparagraph" (see above). Passavant's suggestion that the synod purchase the abandoned property of Mendota College for seminary purposes was acted upon favorably. This caused the transfer of the WARTBURG SEMINARY to Illinois in 1874 and the subsequent opening of a new missionary field. In the same year Iowa came to the MOST CRITICAL point in its development. While the older ministers, who were largely trained at Neuendettelsau, wished to adhere to the doctrines of their teachers in that institution, and suspected in the Davenport Theses a movement toward Missouri, the younger ministers, desiring harmony, were in favor of following Minnesota, Illinois and Wisconsin into the Missouri fold. The REV. J. KLINDWORTH, without showing his hand, succeeded in organizing both parties, his aim being to displace the leaders. The Missouri faction ( Schieferdecker) entered into negotiations with Walther. To aid this movement, the Norwegian, Prof. F. A. Schmidt, then at St. Louis, published a series of articles in "Der Lutheraner," in which he tried, on the basis of so-called "documentary proofs," to prove the dishonest character of Iowa's pastors and congregations. They were reprinted under the title. "Iowas Missverstaendnisse und Bemaentelungen." On the other hand, Inspector Bauer sent a circular letter to the Neuendettelsau graduates, and addressed a "Denkschrift" to the synod, pleading for a return to the original position of Iowa. At the synodical meeting at Madison, Wis., a lengthy discussion disclosed the attitude of Klindworth. In the Madison Theses<sup>5</sup> the synod declared its adherence to the synod's original position, according to which, as an organization, it placed itself above all factions on the general Lutheran position. The two Fritschels, who, actuated by Chris-



tian forbearance, had refused to reply to Schmidt's personal method of attack, were instructed to publish a documentary presentation in "Kirchliche Zeitschrift," the title to be "Iowa and Missouri."

At the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Iowa Synod (1879) Inspector Joh. Deinzer (successor to Bauer) was present, and after expressing his entire approval of Iowa's final attitude, promised continued support from Germany. This assurance was all the more welcome, because of the increasing stream of immigration into Iowa's territory. Help arrived in the form of students educated, or at least prepared in part, at Neuendettelsau, Hesse (Pastor Schedler of Dreihausen), Mecklenburg (Gotteskasten), Hanover, and later by Pastor Janssen of Strackholt. Thus Iowa was able to look after the spiritual needs of western immigrants. Having passed through this doctrinal crisis with the loss of twenty ministers, who for the most part united with Wisconsin,<sup>6</sup> the synod's growth was steady and rapid.

There is little to report about Iowa's movements in recent history. The synod was slightly affected by the controversy concerning predestination, which agitated Missouri in 1880. In the theses of St. Sebald (1881) and Dubuque (1882), Iowa declared against Walther's construction. Many articles in "Kirchliche Zeitschrift" illumined the doctrine from various points of view.

After the Ohio Synod had withdrawn from the Synodical Conference, the Iowa Synod sought to establish FRATERNAL RELATIONS WITH THE OHIO brethren. Gottfried Fritschel arranged a conference of the synodical leaders, who met at Richmond, Ind., and recorded their agreement in the Richmond Theses."<sup>7</sup> But a union was not effected because of former prejudices. Ohio proposed a colloquium in 1887, which, however, did not take place until 1893 in Michigan City, Ind. But Ohio's former Missourians, especially Allwardt and Klindworth, prevented the adoption of the articles of agreement that had been proposed. These were revised in 1909 at Toledo, Ohio, and then adopted by both synods. (See Appendix.)

In 1896 the Texas Synod,<sup>8</sup> in the interest of its missionary work, became a district of the Iowa Synod. At the fiftieth anniversary of the Iowa Synod, meeting at Dubuque, Ia., Deindoerfer only, among the founders was still living.

Iowa's territory extends from western Pennsylvania to the Rocky Mountains and from the northern boundary line of the United State down to Texas. During its existence of 60 years the synod has had but three presi-

dents (Grossmann. Deindoerfer, Richter) and four secretaries. Since 1893 the president receives an official salary, and devotes his entire time to the affairs of the synod.

### **3. Characteristic Features of the Iowa Synod.**

[a] CONSTITUTION. In this respect the synod is very explicit. The lowest circle is formed by the CONGREGATION, which, in turn, is the highest tribunal in all matters pertaining to congregational affairs. For the settlement of controversies which a congregation is unable to adjust, the aid of synodical officers may be solicited. The synod, however, has merely an advisory voice in congregational affairs, and has no power beyond the weight of its arguments. An offending congregation, unwilling to reform, can be punished only by exclusion from synodical fellowship. The different congregations, together with their pastors, constitute the SYNOD, at whose gatherings congregations, actually connected, have a vote, while others have merely the privilege of the floor. All pastors have a seat in the synod and also the right to vote. Its membership being widely scattered, the synod is divided into different DISTRICTS, which decide their affairs so far as they pertain only to their territory. The whole synod meets tri-annually (since 1888) as “A CONVENTION OF DELEGATES,” at which time general matters, such as missions, extensions, publications, institutions, etc., are submitted for discussion. Since its very beginning Iowa has arranged a system of voluntary contributions. On certain days all congregations receive offerings for specific objects. Special collections are taken only for extraordinary purposes.

In CASE OF COMPLAINTS appeal may be made to the synod at large, but the decision is binding only if it receives the consent of the parties.

[b] Having been founded by the liturgical genius of Loehe, the synod has, from the start, laid great emphasis on LITURGICAL FORMS of worship, private confession in addition to public confession, and the examination of those applying for reception into the congregation (catechumenate). But in the case of many congregations the effort of the synod in this direction met with little appreciation, and, according to the judgment of Deindoerfer, too great insistence on these matters often hindered the synod's growth.

[c] Oversight of the doctrines and practices of pastors and congregations was provided for from the beginning, by a quadrennial VISITATION of every congregation by the president or some special officials of the synod. Details

of this visitation can be found in the “order of visitation,” as given by Deindoerfer, pp. 280-284.

[d] From its very beginning Iowa has taken a stand against SECRET SOCIETIES that make religious pretensions. It demanded a similar attitude, at least in principle, from the General Council, declaring itself satisfied with the Pittsburg Declaration (see “Four Points”). In the matter of practice it agrees with Missouri and Ohio.

#### **4. Educational Institutions.**

In a sense, the Iowa Synod is the outgrowth of the seminary which was transferred from Saginaw, Mich., to Dubuque, Iowa. After its removal to St. Sebald in 1857. it was known as “The Wartburg Seminary.” It developed under many hardships, being inadequately supported by the congregations and the subsidies from Germany and Russia. The establishment of a separate college at Galena, Ill., previously the preparatory department, was somewhat premature. In 1874 the seminary was removed to Mendota, Ill., and finally returned to Dubuque (1889), where at present, in commemoration of the Reformation Jubilee (1917), an imposing structure is being erected. The first president of the institution was Inspector Grossmann, joined later by the two BROTHERS FRITSCHEL. After the transfer to Mendota, Grossmann devoted his time to the Teachers’ Training School at Waverly, Ia. The two Fritschels carried on the seminary work almost without any assistance for many years. After their death (1889 and 1900) Wilhelm Proehl and afterwards Max Fritschel became presidents. The institution was altogether German at first, but is gradually and increasingly adding English departments. It has a practical and a theoretical course, each extending over a period of three years. The faculty consists of: Max Fritschel, president; Dr. M. Reu; Geo. J. Fritschel; G. J. Zeilinger. A fifth professor is to be elected in 1916.

WARTBURG COLLEGE dates from the year 1868, when it started as an independent institution at Galena, Ill. In consequence of the Klindworth difficulties, it was removed to Mendota in 1875, and conducted there as a preparatory department of the seminary. In 1885 it was combined with the Teachers’ Seminary at Waverly, Ia. Since 1894 it has been located at Clinton, Ia. The TEACHERS’ SEMINARY at Waverly, Ia., founded in 1879, is conducted in connection with an academy and a pro-seminary. Institutions of

different DISTRICTS are located at Sterling, Neb., Eureka, S. Dak., and Seguin, Tex.

## **5. Missionary Activities.**

The synod has at all times considered it of utmost importance and worthy of strenuous efforts to organize scattered Lutherans into congregations. Special funds for missions and the support of missionaries were formerly unknown, but since 1879 this matter has been definitely arranged. At first there was a GENERAL BOARD and later district boards which conducted the work of missions. Loehe also encouraged the work of foreign missions in the Iowa Synod. An INDIAN MISSION was organized, the financial support for which was received from Germany. But on account of Indian insurrections during the Civil War, this work had to be abandoned. (See Geo. J. Fritschel, History pp. 347-359). When the General Council began its missionary labors in India, Iowa took part in the enterprise. Later it cooperated with Neuendettelsau in the mission of New Guinea. Some individual gifts are being contributed to the Council, to Leipzig and to Hermannsburg. The Synod has ORPHANS' HOMES at Waverly, Ia., Toledo, Ohio, and Muscatine, Ia. The orphans' homes are connected with HOMES FOR THE AGED.

## **6. Publications.**

Like other synods, Iowa has a number of publications: "Kirchenblatt" (semimonthly); "Kirchliche Zeitschrift" (monthly); "Jugendblatt;" "Lutheran Herald" (monthly); it has recently devoted considerable attention to Sunday school literature. The Wartburg Publishing House has its offices at Chicago and its press equipments and storehouse at Waverly, Ia.

## **Biographical Notes.**

THE FRITSCHEL FAMILY. The BROTHERS FRITSCHEL, descending from an ancient family of armor-makers of Nuremberg (which can be traced back to 1632), were the first theologians of their family. Their parents belonged to the circle of believers in touch with Loehe. The two brothers received their training under Bauer and Loehe at Nuremberg and Neuendettelsau; Gottfried was sent to Erlangen, where for a year he studied under Hofmann, Thoma-sius and Harnack. In 1853 Sigmund emigrated to America, took part in the

organization of the Iowa Synod and assisted Grossmann in the work of the seminary. Financial support being meager, he took charge of a congregation at Platteville, Wis., whence he started successful missionary work. Later, at the urgent request of Grabau, he served the Buffalo Synod congregation at Detroit and joined the Buffalo Synod. In 1857 the younger brother was called to the seminary, and Sigmund returned to it a year later. The two brothers worked side by side most effectively at St. Sebald, Iowa, and at Mendota, until they were parted by death. Their influence extended far beyond the bounds of the synod whose leadership made them famous. Gottfried died at Mendota, Ill., in 1889, and Sigmund at Dubuque in 1900. Both were prolific writers and regular contributors to "Kirchenblatt," "Brobstische Monatshefte" and "Kirchliche Zeitschrift." Gottfried is the author of the "Passionsbetrachtungen," "History of Indian Missions in the 17th Century," and a series of pamphlets. At the twenty-fifth anniversary of the synod both received the degree of D. D. from Muhlenberg College. Their sons, too, have become prominent in the Iowa Synod. The two oldest sons of Sigmund died soon after their ordination. John Fritschel has been professor in the college since 1888 and its director since 1904. His brother Max has been professor in the seminary since 1892 and its director since 1906. Gottfried's son, George J. Fritschel, having served congregations at West Superior, Wis., Galveston, Texas (causing the subsequent union of the Texas and Iowa Synods), Loganville and Fond du Lac, Wis., now occupies his father's chair in Wartburg Seminary, vacated by the death of Prof. Wm. Proehl. He is the author of a German "History of the Lutheran Church in America" and of "Schriftlehre von der Gnadenwahl." His brother Hermann is the successful manager of Passavant's charitable institution; Gottlob is pastor at New Hampton, Iowa, and Conrad a teacher at the college at Clinton, Iowa.

GEORGE MARTIN GROSSMANN, born in Hesse (1823), graduated from the Teachers' Seminary of Friedberg at the age of 19 and served that institution as assistant teacher. Later he was instructor in the private schools of Rotheim and Lollar. Here he was converted through the influence of Pastor Di-ffenbach, and placed himself, though married, at the disposal of Loehe for the American service. After studying theology at Erlangen. he went to Saginaw, Mich., as founder and inspector of the Teachers' Seminary. After the organization of the Iowa Synod, he was president of that body for thirty-nine years. He was president of the seminary until 1875. when, on account

of his health, he resigned for a time, but, having recovered, started the Teachers' Seminary. From 1885 to 1895 he was also president of Wartburg College at Waverly, Ia. He retired in 1894, and died three years later on the forty-third anniversary of the synod which he had served in many ways.

JOHANNES DEINDOERFER, D. D. born, 1828. at Rosstall, near Neuendettelsau, received his theological education at Nuremberg and Neuendettelsau. On September 14, 1851, he was (like Grossman and S. Fritschel) ordained as "shipchaplain" by Pastor Meinel of Hamburg. He was pastor of a congregation ("Frankenhilf") near Saginaw. Together with Grossman, he emigrated to Iowa in 1853, and became pastor of "St. Sebald at the Spring" (Iowa), serving there until 1856; pastor at Madison, Wis., until 1860; at West Union, Iowa, until 1865; Toledo, O., until 1870; Defiance, O., until 1889; Ripon, Wis., until 1894. As long as Grossmann was president, Deindoerfer served as vice president, and succeeded him as the salaried president. For sixteen years he was also president of a district. His many talents and his able pen were devoted to the service of the synod, whose distinctive features he emphasized as a true disciple of Loehe. Noteworthy among his books are his "Geschichte der Iowa Synode," and also his three "Denkschriften," 1864, 1879, 1904.

F. RICHTER, D. D. (General President), born in 1852, is the son of a pastor in Saxony. Private tutoring and a course in the gymnasium preceded his theological training, which he received at St. Sebald (1870-1874). A visit of S. Fritschel at his father's house was the cause of his emigration. He attended the universities of Erlangen and Leipzig 1874-1876. After his return to America, he became assistant teacher in the seminary and college at Mendota. He took charge of the congregation in the city (1879-1894). From 1887 to 1904 he was president of the Southern District. In 1894 he was elected president of Clinton College, holding that position until 1902, when he became editor of "Kirchenblatt." Since the fiftieth anniversary of the Synod in 1904 he has been the president of the Iowa Synod, being the third in this honorable succession. In 1901 Thiel College conferred on him the degree of Doctor of Divinity.

PROF. JOHN MICHAEL REU, D. D., born at Diebach (near Rotenburg), Bavaria, in 1869, received his education in the Latin School of Oettingen, through private tutors and at the Mission School of Neuendettelsau. He came to America in 1889, was called to Rockfalls, Ill., in 1890, and to the faculty of the Dubuque Seminary in 1899. Among his literary output we

would mention "Old Testament Pericopes," 1901-6; "Katechismusauslegung," 1904; "Wartburg Lehrmittel," 8 small volumes; "Catechetics and Ethics," 1915, and especially "Quellen zur Geschichte des kirchlichen Unterrichts zwischen 1530 und 1600" (1904), four volumes being published up to the present. In recognition of this book the University of Erlangen (1910) conferred on him the title of "Dr. Theol." — a distinction not shared by any American since 1845 (Philip Schaff.). Beginning with the third volume, this great work by Dr. Reu is being financed with the aid of the Society of the History of the Reformation and of the Berlin Kultusministerium. The first half of Volume V, comprising 500 pages, has been published. A sixth volume will conclude the work. Since 1905 Dr. Reu has been the editor of "Kirchliche Zeitschrift," which is the theological monthly magazine of the Iowa Synod. He is also a contributor to the "Katechetische Zeitschrift," "Archiv fuer Reiformationsgeschichte," "Zeitschrift fuer Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichtswesens in Deutschland," etc.

