

*William M. Reynolds, Charles
W. Schaeffer, J. G. Morris,
Emanuel Greenwald, et. al.*

The Evangelical Review

Volume 2



LutheranLibrary.org ● er-02

"The history of the Church confirms and illustrates the teachings of the Bible, that yielding little by little leads to yielding more and more, until all is in danger; and the tempter is never satisfied until all is lost. – Matthias Loy, *[The Story of My Life](#)*

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. 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.

THE
EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

EDITED BY C. P. KRAUTH, D. D.

Professor of Biblical Philology, Exegesis, and Church History in the Theol. Seminary,
Gettysburg, Pa.

“Es sei denn, dass ich mit Zeugnissen der heiligen Schrift, oder mit öffentlichen, klaren,
und hellen Gründen und Ursachen überwunden und überweiset werde, so kann und will
ich nichts widerrufen.”—LUTHER.

VOL. II.

GETTYSBURG :

PRINTED BY H. C. NEINSTEDT.
1850-51.

THE
EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. V.

JULY, 1850.

ARTICLE I.

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

By C. P. Krauth, President of Pennsylvania College.

THE time has, perhaps, arrived, in which it becomes the duty of the Lutheran Church in the United States to examine its position, and to determine its future course. It cannot be denied that at this moment the state of things amongst us is peculiar, and that necessity exists for definite views in regard to our duty, in these circumstances, deserving to be called critical.

The Lutheran Church in this country traces its origin to the Lutheran Church in Germany. It is an integral part of the great Lutheran family which is spread so extensively over Germany, and other Germanic countries. Coeval with the Reformation, and established upon the doctrinal system of Luther, as expressed in the Augsburg Confession, its Apology, the Smalcald Articles and the Catechism of Luther, as developed and explained in the Formula Concordiæ, its history has been rendered illustrious by great intellectual and moral achievements. Unfolding its banner in this Western hemisphere, it marshalled its soldiers to no other service and aimed by no new weapons to accomplish its victories. It did not, in other words, profess to be any thing but Lutheran. Its first ministers, educated in the schools of sound Lutheran theology, designed to transfer the same to this country. They followed their countrymen who had emigrated to America and brought

with them the faith in which they had been nurtured. That the orthodoxy of the olden time was gradually lost sight of, that the Confessions were practically superseded, that formal subscription was entirely abandoned, are facts which admit of no controversy. It is true, since the commencement of the era, as it has been called, of the General Synod, the Augsburg Confession has again been brought into notice, and a limited subscription to it enforced; but it cannot be regarded as any thing more than an approximate return to the ancient landmarks.

What, however, is *the precise position* of the church called Lutheran, in this country, and *what are its duties*. These topics we will examine.

In treating of the church, called Lutheran, in the United States, we embrace every part. It numbers about 750 ministers, 1700 churches, is spread extensively over free America, and is found principally in the States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, New York, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, Missouri, Tennessee, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia. Other States, likewise, contain churches and ministers. The *first* fact that we state, as respects this church, in its entire extent, is that it is orthodox. Its faith in its leading features is the common faith of Evangelical christians. Free from every form of Rationalism, or Neology, it, throughout its length and breadth, contends for the faith which was once delivered to the saints, so far as that faith is expressed in the Apostles', the Symbolum quicunque and the Nicene Creed. It is, indeed, remarkable, that a church, which is so closely connected with Germany, should have remained free from the taint of that heterodoxy, which has made such sad havoc in our Fatherland. The manifestations of neology, few and far between, which have here occurred, have strutted a brief day and have disappeared. It will be observed, that the orthodoxy which we now assert, is not a symbolical orthodoxy; it is not that of the Book of Concord, it is not the orthodoxy of the Lutheran church in some of its most peculiar elements. It is that orthodoxy which the Reformers found existing in the Church of Rome, derived from the primitive ages, which they could not discredit, and which was received by them and by others. — All Lutherans in this country believe in the doctrine of the Trinity; the fall of man; the depravity of man; the Atonement; Divine influences; the necessity of regeneration; Justification by faith; good works; future happiness and misery.

That we are enabled to make these statements, in regard to our church, is a gratifying announcement of a condition, which

if not absolutely healthy, has many symptoms of soundness. If it may not authorize us to assert, that it needs no healing appliances, it awakens the hope that no desperate disorder has settled upon its vitals. Sad would be our tale, if we must report, that every vestige of the faith of our Fathers had disappeared; and the ground had been assumed that the historical claims of the Canonical books of the Bible could not be made out; that the inspiration of the Scriptures was invalidated by the glaring contradictions contained in them; that its miraculous facts were mythical developments; that the Son of God—very God of very God—was a mere man; that the influences of the Spirit are only the suasive power of the truth; and that the retributions of eternity resolved themselves into universal happiness. But we have given, and we think with full authority in the facts, a different picture, and we may thank God and take courage.

We state further, that our church is *Lutheran*. This cannot be said without some qualification. We do not make use of an identical proposition, having proposed to consider the Lutheran church and describing its characteristics, when we say it is Lutheran. Our meaning is, that the church called Lutheran is, not in the most unlimited sense, but in a very full sense, Lutheran. To many it may appear that we have wandered far away from the church of our Fathers, and nothing remains but a name which ought to be regarded as a misnomer, or to be defined Lutheran, because anti-Lutheran. We entertain no such view. Should any one aver, to put the matter in a concrete form, that the Lutherans are not Lutheran, it might be asked, what are they? Are they Romanists? assuredly not. Are they Episcopalians? all deny. Are they Presbyterians, either old or new school? they could not subscribe the Westminster Confession of faith. Are they Baptists? still less than they are Presbyterians. Are they Methodists? Episcopal or Protestant? they would be unwilling to avow it. What are they—they are Lutherans. It is not, however, merely a peculiar ecclesiastical position, different from that of all others; it is not doctrines, which are not found in the same connexions, in any other church, on account of which we ascribe to ourselves the epithet Lutheran, and claim as a characteristic, that we are Lutheran; but, first, because we are a branch of the great Lutheran tree; because we have been and yet are nourished by its vital juices; because our sympathies are Lutheran; because our views of church government are Lutheran; because our worship is Lutheran; and because our doctrinal system, in all its leading features, is

Lutheran. That we adhere firmly to the teachings of our church upon the subject of church government, is known to all. That we concede, in regard to rites and ceremonies in the worship of God, what our Symbolical books do, is known to all. But, above every thing else, we claim to hold, with a purity unsurpassed, that cardinal doctrine of a standing or falling church, the doctrine of justification by faith. We hold it in connection with the freedom of the will; conditional decrees of God; a universal atonement; salvation freely and sincerely offered to every man; with the entire rejection of unconditional election.

It is Lutheran, too, in regard to the Sacraments, if not in every particular, yet in every essential point. 'The controversy upon the subject of the Sacraments, and particularly that of the Lord's Supper, had reference, not merely to their precise effects, and the manner in which the Redeemer is present, but to their necessity and permanent value. The Lutherans saw, or thought they saw, in the opinions of those who differed from them, tendencies subversive of their importance, and hostile to a due reverence for them. If they were merely symbols; if they contained nothing; if they communicated nothing; if they were a mere nucleus around which the truth gathering produced its effect; they supposed the transition would be easy to their entire rejection. Now, without asserting that they did not ascribe more to their opponents than they contended for, it is easy to see, that in seeking to counteract dogmas, certainly pernicious if entertained, they may have resorted to representations, in the opposite direction, which might not be sufficiently moderate. Without, however, following them now into every discrimination that they made, we can assert, that the Lutheran church in America is with them, 1st as to the number of the Sacraments; 2d. the subjects; 3d. their efficacy; maintaining on the last point, that grace is administered in Baptism; that Christ is truly present, in special blessing, in the holy Supper; that both are perpetually binding upon the church, and not to be rejected or despised without deep guilt.

In its position, then, as respects liturgical services; in its views of sacred music; in its leading doctrines; in its ecclesiastical polity; in its profound veneration for the Sacraments, and its persuasion of their highest efficacy, it may be said to be Lutheran. It is so, too, in the attention that it bestows upon the religious instruction of children; the catechising of the young; the practice of confirmation, and the use of confession and absolution, in connection with the Lord's Supper.

It is Lutheran in advocating and aiming to produce vital piety ; carefully avoiding the extremes of fanaticism on the one hand, and of dead formalism on the other. In this respect it may be more conformed to the pietism of Lutheranism, not without some lapses into its errors, but on the whole adhering to its purer forms. It is not chargeable with a spirit different from that of its founders, in relation to the importance of piety in the ministry of the Gospel, and a thorough education as the best means of rendering such a ministry efficient. It has the same uncompromising hostility against the errors of popery which its founders displayed, and a charity enlarged even beyond its original bounds, and a readiness to have fellowship with all that love our Lord Jesus Christ, both theirs and ours.

The church is Lutheran upon the subject of the Festivals. It has no sympathy with the prevailing aversion to every thing of human appointment, or which has found favor in the Church of Rome. The observance of the days commemorative of the leading events in the history of Human Redemption, which found a place early in ecclesiastical usage, has been retained with more or less care. To the principle there are but few to object. In practice there may have been more looseness than could be desired ; but we think the conviction has been gathering strength, that the utility of these festivals is not inconsiderable, and there is a disposition to return to them. The celebration of the birth of the Redeemer of the world ; the commemoration of His crucifixion ; His resurrection from the dead ; the ascension and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, on the days of Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Advent and Whit Sunday may be mentioned as those which have retained a place in our cycle of holy days, and treated with some of the veneration which they deserve. No difficult matter would it be, if we have not mistaken the character of our church, to induce it to meet the claims of any proper requisition in this direction, and, therefore, if we may not so decidedly pronounce the church Lutheran in its practice, it is so in its feeling, and we think that the part of the church least baptized with the Lutheran spirit, exhibits individuals who go as far as the straightest school of orthodoxy in this particular direction.

Notwithstanding what has been said, we remark that the church is divided on some points. Although some minor shades of opinion might be referred to, we direct attention to one point as alone material. In the Augustan Confession, the 10th Article, on the Lord's Supper, reads thus : "Concerning the Lord's Supper they teach, that the body and blood of

Christ are truly present, and are administered to the communicants, and they condemn those who teach otherwise." The doctrine of the real bodily presence, here presented to the view, and, certainly, a part of its primitive faith, is that about which there is not uniformity amongst us. All admit that Christ is present, but all do not explain that presence in the same way. That the older view has advocates is a matter of notoriety; that their number has increased by emigration from abroad, is likewise well known; that these views are finding favor amongst men whose training predisposed them to reject them, it would be useless to conceal. On the other hand, a large part of the church asserts its inability to comprehend and to receive this doctrine. Regarding the body of Christ as removed from earth and possessing no power of universal diffusion; not comprehending how any influences emanating from it can be conducive to human salvation, they confine their belief to a real spiritual presence. Out of this doctrine of Christ's presence have grown views, or views have been expanded, in regard to Christ's person, the relation of his divinity to his humanity, and of his humanity to his divinity, such a conception of the union of the two natures, as discarding Nestorianism on the one hand, and Eutychianism on the other, predicates of the human what belongs to the divine, and of the divine what belongs to the human. In these theories, and that interpretation of the word of God which has been evoked to sustain them, our divines who have been moulded in the forms of the church in this country, have felt an inaptitude to follow them. They have not refused admiration to the sublime conceptions of the Son of God and the profound reverence for the Scriptures displayed in these speculations, but have thought themselves too much obligated to listen to the voice of reason to admit of their giving their formal assent.

The church, we remark again, is not without alienation of feeling growing out of these differences. Although but little direct controversy has yet appeared, there has been some, and both parties have manifested the usual temper of polemics. Each has displayed a strong disposition to adhere to its peculiar views, and to condemn severely the opposite side. On the one hand, the rejectors of a real bodily presence have treated the doctrine as absurd, as papistical, as unwarranted by the word of God; they have ascribed it to darkness of popery still hanging about the minds of the Reformers; have asserted that in the present day they would be the foremost to discard what they contended for in the most strenuous manner, whilst

living. Representations have been employed concerning their doctrines, which would be considered as a wretched caricature of what they maintained. They have been charged with sentiments they repeatedly and solemnly disavowed. There has appeared from time to time a disposition to hold them up to contempt and ridicule, and all their great merits and services have been overlooked, in the zeal to overthrow one of their doctrines. The mind has become heated as it pursued this supposed heresy, and has dressed it up in forms which it was never designed to wear. Whatever may be our sympathies with the combatants on this side of the question, we hesitate not to say that they descended into the arena without perceiving properly their opponent, and employed instruments of destruction which could accomplish nothing. On the other hand, the advocates of the opposite view have been too ready to condemn in no measured terms those who differed from them, not only as in error on this point, but as wrong on every other, and not only as unsound on the Holy Supper, but as in general rationalistic. They have regarded their dissent from their views, not as founded in what they believed a fair interpretation of the word of God, but an unwillingness to believe what they could not comprehend. They have been ready not only to deny them a place within the pale of Lutheranism, but to deliver them over to the uncovenanted mercies of God. A narrow, bigoted spirit has displayed itself, which, if connected with the most perfect doctrinal system, could be no great recommendation of it in the eyes of those who prefer power to form.

We have no doubt stated the extreme on both sides, and yet the moderate have not been free from similar tendencies.—That alienation of feeling should be the consequence of this state of things, is quite natural; it has not risen very high; it has produced no outbreaks; it has led to no legislation; it has given rise to no separation; but it has cooled love; it has awakened suspicion; it has prevented union; it has led to preparation for future emergencies; and it has tended, and we think powerfully, to division. Now, in all this, we ascribe blame to Old Lutherans and to New, if we must make distinction; to graduate the precise quantum to be assigned to each, is not our province; it might be thought that we are not the proper persons to hold the balance; in any event the task is cheerfully declined. Notwithstanding this state of things, the church has strong bonds of union. They are found, not merely in their common name, in their common ancestry, but likewise in their attachment to the past glories of the church;

their devotion to the same literature, and their study of the same works. If not accordant in all points, they are so in many, and they find in themselves a greater nearness to each other than they can find any where else. If we take the case of the Old Lutheran, where will he find christians that agree so nearly with him in his views of Luther, Melancthon, Chemnitz, Andreä, Hutter, Calovius, Quenstedt, Spener, Franke and Buddeus amongst the dead; Sartorius, Rudelbach, Guericke, Löhe, Harless and de Valenti amongst the living, as the New Lutherans. Where will we find men so well acquainted with the Symbolical books of his church, its divines, its history, and prepared to glory in the whole, as the same men? Where will he find men willing to listen so candidly to his defence of his faith, so ready to subscribe it, if conviction can be produced, as the same class of divines? Where will he find brethren so ready to acknowledge his ministerial pretensions, to aid him in necessity, and to assist him in obtaining a suitable field of labor for his Master, as in those who, designated by the same name which he bears, profess allegiance to the same cause? We speak what we know, we testify what we have seen. On the other hand, although we ascribe more of the hardness and repulsiveness of sectarianism to the opposite side, yet bating a few extreme cases, and there may be such on the other, we think that there must be kindly feeling, there must be a deep interest, a lively sympathy, a powerful elective affinity drawing towards his brethren of the common faith in general, the zealous champion for the older orthodoxy. We are sure that it is so, in some instances, and a more extensive acquaintance with that class of divines would, no doubt, have authorized broader assertions. A more intimate communion than has yet taken place would tend powerfully to lessen the resiliency, which has thus far appeared, and to amalgamate materials not very unlike each other. May we not hope that that comparison of views, for which the *Evangelical Review* has given an opportunity, accessible as it is to every part of the church, will tend to harmony, to uniformity of opinion, and to mutual forbearance? May we not hope that it will so reveal us to each other that we shall know that our differences are less than we supposed? We entertain such hopes, we expect such results, we pray for such issues. God hasten it in His time, and enable us to see eye to eye! The leaven worketh, it is silent but sure in its operation; it will progress in its influence; and we anticipate most confidently that the three measures of meal will soon be leavened.

We state in addition, that the church is inclined to hold fast all that she can of her ancient faith. The Lutheran church in this country is in a state of reaction. She has passed, in some parts, through an extreme subjectivity, an extreme leaning to the emotional in religion; she permitted herself, to some extent, to be carried away by the surges of animal feeling, and lost much of her ancient propriety. She is now retracing her steps, acknowledging her error, seeking release from crude views and objectionable measures. She is hunting amongst the records of the past for the faith of former days, and endeavoring to learn what she was in her earliest form. The desire for the symbols of our church, the attention that is paid to them, the admiration that has been expressed of them, the candor with which they are viewed, the expressed willingness on the part of many, only to dissent, when it cannot be avoided, all indicate a new state of things—and are adapted to produce the conviction that the church is disposed to renew her connection with the past, and in her future progress to walk under the guidance of the light which it has furnished. There is no fear of any doctrine which our symbols contain, no unwillingness to give it a fair examination, and a predisposition, rather than the contrary, to receive and assent. If these statements are correct, it certainly shows a remarkable state of things in our Lutheran Zion, it must awaken the enquiry, whither do these things tend, and what will be the issue?—How we should demean ourselves under existing circumstances, what part we should perform in this great movement, are important enquiries, and bring us to that division of our subject in which we propose to treat of the duties which are obligatory upon us as a church, in the condition in which we find ourselves, in the providence of God.

It is our duty, we think, holding fast what we have, abandoning no ground that we fairly occupy, to aim at union in view and harmony of action. The points in which we agree are so numerous—our predilections as theologians are so much alike, our principles are so uniform, that it does not appear improbable that we may be brought to as perfect a coincidence as can be expected of humanity; and in the way of harmony of action, we can perceive no impediment. Those views, to which we have referred as peculiar to one class of Lutherans, the views about the Lord's Supper and the person of the Redeemer, so strenuously asserted by the Lutheran Fathers, men of great ability, profound students of the word of God, and holy men too—asserted in view of as powerful objections, and

as powerfully wielded as can well be conceived, revived so extensively abroad, and amongst the best men and the ablest divines of our church—ought not to be considered as absolutely incredible by us, but rather we should give them a candid examination, try the arguments by which they are supported; test the modifications with which they are re-asserted, and then and only then determine where truth lies. We are satisfied, that we have had an imperfect understanding of these opinions, have examined too carelessly, or not at all, the grounds of them, have caught too readily at the perverted views of their opponents, and have too hastily identified them with doctrines from which they differ very widely. It is due to our church, it is due to our symbols, it is due to our brethren, that we should pursue this course. It is due too to the memory of our Fathers, if we do dissent from them, that we should nevertheless be able to vindicate them from those objections which are based upon a one-sided and very inadequate understanding of what they taught.

To bring about the state of things which we desire, it is obviously, too, the duty of those on the opposite side to remember, that their doctrines were not universally received, that even amongst those who fought under the same banner, there was occasionally a dissenting voice, that the great Melancthon himself gradually departed from the doctrine of the presence, as held by his most celebrated coadjutor, and that death alone prevented his expression of that view of Christ's presence, which has been ascribed to Calvin—not a real spiritual presence, but as it has been called by the Mercersburg school of Theology, in our country, which has promulgated it as the ancient faith of the German Reformed Church—"a spiritual real presence." The controversies in the church on the subject of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, the fact that even in the Romish Church, during the middle ages, able men appeared against the settled opinion, should teach us moderation, induce us to bear with those who may differ from us, lead us to believe that uniformity of faith is not unattended with difficulty, to feel persuaded that though there may be a difference in explanation, all realize the same results, because all true christians display the same character, and to be persuaded, that, if we have so much the superiority in argument over our opponents, they will not hold out long against us.

We are satisfied, that, if primitive Lutheranism is to make progress in this country, it will at first be amongst Lutherans; if converts to the doctrine of the real presence are to be made, they will not soon be derived from any other quarter. In them

we will have an unprejudiced auditory, men who will hear our proofs, who will calmly weigh them, and will give their acquiescence, if they believe it right. In the meantime, let us cultivate peace, harmony, let us endeavor to act together, let us be united and seek to do each other good. Let us aim to diffuse a spirit of harmony, concord and peace amongst our people, and the God of peace will bless us.

It is our duty to avoid controversy of a bitter, alienating character. We do not object to controversy, but to such as tends to alienate and embitter feeling. Contend should we for the faith, but in a meek and gentle spirit. Treating our opponents with fairness, seeking to do full justice to their views, we should abstain from all reproachful epithets, and endeavor by honest arguments to vindicate our position. We are to contend for truth, not for victory, for the glory of God, not our own. We are to aim to persuade men, not to compel them. It is said that the truth is mighty, and will prevail; we believe both: it is mighty and it will prevail. With an ardent love of it, with a sincere desire to propagate it, we should make it our constant employment to bring it before those to whom we have access. If we are to be members of the same christian household, if we would dwell comfortably together, it will be necessary to avoid all heated strife, and all condemnatory language.

We entertain no doubt that the utmost good will is cherished, by that part of the church which has least of the Lutheran element, towards that which has most. They have no desire that they should be alienated, that they should stand aloof, that they should not be regarded and treated in the fullest sense as brethren. They would have them partake in the operations in which all can participate, and be associated in every organization designed for concentrated action. They claim reciprocity in the feelings and actions of the others. They ask that both may grow together till the harvest. They believe that it will be best for all. They are persuaded that it will tend to the glory of the ascended Redeemer, to the welfare of his church, to the best interests of the German population of our country, and therefore do they urge that one should be regarded as our master, even Christ, and that we should look upon ourselves as brethren.

Another duty, we think, is to use the great symbol of the church, the Augsburg Confession, allowing such latitude in the subscription as is compatible with harmony. We believe that there has been too much looseness, in our church, in regard to the necessity and utility of creeds, in general. The

change from the original ground occupied by the church, the disuse of the symbols, the latitudinarianism about them, were calculated to be productive of much evil. That this has not occurred, may be said to be happy for the church. We believe that the evils to be dreaded from the neglect of the symbols, have not followed in a very great degree, yet they have in some. That orthodoxy which we retain, strongly tinged as it is with Lutheranism, has various phases, never running perhaps into Calvinism, on the one hand, or Pelagianism on the other, but sometimes passing almost into the region of the one, and at others hardly steering clear of the other.

Now we suppose that this requires a remedy, and we can suggest no other, in the present state of our church, than the use of the Augustan Confession as a creed, and requiring the subscription of it, within certain limits, by every minister of Jesus Christ who serves at our altars. It may be said, that it has been used, that it has received the sanction of the General Synod of our church, and that it is subscribed by the ministers of those synods which are connected with the General Synod. This is true, but we object to the liberty allowed in that subscription. Thus far, it has been without serious injury, but it is liable to very great abuse. The terms of the subscription are such as to admit of the rejection of any doctrine or doctrines which the subscriber may not receive. It is subscribed or assented to as containing the doctrines of the word of God substantially; they are set forth in substance, the understanding is that there are some doctrines in it, not contained in the word of God, but there is no specification concerning them. Every one could omit from his assent whatever he did not believe. The subscription did not preclude this. It is at once evident that a creed thus presented is no creed, that it is anything or nothing, that its subscription is a solemn farce. It is true, that the views of subscribers were ascertained in advance of their subscription, and the dangers were avoided which otherwise might have ensued; but then they were ascertained under no circumstances of special solemnity, under none that bind the conscience as does an oath of subscription to a creed, and consequently nothing was gained, or if there was a previous conviction as to the soundness of the candidate, the subscription was superseded as entirely supererogatory. To set aside this great, this venerated symbol, would meet with no favor in the church, an *ex animo* subscription is not possible to all. What then is to be done? We insist upon a creed, we consider it a *sine qua non*; the church cannot operate harmoniously, efficiently without it, the only course that we can de-

wise is to give it normative authority. It may be subscribed *ex animo* by all who can do so; it may be subscribed by others, with the privilege of dissenting from certain doctrines, which shall be stated or specified. The doctrines from which there may be dissent, cannot be any that are essential to the orthodox system, cannot be any which, if received and rejected in the same church, would tend to confusion. Different views may be allowed in regard to the power of the sacraments, but not as to their validity, not as to their subjects.— Different views may be allowed in regard to our relation to the first man, and the manner in which we became involved in his sin, but not in regard to the sinfulness of man, original sin, and the necessity of regeneration. Different views may be entertained as respects the *communicatio idiomatum* in the natures of Christ, but not in regard to those natures. Carefully must we exclude every form of Arianism high and low, Socinianism and rationalism, and anti-trinitarianism of all kinds.

These are the conclusions to which we have come upon this subject; we confess its difficulty, and can only say to any or to all—if you have anything better, candidly impart it—if not, use this with us. It was a different course which led to the division of the Presbyterian church in this country; it was in a position very much like our own, and we suppose that such a plan as we propose would have prevented a separation neither necessary nor profitable, but which may, in the end, be conducive to the glory of God.

It is our duty to raise up a ministry well educated in secular and theological science, and properly instructed in the doctrines of the church. On the subject of ministerial education our church is very sound in theory; in practice it has been very deficient. Once the plea for hasty and imperfect preparation was, the want of literary institutions and theological seminaries. Now we have them in great abundance, and the cry is that the supply exceeds the demand. Once the plea was, the wants of the people were so pressing that they could not wait till the necessary preparation was made. Still this is the cry, whilst men are getting ready we are left to perish, but we think it is time to turn a deaf ear to these importunities. An uneducated ministry cannot accomplish what the church needs. By thrusting uneducated men into the vineyard, we retard the work of human salvation. The case is plain, if education is necessary, (if not, what mean the prodigious efforts we have made to establish schools, and the large sums we have expended to endow them,) we must allow the proper time for the

completion of it, and if God will have the lips of the priest to keep knowledge, we are doing, not counteracting his will, when we require those who receive from us the ministry of the everlasting gospel, to be workmen that need not be ashamed; able rightly to divide the word of truth.

When we look at the learning of the clergy of our church in Europe—as it was and as it is—and compare it with our own, there would appear to be nothing in which we are less Lutheran than in this. We have men educated both in this country and in Europe, whose learning would adorn any American church; but we have many too, faithful men, we concede, and not unblessed of God, brethren dear to us, as to those who laud their deficiencies, who fall much short of the measure of that stature which we would prescribe for the Bishops of Christ. Our duty is to labor for the elevation of the ministerial standard, to educate men well, and in their instruction to induct them into a deep acquaintance with the doctrines of the church, as set forth in the symbolical books. We would have them intimately acquainted with its history, we would have them acquainted with its divinity in its various changes, in the period of its palmiest orthodoxy, in its pietistic form, in the subsequent changes, and in that form in which, in the present day it is renewing its youth, and mounting with wings like eagles. Too ignorant have we been of our own doctrines, and our own history, too little have we known of the fountain from which we sprang, and we have taken pride in times past in claiming a paternity in every reputable form of christianity, and have denied our proper parentage, in our mendicancy for foreign favors. Shame that it has been so! We should leave these cisterns and return to the source of living waters. Let us go back to our father's house, let us see what it has, make ourselves acquainted with its structure and furniture, let us sit down at its table and partake of its viands. They will better suit our appetite than the crumbs which we have gathered elsewhere; their nourishing influence will be more powerfully felt, and we will increase in fairer proportions and in a more robust health than we have heretofore done.

It is our duty to exert a conservative influence. The true position of the Lutheran church is conservative. It should hold fast the form of sound words which it has received, and display its doctrinal and ritual moderation. Occupying a middle position between prelatical Episcopacy and *jure divino congregationalism*; extreme neither in the one direction nor the other; conceding to utility all that it can ask, without detriment to order; avoiding in doctrine the errors of Calvinism,

and those of low Arminianism and Pelagianism; repudiating a mere animal religion whilst it shows no countenance to a morality cold and religionless—these its true position, its very essence and form, adapt it to exert an influence favorable to doctrinal soundness and religious purity. We do not claim for it too much, when we ascribe to it a capacity to uphold a true living system of christianity, when we regard it as adapted to exert an influence opposed to extremes in the one direction or the other. It might appear invidious to ascribe such a power to the Lutheran church exclusively. This we do not do, but at the same time, we think that in no other is their capacity to do so much, and upon so extensive a scale. No other church occupies, we think, so nearly the central point between Roman Catholic and Protestant extremes. No other so central a point between the high Churchism of Protestantism and the extremes of Protestantism, and therefore we suppose that no other can more fairly regard itself as summoned to act a conservative part—conservative not only by upholding a moderate orthodoxy in doctrine—ecclesiastical government and ceremonies—but by preventing extremes, either on the one hand subversive of human liberty, or on the other of the grace of God. It neither makes man independent of means or of God. It connects not his salvation with direct influences without means, nor does it grow out of means without the influences of God.

It is our duty to contribute to the evangelizing of the world. The Lutheran church has distinguished itself in times past by zealous and successful labors amongst the heathen nations of the earth. Some of the most venerated names amongst the missionaries of the cross belong to her communion. Who have labored more faithfully and successfully than Ziegenbalg and Plütschau and Schwartz? Who than Hans Egede? But we cannot dwell on these things. Our faith was brought to our own country and countrymen by Germans. They were missionaries and had much to endure in their labors of love. But they labored not in vain. God was with them and the church of God to which we belong, amidst all its difficulties, in its present prosperity, remains to attest the blessing of God, which followed their labors. On us does it devolve to carry on this work. To build up our people in their most holy faith, to supply the waste places of our Zion in this western world, to send the gospel to the heathen. Nor is the church idle; It has its missionaries abroad, who labor with encouraging success. It has its missionaries at home, whose labors are owned of God. The harvest to which we are invited is

truly great, and the laborers that we have in the field too few. What shall we do? Turn a deaf ear to the calls that come to us—respond we can do nothing? God forbid! Let us address ourselves to the work. Let us bring into the ministry able and faithful men; let us be willing to contribute of our substance, let us enquire how we can best subserve the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom. Let us devise in our synods, and in our General Synod, methods of increasing our power, concentrating our energies, bringing out our strength, and prosecuting with the utmost success the great work assigned us by him who gave the command—"Go preach the gospel to every creature"—the work of turning men in christian and heathen lands from darkness to light, from the power of satan to God.

ARTICLE II.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR, AND THE FESTIVALS OF THE CHURCH.

By Rev H. I. Schmidt, A. M.; Prof. of German Lan. and Lit. in Columbia College, N. Y.

In the Old Testament church, in her worthies, her history, and her institutions, there were, although modern rationalism can discover nothing of the kind, many types of the divine founder, the development, and the institutions of the christian church—shadows of greater and better things to come. The historical analogy and the typical relation between the passover and the Lord's supper are so obvious, and so clearly designated by scripture, that here to deny is tantamount to charging Revelation with falsehood. In the case of circumcision and baptism, the typical connexion, although not less decided, is perhaps less obvious, because less circumstantial; nor is it distinctly recognized in the writings of the New Testament. Similar relations will be found to exist in respect of the observance of times and seasons. The year of jubilee, e. g., is, we presume, regarded by all biblical critics of the sacred word as a type of the gospel dispensation. In this connexion we believe, that the principles of typology might be more extensively applied than they generally are: that there are instances in which the language of scripture, without actually expressing a typical reference, yet clearly implies it,—and indeed, that events or transactions are recorded, whose entire significance is typical. Thus, for example, we believe, as the Al-

mighty is not limited in his operations by those disabilities which affect human agents, and as he cannot, like them, require rest, that his employing six days in the work of creation, and then resting on the seventh day, and hallowing it, is to be regarded as constituting a normal type of that division of time not based upon natural phenomena, which has obtained ever since the creation; only, however, among Jews and christians with strict reference to sacred time. The feast of Pentecost, which commemorated the giving of the law on Mt. Sinai, is admitted to have typically prefigured the effusion of the Holy Spirit on the apostles. The analogy is here very striking; and as the Jewish church may be said to have been first constituted by the giving of the law, so the great day on which the Spirit was poured out upon the assembled apostles, may be regarded as the birth-day of the christian church, and the divine recognition of the typical relation may be inferred from the selection of the day of Pentecost for the occurrence of the momentous event, which opened that great spiritual campaign, through which the world is to be subjected to Christ.

Every biblical student knows, that, besides the ordinary civil year, beginning on the first day of the month Tisri, the Jews had an ecclesiastical or religious year, beginning on the first of the month Nisan, and that from this month not only their sacred feasts were computed, but also the oracles and visions of the prophets sometimes dated. How early this mode of reckoning time was adopted in the christian church, is not precisely known; but the practice is very ancient, and there can be no doubt, that the christian ecclesiastical year was adopted from the Jewish, and that, at first, they exactly coincided. In close correspondence with the religious reckoning of the Jews, the feast of the Annunciation, March 25th, was in the fifth century accounted the beginning of the ecclesiastical year; but in the Western church the ecclesiastical year has been generally dated from the advent of Christ, to the commemoration of which the four Sundays preceding the twenty-fifth of December are now assigned, the first constituting the beginning of the *Kirchenjahr*, the christian ecclesiastical year.

This practice of the christian church finds, therefore, if not its authoritative, yet its actual, historical type, in the arrangements and institutions of the old covenant church. Now we are perfectly sensible, how necessary it is to exercise great caution in interpreting types; and also, that we have no authority to designate persons or things mentioned in the Old Testament, as types either of Christ, or of christian institutions, unless

such relation is, in one way or another, pointed out and recognized by the Savior or his apostles. We have, therefore, no intention to claim for the ecclesiastical year and the festivals of the Jews, a genuine typical, least of all, a normative character, whereby like observances would be rendered obligatory on the christian church. We are quite aware of the tendency of a general recognition of any such claims, to more extended judaizing, and we are, therefore, far from advocating them.— We seek, on the contrary, a broader basis than is afforded by a type or types. The subject involves a principle of analogical reasoning, which it is important not to overlook, as it has peculiar force in cases like that before us. It is admitted by all writers who have a due respect for the sacred text, that the ritual law, the Mosaic economy in general, was typical of the Messiah, and of gospel blessings. It is, indeed, not at all at the option of the truly evangelical theologian, whether or not he will admit this to be true; for it is a point definitively and fully settled by the epistle to the Hebrews. We expect, of course, to discover an agreement, in all essential points, between the type and that which is typified. When the anti-type appears, the type, no longer necessary, passes away. Thus the entire constitution, and the sacrifices of the Levitical priesthood, having been simply designed typically to prefigure Christ and his atoning sacrifice, ceased; at his appearance, to possess any importance, and belong, therefore, to the old things that have passed away entirely. This is true of the whole Jewish ceremonial, which had merely a temporary importance and validity. But some of the types prefigured institutions, which were to take their place, and permanently to retain it, in the church of God. Such is the gospel covenant, with its unspeakable blessings, foreshadowed by the covenant with Abraham. Here belong also baptism and the Lord's supper, typified by circumcision and the passover. Thus institutions of the Abrahamic church, not directly pertaining to the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ, nor designed merely to separate and distinguish the Jews from surrounding nations, but based upon principles of universal importance, relating to, and involving, interests as momentous under the new as under the old covenant, were types of institutions in the christian church, destined to continue to the end of time. And it is under this category, that we would trace the analogy between the christian and the Jewish festivals. They belong to those features in which we naturally expect to discover a connexion and family resemblance between the old and the new church. The Jewish festivals were not ceremonial or prospective, as were other in-

stitutions of the Jewish ritual: they were historical, retrospective, commemorative of the most important facts connected with the establishment of the Old Testament church. Appointed by God himself, for the momentous purpose of keeping alive the memory of the most important and solemn transactions and events, and especially of instructing children and youth relative to his wonderful dealings with his people, they had a direct historical, practical, ecclesiastical and permanent interest for the whole Jewish nation. Without regarding them as normal types, *requiring* similar institutions as their anti-types in the christian church, we contend that they authorize, justify, sanction, and render desirable and expedient, such institutions among us. Expecting to discover an agreement between the christian and the Jewish church, in points of essential ecclesiastical importance, in matters involving like principles and circumstances, and reasoning from analogy, it is precisely the ecclesiastical year, with its cardinal festivals, in which among other and more important features, we should look for the intimate connexion, and the essential oneness of the Abrahamic and the christian church. The force of analogical reasoning is here complete. The circumstances, the principles involved, the end to be attained, are, in both cases, essentially the same. The computations of the ecclesiastical year have reference to affairs that concern the church as such, distinct from the world:—the church festivals commemorate facts or events standing in intimate and momentous connexion with the religious interests of mankind, concerning and interesting deeply those who belong to the church, who believe her doctrines, who honor her institutions, and look forward to the enjoyment of her glorious inheritance. The divine founder of our holy religion did not, indeed, prescribe the observance of sacred feasts; but neither did he make any disposition as regards the Sabbath. It may be said that the cases are not parallel. They are not. The Sabbath is here mentioned, because the early church, necessarily retaining it, considered itself authorized to christianize it, (if we may use the expression,) by transferring it to our Lord's resurrection day, and by modifying its observance and exercises, so as to adapt it to the character and wants of the christian church. The same was done as regards the day of Pentecost, which became at once, without a change of day, a great christian festival. Is it wrong to claim these primitive transfers, and the general precedents of the Jewish church, as duly authorizing the appointment of christian festivals, connected with matters of the highest moment to the church? The great Jewish festivals were, as we

have said, not connected with the Levitical law; they related to events prior to the prescription of the ceremonial law and ritual, and of paramount importance in the establishment and organization of the Jewish church, as a great religious and moral organism. Appointed by God himself, we may venture to suggest, that divine wisdom ordained them, as possessing an important practical, and fruitful adaptation to a principle or element in human nature, operative, not among Jews only, or at particular periods, but universally, and in all ages. And does not the law of analogy justify us in saying that, with the character and design of the old covenant institutions before us, it is consistent and in harmony with the designs of divine wisdom, to maintain similar institutions under the last great economy of God with men? Such was evidently the view taken of this subject by the primitive church, and hence the early origin of christian church festivals. Expecting to resume, on a subsequent page, sundry points here merely glanced at, we propose to add here a few historical data relative to the church festivals, before we discuss the importance and advantages of these.

In their adoption of the ecclesiastical year, the early christians appear to have been influenced by the consideration, that the church, as a distinct and purely religious organization, having affairs and interests of her own with which the world and its various arrangements had no connexion, should, as such, and for the regulation of her peculiar concerns and institutions, have her own system of computing time. They rejected the names currently given to the months of the secular year, as associated with Paganism, or immediately derived from Pagan divinities and heroes. They divided the year into fifty-two weeks, designating them severally by specific names, which, as they have gone out of use, it is not necessary to recount. In the same manner they had their own names for the different days of the week.

Regarding the leading incidents of our Savior's life with profound interest, and their regular commemoration as permanently and highly important to those who confessed his name, they wished to embrace in their sacred seasons those *dies memoriales*, so as to have them regularly recur during the ecclesiastical year, the only sort of year which they recognized. The soundness of the principle, and the justness and correctness of the feeling, by which they were actuated and governed in making these arrangements, will be disputed only by those who regard all external matters, all forms and ritual institutions, as utterly unimportant, respecting which all church-

members are at liberty to carry out their own subjective notions, and which they may observe as they please, or if they so prefer, not observe at all.

A principle of vast moment lay at the foundation of the Jewish ceremonial, so burdensome in itself, yet so necessary for the Israelites, that they might be a peculiar people, and preserved from all comminglings with surrounding abominations. What was purely typical in it, passed away, of course, with the coming in of the new dispensation; and thus, also, with the new historical associations, and the higher and purer spirituality of the christian doctrine and economy, the entire Jewish ceremonial lost its validity, as pertaining to an effete and virtually defunct organism. But the Jewish festivals occupied, as we have already observed, different ground. And although, with the history of a new church-foundation, these were also destined to be superseded, the principle which demanded, and led to their establishment, is not dead; it is as vital and as efficient in the christian, as ever it could be in the Jewish church. It needed only that it should be respected on the historical basis, and in a manner consistent with the spirit, of the new dispensation. And it is the perennial influence of this principle which introduced, in the christian church, the ecclesiastical year and its great festal celebrations, and which will ever preserve christian festivals, in some shape or other, among the professors of our holy religion. This point will be again considered, *infra*; at present we are to give a brief sketch of the early history of the sacred seasons of the christians. These were, at first, few in number, for those of the Passion, of Easter, and of Whitsunday, are the only ones mentioned in the most ancient rubrics. Easter, commemorating our Lord's resurrection, was the first that was regularly observed as a festival of the church; and it is frequently spoken of as such, under the designation "*πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον*," in the writings of the earliest christian fathers.—Justly regarding our Lord's resurrection as an event of paramount importance in the history of man's redemption, to the church as a body, and to the faith and hope of every individual believer in Christ, the early christians not only commemorated it weekly, on every Lord's day, but set apart, for its special commemoration, an annual festival, which was celebrated with great solemnity. And at first, until these matters were regulated by ecclesiastical authorities, this festival was the beginning of the ecclesiastical year.

The Sunday which precedes Easter, and is denominated Palm-Sunday, from the palm-branches strewn on the way when

our Lord made his entry into Jerusalem, is commemorative of this event, and the entire week commencing with this day has been, from the beginning, set apart under the designation of "the great week," or "the passion-week," for the commemoration of the last events in our Savior's earthly career. The last three days of the Passion-week were then, and, by several churches, are still esteemed as preëminently sacred, and observed with peculiar solemnity. These are Maunday Thursday, i. e. *Dies Mandati*, the day of the mandate, or the commandment; the day on which our Lord gave the great commandment, that we should love one another. Being a communion-day, it was also denominated "*dies mysteriorum,—eucharistiae,—panis,—indulgentiae*. Even after the ancient *agapae* had been long discontinued, this day was observed as a feast of love. Good Friday received this appellation from the unspeakable benefits accruing to mankind from our Lord's crucifixion and death, which it is designed to commemorate by exercises of the deepest solemnity. The last day of that week was, among the Jews, "a high day," for reasons which may be found stated in any good commentary on the Gospels: among christians, it was denominated "the great Sabbath," because during this day our Lord's body reposed in the tomb: it "was observed, with rigorous precision, as a day of fasting. Religious worship was celebrated by night, and the vigils of the night were continued until cock-crowing, the hour when the Lord was supposed to have risen. At this instant the stillness of the midnight vigils was suddenly interrupted by the joyful exclamation: The Lord is risen! The Lord is risen! The Lord is risen indeed!"¹ And now commenced the exercises of Easter-Sunday, "which was celebrated with every demonstration of joy, as a second jubilee. In connexion with the appropriate devotional exercises, it was customary to celebrate the day by deeds of charity and mercy—by granting liberty to the captive, freedom to the slave, and pardon to the criminals. Charity was dispensed to the needy. Courts of justice were suspended. Each participated in the general joy, and felt his bosom swell with the 'wide wish of benevolence.'"¹ We have here presented, relative to the Passion-week, and the festival of Easter, only the more essential points of external arrangement, including particularly those in which the practice of several Protestant churches still agrees with that of the primitive church. The day of Pentecost, in modern

¹ Coleman's Christian Antiq. p. 438. For other particulars the reader is referred to the same work, from which some of the facts above stated have been derived.

times denominated Whitsunday, commemorated, at first, both our Lord's ascension, and the effusion of the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles. Subsequently a separate day, shortly preceding Whitsunday, was set apart as the festival of the Ascension, which arrangement still obtains. The celebration of the day of Pentecost as a christian festival, commemorative of the outpouring of the Spirit, commenced in the third century, and was afterwards authoritatively decreed by the council of Elvira in Spain, A. D. 305.

Among the great festivals of the church, that of the Savior's Nativity was the last introduced. It forms, among the sacred seasons of the ecclesiastical year, a distinct section or cycle, commencing with the first Sunday in Advent, and closing with the festival of Epiphany, which occurs on the sixth of January. Our readers are, doubtless, aware, that the Eastern and Western churches differed, during about a century, as regards both the time and the manner of observing the festivals of the nativity; and it was not until about the end of the fourth century, that the two churches came to the final agreement, to celebrate Christmas on the twenty-fifth of December, and Epiphany on the sixth of January, which arrangement has continued down to the present day.

We do not consider it necessary to enter into any further specifications. As Protestants, having an eye only to what is of essential moment, and denying the importance, or propriety of observing Saints' days, we are concerned only with the cardinal festivals of the church, which relate to events or doctrines of paramount importance to all. To those which have been named, we have only to add Trinity Sunday, a festival the design of which is sufficiently indicated by its name.—Sundry considerations that might be introduced here, will come up in the course of the following observations upon the permanent importance of church-festivals, and, by implication, of the ecclesiastical year. Ere we proceed, we have only this one remark to premise, that, if the early christians reckoned time exclusively by ecclesiastical years, entirely distinct from the civil years, by which the computations of others were regulated, this may indeed have caused, as is often alleged, much confusion and inconvenience; but that no such disadvantages can arise, when, as has long been the case, the arrangements of the ecclesiastical have reference solely to the sacred seasons of the church, while all other affairs are chronologically arranged according to the common reckoning by civil years.

And now to the point more immediately before us. Is the continued observance of the ecclesiastical year, with its sacred seasons, important, and fruitful of good? That such is our belief, must have already appeared from the preceding remarks. As this observance was not commanded—not in any way directly prescribed by our Lord or his Apostles, it is a subject which, of course, lies open to discussion, and in relation to which christians are to agree among themselves.—Among the early christians, the observance of religious festivals was a voluntary act; there is sufficient evidence to show, that they did not regard it as involving any imperative obligation; although, at an early period, there were not wanting those, who represented the practice as obligatory, until, in the fourth century, it was enjoined by divers councils as a duty. The ecclesiastical year, with its cardinal festivals, has at all times been a characteristic and conspicuous feature of the constitution and the ritual usages of the Lutheran church. Yet, after the admissions just made, it will doubtless, be regarded as incumbent upon us to show some reason, for affirming the perpetual importance of these institutions.

And here we have, in the first instance, to meet the objection which many will be ready to urge, that the observance for which we are contending is condemned by the Apostle Paul himself. Those churches which reject the festivals altogether, lay great stress on the only two passages in the New Testament, that have a direct reference to the practice of christians in relation to such days: we mean Gal. 4: 9. 10. Col. 2: 16. But we totally deny, that those two passages have any connexion with the matter here in hand — with the general aspects of the subject under consideration. Paul is warning both the Galatians and the Colossians against the influence of Judaizing teachers; against those false reasonings and persuasives, by which these sought to bring the early converts to christianity into renewed bondage to the Levitical law and its multiplied observances. But to claim his words as condemnatory of religious festivals in general, would be quite as judicious and pertinent as to argue from Rom. 3: 28. et al. loc., that Paul was opposed to good works, to christian virtue and holiness. The Apostle is here speaking of the Jewish festivals, the year of Jubilee, the new moons, and holydays—those which were divinely appointed, as well as those which had no other authority than “the tradition of the elders;” with all of which the judaizing teachers of that day labored hard to burden the disciples of Christ, maintaining that the obligation to keep them all neither was, nor could be, abro-

gated. These absurd attempts — absurd, because they aimed to perpetuate the institutions of an economy which was itself abrogated, and no longer valid—created many difficulties in the early church, and required to be vigorously dealt with. But to press these passages into the service of an argument against church-festivals in general, is to take a sword having more than one edge, and cutting too many ways. This could be easily shown, if necessary; but we content ourselves, for the present, with resting in the position, that the Apostle speaks simply of Jewish institutions, with which christians had nothing to do; so that it was not only foolish, but utterly wrong, that they should suffer themselves to be burdened with them. But let us here once more repeat, that the great Jewish festivals did not belong to those institutions, whose character was merely typical, and whose real value consisted solely in their prospective significance; but that they had their foundation in history, in the most important events connected with the establishment and life of the Israelitish church, and that they were designed to perpetuate, in never-fading freshness, the memory of those events, and to awaken and foster sentiments of reverence and love towards the God of Israel, in every new rising generation. The organic consciousness of the Jewish church derived its vital element through these great events and their ineffaceable remembrance: they were to that church what the roots are to a tree: they could have ceased to be remembered, and to be looked upon with profound and reverent interest, only with the utter extinction not only of the Jewish church, but of the Jewish race. And such commemorative festivals are of equal importance to every religious organization which has, or pretends to have, an historical basis. Among Muhammedans (not to instance any others) the ecclesiastical year, or rather, their entire chronology, counts from an event, contemptible enough in itself, but of great importance in the establishment of their false religion. Whether the existence of pagan religious festivals had, as some say, an influence in the introduction of christian festivals, we neither know nor care; the principle which calls for them is deeply seated in the nature and the wants of the human soul, and is every where the same: it demanded their establishment under the old covenant: it desires and demands them under the new; and the appointment of them, by the divine founder and Head of the Jewish church, authorizes and sanctions their establishment in the church of Christ. This could, by no means, be affirmed of any of the ceremonial observances of

the Jews, in respect of which a totally different principle prevailed, from that with which we have to do here.