### **§ 30. The Buffalo Synod.**

Eight months after the departure of the Saxons, PASTOR J. A. GRABAU and his Erfurt congregation emigrated to America (1839). Among the members of his flock was H. von Rohr, captain of the Prussian artillery. The majority of these "Prussian Lutherans" settled in the neighborhood of Buffalo, N. Y. Grabau, having discovered the spurious character of a union between Lutherans and Reformed, took offense at the royal decree which abolished the old church books. Having requested the privilege of retaining the Lutheran formula, he was suspended and imprisoned, but refused to yield. His congregation urged emigration to America, where religious freedom seemed to be assured. Grabau, still hoping that Prussia would recede from her attitude, refused at first, but when a written statement was made by Frederick William III. to the effect that Lutheranism would be tolerated only within the bounds of the union, he left for America, and settled at Buffalo in the fall of 1839.

During the time of his troubles he had come into touch with the Lutherans of the Uckermark and of POMERANIA, who were following the lead of Pastors Ehrentroem and Kindermann. It was hoped that they might decide to emigrate. When the king died (June 7, 1840),<sup>9</sup> his successor (Frederick William IV.), discarding his father's methods, conceded certain rights to the

Lutheran Church. This halted the emigration project of the Prussian Lutherans, especially as the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Prussia (BRESLAU SYNOD) declared against emigration. Soon afterwards the school question roused opposition, because Lutheran children were forced to attend the schools of the Union, and Lutherans were not permitted to employ their own teachers. While the Breslau people finally agreed to this rule and privately instructed their children in religion, Kindermann's and Ehrenstroem's followers saw in such a submission a denial of the faith. They insisted on emigration. Their faith in the Breslau authorities seemed to have been shaken when these conferred upon the elders part of the pastoral care and the office of the keys, and especially when they claimed the right to depose ministers. The warning against emigration was looked upon as a chiliastic heresy. While KINDERMANN and EHRENSTROEM bowed to these decrees, their congregations rebelled. This finally resulted in a withdrawal from the Breslau Synod and a subsequent decision to emigrate. The Breslau Church authorities refused communion to the insurgents, and tried to prevent emigration by transferring Kindermann from Pomerania to Breslau. But the congregations remained firm. In 1842 TWO EMIGRANT ORGANIZATIONS were formed. In several ships the Pomeranians left Stettin for New York, where they arrived in September, while the Uckermark people went by way of Hamhurg to Buffalo. Ehrenstroem meanwhile was arrested in Hamburg on account of his sermons condemning the Union, and was turned over to Prussia; he followed his flock in 1844.<sup>10</sup> Kindermann and his people settled in the forests near Milwaukee. Kindermann died (at Kirchhain) in 1854. Pastor Krause was located at Freistadt.

During turbulent times like these the SYNOD OF BUFFALO came into being. Its first meeting was held at Milwaukee and Freistadt, Wis., June 12-15, 1845. Four pastors were present: Grabau, Kindermann, Krause and H. von Rohr. Pastor Brohm of New York was invited to attend, but declined because his friends in and around St. Louis had not received an invitation. While the conference decided on the name, "Synod of Lutheran Emigrants from Prussia," it was commonly known as the Buffalo Synod. The latter name it afterwards adopted.

As early as 1840 Pastor Grabau sent a PASTORAL LETTER (written, not printed) to vacant congregations warning them against ministers who had not been properly ordained (§ 23, I, 1). This letter, having been sent to St. Louis, caused the CONFLICT between Grabau and Walther, who scented in



it those hierarchical tendencies which he had experienced amid bitter circumstances. In consequence of this controversy Missouri opposition churches were established ("rabble congregations," according to Grabau) in the territory of the Buffalo Synod. The strife between the two factions became exceedingly caustic and personal. In 1853 Grabau visited Germany for the purpose of winning friends to his cause. Temporarily he maintained PLEASANT RELATIONS with the IOWA SYNOD, transferring congregations around Madison to that synod, and calling Fritschel and Doerfler to vacant Buffalo Synod churches. But in the controversy between Iowa and Missouri, Grabau sided with the latter. Owing to its many peculiarities and Grabau's unyielding temper, the Buffalo Synod did not grow rapidly, even though a theological seminary, with Grabau as instructor, had been established.

In 1886 von Rohr and Grabau failed to agree. Two factions arose in the Buffalo Synod, each claiming to be the pure original synod. A colloquium, HELD AT BUFFALO between the Missourians and the numerically superior faction of von Rohr, resulted in the admission of Hochstetter and eleven others into the Missouri Synod, while the smaller portion of von Rohr's party continued to exist until 1877. Afterwards a part of it returned to the Grabau faction, while others cast in their lot with various other synods. Von Rohr's son became influential in the Wisconsin Synod.

Patterned after the old Saxon and Pomeranian constitutions, the Ministerium (ministers only) chose a "senior ministerii" as their synodical leader. This title, however, was changed into "president" at the meeting in 1886. Buffalo declares, in opposition to Missouri, that ordination is an essential part of the "rite vocatus" of the Augsburg Confession (Art. XIV) and that the Church is essentially visible and has invisible glory.<sup>11</sup>

Like its opponent, the Missouri Synod, Buffalo is very rigid in doctrine and practice. Its pastors are pledged to all the books of the Concordia. The eleventh article of the Augustana is literally interpreted; so that every congregation has PRIVATE ABSOLUTION, public absolution not having been permitted until 1891. Gross sins are punished by excommunication, and the offender can be restored only after public confession in the presence of the congregation. No member is allowed to belong to a secret order.

A REVISION of Buffalo's synodical CONSTITUTION in 1886 resulted in a quiet setting aside of many of its peculiarities. The synod extends from New York to Minnesota, and has two conference meetings biannually. while the whole synod convenes once in three years.

- 
1. See “Synodalgeschichte.” by Peter and Schmidt, pp. 126. 128, 139, 144, 191. 264.↵
  2. A vivid description of the synodical transactions at Wheeling, together with a reprint of the resolutions pertaining to the viewpoint of Ohio, may be found in the volume of Peter and Schmidt, pp. 227-238,↵
  3. Published in Brobst’s Monatshefte, 1867.↵
  4. The different forms of the constitution are found in Kraushaar, pp. 373-89.↵
  5. They form an appendix to the constitution.↵
  6. Also Klindworth, who had failed to establish an “original” Iowa Synod with the aid of the malcontents.↵
  7. Never printed, but partly found in the conclusion of S. Fritschel’s “Distinctive Doctrines.”↵
  8. Pastor Joh. Roehm, who studied on the Wartburg, caused Geo. T. Fritschel’s call to the college at Brenham through which contact with Iowa had been established.↵
  9. On the same day when the church of the emigrants was being dedicated at Buffalo.↵
  10. Soon he became a victim of strange hallucinations, tried to perform miracles and eventually lost his faith altogether. He traveled from Wisconsin to New York, thence to San Francisco and died in a poor house. By excommunicating him, Grabau had deprived him of any kind of influence among the Prussians.↵
  11. These statement do not indicate whether Buffalo considers the feature of invisibility essential to the true church.↵

## 9. The Norwegians And Danes.

### § 31. The Norwegians.

#### I. Condition Of The Church In Norway.

In order to understand the development of the Norwegian Lutheran Church in America, we should have some prior knowledge of the condition of the Church in Norway. This we will proceed to give.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century a wave of rationalism deluged the Church of Norway, as it had other European countries, and put its mark on every feature of that country's spiritual life. Then there came an AWAKENING over the whole land through the earnest preaching of a pious layman, HANS NIELSEN HAUGE (1771-1844). He was converted in 1796, and soon began to preach the Word to the people. He traveled all over the land, mostly on foot, and everywhere he went his labor bore rich fruitage. He also induced other Christian laymen to take up the work.

He did not put himself directly in opposition to the clergy; but, while their sermons were permeated with rationalistic views, leading to religious indifference, if not to open ungodliness, he preached the gospel in its purity and simplicity, telling sinners to repent, find forgiveness in Jesus Christ, and live a new life. In the opinion of many of the ministers Hauge was a fanatic, and so they put every possible obstruction in his way. By their influence the government, in 1804, had him arrested for preaching in public, which was forbidden to laymen by an old section of the law. On account of the examination of six hundred witnesses and other delays, his case dragged on for years. Meanwhile he was confined to jail. In all, he spent ten years in prison, and came out broken in health. During the last eight years of his life he resided on his farm, called Bredtvedt, near Christiania, Norway, directing from there the religious movement he had inaugurated. He died March 29, 1842, receiving honor at the last from both friend and foe.

The persecution and death of Hauge did not slacken or quench the fire he had kindled. Others took his place and continued the work. Less broad-minded than their great leader, they sometimes showed a more unfriendly feeling toward the clergy than he did. but there was no separation, for

Hauge was a faithful Lutheran. and earnestly advised his friends not to leave the Church.

Eventually the younger ministers (as was the case in Germany) felt the incoming tide of the new life. Professor Stener Johannes Stenersen (who taught in Upsala, 1814-35). Svend Rorckmand Horsleb (1814-36). Rev. Wilhelm Andreas Wexel. Prof. Karl Paul Caspari (1847-92), and Gisle Johnsen (1849-94), all exerted a great and salutary influence on the young theologians. They were STRICTLY CONSERVATIVE LUTHERANS, so that there should have been the greatest harmony between them and the Christian laymen; but unfortunately their very conservatism was viewed as a hierarchial tendency by some of the friends of Hauge. To this may be added, that many of the clergy did not look with favor on the lay preaching so dear to the Haugians. The difference between these two allied wings became evident in its American development.

## II. Organization Of Norwegian Synods.

In the year 1839 a young Norwegian traveler published a book telling about his observations in America. This gave a new impulse to the emigration already begun. Wisconsin and Northern Illinois, at that time the wild Northwest, seemed to be the most attractive localities to the Norwegians. Later on they also moved into the border states of Iowa and Minnesota. It is said that in 1847 there were 15,000 Norwegians in Wisconsin and 33,000 in Illinois. These figures may be too high, but the number certainly was not insignificant. Among them were several "Friends of Hauge." For mutual edification they met in their log cabins, singing, praying, and reading a sermon or listening to a lay preacher. One of the most prominent of these was ELLING EIELSEN, who was born in Vos, Norway, Sept. 19, 1804, and came to America in 1839. He had been preaching both in Norway and Denmark, and continued his work here. He held his first meeting in the house of an English woman in Chicago, and went from there to Fox River, Illinois. where he found a large Norwegian settlement. Here he built a house, and used the second floor for meetings. On Oct. 3. 1843, he was ordained by Rev. Hoffman, the Lutheran pastor at Duncan's Grove,<sup>1</sup> about twenty miles north of Chicago. Eielsen traveled everywhere among the Norwegian settlements, and established many preaching stations.

THE FIRST SYNOD. The need of some kind of organization was soon felt. The "friends from far and near" therefore met at Jefferson Prairie, Rock County, Wisconsin, April 13-14, 1846, and organized the "Evangelical Lutheran Church of America," a rather high-sounding name. Eielsen was now assisted by two young men, Ole Andrewsen and Paul Andersen. For a time they worked together harmoniously; but after a while discord arose over liturgical forms and certain doctrines, and in 1848 a separation took place,<sup>2</sup> leaving Eielsen alone.

THE SECOND SYNOD. The mission work of the German Lutherans evidently brought some of the young clergy in Norway to think about the duty they owed to their brethren in the faith across the sea. A Norwegian minister writes to Pastor Loehe:<sup>3</sup> Since my visit with you we, too, have taken an interest in American affairs. You know, of course, that several thousand Norwegians have emigrated to Illinois and Wisconsin, where they have lived until now without the service of a minister of the gospel. During the last summer, however, a young Dane (C. L. Clausen), a truly pious and earnest man, with sound Lutheran convictions, went over there, and has just been ordained. And this month Rev. J. C. W. Dietrichsen, a Norwegian, who was with me in the greater part of my travels in Germany, will also go to help our beloved countrymen in North America. A Christian man here (Sorensen) has offered him 3,000 Gylden (\$500) for that purpose. It would be very desirable that German and Norwegian Lutherans should work hand in hand in America."<sup>4</sup>

From the Norwegian Lutheran Church in Muskego, Racine County, Wis.,<sup>5</sup> a delegation came to Rev. Krause, in Freystadt, asking him to ordain a young man, by the name of CLAUS LAURIZ CLAUSEN, to the ministry of the gospel. He had been called as their pastor SEPT. 13, 1843, which is regarded as the BIRTHDAY OF THE NORWEGIAN LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA. Spiritual work had been going on for some years, but this was the first time Norwegian Lutheran Christians came together to form a congregation and have the ministry of the gospel established among them. Having passed a creditable examination, Clausen was ordained on the eighteenth of October of the same year, in the presence of the Muskego congregation. From that time ordained pastors arrived from Norway, among them the following: J. W. C. Dietric, 1844; H. A. Stub, 1848; A. C. Preus, 1850; H. A. Preus, N. O. Brandt and G. F. Dietrichsen, 1851; J. A. Ottesen, 1852; and U. V. Koren,

1853. These men, with delegates from their congregations, organized, in 1853, the Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Church of America.

THE THIRD SYNOD. REVS. P. Andersen and O. Andrewsen, who severed their connection with E. Eielsen (see above), united with others in the Northern Illinois Synod, and, with the Swedish pastor Esbjorn, formed a Scandinavian conference. In the fifties several other ministers, both Norwegians and Swedes, joined this synod, but in 1860 they all withdrew and organized the SCANDINAVIAN AUGUSTANA SYNOD. The meeting was held in Rev. O. Andrewsen's church at Jefferson Prairie, Rock County, Wisconsin. The two nationalities worked in perfect unity, but, as the membership increased, the Norwegians asked permission to form a synod of their own, to which the Swedes willingly gave their consent.

Thus we see that the Norwegian Lutherans in America were DIVIDED from THE VERY BEGINNING, and, as we shall see, more divisions came later.

### III. History Of Individual Norwegian Synods.

[1] HAUGE'S SYNOD.