What, then, is that principle from which their necessity arises; what is that element in human nature, which has been so frequently referred to, as demanding the appointment of such institutions as those of which we are speaking? We might, in reply, point to a variety of motives in this direction, deeply resident in the human soul: we might instance, among others, what may be regarded as one of the fairest features of fallen humanity; the commendable desire, natural to man in every age and clime — honored in every relation except the relations of religion — gratefully and reverently to commemorate, on stated days, and by suitable celebrations, facts and events in which he has reason to take a deep interest, because they have proved to him the causes or channels of great benefits,—of advantages and blessings accruing to successive generations. The desire thus to manifest his due appreciation of their importance, his gratitude for the benefits enjoyed, his thankful solicitude to inspire others with the same sentiments that animate his soul, his anxiety to perpetuate, in ever-green freshness, the memory of events to which he regards himself, and his country or his race, as deeply indebted, is a just and praiseworthy desire, a feeling that ought to be respected and cherished, an impulse that ought to be sustained, and strengthened and encouraged; for it is productive of much good in this our world. And this view, alone, of the subject, exhibits the importance of religious festivals. On this, however, we shall not here insist; for the point which we have more particularly in view is this, that when great and momentous events, through which mankind derive important blessings and advantages, are not thus statedly, reverently, and gratefully commemorated; where the cost at which these were procured is not thus kept before the mind, it is only too characteristic of human nature, not only to forget those great events themselves, and the benefactors who achieved them, but also to lose the appreciation of those blessings which they were the means of bestowing. And hence it is perhaps not only obedience to the impulse first named, — which ought surely to be preëminently respected by christians as the recipients of the greatest of all conceivable blessings — but a consciousness of their infirmity, and a desire to counteract its unthankful tendencies, that prompts men to the stated celebration of days, illustrious for great events in the secular history of nations. Against the effects of this proclivity of mankind to forget benefits and benefactors, He, who knows human nature

infinitely better than man can understand it, saw fit to ordain peculiar precautionary measures, in view of those gracious and mighty interpositions, through which He effected the deliverance from Egyptian bondage, the preservation in the wilderness, the victory and establishment in the promised land, of his people Israel. In this connexion we need refer, among a great number of passages in point, only to Heb. 9: 4, to Joshua 4: 1-9, to Exod. 23: 33-44, to Exod. 12: 11-17. 25-28. It is important to note the design of these acts and celebrations, so distinctly pointed out at the time of their appointment, and especially to mark the reference which is had to the proper instruction of the young, for all coming generations. These festivals, then, were divinely appointed,—appointed by the great Head of the Jewish church—and, as they differed, in their character and design, from the ceremonial observances of the Levitical law; nay, as their design is expressly stated by Him who appointed them, we may justly conclude, that under circumstances greatly similar, and with substantially the same design in view, the christian church may safely regard herself as carrying out the instructions of divine wisdom, in establishing and solemnly observing similar festivals. No man has the right to assign the reasons, why the Divine Founder of our holy religion did not himself ordain the observance of such festivals, but it would be very easy to point out considerations of the utmost importance which would satisfactorily explain his abstaining from their appointment. It is sufficient to say, that the disciples did not fully understand the mission and design, or comprehend the teachings of their master, until after he was removed from their midst; and thus any such appointments made during his mortal career, would have been premature, as they would not have been understood. That the Apostles should have, in like manner, abstained from ordering such institutions and observances, may have arisen from the peculiar position of the infant church, from the difficulties and dangers by which it was encompassed. Yet we have already seen, that they did not entirely abstain from such measures, inasmuch as they immediately began to observe the day of our Lord's resurrection, as the Lord's day.

And now, in order more fully to exhibit the rationale and the importance of the christian church-festivals, we must consider, more particularly, a feature of the greatest consequence, that must characterize every true religion, and which, among all the religious systems ever propounded in our world, is peculiar to the only two which really had a divine origin, and therefore divine approval. This feature is, that they have a

genuine historical basis, clearly and minutely exhibited and delineated in authentic historical monuments. The religious impostors and the religious enthusiasts of all ages have deeply felt and duly appreciated this desideratum, and hence the puerile fictions of Muhammed, the poetic vagaries of Buddhism, and even the ridiculous forgeries of the Mormon prophet. True to the instinctive requirements of human nature, all who seek to impose a false religion upon men, are careful to invent for their spurious revelations a fictitious historical basis; for no one doubts that a divine revelation to man necessarily implies a direct, obvious, unmistakable, divine interposition in the state and progress of human affairs, the external sensible demonstrations or manifestations of which constitute the historical basis of the religious system, which any such revelations is designed to introduce and establish. We have, already, more than once, referred to the great events connected with the establishment of the Israelitish church, and sufficiently expatiated on the institutions appointed by the divine legislator himself, for the purpose of deeply depositing and firmly rooting them in the memory and the reverent regard of his people. Had the religion of the Jews been a mere speculative system of doctrines, a mere human contrivance, proceeding from the brain of Moses, or of any other mortal, without being sustained, and, if we may use the expression, endorsed by a series of facts unquestionably divine, it is evident that, with Israel's extraordinary propensity to forsake the worship of Jehovah, and to take up with any disgusting scheme of idolatry, the religion of the twelve tribes would, at an early period, have been utterly swept away, and entirely supplanted by the abominations, which really seemed, more than once, to have extinguished the true faith. But the religion of Palestine was not a human invention. The Ark of the Covenant, the pot of manna, Aaron's rod, and the tabernacle itself, with its costly furniture and ornaments, were so many tangible memorials that they could not, in spite of the spirit of rebellion and apostacy, fail to preserve the memory of a most marvellous dispensation from heaven. But as these, after the tabernacle had given place to the temple, were spoiled, carried away, and destroyed by the enemy, and as, moreover, they are not directly important to our present purpose, we need not farther dwell upon them. There were other monuments of greater importance, exhibiting the solid, indestructible, historical basis, on which was erected the church of the Hebrew: and these were the written histories of Moses and of Joshua, and those great festivals, in which much of that

history was statedly, again and again, re-enacted; around which the most glorious traditions clustered, in rich luxuriance, like the ivy around some old storm-beaten cathedral, and whose significant and imposing solemnities thoroughly filled the consciousness of the Hebrew commonwealth with the ineradicable memories of the wonderful past, and supplied a substratum in the public mind and heart, of which the messenger of Jehovah could take hold, and which gave point and effect to his rebukes, his representations, his denunciations and his invitations. A religion without any authentic narrative of a genuine historic origin can sustain no relation to, can have no hold upon, man's conscience. But while the prophets of the Lord had the great events of Israel's deliverance from Egyptian bondage, and the establishment of the Hebrew church, recorded in the historic documents, whose genuineness and authenticity no Hebrew dreamed of questioning, embodied in the Passover and other festivals, living, in spite of Baal and Moloch, in the traditions and hearts of the people, to fall back upon; while they could point to these, ever the same, testifying of the arm of the Lord of hosts, stretched out for the deliverance, the guidance, the establishment and the protection of his people, they possessed a mighty lever for the upheaving and overthrow of every base and baseless structure, and the reëdification of Jehovah's church on that lasting foundation, which is not even yet destroyed, but is the historic ground, on which rests the glorious foundation-stone of our holy religion. And how could the demand, which the instincts of our reason prompt us to make of every religious system professing to have God himself for its author, be more triumphantly answered than it is in the written history of man's redemption, and in the writings connected with the establishment and instruction of the christian church? The assaults which have been, century after century, directed against the christian faith, could not have failed of success, if they had been aimed, with equal ingenuity, skill, and perseverance, at any system made up of mere human theories and contrivances. But so perfectly authenticated are the wonderful facts connected with the redemption of mankind, that no ingenuity of skepticism, no virulent assault of malignant infidelity, has ever been able to shake them. The man who can pronounce the Gospel-history a fiction, or a collection of myths, is, beyond the possibility of doubt, a fool or a knave; the invention, by any human mind, of such a history, is purely an absolute impossibility; there is no accounting for the appearance of the four Gospels, in that age and country, (or, indeed,

at any time and any where) written by obscure and unlettered men, portraying, with minute detail, a life like that of the Savior, recording doctrines and precepts like his, except by simply believing, that they declare the pure, unvarnished truth, and that Jesus of Nazareth was truly the Son of the living God, the only begotten of the Father. Even the notorious work of Strauss, with all its array of learning and acute criticism, is only a tissue of recklessly audacious negation; nothing better than a bold exhibition of ingenious, but unprincipled and unblushing pettifogging, in support of a perfectly arbitrary foregone conclusion. The man who would hope to engage in a successful crusade against christianity, must first give a rational and satisfactory account of the existence of the New Testament, and that extraordinary revolution in human affairs which undeniably began about eighteen hundred years ago, all which, on the presumption that the Gospel-narrative is a fiction, or that Christ was other than it represents him, has been accomplished by a few poor, illiterate, Gallilean impostors; that is, he must successfully accomplish an undertaking so hopelessly absurd, that we would fain hope that it will never again be attempted.

It is the well authenticated, insubvertible facts of the origin of christianity, facts rendered invincible by an overwhelming force of external, and of still more powerful internal evidences, which have at all times foiled its adversaries; upon which they have ever spent their strength in vain, like a besieging army upon the solid rock upholding some impregnable fortress—like the raging billows, surging, without cessation or rest, against the barriers which the Maker has appointed. These momentous facts are the glorious heritage of the church; and “as the mountains are round about Jerusalem, so the Lord is round about his people from henceforth even for ever. For the rod of the wicked shall not rest upon the lot of the righteous.”—These wondrous facts, which constitute the firm historical basis of our holy religion, must needs be unspeakably precious to evangelical christendom, which could not manifest a more alarming symptom of degeneracy and decline, than indifference towards them, and neglect as regards the grateful, reverent, exultingly joyful remembrance of them. *Now to commemorate, seriously and solemnly, these great facts, to keep them distinctly before the mind of christendom, to hold them up before the world as the foundation of our faith and hope, to unfold and illustrate their wonderful nature, to endear them to the hearts of christians, and to saturate (sit venia verbo) the consciousness of the church, with a sense of their awful*

glory, and their incalculable importance, is the design of the great festivals. They serve again and again to assure the world, that christians have not believed in cunningly devised fables, which dreading scrutiny, shun the light; but that we know where we stand; that we invite inquiry and solicit investigation, and that we are not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; and they stately afford to God's people occasions or seasons for the special consideration of the great facts which sustain their faith, for serious and devout meditation upon the separate links in that great chain of events, which forms an impenetrable and impregnable bulwark around the doctrines of our faith—for extending our knowledge of their character—for deepening our conviction of their importance—for renewing and confirming their hold of the memory.

In order that this article may not be extended beyond all due bounds, we shall condense what more we have at present, to say upon our subject, into as narrow a compass as possible, under four distinct heads. And *first*, we have seen that the observance of the ecclesiastical year and of church festivals, has come down from the early ages of the church. The Reformers, who, especially Luther, were not speculative theorists, but practical men in an eminent degree, wisely retained this institution, and in the Protestant churches of Europe, with a few exceptions, it has ever been strictly honored. But it is not important, in this connexion, to refer to other churches; it is sufficient to state that in Europe, the ecclesiastical year and the stated appropriate celebration of the great christian festivals, has been at all times a prominent feature in the practice of the Lutheran church; so much so, that, while indeed we are far from regarding the observance of church festivals as imperatively binding upon christians, the abrogation of this institution would rob Lutheranism of one of its distinguishing characteristics, despoil our church of one of its most delightful, commendable, and practically fruitful usages, rend out of her fabric one of her most beautiful building stones, and thus mar the fair proportions of our ecclesiastical structure, and rudely invade and assail our ecclesiastical consciousness. It cannot, we believe, be denied, that in our American church, the observance of the cardinal festivals has, for some time past, been gradually falling more and more into desuetude. It is but one among many instances, in which the ancient practices, the fair and venerable lineaments of Lutheranism, are permitted to yield to the inroads of extraneous and ungenial influences.—To us this gradual abandonment of institutions and usages which have ever been prominently distinctive of our evangel-

ical communion, is a sad and ominous symptom, and we, for one, cannot consent to see one after the other of the noble and excellent characteristics of our church swept away by ecclesiastical indifferentism, by an excessive liberality, which, in its extreme readiness to assimilate itself to other surrounding denominations, ends by committing ecclesiastical suicide, without entering our protest, and entreating our brethren to "stand still and consider" to what all this must in the nature of things, eventually lead. We ascribe this growing disregard and neglect of the festivals of the church to the influence of Puritanism, which is deeply felt in our midst, and seems to have taken firm hold of the minds of many. We entertain a profound respect for Puritanism, without being, for that reason, prepared to approve of all its developments. We shall have occasion to resume this subject in a different connexion, and therefore conclude our remarks on this point, by expressing the hope that the Lutheran church will not supinely surrender to the influence of other denominations, what is interwoven with her entire past history, what is in itself, beautiful and good, and consistent with the principles and spirit of christianity, and what has exhibited, in practice, the most salutary and beneficial tendencies.

In these last words we have stated our *second point* : viz, the happy practical results which arise from the appropriate and solemn observance of church festivals. We have spoken extensively of their design, about the importance of which there can be no dispute ; and the only question that can remain, is, whether they are really adapted to realize the object for which they are instituted. The simple answer is, that this depends entirely upon the manner in which they are observed ; and we contend that when they are, as they ought to be, celebrated with due seriousness and solemnity, with appropriate exhibitions of religious truth, and any other suitable religious exercises, all calculated to impress the mind and heart with the momentous importance of the great facts in the history of human redemption, they are, to all intents and purposes, quite as well adapted to the attainment of their specific design, as is the Sabbath to the attainment of the great purposes for which it has been appointed ; for in the latter case, as well as in the other, everything depends, and must depend, upon the manner in which the institution is observed ; whether it be duly respected and improved, or neglected and abused. The point is one which does not admit of much abstract argument ; at all events no reasoning would avail against the results of fair experiment ; experiment made under such circumstances and

conditions as we would consider fair and just, if the tendencies of the Sabbath were to be tested. Such observation and experience must, therefore, supply the proper test of the correctness of our position in regard to this subject; and certainly so far as we may be allowed to refer to our own observation and experience, we are prepared to testify to the great practical benefits arising from the appropriate observance of the cardinal festivals. For reasons which will, at once, suggest themselves to the judicious reader, we shall not here refer to any portion of our own church. There is no church, in which the great festivals are more strictly and solemnly observed, than the Moravian, a denomination whose confession of faith is our own venerable Augustana. During our early connexion with this church, we had ample opportunity to observe and experience the deep, powerful, healthful and highly beneficial influence of these solemn celebrations, especially on the minds of children and youth. They call forth a spirit of inquiry; they awaken and cherish a lively interest; they produce a profound appreciation as regards the great facts of the christian religion, which nothing can, in like manner and degree, effect, particularly in the case of young persons. For our own part we can truly and gratefully say, that their striking appropriateness, and their deep solemnity, especially as respects the exercises continued during the entire passion week, made, and have left impressions on our own mind and heart, which neither time nor circumstances can ever efface; and we are not aware that their influence was, at any time, or in respect of any, young or old, other than most benign and blessed, and such as christian festivals should ever be adapted to produce. That the impressions thus received should fade from the minds of the thoughtless and frivolous, is but to say, that they experience the same fate as every religious and holy influence.

Our third point is the relation of the festivals to special and protracted efforts for the conversion of sinners, and the revival and edification of God's people. It cannot be our present purpose to advance arguments, either for or against protracted meetings, nor in any respect, to define our position with regard to them. The only objection to them which we desire here to state, is, that they are generally got up extemporaneously, as one or more individuals may think proper, and not always, perhaps, with due consideration. Now, what we wish in this connexion to insist upon, is, that in her great festivals, the church is provided with stated annual protracted meetings, which may be improved to any necessary and desirable extent,

for the advancement of Christ's kingdom by special efforts, and preëminently solemn exercises. The season of Advent closing with Christmas, and, if not the whole season of Lent, yet at least the entire passion week closing with Easter Sunday, furnish suitable occasions for religious exercises of more than ordinary frequency and interest. The facts and events which these seasons, as also the day of Pentecost, are designed to commemorate, are the most important and solemn connected with the great scheme of human redemption, and the establishment of Christ's church on earth. They are, therefore, if observed in the right spirit and manner, highly adapted, in themselves, to arouse inquiry, to engage attention; to excite interest, to awaken serious and solemn reflections, to produce and deepen religious impressions, and to bring home the truths of christianity with power and effect, to the conscience and heart. But their peculiar advantage, in this respect, lies in this, that they are not extemporaneously got up, as one individual or a few may deem expedient, but that they occur regularly, at stated periods. Hence, as we know from our own observation, they are looked forward to, and expected, with an interest deepening as they approach; the mind becomes prepared for their arrival, and occupies itself in the devout contemplation of the great facts, the glorious events, the solemn scenes, which they commemorate, and of the momentous truths which are based upon, or connected with them. And thus (at least our own experience bears us out in saying so) from earliest childhood, the sweetest, most hallowed and fruitful associations cluster around these sacred festivals of the church. We do not deem it necessary to press this point farther; we may safely leave it to the reflecting and devout reader to judge for himself, what abundant and happy results the church might reap from the appropriate and solemn observance of the great festivals.

We are yet, in the fourth place, to notice briefly the main objection that is urged against the observance of festivals; we have, in fact, never heard more than one that deserves any attention at all; and this is, that they are liable to abuse—that they are often and much abused. But usages so beneficial in their tendency, and identified with the character and life of a church as these are with the Lutheran, ought not to be suffered to fall into disuse, without far more cogent reasons than this. And, indeed, when we look at the extent to which the observance of church festivals has fallen into desuetude among American Lutherans, we are surprised that confirmation should have been retained, as the mode of receiving members into the church; for, certainly, during a long period, greater abuses

were, in many places, connected with this rite, than, we are confident, ever attended the observance of the great festival days. We know very well that Christmas, Easter Monday, and Whitsun-Monday, have been greatly perverted by ignorant and infatuated, and ungodly people, to unhallowed pursuits and amusements. But we may here most appropriately and decidedly insist on the fair application of the good old maxim that "*abusus non tollit usum*"—that the abuse of a thing does not abrogate its use; and in addition, we may ask—and we well know what the candid answer must be from the dwellers in our great cities, from town and country—whether the Sabbath has fared, or now fares, any better, and whether christians ever dream of giving up its observance, because fools and sinners abuse it?

An eminent New England divine once remarked to us, that it was a want deeply felt in consequence of the abrogation of all church festivals, that led the Puritans to adopt, in their place, the regular annual thanksgiving and fast days. The appropriateness and value of days of thanksgiving and of fasting we are not in the least disposed to question. But he that has resided, as we did, for years in the emporium of New England, and has thus had ample opportunity of noting the manner in which thanksgiving and fast days are there observed, will not envy the Puritans their exchange. If church festivals have been abused and perverted, then surely the days here spoken of, have nothing whereof to boast: and in this instance, certainly the influence which Puritanism has exerted on the usages and practices of our church, ought to be shaken off. The objection here considered is then unmeaning in itself, and worthless to any argument adverse to church festivals:—if it were valid and available wherever it can be raised—and what is there in human life on which a shallow and contracted judgment may not bring it to bear—it would speedily sweep away the most beneficial and sacred institutions, even the word of God itself, than which nothing is more fearfully abused and perverted by the folly and wickedness of man.

The objections based on the uncertainty of the day of our Savior's nativity, and on the unsuitableness of the terms Christmas and Easter, are obviously of no account whatever. They do not, in the slightest degree, affect the question before us.—What we want is, that the great facts or events which are inseparably connected with, and of unutterable importance to, the establishment, and the continued existence and prosperity of the christian church, be suitably commemorated and improved, on stated anniversary festivals, we care not at what

season when historic dates cannot be ascertained, nor under what designation, provided it be consistent with the dignity and sacredness of our religion. And here we leave the subject to the serious and candid consideration of our readers.

ARTICLE III.

SYMBOLIC THEOLOGY.

By Rev. Charles F. Schaeffer, A. M., Red Hook, N. Y.

IN an article which appeared in the last number of the *Evangelical Review*, we attempted to exhibit the nature and objects of Symbolic Theology, or of "Symbolics," considered as a branch of the science of Theology. We were so long detained by the consideration of several important preliminary questions, that we found no room to introduce any illustrations of the manner in which theological subjects are treated in this department. Without repeating our remarks on the principles which we recognized in that article, we merely premise, on this occasion, that no controversial elements can be here introduced with strict propriety, and that formal efforts to sustain or overthrow a doctrine by any process of reasoning, or by express passages from Scripture, belong to Systematic Theology or Dogmatics, and are excluded from Symbolics. We are now prepared to accomplish our original design, which was, to give a comparative view of the tenets of different religious denominations, as far as some one leading doctrine would furnish an opportunity. We confess that the selection was difficult.—The vital importance of the "distinctive features" of the Lutheran church has not always been appreciated, and a general impression seems to prevail, on the contrary, that no grave doctrinal differences exist between her and the several orthodox denominations in the United States, except those which arise from her peculiar views respecting the Eucharist or Lord's Supper, and, possibly, also the sacrament of Baptism. On these points, it is usually assumed that she is sadly in error; no attempt is made to investigate these views, to explain them, and to demonstrate their truth; her supposed friends have sometimes found it to be more convenient to themselves to abandon as untenable the post which God assigned them, and more agreeable to her opponents to concede that her founders had been beguiled, and had lacked the wisdom of the nine-

teenth century. We were, at first, prompted by these facts to select the subject of the two sacraments on this occasion ; but that a difference of opinion here exists between ourselves and our "dissenting brethren," is admitted, and we did not feel disposed to introduce them formally, without an attempt to vindicate the correctness of our views by the introduction of Scripture proofs. Moreover, we were desirous to show the fallacy of the usual statement, that the act of a Lutheran who abandons his church for another, does not imply a very serious change of religious views, by exhibiting various points of difference that are actually found in doctrines respecting which a general agreement is supposed to exist. It is the opinion of many, for instance, that Lutheranism and Methodism employ the same weapons in their contest with Calvinism, while, in reality, the Lutheran church sympathises with neither of these two antagonistic forces, and cannot consent to recognize either as an ally in any charge which she may make against the other. Thus, too, it is usually supposed that the orthodox churches essentially agree in their views respecting the Trinity ; but when this doctrine is fully developed and placed in combination with those that are allied to it, as the interests of the truth demand, we are necessarily conducted to specific explanations respecting the *person of Christ* ; now this point, which, in works on Systematic Theology is not commonly discussed in the same chapter in which the doctrine of the Trinity is presented, is nevertheless of the utmost importance in any statement which a writer may design to give of the scriptural declarations respecting the divine nature. Here the Lutheran church stands perfectly alone, entertaining ideas respecting the person of Christ so august and truly scriptural in themselves, while they are also intimately connected with the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, that, if no other feature distinguished her, she would be remarkable for the fullness of her orthodox opinions respecting the divine and the human nature of Christ.— All these subjects, however, we have concluded to dismiss, as they involve doctrinal discussions and scriptural proofs from the introduction of which we are precluded by the nature of the subject which gives a name to the present article. A doctrine which usually occurs near the beginning of creeds and confessions we have finally selected, since, without leading to serious misapprehensions, we may dispense with any direct examination of the scriptural proofs, or the employment of any other mode of argumentation : we refer to the doctrine of *Original Sin*, in connection with *Free Will*, and the *Imputation of Adam's sin*.

It is not necessary to repeat the remarks which we made in the former article on the principle, recognized by all candid inquirers, that the doctrines of any church are to be sought in her creeds or confessions, and not in the private or unauthorized writings of her members. Neither is it now necessary to enumerate the names of the symbolical books which constitute the creed of the Lutheran church. But before we proceed we desire to advert to one question which may occur to the general reader: What authority does the "General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran church in the United States" possess in matters of faith? Our unequivocal answer is: None whatever. That Synod which has already accomplished a large amount of good, and the successful labors of which we have, during many years, observed with gratitude to the great Head of the church, is simply an *advisory* body; it is not recognized by the Lutheran church at large in any other capacity. Its members do not represent the whole, but *only a section of that branch* of the church which is found in the United States, and can much less act for the great mass of the church as it exists in the world; it is, consequently, not entitled to the rank of a provincial, still less to that of a general, council.— Besides, its founders and present friends never designed that it should touch, alter, reject or sanction the church creed. It can give no new authority to our symbolical books, by any unmeaning admission that the contents of one of them are "substantially correct," for these books were recognized, revered and believed long before this General Synod existed, even in imagination, and its friendly or hostile acts cannot reach one jot or tittle of these books. Hence, the action of the General Synod is not of more consequence, when the *creed* of the church at large is discussed, than the action which the most obscure individual might be pleased to take in reference to them. It never gave these books to the church, neither can it take them away. When our inquiries concern doctrines, we ascend to a period anterior to the formation of this modern Synod, and consult the symbolical books alone, to which it is indebted for its very existence, and to which it owes, and we sincerely trust, will always render, the most profound reverence.

We may also add, in this connection, that those venerable men, who originally brought the name and doctrines of the church to the shores of America, and whose memory is gratefully cherished by her, occupy a similar position. They would have repelled with honest indignation any attempt to represent them in the light of "Separatists." They loved their church,

revered her doctrines, prized her name, sustained her institutions, and ordinances with enlightened zeal, and adhered with unyielding tenacity to the principle that the church of which they were members in this country, was identical with the church of the mother country, in spirit and in doctrine, as well as in name. Influenced by the purest principles of religion, and strictly observing the dictates of honor, they would have regarded those as base and degenerate men, who would have proposed to rupture insidiously the sacred ties that bound them to the church in Europe, by retaining her name, while they placed unhallowed hands on her creed, or changed its whole character by their mutilations. We dare not affix a stigma to their venerated names: we cannot tolerate, for a moment, the preposterous idea that they claimed the right, or entertained the desire, while they remained "Lutherans," to disown in the most indirect manner, one page of the Symbolical books. Even if they had, however, been capable of such irreverence and fraud, their course could not have affected the authority of these books; we are not aware that these founders of Lutheranism in America were authorized by any competent tribunal to legislate for the church, and reëstablish, suppress, or new-model her doctrines. Such an attempt, on the part of a few scattered men in a remote country, to "nullify" the Creed of a great and widely-extended church, — such a crusade of a little band of humble and feeble men against a mighty structure of divine truth like that which Lutheranism presents to the gaze of the world — really, the idea is so monstrous, that if it possessed more substance than a shadow, we might expect that it would evoke these departed worthies from their graves, and compel them to deny the foul imputation. We have made these explanations simply for the purpose of accounting for the fact that, in our subsequent statements, we make no reference whatever to any authorities which have arisen since the original promulgation of our creeds, and which must rise or fall with these creeds, if they are Lutheran not only in name, but also in deed and in truth.

When the Lutheran church originally assumed a distinct and independent position, the circumstances of the times imperiously demanded a full development of the truth. Divine Providence assigned to her the task of deriving the materials for her confessions of faith from the Holy Scriptures alone, while she rejected the traditions of that corrupt church of Rome, which impiously claimed to be the church of Christ. Later ecclesiastical organizations enjoyed the advantage of finding in her admirable symbols the pure truth of God em-

bodied in suitable language. They largely shared in her treasures, and, consequently, the Protestant churches could not differ as widely and essentially from her as the church of Rome. While, however, they were led by the power of the truth to adopt many Lutheran tenets, various circumstances combined to give to each new Protestant creed a distinct form or character. In some cases, very grave departures from the "form of sound words" occurred, and separate religious societies were gradually formed, each characterized by a peculiar combination of doctrines, or different shades in the expression of leading points of the christian faith. The Lutheran will recognize some precious truth in the creed of each of the modern orthodox denominations, but he will discover in none a similar exhibition of divine truth in general; he will, at times, meet with doctrines, well known to him, but divested of some of their most admirable features; other essential portions of the truth, again, which afford unspeakable consolation and delight to the soul, he will find, in all their fulness and power, in no communion but his own. By a misapprehension, for the occurrence of which we can readily account, the general conformity of the creed of the Protestant Episcopal church to our own, has seemed to justify the process by which they are styled "English Lutherans," in some of the middle States. With respect to the doctrines of the church, Lawrence makes the following remarks in his sermons: "preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1804." — "Our Articles [of the Church of England] were modelled after the Lutheran in opposition to the Romish tenets of the day."¹ "When Edward ascended the throne * * the offices of our church were completely reformed * * after the temperate system of Luther. * * At the same period also, the first book of Homilies was composed * * equally Lutheran,"² &c. "On the whole, therefore, the principles upon which our Reformation was conducted, ought not to remain in doubt; they were manifestly Lutheran. Our Reformers, indeed, had they been so disposed, might have turned their attention to the novel establishment at Geneva * * * but they rather chose to give reputation to their opinions, and stability to their system, by adopting, where reason permitted, Lutheran sentiments, and expressing themselves in Lutheran language."³ While we concede to this distinguished Episcopalian and to those of an earlier day, the privilege to adopt such expressions, it cannot be denied that

¹ Bampton Lectures, p. 9, printed, Oxford 1820.

² Ib. p. 15, 16.

³ Ib. p. 25, 26.

their successors combined with the original Lutheran elements so many foreign materials, of which Puseyism is the noxious fruit, and departed so far in principles and practice from the source from which they derived their fundamental doctrines, as to present, in our day, a system altogether foreign to the feelings and views of a Lutheran.

As an illustration of the fact, that divine truth, as a whole, has a peculiar aspect in the Lutheran church, we may refer to that part of Systematic Theology, which, by some writers, is called *Anthropology*, as distinguished from *Christology*, &c., and which treats specially "*Of man*," that is, of man's original condition, the fall, original sin; &c. Our limits will not allow us to furnish very extended quotations; still, we can give a condensed statement of the doctrines of the church on these subjects, and compare them with those of several other religious bodies which assume, with more or less justice, the name of *Protestant*.

According to the doctrines of the Lutheran church, God originally created one man, and one woman, from whom all human beings on earth are descended. Adam and Eve possessed many excellencies of body and spirit, which were impaired or lost after the fall. They were endowed with perfect health of body, and a physical nature so well adjusted or balanced (*æquale temperamentum qualitatum corporis*), that not one of its tendencies was marred by excess or defect. Their moral nature was characterized by the gifts of wisdom, knowledge and the fear of God, confidence in Him, integrity, or innocence and purity (rectitude) and the power to do works of righteousness, while the liberty of the will necessarily implied an ability to disobey God. See *Apol.* p. 53, ed. Rechenb. In these excellencies consisted their "original righteousness," (*justitia originalis*), that is, "man was originally created in truth, holiness and righteousness."¹ Without asserting that their bodies were not liable to dissolution previous to the fall, it nevertheless follows from our established principles, that in the state of innocence they were immortal or exempt from the influence of death, that is, according to Quenstedt, they enjoyed, not an *absolute* (*non posse mori*), but a *hypothetic* immunity from death, (*posse non mori*).

This point, respecting which formal quotations from our Creed need not be presented, has not occasioned serious difficulties among orthodox Protestants. Representations similar

¹ *Conc. Form.* p. 640.

to the above, and even similar terms (*e. g. justitia, sanctitas &c.*) will be found in the Conf. Helv. II. 8. Conf. Belg. Art. 14. Canon. Dordrac. 3, 1. Catech. Heidelb. 6. West. Conf. IV. 2. The "original righteousness" of our first parents is mentioned, without further specifications in Art. 9. of the Episcop. and Art. 7 of the Methodist Articles. The Arminians and Socinians exhibit less conformity to the Lutheran model, and the Romish church differs from all others in her general representations of the subject, with occasional affinities — which it does not belong to our present purpose to investigate.

While the more important denominations generally concur in opinion on this point, they begin to diverge in sentiment and language, when they set forth the *manner* and *degree* in which Adam's sin influenced his descendants. The Lutheran church primarily assumed certain positions, impreguably fortified by the word of God, to which she strictly and consistently adhered in all her confessions. Later religious communions adopted her views with various modifications, which distinctly appear in their respective Articles on Original Sin, the Freedom of the Will, and the Imputation of Adam's sin.

On these points the Lutheran creeds present the following statements: They consider Original Sin in a two-fold aspect: negatively, as a defect and loss of original righteousness, that is, the love and fear of God, &c. and positively, as an actual corruption, a depravation, or *concupiscence*. *Apol.* p. 55. This word, in the Lutheran sense, needs a brief explanation. The original term, ἐπιθυμία, which occurs thirty-eight times in the New Testament, is usually translated by the word "lust," and only three or four times by "desire;" in three passages it is rendered by "concupiscence." In an important chapter, our translators have given both versions (*lust* and *concupiscence*) of the same word in two consecutive verses, Romans 7: 7, 8. "When we speak of concupiscence, we mean not only acts or fruits, but a perpetual inclination of nature, until we are born again."¹ It is further defined to be "not only a corruption of the qualities of the body, but also a depraved (inclination and) tendency to carnal things in the higher faculties of man"² that is, a corruption of his moral nature, a reliance on human wisdom, &c. and a contempt of God; and it is declared to be essentially sinful in itself.³ Our references and extracts belong to both the Latin and German copies; in some cases we

¹ *Apol.* p. 51.

² *Ib.* p. 55.

³ *Apol.* pp. 51—57. *Conc. Form.* pp. 575, 639.

have combined the two, so that our translations are not always made *verbatim* from one copy exclusively.

In the following extracts Original Sin is described: "Our churches also teach that after the fall of Adam, all men who are born according to the course of nature, are born with (or in) sin, that is, without the fear of God, without confidence towards God, and with concupiscence (evil lusts); and that this disease or original depravity is truly sin, which condemns and now also brings eternal death upon those who are not born again by Baptism and the Holy Ghost. — They condemn the Pelagians and others, who deny that this original depravity is sin, and who, for the purpose of depreciating the glory of the merits and benefits of Christ, maintain that man can be justified before God by the natural and inherent powers of reason."¹ The *Apology*, p. 51, expands these thoughts, and maintains that all the children of Adam, from their very birth, have depraved hearts, and are incapable of fearing or trusting God. It proceeds to say that this corruption or viciousness of man's nature is born with him, that the absence of the fear of God and the want of faith are not merely defects, but actual sins, and that man continues in this sinful state, until he is regenerated, p. 56; that, without a knowledge of the nature of original sin, man will not seek after Christ, and that a mere moral life (*ehrbar Leben — justitia*) is nothing but hypocrisy and an abomination before God, (*Heuchelei und Greuel*), unless we acknowledge that we are miserable sinners before God, naturally destitute of love, fear and confidence towards God, p. 56; and that none but Christ can deliver us from this deadly sin, (*Todschild*). p. 58. "This original or hereditary sin is so deep and foul a corruption of nature that it cannot be known by our reason, but must be learned and believed through the revelations of Scripture," &c.² "We believe, teach and confess that original sin is not a slight (*schlechte-levem*) corruption of human nature, but rather so entire or deep (*tiefe-profundum*), that it has left nothing sound or uncorrupted in the body and soul of man, in his internal and external powers; according to the hymn of the church: Through Adam's fall the nature and being of man have become totally depraved."³ The same symbol asserts that original sin is not only an entire absence or defect of all that is good in spiritual things, (that is, things which relate to our conversion and salvation, p. 656,) but also a very evil, unfathomable, inscrutable and unspeakable corruption of the whole nature and all its powers, espe-

¹ Augs. Conf. Art. 2.

² Smalc. Art. p. 317.

³ Conc. Form. p. 574.

cially of the higher and principal faculties of the soul, that is, of the understanding, the affections and the will; that, since the fall, man inherits from his parents uncleanness of heart and depraved lusts and inclinations, so that he is naturally an enemy of God, and that, in consequence of his total corruption, which is itself a grievous sin, (p. 639) and the source of all sins, we are by nature the children of wrath; insomuch that, independently of any personal acts, or, aside from the sinner's own transgressions, his nature and person, being in a state contrary to God's will, are sinful and worthy of condemnation, on account of the sin which he has inherited."¹ "We are taught by the word of God that our corrupt nature of itself, and by its own powers, can, in things spiritual and divine, do nothing that is good, not even in the least degree, so as to originate good thoughts; and further, the Scriptures assert that our corrupt nature of itself and by its own powers, can do nothing else but sin before God." p. 643. "The unregenerate man can do nothing good in things spiritual and divine." p. 656.

In consequence of this corruption, the freedom of the will has been seriously affected. If the unregenerate man has lost all inclination and all ability to do good, as the above extracts declare, it follows that his will can be inclined only to that which is evil, and, consequently the quality or attribute of liberty or freedom is no longer possessed by his will in such a sense that it can of itself as freely turn to virtue as to vice.² Hence the following doctrine is held by the church: "Concerning Free Will our churches teach, that the human will possesses some liberty in the attainment of civil righteousness, (Germ. to lead an honest life outwardly) and in the choice of things that are under the control of reason. But it has not the power, without the Holy Spirit, to attain to righteousness before God, or spiritual righteousness, (Germ. to become acceptable to God, to fear him sincerely, or to believe, or to expel the inborn evil lust from the heart, without the grace, help and operation of the Holy Spirit who is given through the word of God) because 'the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God,' 1 Cor. 2: 14. but this is produced in the heart, when the Holy Spirit is received through the word. * * * They condemn the Pelagians and others, who teach, that, without the Holy Spirit, we are able, by the mere powers of our nature, to love God above all things, and to observe the precepts of God in their whole extent. For,

¹ Conc. Form. pp. 639, 640.

² *Ib.* p. 661.

although our nature may be able to perform external works in a certain manner, since, for instance, it can restrain the hands from theft or murder, yet it cannot produce inward sentiments, such as the fear of God, trust in him, purity, patience, &c.”¹ “In other external things, and in the affairs of this world, which are controlled by reason (in things not relating to the love and fear of God) there still remains to man in some degree an understanding, or power, or ability, although even this is greatly impaired,” &c.² “In secular and external things which relate to our food or bodily support, man is industrious, wise and very diligent, but in spiritual and divine things, which relate to the salvation of the soul, he is like a statue * * which does not see,” &c. p. 661. “He may move the limbs of his body, hear the Gospel, meditate on it * * but cannot believe * * * unless the Holy Spirit operates in his soul, and kindles faith in him.” p. 662. “Reason and the natural free will have in some measure the ability to lead externally an honest life, but the new birth is the work of the Holy Spirit alone.” p. 663. * * “Nor do we take away the liberty of the human will. The human will possesses liberty in the choice of works and things which reason comprehends by itself. It can effect civil righteousness, or the righteousness of works, (that is, an external correct life, *ehrbar Leben*); it can speak of God, worship God externally (*äusserlich*), obey magistrates and parents, and in the choice of outward works can withhold from murder, adultery and stealing. For since natural reason remains after Adam’s fall, so that we may know good and evil in those things which are perceived by means of the senses and reason (*Sinnen und Vernunft*), the possibility of choosing remains, and the liberty and ability of leading an honest or dishonest life. * * * If we concede to the will the liberty and ability to perform the outward works of the law, nevertheless we do not concede that these spiritual things proceed from the free will, namely, the fear of God, faith, &c. * * * for these cannot be wrought without the Holy Spirit,” &c.³

These translations are founded on a combination of the Latin and German originals. Other passages respecting the will we omit, as they may more appropriately be introduced in a presentation of Lutheran views respecting human ability and the operations of the divine Spirit — a point which we have not room to consider at present.

The following extracts refer to points intimately connected with the general subject. “When Luther holds, that original

¹ Augs. Conf. Art. 18.

² *Ib.* p. 640.

³ *Apol.* pp. 218, sqq.

sin remains even after Baptism, he means (or has written) that Baptism takes away the guilt of original sin, although the *material* of sin, as our opponents term it, namely concupiscence, still remains. Concerning this material he adds, that the holy spirit, given through Baptism, begins to mortify concupiscence and creates new motions in man, (Germ: daily destroys evil lusts, and introduces into the heart a new light, a new mind and confidence)." *Apol.*, p. 56. "We affirm that no one but God can separate this corruption of nature from nature; which separation will be fully accomplished through death, in the resurrection. *Then* will our nature (that of the regenerate) which we now bear with us, arise without original sin, and, altogether separated and withdrawn from it, will enjoy eternal felicity." *Conc. Form.*, p. 575. "Although those who truly believe and are converted and justified, are regenerated and renewed in the spirit of their mind, nevertheless their regeneration or renovation is not perfect or absolute, but only commenced; and these believers are perpetually warring in the spirit of their mind against the flesh, that is, their corrupt nature which adheres to us even unto death." *ib.*, pp. 595, sq. "If the believing and elect children of God were perfectly renewed in this life by the indwelling spirit, so that in their whole nature and in all its powers sin could no longer adhere, they would not need the law * * * but their renewal is not completed or fully consummated. Although their sins are covered by the most perfect obedience of Christ, so that these are not imputed to believers unto condemnation, and although the mortification of the old Adam, and the renewal in the spirit of their mind is commenced by the holy spirit, nevertheless the old Adam always remains in their nature, and in all their internal and external powers, according to the apostle, Rom. 7: 18, sqq. Galat. 5: 17." *ib.* p. 719. From these passages it appears that the Lutheran church teaches not only the doctrine of original sin in its most impressive form, but also, while conceding the use of the expression *freedom* or *liberty of the will* in temporal concerns, recognizes no free will in such a sense that man can dispense with the aid of divine grace either at the beginning or at any subsequent period of the divine life; the church also emphatically denies that entire sanctification or sinless perfection is attainable in this life. The influence of Baptism, to which there are brief allusions in the above extracts, we shall not at present examine, as that point properly belongs to another chapter of the Lutheran system.

The imputation of Adam's sin is also closely connected with the general subject of original sin. The declarations of

the church on this point, in addition to Article II of the Augs. Conf. which we have quoted above, are the following: "We repudiate and reject the false views and vain doctrines of the old and of later Pelagians, namely, that original sin is only a *reatus* or guilt, contracted through the transgression of another, without any corruption of our nature; that evil lusts (*Lüste-concupiscentiæ*) do not constitute a sin * * * and, that this defect (i. e., the absence of all that is good) and hereditary evil, is not properly and truly such a sin before God, that on account of it man is a child of wrath and condemnation, and will perish under the tyranny and dominion of sin, unless he is united with Christ and delivered by him." *Conc. Form.* p. 642. "On account of this corruption, and the fall of our first parents, the nature or person of man is accused and condemned by the law of God." *ib.* p. 639. "All men, on account of the disobedience of Adam and Eve, lie under the wrath of God, and are by nature the children of wrath, as the apostle testifies: 'by one man's disobedience many were made sinners,' Rom. 5: 19." *ib.* p. 540. "Concerning sin we confess, as Paul affirms, Rom. 5: 12, that by one man, Adam, sin entered into the world, by whose disobedience all men were made sinners, subject to death and the devil. This is called original, hereditary, the principal and chief sin." *Smalc. Art.* p. 317. In the following passage it is expressly denied that Adam's sin, *per se*, renders *us* guilty before God, or is imputed to us, and the whole connection shows the meaning to be, that we ourselves as we are, independently of Adam, through our own state and personal acts, are guilty before God. "Some (of our opponents) maintain that original sin is not a certain viciousness or corruption in the nature of man, (derived from his birth,) but only a servitude or condition of mortality, (Germ: an infirmity and burden imposed) which the descendants of Adam endure, on account of the transgression of another, *without any sin of their own*, and, moreover, that no one is condemned to eternal death on account of original sin, but rather resembles the children of a bondwoman who are born as servants, and endure this condition without any vices (or guilt) of their nature, simply on account of the calamity of their mother. This impious opinion displeases us, &c."—*Apol.* p. 51. Consequently, our creed does not, in the most distant manner, maintain that we are guilty before God on account of Adam's sin, and independently of our own personal character and conduct.

These passages are all that the Symbolical books contain, which, even by a violence of interpretation can be compelled

to refer to the imputation of Adam's sin. According to these books every deviation from the path of duty prescribed by the divine will, is a *sin*; the tendency to such deviations is termed sinfulness (*vitiositas*;) this vicious tendency of our nature is a depravation of its original excellence, and is really a corruption. St. Paul, to whose writings the Symbolical books refer, characterizes the state of the unregenerate as one of sin and enmity towards God, Rom. 5: 8, 10; the cause of this wretched state of man he traces to Adam, in verses 12-19.—Now this condition of man, which renders him corrupt and hostile to God, the Symbolical books regard as, unquestionably not pleasing to God, but sinful in his eyes, insomuch that without considering his own acts, his sinful state was already worthy of condemnation. But these books, following the course which Paul pursues in saying that 'death passed upon all men for that all have sinned,' v. 12, immediately combine with original sin the guilt contracted by man's personal transgressions, and in the character of a corrupt descendant of a fallen and sinful ancestor, whose own sins have involved him in additional evils, man appears precisely in the light in which he has been represented in the passages given above.

The leading propositions, consequently, derived from Romans, chap. 5, or from our Symbolical books are: that Adam became a sinner, and lost his original righteousness, that his descendants shared in the corruption which he introduced, that the whole race thus became sinful in God's eyes, and that each individual, previous to his regeneration by the Holy Spirit, continued to do sin only. But our creeds make no mention whatever of an imputation of Adam's sin to us, neither do they entertain the view that we are punished for his transgressions. Certainly, such doctrines are not meant, when they say that when God looks down on men as they actually appear, he discovers in the heart a natural enmity towards himself, which when developed, leads to personal offences against his law; this position of unregenerate men is inconsistent with his holy law, is characterized by rebellion, and in view of God's essential truth and holiness, cannot escape his condemnation. We reject the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin entirely, and also the term itself, which does not once occur in the whole volume of our creed. We do not recognize the theory according to which he is denominated our 'federal head;' we do not believe that God either considers us guilty of Adam's sin, or punishes us for his transgressions. We simply follow St. Paul's instructions, without adding to their extent or devising new forms of expression, and without sanctioning any modifi-

cations or changes in his pure doctrines that would render them inconsistent alike with our natural sense of justice, and with the character of God, as far as it is revealed in Scripture.

The position which the Lutheran church assumed on the subjects presented above is peculiar to herself. She adopted views equally remote from the Calvinists and the Arminians; the intermediate ground which she occupies can be rendered distinct by the following brief view of the doctrinal systems of others. We begin with one extreme; we then approach our own ground; we ultimately reach the other extreme, and thus observe the various points of approximation and divergence. As the rules of Symbolics require us to place the views of our own church and those of others in juxtaposition, the exhibition of doctrinal truths and errors may sometimes assume the semblance of sectarianism. We do not, however, design to attempt a vindication of our present course, or repel a charge so odious by any elaborate apologetic remarks, as the intelligent reader will at once perceive that we are neither defending nor repudiating any system. Our remarks avoid all personal allusions, and are intended simply to set forth conflicting views on an interesting subject. We recently examined a large collection of paintings, in company with an esteemed friend.— One noble painting fascinated us by the grandeur of the subject, the beauty of the coloring, the attitude of the principal personage, and that undefinable feeling of inward harmony and joy, with which a spectator contemplates such a finished work of art. Our friend was far more powerfully attracted by another painting, also possessed of great merit, but not, in our view, comparable to the one which had won our unqualified admiration. We exchanged opinions freely, stated our preferences, compared the abilities of the two artists, disagreed entirely on the subject of their talent and skill, but nevertheless found many traits in both paintings which gave us equal pleasure. We could discuss the subject without indulging in unnecessary personalities; we left the exhibition-rooms soothed and delighted by all that we had witnessed; and while each freely extolled his favorite, neither felt disposed to be offended by the different choice which his friend had made. On the present occasion, there is as little reason for giving or taking offence. We occupy the position of a spectator, who merely compares one object with another for the sake of the pleasure and instruction which that occupation gives—we are not seated on the bench of a judge, and do not claim authority to decide. We trust that these explanations, which are made in good faith,

will protect us from any unjust charges that others might, through a misunderstanding of our real motives, be disposed to make.

The Socinians confess that Adam's sin rendered the death of his descendants unavoidable, *Cat. Racov.* p. 21, but proceed to express the following views: "It is certain that through the fall of Adam the nature of man was by no means vitiated in such a way that he was deprived of the liberty and will either to obey or disobey God, in those things to which, when God demands them, the threat of punishment or the promise of reward is annexed. * * * As the fall of Adam was one act, it could not have such an effect as to deprave the nature itself of Adam, much less that of his posterity." *ib.* p. 294. "There is no original sin at all, and therefore it could not vitiate the free will," &c. *ib.* qu. 423. With the Socinians, therefore, we have no affinity whatever.

The Arminians, who, as Guerike says, §40, "agree in essentials with the Socinians in an anthropological point of view" assume the character of an orthodox party, when they say (*Conf. Rem.* 7, 3.) that through the sin of Adam all men lost original righteousness, were born subject to death, &c.—But their system is, in this point as in many others, characterized by vagueness, reserve, reluctance to adopt, or anxiety to dilute the positive declarations of scripture, and a tendency to some of the principles of Pelagianism as well as Socinianism. As an illustration of their general spirit, we refer to one of their most eminent writers, whose works acquired almost symbolic authority among them. "We confess," Limborch says, "that infants are born less pure than Adam was created, and with a certain propensity to commit sin, which, however, they derive not so much from Adam as from their immediate parents," &c. *Theol. chr.* 3, 3, 4. "This impurity is physical, not moral, and is so far from being truly and properly called sin, that the first motions thence arising are materials for the exercise of virtue." *ib.* 5, 15, 15. "Scripture teaches that there is no corruption in infants which is truly and properly a sin." *ib.* 3, 4, 4. "God never took away," says one of their symbolic works, "the innate liberty of the human will, which was originally given once for all at the creation." *Conf. Rem.* c. 6., p. 22. "The Arminians," Winer remarks, p. 64, "not only recognize in general no sin in 'the inclination to commit sin,' but even deny that this 'inclination' remains through life in the regenerate, and produces a constant struggle of the flesh with the spirit. *Vid. Apol. Conf. Rem.* p. 128, sq. Limborch, *Theol. chr.* 5, 15, 2, sqq." Here their identity with the Methodists

is complete. The latter are described by Watson, who is one of their highest authorities, as "that large body of christians, often called Arminians, who follow the theological opinions of Mr. Wesley." Theol. Institutes, II ch. 18, p. 240.—After their secession from the church of England, they retained certain portions of the "Thirty-nine Articles," while others were found to be inconsistent with Mr. Wesley's views, and were unceremoniously expunged. On the doctrines in question, the Methodists, whether they adopt or reject Arminian views, differ widely from us. For the sake of convenience we present the appropriate articles from the creed of the Episcopal church. Lawrence, whom we have already quoted, remarks: "The first of our Articles was taken almost verbatim from the first of the Augsburg Confession, * * * the *ninth* article evidently kept the same confession, although more remotely, in view." pp. 236 sq.

"Art. IX. *Of Original or Birth sin.*—Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk :) but it is the fault and corruption (*vitium et depravatio*) of the nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, (*ab orig. jus, quam longissime distet,*) and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth (*concupiscat*) always contrary to the Spirit; and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection (*depravatio*) of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek *φρόνημα σαρκός*, which some do expound the Wisdom, some Sensuality, some the Affection, some the Desire of the Flesh, is not subject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized; yet the apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin, (*peccati tamen in sese rationem habere concupiscentiam.*)

"Art. X. *Of Free Will.*—The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith, and calling upon God; wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us (*nos præveniente*) that we may have a good will (*ut velimus,*) and working with us, when we have done that good will."

The second of these two articles occurs as Art. VIII, without the change of a word among the "Articles of Religion" of the Methodist Episcopal church, which are "declared, by the

restrictive regulations which limit the powers of the General Conference, to be unalterable," according to Dr. N. Bangs, in Rupp's Orig. Hist. of Rel. Den. p. 441. But the former appears among the Methodist articles in the following shape:—"Art. VII. *Of Original or Birth Sin.*—Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk,) but it is the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually." The suppression of the latter portion of this article, as it appears in the "Thirty-nine Articles," is a very significant fact. The Methodists, by expunging these declarations seem to deny unequivocally that original sin "doth remain in the unregenerated;" they deny that "concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin," and this rejection of truths of the utmost consequence in the Lutheran view, and that too, on a point in which they are not usually supposed to differ from us, is an instructive illustration of the fact that, in its whole spirit and character, Methodism is at variance with Lutheranism. Two causes, a general and a special, may be assigned for their departure from the Episcopal creed: the former exists in their acknowledged Arminian tendencies: the latter, in the obvious irreconcilableness of the Lutheran doctrine, as adopted by the Episcopal church, with Wesley's views respecting "Christian Perfection." In Tract, No. 36, of the N. York Methodist Tract Society, Wesley's "Plain Account of Christian Perfection" is re-published. In this little work he adopts the principle that "A christian is so far perfect as not to commit sin." p. 6. This point he further explains on p. 10. "Quest.—What is implied in being a *perfect christian*? Answ.—The loving God with all your heart, and mind, and soul. Deut. 6: 5. Qu.—Does this imply that *all* inward sin is taken away? An.—Undoubtedly: or how can we be said to be *saved from all our uncleanness*, Ezek. 36: 29." We find some difficulty in defining the real views of the Methodists, as their doctrine of "entire sanctification" does not seem to be precisely consistent with itself, or rather, the language in which it is clothed, is not successfully chosen. Thus, in the same tract, p. 57, after reiterating that "there is such a thing as Christian Perfection," Wesley proceeds to maintain that this *perfection* is "*improvable*," while the very terms which he usually employs, *perfection*, and *entire sanctification*, p. 11, seem to indicate that the highest point of *improvement* is necessarily reached before perfection or entire sanctification can be predicated of the christ-

ian. We find nothing analogous to this theory in the whole extent of the Lutheran system, neither does it seem possible that the same intelligent mind can combine in one satisfactory religious system, suited to actual life, the leading tenets of the Lutheran and Methodist theories, on the subject before us, even without adverting to other peculiarities of each system, which, like a vast gulf, forever separate them.

The Episcopal church, as it appears from their articles which we have quoted above, has faithfully imitated the Lutheran model, as far as its brief articles permitted, and scrupulously abstained from the introduction of points inconsistent with the general principles which it recognized; still, the thirty nine articles are somewhat vague, give no precise delineation, like our own symbols, of the actual effects of Adam's fall, and, owing to the circumstances in which they were prepared and adopted, cautiously avoid any allusion to the imputation or non-imputation, in any sense, of Adam's sin, so that even without the infection of Puseyism, Episcopalianism and Lutheranism assume characters essentially distinct.

The confessions of other Reformed churches, among which the Episcopal is ranked by German writers, begin to deviate, like the Methodist, in various ways, from the path which the Lutheran church originally chose and retained, although they usually employ language like our own, in describing man's corruption and guilt. The *Westminster Confession* of faith, of the Presbyterians, adopts our own views so far as to teach that our first parents, after the fall, became "wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body," (ch. 6. §2); that "from this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions," (§4), and that "this corruption of nature, during this life, doth remain in those that are regenerated; and although it be through Christ pardoned and mortified, yet both itself and all the motions thereof, are truly and properly sin." §5. Of Free Will it asserts that "man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation," &c. (ch. 9. §3.) and that "the will of man is made perfectly and immutably free to good alone, in the state of glory only." ib. §5. While it continues to speak in this manner, it adds, however, that "the guilt of this sin (of our first parents) was imputed * * * to all their posterity," &c. ch. 6. §3. This statement agrees with the sixteenth answer in the *Shorter Catechism*: "all mankind * * sinned in him (Adam) and fell with him," &c. Such representations are totally at

variance with the language and spirit of our creeds, which while they harmonize with the Westminster Confession in many of its statements respecting original sin, and free will, cannot sanction its doctrine of imputation. The same views of depravity occur in Conf. Basil. 2. Conf. Helv. II: 8, 9. Conf. Gall. Art. 9, 11. Conf. Belg. 15. We specially refer to the Canons of the Synod of Dort. (Can. Syn. Dordr. cap. III and IV. 1—5.) recognized by the Dutch Reformed church, and the Heidelberg Catechism, qu. 7 and 8, adopted by the German Reformed church. These employ language much like our own on the subjects of original sin, human inability and free will. We have not room to offer extracts from the various confessions; they all lie before us in one volume of more than one thousand pages, entitled *Collectio Confessionum in eccl. reformatis publicatarum*. Eddidit Dr. H. A. Niemeyer. Lipsiæ, 1840. The opinions of smaller ecclesiastical communions, our limited space does not permit us to detail; Baptist authorities on the subjects before us, we omit altogether.

The statements here presented refer to several points in theology which are not now believed to be of sufficient importance to justify a controversy; it is usually assumed that here the "orthodox churches" do not materially differ from one another. Nevertheless even these points, without introducing others in which more serious differences are acknowledged to exist, are sufficient to illustrate the principle that the Lutheran system, as a whole, cannot be combined with any other in Christendom, without destroying its integrity. Our church breathes a spirit of its own, views divine truth in a light peculiar to itself, and borrows from none, while it freely communicates to all who will receive. Our peculiarities are, however, regarded at times, in a very indistinct light, even when they are not designedly concealed; it seems to be supposed that a Lutheran, who resolves on retiring from his own church, can conscientiously retain his ancient faith, while, in truth, a revolution in his ecclesiastical connections implies an essential change in his whole character. For it cannot be demonstrated that these points are merely of a theoretic nature, and, that they do not exercise an influence in actual life. Surely, a believer's character and conduct will be ultimately affected by the peculiar views, which he may entertain respecting man's inability to do good of himself—his feelings and his actions must be influenced by his views respecting the degree of holiness which is attainable in this life—the honor which he gives to God, and the love which he entertains towards the Savior will necessarily correspond to his personal views respecting the actual benefits which

Christ is thought to have conferred on fallen and guilty man by the atonement. The Lutheran, for instance, who really cherishes in his bosom the peculiar spirit of his church, and who, consequently entertains the above-mentioned views on original sin, &c. precisely as the Symbolical books inculcate them, will be necessarily governed, not only by opinions but also by feelings different in their operations from those which the Presbyterian and Methodist seem to prefer; and this fact would be placed in a still more distinct light, if we had room to refer to the Lutheran doctrines of the Atonement, the person of Christ, the operations of the Divine Spirit, and the two Sacraments, which differ widely from those of any other church in their form, spirit and combination. Lutheranism like Presbyterianism teaches man to abase himself deeply and sincerely before God, unreservedly ascribes all glory to Him, highly exalts the Savior, proclaims that the influences of the Spirit are indispensable to man's conversion and sanctification, and warns men that the "fight of faith" (2 Tim. 4: 6-8.) does not end till their course on earth is finished. A feeble echo is heard from Episcopalianism, partially repeating these declarations. But Lutheranism, without being retarded in its movements by a negative character like the latter, is now compelled to dissolve its connection with Presbyterianism; our views of God, as an *impartial* and wise Father; of Christ, as the Savior of the *whole* world; and of the Spirit, as the author of the conversion of those who voluntarily yield, and are not controlled by an *irresistible* divine influence, are so cheerful, consistent and animating, that, if we take but one point, ideas like those of the imputation of Adam's sin, which would make us personally guilty, produce nothing but discord in our hearts; and we are compelled to acknowledge, with deep regret, that the spirit of Lutheranism and the spirit of Presbyterianism can never harmonize in these points, although both regard several very precious doctrines with equal veneration.

There is still less affinity between Lutheranism and Methodism; both recognize, of course, with equal promptness, many of the leading doctrines of the christian religion; and the circumstances under which the latter originated, naturally infused a large portion of our views into its creed; we allude not so much to the somewhat circuitous channel of the Thirty-nine Articles, as to the immediate influence which it is known that one of Luther's works, and the society of several Lutherans, who possessed a living faith in Christ, exercised on Wesley's mind and heart. The uncompromising hostility with which the Methodists speak of Calvinism,—a system which our

church had long before the days of Arminius and of Wesley disowned, — and the prominence which they give to their so-called *Arminian* tenets, have really led to the supposition that, because they are not Calvinists, it necessarily followed that they fully accorded with us in doctrine, and, as another result, many have believed that they paid Lutherans a welcome compliment when they branded *them* with the name of Arminians, not being aware that we sympathize no more with Arminius and Wesley, than we do with Pelagius and Calvin. As the interests of the truth cannot be promoted by such serious misapprehensions, we do not hesitate to disown them unequivocally.

The Lutheran believes that original sin is a foul blot, or a deeply seated disease, or an awful calamity, the effects of which, as he thinks the Scriptures teach, will be felt by the most holy christian during his whole earthly existence; but Methodism does not prostrate itself before God in the same spirit, does not seem to look on this sin with such terror, and clings unconsciously to the idea that Adam's transgression did not inflict such a crushing blow on his descendants, nay, that even in this life, the chief or moral effect may cease to be felt; and yet it cannot deny that a physical effect, by which death has become inevitable, still continues. The doctrine of "entire sanctification," which the Lutheran believes to be most dangerous in its character, the Methodist prizes as his chief ornament. As they, respectively, adopt fundamental principles, which can never be combined in one system, their religious views and feelings must be essentially different. The Methodist cannot fully unite with the Lutheran, when the latter expresses his admiration of God's pity and compassion; he cannot understand the feelings of the truly converted and sanctified Lutheran, who still confesses that he is not yet delivered from "the body of this death;" he cannot accord in spirit with the latter, who, although repentant, believing and justified by faith, still feels that a spiritual warfare must be continued by him, and whose prayer, therefore, for new measures of divine grace will differ in their whole spirit from those of the Methodist. The entire method in which he combines the various doctrines of grace is different from the one according to which the Methodist mind has arranged them, and he will, therefore, when imbued with the true spirit of his church, find something so uncongenial or foreign in the Wesleyan system, that even Calvinism cannot present such numerous and sharply defined points of repulsion. On the other hand, the Methodist, proceeding on his own principles, and com-

mingling various elements of truth with those essential to his peculiar system, will naturally regard Lutheranism in an unfavorable light; to him it seems to be a defective system, since it cannot recognize his favorite views; it seems, again, to be overburdened with doctrinal statements respecting points that have no connection with his theology. Besides, Lutheranism does not assign a rank to any one doctrine which would unjustly depress another; it presents the doctrine of the Atonement and others, in such high relief, that those of repentance and holiness do not stand alone in the first rank; and such a procedure leads the Methodist to ascribe coldness or formality to the whole system, although, we believe, he does not actually accuse it of heterodoxy. In truth, our church ascribes no importance to subjective views or evanescent feelings, but invests doctrines like those of justification by faith and the sacraments with a character so august, and reveals a remedy for original sin so efficacious and worthy of God, that while Methodism cannot adjust these statements to its own proportions, it cannot stigmatize them as contradictions of Scripture.

We make these remarks in reference to theories alone, without the least design to adopt or invite a controversial treatment of the general subject. We should take pleasure in enlarging on the influence which each system, to which we have referred, must necessarily exercise, in the course of time, on the mind and heart of its adherent. But such a course, which might seem to lovers of peace to assume an aggressive character, would have no immediate connection with the general subject of Symbolic Theology, and, in this place, cannot receive our sanction. Other doctrinal points, such as Predestination, the Person of Christ, the Atonement, the operations of the Divine Spirit, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, on all which the Lutheran church either has views peculiar to herself, or entertains such as are arranged in a form and manner peculiar to herself, are far better entitled to our attention.— They are, however, necessarily excluded by the limits assigned to us, which we have, on this occasion, unreasonably transcended, and could, moreover only then be appropriately presented, if we should select as the title of the article the name of *Dogmatics* or *Dogmatic Theology*.

ARTICLE IV.

THE CHURCH QUESTION.

By Rev. J. A. Seiss, Cumberland, Md.

THERE is not a question which, at this moment demands such serious and profound attention from American christians, as that which relates to the church, and our position and duty with regard to it. There was a time when the Arian controversies made the doctrine of the Divine nature the most important and absorbing topic of investigation. There was another time when the prevalence of Pelagian heresies assigned the preëminence to the doctrine of the fall and depravity of man. And in the days of the Reformers, the incumbrances which the Papacy had imposed upon the mode of salvation rendered the doctrine of justification by faith the leading subject of inquiry. And if circumstances can be imagined in which *the doctrine of the church* should take precedence, those circumstances now exist. Different opposing communions with which we are in daily contact, separately claim to be the only true church of God on earth. Swarms of petty sects, of all shades of theological and political complexion, assert with equal confidence and zeal an equal title to a place in the holy christian society. Every year brings us tidings of secessions of men from established denominations, who assume to themselves the high prerogative to organize churches, and to appoint ministries and ordinances to suit their own fancies. And even doctors of Divinity have not hesitated to declare, that every man should be his own church. Can it, then, be doubted, that the time has come for the sifting of these pretences? Is it possible that the true church of God is to be found in these unnumbered antagonistic factions? Can those be members of the same undivided body of Christ whose relation to each other is hostility and death? When one party cries, lo! here is Christ, and another, lo! there he is; are we to disobey the Savior and believe them all? Are we to strike hands with every spirit, and say, Thou art our brother? Has our Lord left us no directions by which to distinguish between false prophets and those who bear authority from heaven? Is nothing more demanded to make christian ministers and christian societies, than for men to come together as a debating club, and declare themselves the authenticated followers of Christ? These are questions which Providence is pressing upon us every day with ever increasing solemnity. They force them-

selves into our minds in the public assembly, in the benevolent society, in the social circle, and in the meditations of retirement. Can we, then, be faithful to God, to our consciences, to society at large, to shrink from an attempt to answer them? Shall we be ridiculed and hissed, for endeavoring to settle our position on that neglected article of the creed which treats of *the holy Catholic Church*? Rather let the hands be withered, and the tongue be dumb, that would seek to hinder us from defending our precious faith. We must awake to an attention to this matter. We have already slumbered too long. Mischief has been done, through our indifference, which it is too late to remedy. We have too long contented ourselves with vague and popular notions, which are floating up and down in this or that denomination, without attempting to ascertain their truth. Under false conceptions of charity and a dread of offences, some have feared to speak out, even where conviction revolted at the monstrous extravagances of the age. We have cried peace, peace, when there was no peace. We have folded our arms in our unguarded tents, until the alarms of war ring on every side, and bayonets of destruction glitter at every door in the camp. We have protested against Rome, and protested faithfully and successfully; but we have not been sufficiently watchful of the spirit of Zwickau. We have been so hot in the pursuit of our ancient enemy, that the home territory has become infested with thieves and murderers. We have been diligent in our endeavors to dethrone one pope, while we have unconsciously contributed to set up hundreds in his place. We have taken such ultra ground, that the blows of schism are becoming quite as embarrassing as papal bulls.

We also hear many sorrowful lamentations over the Puseyistic tendencies of the day. Many solemn appeals are rung in our ears to beware of its insidious influences. And we question not that it is well enough to be on our guard. But is not Puseyism the legitimate fruit of the radical and rationalistic spirit, which rules so large a portion of Christendom? Is not highchurchism the true counterpart of *nonchurchism*? Is it not an established axiom, that extremes meet, and that going to the one we come in contact with the other? And upon the principle that the removal of the cause will do away with the effect, we have only to retire from our unchurchly extravagance, and we at once sweep away these popish inclinations. It has been well said, that "the safety of Rome lies in the indifference and ignorance of Protestants concerning the true Catholic Church of Christ. Once let that article of

the creed—*one holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church*—be generally understood, and the usurper of an unholy lordship over God's heritage shall be driven back, powerless, to the narrow limits of his own true jurisdiction." And the same is true of *semi-Rome*. No time should, then, be lost, and no pains spared, to find out a consistent position, and there to plant ourselves on the golden *via media*.

What is the Church?

From the manner in which some men speak of the church, we are left to infer, that they consider it as a mere system of truth. They seem to use the word *church* as being equivalent to the word *christianity*. Their idea implies, that the church is to be found in books, or parchments, or confessions of faith. But nothing could be more discordant with the Scriptures than such a position. The church is not a philosophy, but a living body. It is founded upon truth; it receives truth into its essential constitution; but it does not necessarily exist wherever there is truth. It comprises "one Lord," and "one Baptism," as well as "one faith." It embraces apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers, and saints, all in one "body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth." (Eph. 4: 5, 11, 16.) The church and the truth are mutually dependant; but they are very far from being identical. The church bears the truth, as the candlestick bears the light that is put into it, (Matth. 5: 15; Rev. 1: 20.) as the monument bears its inscriptions, (1 Tim. 3: 5.) or as the canvass of the artist displays the picture which is thereon delineated. And so the truth is the proper ornament and glory of the church. Nevertheless, the church is more than truth. For this reason the church is not to be found even in the Bible itself. The Bible is a simple record of truth. It is a divine *cast-picture*, directory of the church, because it is an inspired description of the organization and nature of it; but it is not, *in any sense*, the church itself.—The Bible gives us the revealed *idea* of the church, and directions where to find it, and the marks by which to identify it, and instructions concerning our duty towards it; but the church has its own distinct and separate being. The Bible does not even carry the germ from which a legitimate church may spring; and that for the satisfactory reason that a child cannot create its parent. The church existed prior to the Bible. The Bible is partly the creature of the church, and has sprung from it much as the history of nations springs from and is subsequent to their formation. Men only become members

of the church when they are baptized in the name of the Trinity. (Matth. 28: 19.). But the Bible cannot baptize; nor does the Bible appoint any one to baptize. It tells who have been appointed to administer this sacrament, but of itself it gives such authority to none. How, then, can the Bible be the parent of the church?

Nor does the church consist, as some would teach us, of the isolated individuals, or associations, which may happen to hold the christian faith. A man may believe the Jewish Scriptures, and still not be a Jew, or approve the American Constitution and still not be an American citizen. And so he may receive the doctrine of Christ, and yet not be a member of Christ's Body—the church. Voluntary associations may adopt the Bible, and profess to govern themselves by its moral precepts; but no one dare call them churches for that reason alone.—The church is a *peculiar* society. Else how could we distinguish it from other moral and religious communities with which the world abounds? But of this more anon.

The Church is a Visible Society.

This is indicated by the derivation of the word with which the Scriptures designate it, and is satisfactorily shown from all the connections in which the sacred writers use it. (Matt. 18: 17—Acts, 20: 28—1 Cor. 1: 2—Gal. 1: 13—1 Tim. 3: 5.) Chrysostom once said, "It is easier for the sun to be extinguished, than for the church to disappear." This declaration also expresses the universal christian belief of his time, and what has ever been maintained by the great mass of Christ's followers. The Eastern and Roman churches always insisted on the visibility of the christian society. And the same is affirmed or implied in the Augsburg, Saxon, Bohemian, Tetrapolitan, Helvetic, Gallican, and most other confessions. Nor is the church only *apparently* or *partially* visible. It is really and completely so. In its true acceptation there is nothing invisible in it. Its members are visible men and women, openly and according to Divine rule, confessing Christ. Its ministers receive and hold their offices openly. Its faith lies exposed to the inspection and recognition of all. Its ordinances are all external. And everything entering into its constitution is open and visible. With Melancthon, we agree, that "the christian church stands not *alone* in fellowship with outward signs, but also in inward communion with the everlasting riches of the heart—the riches of the Holy Spirit, of faith, of fear and love of God." (Apology, Art. 4.) But with the Augsburg Confession, we contend, that these internal riches

only come to be enjoyed through external channels—through the properly preached word, and the properly administered Sacraments. (Art. 5.) An invisible church, as distinct from the visible, is a mere human conceit, born from schism and nurtured by licentiousness. It is a deceitful snare, which, it is to be feared, has led many astray. The time has never been, when the church was unknown to the world in which it existed. And if there is any concealed way of entering its communion, or of securing its immunities, it is known only to God; for there is no intimation of it in his word. It is certain; the New Testament does not record the case of a single believer, who was not also publicly united with the rest of Christ's people.

For this denial of the scholastic dogma of an invisible church as separate and distinct from the visible, severe censures no doubt await us. But what we have here written, we have written. We shrink from no responsibility thus incurred.—But before leaving the topic we must be allowed a little space to glance at those arguments by which men have persuaded themselves into the delusion of an invisible church.

It has been said, that the true church consists exclusively of the elect; that the elect are unknown and invisible; and that, therefore, the true church is invisible. But it is a false assumption that the true church embraces only such as are elected to eternal life. The parables of the tares and the draw-net (Matt. 13,) show that it is false. According to these parables, the church is to comprise some who shall never see life, and who shall only be separated from the righteous in the day of judgment. Nor is it true that the elect are unknown. They may be unknown *as elect*; but are they not known as christian professors? Does not the Savior in Matt. 10: 32, 33, and Paul in Rom. 10: 10, set forth *an open confession of Christ* as indispensable to salvation? How, then, can there be any *unknown elect*, or an invisible church? Some also tell us, that the qualifications and worship of true christians are things of the heart, and that therefore the true church is invisible.—But granting that faith and devotion must engage the heart to be genuine, that does not prove that no external worship—no sacraments—no ordinances were instituted to assist in begetting and developing those internal affections. Though christianity concerns men's hearts, no one dare say that it is confined to the hidden man. It also concerns the life and external conduct. It includes the observance of outward rites which Christ has appointed. And where these visible manifestations—these "*fruits*" are lacking, the Savior has authorized us to infer that

there is no true religion, and of course no church. (Matt. 7 : 20.) Others again refer us to the great apostacies of which the Scriptures speak. They tell us that a man of sin was to be revealed, who should exalt himself above all that is worshipped, and as God, sit in the temple of God, showing himself as though he were God; and that if any true church was to exist at that time, it must be invisible. But it by no means follows that because of apostacies there should be no true church. Though the son of perdition does enter God's temple, and lay his polluted hand on God's altar, that cannot prove said temple and altar to be no longer the Lord's. Though he usurp the Divine attributes, it does not hence follow that all are his worshippers. The very predictions relating to Antichrist distinguish some who receive not his mark, and thus fall in with history which asserts that there always have been christian communities openly protesting against the usurpations of the papacy. Some remind us, that, by making the true church exclusively visible, we deny church membership to unbaptized infants, and such men as may have been deprived of the privileges of the sacraments. But what of that? We do not thereby exclude them from the Divine mercies. Theirs is a peculiar case, and doubtless will be satisfactorily met by methods which it is of no practical concern to us to understand.— There is no passage in the New Testament which declares them the true and regular members of the church. Even in that affecting passage in Matthew 19 : 14, it is not of uncircumcized or unbaptized children, but of children upon whom the great Bishop of the church had openly laid his hands and blessed, that it is said, "of such is the kingdom of heaven." It has also been argued, if the true church is always visible, the Protestant or Reformed church is not the true church, because it was not visible before the Reformation. But this objection takes for granted that the Reformers were schismatics; that they separated themselves from the visible church; that the comunions which sprung up under their opposition to papal errors, were different from, and antagonistic to the visible church; and that the Reformed church in its several branches is not the same church which existed from the times of the apostles. All this we peremptorily deny. *Luther and his associates never did separate from the visible church.* Luther opposed only *the papacy*, not the church. He set himself against what he conceived to be great errors and most unrighteous usurpations, and always declared his willingness to be controlled in the matter by the decisions of a council recognizing the Scriptures as the only standard of faith and practice.

In his first opposition to Tetzels and indulgences, he submitted himself to the judgment of his bishop, then appealed to the pope, and in the whole controversy declared himself willing to abide by the sentiments of the church, whenever those sentiments should be elicited by means of a general council.— And as he never separated *himself* schismatically from the visible church, so he was never legally *expelled* from it. He was condemned without such a hearing as truth and justice demanded; it was a usurped, illegitimate, and anti-scriptural authority which pronounced his excommunication; and some of the German bishops, to whom he was more directly amenable, refused to sanction the bull which sought to brand him and his followers as heretics. If he had been condemned and excommunicated as the Arians and other ancient heretics, by clear and undoubted decisions of the church general, there would have been a real and legal separation between him and the visible church. As it is, however, Luther and his associates never were cut off from the visible communion of saints by any legal method or authority, and consequently never were severed from the visible church of Christ. The church of the Reformers is the same church in which they held communion before the Reformation. The very word *re-formation*, by which we designate the changes which they wrought, sets forth the idea of historical identity with the church that existed under different modifications before their time. *They never left the church, and the church was never taken away from them.* It was the same visible church before as after, and after as before, the rupture with the See of Rome. It was not now first created, but simply relieved of papal corruptions.— The church of the Reformers, then, is not an invisible church, neither was there anything in the Reformation itself to render it an invisible church.

In the "Formula for the government and discipline of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, published by the General Synod," chapter II, the invisible church is spoken of as the only true church of Christ. The principal passage quoted in proof of this assumption is Eph. 4: 1-7. But we ask our readers to turn to their Bibles to see whether there is one word in that interesting passage in regard to an invisible church. Nor is there any thing in it implying such an invisible church. On the contrary, this quotation designates the church as a called-out body; as a community sufficiently distinguished to be publicly addressed; as an association subject to be torn asunder by the indulgence of improper dispositions; nay, a society holding baptism, which is an external ordinance, as a matter of

indispensable observance. Other passages referred to are found in Matt. 7 : 21, and 11 : 50. But what is there here to show that the church is invisible? If hypocritical professors do come short of Heaven, does that prove that we can be members of Christ's body, and obtain salvation without a public profession? Moreover, these quotations set forth obedience to the Divine will and commandments as the grand condition of church-membership and salvation. But is not the confession of Christ before men a Divine command? Are not baptism and the Lord's Supper Divine commands? And can a man attend to these and not visibly associate himself with the brotherhood of believers? Another proof-text cited by the Formula is Acts 10 : 35. But if this declaration proves that the church is invisible, it proves too much, by proving at the same time that a man may become righteous and attain Heaven without Christ. The apostle simply wishes to say here, that the gospel was not restricted to the Jewish nation. And the case on which it is based is peculiarly unfortunate for the advocates of an invisible church. Devout of mind, and benevolent of heart, as this centurion was, there still was something lacking, and something so important as to justify the performance of a *double miracle* to have it supplied. If Cornelius was really justified before God, and a real member of the true church, why was he directed to send for Peter to learn what further was necessary? Why did Peter begin by telling him to believe in Christ in order that he might have remission of sins? (v. 43.) Why was water demanded for his baptism? (v. 47.) Why all these extraordinary measures to bring the distinguished Gentile into contact with Christ's appointed minister, and under obedience to Christ's own appointed ordinances? Do not all the facts argue that God does not regard any man, however generous or devout, as a perfect and approved christian, until he has been brought into external and visible communion with the church, and hence, that there is no such thing as an invisible church? Again, we are referred to John 18 : 36. Here the Savior denies that his Kingdom is of a secular nature; that it is like earthly Kingdoms; or that it would be established by human power, or the might of human armies. But what is there in this to set aside its visibility? The earth had a heavenly Creator, is ruled and preserved by laws of heavenly appointment, and once resembled Heaven in many particulars. Is the earth therefore invisible?—No more is the church a hidden thing because of its heavenly origin and character, or because it is promoted by influences

which are unseen. There is nothing strong enough in all these arguments and quotations to warrant our belief in the existence of a separate invisible church. *The church is really, wholly, and universally visible, and will continue so forever.*

Divinity of the Church.

Assuming that the church is a visible society—a living historical corporation, we may advance to another position. The church is a *Divine association*. It is a society which God himself has collected and constituted. It is not only *a called assembly*, but an *assembly called of God*. If we begin the church with the call and covenant of Abraham, or with the call and institutes of Moses, it is all the same. God called the one and commissioned the other. The Lord himself in the flesh gathered around him that little flock who constituted the church when he left our world; and, as it increased in number after his ascension, the history says, “*The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved.*” The Scriptures with peculiar emphasis style it “*The church of the living God.*” It is not a mere voluntary association resting only upon considerations of policy, and which may be dissolved and revived at the option of men. The church is viewed, only by too many, in the same light as that of a Missionary or Tract society, or of a Bible-class. And hence, whenever they begin to feel church control in anywise inconvenient or embarrassing to their worldly inclinations, they consider themselves justified in withholding submission, and in forming sects with such arrangements as may suit their own taste and ease. Knowing that it is an approved political principle, that the right is in the people to change and abolish their government as contingencies may seem to require, and to “institute new government, laying its foundations in such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall be most agreeable,” they consider themselves clothed with the same liberties in ecclesiastical affairs. But all this is in positive contravention to the idea that the church is of God. If the church were of mere human authority, if its ordinances were only matters of human expediency; then we might allow of such liberties. People then might establish as many petty rival churches as they had a mind to. But every good christian is bound to look upon the church in a different light. Every good christian is bound to regard it, and everything belonging to its essential organization as Divine—as bearing the seal of heaven, and forbidding violence to all on pain of everlasting death. God is in the church. His authority is in it, for he has said to it, “whatsoever thou

shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.”—(Matt. 16: 19.) His power is in it, for he has said, “The gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” His presence is in it, for he hath said, “Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world,”—and, “Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.” (Matt. 28: 20, and 18: 20.) His sovereignty is in it, for he has declared in his word, “The saints shall judge the world.” (1 Cor. 7: 2.) Yea it is so radiant with the Divinity that pervades it, that it is called “*Christ’s body*, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.” (Eph. 1: 23.)

The Essential and Distinguishing Marks of the Church.

It was remarked above, that the church must have in it some peculiarities, by which it is to be distinguished from other religious and benevolent societies which exist among men. And as a Divine association, it must have some characteristic principles of organization which necessarily exist wherever the church exists. Accordingly, the Scriptures set forth four particulars, which always and everywhere go along with, and are essential to the holy christian society. The first is, its divinely appointed ministry; second, its divinely taught faith; third, its divinely instituted ordinances; and fourth, its divinely authorized discipline. Where these are, there is the church of God; and where these are wanting, no pious pretensions can entitle any people to a place in the body of Christ.

First mark. That the true Church of God has in it a peculiar order of men, set apart for the performance of special duties which belong only to them, and holding authority from the Lord Jesus himself, will require no labored argument to prove. We read in the Evangelists, that while yet on earth, the Savior took to himself twelve men, and having instructed them in all wisdom concerning the kingdom of God, delivered to them a last solemn charge in these words: “Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.” “As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.” (Matth. 28: 19, 20; John 20: 21.) Here is a commission from Him who possessed all power in heaven and on earth. It is a most remarkable and significant document. It contemplates the preaching of the Gospel to “*all nations*,” and until “*the end of the world*.” But how could eleven men, morta

as ourselves, do all the requisite preaching from the Savior's ascension to the end of the world? How could they instruct and disciple all nations, when some of those nations were not to rise till they were in their graves? There is, beyond question, but *one way* in which it was possible for them to do it. That way was, for them *to select and empower representatives and successors*. And it is clear that this is the understanding which the apostles had of the Lord's commission. As soon as he had taken his departure to glory, they began to "seek out men full of the Holy Ghost," and to empower them "by prayer and the laying on of hands," to take part with them in the great ministry which they had received. And in the subsequent epistles of the apostles, we find specific directions given to those whom they had admitted into the holy office, to commit the same authority to other faithful men who should be able to teach others also. Nor can we attach any other meaning to Paul's solemn cautions to Timothy: "neglect not *the gift* that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery"; "lay hands suddenly on no man"; but, that he considered ordination as a transfer of a high official trust originating with Christ, and intended in this way to run on from generation to generation to the end of time.

It is not material, on this point, whether we consider the apostles as the heads of a superior order of ministers, to whom the power to ordain was ever to be exclusively confined, or whether we look upon them as having imparted to all whom they ordained an equal and indiscriminate authority. The only thing now insisted on, is that Christ Jesus has himself, not through the assembled membership, but in his own true person, appointed a ministry for his church; and that that ministry is to continue for all time by a regular transmission of official authority from one to another. This we consider the clear and unavoidable inference from the Savior's commission, and from the proceedings of the apostles under that commission. And as a consequent to this, we hold, furthermore, that no society is a christian church, without the christian ministry — a ministry which has a real historical connection with the apostles. When a man sets himself up as an officer in the kingdom of the Redeemer; when he claims to be an ambassador from the court of heaven, and to speak to men in the Savior's name; he must show his authority to have come from Christ, or be denounced as an impostor and blasphemer. How can men appoint ambassadors of God, unless God himself has commissioned them to do it? How can church-members con-

fer a power which they do not possess? And if they attempt to say who shall speak in the name of God and who shall not, do they not thereby put themselves above God, and assert more blasphemous things than the pope? Nor can the case be altered whether they be found upon some lone isle, cut off from all the rest of the world, or under the shadow of St. Peter's at Rome. Locations cannot alter principles. As well might men claim the right to make sacraments and fabricate Divine promises, as for men uncommissioned to talk of authorizing and constituting ministers, whose responsibilities are alone in heaven. "Verily, verily, I say unto you," exclaims the only universal Bishop, "He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber. But he that entereth in by the door, is the shepherd of the sheep." (John 10: 1, 2.) There is no legitimate church without a legitimate ministry.

The second mark and fundamental particular belonging to the church of God, is her divine *faith*. The same authority which we have for the ministry, also laid down with equal explicitness, and as of equal importance, what was to be preached and believed. The apostles were to go, in person, and through their successors, and teach all nations. But what were they to teach? The commandments of men? The results of scientific explorations? The abstractions of philosophy? No; only too oft,

— when Paul has served us with a text,
Has Epictetus, Plato, Tully preached.

They were to teach *only*, but *all the things whatsoever Christ the Lord had commanded them*. Nothing was to be added; nothing was to be omitted. The Savior's lips had given out the message they were to publish to the world. These divine communications have been plainly and fully recorded in the New Testament. In some minor matters diversity of individual opinion is allowable without detriment. But the honest and hearty reception of *all the leading doctrines* of the Scriptures, is absolutely demanded from all who would be accepted christians. They cannot become entitled to a place in the true church without it. The Augsburg Confession, insists upon *a pure Gospel*, preached according to its true intent and meaning, as essential to the true unity and existence of the christian church. (Art. VII.) Paul says, "If any man preach any other Gospel than ye have received, let him be accursed." (Gal. 1: 9). And the Savior himself has declared, in regard

to the very message which he hath sent his ministers to declare, "He that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark 16: 16.)

The faith of the church, gathered from all the Scriptures, and once delivered to the saints, is contained in that noble form of sound words, commonly called *The Apostles' Creed*.—When, or by whom this ancient symbol was composed, we have not the most reliable information. Its title, a general tradition among the earlier christians, and some among modern professors, assign its authorship to the apostles of our Lord. Ambrose, a father of the fourth century, declares that the twelve apostles, as skilful artificers, assembled together, and made a key by their common advices; i. e. the Creed; by which the darkness of the devil is disclosed, that the light of Christ may appear." Rufinus, a father of the same century, asserts, that they, the christians of that period, had "received by tradition from the fathers, that, after the ascension of our Savior and the effusion of the Holy Ghost, before the apostles separated from each other to go into the habitable parts of the world to preach the Gospel, they settled among themselves the rule of their future preaching to prevent their teaching different doctrines, during their separation, unto those whom they should unite to the christian faith: whereupon they assembled all together, and being full of the Holy Ghost, they composed the creed; each one inserting what he thought convenient, and ordered it to be a test of their future sermons, and a rule to be given to the faithful." (*See King's Hist. of the Creed*, p. 24.) That this account of the creed, at least so far as its general form and substance are concerned, is correct, is not to be doubted. The Scriptures themselves give intimation of the existence of some brief and comprehensive summary of christian doctrine, which was authoritatively received by all believers. Jude speaks familiarly of "the faith once delivered to the saints." (v. 3.) Paul refers to "the form of sound words" which he had delivered to Timothy, and charges that young minister to be careful to "keep the precious trust." (1 Tim. 1: 13, 14.) In Hebrews (12: 6.) he tells of "first principles of the oracles of God," and in Romans (12: 6.) alludes to "the analogy of faith." And John also lays peculiar stress upon what he calls "the doctrine of Christ Jesus," and commands us not to receive him into our houses who brings not "this doctrine." (2 Ephes. 9: 10.) And when we consider, that the whole framework and marrow of the creed are presented in the formulary of baptism, which Christ delivered to the apostles, we have strong presumptive scriptural testimony for the apostolic origin of it. Nor has any one ever been able to point out for it any other origin. When and where the

amplifying expressions: “*he descended into hell*”—“*the communion of saints*,” and the word “*catholic*” before “*church*,” were introduced, we know; but for all the rest, apostolic origin is the most reliable of any that has ever been assigned it. We also have several recapitulations of the early christian faith, in the writings of the fathers, all of which agree in form and substance, and generally in every *word* with the Apostles’ Creed. The most full and satisfactory recitation of this kind is given by Irenaeus, the intimate friend of the apostle John’s disciple, Polycarp, in his work *Against the Heretics*. Origen and Cyprian, and Tertullian also speak of a *regula fidei*, and rehearse its contents to the same effect. And the Apostles’ Creed is in itself so simple and dignified in its terms, so comprehensive in its extent, and so full of heavenly truth and wisdom, that it resembles more the words of the Holy Ghost, than any that unaided man has ever been able to select. Augustine calls it “the illumination of the soul—the perfection of believers, by which the bond of infidelity is dissolved, the gate of life opens, and the glory of faith is shown. Little, indeed, in words, but great in mysteries; short, so as not to oppress the memory, yet comprehensive, so as to exceed the understanding. Worthy, therefore is this creed to be attended to, since whatever is prefigured in the patriarchs, declared in the Scriptures, or foretold in the prophets, concerning the blessed Trinity, and the mystery of our Savior’s incarnation, death, and crucifixion is contained in it.” Cassian, another father, affirms, “the Creed comprehendeth in itself in few words, the faith of both Testaments, and the sense of the whole Scripture.” And Tertullian has remarked, though not without some degree of extravagance, “*Nihil ultra scire, omnia scire est.*” These considerations, if not entirely conclusive, are yet sufficient to assign to the “Apostles’ Creed” an antiquity which penetrates the earliest times of our religion, and an authority the most venerable. A few explanatory phrases have been added, from time to time, as guards against new heresies that arose. But, still, it is the oldest, the best, and the most authoritative that ever issued from the christian church. Irenaeus, after repeating it, says, “This faith the church guards carefully as if she dwelt in one house; believes as if she had but one soul; and proclaims, teaches, and delivers, as if she possessed but one mouth.” But why was the church so careful and unanimous with regard to this matter? Simply because this faith is essential to her christian character. Nor is there a perfect divine church, where the plain and glorious

truths of this creed are not received, preached, and made the subjects of joyful exultation.

The third mark essential to the church of God relates to its *ordinances*—the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. That our blessed Savior appointed these as standing and indispensable observances for his church, is very satisfactorily taught in the Scriptures. In that great commission to which we have already alluded, it is enjoined, "Go ye therefore and teach," or as the margin more properly has it, "*disciple* all nations." But how disciple them? By merely preaching to them the truth? No: "*Baptizing them* in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Can any one be a disciple of Christ, then, without Baptism? And if Baptism is requisite to discipleship, can that be a christian church which fails to administer this ordinance to its members according to the word of God? Paul says, "The Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body which is broken for you: *this do* in remembrance of me. After the same manner he took the cup when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood; *this do as often as ye drink it* in remembrance of me. For as often as ye do eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." (1 Cor. 11: 23, 24, 25, 26.) And on another occasion the Savior declared, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you."—(John 6: 53.) But how can a man eat the flesh, or drink the blood of the son of man *in any sense* without faithful attention to his ordinances? Nay, is not this eating and drinking, in its highest and most literal acceptation, the participation of the holy communion? What says Paul, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" (1 Cor, 10: 6.) How, then, can a man become partaker of Christ without becoming a partaker of this sacrament? And how can that be a true christian church in which the Eucharistic feast is not celebrated according to Divine command? It cannot be. And the framers of the Augsburg Confession have solemnly testified that it cannot be. Else what do they mean by saying, "the holy christian church is the congregation of the saints, in which the gospel is correctly taught, *and the sacraments are properly administered.*" (Art. 7.)

The fourth mark, which was mentioned as entering into the fundamental constitution of the church, is its Divine *discipline*. We do not assert that Christ has given his church a specific, complete, and exclusive form of government. He has, to a considerable extent, left the field of church polity open to the exercise of common sense, assisted by the circumstances, in which, in different ages and nations, it may be called on to act. All we mean is, that the Savior has not given up his church to the control of human wit and wisdom without some reservations. He has laid down certain primary laws; and to these he requires all earthly arrangements to be conformed. Thus: it is Divinely required of the church, in all ages, to exact of those, who are to be received into its communion, an open profession of christian faith, and of their determination to live christian lives. Hence the apostle said, "with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." And to the same effect are the words of Christ, "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine." (Matt. 7: 6.) Indeed it would be impossible for the church to remain a visible body, did it not exact such a public confession from those who are to be its members. It is also required of the church, through its proper officers, to exclude from its communion such as habitually and openly disgrace their profession and deny their faith. Christ said expressly, respecting every incorrigible offender, "tell it to the church; but if he refuse to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." (Matt. 23: 17.) And in the same way it is demanded of the church to make provision for the temporal wants of its ministers. Not that the church is obligated to support every drone and dolt who chances to be called a preacher. But nothing can be plainer than what Paul says on this point with respect to the true and approved ministers of the Lord. "Even so hath the Lord ordained, that they which preach the gospel shall live of the gospel." (1 Cor. 9: 13, 14—Gal. 6: 6—1 Tim. 5: 18.) Here, then, are principles which the great Founder of the church has laid down for her. They are part of her organization. And that society which refuses to carry them into effect, is guilty of disobedience to Christ, and cannot be a part of his fold.

From what has now been said, though we have merely touched on the difficult and important subject, we see how superficial and imperfect are the general views of christian people on a question, which, of all others, it becomes us to understand. Again and again, the statement has gone out from lips

professing christianity, "The church is not the priest—not the faith—not the ordinances of Christ's religion, but the assembly of the pious." But we have seen, (we would fain hope to satisfaction,) that the priest, the faith, and the ordinances are just as essential to the church, and just as much a part of it, as pious members. These several particulars are each indispensable; for *the true church of God is the society of the pious adhering to the ministry which Christ ordained, openly professing the doctrines which he taught, observing the ordinances which he instituted, and submitting to the disciplinary regulations which he laid down.* This holy and Divine association is not confined to any one nation, or language, or form of government or worship. There are, and there legitimately may be, diversities in its various branches, as there are different apartments in the same dwelling, or different members in the same body. Amid all people, kindred and tongues; amid all the conflicting sects and parties which cut up human society, the true church of God still here and there evinces its presence. The broad stream of its historic life still flows on. And we are assured by Him who cannot lie, that it will thus continue to flow on, until it settles down into the sparkling and universal sea of millennial glory.

The Design of the Church.

The design of the church in this world is two-fold. It is intended to be *a pillar of the truth*, and *an ark of salvation*. The truth as it is in Jesus was first given to the church. When the Savior went up from the earth to resume the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, he committed his gospel to the little mother church which he had himself collected. He delivered his commandments to his apostles in trust for all mankind. And it was altogether necessary that they should be given to some established association. When man was first created, God gave him a sufficient revelation.—But it was soon lost and forgotten. It faded entirely from the earth, because there was no fixed organization to preserve it against the oblivious influences of depravity. God pitied the world in its ignorance, and came down again to renew the knowledge of his will. That his heavenly communications should not again be lost, he called Abraham, and established the Jewish institutes. Hence it is mentioned as the chief honor of the Jews, "that unto them was committed the oracles of God." And as the christian church is only a modification of the church in which the Jews held membership, its office is the same. Having received the ancient Scriptures

from the expiring Jewish polity, and added to them all that inspired men have since written for our learning, it has become the great *Trustee* of the Divine oracles. And this holy association has never been unfaithful to her office. The church has not only preserved the Scriptures entire and uncorrupted to this moment, but has published them abroad in nearly all languages, and put them within the reach of nearly every child of Adam. Accordingly the apostle does not claim too much for the church when he styles it "*the pillar and ground of the truth.*" The faith of the church is truth. Truth lives in its members; truth speaks in its ministry; truth works through its ordinances; and truth depends upon it for nearly all its efficiency and glory. The pillar of truth! Yes, a vast and magnificent pillar, which God's hand has reared amid the darkness of earth, flashing from its sides and top, and every stone and timber in it a light, that is piercing all nations, and attracting angelic admiration. The more men have exercised themselves in its illuminations, the clearer have been their heads, and the purer their hearts. The most famous sages have learned wisdom from it; and without it, truth must utterly die away from the earth. The church has written our best books, inspired our best poetry, dignified our literature, guided our science, and without what it has done for human enlightenment, we should now be groping in a night of error without moon or stars. To destroy the church would be like blotting out the sun in the heavens. It would not only die itself, but put out all those minor lights on which some might think to depend.

But the church is not only intended to serve as a pillar which, alone amid the ravages of time, is to support the sole light by which men can securely navigate the sea of life. It is also an Ark to which alone the Scriptures point us for salvation.—What will be the character of God's dealings with those of our race who live and die without the gospel, or never had the opportunity to become acquainted with its true character and requirements, is of but little moment to us. "Them that are without, God judgeth;" and in his hands their case must be left. The plain teaching of revelation is, that those to whom the gospel is preached, must be members of the church of God, on pain of being excluded from his favor for ever. This assertion may be startling to some; but is it not the truth?—Where is the passage that will allow us to say, that there is any possibility for the salvation of those who, having the church sufficiently proposed to them, do not become members of it? On the other hand we read that "Christ is the head of the body,

the church." (Col. 1: 18.) From this we must infer, that those who are separated from the church are separated from Christ's body, and of course from Christ himself. And concerning those who are separated from Christ, it is written, "If any man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered, and men gather them and cast them into the fire, and they are burned." (John 16: 6.) The Holy of holies in the Jewish temple was a type of Heaven, and the Sanctuary a type of the christian church; but God gave directions that no opening should be made into the most holy place, save through the Sanctuary. And if it is possible to be saved without the church, wherefore was it instituted? Whence the necessity for having it at all? If we can come to Heaven without passing through it, is it not a superfluous and unnecessary thing? But how dare we look upon God's interpositions to establish and preserve it, as mere wanton and prodigal expenditures of his power? Better make all men liars than charge such trifling and folly on the Deity. God does nothing but what accords with his dignity and wisdom. And as he has put himself to the pains of giving us the church, we are bound to infer that he saw necessity for it. And if we admit that there is necessity for it, we are bound to conclude that there is no salvation out of it. Such has also been the conclusion of the most profound Biblical scholars that have ever blest the world with their wisdom and piety. Origen says, "Let no one persuade himself, let no one deceive himself; without this house, that is, without the church, no one is saved: (*Or. in lib. Jesu Nave Hom. 4, tom. 2.*) The martyr Cyprian declared, "That man cannot have God for his Father who has not the church for his mother. If any could escape the deluge out of Noah's Ark, he who is out of the church may also escape." (*Cypr. de Unit. p. 254.*) Augustine asserts, "No one cometh to salvation or eternal life, except he who hath Christ for his Head, except he that is in his body, the church." (*Aug. Cont. Don. p. 392.*) The Synod of Zerta in 412, said, "Whosoever is separate from this church, however innocently he may think he lives, for this crime alone, that he is separated from the unity of Christ, will not have life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." (*Con. Zert. Tom. 1, p. 1203.*) Our own Luther says, "Out of the church there is no truth, no Christ, no salvation." (*Kirchen-Postill. p. 100.*) Calvin says of the church, "Out of her bosom there can be no remission of sins, or any salvation." (*Calv. Ins. lib. 4, tom. 1, §4.*) The Westminster Assembly declares, "Out of the house and family of God there is no ordinary possibility of salvation."