In 1850 a young man with a good education, P. A. Rasmussen, came to the Eielsen Church, and taught parochial school first at Necnah, then at Jefferson Prairie, Wisconsin, and finally at Fox River or Lisbon, Illinois. The congregation here called him as their pastor in 1852. Before taking charge, he desired a better theological training, for which purpose he went to the Lutheran Seminary at Ft. Wayne, Indiana. On Palm-Sunday, 1854, he was ordained by Prof. W. Sihler and Prof. F. A. Craemer. He assisted Eielsen, who had no organizing talents and placed little value on form and order. But Rasmussen had a clearer view, and pointed out many things in the constitution that needed improvement. This offended Eielsen. He looked upon the young assistant with suspicion at once, fearing he might bring about new and dangerous changes. Their relation became more and more strained, and after a stormy meeting at Primrose, Wisconsin, in 1856, Rasmussen and his friends left Eielsen. In 1862 he joined the Norwegian Synod. For the second time Eielsen stood alone; but he soon ordained some of his most capable lay preachers, and in 1861 there were four ordained ministers in his synod. The field also increased and the church grew; but, much to the annoyance of Eielsen, the people continued to find fault with the constitution, and demanded a revision. At the meeting in 1874, it was decided that the ministers

should meet at Minneapolis in July, take the matter under consideration, and report to the next annual convention. The report contained both a draught for an entirely new constitution and a revision of the old one. For the sake of peace and harmony those who were in favor of a new instrument withdrew their proposition, and declared themselves satisfied with a revision. But Eielsen thought they went too far, and therefore he held a private consultation with seven of his friends. They agreed to a few minor changes, and said the synod might add explanatory notes to obscure paragraphs. To prevent a schism, this was agreed upon. So amended, the constitution was temporarily adopted. The name was changed to Hauge's Synod. Although Eielsen and his friends had given their consent to the revision, they held a meeting in Jackson County, Minnesota, during the winter of 1875, and decided to stand by the old constitution as it was, thereby ORGANIZING THEMSELVES INTO A CHURCH BODY. They elected Eielsen as president.

By this time Eielsen was growing old, and so did not seem to realize the import of all that was taking place. He came to the next annual convention of Hauge's Synod, looking upon himself as a member of that body. It might have been just as well if the meeting had recognized him as a member, harmless as he now was; but when they asked him about his connection with the Jackson party, they could get no satisfactory answer. A committee which interviewed him three times privately succeeded no better. Before his case was decided, he sent a letter to the Synod — probably written by others — accusing it of harboring new and dangerous tendencies toward hierarchy and church formality. This indicated his attitude. A resolution was then passed by the Synod regretting the action of Eielsen and his followers and declaring that fellowship with them must be looked upon as broken. A later attempt to restore harmony also failed, because Eielsen insisted that synod must acknowledge its sins, and come back to the old constitution. This the synod could not do. Eielsen died in 1883, but his "old friends" still continued as a separate organization.

The year 1876 turns A NEW LEAF in the history of Hauge's Synod. It then had twenty-three ministers, and from that time made steady progress in all branches of activity. On the whole, a spirit of peace prevailed. But in the nineties a controversy arose between H. H. Bergsland, Professor of Systematic Theology at the Red Wing Seminary, and Rev. O. S. Meland, who also had been a professor at the same institution and was now pastor of the church which the seminary people attended. Rev. Meland accused the pro-

fessor of false doctrine. For a time the discussion grew hot, and it looked as if there might be a disruption; but the synod found no heresy in Prof. Bergsland's teachings (1896), and the matter subsided. Bergsland continued as professor until his death (1907).

The OFFICIAL ORGAN of the synod, "Budbaeren" ("The Messenger"), was founded as a monthly in 1863, with Revs. O. Hansen and O. A. Bergh as editors. For many years it has been published as a weekly. The synod also publishes a Norwegian Sunday-school paper, "Bornevennen" ("The Children's Friend"), and, in conjunction with the United Church, also an English Sunday-school paper, "The Children's Companion."

After various fruitless attempts a Church College and Seminary were established at Red Wing, Minnesota, in 1879. Up to the present time the seminary has graduated 165 students and the college 266 (27 with the A. B. degree). The seminary faculty consists of Professors E. W. Schmidt, M. A., O. M. Wee, and G. M. Bruce, M. A., B. D. The seminary offers a three years' and the college a four years' course, the latter culminating in the A. B. degree. The academy (four years) prepares for the college and the State University. There is also a commercial course of two years. These institutions were originally for boys and young men, but women are now admitted to the college. A co-educational school is located at Jewell, Iowa, known as the Jewell Lutheran College.

The Synod maintains a MISSION IN CHINA, which was started in 1891, with Fancheng as the center. In this city it has a high school, a hospital, a dispensary, an orphans' home and schools for boys and girls. Besides Fancheng, there are the three main stations of Tszho, Taipingtien and Sinyeh. From these centers the work extends to forty outer stations and a number of day schools. The theological seminary at Hankow is being jointly maintained by four Lutheran missionary societies. Pastor O. R. Wold, of Hauge's Synod, is president. The synod has 17 missionaries, among whom are one physician, one nurse and five ordained pastors. These are being aided by some 90 native workers (Bible women and teachers). It has 1,000 converts. HOME MISSIONS are being carried on in Canada and the Northwest, 30 missionaries covering the ground. It supports an ORPHANS' HOME with 60 children and a HOME FOR THE AGED at Beresford, S. Dak., where 30 old men are being cared for.

[2] THE NORWEGIAN LUTHERAN SYNOD.



This synod was founded in 1853 by the cooperation of Pastors C. L. Claussen (ordained by Pastor Krause), A. C. Preus, H. A. Stub, H. A. Preus, G. F. Dietrichsen, N. Brandt and J. A. Ottensen. All of these were ordained in Norway for the American field. From the very start the synod has represented RIGID LUTHERANISM. It sustained relations with the faithful in the Norwegian State Church. Soon it made COMMON CAUSE WITH THE GERMAN LUTHERANS (a union hoped for at Dietrichsen's departure; see letter to Loehe). At first no attempt was made to start a seminary. A commission, investigating different Lutheran institutions, decided in FAVOR OF THE SEMINARY OF THE MISSOURI SYNOD. This was made the seminary of the synod, and Laur. Larson, in 1859, was called by its faculty as Norwegian professor. But when, during the Civil War Walther's sympathies were with the South, the Norwegians, opposing secession and slavery, took offense, withdrew from St. Louis, and opened THEIR OWN SEMINARY at Halfway Creek, La Crosse County, Wisconsin, with Larson and Schmidt as professors and an enrollment of eleven scholars. In 1862 it was transferred to Decorah, Ia., where in 1864 the cornerstone was laid for a building costing \$100,000, which was dedicated in October, 1865. In 1872 F. A. SCHMIDT was sent to St. Louis as Norwegian professor. When the practical department of St. Louis was transferred to Springfield, Pastor O. B. Asperheim became a member of the faculty. But a year afterwards the Soldiers' Orphans' Home of Madison, Wis., became the home of this practical department. Here Professor F. A. Schmidt was appointed second professor. H. G. Stub came to this seminary as a successor to Asperheim in 1878, and the theoretical department of St. Louis, having been transferred, was united with the practical department. In 1872 the synod took part in the forming of the SYNODICAL CONFERENCE, to which it belonged until 1883. For a long time it was the largest Scandinavian body in America. Representing conservative Lutheranism, it had to resist various doctrinal onslaughts. Professor Asperheim in 1878 was accused of heresy by the Pastoral Conference in Milwaukee, because he had criticized Walther. Asperheim resigned, took charge of a New York congregation for a time, and eventually returned to Norway.

The most violent controversy within the synod raged around the QUESTION OF PREDESTINATION (1880). Schmidt attacked Walther's theory of election contained in the synodical records of 1877 and 1879. The synod was divided into two opposing camps. To prevent a division, it LEFT THE SYNODICAL CONFERENCE in 1883. However, a schism occurred seven years later.

Schmidt and his followers (a third of the synod) withdrew and formed a "brotherhood." In 1890 they united with other bodies, forming the United Norwegian Lutheran Church.

Though greatly weakened, the synod continued its work with much zeal and extended its activities in many directions.

It has put great emphasis on religious training. Luther College, the oldest Scandinavian High School, located at Decorah, Ia., has an endowment fund of \$250,000. LUTHER SEMINARY (located at first at Madison, Wis., afterwards at Robbinsdale, Minn., and now at St. Paul, Minn.) has the following faculty: Revs. Prof. H. G. Stub, D. D., Joh. Ylvisaker, D. D., O. K. Brandt, B. A., and E. Hove, B. A. It has an average attendance of 50 scholars. The Lutheran TEACHERS' SEMINARY, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., has 10 professors and about 200 students. The Girls' Seminary at Red Wing, Minn., and ten academies at various places are being maintained by private funds. The synod conducts two homes for the aged and three orphans' homes. A number of hospitals are being supported by individual members of the synod.

It has FOREIGN MISSIONS in South Africa, China and Alaska, and an Indian mission not far from Wittenberg, Wis. Home missions are being maintained in Utah, New York and Galveston (immigrants), and seamen's missions in New York, Galveston and San Francisco. Its combined property is worth \$1,000,000.

### [3] THE UNITED NORWEGIAN LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA.

After withdrawing from the Synod of Northern Illinois, the Scandinavians, in 1860, organized the SCANDINAVIAN AUGUSTANA SYNOD in a little Norwegian church at Jefferson Prairie, Wis. Ten years afterwards this synod met at the new Swedish church of Andover, Ill. At this time the number of Norwegian ministers had greatly increased, and they decided to organize a synod of their own. To this the Swedes gave their unanimous consent. The Norwegian pastors and delegates then withdrew to the old church nearby in order to organize the new synod (§ 19, 5, 6). Rev. O. J. Hatlestad was elected chairman and Rev. J. M. Eggen secretary. A previously appointed committee on constitution reported. Meanwhile only two paragraphs were adopted, relating to confession and name, the latter being "The Norwegian Augustana Synod." The rest was laid aside until a conference could be held with Rev. B. Gjeldaker, of Silver Lake, and Rev. C. L. Clausen, of St. Ansgar, Iowa, who had left the Norwegian Synod on account of that body's attitude on the slavery question. If these men, with their large congregations,

would join in the formation of the new synod, it would be desirable to have them do so, and it was decided that they should have a chance to take part in the discussion and adoption of the constitution.

The conference was held at St. Ansgar, Iowa, in July of the same year (1870). Finding no doctrinal difficulties. Rev. Hatlestad read the report from Andover. and Rev. Clausen submitted a new draught for the constitution. This was finally adopted, the resolutions from Andover rescinded, and a new society was formed called "The Conference for the Norwegian Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America." Clausen was elected president.

The outlook now was bright for a time, but, sad to say, for only a short time. Before he left. Rev. Hatlestad handed in a protest against the repeal of the Andover resolutions, and later on called the Norwegian Augustana Synod to meet at Jefferson Prairie, Wis., the same fall. Here the resolution adopted at St. Ansgar. repealing the adoption of the two paragraphs of Andover, was declared null and void, and the meeting resolved to complete the Andover organization by adopting the rest of the proposed constitution. Thus the year 1870 marks both a union and a disunion. The majority followed Clausen and Gjeldaker, while the minority organized the Norwegian-Danish Augustana Synod. Antagonism between these two factions was strong at first, but later on a better feeling prevailed.

The ANTI-MISSOURIANS had meanwhile withdrawn from the Norwegian Synod. They effected a temporary organization, hoping for an eventual union with the two other synods. At a series of conferences the conclusion had been reached that there were no fundamental differences between Hauge's Synod, the Conference and the Augustana Synod. This caused the merging of the three currents (Norwegian Conference, Augustana Synod, and Anti-Missouri Brotherhood) and the forming of the UNITED NORWEGIAN LUTHERAN CHURCH OF AMERICA.<sup>6</sup> The Conference had 379 congregations, the Brotherhood 231 and the Augustana Synod 41 congregations. Without a dissenting vote they decided for union.

Such a united front seemed to preclude any possible rupture. But when the AUGSBURG SEMINARY, hitherto the property of the Conference, was to be transferred (according to agreement) to the United Church, the trustees refused to accede to such a demand. A subsequent trial, appealed from court to court, resulted in the synod losing the building, but retaining the endowment. The real cause of the trouble was dissatisfaction with Profs. Oftedal

and Sverdrup, who resigned and founded the FREE CHURCH (1893). Since then peace has reigned in the borders of the United Church.

Its theological seminary is located at St. Paul, and has the following faculty: Rev. F. A. Schmidt, D. D., Professor emeritus; M. O. Bockman, D. D.; J. N. Kildahl, D. D.; E. Kr. Johnsen, M. A.; C. M. Weswig, D. D.; M. J. Stolee, B. M. The college is located at Northfield, Minn., and has 32 teachers and 500 scholars. It is one of the greatest church institutions of the Middle West. A Teachers' Seminary is located at Madison, Minn. Schools for higher education are located as follows: Pleasant View Luther College, Ottawa, Ill.; Scandinavia Academy, Scandinavia, Wis.; Waldorf College, Forest City, Ia.; Concordia College, Morehead, Minn.; Spokane College, Spokane, Wash.; Columbia College, Everett, Wash.; Camrose College, Camrose, Alberta, Can. The lastnamed institution is jointly owned with Hauge's Synod. In all these institutions the ENGLISH LANGUAGE prevails, while the seminary is largely NORWEGIAN. The services in the congregations are conducted mostly in the Norwegian language, but English is growing in favor. Some congregations divide their services between the two languages. "LUTHERANEREN" is the Norwegian organ, "THE UNITED LUTHERAN" the English organ of the synod. The Sunday-school papers appear in both languages.

The United Synod is zealous in HOME and FOREIGN MISSION WORK. It has foreign missions in Madagascar and in the district of Honan, China, and, besides, supports many others.

Among the CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS may be mentioned the Deaconess' Motherhouse in Chicago, a number of orphans' homes and hospitals in the Middle West, orphans' homes at Wittenberg, Wis., Beloit, Ia., and Lake Park, Minn., homes for the aged at NorthwDod. N. D., and at Wittenberg, W<sup>is</sup>. The synod has a pension fund for its pastors and professors. Its property is worth \$2,000,000.

#### [4] THE NORWEGIAN LUTHERAN FREE CHURCH.

This organization gathers around Augsburg Seminary as its center. The seminary was opened at Marshall, Wis., 1869, and is the oldest theological school among the Norwegians in America. In 1872 it was transferred to Minneapolis, Minn. Its first president was Prof. A. Weenaas. Prof. George Sverdrup served as its president from 1876 to his death in 1907. During a period of 44 years it has trained 367 pastors. Entrance to the seminary proper is preceded by a four years' college course, in which Greek is the

principal language, in accordance with the rules of the institution, requiring that the Word of God shall form the chief subject of study.

In 1890 the Augsburg Seminary became the theological school of the United Church, but in 1893 the annual meeting decided to withdraw its support, unless the seminary or its control was turned over to the United Church. This brought the resignation of Profs. Sverdrup and Oftedal as professors in the United Church; but they continued their work in the seminary. In this they were supported by about 50 ministers and 60 congregations, who formed a separate organization. The Free Church differs from other Norwegian Lutheran synods in this respect: it has no constitution, and its annual meeting is not a representative body of delegates elected by the congregations, but a free gathering in which anyone who agrees to the Free Church principles can take part. Christian schools, missions, etc., are supported by the congregations, but the control is in the hands of different boards, as Boards of Trustees for Augsburg Seminary, of Missions, etc. They have three schools for higher education, Augsburg in Minneapolis, Minn., a Ladies' Seminary in Fargo, N. D., and an Academy at Everett, Wash. In the line of mercy they have a Deaconess' Home in Minneapolis and two Orphans' Homes at other places. Beside supporting the Jewish and Santhal mission, they have their own field in Madagascar and have of late decided to take up mission work in China.