(Chap. 25.) And many, many quotations of like import might be made from the writings of learned and holy men of more recent times. It cannot be that these were all mistaken. These great lights of the christian church could not have been so uniform and harmonious in the support of a doctrine which has no foundation in Scripture. Credulity staggers at the bare thought that they were all in error. It is the voice of all ages, and the voice of all parties that they furnish us; and we are bound to respect their testimony. The church is, then, designed as *the way*, the *only* way for us to enter Heaven. It is our *only* hope for everlasting life.

Conclusion.

In offering our thoughts on this great question to the readers of the Review, the promotion of truth and evangelical religion is our only motive. We have no sympathy with Rome or with Oxford. We prefer our present home to Italy or England. We are Protestant in our relation to Popery and Puseyism. We are *Lutheran* in our views of sacred truth, and *Evangelical* as to the grounds upon which we rest our views. But we believe in the holy Catholic Church. We avowed this belief when we swore allegiance to Jesus. We boast a connection with that glorious company, who from the supper-hall which witnessed the first advent of the Paraclete, pitched their tent on the graves of the Cæsars, drove the babbling sophists from the Porch and the Academy, opened the text-book of christianity in Antioch, Athens, and Byzantium, and spread the news of salvation over all the earth. We rejoice in being in the communion in which apostles, martyrs, and confessors labored, suffered, shone, and triumphed. And let no man cry against our serious and honest attempt to bring out what we conceive to be the only true ground upon which such claims can be successfully maintained. We love the church, and long to see others regard it with proper interest, affection, and faith. We have received it and trust to it as our spiritual mother. She took us when we were yet in the arms of her who bore us, marked us with the seal of heaven, instructed us as we grew into years, nourished us when we were weak and friendless, invited us to a place among those who stand as watchmen on her walls; and when sight grows dim, and our limbs tremble with feebleness beside the grave, we expect her to lay us down with solemn care in that chamber of rest from which the resurrection morn shall awake us to sleep and die no more. And God forbid that we should ever fail to caress her matronly hand, or cease to love, honor, and defend her.

To her we piously commit our ways, in hope that her glorious Husband in heaven will bring us at last to join the sublime Assembly and church of the first born above.

ARTICLE V.

THE ARTICLES OF TORGAU.

Translated by Rev. C. Porterfield Krauth, A. M., of Winchester, Va.

IN the second number of the Evangelical Review,¹ a general statement was made of the nature of the relation of the Articles of Torgau to the Augsburg Confession. The external evidence that they formed its basis, we regard as entirely satisfactory, and the internal is, if possible, still stronger. If the reader will refer to that portion of the Review, it will be unnecessary for us to repeat the general facts connected with their history. They form the most important original document connected with the history of our Confession, and possess also great value as an aid in its interpretation. We have thought, therefore, that a translation of them would form a natural appendix to the article on the Augsburg Confession, and would be interesting and valuable to all who desire to be familiar with the history of our great doctrinal standard.

We shall not accompany the articles with any illustrations except a reference to the parallel parts of the Augsburg Confession.

*Confession of the Christian Doctrine and Faith, comprehended in Seventeen Articles, by Dr. Martin Luther.*²

I. (Of God.)

We confess that constantly and with great accord it is taught among us, that there is one only true GOD, Creator of heaven and earth; yet so, that in this only, true Divine Essence, there

¹ P. 246.

² *Historia Comitiorum Anno M. D. XXX. Augustæ Celebratorum, repurgatæ doctrinæ occasionem, &c. per Georgium Coelestinum, Francofurti ad Od. 1597.*

Four Vols. Folio. I. Fol. 25—28.

Histoire de la Confession D'Auxpourg &c., recueillie par le D. David Chytreus, &c. et nouvellement mise en François, par Luc le Cop. Anvers. 1582. 4to. pp. 19—23. This translation is rare.

are three distinct persons, to wit: GOD THE FATHER, GOD THE SON, GOD THE HOLY SPIRIT: and that the Son begotten of the Father from eternity, is truly and by nature God with the Father: and that the Holy Spirit proceeding from eternity from the Father and the Son, is truly and by nature God with the Father and the Son: as all these things can be most clearly and firmly demonstrated by Scripture, John 1. In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by Him.—Matthew 28: Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: and many other like passages especially in the Gospel of John.

Augs. Conf. Art. I.

II. (*Christ.*)

That God's only Son became true man, having been conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the virgin Mary, perfect man, consisting of body and soul: and not that the Father, or Holy Spirit became man as the Patripassian heretics feigned, and not that the Son assumed a body only without a soul, as Apollinarius falsely taught: for Christ himself in the Gospel oftentimes maketh mention of his soul, as when he says: My soul is sorrowful even unto death. That the Son of God became man is clearly written, John 1. in these words: The word became flesh, and Gal. 4. When the fullness of the time was come, God sent his Son born of a woman.

Augs. Conf. Art. III.

III. (*Expiation.*)

That Jesus Christ, the Son of God, true God and man, is one indivisible person, who hath suffered for us men, was crucified, dead and buried, arose on the third day from the dead, ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God, being Lord of all creatures, so that no one can or should believe or teach, that Jesus Christ is man only, or in his human nature alone suffered for us; but since God and man form, not two, but one inseparable person, we must believe and teach, that God and man, or the Son of God hath truly suffered for us, as Paul, Rom. 8. sayeth: God spared not his own Son but hath delivered him up for us all. 1 Cor 2. If they had known the Lord of Glory they would not have crucified him: and many like expressions.

Augs. Conf. Art. III.

IV. (*Original Sin.*)

That Original Sin is truly sin, and not merely a weakness or defect, but sin of such kind, that it would condemn all men

engendered from Adam, and separate them from God forever, had not Christ interceding for us, made expiation by his suffering for this sin together with all others thence flowing, which he took upon himself, and having borne them in himself wholly removed them, as it is clearly written Psal. 51. and Rom. 5. in regard to this sin.

Augs. Conf. Art. II.

V. (*Justification.*)

Since therefore all men are sinners, subject to sin, to death, and the devil, it is impossible that man by his own strength or good works, should deliver himself from it, and be justified before God. On the contrary he is not able ever to prepare or dispose himself for righteousness, but the more he endeavors to free himself, he doth make the case but worse for himself.

The sole mean whereby we obtain righteousness, and freedom from sin and death, is, setting aside all merit and work of our own, to believe in the Son of God who suffered for us. This faith is our righteousness. For God reputes and considers as righteous, innocent and holy, and imparts remission of sins and life eternal unto all those, who have *this* faith in his Son, to wit: that for the Son's sake they are received into grace and made sons of God: as St. Paul and John richly teach us all these things in their writings. (Rom. 10. With the heart we believe unto righteousness.) John 3. That every one, who believeth on the Son, might not perish, but might have life eternal.

Augs. Conf. Art. IV.

VI. (*Faith and Works.*)

That this faith is not a human work, nor can any man obtain it by his own strength, but it is the work and gift of God, which the Holy Spirit given through Christ worketh in us. And this faith, since it is not an empty and false persuasion of the heart, such as hypocrits have, but is an efficacious, new, and living thing, brings forth many fruits and good works: towards God, in praise, thanksgiving, invocation, teaching and preaching his word: and towards our neighbor in love, aid in counsel and help, by alms, and loans: and finally, by bearing adversity with patience even until death.

Augs. Conf. Art. IV. VI.

VII. (*Ministry.*)

In order that we may obtain this faith, the ministry has been instituted by God to teach the Gospel. For by the Gospel God causes this faith to be announced to us, with its efficacy,

fruits and benefits, and through the Gospel as the means or instrument, effects faith by the Holy Spirit, where and when it seemeth him good: other than this there is no mean, mode or way of obtaining faith. For all thoughts apart from or previous to the word preached, however holy and good they may seem, are mere errors and lies.

Augs. Conf. Art. V.

VIII. (*Sacraments.*)

To this preaching of the word God has added external signs, which are called sacraments, to wit: Baptism and the Eucharist, through which also, together with the word, God offers faith and his Holy Spirit, and strengthens all who fly to him.

Augs. Conf. Art. V. IX. X. XIII.

IX. (*Baptism.*)

That Baptism, the first sign or sacrament, consists of two things, to wit: water and the word of God; that is, that men shall be baptized with water, and the word of God shall be pronounced at the same time. Nor is it only common water in Baptism, (as the blasphemers of Baptism now teach,) but since the word of God is added to the water, and Baptism is founded in the word of God, it is a holy, life-giving and efficacious washing, and is as Paul calls it, Tit. 3. and Eph. 5. "The Laver of regeneration, of the renewing of the Holy Ghost;" and that Baptism should also be extended and imparted to infants.

But the word of God, on which Baptism is established, is in Matth. 28.: Go, baptize in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Mark 16. Whosoever believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.

Augs. Conf. Art. IX.

X. (*Eucharist.*)

That in the Eucharist or Sacrament of the altar, are truly present, in the bread and wine, the true body and blood of Christ, according to the words: This is my body: This is my blood. (And not that there is only bread and wine, as certain adversaries contentiously maintain.) These words also require and confer faith, and excite it in all, who seriously seek this sacrament, and do naught contrary thereto: as also Baptism, when it is thus sought, brings and bestows faith.

Augs. Conf. Art. X.

XI. (*Confession.*)

That private confession is not to be enforced by laws, (as also neither Baptism, the Supper nor hearing the Gospel should

be forced,) but should be free, yet so, that we know how salutary and necessary it is to afflicted consciences, because of absolution, that is, the word and judgment of God which is pronounced in it, by which the conscience is freed from its sins, and is rendered peaceful and tranquil. That also it is not necessary to enumerate all our sins, but those only may be indicated, with which the heart is most wrung and distressed.

Augs. Conf. Art. XI.

XII. (*The Church.*)

That one holy Church universal is and shall remain on earth to the end of the world, as Christ hath said, Matth. 28: Lo, I am with you always, even to the consummation of the world. But this church is none other than believers in Christ, who preserve and profess the aforesaid articles in true faith, and for that cause endure persecution and martyrdom in the world. For where the Gospel is taught in purity, and the sacraments legitimately administered, there certainly is the true church, and it is in no wise bound up with certain laws and outward pomp, with a certain place or time, with certain persons or ceremonies.

Augs. Conf. Art. VII.

XIII. (*Judgment.*)

That our Lord Jesus Christ shall come at the last day to judge the quick and the dead, in order that he may give eternal life to those who believe on him, having freed them from all ill: and moreover may chastise the unbelieving and wicked, and may punish them and devils with eternal torments in hell.

Augs. Conf. Art. XVII.

XIV. (*Magistracy.*)

That in the meantime, until the Lord shall come to judgment, and shall do away with all power and rule, we are bound to honor and obey the political magistracy, as a state ordained by God himself to defend the good and restrain the evil.

That a christian legitimately called may properly live in and attend upon such estate, without danger of losing his faith or the salvation of his soul.

Augs. Conf. Art. XVI.

XV. (*Monastic vows.*)

From all these things it follows, that the doctrine which prohibits marriage and the use of meats to priests and ecclesiastics, together with the whole life and vows of monks (since by

them the grace of God and the salvation of the soul are hindered, nor should they longer be permitted) is impious and devilish, as Paul 1 Tim. 4. calls it, since Christ alone, is the only way to grace and the salvation of souls.

Augs. Conf. Abus. Art. 5.

XVI. (*Mass.*)

That before all other abominations the Mass, which has hitherto been regarded as a sacrifice and good works, by which the grace of God and salvation may be obtained for another, should be abolished: and in its place should be observed the divine ordinance of distributing to each one the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ in both kinds, that each may have the peculiar strengthening of his own faith and the peculiar consolation necessary for him.

Augs. Conf. Abus. Art. III.

XVII. (*Ceremonies.*)

That ecclesiastical ceremonies, contrary to the word of God, should be abolished: and that others should be left free either to be used or not used, in accordance with the law of love, which teaches us not lightly and without important reasons to occasion offence to another and unnecessarily disturb the common peace.

Augs. Conf. Abus. Art. XVII.

The Brandenburg theologians, Wimpina, Mensing, Rebdorf and Egersma, in their reply, express surprise that Luther had not repeated the several hundred heretical and seditious articles, which they alleged to exist in his other writings.— They reproached him for having mingled so much, that they were compelled to acknowledge as orthodox, with his errors, but find a reason for it in his disposition to dilute in this way the poison of error so as to secure for it a more ready reception. They take up the articles one by one. The first *three* they approve, in the *fourth* though disposed to cavil, they are unable to lay hold of anything which they show to be reprehensible; on the *fifth* they say, that we are justified by that faith which worketh by love, which Luther by no means denied, though he properly separated love from the act of justification; confounding faith with a mere intellectual apprehension of religion, they object that it is consistent with the commission of enormous sins; on the *sixth* and *seventh*, they have nothing but verbal niceties; on the *eighth*, they contend for several sacraments; on the *ninth*, they trifle; on the *tenth*, they maintain transubstantiation and the communion in one kind;

on the *eleventh*, they insist upon sacramental confession in accordance with the papal statutes; on the *twelfth* they present the ordinary arguments for the visible church, which they, of course, hold to be the Romish; the *thirteenth* they do not seriously object to; on the *fourteenth* they put the ecclesiastical magistracy on the same footing with the secular; the *fifteenth* and *sixteenth* they wholly reject, and, whilst they do not deny the *seventeenth*, they insist upon knowing from Luther what ceremonies he regards as in conflict with the word of God. This reply may be considered as sustaining the same general relation to the subsequent ampler "confutation" of the Augsburg Confession, which the Torgau Articles do to the Confession itself. It was written in German under the title: Brief and Christian Instruction opposed to the Confession of Dr. Martin Luther, brought out anew in seventeen Articles, for the approaching Diet at Augsburg, (1530).¹

ARTICLE VI.

THE WORK OF AN EVANGELIST.*

By Rev. E. Greenwald, of New Philadelphia, Ohio.

"Do the work of an Evangelist," is the earnest and comprehensive injunction given by St. Paul in his pastoral charge to his son Timothy. The opinion has been expressed by some in their criticisms on this text, that by the term "Evangelist," the apostle refers to a separate order of men, whose duty it was, not to become settled pastors in charge of particular congregations, but to itinerate through the church in the character of modern revivalists. We are inclined to doubt, however, whether the few passages in the New Testament where the term "Evangelist" occurs, authorize the conclusion that this was the name of a separate order of ministers which existed in the primitive church. Matthew, Mark, Luke and John have been, from the earliest times, called the "Four Evangelists," from the Greek word *εὐαγγέλιον*, *gospel*, because they were the writers of the books called the "*Four Gospels*," but not to denote that they constituted a separate ministerial order. Luther

¹ Seckendorf, Walch.

*The present Article is the substance of a discourse delivered by the writer before the Synod of which he is a member; which fact will account for the manner of a number of its passages.

in his German translation of the Bible, translates this passage, "*thue das Werk eines Evangelischen Predigers*;" i. e. "do the work of an Evangelical preacher." According to his opinion, inferred from this translation, an "Evangelist" was any evangelical preacher; the term expressed the proper work of any preacher of the Gospel; and we think this view of the subject is the correct one. Whichever side of the question may be taken, it is undoubtedly true, that the modern so called evangelists, have been on the whole, a curse rather than a blessing to the churches that have employed them; they have corrupted the church by false doctrine, and rent it into parties by schism; they have disseminated a spurious christianity, and spiritual death has followed at their heels; in short, wherever they have appeared, "they have unsettled everything and settled nothing."

In considering briefly the "Work of an Evangelist," we remark,

1. *It is the Work of an Evangelist to preach the Gospel.*

This is his proper work. This is his business in the world. The commission which he has received from Christ, the great Head of the church, is, "Go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned." Christ appeared on earth to make an atonement for the sins of the world, and to perfect a plan by which men may be saved. Before he ascended again to the heavens whence he came, he set apart and commissioned the christian ministry to traverse the world in all directions, and make known to all the inhabitants of the earth, the great salvation, which he had purchased for them. The term "Evangelist" means, *a herald of good news*, and appropriately designates his benevolent commission to a perishing world. The church, and especially the christian ministry in the church, like the angel that was seen flying through the midst of heaven, "has the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation and kindred and tongue and people." Isaiah has beautifully described the merciful office of the christian ministry, in terms, which, though primarily intended to designate the office of Christ, the Divine Messenger himself, yet appropriately and truly describe the work of those whom he has commissioned to speak to the world in his name. "The spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the

opening of the prison to them that are bound ; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God, to comfort all that mourn ; to appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness ; that they might be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord, that he might be glorified.”

2. *It is the work of an Evangelist to instruct men in the knowledge of the truth.*

Shortly before his ascension into Heaven, Christ gave to Peter this important direction. “Feed my sheep.” The proper food for the inquiring minds of men, is correct and wholesome instruction. The christian minister who would carry out this recommendation of his Lord, must be well instructed himself, so as to be enabled from his own rich stores of knowledge, to instruct others. Mere rant and vapid declamation from the pulpit, may endure for a season, and even be very popular with a certain class of persons, but like unsubstantial food, their tendency is to produce lean souls and unstable christians. The apostle Paul advises, “Let all things be done unto edifying ;” and he expresses his own determination in the following strong language ; “in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue.” It is therefore strongly commanded in the scriptures, and plainly sanctioned by common sense, that the christian minister must seek to instruct the understandings, and enlighten the minds of his hearers.

But by truth alone, can the minds of men be enlightened. Truth is light ; error is darkness. Truth is from God ; error is from the devil. Truth conducts to heaven ; error leads to hell. These remarks may seem harsh to some minds, but duty compels us to make them. We have always believed that correct principles were essential to correct practice ; that a man’s conduct is governed by his principles ; and as the stream never rises higher than the fountain, so his conduct will never be better than his principles. Corrupt the fountain, and the stream is impure ; poison the spring, and the waters that issue therefrom, are dangerous and impregnated with death. A strong foundation is not more necessary to the security of an edifice, than sound doctrine is essential to the stability and consistency of christian practice.

Observation confirms the truth of these remarks. The most steadfast, active, and consistent christian is invariably he, who

has been most enlightened and best indoctrinated. Those congregations too, that have been best instructed, are always found to be the most prosperous, and to exhibit the most fervent and active piety. Whilst those congregations that have been collected together without reference to principles, and with little community of sentiment, have possessed a precarious and ephemeral existence, and have declined as rapidly as they arose.

It is therefore plainly the duty of the evangelical preacher, in the language of Solomon, "to teach the people knowledge." "He is set for the defence of the truth," and should "always be able to give a reason for the hope that is in him." In doing so, however, he should not devote an undue proportion of his time to doctrinal discussions, nor manifest too much of a controversial or polemical spirit. Some ministers exhibit a most unamiable temper; are always brandishing their weapons for fight; and administer their doctrinal doses *ad nauseam*, so as to disgust and drive away from the sanctuary, their most intelligent and pious hearers. Whilst therefore the christian minister should on all proper occasions plainly and earnestly enforce the distinguishing doctrines of christianity, "whether men will hear or whether they will forbear," yet he should never forget that doctrine is important only as it leads to correct practice; that a foundation in itself, is useless if no superstructure is erected thereon; and that an architect is very unwise who is forever engaged in laying his foundation, and who never proceeds to the construction of his edifice.

3. *It is the work of an Evangelist to win souls from vice and sin to virtue and piety.*

The commission given by our Lord to St. Paul at the time of his miraculous conversion, indicates the object of every christian minister's appointment. He is sent to his fellow-men "to open their eyes, to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and an inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith that is in me."

The minister of the gospel, from his elevated position on the walls of Zion, looks around and sees a world lying in wickedness, alienated from God, and in a perishing condition. He is commissioned as God's ambassador to a dying world, to call upon men to repent, to forsake their sins, and accept salvation upon the terms which he is authorized to offer. The salvation of man should always, therefore, lie near to a faithful minister's heart, and for this he should preach and pray;

and to this he should devote his talents, and consecrate his strength. For this, as a dying man to dying men, he must "preach the word, be instant in season, out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine." His heart should be in this work, the love of God constraining him, and urged by intense love for souls, he must earnestly labor to be the means of converting them from the error of their ways, and rescuing them from impending destruction.

5. It is the work of an Evangelist, to seek to awaken and foster in the hearts of his hearers, a spirit of piety and devotion.

He should himself be a man of prayer, and he should ardently desire to promote the same fervent spirituality in the breasts of others. The same "live coal," which he has taken from the altar of God to kindle the flame of devotion in his own heart, he must apply to the breasts of his hearers, that the same spirit of devotion may be also enkindled there. He should never permit the duty, important as it is acknowledged to be, of defending the doctrines and usages of the church, to cause him to overlook, or attach too little importance to the claims of a living piety. There is danger of this. Let us take heed that the form of sound words, and church order be preserved, but let us be equally careful that that form be not an inanimate corpse, but deeply imbued with spiritual life, and active in the performance of every good work. Whilst we avoid the error on the one hand, of mistaking superficial feelings, and frothy excitements, and extravagant vagaries, for vital godliness, let us not permit the genuine piety of the church to be destroyed on the other hand, by being congealed in the chilling atmosphere of mere formalism.

6. Again; the christian minister must always be the uncompromising enemy of vice and sin in all their forms.

He is the divinely constituted guardian of public morals.—To denounce vice and uphold virtue, is his legitimate work.—From the watch-tower of Zion, he must "cry aloud and not spare, lift up his voice like a trumpet, and show the people their transgressions, and the house of Jacob their sins." He should be to his people a pattern of holy living, and an atmosphere of purity should continually surround him. He should rebuke vice with majesty, and from his presence it should shrink away abashed. Whilst his course should always be marked with prudent forethought, and a tender consideration for the infirmities of human nature, yet he must not be afraid

to call things by their right names, and depict vice in its own odious ugliness, that it may be hated and avoided. At the same time, however, that he reproveth the crime with sternness, his heart should melt with compassion for the criminal, and weeping for the guilty, while he denounces his guilt, he will resemble his Divine Master in Heaven, who, whilst he hated the sin, loved the sinner.

No permanent moral reformation can be effected but by the agency of divine grace. But the grace of God operates through means. The principal, and most prominent of these means, is, the preaching of the Word. "Sanctify them through thy truth," prayed the Savior, "thy word is truth." Men, by individual and associated effort, operating apart from divine truth, and sometimes in hostility to it, have congratulated themselves upon having, in their wisdom, devised an equal, and indeed superior method of curing the moral ills of mankind, than God in his mercy has made known through the gospel; but in these, as in all other instances, the result has proved that the "wisdom of men is foolishness with God." The result has proved, that

"The Pulpit, when the sat'rist has at last,
Strutting and vapping in an empty school,
Spent all his force, and made no proselyte,
I say the pulpit, in the sober use
Of its legitimate peculiar powers,
Must stand acknowledged whilst the world shall stand,
The most important and effectual guard,
Support and ornament of Virtue's cause."

7. It is the work of an Evangelist to dispense the christian Sacraments.

Our church, very properly, attaches much importance to the holy Sacraments. Being of divine origin; instituted by Christ himself; committed to the church as a sacred deposit, and conveying peculiar and important blessings to the worthy participant, we cannot do otherwise than highly revere them. Whilst we wish to avoid on the one hand, the superstitious reverence with which the church of Rome regards them, we cannot coincide on the other hand, with the barren estimate which some Protestants have formed of them. We believe them to be something in themselves, objectively, and not variant, subjectively, according to each individual's notions concerning them. According to the views of many, they are either something or nothing, according as the faith of the participants may vary. They are supposed to be nothing in themselves, but their character is constituted by the person

who is the subject of the rite. For example—Baptism to the believer is a laver of regeneration; to the unbeliever it is merely being wetted with water: To the believer the Lord's Supper is the body and blood of Christ; to the unbeliever, it is only a piece of bread and a sip of wine. Consequently having no settled character themselves, and as the sentiments and feelings of persons participating in them are as opposite as the poles, they are forever vacillating, like the dancing puppets between the positive and negative plates of an electrical apparatus. From this view of them, we must necessarily dissent.

Let us not be misunderstood. From this view of the sacraments, it does not necessarily follow, that they save us *ex opere operato*. In other words, it does not necessarily follow that because the sacraments are something in themselves, the mere act of participation will save us, whether we have faith or not. By no means. They become to the participant either a savor of life, or a savor of death, and whether they shall be the one or the other depends upon the presence or absence of faith in him who partakes. If they were nothing in themselves, this could not be the case, but being veritably something in themselves, this result plainly follows. This view of the sacraments, therefore, instead of dispensing with faith in the participant, renders it absolutely indispensable that he should believe.

These are the holy mysteries of which Christ has constituted us the stewards. In view of their sacred character, and our manifest insufficiency, we may well exclaim with the apostle Paul, "Who is sufficient for these things?" They should be approached with "clean hands and a pure heart, and with a soul that has not been lifted up unto vanity."

In addition to the act of *dispensing* these divine ordinances, it is the work of an Evangelist to instruct his hearers concerning their nature, to urge suitable preparation for their observance, and to render their administration edifying, and promotive of the objects of their institution.

8. *It is the work of an Evangelist to impart religious instruction to the youth.*

"Feed my lambs," was the earnest injunction given to Peter, by our Lord, just before his ascension to heaven. And "feed my lambs," is still the imperative call of the Master to all who would minister in his name. To impart religious instruction to the young, should be considered by every christian pastor as one of the primary objects of his appointment. No

multiplication of other duties, however important, can be an excuse for the neglect of this. It is well known that first impressions are the most lasting, and principles early imbibed are longest retained; policy, therefore, should dictate to every christian minister the importance of sowing the seeds of divine truth in the youthful mind, before it shall have been poisoned by the infusion of error.

The Lutheran church has always attached the highest importance to the religious instruction of the young. In her admirable system of Catechetical instruction, she has fully and wisely provided for this object. This system has borne the test of time, and the longer it is tried, the more highly it is appreciated. It is very gratifying to perceive that some ministers, who were induced to substitute, for a season, another system in its stead, have become convinced, after a few years' trial, that the catechetical system is far superior, and they now advocate it more strongly, and practice it more actively than ever.

One important object of a course of catechetical instruction is to lay, in the minds of the young, a strong foundation of *principles*. It is to make them acquainted with the *doctrines* of religion, and the proofs by which they are substantiated. The more thoroughly this system of indoctrination is pursued, the more beneficial and apparent are its results, in the greater intelligence and steadfastness of the subjects of such instruction when admitted to the communion of the church. They are not "unstable souls," easily "beguiled," spoken of by St. Peter, but have a reason for their faith, and can render a reason. A congregation of such members, combining fervent personal piety and active obedience with thorough doctrinal knowledge, realizes our perfect conception of what a christian church ought to be.

On the contrary, young persons admitted to the communion of the church, without such preparatory doctrinal training, are nominally church-members, it is true, but they are, for the most part, ignorant of its principles, and destitute of a proper church spirit. A very limited degree of observation is sufficient to satisfy a reflecting mind, that congregations constituted of such materials, are fluctuating, short-lived and inefficient. The present condition of many, once apparently flourishing congregations, affords a sad confirmation of the truth of this remark.

But when, in the course of catechetical instruction, we have thoroughly indoctrinated our catechumens in the principles of our holy religion, we have not performed all our work. There

are in religion things to be experienced, and things to be done, as well as things to be believed. We must not only instruct the head, but we must also seek to improve the heart, and reform the life of the catechumen. The faithful pastor will use his earnest endeavors to lead the dear youth committed to his care, to repentance for sin, to faith in Christ, and to holiness in life. He will perseveringly urge home upon their consciences, the plain and practical truth, that they are sinners and need to be forgiven; condemned and need a Savior; depraved and need renovation of heart. The anxious desire of his heart, and the great object of all his endeavors must be, to bring them to Christ. He will pray for them and with them; he will instruct them in public, and admonish them in private; and will leave nothing on his part undone, to secure their salvation. He will faithfully do his duty, so that, if any shall be ultimately lost, his conscience will be clear of all blame.

9. *It is the work of an Evangelist to exercise a careful supervision over the doctrine and life of the members of his charge.*

The christian minister is not only a preacher, but also a pastor. As such he is the spiritual guide and adviser of each individual member of his flock. His business is the "cure," or care of souls, and he is in the full sense of that expressive German word, a "*Seelsorger*." This is confessedly the most difficult part of his work. It is comparatively easy for the minister of the Gospel to be faithful in performing the duties of a *preacher* in the pulpit; but to approach an erring member in private; to meet him face to face, and discharge with fidelity to his soul, the duty of a *pastor*, requires the greatest exercise of prudence, the most perfect self-control, and the kindest manner of address. Although a minister is naturally inclined to shrink from the discharge of this often most unpleasant duty, yet it is a duty from which he dare not shrink. His ordination vows, and fidelity to the souls of men, forbid it. True, he needs to be "wise as the serpent and harmless as the dove," but he is directed, "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him."

Pastoral care is the best kind of church discipline. All the conception which some persons have of church discipline, is expressed by the phrases, "taking the name off of the paper," and "putting out of meeting." If this were all that is comprised in the exercise of church discipline, it would indeed be easily and soon done. But what a miserable conception is

this, of one of the most responsible duties, and important prerogatives of the christian ministry!

10. *It is the work of an Evangelist to visit and administer religious consolation to the sick and dying.*

“Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God!” As the christian minister is the spiritual guide and adviser of the members of his charge, they will also look to him as their comforter, when troubles arise. Knowing that he sympathizes with them in their joys and their sorrows, they wish him to be not only a partaker of the one, but a minister of holy consolations in the other. How welcome to the sick and dying are the visits of their affectionate friend and pastor! When he speaks to them of Christ and heaven, and bids them hope and trust; when he kneels by their bed-side and offers for them the fervent prayer of faith, their doubts and fears give way to pious confidence, their drooping spirits are revived, and the heavy load of their affliction is lessened and removed. Animated by the hopes he imparts, and soothed by the consolations he administers, they are enabled to depart in the triumphs of faith, and gently fall asleep in the arms of the Redeemer.

There are, perhaps, no services which a minister can render more highly appreciated, or more gratefully accepted than this. Gladly and conscientiously, therefore, must he perform this duty. Merely social visits, though delightful to him, and greatly desired by the members of his charge, may be dispensed with; but pastoral visits to the sick and dying should never be neglected. “It is better,” for him, “to go to the house of mourning, than to the house of feasting.” Fidelity to his own soul, and love to the souls of others, should constrain him.

Such are some of the chief duties of the christian ministry—such the principal “work of an evangelist.” Responsible in the highest degree is our sacred calling.

’Tis not a cause of small import
The pastor’s care demands;
But what might fill an angel’s heart,
And fill’d a Savior’s hands.

The young candidate should approach it with trembling, and the experienced pastor should daily become more sensible of its awful responsibilities. In devout reliance, however, on the gracious aid of the Great Master, who has said, “Lo, I am with you alway even to the end of the world,” let the christian minister gird himself for the performance of his arduous task. “I can do all things,” says St. Paul, “through

Christ, who strengtheneth me.” When the same Apostle exclaimed, “Who is sufficient for these things?” he was answered, “My grace is sufficient for thee.” Relying upon divine grace for help, let us do our duty, and then leave the result to God.

ARTICLE VII.

FORCE OF MORAL AND MENTAL CULTURE IN THE FORMATION OF CHARACTER.

By the Rev. L. Eichelberger, A. M., Principal of Angerona Seminary, Winchester, Va.

MORAL culture has for its object the emotions of the heart, mental culture the powers of the mind. The former seeks the correction of human nature, its perverted dispositions and evil tendencies; the latter to give it understanding. The one aims at its accomplishment by the development of higher and better motives of action, the other by the development of intellect and its progressive enlargement. The one regards man in his moral aspects; the other regards his mental endowments and their susceptibility of improvement. Whilst each separately may go far to accomplish its object, both combined must exert a much more potent influence, and jointly constitute an agency adequate to accomplish the work proposed. Such is the power of moral and mental culture, the force of which, in the formation of character and the discipline requisite to give it success, we propose considering in the following pages.

By the constitution of human nature, we are creatures of feeling and emotion rather than of intellect. The former will predominate, as they do in the masses of mankind, unless subjected to the control of a higher and safer principle. Nor is it remarkable, as man is constituted, that this should be the case. For wise and prudential reasons, the Creator has ordained that these grosser elements of his nature should first be developed and in part matured. This is therefore a universal law of human existence. The child is first the creature of sensation and emotion only. During its early years these are more and more fully exhibited. They grow with its growth and strengthen with its strength. Judgment and intellect are later in their development and slower in their growth. The former are now deeply rooted and potent to resist, whilst yet the latter are only feebly evolved, and require moreover much fostering care and discipline to strengthen and mature them. But too

often this fostering care is withheld, in which case man through life remains the creature of sense and feeling alone. Wanting moral and intellectual control, passion and prejudice are made his only guides, and lead him, necessarily, astray. His pursuits in life are governed by the impelling motive of self alone, and seldom extend beyond the narrow limit it circumscribes. He aims no higher, because the law of sympathy binds him to this as a common centre, around which all his emotions revolve and beyond which they never go. Where the principle of self-interest is less strongly developed, and moral and intellectual influences are wanting, man becomes still more grovelling in his pursuits, reckless as to consequences, and abandons himself entirely to sensuality and vice. Hence the multitudes of this class found every where in society, constituting its lowest grades, and seldom brought under the influence of moral principles adequate to control or reform them.

But in cases where moral influences are not entirely wanting, and the intellectual powers are partially developed, this development is often so clogged and fettered by extraneous influences, wrong exciting motives, undue parental partialities and indulgences, or vicious associations, that the effort at discipline proves a failure, and the youth that promised fair in boyhood becomes, as in the former case, an example of disappointed hope, grovelling in his pursuits and morally vicious in all his tendencies. In these instances moral and intellectual culture, rightly directed, was the principle requisite to form a proper character, and its absence the fatal rock upon which it was wrecked. Moral ruin was the necessary consequence. Under these circumstances no better result could be expected. To hope for any other would be contrary to the law of cause and effect, which governs in moral as well as in physical being.

To a philosophic and reflecting mind, it is evident, from the nature of the case, that right character in after life can only result from right training. As the boy ripens into manhood, character of some kind will be formed, and will be formed upon the basis of the elements most freely and largely permitted to enter into its composition. This is a necessary consequence, and has its sad exemplification in the crowds of the vicious and debased who throng our towns and cities, and finally fill our almshouses and prisons; beings lost to themselves and a burden to society. Sense and feeling, passion and prejudice, youthful propensities of every kind, improperly and immoderately indulged, and the absence of all proper moral and mental culture to control the progressive development of

these grosser elements of being, gave direction to character in its practical formation, and determined the result.

So it must ever be. Separate from man, whether in childhood or in after life, the influence of right principles and of sound religious and mental culture, and he must sink necessarily in the scale of being. He rises not to the proper dignity of his nature, and feels no ambition to excel in objects of true moral worth, because the necessary impelling motives are not exerted. You form the man, but not the character essential to the useful citizen, such as will be qualified to fill, with benefit to society and credit to himself, the various stations in life he might otherwise have been fitted to adorn. In other words, his character has been a failure. The only remedy for this, adequate to the nature of the case, is to be found in the principles of sound moral and mental culture, judiciously and properly applied. We proceed, therefore, to notice more specifically the operations of these principles, in their influence upon character.

By character, we mean the possession of such qualities of the heart and mind as give a useful, beneficial and valuable direction to human effort, stimulate to untiring diligence in its pursuits and fortify it against great discouragements in their accomplishment. Its aim is high in all the departments of life, whether social, moral, or intellectual. It seeks the greatest possible good, and the communication of it to the greatest number. It does this uninfluenced by feelings of selfishness, covetousness, or vain applause. Its benevolence spends itself upon the wants of others, and in its ample folds embraces the necessities of man, whenever and wherever found; in all climes, in all pursuits, in all conditions of human life. Its sympathy, warm from the heart, is exerted every where, and is alike active at home and abroad. It travels over land and sea and circumscribes the poles. In distant continents, in heathen and in christian lands, in civilized and savage life, it realizes human woe and seeks to relieve it. Like an angel of mercy descending from above, and winging its flight onward throughout the world, it goes wherever the footsteps of man have gone, and dispenses blessings wherever human misery may be relieved or human want assisted. In its errand of mercy, it never tires or falters. By day and by night, at all times and under all circumstances, it is alive to every impulse of humanity, and trembles lest some object of its charity should perish before its intended relief can be exerted. "What its hands find to do, it does with all its might, lest the night come in which no man can work." Such is human character, or at

least its proper standard. Nor are its delineations too elevated or refined. If its complete development was exemplified in the Son of man as a model for human imitation, it is not assuming too much to adopt it as the standard to which human effort should aspire, and by which it should be judged. But, if this be objected to, let us take a Paul from among apostles, a Luther from among reformers, a Washington, a Franklin, a Howard, and a host of others, as exemplifications of human character and of the qualities it involves. These are not inimitable, and practically illustrate the position we have assumed. We shall now proceed more directly to the consideration of the subject, and remark,

1. That right moral and mental training, in the formation of character, such as we have described, gives it a *safe and proper direction*. This is among the first steps to be taken, and if possible is more important in childhood than in after life. The mind is then susceptible, and *impressions* for good or evil are easily made. It is then comparatively free from all bias or tendency, except so far as the inclinations incident to childhood control it, and will consequently take such direction as may be given it. This is evident from the nature of the case. If brought then under the influence of sound moral and mental culture, its intellectual development will be directed by it, and formed accordingly.

But as an element of character, it must be so proportioned as to exert an adequate influence, and must be early enough in life to admit of that influence being effectual. When mental development begins, as we have shown, the child is already under the control of its physical tendencies which have priority given them, and now require to be counteracted and restrained. If the moral and mental element now sought to be evolved, be not adequate to this restriction, and, as a counter element, is not adequately assisted, the former must and will prevail. Hence the multiplied failures in mental discipline and educational efforts. Mental energies are evolved, and often of sufficient mental force, but subsequently they are so imperfectly exercised and so feebly assisted as to linger in the rear, and never gain the ascendancy. The physical and sensual energies prevail and give direction to character accordingly. Had the counter elements gained the ascendancy, the character formed would have been the opposite.

The same result follows when moral and mental discipline are withheld too long, or not applied at a period of life sufficiently early to be efficient. The physical man, as it were, is

now already matured. The 'sensual energies have already gained a giant's strength, and like a strong man armed, they maintain the mastery. In the contest that ensues, the victory is easy, and the moral energy is again subjected to the physical. The latter gives that direction in the formation of character, which the former should have supplied, and the result is accordingly. In either case, had the moral and mental energies, in their progressive development, been so disciplined and assisted as to have gained sufficient strength, they would have counteracted the sensual tendencies, and to the character formed would have given such direction as to have fitted it for accomplishing the proper objects of life. "Just as the twig is bent the tree's inclined," is an adage of the soundest philosophy and of the fullest experience. It is based upon the fixed constitution of things, and you cannot alter it. Its importance may be forgotten or disregarded, as it too often is, even by those sufficiently intelligent to appreciate its worth, and the child's character is left free to take its own direction, in its own way. The result is so self-evident, that it needs no prophet to predict it. Solemn and painful regrets in after life, however genuine, come too late to correct the evil or repair the injury, and should admonish parents of the great importance of the principle we are here considering. They should learn from it the wisest lessons of instruction on the subject, and be made careful to apply them, and to apply them properly. They can do much, very much, in giving direction to the character their children are to form, provided their efforts are adequately exerted, and exerted at a proper time. Moral and mental culture, if rightly and properly applied, will be a lever in their hands sufficiently energetic for the work to be performed; but if feebly exerted, as it too often is, it might as well not be exerted at all, for the result must be a failure. To the absence or improper application of it, the ruin of multitudes of the young may be traced, and the criminal indifference, if not total recklessness of parents in regard to it, seems to form a striking characteristic of the age, and in a moral point of view, presents indeed a sad and cheerless prospect for the future. The young now-a-days are left, independent of almost all control, to consult wholly their own wishes, follow out their own fancies, and choose unrestrictedly their own way, which but too often proves "the broad and beaten way that leadeth to destruction." Even when they know the right, they have not energy to pursue it. They are thus left, in the formation of character, uncontrolled, to give it their own direction, or such as chance may supply, and this is generally bad enough. Moral and mental culture is but

feebly exerted, and under such adverse and opposing circumstances as to give it no controlling influence. The result necessarily must be fatal to the child and all its future prospects. The importance of the same principle, in its operation and bearing upon the formation of character, is also plainly exhibited by the wise man where he says, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it."

2. Correct moral and mental training will furnish *right motives for exertion*. Nothing can be gained, either in early or after life, without exertion. This is too plain and palpable to require illustration. In the formation of character, however, it is a principle so vitally important and yet so much neglected, that it claims to be specifically referred to. "Idleness produces vice, want and misery," is a maxim true under all circumstances and in all cases. As a principle, in its influence upon life and the habits of life, it should be properly understood and always kept in view. It is founded in the nature of things, and its results are certain. Its sad confirmation is seen, in the condition of want and misery everywhere attending the idle, and in the end adding crime to the catalogue of their other woes. The want of exertion was the fruitful source from which their miseries sprung, and as an element of character, paralyzed the whole of life and rendered it worse than useless to its possessor.

But exertion is labor, and mental exertion is still a higher degree of labor. Human nature is adverse to it, especially in childhood. It seeks to avoid all occasion for it, and regards its requirement as severe and cruel. It submits to it from necessity, not from choice. It labors, if at all, only from constraint. The mental energies are not yet sufficiently evolved to appreciate its worth, and its physical tendencies, not yet controlled by a higher principle, are not only in themselves inclined to inertness, but the mind itself approves the choice. The more too this inertness is indulged, the more it is desired, and aversion to exertion is increased. - Now this tendency to inertness, and this resistance to labor, thus fixed and confirmed, must be corrected and removed. The child's taste and disposition must be influenced, and so changed as to appreciate the objects of instruction, and their influence upon life, for success in which exertion is indispensable. The task generally will be difficult, because a great work is to be accomplished, a great object is to be gained; but it must be accomplished at all hazards, however many and formidable the obstacles to be overcome. The object must be gained, and effectually gained,

or the child's character will take its own direction, or rather follow on in that already formed, and will mould its after life accordingly.

We now see the value of right motives to exertion, and their successful application. If, in the case before us, they can be so selected and applied as adequately to excite the mind and change its tendencies; if by their force and character, the child's disposition can now be so influenced as to impel it to suitable mental effort, a new direction will be given it; for if its mental energies are sufficiently excited, they will be exerted accordingly. This can only be done by the force of motives adequate to the task. No other power can or will effect it.—All other influences will be vain and useless. Even then its aversion to labor is not removed, but exertion itself is now esteemed a virtue. *Labor ipse voluptas*—labor itself a pleasure, becomes its motto, and sustained by the force of adequate motives, it finally overcomes the opposite principles of inertia, and secures success. A safe and hopeful direction is now given to character in its embryo formation, based upon the change produced in the mind's susceptibilities, by the force of motives so selected and applied as to accomplish the object proposed.—Its ultimate results for good, upon the character in life it has aided to form, time only can realize.

We have said nothing as to the kind of motives most proper to be applied, and most likely to have success. Their selection and application are so various, and so much dependent upon circumstances that, as a general rule, they must be judged of mainly by the discretion of parents themselves. Their own knowledge of the child's peculiar taste and tendencies, its habits and disposition, as far as they are already formed and manifested, must guide them in the important work here to be performed. In general, they should be either of a moral character, or so blended with sound and healthy moral influences, as to make them abiding. Our firm conviction, based upon no little share of observation and experience, is, that apart from proper moral influences, motives will exert but little permanent force, however great the charm that may be thrown around them. If this be so, and we cannot doubt it, it indicates clearly the great principle that should govern in the case before us. Where parents, and others having the care of the young, are deficient in adequate intelligence and morality, as they too often are, to appreciate either the force of motives to exertion altogether, or to select such as are likely to be efficient, no help can be furnished them, and their children must fare accordingly.

3. Moral and mental culture excites to suitable *industry and perseverance in the objects of human pursuit*. Success in life depends both upon the degree of exertion put forth, and its continued application. This is the result of long and settled experience—experience too painfully true to be doubted.—Solomon says, “I went by the field of the slothful; and by the vineyard of the man void of understanding; and, lo! it was all grown over with thorns, and nettles had covered the face thereof, and the stone wall thereof was broken down. Then I saw and considered it well; I looked upon it and received instruction.” The instruction the wise man received was what we are now urging, that without exertion nothing can be accomplished, no matter in what department of life we may be engaged, or what may be the advantageous circumstances of our situation in other respects. Again he says, “Go to the ant, thou sluggard; consider her ways and be wise. The soul of the sluggard desireth, and has nothing; but the soul of the diligent shall be made fat.” Paul exhorts that we be “not slothful in business,” and the servant that hid his Lord’s talent in the earth, the Savior condemns as both “wicked and slothful.” We have therefore the teachings not only of experience, but of heavenly wisdom, to exite to diligence, and to admonish us, that without it, life will be a failure, and its objects unaccomplished.

Nor is diligence alone required. It must be diligence continued without ceasing in the objects of pursuit. Christ said, even in reference to himself, “I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day; the night cometh when no man can work.” We have here precept and example, united in the person of one who had but to speak the word and it was done, to command and it stood fast forever; and yet he was untiring in the work that was given him to do.

So it is in life, and so God has ordained it. “Cursed,” said he to Adam, “is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life. Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground, for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return.” Here we see that labor, by divine appointment, is made the portion of man, and he cannot escape from it, without doing violence to God’s own ordering of things, and the whole constitution of nature as unalterably fixed and determined. Man should learn wisdom, therefore, from the teachings of his Maker, and not vainly and presumptuously strive to resist what God has enjoined. Effort, therefore, is essential to success in life.

The powers of man, physical and intellectual, are required to be exerted, and perseveringly exerted. To this law of his being he must submit, or utterly fail in the great objects of life, designed to be accomplished. It becomes, consequently, an element of character of the utmost importance, and cannot be dispensed with without ruin to the whole. No matter how great and promising the other qualities that compose it, if this be wanting it will vitiate them all, and spread a fatal paralysis over the whole project of life. It must, therefore, be insisted on as indispensable, as efficient and successful character cannot be formed without it.

But, as already said, exertion is labor, and this continued exertion becomes *a weariness to the flesh*, even in cases where it is assisted by proper discipline and the force of christian principles superadded. How then shall it be secured to the young, and especially in the absence of both the latter. The answer is evident. It must constitute a part of their moral and mental culture. They must be trained to it from childhood. Educational efforts must be directed with reference to it, and the mind in its progressive development, must mature under its influence. Let this be done sufficiently early in life, and under the guidance of judicious moral and mental training, and the result need not be doubted. However difficult the task, in most instances it will be crowned with success, and the gain to parents and society at large, will amply repay all the care and labor it has required.

4. Again, correct moral and mental culture *tends to promote virtuous emulation*. Emulation is desire to excel. The principle is among the strongest in childhood, and is felt through life. Parents from experience learn to know the force of it in exciting their children to desired action, and, in after life, it often stimulates to the greatest exertion of human energy. The soldiers of an army are sometimes excited by it to deeds of valor requiring almost more than human strength. The page of history, especially classic history, records instances of heroic daring and self-devotion that seem incredible, and can only be explained on the above principle, acting in connection with ardent patriotism. The plains of Marathon and Thermopylæ will furnish, to the end of time, a striking illustration of human prowess and undaunted energy, when this principle is fully developed. The famous retreat of the "Ten thousand," rendered immortal by the pen of their leader Xenophon, presents many instances of it worthy the admiration of the classic reader, and the "*Decima legio*," in Cæsar's army, was made by it a terror to the Gauls, and a bulwark of strength and secu-

rity to the Roman arms. Nor is modern history without suitable examples of its power and influence. The well known struggle of our own beloved land for independence, with but the strength of an infant, compared to that of its mighty oppressor, furnishes many illustrations of the same principle, and the unexampled devotion of a suffering and untiring army, enabled the patriotic Washington to save, perhaps, his country by it.

We grant, indeed, that emulation, as a motive to exertion, is often improperly used and applied. To excite to effort merely to excel, and for the sake of vain applause, is not only without adequate motive, but is effort exerted under the force of motives wrong in themselves, and ultimately injurious. Whilst no permanent good is effected, lasting evil is perpetrated. Exertions thus produced are mere impulses of the moment, caused by transient and temporary excitement, and pass away, when the influence is removed by which they were produced. Parents governing their children by means of the principle thus abused, and condemned by the teachings of a sound and wholesome discipline, learn from sad experience its insufficiency, and ever and anon are forced to resort to new expedients to secure success. This should be sufficient to condemn it altogether, and cause its speedy abandonment. Such, however, is not generally the practice of parents and others in the government of the young. Wrong motives, founded upon improper emulation, continue to be applied until they ultimately fail to excite altogether; or what is worse, now finally mould the character formed under their influence and susceptible only of the worst impulses. And such must always be their legitimate fruits. The mind will be acted upon, but will ultimately be injured to the extent to which, by the force of wrong and improper emulation, it has been influenced.

But virtuous emulation has a higher motive for its object.— It impels to exertion for the sake of doing good to ourselves and others. It ever aims at the highest degree of usefulness, and stimulates to suitable efforts to accomplish it. It excites to a laudable ambition, and the more this is done, the more effectual will be its results for good on the character you form. Emulation of this kind cannot then be too strongly encouraged. The more it infuses itself into the youthful mind the better, for it constitutes one of the safest principles by which it can be governed in future life. It is free too from all evil tendencies, and seeks for its objects only such as are praiseworthy and commendable. This principle, so desirable in the formation of

character, right moral and mental culture tends to excite and encourage.

5. Moral and mental culture imparts *right views of the objects of life and qualifies us properly to appreciate them.*—Generally speaking, our exertions in life are put forth in proportion to the estimate we put upon the objects of our pursuit. If these are regarded as of but little intrinsic worth, we treat them with indifference; but if highly estimated, we are ready to make the greatest sacrifices to secure them. The “Ten thousand Greeks,” already referred to, regarding their safe return to their native land as the dearest object to them, in life, were willing to brave every danger and endure incredible hardship to accomplish it. Columbus, when in daily expectation of seeing land, and his soul filled with the magnitude of the discovery he hoped to make, resorted even to stratagem to quiet the minds of the impatient and enraged seamen, willing himself to peril every danger, as he had already conquered the most insurmountable obstacles, stimulated by the hope of giving a new continent to the world. The misguided alchymist, hoping to discover the elixir of life and make gold, labored day and night with a zeal and energy worthy of a better object. And in our own day we have gotten up another Argonautic expedition to bring back the golden fleece, not from Colchis, but from the shores of the Pacific. In these adventures, California gold is an object as potent perhaps as that which governed the Grecian chieftains, and quite sufficient to embolden the daring spirits engaged in them to peril the dangers of sea and land as heroically as did the Argonauts of old.

The same principle governs in early as well as in after life. The child is ready to exert its energies to the utmost, if influenced by a prize of sufficient magnitude. Cyrus, when a boy, though a prince of the highest expectations, sought to be made cup-bearer in his grandfather’s court, that he might have the king’s commendation for the excellent manner in which he should perform the service. To the king’s sarcastic censure, that, like Saco, he had not tasted the wine before handing it, a prominent part of the cup-bearer’s duty, his noble reply, “Because that it was poison and made those act very foolishly who drank it,” showed also that he would not allow the meed of praise he had merited to be undervalued or impaired. The disposition manifested by this noble Persian prince, though only a boy, belongs to youth in general, and strikingly illustrates it. Give them proper views of the objects of life most desirable to be obtained, and let them be properly appreciated, and appropriate energies will be exerted in their accomplish-

ment. This, as an element of character, right moral and mental culture tends to impart.

6. Moral and mental culture *elevates and purifies the mind*. We have no difficulty in fixing upon a proper standard of mental elevation. The high and commanding position, in every department of life that men have occupied, furnishes a safe criterion for those who may come after them, and should excite to proper zeal and perseverance in its attainment. "What others have done, may be performed again," is a maxim no less true than valuable for the encouragement it offers to youthful enterprise. It should be early impressed upon the mind of every youth, that he may grow up under its influence and rightly appreciate it. Proper mental energy will be developed by it, and a maturity of thought secured that would otherwise be impracticable. This is constantly tested by experience, and cannot be doubted. Aiming high, commendable success will not be difficult, whereas, without it, the best talents and brightest parts are often sadly disappointed. The reason is found in the want of that mental elevation necessary to stimulate the mind, and excite its energies to proper action.

But supposing that the youth fails at last in reaching the highest grade of attainment, or the topmost niche in the temple of fame, still his onward progress has been greatly stimulated by the models of superior merit and excellence at which he aimed. He may not become a Demosthenes, a Pericles or a Cicero, a Homer, a Shakspeare or a Byron, an Apelles or a Titian; he may fall far short of these and other models proposed for imitation, and yet his success will gain an eminence that never would have been reached, but for the zeal inspired by these models of perfection. They excite in the mind a noble and commendable ambition, and stimulate it constantly to suitable exertions. They invigorate its energies and counteract that native tendency to mental paralysis, so common to the young, and so fatal to success. The youthful mind should be disciplined, therefore, under the influence of this ennobling and elevating principle, as it constitutes an element of the character to be formed, too important to be overlooked.

It also tends to purify the mind by its elevating influence, it purges it from the dross of sensual and vicious tendencies, and, by making it virtuous, renders it more intellectual. It dignifies the objects of moral and mental pursuit, and surrounds the mind with a better and purer atmosphere. Imagination is elevated and refined. Judgment is rescued from the bias of

fatal prejudice and passion. Its conclusions are on the side of truth and virtue, and its energies are exerted accordingly. Taste is now rightly cultivated and improved, and mental effort is directed to its noblest ends. The intellectual powers, in their widest expansion, are now consecrated to the glory of God and the good of man, the true end and object for which they were bestowed. But abstract this purifying element from the character that is formed; let it be matured under the influence of low, grovelling and vicious tendencies; let these control and govern it, and you reverse effectually the picture we have given. The mind sinks to a level with the low and grovelling views that absorb it. Its taste is perverted and abused. Its imagination is vitiated. Its desires are impure, sensual, devilish. Its perceptions are blunted. Its judgment is now wilfully blinded, and its conclusions are against the truth and on the side of error. It is left, in a word, under the dominion of all its corrupting and vicious tendencies, and takes its character accordingly. Right moral and mental culture corrects this vicious tendency, and by elevating and purifying the mind infuses into it an element by which this vicious tendency is controlled.

7 Correct moral and mental culture *purifies the heart and improves its moral susceptibilities*. The Grecians made religion, false as were their theories, the impelling motive to success in life. Among them no undertaking, however important, was expected to be realized, unless their gods sanctioned it and were rendered propitious. The oracles of Delphi and Dodona were of high and sacred veneration, and in all their enterprises were carefully consulted. Not to do so would have been considered sacrilegious in the highest degree, and a sure omen of defeat. The sacred character of their divinities, and the number, costliness and celebrity of their temples, testify to the religious devotion of the nation. Nor were their rulers, orators and statesmen, less observant of the duties of religion than the masses of the people, or less careful in regard to its obligations. The Romans were characterized also by a similar devotion to their deities and veneration for their authority. Other nations of antiquity, in a greater or less degree, present the same religious aspects, and by their numerous sacred rites and ceremonies, but too often cruel and bloody in the extreme, show their sense of obligation to its duties, however rude and grovelling their views in regard to it. To the duties and sanctions of religion, the teachings of philosophy were superadded; and however defective their systems and vague their notions in many points of view, they merit our respect for the industry

and perseverance exhibited in support of them, and for the end and objects they proposed to accomplish. This was the improvement of man's natural susceptibilities, and their subjection to the common dictates of morality and religion.

If such was the character of heathen nations, "darkened in their understanding," and given over by God, as the apostle tells us, "to a reprobate mind," how much greater are our obligations to recognize and appreciate the influence of religion and virtue in the affairs of life, and especially in the formation of the character by which life itself is to be directed and controlled. Surely we, who have the teachings of a divine revelation superadded to the dictates of nature, cannot appreciate too highly the importance of a pure morality, of right religious principles and their influence upon the destiny of life. We know their intimate connection with the best interests of life, and that apart from their reforming influence, no hope of success can be abiding. They must correct and purify the heart, the fountain of life. If this be turbid and impure, the streams from it will be impure also. "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies, pride, foolishness. All these evil things come from within and defile a man." This fearful exposition of the heart in its impurity, and uncontrolled by a proper religious sentiment, is given by Christ himself, who, knowing what was in the heart, knew best how to describe it. He adds also, "if the light in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness." The heart then must be purified. Its moral tendencies must be rightly influenced and controlled. It must be governed habitually by a proper conviction of its moral and religious obligations, and the duties they impose. This is so requisite to success that it cannot be dispensed with. It has been rightly said, "The undevout philosopher is mad." That "study without prayer is atheism," and that *bene orasse est, bene studuisse*, "prayer is the best study." God gives to those that are good in his sight, says the wisest of men, "wisdom and knowledge and joy. The sentiments of virtue and religion must then be duly cultivated and regarded. They must elevate and purify the heart. They must direct and govern its moral emotions, and subject it to the guidance of proper moral obligations. This must not only be an important element in the character formed for life, but must be its basis and support. It must be founded and rest upon it. Without it all the other elements of character, however valuable in themselves, will avail but little. This is essential to complete the whole and give it efficiency adequate to success. This right

moral and mental culture tends to secure, and is the only agency by which it can be effected. Let it then be fully appreciated, and have the consideration it merits, as human destiny so materially depends upon it, and cannot be safely directed without it.

Finally, moral and mental culture, as a means of discipline, to be effectual, *must be rightly applied*. On its proper direction the whole result, however important, at last depends. A mistake here must prove fatal to the whole, and disappoint the best expectations that otherwise might be realized. But such mistake is not necessary and may be avoided. To do so, however, requires the unqualified subjection of mistaken parental kindness, and the natural tendencies and inclinations of the young to the laws of sound moral and mental discipline, however severe such subjection may be, and however great the repugnance by which it is resisted. Such, as we have shown, is human nature, and so early and rapid its physical and sentient developments that otherwise they cannot be adequately restricted. The laws of moral and mental discipline alone can govern them, and hence they must not only be enforced, but so enforced as to effect the end and object proposed. To withhold, or only partially apply them, would be to give up the child a ready victim to the corruption of human nature and to ultimate ruin. This would be inevitable. The vicious and abandoned never fail to ascribe their loss of character and final degradation, to the want of wholesome discipline in early life. This is attested by the uniform confession of the criminal, and is an appalling comment upon the principle of unrestricted indulgence, by which parents too generally allow themselves to be governed in the direction of childhood. A mistaken sympathy and wrong parental partialities, are substituted for discipline and the restrictions it imposes, and the child's ruin is the necessary consequence. No other result could be expected, nor is any other hoped for, where parents act upon the mistaken principles to which we have referred.

We do not expect to give here the details of such system of discipline as should govern universally, much less be applicable to specific cases. Our object only is to refer to it as a great principle to govern generally in early life, and to such aspects of it as are universal in their application. Its details are as multiform and various as the mind itself. In their selection and application they require to be no less varied, in doing which the discretion of parents must guide them, keeping strictly in view the objects to be accomplished. As a great principle, then, to be effectual in controlling life, we add,

(a) It must be applied *in childhood*. We know the age at which the child begins to lisp the elements of sound, and observe the conduct and actions of those around it, but we cannot know when it begins to think. This, however, is usually much earlier and its progress more rapid than is generally supposed, and doubtless precedes its efforts at speech. Its first ideas are necessarily of the most simple character, and connected with the objects of life with which, by habit and constant association, it is made familiar. But nature has already instructed it in the language of intelligent expression, and this it soon learns perfectly to read and understand. Here, then, the work of discipline must begin, of course mild and gentle in its nature, adapted to the tenderness of infant childhood, but still *it must be discipline*. We again repeat, it must here begin, for even in infancy itself it cannot safely be dispensed with. Here the groundwork must be formed; the firm foundation must be laid, and the first lessons of submissiveness enforced. This may be regarded as hypothetical and visionary, and may seem to argue a want of natural affection for the helplessness and tenderness of infancy. Many parents will, doubtless so regard it, and refuse to give the subject even a partial investigation. But still we must insist upon it, as involving the success of the principle we are urging, and to its absence here, in many instances may, doubtless, be traced its subsequent inefficiency or only partial success. We, therefore, most solemnly admonish parents of the danger of indifference here, unimportant as it may appear. If neglected in childhood, it most likely will be neglected altogether, or if subsequently attempted will easily be resisted. To be effectual, its first lessons must be given in the nursery.

(b) It must be continued *throughout childhood and early life*. We are not sure that the assumption of a prominent writer may not be true, "That character for life is determined in infancy." It is formed, however, in childhood. Even in early childhood, a fixed direction is often given it, which controls its final destiny. Of this we cannot have a rational doubt.—Some writer says: "The man is made at six years of age." Other writers concur in the same sentiment and confirm its general truth. Admit it to be true, as it doubtless is, that thus early in life the elements of character are so developed and formed as to give a fixed direction to human destiny, and how immensely important, even in childhood, becomes the work of moral and mental discipline, and such adequate exertion of it as the right formation of character requires. Parents may see here how much depends upon it, and learn to appreciate it.

They cannot estimate its worth too highly, for if in early life the tendencies of a corrupt nature are to be restricted and controlled at all, they must be by the force of a wholesome discipline. Its influence alone is adequate to the task, and to be effectual must not only keep pace with their progressive development, but must be strong enough to govern and subdue them. It must be so proportioned and exerted as to maintain the ascendancy, and this must be done however arduous the task, as ultimate success depends upon it. We are the advocates, therefore, of a stringent discipline, even in childhood, and believe we cannot too forcibly insist upon it.

(c) It must be *adequately enforced*. Partial discipline involves the consequence of a partial insubordination, and ultimately becomes no discipline at all. This result will be inevitable, and follows necessarily from the nature of the case. In the contest that ensues, the principle of insubordination, sooner or later, will gain the mastery, especially as parental sympathy and the impulses of nature in both the parents and the child, are enlisted in its favor. The result is fatal to the end designed to be attained, and fatal only because the effect of discipline was paralysed by the force of resistance sanctioned by its partial exertion. To be effectual it must be adequate to the necessities of the case, so as wholly to control it. Any degree of discipline, short of this, has but little hope of success, and, in general, the wise man's proverb is verified by the experience of the parent, viz, "He that spareth his rod hateth his son, but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes."

(d) It must be exerted *with firmness and decision*. This is especially requisite in early life. In childhood it is essentially important, and will materially influence the result to be produced. In fact, it almost wholly depends upon it, as all must know who have given the least attention to the subject. Children are always quick to perceive the degree of firmness exhibited by those who have the government over them, and are ever ready to avail themselves of the advantages that its absence offers. They find here a remedy always at hand against coercion altogether, and use it accordingly. The principle now becomes but a partial discipline, such as is referred to above, and its results must be the same. Parents themselves here paralyze its energies and destroy its efficacy. Want of firmness on their part undermines the whole and involves it all in certain ruin. Like a spongy surface, it yields in proportion to the force of pressure against it, till ultimately it loses its power of resistance altogether. It is now wholly impotent in their hands, and children so regard it. On the other hand, the

exhibition of firmness and decision in the administration of discipline, would soon secure the mastery and render its subsequent application less needful.

(e) It should be *moral in its tendencies and always founded upon justice and equity*. We have already said, we have but little confidence in motives to exertion, not moral in their influence upon the child. Their effect will be transient, and do but little good. The same is true in regard to discipline, and, if possible, its moral tendency is still more essential to success. This is too evident to require illustration, and if discipline be exerted without it, a total failure must be the consequence. Independent of the superior force of moral influences, the nature of the child requires that its restraints should be moral in their tendency, otherwise they are unsuited to the character of the subject they are designed to govern. If not moral in their influence, as far as human nature is concerned and is designed to be governed by them, they can therefore do but little good. In its administration too, justice and equity should ever prevail. Of these the child believes itself competent to judge, and however crude and simple its system of ethics, it rightly assumes that it should be dealt with in accordance with them. Their gross, or even perceptible violation, will tend to excite increased hostility to restraint, and add to the difficulties incident to the exercise of discipline. Besides, their palpable violation, on the part of parents and others concerned in the instruction and government of the young, is a dereliction so gross and flagrant, that it cannot be too severely condemned.

(f) It must have constant reference *to the object to be accomplished*. This should ever govern, and will go far to aid in the right application of all moral and mental restraints, and the mode and measure of discipline by which they are to be enforced. In fact, intelligent discipline cannot be exerted without it, and moral and mental influences will ultimately effect but little, and often do more harm than good, if not selected and enforced with an eye constantly to the end they are intended to secure.

(g) It should always be based upon a *tender solicitude for the child and constant prayer for success*. The former should exist as a dictate of nature, and its absence, on the part of the parent, would argue a want of natural affection almost impracticable and condemned by every feeling of humanity. Such a parent would be a reproach to his species, an outrage to human nature, and morally disqualified for discharging the duties of discipline at all. The latter affords the best assur-

ance the parent can have of success. The christian parent especially is presumed to be sensible of its worth and will rightly appreciate it. Here, as in other things, he should regard it as the source of his "power to prevail," and his only sure guarantee of success. On this he is divinely authorized to rely, and the tender solicitude for the ultimate well-being of his child, and for its proper moral and mental training, indispensable to such well-being, here rest upon the firmest foundation his hopes can have. Let him then improve it as the potent and all-sufficient means for this end God has mercifully vouchsafed to furnish him, and faithful, otherwise, in the right moral and mental culture of his child, his best expectations in regard to it, will not be disappointed.

We might furnish other specifications, showing the principles that should govern in the application of discipline, to make it effectual in the proper formation of character, and indispensable to the success of all moral and mental culture based upon it, but as our design is only to exhibit the principle that should govern and not its details, we deem those already given sufficient. From the general hints we have furnished, parents themselves will be able to infer others of a similar character and supply the deficiency. And as the subject is one of immense moment, as well to them as to the young; it is presumed it will receive from them adequate attention. They are the parties most deeply interested, and should fully realize its profound importance. If neglected, or the duties it imposes are improperly discharged, God and posterity will hold them accountable for the result, to remedy which, bitter regrets in after life will be as unavailing as they are painful.

The views presented show the great importance of the subject we have considered. Its influence upon society and on all its prospective interests, for weal or for woe, is incalculable. Time only can reveal it. If, in regard to its ultimate destiny, society has a *conservative principle* to control and preserve it, such conservative principle must be found in the right application of sound moral and mental discipline, and in it alone. You cannot derive it from any other source. Other appliances, as means of reform, may aid to some extent, but they come too late to be effectual. Besides, they are only remedial in their influence and always uncertain in their results. In society as in medicine, an ounce of prevention is better than a pound of curative nostrums. The latter are serviceable when disease is engendered or matured, the former invaluable as security against the infection altogether. And as matter in the aggregate is made up of separate atoms, so society is com-

pounded of elements, in their simple state susceptible of such formation as may be given to them. This, then, is the proper time to mould them aright. Here not only must the work begin, but must be mainly completed; for if you would have man qualified to meet the high destiny for which he was designed, and the body politic pure and healthy, you must purify the elements of which it is composed. These in the aggregate will alternately govern, as they should, and their course will be wise and virtuous, or wrong and ruinous, according to the direction previously given them. Their rule will be in strict obedience to the character they profess, be that character what it may. Progression, too, is a law of nature. It pervades the universe, and governs also in the destiny of man. Character, like every thing else, is the result of progressive formation. It goes on step by step. Its progress is slow but certain. Ultimately it will take its due form and dimensions. You cannot arrest it; no more than you can stop the mountain torrent or hem in the sea. Nor should you, if you could. How important, then, its proper formation, and the timely infusion of such conservative elements as will guide it aright, and secure to man the best interests of life. Let this be done, and done efficiently, and you build for society a sure basis, upon which its interests may safely repose — a foundation firm and broad enough to sustain the fairest hopes of man, the brightest anticipations of human greatness, and the largest objects of human desire.

ARTICLE VIII.

JOURNAL OF A VOYAGE FROM PHILADELPHIA TO EBENEZER, IN GEORGIA, &c., IN THE YEARS 1774 AND 1775, BY HENRY MELCHIOR MÜHLENBERG, D. D.

Translated from an unpublished German manuscript, by Rev. J. W. Richards, Pastor of St. John's Church, and Prof. of German in Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

(Continued from p. 560, Vol. I.)

MONDAY, Nov. 7th. Esquire Millen kindly prepared to take me to Ebenezer, to Pastor Rabenhorst's. He rode, and his servant conveyed me in a chaise. We arrived between 3 and 4, P. M., and found my wife and daughter tolerably well. I was much affected by the kind welcome of Rev. Rabenhorst and his dear wife. In the evening the father of the family

read Ezech. 46, accompanied it with remarks, and concluded with a fervent prayer.

I received to-day the following from both parties: 1. *from pastor Triebner's party.* "To give you, Reverend Sir, some information of the views of our party and of their complaints, we have briefly prepared the following preliminary statement: 1st. That soon after my arrival, pastor Rabenhorst conducted himself coldly and discontentedly towards the regulations of our reverend Fathers, by either wilfully departing from them, or by expressing himself against them after this manner: We were not bound by the regulations of our Fathers; if it depended on them the ministers might die and perish here; I should only agree with him; the congregation to a man rallied around him; if I governed myself not by him great disturbance would ensue. This occurred the first four weeks after my arrival, while I lodged at his house. This declaration astonished me very much, and compelled me to observe the regulations of our Fathers and their validity; likewise to notice the conduct of Rev. Rabenhorst. 2. That on the 14th post Trinit. contrary to all custom known to me in proclaiming the marriage of young persons, Rev. Rabenhorst introduced innovations, and, as it were, gave the signal for the disturbance which followed, viz.: He proclaimed them the first time in Zion, and the next Sunday, during the singing of the last verses, requested me in a note, which he laid on the pulpit, to proclaim them the second time; against which I protested in the following words: that I knew not why these persons should not be proclaimed the first time here, as usual; and I proclaimed them there the first time. 3. That several conferences were held by Rev. Rabenhorst and the vestry, in which they desired to bind me to the peace under the following conditions, viz.: that Mr. Rabenhorst was the older minister, and in Mr. Bolzius' place, who resigned, and that I was the younger and must yield. To which I rejoined, that pastor Bolzius' place was still vacant; that Mr. Rabenhorst, it was true, was the older minister, but not like Mr. Bolzius; that I was not sent hither to be his servant; that if Mr. Rabenhorst wished to innovate, and would not obey the Regulations of our venerable Fathers, the congregation would be ruined, and it were better that Mr. R. had never come to Ebenezer, but had gone with the third Swabian transport to Halifax, &c. &c. This my declaration was immediately converted into complaints and accusations, and I was every where represented as one who would not submit, and who refused to be reconciled and at peace.

4. That Mr. Rabenhorst nevertheless continued his innovations, by proclaiming in Zion, and merely giving me the names of the persons in a few lines to proclaim them here in this church. As long as there were persons in the congregation with whose circumstances I was acquainted, I willingly did it till the formal separation in the year 1773. But a person having been sent to me who was reported to have a wife elsewhere, I protested against such a demand of me, saying: that I was not bound to accept such notices from Mr. Rabenhorst; that I must report to the "venerable Society" how many persons were lawfully married; the person in question should first bring a certificate that he was not married. For peace sake I proclaimed also this person, whom Mr. Rabenhorst married.

5. That in consequence of the understanding of Mr. Rabenhorst with the people in Zion to call me to account about my sermon on the 8th Sunday post Trin.: I was rudely assailed by more than thirty persons, and exposed to a dangerous sickness, which Mr. Rabenhorst might have prevented if he had desired.

6. That great exertions are made to have all congregational matters under the Trustees transacted at Zion; to which we would not accede.

7. That under the six years management of the mills, undertaken by Rev. Rabenhorst, at the request of the congregation, the mills were nearly ruined, and no account of them was rendered, although one was faithfully promised when the management was undertaken.

8. That no such church discipline, as had been heretofore practised, was enforced by Rev. Rabenhorst's party.

9. That persons, who do not contribute any thing here to the preservation of public worship in general, and who have separated themselves from the congregation, demand, according to their letters, five pounds sterling of the money of "the Society," for the salary of the schoolmaster in Zion, which has been denied them, until they shall have fully united with the congregation.

10. That the obligation of pastor Rabenhorst for £649, is five years without date, and the interest is computed sometimes at £30, and again at £40 sterling, whereas in the year 1769, it was fixed by the Reverend Senior Urlsperger at £52 sterling; and thus the congregation loses annually £12 sterling. 11. That the ministers' glebe, which in part was purchased, surveyed and improved at the expense of our European benefactors, Mr. Rabenhorst, contrary to original design, has had secured in his own name, and has thereby given oc-

casation for great strife, and sorrow to our venerable fathers, and also offence in the congregation. 12. That reconciliation and settlement of difficulties have often been offered to Mr. Rabenhorst, but were refused. Also, that he declined the request to aid in bringing all things into good order, and said that he did not wish to have any thing to do with our trading concern. 13. That the existing separation has been mainly caused, by letters written by Mr. Rabenhorst and eleven members in the name of the congregation, and of which letters the congregation nevertheless was ignorant, when asked concerning them. 14. That notwithstanding every exertion, also of public acknowledgment on the part of Mr. Triebner, peace has never been re-established. 15. That said (Rabenhorst's) party lately (in the month of June of this year), partly through craft and partly through violence, obtained a majority of votes and caused the church to be locked, to be guarded with swords, and thus deprived this part (Triebner's) of the congregation of the lawful use of their minister and church."

No. II. *Complaints of Reverend Rabenhorst.*

1. I complain, that although from the beginning I had the most cordial intention to live in brotherly love and harmony with Mr. Triebner, and to labor with him as one man in all things at Ebenezer, and in other Evangelical Lutheran congregations, and faithfully to minister to the members as the sheep of Christ, our only chief shepherd, in all the means of grace; yet that said Mr. Triebner has so conducted himself towards me, from the beginning till now, that brotherly harmony has been hindered and entirely destroyed.

2. He not only unjustly accused me, in my own house (during the five weeks he was with me), of various things; but, soon after his arrival, began to condemn our management of the school, and to denounce our labors with the children, and spoke of all manner of innovations and changes, from which I dreaded much mischief, and, to my regret, was compelled to oppose him.

3. He shamefully misrepresented me in the well meant arrangement of the salaries, in which, with the concurrence of the congregation, the salary of the ministers was increased one-half; sought to deprive me of my addition, and caused much uneasiness in the congregation in consequence thereof, and misrepresented the matter to the "Fathers."

4. He perverted and slandered the good arrangement of the mill-establishment, as though I designed to use it for my pri-

vate interest. 5. The sale of the minister's glebe, made by my deceased colleague and other members of the congregation, and confirmed by our "Fathers," he so shamefully perverted in regard to myself, as to misrepresent me to the congregation and the late Mr. Whitefield, as a thief, a cheat, and virtual swindler. 6. From the beginning to the present time, his greatest exertion has been to turn the hearts of the hearers from me, and to instil into them whatever might tend to lower me in their estimation. 7. He denied my lawful call to Ebenezer, my conduct in my office, the good testimony of my hearers concerning it, the good harmony existing between me and my deceased colleague in our pastoral relations; and I was greatly grieved in consequence thereof. 8. In addition to the dishonor inflicted upon my honest name, I was represented as a false teacher, a perverter, and a destroyer of the congregation. I must bear the blame of the division in the congregation, though it was effected by his own obstinacy and tyranny, he having most dreadfully abused, for the purpose, the preaching of the word of God, and the Holy Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. This last he refused to me myself, because I made known to our venerable Fathers the great distress of Ebenezer, and deduced its difficulties from the source mentioned, 2 Tim. 3: 1-9.

9. He abolished the fellowship of colleagues, to confer and pray, &c., with one another, for fear his affected superiority over me might not be sustained; in consequence of which in important cases, he rejected my remonstrances with hard criminations which he was unable to prove, and has so discouraged me, that I cannot venture at any time to enter into the relations of a colleague with him. 10. It being my special vocation to serve, in my office, others beside those in Ebenezer, I did not, however, wish to make a monopoly of it, but would have been much pleased, if Mr. Triebner had visited others also, in which case I would have labored only in Ebenezer, but he refused to comply; in consequence thereof I am compelled alone to serve other congregations, if they are not to be deprived altogether of the ministry in the Evangelical Lutheran church. But I having now done this, and having willingly given over to him the imagined superiority of a city Pastorate, I have been compelled to endure undeserved suffering, also for this reason, both from himself and in the congregation. I could never do right. If I came into town to preach, he invented all kinds of mischief and ill will—ran out of church—laughed at my preaching, to the great scandal of the congre-

gation, and also censoriously criticised my sermon. If I did not come to town to preach, I was calumniated and slandered as a fox, who made gaps and wished to fill his stomach with berries. *Sapientibus sat.* Christian Rabenhorst.

Ebenezer, Nov. 5, 1774.

No. III. *Articles of complaint by the Deacons of the congregation at Ebenezer, against Mr. Triebner and his adherents.*

1. Ingratitude.—It is undeniable, and manifest to the eyes and minds of the whole congregation, that Pastor Rabenhorst received Mr. Triebner on his arrival here, as a dear brother, yea, as an affectionate father his dear son; and that on the contrary, Mr. Triebner treated Mr. Rabenhorst in all things, as far as he could, after the example of Absalom.

2. Avarice or covetousness.—Mr. Triebner tried, through all kind of craft, to get all the money of the congregation into his hands, and persuaded the people who had bonds or obligations in Mr. Rabenhorst's hands, or were otherwise obligated to him, to pay the money to him, viz: to Mr. Triebner.

3. Anger and revenge.—When the deacons or the congregation met, Mr. Triebner began to be excited, and rave most unreasonably, and to abuse them, calling them liars, villains, &c.; yes, he even proceeded to such lengths as to make fists at them, and to thunder forth his curses and anathemas in violent passion most furiously before the pulpit.

4. Pride and arrogance—which vices he possesses in an eminent degree. God and the welfare of his hearers must yield to his honor, and be subordinate to it. He must be the superior and the highest in all things, and considers it beneath his dignity to suffer a co-equal, and much more, a superior. His honor appeared to be very much injured, when he was required to admit of any thing from Mr. Rabenhorst, or to do any thing after he (Rabenhorst) had already done the same.

5. Hatred, envy and implacableness.—He is hurt, if any one speaks well of, or for Mr. Rabenhorst and his friends; he heartily wishes him and them all manner of misfortune, even damnation itself, and seeks to mould all his creatures according to this, his own image. They hate and envy Mr. Rabenhorst and his friends, belie, persecute and slander him and his flock most dreadfully; deny him, not only all claim to the common property, but also to the vessels belonging to the church. The above is only a brief summary of our complaints, and a faint outline of the image of our Evangelical

minister, Christopher Frederick Triebner. May God have mercy upon him, and each one of us.

JOHN ADAM TREUTLEN
ULRICH NEIDLINGER
CHRISTIAN STEINER
JOSEPH SCHUBTREIN
SAMUEL KRAUSS
JACOB C. WALDHAUER.

Ebenezer, Nov. 5, 1774.

Nov. 8. I was indisposed and depressed on account of the many complaints and sinful distractions and confusion in the Ebenezer congregations. In the evening we were visited, by the Rev. Dr. Zubly, who has returned from Purisburg, and lodged over night at pastor Rabenhorst's, and entertained us with useful conversation. In the evening we read Ezech. cap. 47, and commented upon it.

Nov. 9. Conversation with Rev. Dr. Zubly. Esquire Treutlen came afterwards, followed by pastor Triebner. Pastor Rabenhorst rode away to preach. Mr. Triebner took me in the chaise to his home at Ebenezer, where I had the pleasure of again seeing and conversing with widow Gronau and widow Lenke, and their dear daughters; and where I dined also, and afterwards visited the former dwelling of the deceased pastor Bolzius. Mr. Treutlen came in the evening, and in the presence of pastor Triebner and Mr. Wertsch, proposed arbitration bonds; but they could not come to an understanding, and they feared some danger, as if *anguis sub herba latet*.

Nov. 10. Wrote a few lines to a deacon, Mr. Jacob Waldhauer. I had requested the deacons, &c., to meet in conference, here in Ebenezer, to-morrow, viz: on Friday the 11th. But as I am not yet ready, and do not wish to hurry myself, and intend, God willing, to remain here yet awhile, therefore I wish to postpone the conference to some future suitable time; and I requested Mr. Waldhauer to communicate this to the other deacons, that they might not come to-morrow in vain, and I sent also my respects to his family. At the same time I wrote a few lines in English to Esquire Treutlen. Afterwards pastor Triebner conducted morning worship; read in order, Isa. cap. 44, and closed with a very powerful prayer. About 10, A. M. I went with Mr. Triebner to Mr. Wertsch's house, in the second story of which, a few men, women and children were assembled, to whom he preached a Thanksgiving sermon, in view of the past harvest, from Joel 2: 23 to 27. Proposition: Encouragement to believers to praise God for the reception of spiritual and temporal blessings, &c.; he preached fluently,

practically, systematically and edifyingly. The house being near the Jerusalem's church, I heard the bell ringing twice, and learned that pastor Rabenhorst had preached in the church; and he came to us; and I besought the two ministers to meet me, God willing, to-morrow, here in the house of the deceased Bolzius, and confer with me privately. I received a few lines in answer from Esquire Treutlen, dated Nov. 10th inst.

Nov. 11. I conferred with pastor Rabenhorst and pastor Triebner in the house of Rev. Bolzius, deceased, from 10 A. M., till 4 P. M. In the evening I returned to pastor Rabenhorst's.

Nov. 12. Wrote two letters, one to Miss Mary Werley, and another to Mr. Kalteisen, in Charleston,¹ which Mr. Rossberg will take with him to Savannah and forward. Visited by two deacons, Messrs. Schubtrein and Neidlinger; and also by Jacob Mack. My daughter rode with Miss Treutlen, 14 miles, to her father's house.

Nov. 13. I rode with pastor Rabenhorst, and my wife with Mrs. Rabenhorst, to Ebenezer; we halted at pastor Triebner's, from which place we three ministers went to Jerusalem church, where I, an old bungler, had to preach before a large assemblage of persons, gathered from far and near, as is customary on occasions when any thing unusual occurs. We dined at pastor Triebner's. In the afternoon, pastor Rabenhorst gave instruction from the catechism, in Jerusalem church, which was full of young and old persons, who conducted themselves orderly and devoutly. He has an excellent gift and method in catechising. Pastor Triebner preached also a sermon in the afternoon, in Mr. Wertsch's house, to his few adherents, which seemed a sad and lamentable occurrence to me. Pastor Triebner showed me a letter from Rev. Pasche, dated, if I mistake not, Sept. of this year, in which I read with sorrow that pastor adjunctus Bolzius is dead already, and pastor Burgmann has been called away from London, &c. But I learned also, to my joy, that our beloved, venerable father Ziegenhagen is still alive. In the evening we returned to pastor Rabenhorst's. A vestryman of the small congregation in Gosen, which pastor Rabenhorst attends as a chapel of ease (filial), enquired whether I would not, God willing, preach for them next Sunday?—I promised to do so, with the consent of pastor Rabenhorst.

Nov. 14. I examined the papers and accounts of pastor

¹In the whole Journal Charleston is spelt "Charlestown," but I followed the former orthography for the benefit of modern readers, to distinguish it from Charlestown, in Massachusetts.

Rabenhorst, concerning the minister's glebe formerly belonging to the congregation, and made the following observations. 1. Rev. P. Bolzius, deceased, and Rev. Lemke, deceased, took possession, without a grant, of one hundred acres of land, and built a saw-mill thereon, (partly from the income of the old saw mill, and partly from voluntary contributions in Europe,) for the common benefit of Ebenezer (zum gemeinen Besten Ebenezers), but instead of benefit, it resulted in loss and injury.

2. The aforesaid one hundred acres and saw mill were sold to the person, who was then and afterwards, the trustee of this new institution for the support of the third minister in Ebenezer, for 50 pounds sterling, as appears from the agreement dated Feb. 25, 1754. The sellers, who signed it, were Rev. John Martin Bolzius, and Lemke. The witnesses were Messrs. Christian Rabenhorst, John Ludewig Meyer, John Flörl, Christian Leimberger and Simon Reuter. 3. These hundred acres were insufficient for such an institution. 4. Pastor Bolzius advised pastor Rabenhorst to apply to the English council for a grant for the five hundred acres, which he had a right to claim (every gentleman had a right to take up five hundred acres of land). Mr. Rabenhorst did so, and had 400 acres of his claim, and in addition to it, the one hundred acres with the saw mill, for which there was yet no grant, measured and both included in his grant; consequently the hundred acres with the saw mill, and the 400 acres of Mr. Rabenhorst's right, together 500 acres, formed the intended minister's glebe or parsonage. 5. Parson Rabenhorst lent, or presented these 500 acres to the congregation, for the support of a third minister, on the following four conditions, as appears from a document executed March 12, 1754, and signed by the donor, namely Christian Rabenhorst, and the above witnesses, Rev. Bolzius and Lemke, Meyer, Flörl, Leimberger and Reuter. The reserved conditions were as follows: 1. That no onera or taxes connected with the land, should rest on Mr. Rabenhorst personally. 2. That no one, who should be minister or member of the congregation, from time to time, should regard said land as his property, or sell it. 3. That it should always remain a parsonage or minister's glebe; first, for the use of the third minister in Ebenezer; and secondly, for the aid of the other ministers in Ebenezer. 4. In case the Institution to be founded thereon should not be created, then, 5. The right to the land should revert again to Mr. Rabenhorst, or his heirs, or to the King or government. 6. In consequence hereof, a number of

negroes was bought, and preparations were made to use the saw mill and to cultivate the land, which required money.— But the land being poor, and the saw mill unprofitable, and the fund or money to be invested therein in danger of being lost, our dear brethren in the ministry became concerned and afraid, and Rev. Bolzius resolved to relinquish the plantation, and to sell the land, the negroes, &c., and to make the best of the proceeds. Rev. Rabenhorst protested at first against the sale, consented, however, finally, and proposed to his colleague Bolzius, to become the purchaser himself, with divine help, on condition that our reverend Fathers would consent thereto. But in case the venerable fathers should not consent to the sale, then Mr. Rabenhorst offered to make an unconditional present of the land, and to surrender his right in the same. 7. Pastor Bolzius joyfully and thankfully approved of the sale of the plantation to Mr. Rabenhorst, and it was confirmed by our reverend Fathers willingly and with many good wishes, as appears from letters written by our reverend Fathers. 8. Consequently a deed was made, and the plantation and appurtenances were sold to Mr. Rabenhorst and his heirs, in fee simple for the sum of £649, 16sh, 5d, sterling. The deed is dated June 18, 1761. The sellers were Rev. John Martin Bolzius, Herman Heinrich Lemke, John Flörl, Senr., Theobald Kiestor, George Faul, and Christopher Krämer. The witnesses were C. E. Thilo and John Casper Wertsch. 9. Pastor Rabenhorst gave to the sellers his obligation or bond for £649, 16sh, 5d, as the purchase money, at the time when the deed was delivered, conditioned to pay the capital in eight years, and in the meanwhile to receive the interest of said sum, at 5 per cent, as part of his salary as third minister. If, however, within the eight years, Mr. Rabenhorst should be directed to another pastoral charge and adequate salary, then he would either pay the capital of £649, 16sh, 5d, sterling, in such manner as our reverend Fathers, as directors, should appoint; or pay the interest thereof, at 6 per cent, sterling, per annum, as long as the capital remained in his hands. As our reverend Fathers have hitherto not changed his station, and have given no orders whether, or where, or to whom, or for what purpose he shall pay the capital; therefore the capital still remains safely with him, and until further orders, he is willing to receive the interest of the capital at 6 per cent, as two thirds of the salary stipulated for him by our reverend Fathers. What value had Rev. Rabenhorst now received for such a capital of £649, 16sh, 5d? Answer: 1. 400 acres of his own land, which had first been granted to him in fee simple by the King,

the same as to other genteel inhabitants; thus he bestowed 400 acres to the Institution, and afterwards had to buy them again. Does this evidence self-interest? 2. A saw-mill, very seldom useful, having frequently too much, and very often too little water. 3. One hundred acres of poor land, with the saw mill, which hundred he was compelled to have located and granted as owner, with his own 400 acres, because some one else could have taken them away, not being granted.

4. What more did Mr. Rabenhorst receive in value for his capital of £649, 16sh, 5d? Answer: I have examined the inventory, in which, among other things, I find when he received the plantation, he was charged with the following:

a) For the saw mill and small frame house, ricketty cattle sheds and stables,	£50 Sterling.
b) By pastor Lemke for repairs of said wooden buildings,	£17 19 sh. 7 d.
c) For surveying the land,	5 2 6
d) For a claim made by a man on 50 acres of this land,	3 15 3
e) Further; he is charged with eleven negroes, aged and children, some of them feeble and worn out, and one negress (a girl) had already died; and for all kinds of trumpery, hoes, shovels, &c.	363 18 00
f) To this was added, the voluntary collections which our Reverend Fathers had sent, and were already expended on the plantation before it was sold to Mr. Rabenhorst,	209 1 1
	<hr/>
	£649 16 sh. 5 d.

The total amounts to the sum which pastor Rabenhorst has obligated himself to pay, namely to £649. 16 sh. 5 d.

NOTE. From Jan. 2, 1757, to the time of sale, June 18, 1761, while the minister's glebe still belonged to the congregation, and was under the superintendence of the Rev. Ministers Lemke and Rabenhorst, the following sums were expended thereon:

	£	sh.	d.
1. Bill of Exchange from Senior Wilsperger, in April 1758,	45	04	8
2. Another Bill of Exchange, Aug. 24, 1759,	43	00	0
3. July 10, 1760, per pastor Bolzius, from Hallische Account,	3	18	0
4. July 15, 1760, another Bill of Exchange from the Reverend Senior Urlsperger (the congregation owing on the plantation £76. 17 sh. 7 d.)	76	18	5
5. April 7, 1761. Shortly before the sale of the plantation, pastor Bolzius gave	40	00	0
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
The above sums amount to	£209	1	1

The whole sum of voluntary collections, expended on the plantation before it was sold to pastor Rabenhorst, amounts therefore to £440 15 sh. 4 d.

NOTE. What a fortunate circumstance that the plantation was sold to pastor Rabenhorst ! Inasmuch as the free will offerings to the fund for the minister's salary are preserved, and the purchase money amounts to £649. 16 sh. 5 d. sterling, is so perfectly secure with pastor Rabenhorst, until further orders from our reverend guardian fathers, that it could not well be better invested in this country. Well could our beloved brother, pastor Bolzius, rejoice and be comforted that the plantation was sold to the faithful pastor Rabenhorst ; and justly could our reverend fathers assent to the sale, and confirm it with many kind wishes ; for it would not have been an easy matter to find any one who would first make a present of his proprietary right to 500 acres, and afterwards purchase such a plantation for £649 16 sh. 5 d. sterling. If, through divine Providence, pastor Rabenhorst had not lawfully inherited from Mr. Krafft, deceased, an adjoining better piece of land, it would have been impossible for him to have taken the minister's glebe, and still more to pay such a price for it as £649, &c., and these £649 sterling would therefore have been lost. It is prudent and wise in our Reverend Fathers to judge it reasonable, that Rev. Rabenhorst should receive the interest of the capital at 5 per cent, until a change in office should alter the circumstances of the case. For what avails even a Jew's interest, if neither capital nor interest is secured. Scarcely one in twenty, and especially among ministers, understands how to cultivate a farm in a profitable manner. And if pastor Rabenhorst had not obtained some means through his pious wife, and a blessing from God, he would have stuck fast, for it requires capital and causes expense to farm such a plantation, and to sustain through the year a large family of negroes and laborers, and to support them sick and well. How hard and critical was it not for a beginner, after having bought and entered upon his plantation, to have a barn, built with his funds, destroyed at night, together with its contents, by fire, and the loss amounting to £100 sterling ; another year to have three of his negroes die, also costing a sum of money ; and again, the harvest of rice, gathered with toil and labor, to be consumed by fire, the loss on which, according to the prevailing price, amounting to at least £100 sterling. I do not see that the plantation can hinder him in the least in fulfilling the duties of the ministry. He conducts his morning and evening worship without omission, when at home. He preaches Sundays and during the week days, in Jerusalem and Zion's churches, and in the filial chapels of ease in Gosen and Savannah ; exerts himself especially to catechise the young ; visits the schools and the

sick members; and his upright and pious wife is a very sensible, exemplary, industrious and skillful housewife; and as regards the plantation work, he keeps a negro to superintend, so that he himself may lose no time thereby. When I reflect, that he received his call as third minister of Ebenezer, through divine Providence, by means of the lamented Senior Urlsperger; when I reflect, that the worthy man had the opportunity of laboring in the ministry with the estimable and faithful brethren Bolzius and Lemke, and of becoming well acquainted with the circumstances of Ebenezer; when I see with my own eyes, and hear with my own ears in intercourse, that the man possesses a heart of grace, excellent gifts to preach, and still more aptness to catechise; that he insists upon a new creature in Christ Jesus, upon radical repentance, living faith and daily renewal, and that he adorns his sound doctrine with an edifying, sober and godly life, &c. &c.; when I reflect on all this, I must wonder in my simplicity, what could have been the preponderating reasons which prevented our reverend Fathers from appointing Rev. Rabenhorst first preacher, after the death of Rev. Lemke, and even induced them to place at his side, as second preacher, a young man who, although well meaning and gifted, was nevertheless inexperienced, passionate, and a dangerous novice; and moreover, to continue Rev. Rabenhorst as third preacher! Most heartily would I have regarded myself as fortunate, if the Lord God had lent us in Pennsylvania, a laborer like Mr. Rabenhorst, and I would rejoice, even in my last days, if I were permitted to be the adjunct or diaconus of such a teacher. On the 11th inst., last Friday, I witnessed an instructive occurrence. Both ministers, Rev. Rabenhorst and Triebner, at my request, presented their written gravamina [grievances] against each other, and I conferred with them privately, to effect a reconciliation, if possible.— Their written documents and accusations against each other were so severe, that it made me shudder, and my heart wept, and I implored them with tears to bury all the past, to forgive each other cordially, and to be perfectly reconciled. And, although Mr. Rabenhorst had been most grossly wronged, and had been assailed publicly, in honor, office and reputation, yet he was the first, with tears, to extend his hand to his offender, to forgive every thing, and to ask forgiveness. Mr. Triebner could not persuade himself to ask forgiveness, except conditionally; if he had injured him in the way or mode of treatment towards him; and this was founded on the instructions he had received from our reverend Fathers, from which he had derived a bad impression of Mr. Rabenhorst, else he had not

been deficient towards him, but he would forgive him nevertheless, &c., &c. After this conference, which lasted six hours, Mr. Rabenhorst went with me to Mr. Triebner's house, and we ate with him.

With heartfelt sorrow I must humbly remark, that the Ebenezer congregations are not far from their destruction, and will soon be ruined, unless some saving remedy can yet be applied!

1. The large new Jerusalem church in Ebenezer was granted or chartered very imprudently or else cunningly, under the jurisdiction of the Established church of England. 2. The direction of the mills, which pastor Bolzius, before his death, by a written instrument entrusted to pastor Lemke, and which pastor Lemke assigned by similar means to pastor Rabenhorst, caused Mr. Rabenhorst so many undeserved slanders and misrepresentations among the ignorant, on account of the insinuations of Mr. Triebner and his adherents, that he became weary of and resigned it; and now Mr. Triebner and his brother-in-law Wertsch, &c. are striving for it and obtain the receipts. 3. Mr. Triebner, Wertsch and their party, are endeavoring to make pastor Rabenhorst pay over to Mr. Wertsch &c. the £649 sterling of the plantation, under the plea that he would pay £8 per cent. interest for it, which looks plausible to the common people.

Mr. Wertsch having already in his hands a considerable sum of the purchased store money, and hoping to add to it the fund of Mr. Rabenhorst, and being the cause that the Jerusalem church was either through stupidity or carelessness brought under foreign jurisdiction: it is easy to see, therefore, that the whole would be diverted into an unnatural channel, and strangers would reap where they had neither toiled nor sown, &c. According to my humble opinion, it would be advisable for our reverend Fathers to appoint pastor Rabenhorst the first preacher; to condescend to a gracious paternal correspondence, and earnestly to admonish Mr. Triebner to conduct himself more humbly, more fraternally, and more uprightly towards and with his colleague, under penalty of losing his salary from "the Society." In this manner the two parties might be more readily united; the stumbling-block of the difference between the ministers more easily be removed; and at all events, the fund now in the hands of Mr. Rabenhorst, be saved and secured to the direction and disposal of our reverend Fathers. It were desirable that the unfortunate Mr. Triebner had never come to Ebenezer with his unhappy and sectarian temperament.