[5] THE CHURCH OF THE LUTHERAN BRETHERN.

This body was organized in 1890, with Rev. K. O. Lundeberg as president. He is an earnest Christian, and deplored the worldliness of the churches. On a visit to Norway he fell in with the principles of the Free Church there. They advocated the Donatistic idea of pure congregations. Returning to America, he began to preach and practice that doctrine, withdrew from the United Church and gathered the "Brethren" into a separate organization. Being sincere in his application of the rule, he soon found that his theory was only an ideal, a dream, acknowledged that he had erred in his views and interpretation of the Word of God. and returned to the United Church. Meanwhile Rev. K. M. Broen left the Free Church, because he did not think they practiced as they preached, and joined the "Brethren." They have a Bible School in Wahpeton, N. D.. and their report for 1914 shows 11 elders and 20 congregations, with about 1.000 members. They are very much interested in foreign missions, and have a field of their own in Central China.

## IV. Prospective Union Of The Norwegians.

The United Norwegian Synod, having completed its organization, arranged for a number of conferences with the representatives of the Norwegian Synod. This movement received a new impetus when Hauge's Synod (1905), after some discussion, reached an agreement with other synods concerning absolution and the work of laymen. In subsequent controversies the doctrines of ELECTION and CONVERSION (1907) and PREDESTINATION (1911) came up for consideration. While the last dogma presented some difficulties and prevented a final agreement at the conferences of 1908, 1909 and 1910 (five conferences), the opposing parties approached common ground. With admirable patience — a splendid example for all Lutherans — the pursuit of union was continued with the assistance of the laity. At the conference at Madison, Wis. (Feb. 22, 1912), a number of conciliatory resolutions were adopted. They brightened the prospects for an ultimate union, which now seems all but assured, in spite of the opposition of the Synodical Conference. We reprint the Madison Theses because of their important character:

### AGREEMENT.

1. The Synod and United Church Committees on Union acknowledge unanimously and without reservation the doctrine of Predestination which is stated in the Eleventh Article of the Formula of Concord (the so-called "first form of the doctrine") and in Pontoppidan's Explanation ("Sandhed til Gudfrygtighed"), Question 548 (the so-called "second form of the doctrine")-
2. Whereas the conferring Church bodies acknowledge that Art. XI of the Formula of Concord presents the pure and correct doctrine of God's Word and the Lutheran Church regarding the Election of the children of God to salvation, it is deemed unnecessary to Church union to construct new and more extensive theses concerning this article of faith.

3. But since, in regard to the doctrine of Election, it is well known that two forms of the doctrine have been used, both of which have been recognized as correct in the orthodox Lutheran Church, viz., that some, make the doctrine of Election to comprise the entire salvation of the elect from the calling to the glorification, — cf. “Thorough Explanation,” Article XI., 10-12 — and teach an Election “to salvation through sanctification by the Spirit and faith in the truth;” while others (like Pontoppidan, in consonance with John Gerhard, Scriver, and other acknowledged doctrinal fathers, define Election chiefly as the decree of final glorification, with the Spirit’s work of faith and perseverance as its necessary postulate, and teach that “God has ordained to eternal life all those who from eternity He foresaw would accept the proffered grace, believe in Christ, and remain steadfast in this faith unto the end;” and since neither of those two forms of doctrine contradicts any doctrine revealed in the Word of God, but lets the order of salvation, as otherwise presented in God’s Word and the Confession of the Church, remain entirely intact and fully acknowledged, we find that this fact ought not be divisive of Church unity, nor ought it disrupt that unity of spirit in the bond of peace which God wills should obtain between us.
  
4. Since, however, during the doctrinal controversy among us, words and expressions have been used — rightly or wrongly attributed to one party or the other — which seemed to the other side a denial of the Confession of the Church, or to lead to such denial, we have agreed to reject all erroneous doctrines which seek to explain away the mystery of Election (Formula of Concord, Art. XI, 39-44) either in a synergistic manner or in a Calvinizing way; in other words, we reject every doctrine which either, on the one hand, would rob God of His honor as the only Savior, or, on the other, would weaken man’s feeling of responsibility for the acceptance or rejection of God’s grace.
  
5. On the other hand, we reject:
  - a. The doctrine that God’s mercy and the most holy merits of Christ are not the sole reason for our election, but that there is also in ourselves a reason for such election, for the sake of which God has ordained us to eternal life.
  
  - b. The doctrine that in Election God has been determined by, or has taken cognizance of, or has been actuated by, man’s good relation, or by anything which man may do or not do, “as of himself or by his own natural powers.”
  
  - c. The doctrine that the faith in Christ which is indissolubly connected with Election, is wholly or in part a product of, or dependent upon, man’s own choosing, power or ability.
  
  - d. Or that this faith is the result of a power and ability imparted to man by the call of grace and therefore now dwelling in, and belonging to, the unregenerate man, to himself determine to accept God’s grace.

6. On the other hand, we reject:

- a. The doctrine that in Election God acts arbitrarily and without motive, and picks out and counts a certain arbitrary number of indiscriminate individuals, and ordains these to conversion and salvation, while passing by all the others.
- b. The doctrine that there are two different kinds of will to salvation in God, one revealed in the Scriptures in the general order of salvation, and another, differing from this, and unknown to us, which relates only to the elect and imparts a deeper love, a more effective call from God and a larger measure of grace than are brought to him who remains in unbelief and condemnation.
- c. The doctrine that when the opposition, which God in conversion removes from those whom He saves, is not taken away in others who finally are lost, this different result finds its reason in God and in a differing will of salvation in His act of election.
- d. The doctrine that a believer can and must have an absolute assurance of his election and salvation, instead of an assurance of faith, built upon the promise of God, and joined with fear and trembling and the possibility of falling from grace, which, however, by the mercy of God he believes will not become a reality to him.
- e. In a summary, all views and doctrines regarding Election which directly or indirectly come into conflict with the order of salvation and do not give to all a full and therefore equally great opportunity to salvation, or which in any manner would invalidate that Word of God which declares that “God will have all men to be saved and come unto the knowledge of the truth” — in which gracious and merciful will of God all election to eternal life has its origin.

On the basis of the above Agreement the Committees on Union declared that the essential unity concerning these doctrines which was attained was sufficient to warrant Church union.

The two bodies will take these resolutions under consideration at their regular conventions. We do not presume that an agreement will be reached without some difficulty; but it is to be hoped that the synods, recognizing their essential doctrinal unity, will not rest contented until the Norwegians of this country are rallied around a common standard, and thus will be thoroughly organized to accomplish the great mission assigned to them by the living God.

### **Biographical Notes.**



Note: these, with the exception of the last two, have been written by the Rev. J. A. Bergh.

REV. ELLING EIELSEN was born in Vos, Norway, September 19, 1804. His parents belonged to the friends of Hauge, and so from childhood Eielsen was under Christian influence, but did not find peace with God until he was about twenty-five years of age. From that time he felt it his duty to preach to others, admonishing them to repent of their sins and turn to God for pardon. Having traveled as a lay preacher over a large part of Norway and part of Denmark, he landed in America in 1839. He preached his first sermon in Chicago. Then he went from place to place preaching to his widely scattered countrymen. In 1843 he was ordained (or licensed), and in 1864 he and his friends organized Hauge's Synod. Eielsen was a strong character, and was very earnest in his work. He also loved the Lutheran Church as he knew it through his beloved Pontoppidan, whose explanation of Luther's Small Catechism he went all the way to New York — mostly on foot — to get printed; but he came at times in collision with the clergy in Norway, and had a great distaste for everything that had, in his opinion, a taint of state-churchism, much of the liturgy included. He died at his home in Chicago in 1883.

REV. CLAUS LAURIZ CLAUSEN was born on the island of Aeroe, Denmark, November 3, 1820. Although a Dane by birth, the Norwegians are inclined to count him one of their own, as he spent nearly all his life among them. Like his contemporary, Eielsen, he came from the pietistic circles in Norway and Denmark. He had planned to go with Schroeder as a missionary to Africa, but on receiving an earnest appeal from Norwegian pioneers in the wilderness of Wisconsin, he finally decided to come to America. He arrived at Muskego, Wis., in August, 1843, accepted a call as pastor to the Muskego church September 13th, and was ordained by a German minister October 18th of the same year. Being better educated and having a broader view than Eielsen, Clausen saw not only the importance of the salvation of the individual, but also the necessity of the establishment of a Christian church. As far as possible, he therefore gathered Norwegian Lutherans into organized congregations, and worked most of his time as a settled pastor. Preaching the doctrine and using the rites of the Church of Denmark and Norway, he transplanted the church of the Fatherland as far as possible to the new soil of America. He has the honor of laying the first stone in the foundation of the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America. Clausen was not

rugged in health, yet for many years he took a prominent part in the development of the church. It was in his church at Luther Valley, Rock County, Wis., that pastors and delegates met in 1851 to organize a synod; it was also here that the organization of the Norwegian Synod was completed in 1853, Clausen being elected Superintendent in 1851 and Vice President in 1853. He was also the first president of the "Konferents" formed in his church at St. Ansgar, Iowa, in 1870. He was too feeble to attend the meeting at Minneapolis, when the United Church was organized, but sent his greeting. He died two years later, 1892.

REV. PEDER ANDREAS RASMUSSEN was born in Stavanger, Norway, January 9, 1829. He came to America in 1850. At first he taught parochial school, but in 1853 he received a call from the Lisbon Church, Fox Hill, Ill., to become their pastor. To fit himself better for the work, he attended the Ft. Wayne Seminary for one year, and was ordained in 1854. Rasmussen was one of the most impressive speakers of the Norwegian Lutheran Church in America in the last century, and took an active part in its work until a short time before his death. Whatever he did was done with his whole heart. He took a leading part in the controversy between Eielsen's friends and the Norwegian Synod, between the Synod and the Konferents and between the Missourians and the Anti-Missourians. But the greatest service he rendered his church was the prominent part he took in the movement that resulted in the union of the Konferents, the Augustana Synod and the Anti-Missourian Brotherhood in the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America. In this important work Rasmussen was in the front rank, and probably exerted a greater influence than any other man. Beside being an eloquent speaker, he wielded a fluent pen. For fifteen years he edited his own paper, wrote several pamphlets, translated and published books like Arndt's "True Christianity." He was a warm hearted friend of foreign missions, his congregation sending more money to the Mission Society of Norway than any other. He died in 1898, leaving four sons in active service as ministers of the gospel in the United Church.

REV. HERMAN AMBER PREUS was born in Christiansand, Norway, June 16, 1825. He graduated from the theological department of the University of Christiania, and was ordained on a call from Spring Prairie, Columbia County, Wis. He came to America in 1851. In Norway the rationalism of the first part of the last century was followed by a strict orthodoxy. This wave reached its zenith, and wielded its greatest influence in the forties. At

this time young Preus studied theology at the University, and took up his work in America fully imbued with the orthodox spirit of the Fatherland. On his arrival here he detected Gruntvigianism in an article of faith in the constitution of the Norwegian Synod, just organized, and showed his ability by getting the organization dissolved and a new one reorganized with a truly orthodox creed. He was one of the six ministers who formed the Norwegian Synod in 1853, and was its president from 1862 until his death in 1894. He was a born leader. His noble and symmetrical physique, his fine abilities and various acquisitions always commanded attention and respect. In disposition he combined gentleness with resoluteness and inflexibility. With Rev. Preus at the helm there was no danger that the Synod should veer either to the right or the left. He had its destination clearly in view and its course well under control. With his strong convictions, he often clashed with people of other persuasions. He strongly presented his views both on the floor of conventions and in the press. For several years he was associated editor of the synod's official paper. His sermons lacked somewhat in the emotional feature, but were always clear and instructive.

REV. ULRIK WILHELM KOREN, D. D., was born in Bergen, Norway, December 22, 1826, graduated from the University of Christiania in 1852, and came to America in 1853. He accepted a call from Washington Prairie, near Decorah, Iowa, and was for several years the only Norwegian minister west of the Mississippi River. He joined the Norwegian Synod, which was organized shortly before his arrival and took an active part in its work. It was through his influence that Luther College was located at Decorah, and as the years went by he became more and more a power in the Synod until finally, by common consent, he was the acknowledged leader. From 1887, when the Anti-Missourians withdrew, he occupied nearly the same position in the Norwegian Synod as Walther held in the German Synod of Missouri. His word was law. When Preus died, 1894, the presidency fell upon his shoulders. Koren had all the qualifications of a leader. He was a clear thinker, an eloquent speaker, a strong debater, a keen observer and a fine diplomat. He knew when to praise and when to strike. Under his able leadership the Missourians in the Synod grew from a minority to a two-thirds majority. He has also the distinction of being the only Norwegian pastor thus far who has served one congregation for more than half a century. He died in 1910.

REV. GJERMUND HOYME was born in Waldris, Norway, October 8, 1848, and came to America with his parents in 1851. They settled first at Port Washington, Wis., but moved, four years later, to Springville, Iowa. On this journey of about 300 miles the future "bishop" had to walk on his bare feet, driving a cow, the only property his parents had besides a yoke of oxen and a wagon. His father soon died, and young Hoyme had to work his way through school. He studied at the Wisconsin University, and graduated from Augsburg Seminary in the class of 1873. At first he supplied a pulpit in Duluth, Minn., but went later to Menomonie and Eau Claire, Wis. In the United Church Hoyme was sometimes called "our bishop," and there is probably no man who has won greater esteem among the Norwegian Lutherans in this country. His noble character, pleasant appearance, warm heart, and great eloquence won for him the admiration of the people. As moderator he proved to be eminently fair in his decisions on any question that came up for adjustment. He was for years an active member of the Konferents, and threw all the weight of his influence in favor of a union of this body with the Augustana Synod (Norwegian) and Anti-Missourians. In 1890 this was accomplished, and Hoyme was unanimously elected President of the United Church, a position he held until his death, which occurred in 1902.

PROF. GEORGR SVERDRUP was born December 16, 1848, in Balestrand, Norway, graduated from Christiania in 1871, studied in Germany and France, and came to America in 1874, having been called by the Konferents to a chair in the faculty of Augsburg Seminary. Sverdrup belonged to a talented family. His grandfather was a prominent member of the Eidsvold Assembly, which gave Norway its declaration of independence in 1814. His father was a well known clergyman, and his uncle for years the leading statesman of Norway, having the distinction of being called the "uncrowned king." One brother died as bishop, and another is a professor of theology in Christiania. The subject of our sketch was probably among the most gifted. He was a very able teacher, and always attracted close attention, when he took the floor in any meeting. He had a pleasant appearance, and was democratic in his views, but, like every man born to rule, he had a strong will before which everything had either to bend or break. He was one of those forceful personalities who have warm supporters, but also many opponents. He could not adjust himself to the old ways of the Konferents, and events in the United Church did not turn out to his liking. He tendered his resignation

twice, first to the Konferents, when he was re-elected, and later to the United Church, which accepted it. He continued, however, as professor at Augsburg Seminary, his friends being in the majority on the board of trustees, and they started the Free Church movement (1893). Sverdrup was a hard worker, and put the Church under great obligation by giving it the full benefit of his eminent talent for organization at the period of the amalgamation of the Konferents, the Augustana Synod and the Anti-Missourians into the United Church. He died at his home in Minneapolis in 1907.