Some misunderstandings were caused also between Mr. Rabenhorst and the deceased ministers, Messrs. Bolzius and Lemke, but not in their pastoral office and in the cause of Christ, but merely minor matters. But the present strife is injurious to souls, and causes inextinguishable, bitter hatred among the people to children's children, and the kingdom of Satan is promoted thereby. Two ministers are enough and too much for Ebenezer; but three ministers are too many. An old, sensible, and deeply pious minister as pastor, and an adjunct, would probably succeed best; for it is almost impossible to succeed without subordination. We could not have got along in Pennsylvania, if some of my younger brethren in the ministry had not, in various things, yielded and deferred to other councils, until their horns were rubbed off and their eyes opened. In my humble estimation, Mr. Rabenhorst is the only man possessed of understanding and experience, who, with divine assistance, can save the Ebenezer congregations from destruction; if the reverend Fathers will appoint him first preacher, will hold Mr. Triebner tighter in hand, and will honor Mr. Rabenhorst with a paternal and familiar correspondence. He will either restore honestly the capital of £649 sterling to our reverend Fathers for better security, direction and disposition, according to the object of the kind benefactors, or pay it according to their order and direction. His property is sufficient security for the capital in his hands.

Nov. 15. I spent this day in writing. Nov. 16. In the morning pastor Rabenhorst took me to Zion's church, where he had appointed to preach a thanksgiving sermon on account of the past harvest. He catechized first the school children, and preached afterwards warmly and edifyingly from Deut. 2: 7. A copy of a few lines I wrote to pastor Triebner: "My reverend brother in the ministry; I am somewhat indisposed this week and cannot undertake any thing; but next week, according to your good advice, I will hold a confrence with the trustees, viz.: on Tuesday morning at 10 o'clock, in the house of Rev. Bolzius, dec., and on Wednesday at the same time and place with the complainants, pro and con, of both parties. For this purpose I transmit the articles of accusation, or the charges, with the humble request, that my brother in the ministry will please notify Mr. Wertsch and Mr. Flörl and whoever may be connected as trustee with the land, mill, churches, &c. to attend on Tuesday; and those nominated by you, Messrs. Krämer, Flörl, &c. to attend on Wednesday. On next Sunday, the Lord willing, I shall preach in Gosen. In conclusion, I implore you for the sake of Christ and his cause,

of our worthy Fathers, of many friends and of many souls, to exert yourself to the utmost, to pray and strive, &c. that both parties may be reunited and be served in common!— Where two parties oppose each other, there is sorrow and shame. “A house divided against itself cannot stand,” &c. The charges in the accusation between the two ministers were already acted upon and settled in our Conference of the 11th inst. I, too, have experienced such sad congregational difficulties in America, and used this christian maxim, namely, acknowledged my fault, offered reconciliation and forgiveness, and asked for the same; and thus generally the hardest hearts were softened, and the whole matter was speedily adjusted. When strife arises, proper limits are passed, and all sides are apt to fail, and among the holy ones of God none are blameless; where will we find one entirely pure? He that has learned in the high school of Christ, will say, with “a meek and lowly heart,” Lord, who can understand his errors? The worthy servants of the Lord will possess especially this virtue: to acknowledge with an humble and sorrowful heart, also before men, their infirmities and errors, if the kingdom of God can be benefited thereby.

To defend and maintain our errors &c., manifests a low unchristian spirit, or a soul without a spirit. Pastor Rabenhorst has not repented the reconciliation of Nov. 11th, on the contrary when a suitable opportunity presents itself, he says: “there is peace between us.” He cordially remembers his colleague in prayer at family worship, which greatly gratifies me. I hope it is the same on your part. With affectionate remembrance to your mother-in-law, your estimable wife and whole family, I wish to be and to remain my brother in the ministry’s humble servant,

MÜHLENBERG.

Ebenezer, Nov. 15, 1774.

A true copy of the Original.

(a) *On the outside* is written: “Power of Attorney to the reverend pastor adjunctus A. H. Lemke, to direct the mill institutions generally, given to him April 15, 1757, after due consideration by me, John Martin Bolzius, minister in the Evangelical Lutheran congregation; and renewed August 19, 1765, without any alteration whatever therein.

After my death this power of Attorney is to be delivered to my dear colleague, Mr. Christian Rabenhorst, just as I have received it from Mr. Bolzius.

H. HENRY LEMKE.

Ebenezer, April 30, 1767.

(b) *Inside* is written as follows :

“I. N. J. Not knowing how soon the Lord of life and death may summon me from this world, and it being my duty daily to set my house in order to prevent, as far as possible, all confusion and misunderstanding after my decease ; therefore, with the advice of my worthy colleague, I have found it good and necessary to inform my colleague, brother-in-law and godfather (Gevatter), H. H. Lemke, as adjunct pastor and my intended successor in office, of the erection and object of our two grist mills, the saw mill and the rice stamping mill, and to authorize him through this document to superintend said mills during my life and after my death, so that the intended object may be gradually attained, which is this :

1, That all the mills shall not only be preserved, but also strengthened and improved.

2, That in the lapse of time the revenues are to be applied for the support of other institutions in the Ebenezer congregations, such as churches and schools, parsonages and school teachers' dwellings with the assistance of the labor of the members of the congregation, and for the better remuneration of the ministers and schoolmasters.

3, That widows, orphans, sick and superannuated persons may receive aid from it also.

The erection of the aforesaid mills was after this manner : Some years ago the congregation intreated me to give them only 10 or £11 sterling to build a small, simple mill, to answer their pressing wants to grind their Indian corn, wheat and rye. The building having been commenced, with the aid of the greater part of the male members of the congregation, at the place where the mills now stand, it soon appeared that the money was totally inadequate, notwithstanding the millstones were obtained gratis from General Oglethorpe, and likewise some ironwork, at my application. I was compelled, therefore to suffer the Orphan-house to be broken up, (the congregation having no pleasure in it at any rate, and desiring rather to have the children in their service, on account of the scarcity of servants) and to apply the funds in my hands to this building. Through the inexperience of the builders, so poor a mill-dam was erected, that not only all the congregational labor, but likewise a large sum of money was lost ; for the dam often got dangerous holes, and finally had to be entirely torn down with much labor and cost ; the injurious fascines and all the wood work had to be dug up, and an entirely new dam

had to be erected at much expense, with a low race to be used in low water, as the first race was to be used in high water; the money for which I received in part from the Trustees, and in part from other kind benefactors (after repeated written applications from me), through the blessed hands of our reverend Fathers in London, Augsburg and Halle. And the trustees were so kind, that, at my request, they not only presented us more good mill-stones, but also all the ironwork from their dilapidated saw-mill in old Ebenezer, likewise all the boards sawed there and the laths. Having now so much ironwork and boards and laths, and the grist-mills being yet unable to sustain themselves, I was advised to build a saw-mill, in order to preserve and repair the, to us, indispensable grist-mills, which was done; and to accomplish which I was compelled, in reliance on God, to borrow the money, and in which, as in the whole matter, He led me by His parental providence in a wonderful, wise, gracious and powerful manner, so that through a blessing on the mills springing from this act, and through some European gifts of love it gradually came to pass, that the whole debt created on account of building this important saw-mill, for securing the dam, and for making the second race to the grist-mill to grind in high and low water, as likewise the rice shelling and stamping mill, was accurately liquidated. The members of the congregation contributed nothing to this, but they had abundant reason to thank God cordially for the great blessing of the mills, and for the good opportunity they enjoyed, far and near, to earn money in their poverty. Inasmuch as one received no money, but trade, for the boards, it was therefore necessary to begin a trading concern, or store, for which I supplied the fund from the European charities received in Mr. Meyer's time. From the above statement, to which all the yet living Saltzburgers can testify as truth, (much of which is also known to Mr. Lemke), it appears most clearly that the wondrous God has used me, unworthy one, as a weak instrument to procure money, mill-stones, iron work, &c. &c., for the creation and preservation of these extensive mill works, and to lay the foundation of the mill trade; and hence there remaineth no doubt that I am authorized to delegate the supervision or management of these mill institutions, and also of the trade connected therewith, to my worthy colleague and successor, Lemke, *alone* and to no other beside or over him, which I do hereby solemnly, in the name of God and our "Reverend Fathers," after having well considered and weighed the matter. May the Lord bless his labors, counsels and acts

in this important work to the honor of His great name, and to the accomplishment of all the aforesaid good objects!

Ebenezer in Georgia, April 15, 1757.

JOHN MARTIN BOLZIUS,
Minister in that place.”

Memorandum. I, the subscriber, (empowered agent), do testify that the above assignments are the genuine handwriting and personal subscription of the late Reverend pastors, John Martin Bolzius and Herman Henry Lemke, as certified,

HENRY MELCHIOR MÜHLENBERG.

Ebenezer, Nov. 16, 1774.

Nov. 17. Cold, unpleasant snow air. Rev. Rabenhorst and lady have gone five miles to Ebenezer. He intends to preach a thanksgiving sermon in the Jerusalem's church; and parson Triebner has appointed also to preach near the church, in Mr. Wertsch's house to his party, which causes me head and heart ache! The Lord grant that the two parties may soon be united! It requires time, trouble and labor to build a house; but any passionate, unwise and imprudent boy can easily set it on fire and destroy it in a short time. Eccle. 9: 13-18.

Nov. 18. Yesterday I wrote a sheet full of the Journal, extracted from Nov. 7 to Nov. 17, of this year, and dated yesterday; and to-day I filled another sheet, dated this day. I put them up, in order to send them to London and Augsburg to our reverend Fathers. In the afternoon we were visited by pastor Triebner, who informed us that a member of his party, J. B. had died this morning, and would be buried to-morrow in the town. He desired to know whether pastor Rabenhorst, as co-trustee of the Jerusalem's church, would permit him (Mr. Triebner) to preach a funeral sermon to-morrow in the church to the funeral attendants. Their being five trustees (three constituting a majority), and two of them belonging to Mr. Triebner's party, consequently it depended on Mr. Rabenhorst, who by his casting vote made the majority. Pastor Rabenhorst gave his consent, which was wise and pleased me, as a refusal would have embittered the opposition still more, and a permission may, perhaps, aid in appeasing them. In the two sheets designed for our Reverend Fathers, I have reported among other things, 1, the reconciliation between the two ministers of Nov. 11th. 2, the beginning, continuation and sale of the minister's glebe; 3, a statement of how many collections were expended on said plantation, namely:

- a. The total of monies invested by the late Mr. Lemke, as Director of the plantation, in the funds of the salary, and given by him to Mr. Rabenhorst, as per inventory, is £440 15 sh. 4 d.

b. The total of all monies transmitted from time to time to Mr. Rabenhorst, as successor in the direction of the plantation until he bought the plantation, as the account shows in its items, is £209 1 sh. 1 d.

This amounts in all to 649 16 5

and is the total purchase money.

By items :	£	sh.	d.
a.) April 1, 1758. A bill of exchange from Senior Urlsperger,	45	4	8
b.) Aug. 24, 1759. Another bill of exchange,	43	0	0
c.) July 10. From Mr. Bolzius on account of Halle, . . .	3	18	00
d.) July 15, 1760. A bill of exchange from Senior Urlsperger,	76	18	05
e.) April 7, 1761. From Mr. Bolzius, shortly before the sale,	40	0	0
Total, . . .	209	1	1

4, I described the character of pastor Rabenhorst and wife; 5, a copy of the letter to Mr. Triebner; 6, that pastor Rabenhorst received nothing from Mr. von Brahm.

Nov. 19. I examined the following plan communicated to me by a friend: "Inasmuch as the present circumstances and the welfare of the Ebenezer congregations require, as it were, an entirely new arrangement and order, in which not only the members of said congregation shall obligate and bind themselves among and toward each other, but likewise both our Ebenezer ministers, the one to the other, as also toward the whole congregation, their hearers, and the hearers towards the ministers: therefore aforesaid ministers, Rev. Christian Rabenhorst, and second preacher, Rev. Christopher Frederick Triebner, (with the approbation of the vestry and with the consent of all the regular members, and with the assent of the *empowered representative* of the Rev. Directory in London, Augsburg and Halle, as members of the venerable Society in England and benefactors of the Evangelical Lutheran Protestant congregations in and about Ebenezer, holding to the unaltered Augsburg Confession,) have resolved and enacted: 1) that the yet living pastor, Christian Rabenhorst, (on account of his prior lawful call, and of his long and faithful ministry, and of his acquired experience,) shall be accounted and esteemed the first minister in said Ebenezer congregation holding to the Augsburg Confession, both by his colleague, Rev. Triebner, the second minister, and his successors, as likewise by the whole congregation; and this in order, age and rank.

2) Neither of the preachers, as far as the ministration of his preaching and of his pastoral duties is concerned, shall act arbitrarily, on the contrary they shall proceed as one man, conferring with one another, and examining as colleagues what may be best for the congregation, as souls entrusted to their care. Should cases occur in which said ministers cannot agree then the lawfully elected elders and deacons shall be convened,

the matter be impartially weighed with them, and after due consideration shall be decided by a majority of votes, and be entered upon the protocol signed by those who have passed upon it.

3. That said ministers may be able to conduct their office more untrammelled and with greater benefit (as is hoped), they shall be spared as much as possible from all outward, temporal and worldly business and concerns; especially shall they abstain from any special or peculiar assumption in the government or direction of the pecuniary matters and congregational institutions; and they shall manifest themselves as servants of Christ and messengers of peace, yea, as stewards of the mysteries of God.

4. If, however, (which may God forbid!) any of our ministers should fall into doctrinal errors against the fundamental and chief truths of our Evangelical Lutheran creed in God's holy word of the Old and New Testament, contrary to the Augsburg Confession, or violate the moral and civil laws, it being susceptible of proof by impartial and unexceptional evidence and witnesses, then the remaining minister, with the assistance of the elders and deacons, shall investigate the matter, and, if found true, suspend such transgressor from his office by a majority of votes of the vestry and regular members of the congregation, and report the facts specifically to the Reverend Directors in London, Augsburg or Halle, and he shall remain suspended until the good pleasure of our Reverend Fathers concerning it shall be known, or until he shall have satisfied the congregation for his offence by confession, contrition and repentance.

5. Inasmuch as said ministers and pastors receive for their services a considerable portion of their salary from the plantation fund, and from the venerable Society for propagating the Gospel; and inasmuch as the same is insufficient for their temporal support and bodily wants, and our reverend Fathers themselves have thought proper to add to the salary of each of the ministers, to the amount of sixty pounds sterling annually, from the revenue of the congregational institutions: therefore the vestry, or elders and deacons, of the Ebenezer congregation, shall take care that the salary of their ministers be annually completed out of the revenues of the congregational institutions. And in case the salary hitherto specified be inadequate, then the vestry for the time being, or the elders and deacons as they are called, shall provide an addition from the congregational treasury (because, according to the doctrines of Jesus Christ and his holy apostles, and also of our Augsburg

Confession, worthy servants of the Gospel are to receive an adequate support from the service of the Gospel) according as their necessities may require; and this the more as the collections and the established funds, gathered and sent by our reverend Fathers were more especially designed to preserve and continue in the Ebenezer congregation a healthy nourishment for souls in doctrine and life, through the word of God, according to the Augsburg Confession.

6. All the various trustees shall annually present a written report to the regularly elected vestry, or elders and deacons, of the Protestant Lutheran congregation of the Augsburg Confession in and about Ebenezer, of the bonds, obligations or sums of money belonging to said congregation which have been entrusted to them as trustees and are in their hands, and shall give a correct account of them. Such annual accounts shall be signed by the oldest or first preacher, together with the vestry, and be forwarded to the Reverend Directors, Fathers and Benefactors, or their appointed successors, in Europe, that they may know what application is made of the collections they have sent hither. The expense of such correspondence, must be defrayed from the treasury of this congregation.

7. All those who wish to be regular members of the Ebenezer congregation holding to the Augsburg Confession and its economy, (or order) and to conform to it, are obligated to contribute annually, according to their ability, as much as may be required for the support of the churches, the schools and other necessities.

8. The following shall be the requisitions in regard to the election, the office and the duties of the elders and deacons of the congregation, as contained in the vestry book, namely, &c. &c. &c."

NOTE.—In a note appended to this "Journal," page 542 of the *Ev. Review*, it is stated that Israel Heintzleman was "the father of the late Dr. Heintzleman, of Philadelphia." This is a mistake into which the Translator was led by erroneous information received from Dr. H's family, they being ignorant of the true state of the matter. Israel died unmarried, as appears from the *Journal*, &c. The remainder of the note is correct. TR.

ARTICLE IX.

GOD'S WAY THE BEST.

By Henry Mills, D. D., of Auburn, N. York.

A Hymn from the German of Paul Gerhardt. "*Befiehl du deine Wege.*"

1. Commit thy way, confiding,
When trials here arise,
To him whose hand is guiding
The tumults of the skies.
There, clouds and tempests, raging,
Have each its path assigned;
Will GOD, for thee engaging,
No way of safety find?
2. Trust in the LORD! His favor
Will for thy wants provide,
Regard *his* word!—and ever
Thy work shall safe abide.
When sorrows here o'ertake thee,
And self-inflicted care,
Let not thy GOD forsake thee!—
He listens for thy pray'r.
3. Thine eye that's never weary,
Thou GOD of truth and grace,
Sees all that's bright, or dreary,
Befalling all our race:
Of faith—whate'er opposes—
Thou wilt' the cause maintain;
And, when the conflict closes,
Thy vict'ry shall be seen.
4. Thy way thro' nature reaches,
Nor fails its onward course;
Thy work of goodness teaches
Of good the only source:
Thy skill, by naught impeded,
Will what is best pursue;
All by thy people needed
Thine arm of strength will do.
5. Should Satan league his forces,
GOD's purpose to withstand,
Think not their rage and curses
Can stay his lifted hand!
When he makes known his pleasure,
The counsel of his will,
That, in its utmost measure,
Will he at last fulfil.
6. Hope on then!—weak believer,
Hope on, and falter not!
He will thy soul deliver
From deeps of troubled thought.
Thy graces he will nourish,
With hope thy heart employ,

Till faith and love shall flourish
And yield their fruits of joy.

7. Up, Up!—bid now to sorrow
And all thy cares—“Good night!”
Why trouble seek, and borrow
A charge that’s not thy right?—
Thou art not made controller,
How things should be to tell;
'Tis GOD that sits the Ruler,
Directing all things well.
8. The plan to his discretion,
And all its parts, resign?
Thou’lt find, on its completion,
The wonder will be thine—
How, what by thee was noted
As dark,—now understood,—
Most wisely has promoted
His glory, and thy good.
9. 'Tis true, that for a season
GOD may his gifts restrain,
And leave thee room to reason—
‘If all thy trust be vain;’
Or,—while thy hope shall waver,
Thy fears and griefs prevail,
To ask—“Must then GOD’s favor
And all his mercies fail?”
10. But if the trial, ended,
Shall show thy love is true;
His love, to thee extended,
Will show his wisdom too.
From sorrows that oppress thee,
He will thy peace restore,
And by these sorrows bless thee
With heart to love him more.
11. Well bless’d,—such grace receiving!
GOD owns thee for a son!
With joy, and with thanksgiving,
Behold the victor’s crown!
Thy hand the palm-branch raises,—
GOD gives it thee, to bear;—
Then shout aloud *his* praises
Who has removed thy care!
12. The sorrows, LORD, that try us,
O bring them to an end!
With needed strength supply us!
Thy love to us commend!
That we, till death, pursuing
The best—thy chosen—way,
May then, our life renewing,
Praise thee in endless day.

ARTICLE X.

WAYLEN'S REMINISCENCES OF THE UNITED STATES.

Ecclesiastical Reminiscences of the United States, by the REV. EDWARD WAYLEN, late Rector of Christ Church, Rockville, Maryland. Eleven years resident in America. NEW YORK; Wiley and Putnam. 1846; p. 501.

SUCH is the title of a clever volume, decently written, handsomely printed, and containing divers matters of interest to men in general, and to Churchmen in particular. It is the production of an Englishman who came to this country in 1834, took orders in the Protestant Episcopal Church, served several years as the rector of a few small parishes, visited some of our principal places of interest, and finally returned to the land of his birth. The work seems to have been designed mainly for British reading, but is not devoid of interest to us, as showing the thoughts and impressions which are produced in an English mind by American affairs. It is a book which certain classes in this country will read with pleasure, while others will not fail to award it their anathemas for its British insolence, and its high church hauteur.

As we are informed in the preface, it is "intended to demonstrate—if further historical demonstration be necessary—the Divine character of that glorious institution of EPISCOPACY, which," we are gravely told, "is the inseparable note and mark of the church universal in all its true branches, wherever their blessed shade is offered to the members of the human family." And however much the skeptical may be disposed to resist the mode of argument which Mr. W. proposes, he seems perfectly satisfied, that "the wonderful success attending the early, and, more especially, the later efforts of those who have been laboring under the banner of Apostolic Order in the Western Continent, and the remarkable manner in which the *Ark* which they guide has been saved from those fearful storms which have shattered, or greatly impaired, *every other vessel* around her, sufficiently prove to the eye of faith, the Divine character of glorious Episcopacy." What disposition he makes of the Savior's prediction, that "many *false prophets* shall arise, and shall deceive *many*, we are not advised. In our case, it appears to "the eye of faith," as well as to the eye of reason, that in this, and such like passages from holy Scripture, we are pointedly certified that the success of a doctrine furnishes no guarantee of its truth.

But as there is a difference, in human reckoning, between the intention and the fruit of that intention, so these Reminiscences are not as controversial in their character as the preface would seem to indicate. History, politics, ethics, biography, descriptions of natural and architectural curiosities, and all the other great themes of a traveller's journal, are introduced and commingled in a way which he alone who reads, can understand. We now and then have an interesting picture, and occasionally some sober and natural reflections. Our attention is now called to the beautiful scenery on the Hudson; now to the thundering cataract of Niagara; now to the solemn worship of some splendid church. Here we are favored with a peep into some "sectarian meeting-house," and there we are introduced to the private apartments of the author's host. We are first instructed as to the natural and artificial features of Boston, Lowell, and Concord; and the next step brings us to the condition of the "Calvinian heresy." We listen to "a bear story;" the inscription on Whitfield's grave; and to the account of the Salem witches; as they come in singular variety, and are borne to our ears by almost the same breath. But the leading subject of the book, which breaks upon our attention through every thing else, is "*glorious Episcopacy.*" And in his adherence to this, a more conceited bigot we have never met. Without the least apparent difficulty of conscience or reason, he denies church-membership to all communions this side of the Atlantic, save to Anglo-American Episcopalians. He holds New England Congregationalism responsible for "the executions, the nose slittings, the ear shearings, the tongue borings, the unmerciful whippings, the fines, the imprisonments, starvings, and perpetual banishments which the early history of the colony affords," and especially for the tragedy of "the Salem witchcraft delusion;" and hence insists that its history marks it as of the devil. And this conclusion he takes to his heart with as much pleasure as if the English clergy had nothing to do with the superstitions and severities which marked the reigns of James and the Charleses; or as if there were no Episcopal duplicity in the alienation of the Swedes of Delaware from the church of the Augsburg Confession. His Roman Catholic neighbors he condemns as schismatics, for the reason that the "Anglo-American Hierarchy" had taken possession of the ground *two years* earlier than they; and thus claims for his own party the exclusive name of "*The American Church*;" as though there had been no regularly constituted *Lutheran clergymen* on the ground before either of them, and meaning of course, that if he were placed in Italy or Mex-

ico, he would feel himself bound to enter the Romish communion. And with the same originality, astuteness, and self-satisfaction, he disposes of the claims of all other christian professors in America.

“O wad some Power the gift’ie gi’ us,
To see ourselves as others see us;
It wad from many a blunder free us,
And foolish notion!”

X. J. S.

ARTICLE XI.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

- (1.) *Der Brief an die Hebräer. In sech- und dreissig Betrachtungen ausgelegt von Rudolf Stier, Pfarrer zu Wichlinghausen in Barmen. Halle, C. A. Schwetschke und Sohn. 1842. — The Epistle to the Hebrews, explained in thirty-six dissertations, by Rudolph Stier, &c.*

THIS work is one of Stier’s earlier productions, having preceded the commentary on our Lord’s Discourses, and the others which have already been noticed. It is, like the expositions of the Ep. of James, designed for the general reader, in search of instruction and edification, and hence the practical element is decidedly preponderant. The entire exposition is adapted to the wants of those who are not learned theologians, philological criticism and theological disquisition being entirely excluded. A mind like Stier’s is not only constantly, but rapidly growing. Hence the priority in time, of the present work, appears, perhaps, in its greater diffuseness, in the absence of that terse compactness, that concise directness of exposition, that concentrated power of application, which characterize the exposition of the Ep. of St. James. But there are no where evidences of feebleness. The work exhibits the same profound insight into the meanings and bearings of sacred truth which our author displays elsewhere; the same spiritual unction pervades it throughout; the same fervor of devotional feeling; the same earnest desire and faithful endeavor to awaken in his readers the spirit of inquiry after all those things that pertain unto life and godliness, — to lead them into the penetralia of the sanctuary, to unfold to them those great truths, in which religion lives, and moves, and has its being, and to impress them with the necessity and excite in them the desire, of realizing, experimentally, their enlightening, saving, and sanctifying power. While some of Stier’s works profusely exhibit profound and exceedingly extensive learning, a prominent characteristic of them all is the deep impress which they bear of the author’s own enlightened and fervent piety, of his own high-toned and healthy religious character. To those who minister in holy things, the work before us will be a profitable study, and afford ample homiletical materials.

(2.) *Gedichte, christliche und biblische. Neue Sammlung und Bearbeitung, von Rudolf Stier, Pfarrer zu Wichlinghausen in Barmen. Barmen, 1845; Bei W. Langewiesche.—Poems, christian and biblical; a new collection, revised and improved. By Rudolph Stier, &c.*

We are now enabled to confirm, from personal examination, the opinion of foreign critics, which, some time ago, we presented in the pages of this Review, respecting the poems of Stier. They form a neat volume, of nearly 300 pp., and treat of a great variety of subjects, regularly classified under two general heads: I. Christian Poems and Hymns in general: II. Biblical Poems in particular. A brief notice like the present, can only serve to direct attention to a work like this. The lovers of religious poetry will find them a rich feast. Their poetic merit is of a high order, and they breathe a spirit of devotion truly delightful. In the piety that animates them, the artless simplicity of the child, and the freshness and ardor of youth, are not superseded, but exalted, dignified and gently tempered, by the deeper experience, by the gravity, wisdom, and strength of the man. They are instinct with the warm pulsations of a vigorous religious life, and portray, in glowing numbers, many of the most interesting states of the believing heart, and give fit expression to many of its sweetest, most hopeful and trustful musings on things heavenly and divine. In some of them a holy indignation at the perversities of an ungodly age, and a burning zeal for the cause of truth and genuine piety, speak out in strong and fervid tones; but in general, being the utterances of a soul, whose faith and hope are ever strong and bright, the poems are characterized by an air of gentle repose, which sheds its influence over the reader's spirit, like the balmy breath of a soft summer's morning. They serve admirably to exhibit, in a great variety of forms and subjects, the exhaustless opulence of the sacred Scriptures in materials for poesy, and we trust, that the author's conditional promise, to publish hereafter a great deal of the same character, will be ere long fulfilled.

(3.) *Illustrations of Faith drawn from the Word of God. By Rev. Charles Adam Smith, A. M. ALBANY: E. H. Pease & Co. M. W. Dodd, New York. 1850.*

The author of this little work is already favorably known in our church as a most able and ready writer. The volume contains five pulpit discourses, presenting the following subjects: I. The faith of Abel. II. The faith of Enoch. III. The faith of Noah. IV. The faith of Abraham. V. Patterns for us. They are designed to exhibit and illustrate faith under divers aspects, and in different modes of manifestation, while they show that its objects and elements are, at all times and under all circumstances, the same. They are most respectable specimens of pulpit eloquence, as might be expected, Mr. Smith being one of our most popular and effective sermonizers: they are written in a plain, direct, and forcible style: the several subjects are discussed with great precision and clearness, and brought home to the conscience and heart with a good deal of most apposite and close practical application. We are not writing with a critic's pen; otherwise we might take exception

to the limited view presented on p. 17 sq. of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. But as acute discussions, and practical exhibitions of different phases, of a most important subject, the discourses are admirable: we hope that they may be extensively circulated, and we bespeak for them that careful and attentive perusal which they so eminently deserve. They cannot but be the vehicles of a blessing to those who read with reflection and prayer.

(4.) *James Montjoy: or, I've been thinking.* By A. S. Roe.—
NEW YORK: D. Appleton & Co., 200 Broadway. PHILADELPHIA: Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chestnut St. 1850.

In a publication like this, a notice of a work of fiction may seem strangely out of place; nor would any such notice appear on these pages, if the book named above were an ordinary novel. But it is very far from being any such thing. While it is replete with incident, and deeply interesting narrative, it contains but a slight infusion of what regular novel-readers call romance. The book is designed and calculated to do good. Its object is, to commend well-directed thoughtfulness, and generous enterprise controlled and guided by correct principle and sincere piety; to depict the happiness, and the blessed results to both parents and children, of filial reverence, affection, and obedience, and to illustrate them, not only by direct example, but measurably also by their opposites; and, in general, to set forth, in an attractive light, the contentment, the inward peace and joy, the trustful and hopeful submission to the dealings of Providence, and the courage and energy amidst circumstances of trial and difficulty, which are the portion of those, who have made true piety the leading-star of their earthly pilgrimage, and strive in all things, to honor and discharge their duties to God and man. Since we must have works of fiction, it would be well, indeed, if all that are published displayed the spirit, inculcated the lessons, and advocated the principles, which form the pith and marrow of this pleasant volume.

(5.) *Dark Scenes of History.* By G. P. R. James, Esq., author of the *Woodman*, &c. &c. &c. NEW YORK: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1850.

The author of this work is one of the most prolific and celebrated writers of fiction in our day, and his name is a sufficient guarantee, that any book bearing it on its title-page is written with ability, and in an attractive style. With his clear head, his lively imagination, and his command of language, he readily succeeds in winning the attention, and chaining the interest of his reader, to any subject that he may choose to present. In the present work we are glad to find him again in the walks of authentic history, from which he has selected sundry fragments of deep and thrilling interest, and adapted to give full scope to his peculiar powers of narrative and description. The historical subjects which are here portrayed with all the sprightliness of manner, and brilliancy of style, for which James is distinguished, are, 1. The famous affair of Amboise in France; 2. Arthur Plantagenet of England; 3. Perkin Warbeck; 4. The last days of the Templars; 5. The Albigenses; 6. The conspiracy of Cueva; 7. Wallenstein; 8. Herod the great; with all of which are connected what may well and truly be termed "dark scenes of

history." The book is one of deep interest, both historical and moral, and will be a prize to those who would rather seek recreation in culling from history its more romantic transactions and scenes, than in wasting time upon frivolous works of fiction.

(6) *Latter Day Pamphlets.* Edited by Thomas Carlyle. NEW YORK: Harper and Brothers, publishers, 82 Cliff St., 1850.

Five of these pamphlets for the times have, thus far, come to hand. They are decided, unalloyed, unmitigated Carlylisms on the abuses, the corruptions, and the mischievous tendencies of the age. They are caustic as ley, bitter as gall, pungent as horse-radish, harsh as guiacum. Carlyle's wit is clumsy, heavy, savage and trenchant: his sarcasm, often exceedingly well directed, is fierce and scorching; but unfortunately, where he ought to excite nothing but indignation, he often provokes only a cachinnation. There is no doubt, however, that on many most important points, Carlyle speaks out boldly the most startling and appalling truths. There is no denying that "the times are out of joint," sadly, portentously so:—and on many subjects our sympathies are with the writer of these stirring appeals—our views coincide with his.—The times demand deep and strong thinkers, bold, like Carlyle, to proclaim their independent thoughts, but better able than Carlyle to propound remedies, more practical men than he is, more thoroughly imbued with the spirit of christianity. Yet his pamphlets will be much read; read with interest, and doubtless, also, with a good deal of profit. We were particularly pleased with his second pamphlet, which treats of "Model-prisons." In this he stands decidedly on right, and therefore safe ground; and our American public, with its morbid, mawkish sentimentalism about criminals, and its silly opposition to capital punishment, will do well to profit by his fierce castigation. If these pamphlets produce no other effect, than to direct the attention of wiser men, more thoroughly christian men, than Carlyle, to the many evils that prevail throughout the whole social system, and to provoke them to vigorous efforts for their correction, they will assuredly accomplish an important end.

(7.) *The Conquest of Canada.* By the author of "*Hochelaga*;" in two volumes. NEW YORK: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St.

We welcome this work as a most interesting and valuable contribution to the literature relating to the discovery and the subsequent destinies of the N. American Continent. It is decidedly, in every respect, a most able performance. It opens with a general and most luminous introduction, presenting a cursory survey of the ground to be traversed, and briefly indicating the exalted and generous principles, under the guidance of which the author's labors were conducted. Although the body of the work is devoted to the long and severe struggle, which resulted, eventually, in the undisputed predominance, on the North American Continent, of the Anglo-Saxon race, it presents, at the beginning, not only a spirited historical sketch of the discovery of America by Columbus, but also an interesting account of the visits and discoveries of the

Northmen, and a variety of other historical matter, connected with the subject in general. Three long chapters of the 1st vol. are given to the character, manners and customs, and the deplorable fate, of the North American Indians. This part of the work possesses great value and deep interest. The marginal notes, and the extensive appendix also embody a large amount of most valuable information. The whole work is written with great fairness and impartiality, in a clear, beautiful, manly and vigorous style, that never suffers the reader's attention to weary, as it carries him along through scenes of stirring, often most romantic interest. It will occupy a prominent place among the valuable works on North American History, which our age has produced.

(8.) *Cosmos : A Sketch of a Physical Description of the Universe.* By Alexander von Humboldt. Translated from the German, by E. C. Otté ; in two volumes. NEW YORK : Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1850.

We have just received a copy of this work, and are, of course, expected to say something about it. But, surely, it cannot enter our mind to recommend it : we would as soon think of recommending Shakspeare. The best recommendation that can be given to the work, is on its title page : the name of Alexander von Humboldt. He is the only man living who could have thus written this book ; for no man has devoted himself to the study of universal nature for so long a time, and under such auspicious circumstances. We have here the copious and invaluable results of researches, study and thought, conducted with the acutest sagacity, with an unswerving directness of purpose, and a wonderful accuracy and clearness of method, through a life of fourscore years. He has himself traversed our globe in various directions, and inspected its multiplied and manifold phenomena ; furnished with all the aids of profound science, he has looked abroad, with a keen, but reverent eye, into the vast expanse in which our earth is but a speck ; and every where he has gathered stores of knowledge, which are here combined into system, and from which general principles are deduced, or by which they are proved and established. A man of vast reading, as well as a lover of nature, he points out “the incitements to the study of nature, afforded in descriptive poetry, landscape painting, and the cultivation of exotic plants,” and also discusses “the different epochs in the progress of discovery, and of the corresponding stages of advance in human civilization.” The work is a perfect storehouse of knowledge respecting the physical universe—a thesaurus which no general scholar can afford to dispense with. The celebrated Bunsen calls it “the great work of our age.”

(9.) *The Life of John Calvin.* Compiled from authentic sources, and particularly from his correspondence. By Thomas K. Dyer ; with a portrait. NEW YORK : Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1850.

This is, we believe, the first full and detailed account of the celebrated Swiss Reformer's life and labors, that has appeared in the English language. The

work, written in a plain, easy, but dignified style, is one of deep interest.— While it has made us better acquainted than we were before, with Calvin's eventful and often stormy career, it has also given us a far deeper insight into his character, than we had been able to derive from the more limited sources of information hitherto in our possession. The author appears to have executed his task in a spirit of great candor and impartiality. There is, certainly, no flattery in the portrait of Calvin, which he places before us; yet it seems to have been drawn without prejudice, in a frank and liberal spirit. But for this very reason we doubt, whether the book will be popular with the ardent admirers of the great dictator of Geneva. The darker points of his character are neither concealed nor gilded; his inconsistencies are unreservedly exposed, and freely commented upon; and we frankly acknowledge, that the perusal of this work has greatly modified our opinion, and lowered our estimate of Calvin, while it has served to raise, if possible, still higher our admiration of Luther. The reader who, on laying aside this volume, will take up Meurer's life of Luther, cannot otherwise than be struck with the amazing contrast, and more than ever filled with ardent admiration and respect for the latter's noble and generous character. But we would abstain from all remarks that might be considered invidious. The work before us, though it deals very frankly with the defects, and the repulsive features of Calvin's character, is certainly calculated to impress us with an exalted opinion of his extraordinary intellectual gifts and abilities, of the greatness of his designs, of the purity of his purpose, of his firmness and perseverance in the great cause to which he had consecrated himself, and of the mighty influence which he exerted on the reformation of the 16th century. The subject is one which strongly tempts us to expatiate; but we must forbear; and we shall only add, that the perusal of Dyer's life of Calvin, will be a means of confirming and establishing Lutheran ministers and church-members in their attachment to their own confession and communion, and in their reverential regard for the great Saxon Reformer.— The portrait of Calvin is beautifully executed; the work forms a handsome volume of nearly 450 pp.

(10.) *The History of the Confessional.* By John Henry Hopkins, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese of Vermont.

This volume has been called forth by the efforts recently made to restore auricular confession in the Anglican Church, and in the Episcopal Church of this country. There can be no doubt that, "in the system of the Roman church, the Confessional is the right hand of strength," that "it is in their confessional that the priesthood wield their vast and secret power over the people:" that "it is by the confessional that they rivet the chains of superstition upon the conscience and the soul." A thorough acquaintance with the nature and history of this contrivance of priestcraft is, for various reasons, important to Protestant theologians and christians generally, and they will find the whole subject exhibited and discussed in full, and with great ability by Bishop Hopkins, in the present volume. His work presents a great deal of interesting, curious, and valuable information, and will, doubtless, be a classic in this department of theological literature.

(11.) *The Pillars of Hercules; or, A Narrative of Travels in Spain and Morocco, in 1848.* By David Urquhart, Esq., M. P., author of "Turkey and its Resources," "The Spirit of the East," etc. In two volumes. NEW YORK: Harper and Brothers. 1850.

This is by no means an ordinary book of travels. The author, spending a good deal of time in Spain and Barbary, obviously knew well both what, and how, to observe. There is a great deal of most interesting narrative and description, interspersed with topographic, historic, national and personal matters in ample and multiform detail. The author is evidently a man of scholarly habits, and of very extensive acquirements, and he discusses, with much acuteness and learning, a variety of important and interesting subjects, which, during his travels, attracted his attention: subjects connected with natural science; with the political affairs and the domestic economy of the nations whom he visited; with their manners, customs, and religion; with ethnology and philology, &c. &c. It may be that in his philological discussions and etymological derivations, there is sometimes a spice of fancy; but, whether or not, they exhibit a number of most curious and interesting linguistic connexions or affinities, which are calculated to invite farther and closer inquiry. He takes a far more hopeful view of the state and prospects of Spain than men are generally inclined to take, and he gives good reasons for his opinion. The work is rich in valuable, curious, and interesting information. Being the elaborate production of an accomplished gentleman, extensively conversant with men and things, a keen observer and acute inquirer, a skilful generalizer, and a ready writer, it well deserves the attentive perusal of the man of learning and science, as well as of the general reader.

(12.) *The Past, Present, and Future of the Republic.* Translated from the French of Alphonse De Lamartine, Author of "The History of the Girondists," "Memoirs of my Youth," "Raphael," &c. &c. NEW YORK: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1850.

We like the tone and spirit of this book: the former bold and strong, but moderate: the latter, though liberal and decidedly democratic, is conservative and firmly true to sound principle and good order. While it strongly asserts the rights of the citizen and of the masses, it is no less staunch in the advocacy of law and good government, and fearless in its denunciation of socialism, and of other extreme tendencies; and the reverence and homage rendered to the claims of religion are far more unqualified and positive, than we should have expected from Lamartine. It is easy to perceive, that the book is, in a considerable degree, a defence of himself, of the course which he has taken, and the position which he occupies, relative to the politics and general affairs of France. But there is no special pleading in behalf of opinions to which the author stands committed: subjects of every description, involving the interests of France, or of mankind, are discussed with great frankness, candor, and manly independence. Whatever may be thought of some of

its theories and speculations, the book will be admired as a thoughtful, ingenuous and able defence of the French Republic, and of republican institutions based upon the eternal principles of right and justice.

(13.) *Illustrated Histories.* By Jacob Abbott. Published by Harper and Brothers, 82 Cliff St., NEW YORK. 1850. *Mary Queen of Scots, Alfred the Great, Cyrus the Great, William the Conqueror, Julius Cæsar, King Charles I. of England, King Charles II. of England, Queen Elizabeth of England, Hannibal the Carthaginian, Maria Antoinette of France, Darius the Great, Richard I. of England, Richard III. of England.*

We have received nine of the volumes named above. They are books in a high degree adapted to excite a taste for historical reading, by supplying a large amount of instruction and profitable matter, in a form and style that will attract and interest, not only the young, but readers of every class. Mr. Abbott, long and favorably known as a popular writer, has selected a number of distinguished and celebrated historical personages, and, devoting to each a separate volume, has presented of their lives, fortunes, and achievements, a lively and entertaining narrative, rich in incident, and duly seasoned with very appropriate reflections. He has evidently employed considerable research, and shows great tact and skill in selecting and arranging the materials of his narratives, so as to render them not only interesting and entertaining, but instructive and profitable. His easy, flowing, and perspicuous style is well suited to this species of popular literature, while his correct judgment, his good taste, and his well known christian character, eminently fit him to exhibit, expound and improve, for the benefit of the present and the rising generation, the characters, the events and the lessons of the past. We hope this admirable series will not be brought to a close, until it shall have been enriched by a number of additional volumes. As respects externals, the volumes are all of uniform size, all beautifully bound alike, each furnished with a handsomely illuminated title-page: they contain portraits, maps, and other pictorial illustrations in ample abundance. The publication and popularity of works of this class are an omen for good.

(14.) *The Third Part of Southey's Life, by his Son,* published by the Harpers, has been received, and quite equals the preceding in interest and value.

(15.) We have also been favored with a copy of No. I. of "*Harpers' New Monthly Magazine,*" a publication commencing with the present month, and furnished to subscribers at the astonishingly cheap rate of three dollars per annum. We transfer to our pages the following sentences from the Introductory Remarks of the Publishers: "The Publishers of the New Monthly Magazine intend to place every thing of the Periodical literature of the day, which has permanent value and commanding interest, in the hands of all who have the slightest desire to become acquainted with it. Each number will contain 144 pages of the choicest and most attractive of the miscellaneous literature of the age." It is intended, that, besides a considerable quantity of what is appropriately termed light reading, which is selected with a due regard to good principle and sound morals, the Magazine shall present a large

amount of more solid matter, in the shape of "critical notices of the current publications of the day : speeches and addresses of distinguished men upon topics of universal interest and importance ; notices of scientific discoveries, of the progress and fruits of antiquarian research, of mechanical inventions, of incidents of travel and exploration ; and generally of all the events in Science, Literature and Art, in which the people at large have an interest," &c. The Magazine is very handsomely got up, printed on fine paper, adorned with pictorial illustrations, and is well fitted to supersede and supplant much of the periodical literature of the present day.

(16.) *The Life of Ashbel Green, D. D. Begun to be written by himself, in his eighty-second year, and continued to his eighty-fourth. Prepared for the press at the author's request. By J. H. Jones. NEW YORK : Robert Carter and Brothers. pp. 628.*

Dr. Green was a great and a good man, pious and useful, "fitted by his talents," in the language of President Carnahan, "to fill any civil station, and by his eloquence to adorn the halls of our national legislature." Gifted with more than ordinary natural powers, directed in early youth by judicious parents, and furnished with the advantages of an excellent education, he became an ornament to his country, and a blessing to the church. Occupying, during his life, many important positions, and found faithful in them all, his name will always be honored, and his memory cherished in grateful remembrance.

Dr. Green was born in 1762, and was graduated at Princeton in 1783, at the age of 21. The same year he was appointed Tutor of the College, and two years after, Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, which chair he filled until 1787, when he was called to the 2nd Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. Here he remained twenty-four years, during which period, for eight years he served as Chaplain to Congress, in connexion with Bishop White. In 1812, he resigned his Pastoral charge to accept the Presidency of the College of New Jersey, which office he filled for ten years, his administration forming a memorable and highly important era in the history of that seat of learning.— In 1823, after having attained the age of more than 60 years, he retired from his office and removed to Philadelphia, where he remained till the time of his death, engaged in editing a valuable periodical journal, and in works of active benevolence, preaching the gospel, whenever an opportunity presented, especially to the poor, declining to receive any remuneration for his services. When the infirmities of age rendered him incapable of any public labor, he employed his time in reading, writing and in those devotional exercises, which seemed to constitute the very element of his soul as he drew near the consummation of his hopes and joys. In 1848, in the 88th year of his age, he closed his earthly career, in the triumphs of the Christian's faith, and entered upon the rest prepared for God's people.

We have perused the volume with deep interest. Living, as Dr. Green did, during our Revolutionary struggle, and associated with some of the most illustrious minds of that day, many facts are presented, connected with national events, that cannot fail to instruct and interest every American reader. Even the reminiscences, that are given in connexion with his Presidency, we found useful and affecting, and read them with delight, although by many they would be considered as only the jejune record of a monotonous routine of college life.

Although there are some things introduced in the work, which are out of taste, and others which we think rather trivial, we yet regard the volume as a valuable contribution to our literature, and are glad to recommend it to the attention of our readers.

(17.) "*The Claims of Sabbath Schools : An Address delivered to the Sabbath School Union of Cumberland. By Rev. Joseph Augustus Seiss, Pastor of the Lutheran Church of Cumberland Md. Printed at the Civilian Office.*"

The cause of Sabbath Schools addresses its claims to the consciences and sympathies of all men. Among the many benevolent institutions of the day, perhaps there is no one more deserving of our interest and our prayers. The inculcation of religious truth upon the youthful mind, is adapted to produce a most salutary influence, and is generally accompanied with the happiest results. In the hands of the Spirit, perhaps no single instrument for doing good and extending the Redeemer's kingdom, will be found to accomplish so gainful a result. The object of the discourse before us, is to present the benefits resulting from Sabbath Schools, as motives for encouragement. It contains many valuable thoughts, expressed in a manner that will secure the attention and impress the reader, and is altogether worthy the high commendation bestowed upon it by the committee, who solicited the manuscript for publication.

(18.) "*Thoughts on Family Worship. By James W. Alexander, D. D., Presbyterian Board of Education. PHILADELPHIA : pp. 260.*

This is a most excellent little work. Although written by a Presbyterian, it will be read with interest and profit by all who form a proper estimate of the value of domestic religion. There are many heads of families in all our churches, elders and deacons, who maintain no stated daily service of God in their dwellings. To awaken such to their duty, is the design of the volume. The following is a summary of the topics discussed : The nature, warrant and history of family worship : The influence of family worship on individual piety, on parents, on children, on domestics : Family worship as a means of intellectual improvement : Its influence on domestic harmony and love : On a household in affliction ; on visitors, guests and neighbors : In perpetuating sound doctrine : On the church, the commonwealth : On posterity : Practical directions as to the mode of conducting family worship : The reading of the Scriptures and Psalmody as a part of the exercises. The volume

concludes with an exhortation to householders on the duty of family worship, and a reply to various objections and difficulties that are frequently urged for a neglect of the duty. In the chapter on Psalmody, the author makes the following allusion to our own Luther: "The happy influence of spiritual songs is illustrated in the early churches of Germany. Luther was himself a poet and a musician, and he bestowed on his country many of her noblest hymns, and some of her finest melodies. In his writings, he often alludes to this as one of the chosen agencies in the work of the Reformation; and this not merely in the church, but by the way-side, and at home. He relates, that in the earlier part of his labors, he was moved to tears by hearing a wandering beggar, under his window, sing a hymn, which has since become famous, but which Luther had never before heard. . . . The impress still remains. Wherever you meet the German christian, you find him charged with those noble and evangelical compositions. Even the emigrant in his blouse, is sure, if a disciple, to carry across the sea, in his wallet, the black covered hymn-book."

(19.) *A Sermon delivered in Christ's Church, Easton, Pa., on Thanksgiving Day, Nov. 29, 1849. By Rev. Geo. Diehl, Pastor of the Church.* pp. 16.

The practice of setting apart a day for thanksgiving and praise to Almighty God, so common in New England, and recently adopted in most of the States of the Union, we have always admired. It is a public recognition of our obligations to Heaven for the varied blessings we enjoy, and furnishes us as a people, an opportunity of simultaneously acknowledging our common dependence on the Supreme Benefactor. It also gives the preacher an occasion to introduce topics, and discuss questions which might, to some, appear inappropriate to the sacred day. Perhaps our national blessings and civil obligations are too much overlooked, and too seldom occupy the attention of the pulpit. Mr. Diehl's discourse is based on Deut. 11: 25. "*There shall no man be able to stand before you; for the Lord your God shall lay the fear of you and the dread of you upon all the land;*" and his object is to prove the probable perpetuity of our Republic, and to show the foundation of the hope of free institutions in America. Whilst the author satisfactorily proves that our national blessings are likely to be continued, if we are only faithful to our trust, he enforces our obligations to the author of these blessings. The sermon is well written, inculcating sound and patriotic sentiments, and containing views happily adapted to the occasion. There is no real ground for gloomy forebodings with reference to the United States, so long as the christian religion exerts an influence upon our land. Our confidence is based upon the conservative principles of the Gospel. Our hope is in the power of christianity. Let knowledge, sanctified knowledge, be diffused among the people; let the Bible be disseminated; then may we expect that the civil blessings which we enjoy will be perpetuated and extended throughout the world. Heaven, we believe, has marked out a high destiny for this nation, and her achievements will be recorded in the future history of the church.

(20.) *The Life and Correspondence of John Foster : Edited by J. E. Ryland. With notices of Mr. Foster as a preacher and companion. By John Sheppard ; in two volumes. NEW YORK :— John Wiley. 1849.*

John Foster is too well known to need the praise of the Review, and his writings too highly appreciated to render any criticism of ours necessary.—The mere announcement of an American edition of his life and correspondence will be hailed with pleasure. Wherever the English language is read, the productions of this remarkable man will exert an influence upon thinking minds. They abound in striking, philosophical and vigorous thought, and contain an originality and a freshness not often met with in authors of the present day.

This memoir is chiefly compiled from Mr. Foster's letters. The work is objective in its character, and the subject of the memoir is always permitted to speak for himself. The editor has selected, from the materials at his disposal, what would best illustrate the intellectual and moral qualities, the principles and opinions of so distinguished a person. The references to himself and the topics in which he took the deepest interest, are so numerous, that a biography drawn from such sources must necessarily present a truthful and vivid exhibition of the man. The materials of the work have been selected with great discrimination, and the correspondence so arranged as to form a continuous narrative. The candid reader is enabled to form an unbiassed opinion for himself, and to become fully acquainted with the character of Foster.

(21.) *The Mercy Seat : Thoughts suggested by the Lord's Prayer. By Gardiner Spring, D. D. NEW YORK : M. W. Dodd. 1850. pp. 383.*

This is a rich and valuable production, replete with the author's best thoughts on an interesting and important theme—the communion of man with his Maker. It is the result of the careful study of the inimitable prayer which the Savior gave as a directory to his disciples, and embraces in the discussion the following topics : The nature of prayer : God a father : The name of God hallowed : The kingdom of God on earth : The means of extending God's kingdom : The will of God performed on earth : Dependence for temporal blessings : Prayer and pains : The doctrine of forgiveness :—Prayer for forgiveness : A forgiving spirit : A martial spirit not the spirit of christianity : Temptation deplored : The dread of sin : Prayer answered.—Dr. Spring has long been before the christian public as an author, and the elevated tone, rich instruction, and practical character of his writings commend them to the thoughtful attention of all who love our common Redeemer.—This volume will not detract from the high estimate which has been usually placed upon the Doctor's productions. Its pages will be perused with interest by christians of all denominations, by all who delight to frequent the mercy seat. The work is beautifully printed, in large type, and makes an elegant volume, highly creditable to the American press.

THE
EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. VI.

OCTOBER, 1850.

ARTICLE I.

CHURCH DEVELOPMENT ON APOSTOLIC PRINCIPLES.

By S. S. Schmucker, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological Seminary,
Gettysburg.

THE age in which we live is eminently an experimental and suggestive one, an era of contrary extremes. The intellect of civilized man, waked up from the slumber of ages, has been cast upon its own resources, and has been putting forth its most active energies. The discoveries and inventions of the physical arts and sciences, have flashed upon us in such quick succession, as to habituate us to the constant expectation of new wonders. The ball of revolution, set in motion by the reformers of the sixteenth century, has been perpetually rolling on, and has taught men to reflect on their natural rights both civil and religious; so that in politics one nation after another has attempted to assert its rights, and in religion, one sect after another has professed to present a more perfect development of Christianity.

In Germany, where infidelity has assumed its most learned type, neologians have frittered away the sense of every passage that opposed their views, by the unhallowed theory of accommodation and other false principles of exegesis; and, following the guidance of their higher criticism, falsely so called, have rejected one book after another from the sacred canon, until they have divested of all claim to inspiration, the whole, or nearly the whole of those Scriptures, which Paul affirms were

given by inspiration of God. Others, laying hold on the so-called theory of church development, justify whatever meets their views in the various corruptions of the successive ages of the church. This system rests on the acknowledged silence of the Scriptures, and even their opposition to certain matters of faith and practice confessedly found in the mediæval and modern church; such as private and auricular confession, the ceremonies and doctrine of the mass, image worship, worship of saints, angels and the virgin Mary, indulgences, &c. &c. Assuming that primitive Christianity was merely an imperfect germ, possessed of innate tendencies to progressive self-development, they maintain that all these postapostolical appendages to Christianity, of which the word of God knows nothing, or which it in principle clearly condemns, are to be regarded as the legitimate fruits of this tendency to development, and therefore properly embraced in the practice of the church of our day. By this principle the Puseyite justifies all the Semi-Romish rites and superstitions which he retains, and Rome herself, more consequent than he, vindicates the whole machinery of her corrupt and anti-scriptural establishment. Intermediate between these extremes, we behold a party characterized by inflexible dogmatism, a party which we are happy to believe finds but few advocates in the American Lutheran Church, who seem to deny that divinely secured and inalienable right and duty of man, to prove all things and hold fast what appears to him good; a party, to whom every thing old is sacred, and every thing new is vile. These retrogressive reformers, seizing hold of the church at a particular point in her onward progress of development and reformation, would give her a petrified form, a dead stereotyped uniformity for all coming time, excluding all possible further improvement or development. Justifying all the exercise of religious liberty and independent searching of the Scriptures of the men belonging to their favorite epoch, they would practically renounce for themselves all similar right and obligation. They seem not duly to appreciate the fact, that the ministry and membership of the church, are as much under immediate obligation to the Scriptures in one age as in another, and equally independent of all merely human prescriptions.

But these parties find no support in the Scriptures. When we examine the word of inspiration, we find that all these extremes are wrong. On the one hand we are told in various passages, that Jesus Christ and his religion are "the same to-day, yesterday and forever." But on the other hand, the apostle Paul tells us, that his church "*groweth,*" into a holy

temple of the Lord, that it is developed amid all the various influences, social, civil, literary and scientific, thrown around it in its contact with mankind. It "groweth," until the little leaven that Jesus threw into the mass of society eighteen hundred years ago, shall have leavened earth's entire population; it "groweth," until the little band of fishermen and tentmakers, who first unfurled their banners in the vallies of Judea, have pushed their conquests over the earth; it "groweth" until the Lamb that was slain on Calvary, shall have proved himself the Lion of the tribe of Judah, and have put all enemies under his feet. It therefore becomes a question of momentous importance to every enlightened friend of the Redeemer's kingdom, In what light am I to view the present condition of the Protestant Church? Guided by the Book of Heaven, how am I to regard these denominational divisions, which are confessedly fourteen hundred years younger than Christianity itself, and form walls of partition between those, whose life proclaims in loudest terms their right to recognition as followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, whose earnest aspiration was, that his disciples "might be one," "that the world might know that he had sent them"? What relation do these sectarian organizations, and the sectarian creeds and confessions and formularies of government and discipline adopted by them, bear to the essential features of Christ's church as delineated in the records of inspiration, and to those principles of development by which that divinely guided assemblage of believers, founded on the apostles and prophets and Jesus Christ as the corner-stone, is to grow unto a holy temple in the Lord, for a habitation of God through the Spirit? These are questions affecting the general interests of the Redeemer's kingdom; questions, our answers to which must essentially influence our duties to the church, and we see not how any true and enlightened friend of Christianity, can enjoy a conscious sense of fidelity to his duty, until he has by careful, radical and prayerful study of the Scriptures settled his views on these questions.

If we would obtain clear conceptions of this subject, we must carefully discriminate between things that differ. We must distinguish between the church or assembly of professed believers, or as Paul defines it, "them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, who call on the name of the Lord Jesus," and the doctrines, discipline and ritual of that church. In discussions on this subject, the term church is often vaguely employed to designate not only the church properly so called, that is, the assembly of professed believers, but

also her organic law, her doctrines, discipline, forms of government, judicatories and mode of worship. And the Romanists and Puseyites even confer a corporate personality on this dead organic constitution, apart from the living members who are to be governed by it, and by whom alone its preceptive character is shown forth in living action. But such vagueness of nomenclature, must necessarily preclude precision of thought or logical consequence in reasoning; for, however just a predicate that is affirmed, or however logical a deduction that is drawn, if it be doubtful to what subject they are applicable, of course they add nothing to the treasures of our knowledge. The church properly so called, may be viewed from different standpoints, and may be considered, as ideal and real, as objective and subjective, as pure or corrupt, as visible and invisible, as militant and triumphant. Without entering into a discussion of these classifications, it is enough to remark, that on the present occasion we have in view the visible church, or the assembly of the professed believers in Jesus Christ, a collection of individual persons not of things; or as the Augsburg Confession justly defines it: "Est autem ecclesia congregatio sanctorum, in qua evangelium recte docetur et recte administrantur sacramenta."

What things, then, constitute the unchangeable foundation, the essential bases of Christianity, which are to remain the same from the time of their first promulgation by the Savior and his apostles, throughout all ages of the church, "always unto the end of the world."

In laying down our general position, we premise the grand fundamental principle of Protestantism, that *the word of God is a sufficient rule of faith and practice*. If any amongst us do not believe this, they are Romanists at heart and should honestly avow it. If this principle be true, it follows, that all intelligent, all sincere and faithful readers of this word, will arrive at a belief of every thing necessary to their salvation; and the points in which the great mass of them agree, may safely be regarded as certainly taught in the sacred volume. Some few individuals of intelligence, sincerity and fidelity may, through some intellectual idiosyncrasy, differ from the rest on some vital point; but their obliquity is outweighed and must be corrected by the concurrent judgment of the mass. As the great body of intelligent, evangelical, faithful *Protestants* are free, sincere and faithful searchers of the Scriptures, we arrive at the inference, that they will attain a belief of all that is necessary to salvation, and that the doctrines and duties which they unitedly find in Scripture, are certainly taught there. The

Roman Catholics cannot be taken into account here, for they are not *free* inquirers after Scripture truth. The laity confessedly resign their judgment to the priests, and the priests have bound themselves to submit their judgment to tradition, to the opinions of the so-called fathers and the decrees of councils. The Protestant principle of the infallibility and sufficiency of the word of God, does therefore fairly authorize the position, that all those points of faith and practice, which the different orthodox and evangelical Protestant denominations agree in finding in the sacred volume, are clearly revealed in it; whilst those points on which denominations of equal piety, intelligence and fidelity differ, are not so clearly revealed. Hence it follows: *That those things are unchangeable which have, in the judgment of the great mass of the Protestant world, been clearly revealed and definitely settled in the word of God, and as far as they are thus settled, and no farther; whilst on the other hand, all things not thus definitely settled, as well as the mode of administering the organic laws and affairs of the church, not definitely determined in the Scriptures, and all matters not touched on at all in them, are left to the conscientious judgment of christians in all ages of the world.* But the subject will become clearer as we proceed to particularize.

1. *The church's rule of faith is unchangeable.* This is none other than the inspired word of God, without the adjunction of human traditions either of the Jewish elders, or Romish fathers. From this word nothing is to be subtracted, to it nothing is to be added. This word is not a textbook of physical science, as some visionary minds such as Hutchinson, Parkhurst and others vainly imagined; nor is it a *system* of theology; but it is a *popular* revelation of religious truth, and to be recognized as such in all ages. Whatever doctrines are certainly taught, and so far as taught, in this word, are unchangeable in all nations and in all time to come. These doctrinal statements are popular, and include not those systematic relations of these truths, which are superadded by theologians and theological philosophers, and form a cardinal element in the sectarian peculiarities of the present day. These doctrines are those admitted by all the so-called orthodox and evangelical denominations. A statement of these articles of ecumenical Christian faith most interesting and authentic, was adopted and published by the *Evangelical Alliance*, convened at London in 1846. Here we have the unanimous testimony of about a thousand of the most influential, active, distinguished and trustworthy servants of Christ, collected from about thirty re-

ligious denominations, and from all the prominent portions of the entire Christian world, bearing testimony to present and after ages, as to what doctrines, and aspects of doctrines they regarded as clearly revealed and also as fundamental. This summary may at the same time serve as a rallying point of union for the disciples of Christ in all lands, and in all ages to come. It is as follows:

We believe in

1. The divine inspiration, authority and sufficiency of the holy Scriptures.

2. The right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the holy Scriptures.

3. The unity of the Godhead, and the Trinity of Persons therein.

4. The utter depravity of human nature in consequence of the fall.

5. The incarnation of the Son of God, his work of atonement for sinners of mankind, and his mediatorial intercession and reign.

6. The justification of the sinner by faith alone.

7. The work of the Holy Spirit, in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner.

8. The divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the obligation and perpetuity of the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper.

9. The immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the judgment of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteous, and the eternal punishment of the wicked.

Entirely coincident with this is the summary lately published by the Synod of our church in Maryland, as an expression of their judgment as to what doctrines are fundamental to the Christian religion. And both agree in every doctrine with the so-called Apostles' Creed, and the still earlier summary of the faith of the the universal church framed and lauded by Irenæus of the second century, as the acknowledged and ample basis of Christian union throughout the world. Other doctrines of minor importance were never introduced into any Christian creed during the earlier centuries of the church, and we know of no scriptural authority for making any other doctrines the ground of divisions among the disciples of Christ.

Among these doctrines, that concerning Jesus Christ the eternal Son of God and Savior of men, is the life-giving principle, which pervades and animates and stamps the impress of

divinity on the whole system. It is the foundation of our faith and the corner-stone of the church, in or by whom ($\xi\pi\omega$) the building is fitly held together, and firmly sustained. As the walls of a building are bound together by the corner-stone, so the doctrine of the redemption of the world by the Son of God, and the plan of salvation through his blood, are the grand doctrinal foundation-stone of Christianity. Hence also we derive an important canon for testing the accuracy of inferential doctrinal propositions and their systematic adjustment, namely: *Every such inference or adjustment, which detracts from the importance of the Savior, which removes or disparages him as the central sun of the system, must be wrong.*

2. *The church's rule of duty is unchangeable.*

This is founded and grounded on the apostles, prophets and Jesus Christ. This law lays down the eternal principles of right and wrong, of virtue and vice, and is a reflection of the perfections of the deity. Virtue and vice always will and must be opposed in all their intrinsic tendencies, and hence the fallacy of the doctrine of German philosophy, that heresy in its proper place is necessary for the better development of truth, and therefore in certain circumstances more desirable than the absence of it; in short, that a salutary discipline of sinning, is a requisite training for the highest perfection of christian character. To this figment of philosophical imagination we respond: God may and often does overrule the crimes and heresies of men to his glory; yet crimes and heresies are in their nature and intrinsic tendencies evil, and only evil, and that continually. If every event in the history of the church were right, and intrinsically tended to greater good; then every thing done by individuals in the church is right, for in the production of the events of church history, individuals always figure as the agents. If every thing done by individuals in the church is right, then every thing done by others out of the church is right, for there is no form of vice or crime, of which some wicked men in the church have not been guilty. But, if the actions of men in and out of the church are right, then all difference between virtue and vice is obliterated, and the infidel maxim of Bolingbroke, "Whatever is, is right," claims our assent. Instead of being any longer regarded as a maxim of unbelievers, it must be baptized as Christian truth. The philosophical dreams of those German theologians, who regard the age of the apostles, the middle ages and the period of the Reformation as three progressive and successively higher states or developments of the church, thus making the darkness of

the middle ages an advance on apostolic light, are subversive of the fundamental principles of New Testament Christianity. The age of inspiration, when the church was administered by heaven-directed men, must have been the most pure and perfect, if there was any inspiration at all. If uninspired teachers are the best the church has enjoyed, then inspiration was useless, or rather, is a mere fiction. There is no such thing as inspiration, and the apostles of Jesus were not inspired. Is it said, Christianity in its full purity and highest perfection, would not have been adapted to the capacity of the Jews and Gentile nations of the apostolic age? Much less would Christianity, in its present more fully developed form, be suited to the less intelligent and less civilized heathen of modern ages. And as Christianity, on this theory, continues to reach still higher development, whilst the unchristianized heathen make no progress in intellectual improvement, it is evident, that this discrepance, this want of adaptation in the developed teachings of the church to the necessities of the heathen, must be continually increasing; and we would be irresistibly borne on to the absurd conclusion, that the more perfectly Christianity is developed, the less is it suited to be the instrument for converting the unevangelized nations of the world.

3. *The essential features of the church's organic, visible constitution and administration are unchangeable.*

Designing his church for universal extension, and foreseeing that the reflex influence of its government on the civil institutions of nations, would awaken the suspicions of political rulers, our Savior and his apostles settled only the general principles of church government, and a few specific statutes, leaving all the rest to the judgment of believers in different ages, to be accommodated to the genius of the people and the civil institutions of nations. Had he prescribed a detailed organization for the church in all ages, it would, doubtless, have been republican, and would have entirely precluded a union with the state. Hence, there would have been some semblance of ground for the objection of kings and despots, that it forms an *imperium in imperio*, hostile to the principles of their governments, which must therefore be controlled by the civil authorities. These fundamental features, determined in Scripture, are

1. *Visible membership*, conferred by *Baptism*, as the initiatory rite. Every visible body must have some visible mode, or term, of admission; hence, although an individual by conversion becomes a member of the invisible church of God, he

is not a member of the visible church, until he is made such by baptism. “Per quem (baptismum) primitus in Christianorum communionem coöptamur.” Lutheri Cat. maj.

2. *The Lord's Supper*, statedly celebrated as a habitual badge of discipleship, “to show forth the Lord's death till he come.”

3. *The Word of God*, or revealed truth, as the grand appointed instrumentality of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of sinners. This word is either *oral*, as proclaimed by the living minister; or *recorded*, as in the written and printed word; or *symbolical*, as set forth by the sacraments. Divine truth is the grand means of grace, and whatever be the manner, in which it is conveyed to the sinner's mind, if rightly received, it will be blessed of God for his spiritual benefit.

The notion, of Christ's having made himself perpetually *incarnate in the membership of his church* through the sacraments, and of his now dispensing the gifts of the Spirit, not directly to the individual, who publicly or privately hears or reads the truth, or addresses himself in prayer to God; but of his having in the beginning deposited those gifts in the hands of the apostles alone, to be transmitted through their successors, by means of the sacraments, to the church in all after ages,—this notion or collection of notions, is nothing but a human invention, mainly of papal origin, designed to glorify an aspiring priesthood, rather than a condescending God. On the contrary, it is the word of God, which is quick and powerful, sharper than a two-edged sword. It is by “the incorruptible seed of the word,” that we are “regenerated.” “Sanctify them by thy *truth*, thy *word* is truth,” said the blessed Savior himself.

4. *The gospel ministry*, as the appointed functionaries to proclaim and expound this word. Preach the gospel to every creature, said the departing Savior. And said Paul to his son in the faith: “The things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also. The power of electing and inducting, that is, ordaining these ministers, is ultimately vested in the members of the church, and at ordination, some other pastor or pastors, that is, existing elders or bishops (ministers,) should usually officiate. It may also properly be referred to Synods or Presbyteries, on the ground of human expediency. Yet, if the aid of no other pastor can be obtained, those who had authority to elect and appoint, i. e. ordain, an apostle in the place of the traitor Judas, (Acts 1: 21–26,) have also authority to appoint, or ordain, an ordinary minister. Thus thought

Luther, Melanchthon, and their co-laborers, whence it is evident what value they placed on the Romish and Puseyite imposition of hands, and transmission of the sacred office and mystic influence by apostolical succession of bishops! In the Appendix to the Smalcald Articles, § 70–72. we read: “This is also evident from the common practice of the churches. Because, formerly the people elected the preachers and bishops; then came the bishop of the same or a neighboring place, and confirmed the bishop elect, by the imposition of hands; and at that time *ordination* was nothing else than such a confirmation, (Bestätigung, Latin original, *comprobatio, approbation*)” —“Hence it is evident, that the church has power to elect and *ordain* her officers. Therefore, if the bishops are either heretics, or will not ordain qualified persons, it is the sacred duty of the church, by divine right, to ordain ministers and church officers for themselves.”¹ And, says Luther, “Wherever the preaching of the gospel is sustained, there is certainly the Christian church and the kingdom of Christ, no matter how small be the cluster of its professors.”²

5. The *power* of administering, according to the dictates of Scripture and reason, the government and discipline of the church; of admitting applicants to membership, and of excluding them for sufficient reasons from the privileges of God’s people.³ Although men may differ in applying this import-

¹ Hieraus sieht man dass die Kirche Macht hat Kirchendiener (Latin original, ministros,) zu wählen und *ordiniren*. Darum wenn die Bischöffe entweder Ketzler sind, oder tüchtige Personen nicht wollen ordiniren. sind die Kirchen vor Gott, nach göttlichem Recht, schuldig ihnen selbst Pfarrherrn und Kirchendiener zu ordiniren. See also Apology to Conf. Art. xiii, § 12.

See likewise proof of the same fact in Neander’s History, and Gieseler Ecc. Hist. p. 158, Note 4, of Vol. I.

² Walch’s Luth. vol. 5, p. 1413. “wie geringe oder wenig solch Häuflein auch ist.”

³ This power of the church is sometimes designated the “*power of the keys*,” *potestas clavium*. In the Lutheran church of Germany, this power of the keys was supposed to include also the power of declaratively forgiving sins in private confession and absolution.

The Heidelberg Catechism defines “the keys of the kingdom of heaven,” to be the preaching of the gospel and ecclesiastical discipline, by which heaven is opened to believers and closed to unbelievers, “*quibus coelum credentibus aperitur, infidelibus autem clauditur.*”

Some other divines divide the entire power of the church into three species, 1. *δογματικὴν*, or doctrinal, which relates to the doctrines of the faith, the preaching of the word and administration of the sacraments. 2. *διατακτικὴν*, or administrative, regulative, governing, which relates to the government of the church and the framing and altering of ecclesiastical laws and constitutions. And 3. *διακριτικὴν*, or judicial and disciplinary power, or the right of disciplining, of censuring, suspending and excommunicating offenders, and restoring the penitent.

ant principle in the affairs of the church, they all agree in the general principle itself, and maintain that it is the duty of each church to exercise its conscientious judgment. This general principle, therefore, is unalterable, and every pure church should vindicate these rights to itself, whilst variety and improvement in the application of this principle, may justly constitute an element of church development. The judicial power of the church is purely declarative: the Bible being her juridical code, and her decisions being valid only because, and as far as they accord with the inspired word.

In short, the church is a divinely appointed institution, wielding power and influence, that reach the throne of God. These powers are inherent in every individual congregation or church of Christ; for in the apostolic age, the churches stood in no organic connection with one another, but each congregation or church, was independent of every other. The idea that the different churches or congregations in postapostolic ages, have, by uniting in Synods or Assemblies or Denominations, acquired any additional powers different from those possessed by the churches under the apostles, cannot be admitted. It would involve the absurdity, that the church was organized more properly by uninspired ministers, than by the heaven-directed men whom Christ himself selected; and that the apostolic churches possessed less power, than the churches of later ages. If, moreover, the combinations of churches, as they arose in successive ages, acquired additional powers, and different in kind from what they previously possessed, where is the Scripture passage, by which such powers are either promised or conferred? The truth appears to be, that these synthetic ecclesiastical bodies, whether they be styled Synods, Assemblies, or Conventions, &c. possess no powers different in kind, from those originally belonging to individual churches, consisting of the members and elders or presbyters worshipping together. To these synthetic bodies, however, some of these elemental powers have been delegated by the congregations constituting them, and thus Synods &c. may act with more efficiency and exert a greater influence by a union of strength. "Wherever the church exists," say the Confessors, "there is the command to preach the gospel. Therefore the *churches* must retain the power of calling, electing and ordaining church officers.¹ "To

¹ "Denn wo die Kirche ist, da ist je der Befehl das Evangelium zu predigen. Darum müssen die Kirchen die Gewalt behalten, dass sie Kirchendienern fordern, wählen und ordiniren. — Hieher gehören die Sprüche Christi, welche zeugen, dass die Schlüssel der ganzen Kirchen und nicht etlichen sondern Personen gegeben sind, wie der Text sagt, Wo zween oder drei in

this subject the declarations of Christ refer, which testify that the keys were given to the whole church and not to several particular persons, agreeably to Matth. 18: 20. "*Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there I am in the midst of them.*"

4. *The essential features of the worship of the church,* have also been determined, and are unchangeable. These are reading and expounding the word of God; prayer, singing psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, and administering the sacraments. But the times, places and manner of conducting this worship, are, in many respects, left to the experience and peculiar circumstances of every successive age. These are the features of our holy religion, which admit no change, no development. As Protestants adhering to the plenary inspiration and sufficiency of the Scriptures, we hold that whatever is distinctly enjoined in them, cannot be subject to human caprice or change. Hence arises the obligation of every individual Christian, and of Christians united in Church relations, with the moral noblemen of Berea, to search the Scriptures daily, that they may faithfully adhere to this rule. Accordingly the illustrious reformers, Luther, Zwingli, Calvin and others, not only rejected the unscriptural prescriptions of the church before their day, though confirmed by the sanction of successive centuries; but Melanchthon in the Treatise on the Power of the Papacy, appended to the Smalcald Articles, urges it on kings and princes as a duty, to restrain the power of the popes, so that the church, that is, the assembly of professed believers, may not be deprived of her power to judge and determine *all things in accordance with the word of God.* (Ne ecclesiæ eripiatur facultas judicandi et decernendi de verbo Dei. Tractatus de potestate et primatu papæ, p. 351.)

It is indeed true, the facts embraced in the revelation of God in general, and even those of the New Testament in particular, constituting the historical basis of Christianity, were of progressive occurrence. They transpired under the miraculous guidance of God, and the record of them, and of the doctrinal

meinem Namen versammelt sind, bin ich mitten unter ihnen," &c. Smalc. Art. App.

Says Dr. Mosheim, "Although all the churches were in the first age of Christianity, united together in one common bond of faith and love, and were in every respect, ready to promote the interest and welfare of each other by a reciprocal interchange of good offices, yet, with regard to government and internal economy, every individual church considered itself as an independent community, none of them ever looking beyond the circle of its own members for assistance, or recognizing any sort of external influence or authority." De Rebus Christ. ante Constantinum. Sec. I. § 48.

manifestations of Christianity, were also progressive and gradual. Yet at the close of the apostolic age, with the death of the last apostle John, the canon and succession of inspired teachers of Christianity were closed, and Christianity *historically, doctrinally and didactically, became a fixed fact, a finished system, to which no inspired additions were to be made.*

Such, then, being the unchangeable foundation of the church of Christ, we are now prepared for the next inquiry :

What is its progressive superstructure or development ?

In order that the foregoing revelation of divine truth, should accomplish the end designed by God, it is necessary that those truths should be received and understood by men, and should influence the head and heart of all. For this purpose, God has appointed a system of instrumentalities, by which they will be published to the world, and the society of those who receive them be regulated in all their actions, applying to the ever-changing circumstances of successive ages, those general principles and directions, according to their best judgment. And here is the principal seat and occasion of that gradual growth or development of the church, which is the subject of our inquiry. *It manifests itself in the different degrees of perfection, with which men apprehend the truths of revelation and the relations which encircle them, and in the progressive improvement of Christians in the administration of the appointed instrumentalities of the church, guided by the increasing light of universal science and the changes in the civil condition of nations, amid the developments of God's providence and the light of God's Spirit.* Nor have these changes always been for the better. There were times, when the disciples delighted to dwell with one accord in the temple, breaking bread from house to house, and eating their meat with gladness and singleness of heart; and as a consequence of this, "the Lord added to the church daily those that were saved." But on the other hand, at times there were contentions among the disciples, one saying I am of Paul, and another I am of Apollos, and a third I am of Cephas, thus proving, as Paul tells the Corinthians, that they were carnal, "biting and devouring one another and often consuming one another." 1 Cor. 1: 12. 3: 3. Gal. 5: 15. Whilst at one time the ministry lifted up their voices, and with fidelity declared the whole counsel of God, and the church was edified: at others there was "a falling away"; wolves entered the fold in sheep's clothing; false teachers privily brought in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and brought

upon themselves and the victims of their delusions swift destruction.

But let us particularize. We need scarcely say, that the church, 1. "*groweth*," or is developed *numerically*. In the beginning the disciples of the Savior were but few. At a census of the church, taken in the infancy of her history, we are told "the number of names was one hundred and twenty." Afterward, especially after the Holy Spirit had descended on the disciples at Pentecost, thousands were added in a day. Twenty-one years after the death of the Savior, the Roman historian Tacitus informs us, that Christians abounded, not only in Judea where Christianity originated, but also in other countries, not even excepting Rome itself. In about three centuries so large a portion of the entire Roman empire had embraced this holy religion, that the Emperor Constantine, partly from conviction of its truth, but partly also from state policy, declared it the religion of the empire; and at present the nominally Christian population of the earth, is rated at two hundred millions of souls.

Equally obvious is the position, that the church

2. *Is developed geographically*. At first, although the Savior had explicitly declared the field to be "the *world*," yet, in point of fact the actual limits of the church were confined to Palestine, to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel." But soon it took partial possession of adjoining countries, extending even to Rome itself. In the second century, it gained a foothold in Armenia, Syria, Arabia, Babylonia, in Asia Minor and parts of Africa and Europe. In the third century, extensive settlements of Christians were made in France, Scotland, Spain and Germany. In the fourth century Christianity was extended into India, among the Saracens in Africa, along the Rhine and in Ireland. Thus was our holy religion extended from one country into another until it also took possession of this Western world. At present the Christian church is spread over a large part of the world; and although three-fourths of the population of the earth are yet heathen, Christianity has gained a foothold in the principal heathen nations, and paganism is tottering by its own intrinsic weakness, beneath the superincumbent weight of its superstitions and idolatry. But it is not our design to dwell on the numerical or geographical growth of the church: we therefore pass on to its other features of development.

3. The church *is developed ritually*. The essential parts of stated worship of the church, as we have above affirmed, are fixed, namely, reading and expounding the word of God, singing

and prayer. These cannot be omitted or changed, and the Romish church was doubtless guilty of a gross perversion of the appointed worship of the sanctuary, in almost entirely omitting the reading and preaching the word, and superceding them by the protracted ceremonies of her pompous ritual. So entirely unusual was preaching in the Romish church before the Reformation, that the Protestant ministry, who restored it to its primitive place, were so peculiar in this respect, that they were popularly designated as the "*preachers*," from which circumstance, this name of the Christian ministry originated.¹

But nearly all the circumstances and modes, for the performance of these duties, were left to be regulated by the judgment and conscience of Christians in different ages and countries according to their peculiar circumstances, and the progressive lessons of experience, guided by apostolic example. Thus in regard to *preaching the word*, it is undecided, how often, whether only on the Lord's day, or whether also in the week and in protracted meetings; also how long our sermons should be, where they should be delivered in churches only, or also in private houses, or in the open air as at camp-meetings and other convocations: and, finally, it is undetermined, whether our discourses shall be written or extemporaneous, whether they may be read, or must be delivered without the aid of the manuscript. In regard to *prayer*, it is left to the judgment of Christians, how long, how loud they should be; how many should occur in each service, and whether they should be pre-composed and read, or be extemporaneous. From the New Testament and Justin Martyr we learn, that they were extemporaneous in the primitive age of the church, for, says he, each one prayed, "*ὅση δύναμις αὐτῶν*," as well as he could. The most learned and recent investigations confirm the opinion, that written prayers as well as liturgies were introduced generally in the fourth² and fifth centuries, to aid incompetent ministers, who could not conduct the public services well without them, (Siegel III. p. 205,) especially amid the decline of learning in the Roman empire. The true state of the case is given by the recent German Archeologist, *Siegel*, in his "*Handbuch der Christlich-kirchlichen Alterthümer*,"³ and is worthy of citation: "But after the most distinguished Christian teachers had

¹ "Der Spotname, *prædicantes*, den die Römischen Schriftsteller den Lutherischen Pfarrern gaben, gereichte ihnen zur Ehre, und ist in neueren Zeiten an manchen Orten allgemein recipirt; ob er gleich (Prediger) zu eng ist, um das ganze Geschäft eines evangelischen Pfarrers zu bezeichnen."—Bretschneider's *Entwicklung*, p. 799.

² Coleman's *Christ. Antiq.*

³ Leipsic, 1838, 4 vols. 8vo.

passed from the stage, and had been succeeded by others of inferior education; when barbarism and ignorance were making continued inroads on the Roman empire, and the mysterious portions of worship¹ in a measure disappeared from Christianity, or at least assumed a different form and import even in regard to its terms; then the clergy, who felt unequal to the task of animating the religious assemblies by their own powers of mind, found themselves compelled to have recourse to written directories, which were soon composed and furnished by obliging individuals. This was the origin of these formularies which are known under the names of Liturgies and Missals, which, as we shall shortly see, were fictitiously attributed to distinguished men, and even to apostles in order to confer on them greater importance. That such formularies existed as early as the time of the emperor Justinian, is evident from the 137th *novellus*,² which requires bishops prior to their ordination, to subscribe the creed, and repeat the formulary which was used in celebrating the eucharist, and the prayer for baptism, as well as also other prayers. Most probably the close of the fifth century is the period at which it became customary, in the chief cities, to write down these formularies. From this time it was usual, as well in other respects as especially in the ceremonies of worship, to aim at more general uniformity, and the smaller churches copied after the formularies of those in larger and capital cities. Moreover, the constantly increasing ignorance and indolence of the clergy, may have contributed something to the gradual formation of this custom. The industry of *Bingham*, who labors to prove from individual passages, that such standing written formularies had existed as early as the second century, is unavailing. For those passages accurately examined, either do not establish the point in question, or they refer only to individual, rare cases, which cannot prove the existence of a general custom."

The same general position is sustained by Baumgarten and the other ablest archeologists. Yet it is also certain, that individual instances of forms of prayer may be traced to the second century. But the New Testament affords not a shadow of evidence, that the apostles and primitive christians repeated the Lord's prayer, as a stated part of their public worship. Even the evangelists (Matth. 6: 9-13. Luke 11: 1-4.) record

¹ Certain secret rites, borrowed from the heathen mysteries, and concealed from the vulgar.

² This was the designation given in Roman law, to those later and supplementary laws, which were added to the Justinian code, and formed a part of the *Corpus Juris*.

it with variations, and in all the instances of prayer by Jesus and his disciples, no trace of any uniform, prescribed form of prayer is found. Acts 1 : 24. 4 : 24–31. 9 : 40. 12 : 5. 20 : 36. &c. Nevertheless, the intrinsic excellence of this prayer, its divine authority, and the circumstances under which it was delivered, have very properly led to its occasional use in Christian worship.

It is, therefore, reserved to the judgment of christians of every age, whether they will use any prescribed forms of prayer or not, and whether they will combine them with extemporaneous supplications. And so also in *regard to singing*, it is enjoined that christians should sing, as a part of their stated worship. Col. 3 : 16. “Admonishing one another in psalms (ψαλμοὶ) and hymns (ᾠμοί, perhaps such as Exod. 15 : 5. Deut. 32 : 33. Gen. 49. Judges 5. Isaiah 33. 2 Sam. 1 : 17. &c. national songs and elegies of the Jews,) and spiritual songs,” ᾠδαὶ πνευματικαί, poetic effusions of independent character, such as are now termed hymns. But what kind of versions should be used in different nations, whether literal, like Rouse’s rude and prosaic version of the psalms, or more free, like the elegant, poetic and devotional work of Dr. Watts, is undetermined, as also what tunes shall be employed, amid the vast variety produced by different ages. It is therefore evident, that the psalmody, hymnology and sacred music of the church, form suitable and important topics of legitimate church development, and will strongly sympathize with the progress of poetry and music in general, as is seen in the history of this part of worship, especially from the establishment of singing schools, in the sixth century, till the present time.

In our American Lutheran Church, we have happily struck upon the middle path. We have a liturgy of moderate length, expressing the prevailing judgment of our church on the different parts of public worship, which tends to produce a substantial similarity of worship. Yet these forms are not binding; and each minister, with his congregation, possesses the liberty, to make as much or little use of them as he may judge best. If settled uniform modes of prayer and other services, were best calculated to excite devotion, they would doubtless have been provided by God’s word; and therefore the church should ever retain and vindicate a reasonable liberty in all those matters, not determined in the Scriptures. It seems to have been the design of God that the mind of each worshipper and congregation in every age, and throughout all centuries, should in worship be brought into constant and im-

mediate contact with the divine word, so that the truth, as holy men of God spake it, in its inspired relations and connexions, should operate on the intellect and heart of the church in every period of her history.

The complaint has been heard, in ceaseless iteration from a hundred voices for some years past, uttered, in some cases, by good men, with the best of motives, and reëchoed by the enemies of revivals and of practical godliness, to justify their own lifelessness and formalism, that some of our churches have indulged too much in an emotional religion; have yielded themselves too much to the dominion of feeling, in worship. The charge is true; and we have, as is well known, always been a strenuous advocate for strict order in worship. But the charge is no less one-sided than true. For every one of our churches, that was inclined to fanaticism, we have at least a dozen chained down in the frozen embrace of formality, in whom the life of religion has disappeared, and the conversion of sinners has become a rare occurrence. But of these we hear little complaint, and an increased use of the liturgy, is urged, to curb the flights of feeling. If, then, the use of forms and confessions will tend to restrain the irregularities of the one party, let us beware lest it also tend to confirm the lifeless formalism of the other. At least, we feel deeply impressed with the conviction, that more caution is requisite, and more danger to be apprehended from the latter than the former source; nor can we doubt, that our Divine Master regards with greater abhorrence a lifeless formalism, destitute of the power of godliness, than the earnest zeal of his worshippers, even when it occasionally does outstrip their knowledge, and run into confusion.

4. The church "groweth" or develops herself *juridically*, that is, in all that is undetermined in Scripture concerning her mode of government and discipline. Those principles prescribed in God's word should be retained, but all the other numerous arrangements, necessary to carry out the duties of the church, should be accommodated to the genius, the civil government, the manners and customs of different nations and ages. If diversities of duties are assigned to particular individuals by the church, there should be nothing done conflicting with the natural rights of the church-members, and the parity by *divine right* of her ministers. By divine right there is no difference of rank between the incumbents of the sacred office, whether they be termed presbyters, pastors or bishops, and it is evident that ordination performed by a pastor

in his own church is by divine right valid.¹ Upon this ground we should reject, as conflicting with correct principles, Papacy, Episcopacy claiming divine right, the acknowledgment of kings or civil rulers as earthly heads of the church, and the union between church and state. But the different forms of Presbyteries or Synods, and General Synods, and Conferences or Conventions, may all be regarded as modifications of the conventional principle embodied in the council of Jerusalem, attended by the apostles, elders or ministers and lay brethren. The various systems of church discipline practiced in this country by the Lutherans, the Congregationalists, the Presbyterians, the Moravians and Methodists, are of similar nature, and constitute a proper field for church development.

In the same light must *Creeds* or *Confessions* be regarded. They are not enjoined in Scripture, they were not used in the apostolic churches. Yet the good sense of the church soon taught the utility of a creed, long enough to exclude fundamental errorists from the church, and yet not so long as to infringe on that liberty of conscience in nonfundamentals, which is the birthright of every man, and *the vindication of which is essential to the successful development and progress of the church.* For this purpose the so-called Apostles' Creed² suf-

¹ "Weil aber nach göttlichem Recht kein Unterschied ist zwischen Bischöfen und Pastoren oder Pfarrherrn, ist ohne Zweifel wenn ein Pfarrherr in seiner Kirche etliche tüchtige Personen zu Kirchenämtern ordnet, dass solche Ordination nach göttlichen Rechten kräftig und recht ist." The original Latin is more brief: Sed quum jure divino non sint diversi gradus episcopi et pastoris, manifestum est ordinationem a pastore, in sua ecclesia factam, jure divino ratam esse. Smalcald Art. Appendix de Potestate et Primatu Papæ, &c. p. 341. Müller's ed.

² This creed was termed "apostolic," probably because, by common consent, it contained the prominent doctrines taught by the apostles. It was unknown in the first, second, and third centuries; and even in the middle of the fourth, that most learned historian of the Christian church, Eusebius, knew nothing of it. The first mention, and the earliest record of it, are found in Rufinus, who lived in the latter part of the fourth, and the beginning of the fifth century. Yet he states, that tradition traced it, by *oral* transmission, to the apostles: The Romish figment, that the apostles composed it at a council held just before they started into the different parts of the world, each apostle framing a part of it, has long since been exploded. Several of the Christian fathers have given us statements of the doctrines, universally believed by the church in their day, and required as a term of admittance, such as Irenæus in the second, and Tertullian in the third century. These substantially agree with that, given by Rufinus, and called by him the "Apostolical Creed," only the first is longer, and the second shorter than his, which was probably formed from them. Neither of the three contains the clause, concerning the descent of Jesus into hell, or hades. If the primitive church had possessed such a creed, *written by the apostles*, it would not only be found in the Christian writers of the first three centuries and be referred to by them, but would have been gladly received into the canon of the New Testament, as possessing au-

ficed for several centuries, and the Nicene, which is little longer, was added in the fourth century. Subsequent fundamental errors would naturally have justified some brief additions; but the history of the Protestant churches, which is little else than a history of intestine contentions about non-fundamentals, demonstrates, that the creeds under which they acted are entirely too long, and violate the apostolic injunction, "the brother that is weak in the faith," that is, whom ye regard as entertaining some errors of faith, "receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations." Rom. 14: 1. Yes, we regard it as a lesson clearly taught by the Providence of God in the history of the Protestant churches, and especially of the mother church of the Reformation, which bears the name of the immortal Luther, that *her creeds are entirely too long*, the number of doctrines and collateral aspects of doctrines there determined, is entirely too great. This judgment the good sense of a large part of the church in Europe pronounced in the beginning, by refusing to receive some of these books. The same estimate is clearly demonstrated by the judgment and sentiments of many of her noblest sons known in her history as Melancthonians, and Sacramentarians and Cryptocalvinists, who all felt that the points of difference between them and the Reformed, ought not to be made symbolical, nor permitted to put asunder those, whom God hath joined together by the unity of the Spirit, by unity in all the doctrines that were required for ecclesiastical union by the christians of the first four centuries after Christ and even more. Our fathers, therefore, exhibited a just appreciation of the lessons of history, when, half a century ago, they relinquished all requisition of a formal pledge to this mass of former symbolical books, though they continued to believe all the cardinal doctrines taught in them; and practically required only implied belief in the fundamentals of the gospel, as taught in the Augsburg Confession. The General Synod of our church did but reduce to writing, and thus embody in their organic law the wise and liberal practice of our fathers, when they required every candidate for licensure or ordination to make the same pledge in a formal manner. And God has signally blessed the doctrinal basis they assumed. To the enumeration of these fundamental articles, published by the

thority equal to the other writings of the apostles, yea, even superior to them, being the joint work of them all. The probability is, that an oral creed, substantially like that of Irenæus, Tertullian and Rufinus, was used in the church as early as the second and third centuries, though like all oral traditions, it varied in different places and ages, and one form of it was just as much apostolic as the other, that is, they all contained doctrines taught by the apostles.

Synod of Maryland, we see no objection. It gives distinctness to the pledge, and definitely marks its limits. But the position of the so-called old Lutherans of Germany, and of some portions of our own Western States, seems to us evidently a contracted, short-sighted one. It ignores the teachings of history, and the lessons of divine Providence. It resists the proper development of the church of Christ, whilst it attempts to perpetuate the minor peculiarities of Luther and a part of his immediate successors. It almost deifies one man of God, whilst it counts as nought the labors and studies and prayers of a thousand other divines of the same church, as learned as he, and equally pious, who commenced their labors in possession of all the light, which Luther's life of prayer and labor gave him; and yet supposes, that by equal fidelity and study, they accomplished nothing, and he did every thing! That the day will arrive when these men will see and lament their error, we cannot doubt. They will find that they are wounding the Savior in the house of his friends!

5. The church "groweth," is developed, *exegetically*.—The Bible being a revelation from the God of heaven, many christians of the earlier ages supposed it must be interpreted on principles of exegesis, different from those applied to human compositions. Origen especially, who was among the first that theorized on this subject, attributed three different senses to the Scriptures, the grammatical, the moral, and the mystical, which latter he subdivided into two classes, the anagogical and the allegorical. The numerous wild and fanciful notions, to which these false principles conducted this otherwise estimable and learned father, are well known. In later days, and especially since the Reformation, great progress has been made in the interpretation of the word of God. The Romish church at an early day, adopted the tradition of the fathers as her rule of interpretation; yet the fallacy of this rule is evident, when we reflect that these fathers adopted every variety of theological sentiments. That there has been great development, or improvement made in the interpretation of the Scriptures since the Reformation, no one acquainted with the subject will deny. At last, after passing through various fluctuations in the neological schools of Germany, this science has settled down on the principles of common sense, designated the *historical interpretation*, which will not, we think, soon be again shaken. It is now admitted, that in making a revelation to men, in order that it might be intelligible, God must necessarily use language in the sense, in which it was understood by those to whom it was addressed; and that the

Scriptures must therefore be interpreted on the same principles, which are applied to uninspired human compositions. Much light has also been reflected on some portions of Scripture by the fulfillment of *prophecy*, in which the developments of providence in the history of the world, have exhibited the most striking displays of divine prescience, and fixed the import of some passages formerly enveloped in darkness. Vast improvement has also been made in the science of philology, and the different branches of archæology, which throw light upon the Scriptures, such as the manners and customs, the geography and history of the nations referred to in the sacred record. Thus the labors of infidel lexicographers and linguists, have often aided the cause of biblical interpretation, and travels and explorations, prompted by mere secular motives, have frequently cast light upon the word of God. Much has in these various ways been accomplished for the interpretation of the Scriptures, and consequent development of the church, and more will still be done for the same purpose.

6. The church "groweth," or is developed, *theologically*.— This is indeed a wide field, at the mere outlines of which we have time but to cast a glance. The evidences which sustain the faith of the church in the Scriptures, have been gaining ever increasing strength by the investigations of science. The Mosaic account of the present organization of things and of the early history of the world, is confirmed by the achievements in geology, and even by the hieroglyphics of the Egyptian pyramids. The Mosaic account of the unity of our race, though now and then assailed, is clearly established by the deductions of modern ethnologists. In this department we are happy to acknowledge the obligations of our cause to the recent able publication of Dr. Bachman, one of the most distinguished divines and philosophers in our American church.

The church groweth in her *systematic* understanding of the Scriptures. In its objective totality, as delineated by the pencil of inspiration, Christianity is incapable of growth or improvement. But in our subjective apprehension of its principles and doctrines, in the adjustment of their systematic relations to one another, and in the philosophy of its facts and doctrines, it groweth into a holy temple in the Lord. The solar system was just as perfect in itself, when men supposed the earth to be an extended plain; yet our knowledge of it has been growing in every age, until even the discoveries of Copernicus are thrown into the shade. After the lustre of apostolic zeal, and the illustration of apostolic example were taken away, and after the corruptions of Judaism, of Gnosticism, of Platonism,

of Scholasticism, of Romanism and of modern philosophical science falsely so called, had corrupted the doctrines of the church and encumbered the truth, there was necessity and room for improvement in every after age, by returning to the primitive simplicity of apostolic Christianity, and by the application to the Bible of the progressive light of genuine physical and intellectual science. The Reformers succeeded in rejecting the greater part of the corruptions of Romanism; and yet something remained, to be achieved by their successors.

The facts and clearly revealed doctrines of Christianity, are unchangeable; whilst we may justly expect continued improvement in the theories of men for their explanation, and in their success in separating all such theories from the facts and doctrines themselves. As the spirit of liberality is extended over the church, and more amicable relations prevail, sectarian prejudice will exert less influence in the study of Scripture, and there will be greater agreement among christians on those doubtful and disputed points of doctrine, by which, since the Reformation, different denominations are distinguished. By continued investigations in psychological science, the practical influence of truth on the mind will be better understood, and the nature and reasonableness of conversion itself be more clearly perceived. The faithful pastor may learn to apply the truth more appropriately to the peculiar circumstances and necessities of individual sinners, and the church grow in the accuracy of her judgment as to the relative value and proper use of *old measures* and *new measures*, in the conversion of sinners and edification of saints. And, finally, on this topic, the church will grow and be gloriously developed by the increased diffusion over the Christian community, of a juster estimate and discrimination between the fundamental facts and doctrines of our holy religion, and the minor points of sectarian difference. Distinct progress has been made in the present century in this direction, and although the recent growth of Puseyism and formalism in various phases, has created a temporary diversion, our confidence is in the great Head of the church, and we trust she will continue to grow in this respect also, until all who worship Him, shall worship Him in spirit and in truth, and study to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace; until all the different denominations of Christians can say both by word and action, "One is our master," and that is neither Luther, nor Calvin, nor Wesley, but "Christ," and, notwithstanding our minor diversities, *in Him* "we are all brethren," will bid each other God speed, and labor harmoniously side by side for the furtherance of the Gospel.