PROF. PETER LAURITZ LARSEN, D. D., was born in Chrisliansand, Norway, August 10, 1833. He graduated from the University at Christiania in 1855, and came to America in 1857. At first he served as a pastor, but in 1859 he was elected as the Norwegian professor of the theological faculty at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo. When the Synod, in 1861, discontinued its connection with the St. Louis institution and established a school of its own, Larsen was elected President, a position he held until 1902. For many years he was on the editorial staff of "Evangelisk Luthersk Kirketidende," the official paper of the synod, and from 1902 to 1912 editor-in-chief. He was a noble character, an ideal college president and a hard worker. His labor and life are woven into the history of the Norwegian Synod as few others are. He died in 1914.

PROF. FRIEDRICH AUGUST SCHMIDT, D. D., born at Leutenberg, Germany, January 3, 1837, came to America in his youth and studied at the Concordia Seminary at St. Louis, Mo. He served congregations at Eden, N. V. (1859), at Baltimore, Md. (1859-61), and was professor at the Norwegian Luther College at Decorah, Ia. (1861-72). From 1872 to 1876 he was a member of the faculty of the Concordia Seminary, St. Louis; 1876-86 of the Norwegian Seminary at Madison, Wis.; 1886-90 of the Norwegian Seminary at Northfield, Minn. Since 1890 he has been connected with the seminary of the United Norwegian Church at Minneapolis, Minn. He edited "The Lutheran Watchman" (1865-66), "Altes und Neues" (1880-85), "Lutherske Vidnesbred" (1882-88), and has written a number of articles on predestination, having been closely connected with the controversy on this doctrine in the Missouri and Norwegian Synods.

PROF. HANS GERHARD STUB, D. D., born at Muskego, Wis, February 23, 1849, was trained in the schools of the Missouri Synod, and later attended the University of Leipzig. Having been ordained in 1872, he served a congregation at Minneapolis, Minn. (1872-78), and then became professor at

Luther Seminary, Madison, Wis. (1878-88), continuing in this position after the school was transferred to Robbinsdale, near Minneapolis (1888-1900). Since 1910 he has been president of the Norwegian Synod, and has resided at St. Paul, Minn. In the present controversy concerning predestination he takes a leading part as a representative of the Norwegian Synod, which formerly belonged to Missouri.

## § 32. Danish Lutherans in America.

Note: Contributed by the Rev. Prof. P. S. Vig.

### 1. Danish emigration

Danish emigration to America is, in one sense, very old. There were quite a number of Danes among the Dutch of New Netherland, and some of them were members of the Dutch Lutheran congregations of New Amsterdam, Manhattan, etc. There were also some Danes among the Germans in Pennsylvania and members of the Lutheran congregations there. Among the older German Lutheran pastors of Pennsylvania, Peter Brunnholtz and J. D. Leps were Danes. Quite a number of Danes were members of the Moravian settlements in Pennsylvania, and some of their most gifted preachers were Danes, and had been Lutheran pastors in Denmark, among them, Otto C. Krogstrup, A. C. Langgaard, Jakob Friis, Jorgen Solle and others.

Danish emigration to the United States, in the real sense of the word, is, however, a feature of the NINETEENTH CENTURY. Before 1840 it consisted mostly of mechanics, sailors, hunters, and a few physicians, and was restricted mostly to the Atlantic States. Between the years 1840 and 1850 emigration from the rural districts of Denmark began and has continued to this day, so that the Danes in America now number about half a million, about one-seventh of all the Danes in the world.

The Danes in the United States are SCATTERED, and in more than one sense of the term. As a rule, they are not found in great numbers in any one place, with the exception of the great cities of New York, Chicago, Minneapolis, Omaha, Racine, Wis., and San Francisco, Cal. The larger rural settlements of Danes in the United States are found in Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, and the Dakotas. There are Danes in all the states of the Union and in most of the large cities.

In regard to RELIGIOUS AFFILIATIONS the Danes are, perhaps, even more scattered. A great many of the Danish emigrants between 1850 and 1870 came to America as Mormons, and their descendants are now members of that body. Not a few who came here, caring for no religion, became Methodists and Baptists, Adventists, etc. It would be difficult to find a religious sect in America, among whose members there are not some Danes. But very few are Roman Catholics, and most of those who are have become so through marriage.

Not a few of the older Danish emigrants who would not leave the Lutheran Church, because members of the Norwegian and Swedish Lutheran churches in Illinois, Wisconsin and Minnesota. But the great majority of Danes who came to America in earlier days were members of no church, and their descendants today belong to the great unbaptized multitudes of the country.

## **2. Lutheran mission work among the Danes**

Lutheran mission work among the Danes in the United States lags far behind that carried on among the Swedes and Norwegians. The first Lutheran pastor among the Norwegians in the United States was a young Danish lay preacher. CLAUS L. CLAUSEN (1820-1892), who came to America in 1843 and was ordained to the Lutheran ministry October 18, 1843. near Milwaukee. Wis., by the German pastor, L. F. R. Krause, from Silesia. Although Clausen's work was among the Norwegians in Iowa, Wisconsin and Minnesota, he did for his own countrymen what he could. He organized several DANISH CONGREGATIONS, and through letters and visits to Denmark spoke of the necessity of sending missionaries to the religiously destitute Danes in America. Mainly through Clausen's influence a "COMMITTEE for the furthering of the preaching of the gospel among Danes in America" was formed in Denmark in 1869. a voluntary association of four clergymen and one layman. In 1871 this committee sent THREE MEN TO AMERICA, Pastor A. C. L. Grove-Rasmussen, of Gram in Schleswig — to survey the field of work and report to the committee on his return — and two laymen, Mr. A. S. Nielsen, who had worked as a lay preacher in Denmark for several years, and Mr. Rasmus Andersen, who had studied for the foreign mission field. In the same year, 1871, TWO DANISH MISSIONARIES among the heathen, Rev. N. Thomsen from India, and A. Dan from Africa, came to America as pastors

for Danish congregations in Indianapolis, Ind., and Racine, Wis., respectively. A. vS. Nielsen was called by a Danish congregation at Cedar Falls, Iowa, and was ordained by C. L. Clausen, November 17, 1871, at St. Ansgar, Iowa. R. Anderson was ordained in 1872 by A. S. Nielsen as pastor of a Danish congregation at Waupaca, Wis.

### 3. The First Organization.

Clausen, when he ordained Nielsen, was president of the NORWEGIAN DANISH CONFERENCE (founded in 1870), and he naturally expected that the Danish pastors would unite with that organization. That hope, however, was not realized. Pastor Grove-Rasmussen, in his report to the committee in Denmark on his return from America, had warned against union with the conference, it being, in his opinion, TOO ORTHODOX. The truth is that Grove-Rasmussen, as well as A. S. Nielsen and most of the members of the committee in Denmark, were FOLLOWERS OF N. F. S. GRUNDTVIG, and did not consider the Holy Scripture as the formal principle of the Christian Church, but set the Apostles' Creed above it — that, and not Scripture, being the Word of God and the foundation of the Christian Church, connected, as it was and always has been, with baptism, the door into the Christian Church. Of the four Danish pastors in the United States in 1872, three united with some laymen under the name, "THE MISSIONARY ASSOCIATION OF THE CHURCH" (Kirkelig Missionsforening) and started a weekly church paper. "Kirkelig Samler," Rev. A. Dan, editor, Afterwards, in 1878. the name of the association was CHANGED to "The Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church of America," and a constitution was adopted on Grundtvigian lines — emphasizing the fact that said church was the true daughter of the Danish National Church. The church had no Theological Seminary: its candidates for the ministry had to come from Denmark, and were educated mostly under Grundtvigian influence.

Still SOME OF THE PASTORS WERE NOT GRUNDTVIGIANS, but emphasized the Holy Scripture as the formal principle of the church, and worked in accordance therewith in their congregations. Derogatory expressions about Holy Scripture were published in the church papers, and finally a heated controversy took place, lasting for several years, between the ultra Grundtvigians and the orthodox Lutherans. In 1894 A RUPTURE occurred in the church, the Grundtvigians having adopted a new constitution and decreeing that those



who did not subscribe to it before three months had elapsed would be considered non-members of the church. Twenty-two ministers and their congregations failed to subscribe to said constitution.

#### **4. The Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America.**

In the fall of 1894 at Elk Horn, Iowa, the above named NON-SUBSCRIBING ministers, with delegates from some of their congregations, met and organized themselves under the name, "The Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church of North America," electing Rev. P. L. C. Hansen, Cedar Falls, Ia., President, Rev. N. L. J. Soholm, Waupasa, Wis., Treasurer, Rev. H. J. Dahlstrom, Secretary. The new body published a weekly church paper, "The Missionary Messenger;" editors: Rev. N. P. Simonsen and Rev. P. P. Jensen. The Danish high school at Elk Horn, Ia. (founded 1878), was purchased and used for a THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. Rev. P. S. Vig was elected professor. The weekly paper, "Danskeren," published by Rev. J. N. Jersild at Neenah, Wis., was also the organ of "The North Church," the common name of the new body.

#### **5. The Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church Association of America of 1884.**

This church body consisted of Danish pastors who had been educated at AUGSBURG SEMINARY, Minneapolis, Minn., and served Danish congregations in the Norwegian Danish conference. In 1884 they, with the consent of the conference, ORGANIZED themselves under the above name and started a theological seminary at Blair, Neb., "TRINITY SEMINARY." "Kirkebladet," published since 1877, became the organ of the new organization.

#### **6. The United Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (1896).**

After considerable discussion in the papers, and several meetings, the two last named church bodies AGREED TO UNITE. A committee was appointed to prepare articles of agreement, which were adopted by the annual meetings of both parties, and in the fall of 1896 delegates from both met in Minneapolis, Minn., formed the United Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, and elected officers. The united church HAD THEN 63 pastors, 8

missionaries, 127 congregations and 63 preaching stations. It now (1915) has 133 pastors and professors, about 300 congregations and preaching stations, and a membership of about 23,000. Trinity Seminary, Blair, Neb., 22 students, 2 professors, P. S. Vig, president. DANA COLLEGE, BLAIR, NEB., has 10 professors and about 160 students. High Schools at Kenmare, N. D., Racine, Wis., and Elk Horn, Ia. PUBLISHING HOUSE, Blair, Neb., Mr. H. Skov-Nielsen, Mgr. Two Orphans' Homes, Waupaca, Wis., and Elk Horn, Ia. Sanatorium for consumptives. Brush, Colo. Old Peoples' Home, Brush, Colo. FOREIGN MISSIONS: Japan — 5 missionaries; HOME MISSIONS: Moodys, Okla. — 4 missionaries; Mission in Utah. Rev. J. Th. Lund; INNER MISSIONS: Emigration Missions: Brooklyn, N. Y., Boston, Mass., and Seaman's Mission at San Francisco, Cal.

## 7. The Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

After the rupture in 1894, the Grundtvigians were sustained by help from Denmark. Several candidates came over from Denmark and served for some years in America. The Danish church now has 100 pastors and professors, about 100 congregations and a membership of about 20,000. THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY at Grand View, Des Moines, Ia. HIGH SCHOOLS at Nysted, Neb., Solvang, Cal, Tyler, Minn., and Ashland, Mich. ORPHANS' HOMES: Chicago, Ill., Perthamboy, N. J., Tyler, Minn. OLD PEOPLE'S HOME: Des Moines, Ia.

- 
1. This was the famous "Hans Buschbauer," noted for his articles on agriculture, contributed to the Milwaukee "Germania." At one time he was vice governor of Illinois.↵
  2. These two assistants first joined the Franckean Synod, later the Synod of Illinois, and, together with the Swedes, organized the Scandinavian-Augustana Synod in 1860.↵
  3. Kirchliche Mitteilnigen, No. 2. 1844.↵
  4. He managed this fund so carefully as to be able to return \$168 to the donor.↵
  5. Kirchliche Mitteilungen, No. 4, 1845.↵
  6. The Hauges Synod did not take part.↵

## **10. Small Synods of Different Languages.**

### **§ 33. Small Synods of Different Languages.**

#### **1. The Icelandic Lutheran Synod.**

The first settlement of Icelanders at Manitoba, Canada, and in Minnesota (1875) was followed by an immigration to North Dakota and to Northwest Canada. The Revs. Jon Bjornason and Pall Thorlackson organized churches in Manitoba in 1877 and 1878. Thorlackson, after forming congregations in North Dakota, died there in 1882. In 1885 two pastors (J. Bjornason and H. B. Thergrimso) founded a synod which now has 50 congregations, 15 pastors and two students who serve as missionaries. Bjornason was president of this synod for 23 years. There are about 23,000 Icelanders in Canada and North America. Many have no church affiliation, and a number of congregations are without ministerial supply. The synod publishes a monthly paper ("Sameiningin"), and has its own Sunday-school literature, liturgy and hymnal. Its pastors are mostly graduates of the Chicago Seminary (General Council). It shares the theological views of the General Council, having no tendency toward modern liberalism. Two years ago it founded a high school at Winnipeg, Man., naming it after Jon Bjornason, the worthy pioneer of the synod. The school has 3 professors and 30 students. Recently the synod acquired a home for the aged.

#### **2. The Suomi (Finnish) Synod.**

The Finnish Ev. Luth. Synod in America, also called the Suomi Synod, was founded at Calumet, Mich., March 25, 1890. In the beginning it had 5 pastors and 9 congregations. Today (1915) it consists of 35 ministers, 85 church buildings, 132 congregations and 30,000 communicants. It maintains 47 parish schools and 50 teachers. Total valuation of property, \$369,924.00. For missionary purposes it raised \$4,000.00 in 1915. Its main enterprise is the Suomi College, connected with the theological seminary at Hancock, Mich. The school, opened in a rented house in the fall of 1896, acquired property of its own in 1900 and has today 10 professors and 140

scholars. The President of the institution is Dr. J. K. Nikander. The theological department has two professors and 9 students. Confessionally this synod is akin to the Swedish Augustana Synod and the General Council.

# 11. Constitutional Forms of the Lutheran Church in America.

## § 34. Constitutional Forms of the Lutheran Church in America.

ANNOTATION: This is merely a symposium of the excellent material collected by Prof. O. Kraushaar in his book: "Die Verfassungsformen der Luth. Kirche Amerikas," 1911. For a more detailed account the reader has to consult the volume of Prof. Kraushaar. As in his book, so also here, we are not able to consider the condition among the Scandinavians. This cannot well be done until the Scandinavians themselves have given to the Lutheran Church of America a work like that of Prof. Kraushaar.

### 1. Congregational Constitutions.

The constitutional regulations of the Lutheran Church in America are the result of a gradual development closely connected with the history of American Lutheranism. This appears from a careful perusal of the preceding chapters. When MUHLENBERG, the first to undertake the organization of different congregations, entered upon his work, "he found a number of organized churches whose constitutional rules were strikingly alike."<sup>1</sup> He discovered congregations with elders and councilmen. The laymen who had formed these organizations had no doubt gotten their ideas from Reformed congregations surrounding them. Fabricius carried similar principles from New York to the Swedes in Pennsylvania. Germans immigrating to New York probably borrowed them from the Dutch Lutherans. These rules prevailed also under W. C. Berkenmeyer and Joh. K. Stoever, the latter being the chief organizer of congregations in Pennsylvania.

Lutheran congregations at London and Amsterdam, which served as models for the American churches, had worked out some CONSTITUTIONS WHICH WERE USED AS IDEALS at the founding of new churches. MUHLENBERG, having familiarized himself with these constitutions at London, Ebenezer and New York, used them in 1750 in creating a constitution for the Augustus congregation of Trappe (New Providence),<sup>2</sup> and in 1762 in collaborating

with Wrangel to give a constitution for St. Michael's Church in Philadelphia. This constitution conferred upon the CONGREGATIONS "supreme control of their own affairs, such as the choice of a clergyman, the election of officers, etc. It was a congregational government, based upon the free will and consent of the members, thus guaranteeing an activity along Scriptural and confessional lines." The government, on the part of the congregations, was not direct, but they elected pastors and officers, and these formed the COUNCIL, which administered the affairs. In case a pastor was to be called or deposed, SYNODICAL ADVICE was also provided for.<sup>3</sup> This formula of government was amended in 1791 to the effect that congregations should call a pastor, elect officers, etc., without the consent of the synod. Should the minister become president of the council, he would hold this office as a special privilege conferred upon him by the congregation. All congregational matters were being handled by the council which was expected to submit to the congregations only business of vital importance, such as financial conditions, etc. The church council — consisting of six elders, six deacons and the pastor — received new members, dismissed them, exercised church discipline, even against the ministers, officers and members, represented the congregation in court, issued orders, adopted by-laws and, in short, ADMINISTERED ALL MATTERS pertaining to the preservation and regulation of the parish.

This formula of government was the model for the congregations throughout New York and Pennsylvania. True, the synods of these states later composed constitutions of their own (Pennsylvania, 1872; New York, 1852), but these were based upon the original constitution of the patriarch. This constitution of Muhlenberg was (1823) reconstructed into the "FORMULA FOR THE GOVERNMENT AND DISCIPLINE OF EV. LUTH. CHURCH" (enlarged in 1827 and 1864), AND IN THIS FORM IT WAS RECOMMENDED BY THE GENERAL SYNOD TO THE DISTRICT SYNODS. The changes made in the revised edition gave larger authority to the pastors and the synods.<sup>4</sup> The constitution for the Lutheran Church in the South moved along the same line. The Joint Synod of Ohio and the Tennessee Synod based their constitutions on that of the General Synod (1833 sq.). Here, however, the church council and not the synod is the highest authority. When revised in 1853 the obligation to "the doctrine of the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church" was made unalterable. The old practice of pulpit exchange with the Reformed was elimi-

nated. In 1893 this old constitution, which could be traced back to the work of Muhlenberg, was displaced by one of Missourian origin (1843).

WESTERN SYNODS organized their congregations ABSOLUTELY INDEPENDENT of congregational constitutions in the East. BUFFALO SYNOD had no constitution made in America until 1886. Influenced by Grabau's ideas of the ministry, the old constitutions of Saxony and Pomerania were regarded as sufficient. In 1886 a constitution for the congregation in Buffalo was created, which then became the model for others.<sup>5</sup> Councilmen are elected for life. The pastor has many rights and privileges, not on account of the office he holds, but in the interest of good order.

In the spring of 1843 Walther composed a constitution of only 21 paragraphs for Trinity Church, St. Louis.<sup>6</sup> It dealt largely with questions of membership, contributions and the congregational ballot, conferring no privileges upon the council, but vesting all authority in the congregation, which in its monthly meetings decides concerning the reception of new members and all other matters pertaining to the Church, This constitution served as a model in the MISSOURI SYNOD.

The IOWA SYNOD adopted Loehe's constitution in the greatly simplified form given to it at a pastoral conference, held in April, 1855.<sup>7</sup> A peculiarity of this constitution consists in this, that pastors and officers of the synod are given a part in calling the ministers. The president of the synod suggests a candidate, while the election by congregational vote takes place in the presence of some clergyman, if it is at all possible. It is not clear where the authority to depose an unworthy minister rests. Candidates for membership announce their intention to the pastor, and they "are received among the catechumens." A revision (1850) added some regulations concerning secret societies, dances, etc. This constitution had as yet no rules about congregational meetings, property and officers. Here the churches were to be guided by the rules of the state in which they were located. An entirely new constitution was presented in 1877 (by Deindoerfer), and came into general use. Here those former peculiarities have disappeared. The congregation has supreme authority, and, while in case of unsettled controversies it may ask the advice of the synod, such advice ends with the force of its arguments.

All these constitutions, whether Presbyterian or Congregational in character, rest on the PRINCIPLE, expressed in the Formula of Concord:<sup>8</sup> "That the Church of God of every place and every time has, according to its circumstances, the authority, power and right to change, to diminish and to in-

crease them (the ceremonies), without thoughtlessness and offense, in an orderly and becoming way, as at any time it may be regarded most profitable, most beneficial and the best for good order. Christian discipline, and the edification of the Church.”

## 2. Synodical Constitutions.

Muhlenberg took part in the composition of the CONSTITUTION OF THE MINISTERIUM OF PENNSYLVANIA OF 1781. This document, although not recorded in the protocol until 1781, was completed in 1778.<sup>9</sup> It was revised in 1792 and again in 1841. An almost entirely new constitution, was adopted in 1867. The latter was revised in 1886 and in 1906.

The constitution of 1792 became the model for the synodical constitutions of the NEW YORK MINISTERIUM of 1794 (revised in 1816, 1870, 1883) and of the JOINT SYNOD OF OHIO (1824 and 1848). On this same constitution (of 1792) is also based the constitution which the GENERAL SYNOD recommended to its districts and which has been the instrument for the organization of all synods that were ever connected with that body. The SYNODS OF THE SOUTH also used this constitution. The General Synod adopted it in 1829 (cf. § 11, 1, a), revised it somewhat in 1835 and 1864 and more thoroughly in 1875. The constitution of 1792 conferred upon lay delegates the right to vote (with certain limitations), which in the constitution of 1781 was given only to the pastors. Eventually the laymen received the voting privilege unreservedly.

The MISSOURI SYNOD PURSUED A PATH OF ITS OWN. The constitution which Walther suggested at the first meeting was adopted as the basis for the founding of the Missouri Synod (cf. § 22, 4). When the division into districts took place (1854), this constitution was revised and is still valid.<sup>10</sup> However, since 1914 a committee has been authorized to make new revisions. But such a revision will have to be submitted to every congregation before it can be accepted. While Walther's constitution for the congregation is very brief, the one for the synod is exceedingly lengthy, containing at first (1846) 90 and later (1854) 120 sections. It displays the dread of hierarchy. The synod is composed of the local congregations which unite for common work. Congregations are represented by pastors and lay delegates. The vote is confined to pastors of congregations who have actually united with the synod. Pastors emeriti and professors are only advisory members. Only



upon special invitation can the synod take part in the election or the deposition of a pastor. The constitution contains a great deal which properly belongs to works on pastoral theology, to church legislation as a branch of science and to the minutes of synods. It can be changed only by the vote of all congregations connected with the synods. There is, for instance, the proposition of changing the mode of electing professors. Not even that could be done without previously consulting all the congregations. Officers are elected for a period of three years.

THE BUFFALO SYNOD at first was governed by the rules on church government as they prevailed in Saxony and Pomerania, adding thereto in 1861. Not until 1886 did it compose its own constitution, which by greatly altering the original hierarchical features, puts the Buffalo Synod practically on the same basis as other synods. The difference is largely one of phraseology, and a resolution requiring proper interpretation would remove the last remnant of what this synod originally stood for (comp. § 23, 1).

THE IOWA SYNOD had no real synodical constitution until 1864, but in place of it a number of resolutions bearing on the administration of the synod. The constitution of 1864,<sup>11</sup> containing only 31 brief paragraphs, was revised in 1869, 1873 (division into districts), and added to in 1879 and 1888 (representation of districts in a general body). In 1904 all sections subjected to alterations were put into a class by themselves, and thus the constitution was greatly simplified. The leading idea is the centralization in the synod of all efforts for the common cause. The districts (as in the Missouri Synod) are merely territorial subdivisions, arranging local matters, and serving as the instrument of the general body for the guardianship over doctrine and practice of the individual pastors and congregations. All ministers who, though their congregations are not connected with the synod, take a part in the general work, are entitled to vote, while, as to the laymen, this privilege is given only to delegates of congregations which have actually united with the synod.

- 
1. O. Kraushaar, p. 7.↩
  2. O. Kraushaar, pp. 18-25.↩
  3. O. Kraushaar, p. 26.↩
  4. O. Kraushaar, pp. 83-84.↩

5. O. Kraushaar, pp. 107-113.↵
6. O. Kraushaar, pp. 126-129.↵
7. The first form vainly sought by Prof. Kraushaar is found in the synodical chronicles, pp. 8-10; the alterations of 1856 on p. 16.↵
8. Jacobs' Book of Concord, p. 645, a.↵
9. O. Kraushaar, pp. 234-244.↵
10. Some demanding amrdments.↵
11. O. Kraushaar, pp. 373-376.↵

## 12. General Review.

### § 35. A Discussion of the Development of the Lutheran Church in America.

Through Muhlenberg the early Lutheran congregations were placed upon the basis of the Lutheran confessions. It is true that Muhlenberg's Lutheranism lacked the clear vision that comes only as a result of conflict with opposing tendencies. With the exception of the stand against the adherents of Zinzendorf, we do not notice any particular theological opposition, on the part of Muhlenberg, to the various Reformed influences which surrounded him. We may even discover some embryonic principles which, in their ultimate development, contributed towards producing a questionable type of Lutheranism (of. § 9). But there was not much of this with Muhlenberg, and it was unintentional on his part. He would have rejected the development which appeared later in "American Lutheranism."

Connection with Germany was interrupted for a time by the War of Independence. For several years but few laymen and ministers immigrated to this country. This at least brought the advantage that the -American Church was not altogether swamped with the Rationalism then dominating Germany. On the other hand, however, we notice that a tendency toward unionism, which is ever characteristic of Pietism, made headway in that period.

The men who founded the General Synod were anxious to preserve the identity of the Lutheran Church in this country. It was unfortunate, however, that they had drifted away from the Lutheranism of Muhlenberg, and had unconsciously inhaled the atmosphere of doctrinal indifferentism, and thus could not appreciate the fact that the historic Lutheran Church can exist only on a confessional basis. A further misfortune was the withdrawal of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania (1823) and the lack of cooperation on the part of the Joint Synod of Ohio and the Synod of Tennessee. Even if there were un-Lutheran tendencies in these synods, especially in the Pennsylvania and Ohio, yet, because of their German blood, these synods adhered with great tenacity to the traditions of the past, and would have given an entirely different character to later developments, had they taken a part in the forming of the General Synod. Thus the General Synod assumed an English

physiognomy from the very beginning, losing the advantage of German influences, and this, too, at a time when Germany, reacting against Rationalism and the Union, was experiencing a great revival of Lutheran consciousness. Laymen and ministers who arrived from Germany with a faith renewed and strengthened, steered clear of the General Synod, and joined other synods, which thus acquired excellent material for their congregations, and especially a superior class of theological scholars. The confessional element in the General Synod remained in the minority, its press and seminary being controlled by leaders of "American Lutheranism." With the influx of other synods (Hartwick, Frankean, East Ohio and Melancthon synods), which, on account of their doctrinal laxity, preferred the General Synod to other synods, the character of the General Synod became increasingly lukewarm, until it reached the climax of Liberalism in the "Definite Theological Platform."

A reaction was bound to follow. Under the leadership of the Pennsylvania Synod, which had returned to the General Synod, and whose leaders were men of strong Lutheran convictions, a rupture took place at Fort Wayne, resulting in the forming of the General Council. The explicit comments on this movement in preceding pages (§§ 9 and 10) make repetition unnecessary; yet we may raise the question: "Was this rupture unavoidable?" Those who answer in the affirmative refer to the development of the General Council, which has, unhindered by antagonistic influences, developed into a body of faithfulness to Lutheran standards and of adaptability to the American people. Others — good Lutherans, too — answering in the negative, argue that, if the General Synod has grown more conservative in spite of the exodus of the General Council, how much more rapid such a development would have been, had the withdrawing element remained with the organization (giving to it the benefit of its views) instead of antagonizing it by a schism! But since the separation has taken place, we must deal with facts instead of philosophizing about possibilities. We simply repeat that the way which was not chosen was not altogether impassable. Had the two elements remained together, severe conflicts might have continued for a while, but the result would not have been doubtful. Wherever negations and affirmations clash, affirmations will conquer in the end, although negations under certain circumstances may make valuable contributions to the development of affirmations.

The founding of the General Council led naturally to the full acceptance of all the Lutheran confessions. Dr. Krauth had already realized that the adoption of the Augsburg Confession in its historical significance was a matter of vital importance. A further impetus to this position was given by the prospect of attracting synods of very conservative views. That a definite and organic union among all conservative Lutherans failed, was due to the fact that the General Council could not concede in matters of practice what was demanded by the Western synods.

Alongside of the old synods of the East (General Synod, General Council, United Synod of the South), the synods of the West formed an independent stream. We are thinking of the Synods of Missouri, Buffalo,<sup>1</sup> Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, the Swedes and the Norwegians. While Ohio belongs to the older synods, it has gradually adopted the attitude of the Western synods. Men like Walther, Loehe, Wyneken, Grabau, Loy developed a confessional wing which not only accepts all the symbols of the Lutheran Church, but insists on absolute doctrinal unity, does its parochial work on the old Lutheran basis, and in its practice takes a bold position against the American spirit (church fellowship and secret societies). The majority of these synods are united in the Synodical Conference.<sup>2</sup>

A meditating position, embodying vital elements of truth, is occupied by Iowa. While Missouri and congenial synods have, in their pursuit of “dogmatical-traditional” ideals, severed their connection with the Church in Germany, Iowa has adhered to a “historic-exegetical” point of view both in the adoption of the confessions and in the principle of “open questions.” Being in more or less accord with the positive theology of Germany, it is also closely related to the General Council.

The General Synod has grown more conservative. For a long time the founding of the General Council and the bitterness resulting therefrom, impeded such a development. But after the smoke of battle had cleared away, the way was open for an impartial consideration of the confessional questions. The Conservatives constantly gained in influence. The culmination of this confessional movement was reached at the Richmond convention (1909). See the resolutions on pages 451-453. The confessional position as finally expressed was not exactly the position of the General Council. The General Synod did not put the Secondary Symbols on the same level with the Augsburg Confession, but she declared that by accepting the Augsburg Confession she meant the *Invariata*, and that she considered the Secondary

Symbols to be of “great historical and interpretative value.” In the express adoption of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession the General Synod once for all squared itself with historical Lutheranism; for it means the acceptance of Luther’s theology as contrasted with that of Melancthon, particularly along the two historically important lines of Free Will and the Means of Grace.<sup>3</sup> While the General Synod does not commit herself to every view expressed in the Secondary Symbols, yet, by adopted the Invariata and recognizing the historical and interpretative value of the Secondary Symbols, she has placed herself in the position of recognizing the legitimate development of the Augustana, as that development has taken place in the Lutheran Church; that is, she accepts the Augustana in the historical sense.

While the Council was formed by Germans, the development in the General Synod was in the hands of the English element, supported by the Germans.

However, an essential difference remains between the Synodical Conference, Ohio, Buffalo, Iowa and the stricter Norwegians, on the one hand, and the Council, the General Synod and the United Synod of the South, on the other. The former group is being largely dominated by the German spirit. It adheres to German ideals of discipline and consistency, expressing themselves in the application of confessional principles to congregational practice; while the latter synods demand an increasing adaptation to the American spirit. Here any defects in parochial affairs are to be overcome, not by synodical discipline, but by a gradual education. The practical views of the American take the place of German consistency of action.

But in spite of such a difference, the prospects for the union of American Lutherans are brighter today than ever before. All agree in recognizing the Bible as the sole source, rule and standard of faith, accept the Augsburg Confession in its historical sense, and are convinced that the Lutheran Church stands for the most perfect form of religion which has been revealed to us by history. We may mention as a symptom of reapproachment the moderate tone being observed in doctrinal discussions, and also the respectful treatment mutually accorded by the organs of opposing synods.

## **§ 36. Review of the Extension of the Lutheran Church in America.**

The Lutheran Church began as a tiny plant. It had small beginnings in two localities: New York and Pennsylvania. Later we notice scattered settlements along the Atlantic Coast as far south as Georgia. Since immigration was largely directed to Pennsylvania, this state has ever recorded the strongest growth of Lutheran churches. In the beginning of the nineteenth century the stream of immigration, crossing the mountains, flowed toward the West, and resulted in strong Lutheran settlements, especially in Indiana and Ohio, where the descendants of Eastern Lutherans (New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia) established themselves.

The great immigration of the nineteenth century flooded the country with German settlers. These filled the Eastern church, which had been losing ground by the anglicization of its members, formed new congregations and eventually covered the whole West. Finally the stream of immigration — then largely composed of people who had settled in the United States — was directed toward New England.

Thus in course of time we find a strong Lutheran Church in America. Statistics, ever fluctuating, have little purpose. Suffice it to mention the states in which the Lutheran Church compares favorably with the denominations: Minnesota, Wisconsin, North and South Dakota, Iowa, Pennsylvania and Nebraska; or arranged according to the numerical strength of Lutherans: Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, Ohio, New York, Iowa, Michigan, Indiana, Nebraska, Missouri, Maryland. Statistics of 1910 locate Lutherans in every State of the Union.<sup>4</sup>

In Germany and America, among friends and foes, it has become customary to complain of the unhappy divisions of the Lutheran Church in America. Someone, revealing his own ignorance, has spoken of 60 kinds of Lutherans. There are, to be sure, four large organizations and 16 smaller synods. But none will seriously assert that the Finns, the Icelanders, the Danes and the Norwegians, though isolated in their own spheres, represent different types of Lutheranism. Nor can it be said that Iowa and Ohio, while maintaining independent organizations, are different kinds of Lutherans.

There are, in fact, only three divisions of Lutherans in this country: one representing confessional indifferentism; another a rigid confessionalism; and a third a conservative Lutheranism. But these are not always confined to synodical limits.

The history of the Lutheran Church in this country has been marked by violent controversies. Looking at these from the viewpoint of Christian

charity, we do not doubt that much offense has been given. Men have mistaken their personal opinions for the divine truth. Human obstinacy may have been substituted for holy zeal. But, on the whole, it must be conceded that the underlying purpose has been loyalty to the Word of God. These controversies prove that the Church has not lost its vitality, and is still able to defy the new "science," with its scorn of an infallible Bible.

We have called attention to the difficulties of Lutheran progress. The stage of transition which marks the rising generation, linguistic and national prejudices, have often stood in the way. Again there has been a lack of competent men. But the Church has taken hold of these problems in an energetic spirit, preparing its ministers and meeting conditions in America, where it now occupies the third place among the Protestant churches. The impression is gaining ground that this era of American Neo-Rationalism demands as its special antidote the firm position of the Lutheran Church. Preaching Christ crucified, the justification by grace of the repentant sinner, it will give rest to the souls that starve under modern pulpits. May the Lutheran Church ever treasure the teaching of Holy Scripture concerning sin and salvation; for the preservation of the old Gospel is her God-given mission in this age of changing conditions and wavering faith.

## **37. Appendices.**

### **I. The Davenport Theses. (§ §29; 23, 11.)**

[1] The oldest subjects of controversy between the Synod of Iowa and the Synod of Missouri are the doctrines of the Church and of the Ministry. Concerning the doctrine of the Church we could not agree with the Synod of Missouri when it declared that the Church in its nature is invisible in the sense that all that belongs to its visibility must be excluded from the definition of its nature.

[2] On the other hand, we maintained that the Church is, indeed, chiefly the communion of the Holy Ghost and of faith in the heart, but that it is also the communion of the Word and the Sacraments, and that in this sense it is at once visible and invisible.

[3] Since Missouri in its colloquium with Buffalo has conceded that the communion of the means of grace must be reckoned as a part of the nature



of the Church, we no longer regard ourselves as holding views on this point in opposition to those of Missouri.

[4] On the doctrine of the ministry, we cannot concede that, according to the confession of our Church, the ministry originates through the transference of the rights of the spiritual priesthood possessed by the individual Christian.

[5] In opposition to this view, we maintain that the public office of the ministry is transmitted by God through the congregation of believers in its entirety and essence by means of the regular call, because the “*mandatum de constituendis ministris*” (i.e., the command to ordain preachers) is not given to the individual members, but to the Church as such.

[6] In connection with the controversy concerning the Church and the ministry, a difference of attitude towards the Church’s Symbols became manifest. While Missouri extended the obligation of the symbols to all the statements contained in them without exception, we limited the obligation to those statements to which the symbols intended to give symbolical fixedness; and accordingly we distinguished between the thetical and antithetical decisions as the substance of the confessions which is binding on the conscience, and the casual elaborations, proofs, etc., as parts which do not possess immediate and independent symbolical authority.

[7] At the colloquium at Milwaukee, Missouri abandoned the assertion that each and every doctrine which occurs in any manner in the symbols is on that very account binding; and we on our part abandoned the attempts, by means of a distinction between confessional statements and elaborative or demonstrative statements, to define the boundary between what is binding and what is not binding in the symbols. An agreement was reached, in accordance with which both sides designated all the articles of faith contained in the symbols as confessionally binding.

[8] In the doctrine concerning the Last Things, which formed another subject of controversy between us and Missouri, the first point to be mentioned is the doctrine of the Antichrist. Missouri maintained that the Antichrist, in the real sense of the word, is the pope alone and exclusively: but with this assertion we cannot agree.

[9] As regards the pope, we accept all the declarations of our Symbolical Books concerning his anti-Christian character, and acknowledge that all the marks of Antichrist which they enumerate agree with the pope’s kingdom and members.

[10] But while we hereby acknowledge our acceptance of the statements of our confession concerning the Antichrist as found by our fathers in Dan. 11. and of the application which they made of those marks to the papacy, we cannot concede that the respective passages in our Symbolical Books claim to exhaust the exegetical interpretation of the prophecies cited, and we do not regard it as being in conflict with our confession for anyone to hold that the personification of all these anti-Christian elements in a particular individual is foretold.

[11] As regards the so-called Chiliasm, we agree with our opponents in rejecting every doctrine of a thousand years' reign which would at any time rob the spiritual kingdom of our Lord of its character as a spiritual kingdom of grace and the cross, and convert it into an outward, earthly and worldly kingdom.

[12] On the other hand, while we do not as a synod differ from our opponents by accepting any form of Chiliasm, the belief that the reign of Christ and His saints for a thousand years, as prophesied in the 20th chapter of the Revelation of St. John, is still a matter of fulfillment in the future, is regarded by us as an opinion which the Church may tolerate, and not as an error necessitating exclusion from our church-fellowship.

[13] Since Missouri, on its part, has retracted the assertion that each and every form of Chiliasm, even the subtle and most subtle, is not only erroneous, but constitutes an error which necessitates exclusion from church fellowship, and we on our part have, to the satisfaction of our opponents, corrected the expressions to which Missouri objected, particularly with respect to a future two-fold coming of Christ, the difference between us on this point is substantially confined to the doctrine of the first resurrection in Rev. 20.

[14] Missouri not only most decidedly rejects such an interpretation of this passage as would apply it to a bodily resurrection from the dead, but asserts that any acceptance of a partial resurrection before the general resurrection is in itself a denial of the general resurrection, and therefore a fundamental error, in connection with which a chiliastic opinion which might otherwise be tolerated becomes a schismatical heresy.

[15] We, on the contrary, neither desire to deliver any official synodical opinion as to whether this passage must be understood as referring to a bodily or to a spiritual resurrection, nor can we see in the acceptance of a partial resurrection preceding the general resurrection the shadow of a heresy,

since in Matt. 27, at least, such a partial previous resurrection is taught beyond the possibility of contradiction or doubt. And finally we can never concede that an otherwise unobjectionable view of the so-called thousand years' reign can become an heretical error through the interpretation of Rev. 20:4 as a bodily resurrection, provided that no attempt is made to specify how and where this reign of the risen saints shall take place.

[16] In the course of our ecclesiastical controversies, the real fundamental difference between Missouri and Iowa has been seen to be the recognition of "open questions," the existence of which has on our part been acknowledged and proved, but which has on the part of Missouri been energetically denied.

[17] By this expression we do not, of course, mean to say that the respective doctrines are in themselves doubtful or uncertain, nor yet that they may be arbitrarily accepted or rejected, but simply that they are not to be regarded as involving separation from church-fellowship. In distinction from articles of faith, with respect to which there must exist within an ecclesiastical body perfect unanimity, we have always understood "open questions" to mean such doctrines as might be the subject of difference of views without thereby destroying the brotherhood of faith or ecclesiastical fellowship.

[18] Open questions in this sense cannot be such doctrines as are necessary to salvation or to the existence of the Church, but only such as either are not touched upon in God's Word at all, or at least are not taught in perfectly clear passages of Scripture — doctrines concerning which, therefore, no consensus has been reached in the Church, but with respect to which differences of view have always been found among orthodox teachers. In addition to the points mentioned above, we include among these doctrines that concerning Sunday, i.e.. that in the New Testament the observance of a particular day rests for the Christians in nowise upon a divine command, but only upon an inner necessity.

[19] Missouri, on the other hand, regards as unionism to speak of doctrinal opinions which may be permitted to stand side by side in the Church, and at the colloquium at Milwaukee declared that such a difference could be tolerated only when it referred to points concerning which God's Word contains no statement at all, while in all doctrines drawn from the Scriptures, whether they bear upon faith or life, there must necessarily be only one opinion.

[20] Recently, however, Missouri has been obliged, by the course of the controversy on usury in her own midst, to abandon her principle and to adopt ours.

[21] The particular declaration of our opponents in which we find this acknowledgment of the principles expressed is the following: "Know them, every one who desires to know, that we know how to distinguish between articles of faith and such doctrines of Scripture as are not articles of faith. We do not, indeed, permit any doctrine of Scripture, whether it appear great or small, to be made an open question; but while we regard it necessary to contend to the uttermost for every article of faith as one on which our faith and hope depend, to condemn the opposing error, and to deny fellowship to those who obstinately contradict, we by no means regard it necessary under all circumstances to go to the utmost extreme in contending for other doctrines of Scripture which are not articles of faith, much less to pass the sentence of condemnation upon the opposing error, though we reject it, nor to deny to those who err on this point the fellowship of faith.

“If in any controversy the question is one concerning doctrines which do not belong to the articles of faith, then for us all depends on whether the opponents show that they gainsay because they do not want to subject themselves to God’s Word, that is, whether, while they apparently let the fundamental doctrines of God’s Word stand, they overturn the foundation on which all those doctrines rest, namely, God’s Word.”

## **II. The Thirteen Propositions Of Missouri Concerning Election. (§ § 23, 111; 28, 2c; 29.)**

### **Proposition 1.**

We believe, teach and confess that God loved the whole world from eternity, created all men for salvation, and none for damnation, and that He earnestly wills the salvation of all men. And we reject and condemn, therefore, with all our heart, the opposing Calvinistic doctrine.

### **Proposition 2.**

We believe, teach and confess that the Son of God came into the world for all men, bore and atoned for the sins of all men, and redeemed all men without exception; and we reject and condemn, therefore, with all our heart the opposing Calvinistic doctrine.

**Proposition 3.**

We believe, teach and confess that God through the means of grace calls men earnestly, that is, with the purpose that through the call they shall come to repentance and faith, continue in it also to the end, and thus finally obtain salvation; and that to this end God through the means of grace offers to them the salvation acquired by Christ's satisfaction, and the power to apprehend it by faith: and we reject and condemn, therefore, with all our heart, the opposing Calvinistic doctrine.

**Proposition 4.**

We believe, teach and confess that no man will be lost because God did not desire to save him and passed him by with His grace, nor because God did not offer to him also the grace of steadfastness or did not desire to bestow it upon him; but that all men who are lost, are lost through their own fault, namely, because of their unbelief, and because they obstinately resist the Word and grace to the end; and that the "cause for this despising of the Word is not God's knowledge (*vel praescientia vel praesdestinatio*), but the perverse will of man, who rejects or perverts the means and instrument of the Holy Ghost which God offers him through the call, and resists the Holy Ghost who wishes to be efficacious and works through the Word; as Christ says: 'How often would I have gathered ...and ye would not,' Matt. 23, 27" (Book of Concord, Müller 713, Jacobs 656). We therefore reject and condemn with all our heart the opposing Calvinistic doctrine.

**Proposition 5.**

We believe, teach and confess that the subjects of election or predestination are only the truly believing, who till the end or at the end of their life truly believe; we reject and condemn, therefore, the error of Huber, that election is not particular but general and includes all men.

**Proposition 6.**

We believe, teach and confess that the divine decree of election is immutable, and that therefore no elect person can become reprobate and be lost, but that every elect person certainly will be saved; and we reject and condemn, therefore, with all our heart the opposing error of Huber.

**Proposition 7.**

We believe, teach and confess that it is foolish and perilous to the soul and leads either to carnal security or to despair, to seek by means of inquiry into the eternal divine secret decree to acquire a certain persuasion of our election or of our final salvation; and we reject and condemn with all our heart the opposing doctrine as a pernicious fanaticism.

**Proposition 8.**

We believe, teach and confess that a believing Christian should seek through God's revealed will to become certain of his election: and we reject and condemn, therefore, with all our heart the opposing papal error, that we can become certain of our election or salvation only through a new immediate revelation.

**Proposition 9.**

We believe, teach and confess: 1. That election does not consist simply in the fact that God foreknew who would be saved; 2. that election, further, is not simply the determination of God to redeem and save men, and therefore a general election, including all men; 3. that election does not include those who believe only for a while (Luke 8:13); 4. that election is not simply a decree of God that all those who believe to the end shall be saved; we reject and condemn, therefore, with all our heart the opposing errors of Rationalists, Huberists and Arminians.

**Proposition 10.**

We believe, teach and confess that the cause which moved God to choose the elect is solely His grace and the merit of Jesus Christ, and not some good which God foresaw in the elect, not even the faith which God foresaw in them; and we reject and condemn, therefore, the opposing doctrines of Pelagians, semi-pelagians and synergists as blasphemous, dreadful errors, which overturn the Gospel and with it the entire Christian religion.

**Proposition. 11.**

We believe, teach and confess that election is not simply the divine pre-science or foreknowledge of the salvation of the elect, but that it is also a cause of their salvation and of all that belongs to it; and we reject and condemn, therefore, with all our heart the opposing doctrines of the Arminians. Socinians and all synergists.

**Proposition 12.**

We believe, teach and confess that, with respect to the mystery of election, God has “still kept much untold and hidden, and reserved solely for his own wisdom and knowledge,” which no man can or should search out; and we condemn, therefore, the attempt to search out these things which have not been revealed, and to harmonize with our reason what appears to contradict our reason, whether this be done by Calvinistic or by Pelagian-synergistic human doctrines.

**Proposition 13.**

We believe, teach and confess that it is not only not useless and still less dangerous, but necessary and salutary to proclaim publicly to the Christian people the mysterious doctrine of election, in so far as it is clearly revealed in God’s Word; and we do not agree with those, therefore, who think that this doctrine is one concerning which we should keep silence or which we should discuss only among the learned.

**III. The Toledo Theses.**

**I. Thesis. The Church.**

The Church, in the proper sense of the term, is the communion of true believers as it is begotten through the means of grace and as by their use it edifies itself. From this it follows:

[a] According to its real essence the Church is, and remains invisible on this earth.

[b] Common participation in the means of grace is the necessary form of the Church’s appearance and the infallible mark of its existence; and in so far the Church is visible.

**II. Thesis. The Office of the Ministry.**

[a] The rights and duties of the spiritual priesthood comprehend not only the general command and call that believers reduce to practice their fellowship in the Gospel and their right and title to the means of grace, and accordingly teach and admonish one another in every manner, but also that without special call, they preach the Word to heathens and unbelievers, and in case of necessity, administer the sacrament of baptism; and then also, that

they establish the office of the ministry, inasmuch as this office has been originally and immediately given by Christ to the whole Church.

[b] The office of the ministry rests upon a special command of the Lord, valid throughout all time, and consists in the right and power conferred by special call, to administer the means of grace publicly and by commission of the congregation.

[c] The call (to the pastorate) is a right of the congregation within whose bounds the minister is to discharge the office. Ordination is a public and solemn confirmation of the call; and is not an apostolic churchly custom or order.

### **III. Thesis. Attitude to the Confessions.**

[a] A binding subscription to the Confessions (of the Church) pertains only to the doctrines of the faith therein set forth, and to these all without any exception.

[b] Whereas the doctrine of Sunday as taught in the Confessions is a doctrine revealed in God's Word, it is not to be excluded from the body of obligatory dogmas.

### **IV. Thesis. Open Question.**

[a] All doctrines revealed clearly and plainly in the Word of God are, by virtue of the divine authority of said Word, dogmatically fixed as true and binding upon the conscience, whether they have been symbolically settled as such or not.

[b] There is within the Church of God no authority whatever of departing from any truths clearly revealed by the Scriptures, be their contents considered fundamental or non-fundamental, important or apparently unimportant.

[c] Full agreement in all articles of faith constitutes the irremissible condition of church-fellowship. Persistent error in an article of faith must under all circumstances lead to separation.

[d] Perfect agreement in all non-fundamental doctrines, though not attainable on earth, is, nevertheless, an end desirable and one we should labor to attain.

[e] Those who knowingly, obdurately and persistently contradict the divine Word in any of its utterances whatsoever, thereby overthrow the or-



ganic foundation (of the faith), and are therefore to be excluded from church fellowship.

#### **V. Thesis. Chiliasm.**

[a] Any Chiliasm which conceives the kingdom of Christ to be something external, earthly and after the manner of the kingdoms of the world, and which teaches a resurrection of all believers before the day of judgment shall come, is a doctrine directly contrary to the analogy of faith, and is to be rejected as such.

[b] The belief of some, to wit, that the reign of Christ and His saints referred to in Rev. 20, is an event belonging to the future, as also that the resurrection there spoken of is to be understood as a bodily resurrection of some believers unto life everlasting, is an opinion which, though not incompatible with the analogy of faith, cannot be strictly proven from Scripture, no more than the spiritual interpretation of said passages can be shown to be the true one.

#### **VI. Thesis. Predestination and Conversion.**

[a] The error of Missouri on predestination we find to consist in this, that thereby the universal gracious will of God and His decree of election are so separated as to exclude one another, and that thus two contradictory wills are affirmed of God. This error renders unsafe the foundation upon which our salvation is based, and stamps as fundamentally wrong other statements which might otherwise admit of an acceptable interpretation.

[b] Concerning conversion, drawn into controversy in connection with the doctrine on predestination, we confess that, viewed as the placing or planting of a new spiritual life, conversion does not depend to any extent whatsoever on any cooperation, self-determination or good conduct on the part of man, nor consist therein, but that it is wholly and solely the work of the Holy Ghost, working the same by His gracious power in the means of grace. On the other hand, however, we deny that the Holy Ghost works conversion according to a mere pleasure of His elective will, or despite the most willful resistance, for example, in the case of the elect; but we hold that by such stubborn resistance both conversion and eternal election are hindered.

#### **IV. Statements Relative To The General Synod's Doctrinal Basis.**

(Adopted by the General Synod in 1909, in response to the General Council's Theses calling attention to certain apparent ambiguities in the General Synod's position. Only the most important paragraphs are here given.)

While the General Synod's formula of confessional subscription mentions only the Augsburg Confession, without specifying the terms, "altered" and "unaltered," yet it is a historical fact that the General Synod has never subscribed to any edition of the confession save the "unaltered" form, and does not now subscribe to any other edition. This is known as the *Editio Princeps* of 1530-31. and is precisely the edition from which a translation was prepared by a joint committee of the General Synod, the General Council, the United Synod of the South, and the Joint Synod of Ohio, "as a common Standard of the Augsburg Confession in English." (See page 299 of the General Synod's Book of Worship with Hymns and Tunes.) Therefore, the edition of the Augsburg Confession received by the General Synod is identical with that received by the General Council. (Minutes of the General Synod for 1909, pp. 56, 57.)

When the General Synod says, in her formula of confessional subscription, that she accepts "the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word and of the faith of our Church founded upon that Word," she means precisely what she says, namely, that the fundamental doctrines of God's Word are correctly set forth in the Confession. She does not mean that some of the doctrines set forth in the Confession are non-fundamental, and therefore may be accepted or rejected; she means that they are all fundamental, and their exhibition in the Confession is to be accepted by those who accept the Confession... The General Synod therefore asserts that the chief or foundation doctrines of God's Word are set forth in the Confession, and that they are correctly set forth therein. (Minutes, *ut supra*, p. 57.)

RESOLVED, That, inasmuch as the Augsburg Confession is the original, generic Confession of the Lutheran Church, accepted by Luther and his coadjutors, and subscribed to by all Lutheran bodies the world over, we therefore deem it an adequate and sufficient standard of Lutheran doctrine. In making this statement, however, the General Synod in no wise means to imply that she ignores, rejects, repudiates or antagonizes the Secondary Symbols of the Book of Concord, nor forbids any of her members from accepting or teaching all of them, in strict accordance with the Lutheran regulative principle of justifying faith. On the contrary, she holds those Symbols

in high esteem, regards them as a most valuable body of Lutheran belief, explaining and unfolding the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession, and she hereby recommends that they be diligently and faithfully studied by our ministers and laymen. (Minutes, ut supra, p. 60.)

WHEREAS, The phrase, “the Word of God as contained in the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments,” occurs in our formula of confessional subscription; and,

WHEREAS, When our fathers framed this language, the theological distinction between the two statements, “The Bible is the Word of God,” and, “The Bible contains the Word of God,” had not yet been made, or at least was not yet in vogue, and therefore there could have been no intention on their part of committing the General Synod to lax or heretical views of the inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures, but, on the contrary, a sincere desire to plant her firmly on the true doctrine of Biblical inspiration; and,

WHEREAS, The General Synod has ever occupied the same position with reference to the true and complete inspiration of the Canonical Scriptures; therefore,

RESOLVED, That we herewith declare our adherence to the statement, “The Bible is the Word of God,” and reject the error implied in the statement, “The Bible contains the Word of God.” (Minutes, ut supra, pp. 60, 61.)

NOTE. If the reader will now turn to page 184 of this book, and read the paragraphs headed “Article II. Doctrinal Basis” and “Article III. The Secondary Symbols,” he will see that the General Synod has happily eliminated all ambiguity from her confessional basis and statements. These paragraphs give the present confessional status of the General Synod. (§§ 11, 1, f: 35. p. 435 sq.)

- 
1. -The mention of Buffalo in this connection should not be surprising, when we remember that this synod was well represented in Wisconsin.↵
  2. The Swedes united with the Council. The Ohio Synod withdrew, also the Norwegian Synod. Missouri never agreed with Iowa, which leaned toward the Council. Some Norwegians are independent. A union of all Norwegians is under consideration.↵

3. It involves especially Articles II, XVIII, IV, and V of the Augsburg Confession as opposed to Synergism, and Articles V, IX and X, on the means of grace, with corresponding articles on both subjects in the Secondary Symbols.↵
4. See Carroll's "The Religious Forces of the U. S.," revised and brought down to 1910.↵

# Copyright Notice

This book was published 2020 by The Lutheran Library Publishing Ministry [LutheranLibrary.org](https://LutheranLibrary.org). Some (hopefully unobtrusive) updates to spelling, punctuation, and paragraph divisions may have been made. Unabridged. The “Second Revised and Enlarged Edition” was the source of this Lutheran Library edition.

Originally published 1916 by The German Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa.

Image on imprint page is *Still Life With Bible* by Vincent Van Gogh.

This LutheranLibrary.org book is released under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license, which means you may freely use, share, copy, or translate it as long as you provide attribution to LutheranLibrary.org, and place on it no further restrictions.

The text and artwork within are believed to be in the U.S. public domain.

370 – v5

ISBN: 9798567219522 (paperback)

# How Can You Find Peace With God?

The most important thing to grasp is that no one is made right with God by the good things he or she might do. Justification is by faith only, and that faith resting on what Jesus Christ did. It is by believing and trusting in His one-time *substitutionary* death for your sins.

Read your Bible steadily. God works His power in human beings through His Word. Where the Word is, God the Holy Spirit is always present.

Suggested Reading: [New Testament Conversions](#) by Pastor George Gerberding

## Benediction

Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, To the only wise God our Savior, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen. (Jude 1:24-25)

## Basic Biblical Christianity | Books to Download

- [\*The Small Catechism of Martin Luther\*](#)

The essentials of faith have remained the same for 2000 years. They are summarized in (1) The Ten Commandments, (2) The Lord's Prayer, and (3) The Apostles' Creed. Familiarity with each offers great protection against fads and falsehoods.

- [\*The Way Made Plain by Simon Peter Long\*](#)

A series of lectures by the beloved Twentieth Century American pastor on the basis of faith.

- [\*Bible Teachings by Joseph Stump\*](#)

A primer on the faith intended for new believers. Rich in Scripture. Christian basics explained from Scripture in clear and jargon-free language. Many excellent Bible studies can be made from this book.

Full catalog available at [LutheranLibrary.org](http://LutheranLibrary.org). Many paperback editions at [Amazon](#).

## Essential Theology | Books to Download

- [\*The Augsburg Confession: An Introduction To Its Study And An Exposition Of Its Contents by Matthias Loy\*](#)

“Sincere believers of the truth revealed in Christ for man's salvation have no reason to be ashamed of Luther, whom God sent to bring again to His people the precious truth in Jesus and whose heroic contention for the faith once delivered to the saints led to the establishment of the Church of the Augsburg Confession, now generally called the Evangelical Lutheran Church.”

- [\*The Doctrine of Justification by Matthias Loy\*](#)

“Human reason and inclination are always in their natural state averse to the doctrine of Justification by faith. Hence it is no wonder that earth and hell combine in persistent efforts to banish it from the Church and from the world.”

- [\*The Confessional Principle\* by Theodore Schmauk](#)

Theodore Schmauk's exploration and defense of the Christian faith consists of five parts: Historical Introduction; Part 1: Are Confessions Necessary?; Part 2: Confessions in the Church; Part 3: Lutheran Confessions; and Part 4: The Church in America.

- [\*Summary of the Christian Faith\* by Henry Eyster Jacobs](#)

*A Summary of the Christian Faith* has been appreciated by Christians since its original publication for its easy to use question and answer format, its clear organization, and its coverage of all the essentials of the Christian faith. Two essays on election and predestination are included, including Luther's "Speculations Concerning Predestination".

Full catalog available at [LutheranLibrary.org](http://LutheranLibrary.org). Many paperback editions at [Amazon](http://Amazon).

## Devotional Classics | Books to Download

- [\*Sermons on the Gospels\* by Matthias Loy](#) and [\*Sermons on the Epistles\* by Matthias Loy](#)

"When you feel your burden of sin weighing heavily upon you, only go to Him... Only those who will not acknowledge their sin and feel no need of a Savior — only these are rejected. And these are not rejected because the Lord has no pity on them and no desire to deliver them from their wretchedness, but only because they will not come to Him that they might have life. They reject Him, and therefore stand rejected. But those who come to Him, poor and needy and helpless, but trusting in His mercy, He will receive, to comfort and to save."

- [\*The Great Gospel\* by Simon Peter Long](#) and [\*The Eternal Epistle\* by Simon Peter Long](#)



“I want you to understand that I have never preached opinions from this pulpit; it is not a question of opinion; I have absolutely no right to stand here and give you my opinion, for it is not worth any more than yours; we do not come to church to get opinions; I claim that I can back up every sermon I have preached, with the Word of God, and it is not my opinion nor yours, it is the eternal Word of God, and you will find it so on the Judgment day. I have nothing to take back, and I never will; God does not want me to.”

- *True Christianity* by John Arndt
- *The Sermons of Theophilus Stork: A Devotional Treasure*

“There are many of us who believe; we are convinced; but our souls do not take fire at contact with the truth. Happy he who not only believes, but believes with fire... This energy of belief, this ardor of conviction, made the commonplaces of the Gospel, the old, old story, seem in his [Stork’s] utterance something fresh and irresistibly attractive. Men listened to old truths from his lips as though they were a new revelation. They were new, for they came out of a heart that new coined them and stamped its own impress of vitality upon them as they passed through its experience...” – From the Introduction

Full catalog available at [LutheranLibrary.org](http://LutheranLibrary.org). Many paperback editions at [Amazon](http://Amazon).