7. Finally. The church "groweth," is developed, *economically*, that is, she will continue to improve in the method of administering the appointed instrumentalities of her aggressive agency. The grand instrumentality for extending the kingdom of Christ is, and until the end of the world will be, divine truth, either oral, or written, or symbolical as in the sacraments accompanied by the influence of the Holy Spirit; but in the methods of disseminating and applying the truth, there is great variety.

For the promulgation of oral and symbolic truth, the living ministry was established. When the apostles had preached the gospel in any place and made some converts, they selected several of the most intelligent, judicious and pious among them, and appointed them as bishops, also sometimes called elders, in our day, ministers. Thus there was a plurality of ministers or bishops in the town of Ephesus, and Paul directs Timothy to ordain, not an elder, but elders or bishops in every church. These ordinarily pursued their secular profession during the week for support,¹ and labored according to their ability, in the duties of the ministry especially on the Sabbath; whilst it was customary from the beginning to provide for those who travelled as missionaries. In the progress of time more education was required, and secular business was prohibited. Yet no adequate provision was made for a respectable education of the ministers in general until after the Reformation.

¹ This fact is evident, not only from the example of the apostle Paul, who sometimes labored with his own hands; but also from his admonition to other bishops or ministers, not to engage in the pursuit of dishonest gain. 1 Tim. 3:3. Tit. 1:7. 11. 1 Pet. 5:2. In these passages Luther has happily, though somewhat freely, expressed the apostle's idea, by the phrase "*unehrliche Handthierung treiben*," following a dishonest trade or profession. As the so-called *Apostolic Canons*, which subsequently prohibited secular business to the clergy, are inaccessible to many of our readers, we subjoin them. They were written about the close of the third century, when imparity had already crept into the ministry; and are indicative of the customs of that age:

Canon 6. *Neither a bishop, presbyter nor deacon shall engage in secular employment, on pain of being deposed from office.*

And the fortieth canon is as follows:

Canon 40. *We ordain that the bishop shall have the control of the congregational property. For as the precious souls of men are committed to his care, much more ought he to have the control of the church property, that he may freely arrange every thing, that he may aid the poor through the instrumentality of the presbyters and deacons, in the fear of God and in all honesty. He shall also be permitted to apply a portion of it to his own indispensable wants, if he needs it, as also for strange Christians who have come as guests; and in these cases it is not necessary to suffer any want*

Here a great advance was made by the establishment of Protestant universities, and the requisition of a regular and respectable standard of ministerial education. Another development still, was the separation of theological from classical instruction, and the establishment of distinct Theological Seminaries. The last step has been the organization of Societies, by which men of piety and talents are supported by the church in obtaining their education, and the number of ministers is greatly increased. Accordingly, we perceive, whilst the oral truth to be published, remains the same, and the persons appointed to proclaim it are the same, there has been a striking development, or progress in the mode of training these persons, and in the method of supporting them. Whilst the *written* word remained unaltered, in all ages, who does not know the amazing growth or development of the church, in the facilities for its dissemination? As long as the sacred volume could be reproduced only by the pen of the transcriber, the work progressed slowly, and the copies were so rare, that many whole congregations could not boast of an entire set of all the sacred books. But who does not know the amazing change,

(μεταλαμβάνειν δε και αυτον των δεοντων, ειγε δεειτο, εις τας αναγκαιας αυτω χρειας και των επιξενουμενων αδελφων, ως κατα μηδενα τροπον αυτους υστερεισθαι.)

The fifty-eighth canon likewise relates to this subject :

Canon 58. *If a bishop refuse to supply the indispensable wants of a poor minister (namely from the church funds), he shall be set aside ; and if he still refuses to do it, let him be deposed as a murderer of his brethren.*¹

At the Synod of Elvira, (in Spain, near the site of the present Granada) the date of which is not entirely certain, though fixed with probability about the year 313, a restriction was imposed on ministers, by the eighteenth canon, which, however, presupposes that in Spain the secular business of ministers was not yet entirely prohibited.

Canon 18. *Bishops, elders and deacons shall not leave their place of residence for the sake of trade, nor traverse the provinces for the purposes of attending profitable fairs. They may, for the purpose of gaining a subsistence, send a son, or freedman, or hireling, or friend, or any one else ; and if they wish to pursue any secular business, let it be within their province.*²

¹ Roessler's Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, Vol. 4. p. 232, 242, 248.

² Ibid. Vol. 4. p. 280, 281. Episcopi, Presbyteri et Diacones de locis suis negotiandi causa non discedant; nec circumeuntes provincias quaestuosas nundinas sectentur. Sane ad victum sibi conquirendum aut filium, aut libertum, aut mercenarium, aut amicum, aut quemlibet mittant, et si voluerint negotiari, intra provinciam negotientur.

produced by the invention of wooden and then metallic types, and finally by the printing press in and since the fifteenth century, propelled for several centuries by the manual power of the printer? But in the present age, even that wonder-working agent, steam, has been laid under contribution; in multiplying copies of the Bible, and thus laboring for the dissemination of divine truth! In the thirteenth century, when the price of a day's labor was three cents, it would have taken the wages of one man for fourteen years, to purchase a single copy of the Bible, which then cost about one hundred and seventy dollars; whilst at present, the price of a single day's labor will provide for any family a well-printed copy of the word of life. Nor is even this small sum indispensable. Christians have learned to understand their duty so much better, that they have organized societies for the express purpose of disseminating the word of God. In the progress of her development, the church finds a duty devolved on her, of which she was formerly ignorant. And now the circulation of this holy volume, not only keeps pace with the living teacher, but is often sent in advance to prepare the way for him. The dissemination of *religious Tracts*, and the erection of Sabbath schools, are also new features of development in the church, and no one acquainted with the vast machinery now at work in these departments, and the manifest smiles of heaven vouchsafed to them, can hesitate to regard them as important features of christian activity. Nor can we fail to recognize another step in the progressive development of the church, in the systematic form which the *Missionary enterprise* has assumed since the Reformation. The church of Christ is, in its nature, aggressive. To make disciples of all nations, was the great task assigned her; and, from the beginning, she applied herself to the work. Yet it was chiefly done by the heads of the church, without the direct coöperation of the laity. But it may be regarded as a development peculiar to this century, to enlist the services of the *great body of the laity*, by a regular system of organization, which like a net-work embraces the whole church. By the increased commercial connections and rapid transportation by steam, the church is brought into near contact with the heathen world, missionary operations have assumed a regular systematic form, and all evangelical churches participate in this glorious work. Even the *auri fames infanda*, the unhallowed thirst for gold, becomes the incidental occasion for bearing the Gospel to the coasts of the Pacific. And as one science after another illuminates the enterprise and commerce of nations, all will be compelled to bring their tribute to our

holy cause, to the development of the church. Even the progress of *republican principles* in the civil governments of Europe, must tend to develop the true principles of Christianity and the resources of the church. It will ultimately, doubtless, eventuate in a separation of church and state, and destroy that unblest alliance between the kingdom of this world and the kingdom of Christ "which is *not* of this world," which has corrupted and secularized the church since the days of Constantine; and by calling into action the resources of the church distinctively, it will make every private member feel his responsibility, and give him full scope for the exercise of his powers. Thus we see, that the kingdom, or church of the Redeemer, is indeed "fitly framed," is based on an immovable foundation, and possessed of unchangeable fundamental features. Yet it is so constructed, that "it groweth into a holy temple," is developed under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, by the progressive experience of ages, the increasing light of physical, intellectual and moral science, the fulfilment of prophecy, and the developments of God's providence. Nor is the coöperation of that blessed, ascended Redeemer withheld, who when on earth displayed his omnipotence in his miraculous works, and to whom is given all authority (*ἐξουσία* authority, not *δύναμις* power,) in heaven and earth, which he employs as "head over all things for the church."

We cannot close this article, without inviting the attention of our readers to several practical lessons, which flow from our subject. If the principles here laid down are correct, it clearly follows, that our American Lutheran church of the General Synod, is organized in perfect accordance with the most comprehensive and enlightened views of Christ's kingdom, is adapted to all ages of the world, and to every stage of the church's development. On the one hand, its organization secures perfectly the unchangeable foundation of the apostles and prophets, and Jesus Christ the chief corner-stone; and on the other, leaves reasonable scope for the development of the church, under the increasing light of universal science, and the progressive instructions of God's providence. At licensure and ordination we bind ourselves to the apostles, the prophets and Jesus Christ, when we profess to receive the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. We pay due respect to our ecclesiastical ancestry, and secure sufficient doctrinal uniformity, when we declare our belief that the Augsburg Confession, the mother symbol of Protestantism, presents a substantially accurate exhibition of the fundamental articles of God's word.

On the contrary, in those things left doubtful or undecided in Scripture, and referred to the judgment and progressive experience of the church, our Formula of Government and Discipline, together with the Liturgy, expresses our preference on as many points, as are necessary to harmonious coöperation; leaving the residue to the judgment and preference of individual churches and ministers. Even in the undecided points, a pleasing, prevailing uniformity is found; and if, as was the case in the apostolic churches, and as will sometimes be the case among men who think and study the Scriptures for themselves, some minor difference occurs, this may be the subject of amicable discussion in our periodicals, and those who have reason, Scripture principle, and experience on their side, will generally convince others, and thus sufficient uniformity be preserved. It has been objected to this mode of recognizing the Augsburg Confession, that it is too indefinite, and would enable a Socinian to enter our communion, if he did not regard his denial of the Savior's divinity as fundamental. But this is a radical misapprehension of the case. It must be remembered, that not the applicant but the Synod is to decide, after a full examination, whether the candidate agrees with them on all fundamental aspects of christian doctrine or not. They must first determine whether or not they will license him, before he is permitted to take the pledge to the confession. So long, therefore, as the majority of a Synod are fundamentally sound in the faith, they can easily exclude all applicants who are not so: and if the members of any Synod are themselves heterodox, no creed, however long and detailed, will induce them to require of others, what they do not believe themselves. The experience of a quarter of a century, has, moreover, demonstrated the practical sufficiency of this form of a pledge.

But let us listen to the proposed remedies for this defect. And first a preliminary word of those, who urge the unqualified adoption of the whole mass of former Lutheran symbols. Our church in this country, has uttered her judgment so decidedly on this subject, that this point may be regarded as settled. Few, very few of our ministers or congregations will ever be brought so far to surrender their own judgments, or liberty of thought and investigation. As to the suggestion of those, who would have us retain those books as a whole, but at the same time adopt a set of rules, by which four or five species of matter, such as historical, exegetical, &c. shall be excluded from normative authority, it also is out of the question. Various difficulties oppress it. The adoption of such rules for expur-

gating those books, was not acknowledged by the authors of the Form of Concord, or by the Protestant princes who gave normative authority to those writings. And, if it be said, many of our ablest divines have affirmed the right of making these exceptions, we do not deny the right. But others will, with equal right, add other rules, and thus there will be none settled at last. This system would also require too much of the time of our pastors to eviscerate these books, and ascertain what portions of a volume nearly as large as the entire Bible, are normative and what are not.

Moreover, our fathers in this country, fifty years ago, dropped all the symbolic books, except the practical use of the Augsburg Confession, and the employment of Luther's minor Catechism for the instruction of the young. The General Synod has settled this point by embodying this practice in her organic law. As to all practical purposes, the only questions with us are, is it desirable to give greater definiteness to the qualified acknowledgment of the Augsburg Confession, prescribed by the General Synod, and if so, how can it be best accomplished?

Two methods to confer greater definiteness have been proposed, deserving of serious consideration. It has been suggested, that normative authority might be given to the Augsburg Confession as a whole; that those who can conscientiously do so, might subscribe it unconditionally, whilst all others should be at liberty to specify, as excepted, any points to which they could not assent, these being not essential to orthodox Christianity, or of such a nature, as to introduce confusion into the church. Among the points, for legitimate exception, the following were specified: 1) The *power of the sacraments*, but not their validity or subjects. From the fact, that power here must mean something else than validity, and from the known views of the proponent, we suppose it to include the doctrines of baptismal regeneration, and of the real or bodily presence: 2) *Our relation to the first man*, Adam, and *the manner* in which we became involved in his sin; but not the sinfulness of man itself, nor original sin, or the necessity of regeneration. 3) The *Communicatio idiomatum*, that is, the doctrine of an interchange of the attributes of the divine and human natures in Christ, including the position, that divine attributes are conferred on the human nature of Christ. This doctrine is, however not taught in the Augsburg Confession but in the other symbolical books, and therefore its specification at subscription might be omitted. This plan would include all the prominent topics, which we and the great mass

of our ministers desire to have kept free. Nor would we personally have any difficulty with it. Still, there are some objections to this plan. The requisition that each subscriber shall specify his exceptions, would produce a multitudinous record, some also would except more and others fewer doctrines and points. There would thus be no uniformity; and we can perceive but little advantage, in requiring each licentiate to make a public record of his views on such non-essential points, many of which he might subsequently wish to change. The other method of giving more definiteness to the pledge of the General Synod, is that of the Maryland Synod, to enumerate the doctrines and aspects of doctrine, which we regard as fundamental, and on which we adopt the statements of the Augsburg Confession as normative; thus making that Confession absolutely binding on all these enumerated points. This method, on the whole, appears to us decidedly the best. It is clear, definite, and positive: and we feel confident it will cover the real doctrinal position of every member of the General Synod. As it also allows all the doctrinal views of the old Lutheran party, it is truly catholic and tolerant. It presents no difficulty, except to those who are not tolerant themselves; and, if these find any impediment in attempting to enter the General Synod, it is so much the better for the peace and prosperity of our Zion.

Under this pledge, as also without the additional specification of fundamentals, we stand prepared to receive any light, which the age can afford us; to adapt ourselves to the divine and providential developments of millennial enterprise and glory. On this platform, every individual has room to exert his utmost power for the conversion of sinners, to devise and execute the most efficient and far-reaching plans for extending the kingdom of Christ and promoting his mediatorial glory. Standing on this ground our worthy and pious members will be strongly attached to our church, not merely by hereditary preference for our outward forms, which, under other circumstances, would make them Jews or Mohammedans, but by a far stronger, nobler bond, by the conviction, that in it they enjoy the greatest facilities for saving their souls and the souls of others. Let us, therefore, adhere to these apostolic principles. Like the immortal Luther, let us acknowledge the word of God alone, as our infallible guide. This word let us study, whilst we live. From this pure fountain, let us draw our streams of living and life-giving water. Let us respect our predecessors, but not idolize them. Let us venerate the truth which they taught; but not forswear other and further truth,

when we recognize it. Let us be careful not to interpose Luther, between ourselves and Christ or his word. Let us also inquire, whether we are availing ourselves of all the facilities tendered by the apostolic structure of our church, for glorifying God; and whilst we bless him for the religious liberty secured to us in this happy land, and for the apostolic principles of our developed, growing church, let us humble ourselves on account of our unfruitfulness, and purpose, by the grace of God, to labor with increasing zeal and fidelity in the vineyard of the Lord.

This subject also presents us a clear estimate of *the character and relations of the several evangelical Protestant denominations*. It follows, that they are several, co-equal branches of the one true church of Christ, all receiving every thing essential to the Christian religion; whilst they differ only in minor points of doctrine, points less clearly revealed in Scripture, or superadded by the ratiocinations of theologians for the purpose of adjusting the systematic relations of doctrines; and all preferring different methods of organization, discipline, or worship, in matters not settled by the Bible, as best calculated to advance the highest interests of our common and divine religion.

They are therefore different divisions of the same army of cross-bearers, of the same sacramental host, fighting under the one captain of our salvation, Jesus Christ, against the common enemies, the flesh, the world and the devil. Therefore they should not turn their weapons against one another; and the more unity of counsel and concert of action they observe, the greater efficiency will characterize their efforts, and the more rapidly will they press their conquests over the earth. They "are all brethren," whilst "one only is their Master, Christ." Therefore they should cherish fraternal love towards each other, and in prosecuting the great work assigned them, they should call no man "master" but Christ, teaching us in his word. They should suffer no human authority to intervene between him and them, or prevent them from making his word their constant, paramount rule of duty. All jealousy and hatred between these different divisions of the church, should be discountenanced. The disposition to magnify and give prominence to the points of difference, though it may confirm the frame-work of sectarianism, tend to glorify a particular denomination, and minister to sectarian pride, is certainly hostile to the unity of the spirit and bond of peace, enjoined in revelation; and cannot fail to be displeasing to our common Lord and Savior. In the spirit of the magnanimous

Paul, we should rather be predisposed "to receive him that is weak in the faith," whom we regard as in error on some fundamental points of doctrine; "but not for doubtful disputation," *μη̄ εις διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν*, not in order to contend with him on doubtful points, Rom. 14: 1. As the object of the several evangelical denominations is one, and their common enemy one, and as their fundamental interests are one, they should study unity of counsel and concert of action, should coöperate in the promotion of objects of common interest. Whilst each denomination must naturally prefer its own peculiarities to those of any other part of Christ's kingdom, the utmost caution should be observed, not to fall into the dangerous error, either theoretically or practically, of regarding these peculiarities as equal in importance with the great fundamentals of our holy religion, held in common by all. Thus, for ourselves we openly avow that we are *Lutherans*, and prefer the doctrines, the organization and usages of the American Lutheran church to all others; yet, with the venerable Dr. Miller, late professor in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Princeton, we say, "It would never occur to us to place the peculiarities of our creed among the fundamentals of our common Christianity." But for any one sect to set herself up as the only true church, refusing the recognition of others as co-equal branches of the Redeemer's kingdom, is not only highly criminal in the sight of God, but is intellectually contemptible. Such are the proper character and relations of the several portions of the church of Christ, according to the principles of God's word. It cannot be denied, the ideal is a sublime one, entirely throwing into the back ground the great Protestant schism. Would that it were already fully realized!

Whilst the several denominations thus unite in holding fast the great fundamentals of our common faith, and giving them due prominence, they will learn to place less importance on the points in which they differ. They will move on harmoniously, striving together for the furtherance of the Gospel. The word of the Master will be studied more impartially; since change of opinion on non-fundamental points, will be regarded as less important. Some peculiarity of one or other church, will commend itself to the judgment of sister denominations, and be gradually and insensibly adopted by all; as is exemplified in the increasing prevalence of the Lutheran practice of Catechization, in the relaxation of the rigid aspects of absolute or unconditional election by a large portion of Calvinists, and in the abandonment of the doctrine of the real

or bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist, (loosely named Consubstantiation,) by the vast majority of the Lutheran church both in Europe and America. Thus will the asperity of sectarian diversities be gradually abraded. The utmost possible efficiency will be given to the aggressive efforts of christians; the several portions of the one church of Christ, be insensibly brought nearer together in obedience to the "new commandment of the Master, that we love one another." As much uniformity will be attained in doctrine and practice, as is feasible amid the infirmities of our fallen nature, and the church will be developed into the full and glorious completion of the Savior's supplication: "*Holy Father—neither pray I for these alone; but for them also who shall believe on me through their word: that they may also be one, as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they may also be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.*" Thus concentrated, and harmonized in all its parts, continued triumphs will attend the onward march of the church, toward the grand consummated design of her mission. Not only will *the universal priesthood of christians*, the recognition of *individual rights* and the work of *individual conversions*, progress with accelerated velocity; but, by the special outpourings of the Spirit, *nations* will be born comparatively in a day. Kings will become nursing fathers and queens nursing mothers to the church. Civil rulers generally will descend from the chair of state, and do homage at the foot of the cross. The civil and political history of nations, will present a purified and christianized page. The giant evils of the world will be subdued, and, whilst glory is given to God in the highest, peace and good will reign amongst the sons of men. Nor should occasional seasons of adversity, impair our confidence in this glorious consummation. The wheel of Providence is a large one, and cycles of ages may be consumed in its revolution. But it moves onward with a divine impetus, and the time will assuredly come, when the developed church of the Redeemer will have grown into a holy temple in the Lord, and have extended over the entire earth; the time when the kingdoms of this world will have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and from the entire length and breadth of this mediatorial empire, shall arise one universal song of praise, "as the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, *Alleluia, the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.*"

ARTICLE II.

DELITZSCH ON THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

Translated from the German by Professor Jacobs.

*Ueber Verfasser und Leser des Hebräerbriefs mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der neuesten Untersuchungen Wieseler's und Thiersch's : von F. Delitzsch.** [Concerning the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the persons to whom it was addressed, with particular reference to the latest investigations of Wieseler and Thiersch : by F. Delitzsch.]

THE Epistle to the Hebrews is peculiar amongst the books of the New Testament, just as the prophetic cycle, Isaiah 40—66, like to it in spirit, stands alone amongst the books of the Old Testament. In both books, the subject matter, which is divided into three principal parts, possesses the same surpassing importance; and the language the same majestic step and bearing. In both books are felt the breathings of the atmosphere of a future world; and over the origin of both hangs the veil of a deep mystery. No other book of the New Testament possesses such rhetorical splendor, such rythmical melody, as the Epistle to the Hebrews. Its particular form, however, is not one *adapted to* the subject, it is an *emanation from* the subject itself. The Epistle is so melodious to the ear, because the superior glory of the new covenant to that of the old constitutes its substance. The Old and New Testaments are contrasted with each other, and the moonlight of the Old grows pale before the bright sunrise of the New. The style is more oratorical than argumentative; it is not so bold and spirited as that of the Epistle to the Galatians; not so resistless and overwhelming as in that to the Ephesians; its progress is marked by a deeper consciousness of composure, by a more exalted solemnity, and by a more silent majesty.

Before us we behold a treatise, but the special objects of the exhortation, with which the doctrinal part is interwoven, show us at once, that it is a sermon, which the author is delivering to a particular church; and, at the conclusion, the sermon, or as the author himself styles his composition, the *λόγος παρακλή-*

* *Mittheilung aus des Verf. akademischen Vorlesungen über den Hebräerbrief im Winterhalbjahr 1848-9, published in Rudelbach and Guerike's Zeitschr. Zehnter Jahrgang, 1849. Zweites Quartalheft.*

σέως word of exhortation, transforms itself into an epistle. In most manuscripts, and even in the Peshito or old Syriac version, this is placed between the thirteenth Epistle of Paul and the so-called Catholic Epistles. It is not placed among the Pauline, and yet it is not reckoned as belonging to the seven Catholic Epistles. The doubtful position thus assigned it, is already an evidence how uncertain are its origin and aim. Although it bears not the name of an apostle, its contents, nevertheless, have no remote connection with the apostolic writings. The whole Epistle, when compared with the writings of the apostolical fathers, is undoubtedly calculated to produce the impression, that it has emanated from the original creative power of an apostolic mind. And if it has come from an apostle, from whom else could it be, but from Paul? But, except near the close, the Epistle by no means produces the impression that he was its writer. Its form is not Pauline, and its thoughts, though in no part unlike those of Paul, yet rise in many respects, above his style of teaching, elsewhere presented to our inspection. Only towards its close, where it assumes the form of an epistle, are we impressed with the idea that we hear Paul and no one else.

But the same veil which hangs over the author of the Epistle, also hangs over the persons to whom it is addressed.—They constitute a church or churches of peculiar character and experience. But where are they to be found? They have been sought for first in Palestine, then in Syria, in Cilicia and other countries in Asia Minor, and in Egypt. But no satisfactory result concerning either writer or readers has as yet been obtained. Even the direct Pauline authorship is yet here and there defended. We might denominate the author of this Epistle the “great unknown” of the New Testament, as Ewald denominated the author of Isaiah 40—66, the great unknown of the Old Testament. His Epistle bears a resemblance to the Melchisedec of sacred History, of whom the seventh chapter speaks. With a royal priestly solemnity the Epistle moves along, and as Melchisedec had neither beginning nor end, so also this Epistle is ἀγενεαλόγητος, we know not whence it comes or whither it goes.

And yet the question, who are the readers of this epistle, is one of great importance to its proper comprehension. But of still far greater practical importance is the question concerning its author; not, indeed, if the view of Hoffman be right, (*Weissagung und Erfüllung*, I. § 6.), that the canonical authority of a book of the Bible does not depend upon our knowledge of its author, whether he had moreover any special call

in the history of redemption, and therefore whether he was properly inspired. If the canonical authority is not dependent upon the historical testimony of the church, but solely upon the testimony of the Spirit, which assures the community of Christ, that in the Scriptures it has always the same rule of faith (confession) and that fulness of all truth and knowledge which it needs in order to preserve its living communion with its Head, then may the Epistle to the Hebrews be canonical, no matter who is its author. But this testimony of the Spirit, which dwells in the church, has reference to the Scriptures as an organic whole, and not to single disputed books, which, without destroying Scripture as a body might be regarded as not belonging to it. It tells the church, that the divine work of redemption, as unfolded in the Scriptures in its historical and doctrinal contents, is objective and absolute truth; the Spirit produces an internal conviction thereof in the church, and seals it with his yea and amen. But whether, for example, the Epistle of James is canonical or not, the Holy Spirit does not decide by giving direct testimony to the church. If that were the case, Luther would have sinned against the Holy Ghost, when he refused to receive the Epistle of James into the number of canonical books; learned investigation would be cut off in advance, because that testimony would have to be acknowledged as a fact before which we must bow, and we would not dare to arrive at such a result as, that there exists a contradiction between the doctrine of justification of James and that of Paul, since what is canonical cannot contradict itself. Whence, therefore, does the church derive the conviction that a book is canonical? Whence does ecclesiastical science derive it, to which belongs the office of showing, by means of a critical, historical and biblical theological examination, the source and the propriety of that conviction, or of destroying it as occasion may be found? It must be made clear to the church and to science that the author of this book belongs to the number of those, whose office it was to found churches, and to whom belonged the authority and qualifications necessary for this purpose; for only on this supposition could what he said be regarded as canonical, or as constituting a rule or basis for the faith, life and edification of the church. But this calling, and the necessary qualifications and endowments the apostles actually possessed; and, therefore, the canonical authority of a book of the New Testament depends upon its apostolic origin, testified to by the primitive church, confirmed by the testimony of the Spirit, both in general and in particular, in the church of all ages. But yet historical

tradition is by no means free from doubt and controversy concerning all the books of the Bible. The bounds of the canon are consequently not fixed as far as both church and theological science are concerned. The canonical authority of several books yet remains, or at least until now has been, an open question.

We agree, therefore, with Schleiermacher, Twisten, and Nitzsch, amongst the moderns, who regard the canonical authority of a book of the New Testament as depending upon the peculiar relation, which its author sustained towards Jesus; and upon the nature of his sacred calling for the church. Sack, in his interesting tract on the Word of God, also starts out with this principle, in the opinion which he expresses concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews. Bleek expresses the same opinion in his commentary, although he distinguishes too much between the churchly and the scientific as of separate interests. This is the principle which has guided the opinion of the most ancient churches and of the church of the German Reformation. The latter makes the canonical authority of a book of the New Testament dependant upon the agreement of the internal evidence (*criteria interna*), with the testimony of the primitive church (*testificatio primitivae ecclesiae*). In addition to these, the newer Dogmatic demands historical testimony, although it is disposed to give it an inferior place in comparison with the *criteria interna*. In Luther's N. T. as late as 1546–8, the Epistles to the Hebrews, of James and of Judas, and the Apocalypse were placed at the end, as not belonging to the well ascertained canonical books of the New Testament. This explains the reason of the position which they, at present, occupy in the German Bible. Conrad Deitrich (1613) and other writers on dogmatics, class the Epistle to the Hebrews among the Apocryphal Books of the N. T. (*libri apocryphi*) [a very unbecoming expression,] as Carlstadt, in his treatise concerning the canonical scriptures (*de canonicis scripturis*) of A. D. 1520, had placed it among those known as belonging to the third and last book of the N. T. (*novi t. codicis tertiæ et ultimæ celebratis*). Even Nichol. Hunnius, in his popular epitome of articles of faith, (*epitome credendorum*) republished by Brandt, retains the distinction between the *homologoumena* or generally received, and *antilegoumena* or disputed books of the N. T. Our symbols are adapted to this free historical arrangement of the canon. They do not fix the bounds of the canon, because in reality they are not capable of being clearly ascertained. On the contrary the church of Rome, at the council of Trent, laid

down as a church doctrine that Paul had written fourteen Epistles. The Reformed church teaches the same in some of its symbols, viz: the Belgic, the Helvetic of 1566 and the Bohemian Confessions, whilst the Gallic reckons only thirteen Pauline epistles. Much depends upon the fact, that, in such things, the church does not bind itself and ecclesiastical science by a positive rule. The testimony of the Spirit furnishes us with the historical foundation, which is essential to the confirmation of objective truth; but a book is canonical when the testimony of the Spirit agrees with that of history. It is necessary, therefore, to enable us to recognize our epistle as canonical to have the historical testimony of its direct, or at furthest its indirect apostolical origin.

Before we hear the testimony of the ancient church, we must, then, interrogate the epistle concerning the testimony which it bears of itself. The only safe conclusion we can derive from it is, that it was written before A. D. 70; for according to chapter 9: 6-10 the temple was yet standing, and offerings were yet made whilst the author wrote. We also agree with Wieseler, that the epistle justifies the certain conclusion that it was composed before the beginning of the Jewish war, A. D. 66; for it would have been impossible, had that time of judgment and tribulation already arrived, of which Jesus himself, in the near approach of his death, had a clear view and of which he spoke to his disciples, that mention should not have been made of it in this epistle. This indirect testimony of the epistle concerning its author is confirmed by the fact, that Clement of Rome, in his undoubtedly genuine Epistle to the Corinthians (*πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολή*), which was written shortly after the persecution of Nero, and perhaps even before the destruction of Jerusalem (which Hafele, quite recently, has attempted to establish in *Wetzers and Weltes Kirchen Lexicon*, 1848), appropriated to himself whole passages of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and, therefore, that the latter was already in existence is presupposed. When Jerome speaks of a great similarity (*grandis similitudo*) between both epistles, he, without doubt, has these borrowed passages in his eye. But if we look at the relation of these epistles in other respects, there is much more reason to speak of a great dissimilarity (*grandis dissimilitudo*) between them.

There is an immense difference between the richness, solidity and depth of the epistle to the Hebrews, and the poverty, the sermonizing amplification, and the minute prolixity of that to the Corinthians. Schelling is right, when in his lectures on the philosophy of revelation (published by Paulus, p. 714,)

he says, that we may see, in Clement, and especially in the apostolic fathers, how, after the time of the great religious excitement resulting from the introduction of christianity, there followed the deepest depression. A few verses of the epistle to the Hebrews outweigh all the 59 chapters of that of Clement. The latter, therefore, not only confirms the opinion, that the epistle to the Hebrews was composed before A. D. 70; but also gives an appearance of probability to its apostolic, and even to its Pauline origin, inasmuch as it thus appears to be intimately allied to the Pauline books of the New Testament, to the epistles of Paul, and to the Pauline Gospel of Luke (a conclusion which Zeller has indeed attempted to disprove, Jahrb. 1848, 4, p. 530.) The conclusion, however, seems to be confirmed, if we attend further to the epistle itself, by the circumstance of the author standing, according to 13: 23, in a relation to Timothy, which was occupied by none but Paul; and also by the fact that he was in Italy, as appears from 13: 24, which concludes with a salutation only from the saints in Italy; and perhaps still further from 13: 19, from which passage and its context it is clear that the author was then in a state of confinement. This is, however, again rendered doubtful by the positive ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς "I will see you," 13: 23, for which we would have expected to see ἐλπίζω ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς, still not so much so as to justify us, with Wieseler, as quoted above,¹ to conclude confidently that the author, according to this passage, was at full liberty. We cannot obtain an entirely reliable idea of the situation of the author, from the conclusion of the epistle. But so much is clear, that he had determined to visit, in person, the church to which he was writing, and that too in company with Timothy, who had been at liberty, if he should arrive in time; still it is yet possible that the author himself, at the time of writing, was in confinement, but hoped to be immediately discharged. We may take the conclusion as we will, it still points us to Paul, and we appear to have before us one of his letters written in prison, such as that to the Ephesians, in the writing of which he had not Timothy with him. But the impression produced by the conclusion contradicts that to which we are led by the passage 2: 3. According to the latter, the author appears, not indeed as Twisten supposes (Dog. I. p. 96). to belong to a later generation, but to class himself with those who had received the Gospel, not directly, but indirectly, from the Lord. Scarcely could an apostle

¹ Chronologie des apostolischen Zeitalters 1848. Anh: der Brief an die Hebraer.

write thus, and least of all Paul, who at other times so strongly asserted that he had received his gospel not from man, but immediately from the Lord. The figure of speech (*communicatio*) [by which the writer makes himself a partner with his readers, and says *we* instead of *you*,] which has been adduced in favor of this view, is of no avail here. The words (*ὑπο τῶν ἀκουσάντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη*) "confirmed to us by them that heard" (2: 3) do not suit Paul, but rather a disciple of the apostle. Apollos could have written thus; or, as he received the gospel at third hand, from Aquila, the language would have suited Clement of Rome (probably he that is alluded to Phil. 4: 3,) of whom Irenæus, quoted by Eusebius *h. e. iv. 6*, relates "that he could yet see the apostle preach, and hear the sounds of his voice." Barnabas could also have thus written, for Tertullian's assertion *hic ab apostolis didicit (de pudicitia e. 20)* that he learned of the apostles, is at least as worthy of belief, as that of Clement, that Barnabas was one of the seventy disciples. But most assuredly Luke could have written thus, for in his gospel 1: 2, he expresses himself substantially in the same manner as the author of Heb. 2: 3.

We turn now from the testimony which the epistle itself affords, to that of the primitive church. As the epistle itself leads us to suppose one while that it is, and again that it is not Pauline, so the Eastern church declared it is, and the Western church it is not Pauline. Such was the state of the case until the time of Jerome and Augustine. With these first, the testimony of the Eastern church and church writers prevailed over the doubts of the Western. From the councils of Hippo and Carthage (393 and 397) the epistle in virtue of its now acknowledged Pauline origin, retained an unvaried position among the (*canonicæ scripturæ*) canonical scriptures, as one of (*quatuor decim epistolæ Pauli*) the fourteen epistles of Paul. The testimony of the primitive churches has naturally a historical value only down to this time. In order to appreciate and present this testimony correctly, it is necessary to make a liberal allowance for things to be taken for granted, for no portion of the history of literature has been obscured more by the infusion of a false subjective interest, than the expressed opinions of the primitive church concerning the books of the New Testament. This may be clearly seen with regard to the epistle to the Hebrews. The conviction of the oriental church of its Pauline origin, is much stronger and deeper, than would appear from the representations of Bleek, who unconsciously suffered himself to be misled, by his own conviction of its non-Pauline origin, to depreciate the former as much as

possible. The opinion of Tertullian, that the epistle was written by Barnabas, is supposed by Thiersch (*de epist. ad Hebræos, Marburgi* 1848) to be traceable to the tradition of the Monastic churches of Asia, whilst his own view of the matter is, that the epistle is the joint work of Paul and Barnabas, and that they allude to themselves when they speak of the spies, whom "Rahab the harlot," (a type of the Jewish church converted to the faith in Christ,) received in faith. And Wieseler derives, from a passage of Jerome, which directly states the contrary, a far-fetched proof that the view which regarded Barnabas as the author, was spread abroad also throughout the East. He views this passage in a false light, because he considers the Epistle to the Hebrews to have been addressed to Jewish christians in Egypt.

We may safely review the facts upon which are based the testimony and opinions of the primitive church concerning this Epistle, for all the sources of information relating to it are yet accessible, of which Jerome gives a notice in C. 5. of his (*catalogus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum*) list of ecclesiastical writers.

1) Let us review the testimony of the Eastern churches, and the opinions of individuals so far as they are known upon this point.

Throughout the whole East our epistle passes as the work of Paul, and therefore as confessedly canonical; even those ecclesiastical writers, in whom the unpauline form excites a doubt, adhere at least to the indirect authorship of Paul; only heretics, Marcion and the Arians, entirely reject it as not being Pauline. Jerome, who had the most extensive acquaintance with the literature of the primitive church, testifies in his epistle *ad Dardanum*, that this epistle, which is inscribed to the Hebrews, is acknowledged as Paul's the apostle, not only by the Eastern churches, but, on the contrary, by all the Greek ecclesiastical writers, although most ascribe it either to Barnabas or to Clement.¹ Wieseler (p. 508, ff) interprets these as meaning, that the Epistle to the Hebrews was received in the East as coming from Paul, although, at the same time, the most of those who did so, supposed that it had received its present form from Barnabas or Clement. This explanation rests, however, alone on a self-deception of the worthy investigator, by whom we would otherwise be glad to be instructed.

¹ *Illud nostris dicendum est, hanc epistolam quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos, non solum ab ecclesiis orientis, sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis græci sermonis scriptoribus quasi Pauli apostoli suscipi, licet plerique eam vel Barnabæ vel Clementis arbitrentur.*

For since in the East not so much as a single voice is heard, which directly ascribes our epistle to Clement, and since Barnabas is not even named in connection with it, the words *quasi apostoli Pauli* manifestly mean that it is *Pauline*, and the ambiguous *plerique* are, as Tholuck and others have correctly inferred, *most* of the Latins, of whom Jerome immediately afterwards says: "The Latins are not accustomed to receive it among the canonical scriptures."¹

Jerome's unrestricted assertion concerning the opinion of the East is in all respects correct. a) Origen, in his evidences concerning the New Testament canon, which Eusebius has collected *h. e.*, 6: 25, says that the (*νοήματα*) *mind* of the epistle is Pauline, but the form of language is more hellenic than it could be if of Paul, who calls himself (2 Cor. 11: 6, *ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ*) *rude in speech*. Who the amenuensis (*ὁ γράψας*) was, whether a disciple of Paul or not, no man knows. If a church holds the epistle as undoubtedly Pauline (*ὡς Παύλου* = *quasi Pauli*,) we are not to find fault with it; for not without sufficient reason have holy men handed it down as of Paul.² — The fundamental idea of Origen is plain. "According to tradition the epistle comes from Paul, either directly or indirectly, and in either case it is Pauline." b) Eusebius, writing on the canon, III, 25, does not class our epistle amongst the disputed books (*Antilegoumena*,) and also in III, 3, he says: "*but the fourteen (Epistles) of Paul are clearly and generally known.*"³ At the same time he remarks, that some do not include the Epistle to the Hebrews, whilst the Romish church does not even acknowledge it as Pauline. c) The Syriac church also acknowledged it as apostolical. Wieseler has, indeed, (pp. 229 and 510) come to the conclusion that the Syriac church did *not* ascribe it to Paul, because in the Peschito version it is placed after the pastoral letters and that to Philemon; but this position, as the fourteenth of the Epistles of Paul, was also at first given it by the Greek church, (Bleek *Einleitung*, §. 45,) and it was natural, because the epistle was anonymous. If we were to conclude, from its position in the Peschito version, that the ancient Syriac church did not esteem it as Pauline, we would yet expect to hear from her some whisperings of doubt, but on the contrary, James of Nisibis, Efreem and others, acknowledge themselves as adherents to the Pauline origin of the epistle; Theodoret defends it against the Arians; and the

¹ *Eam Latinorum consuetudo non recipit inter scripturas canonicas.*

² *ὃ γὰρ εἰκῆ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασι.*

³ *τοῦ δε Παύλου πρόδηλοι καὶ σαφεῖς αἱ δεκατεσσαρες.*

stichometry of Nicephorus, which, according to Credner's investigation (9. Jahrg.) was derived from a Syriac source, reckons 14 Pauline Epistles. Accordingly it is regarded throughout the whole East as the production of the apostle, and therefore as undisputed. The doubts, wherever expressed, are sought to be removed by means of various auxiliary suppositions, such as, that the epistle was penned by a disciple of the apostle, or, that it was translated from the Hebrew. Wheresoever, in the East, there existed a doubt of its Pauline origin, although we have not a single direct evidence of such doubt, it most probably resulted from an influence extending itself over from the West.

2) For, the West presents to us precisely the opposite of the East. This must not be ascribed to a too late appearance of the epistle in the West, on account of which it might not be regarded as ancient and genuine, as Thiersch assumes,¹ for Clement of Rome is already in possession of the epistle. As far back, however, as we can follow the literature of the West, it does not appear to have been regarded as Pauline. a) The oldest evidence we find, lies in the *fragmentum de canone*, which Muratori has published in his Italian antiquities (*antiquitates Italicae* 1740,) from a now lost manuscript of Ambrosiana. This has been clumsily translated from the Greek.—Thiersch has expressed the suspicion in his *Versuch*, that it is perhaps a mystification of Muratori; but Wieseler² and Credner³ have placed beyond doubt, not only its genuineness, but also its composition towards the second century. This fragment acknowledges only thirteen Pauline Epistles, and mentions, besides, two circulated under the name of Paul, one (*ad Laodicenses*) the yet existing apocryphal epistle to the Laodiceans, and one (*ad Alexandrinos*) to the Alexandrians, with the title: "Composed in the name of Paul against the heretical sect of Marcion."⁴ Wieseler, in his *Studien* and his *Chronology*, maintains, in opposition to Bleek, that this Epistle to the Alexandrians is that inscribed to the Hebrews; Gue-ricke also inclines to this opinion (*Einleitung* p. 50 &c).—But Credner, in the work mentioned p. 88, &c, justly denies this opinion any foundation or plausibility. It is also not easy to determine whether *ad* means for or against.⁵ In favor of the former meaning is the fact, that the Manichaeans quoted

¹ Versuch zur Herstellung u. s. u. p. 352—compare p. 314.

² Studien 1847, 4.

³ Zur Geschichte des Kanon 1847.

⁴ Pauli nomine facta ad Marcionis haeresin.

⁵ πρὸς τὴν Μαρξίωνα ἄίρεσιν.

the Epistle in their favor, but against it, that Marcion rejected it. In either case, the *fragment* gives evidence that so early as about A. D. 170, the Epistle to the Hebrews was not acknowledged as canonical in the West. *b)* Caius¹ acknowledged only thirteen Epistles of Paul, and asserted this to be the case, as we learn from Photius, in his controversy with Proclus (*disputatio contra Proclum.*) His unwillingness to acknowledge more can easily be explained. As he was led to the rejection of the Apocalypse through his opposition to the millenarianism of the Montanists, he was led to the rejection of the Epistle to the Hebrews through his opposition to their perpetual exclusion of those who had apostatized from christianity (*lapsi*).² As this aversion to the Epistle was necessarily increased by the Novatian controversy, it is not to be wondered at that Cyprian, who opposed the Novatians, should have acknowledged only Paul's Epistles addressed (*ad septem ecclesias*) to the seven churches. Philastrius (†387) declares directly (*haeres.* 89) that the Epistle was not regarded as Pauline, and was only here and there read publicly: 1) because of its form: it being written in rhetorical and high-sounding language,³ which is not characteristic of Paul: 2) because that 3: 2, savors of Arianism: and 3) because that 6: 6 savors of Novatianism. The assertion of Credner, Anger and Wieseler, p. 481, that some regarded the Epistle to the Hebrews as (*conscripta ad Laodicenses*) written to the Laodiceans, cannot be here substantiated. Philastrius speaks of two Epistles, and says, that that to the Laodiceans was not at all, and that to the Hebrews only occasionally read in public.

c) It is a matter of great surprise how, beside these witnesses, who contented themselves with merely denying the apostolic authorship of the Epistle, Tertullian,⁴ without any further reason, should designate it as the production of Barnabas. That he does not at all allude to the opinions of the East, although he adduces the Epistle as a warrant for the montanistic view which he held against the restoration of those who had fallen away, is evidence how deep was the opposition of the West. Tertullian, however, is alone in Latin literature in the opinion of the authorship belonging to Barnabas. Jerome, it is true, in the passage above referred to, says: "*Although most ascribe it either to Barnabas or to Clement;*" but, in his (*cat. scriptorum eccles.*) catalogue of ecclesiastical writers, he is able

¹Eusebius VI. 20.

²Hebrews 6: 6.

³*Rhetorice at sermone plausibili.*

⁴De pudicitia c. 20, exstat et Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos.

to name Tertullian only in favor of the former opinion.¹ It is therefore possible, that Tertullian only expressed, with a confident freedom, his own supposition; although Barnabas may have been fallen upon also in larger circles. But since the name of Barnabas is not once named in the East in connection with the Epistle to the Hebrews, we cannot see how Wieseler (p. 507) can assert, that among the oldest church evidences the tradition, that Barnabas was the author of this epistle, alone remains untouched. On the contrary, if we take an unprejudiced historical view of the state of the case, the tradition of the East in favor of its Pauline origin remains untouched; for the aversion of the West, to which the fact that the epistle was anonymous was a welcome circumstance, receives its explanation in subjective interests. As the montanist Tertullian denominated the pastor of Hermas the pastor of debauchees (*moechorum*,) because he acknowledged that there was room for repentance to those, who after baptism had apostatized, so also must the anti-montanistic church regard the Epistle to the Hebrews, which seemed to deny repentance after baptism, as gall which dare not be mixed with honey.

Having heard the witnesses of the church, we will endeavor to come into the clear in reference to the author of the epistle, so far as can be done by a consideration of internal criteria, without entering exegetically into its contents.

That the Epistle was written immediately by Paul, is scarcely possible; that it was, on the contrary, derived from him indirectly, is not only not impossible, but also more probable than that it originated from any one else directly. To prove this will be the aim of the following remarks.

1. The direct authorship of Paul is scarcely possible. A reason, of itself sufficient to prove this, is in advance to be found in the great difference observable between the style and the mode of presenting truth in this Epistle, and in those of Paul. This difference does not lie pre-eminently in new expressions which we do not elsewhere find common with him, such as, that Christ is called (*ἀπόστολος*) apostle and (*ἀρχιερεὺς*) High Priest, and that so much is said of him as the *perfect* and the *perfecter* in relation to the law which was incapable of producing perfection; for if it can be shown, that these are only new modes of expressing new trains of thought flowing from Pauline premises, it might easily be assumed, that as the apostle appears, from his other Epistles, to have been continually sinking himself deeper into the great object of salvation,

¹Sed vel Barnabæ, juxta Tertullianum.

and to have been engaged in its constant pursuit as a subject, not only experiencing, but also intelligently understanding its inestimable value, he here only adopted or invented new expressions for the new ideas that arose in his mind. Besides, in addition to these new expressions, there is quite a number of such as are appropriately Pauline, as (*πληροφορία*) *full assurance*, (*ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς*) *the word of instruction*, the ambiguous use of (*διαθήκη*) *testament, covenant, dispensation*, so that the characteristic Pauline expressions counterbalance the new.

Nor is the difference above mentioned, to be sought in the rhetorical character of the Epistle, for we may regard the Epistles to the Col., Phil., and Eph., written in confinement, which at the same time want the dialectic form, as a transition to this new mode of treating the epistolary material; and if the genuineness of the pastoral epistle is capable of proof, we derive from them evidence that the style of the apostle varies under the different circumstances in which he was placed, and we need not wonder at the difference between the style of his other Epistles and this, which assumes the epistolary form only towards its close, and until then might be viewed as an example of oral apostolical instruction. That diversity, which is scarcely reconcilable with an immediate Pauline authorship, consists in this, that the epistle is entirely free from the rudeness of speech of the apostle,¹ as Origen expresses it, from that, to a great extent, ineffectual effort to confine within the channel of speech the streaming fullness of thought which, in Paul's writings, causes so many disconnected, parenthetical and overburdened dragging sentences. How greatly our epistle contrasts, in this respect, with the manner of Paul. To this epistle belong the finest and most delicate colorings of speech, a solemn rhetorical rhythm, and a skillful expression of thought which does not indeed always equally well succeed, but which yet always exhibits beautiful arrangement of language, and of truly classical sentences. This is the reason that the forms of introducing scriptural citations, and the Divine appellations in this epistle are different from what is usual with Paul, and that many of his favorite expressions and turns of thought, which we might here expect, are entirely wanting. From this we conclude that the particular form of the epistle, as far as there is in such things any critical certainty, excludes the idea of its immediate Pauline origin.

2. But its mediate origin from him is not impossible. By common consent it has as a whole a more intimate relation to

¹ τὸ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου

the Epistles of Paul than to all other writings of the New Testament. The progress of christian doctrine in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is evidently, in many particulars, carried out on the principle and in the spirit of Paul. If we take, for example, the word concerning the exaltation of Christ "above all heavens," (Eph. 4: 10) and that concerning his heavenly intercession for believers (Rom. 8: 34), we have the germs out of which might grow the doctrine of our epistle concerning the high priesthood of Christ in the holy of holies in heaven. In the view which Paul took of the Old Testament ceremonial law as weak and imperfect,¹ all is already included which is said in the Epistle to the Hebrews of the inability of the law to produce perfection and of Christ as the offering and High Priest by whom this object is to be attained. These are only examples. The way, then, in which our epistle treats the Old Testament is no other than a further extension of Paul's figurative method of explaining the subject in hand, as seen in Gal. 4: 21-31, Rom. 5: 14, 1 Cor. 10: 1-6. Yet we cannot deny, that it is very surprising, not anywhere here to meet with certain ideas, which in a measure exercise a controlling influence upon his mode of looking at things. The apostle, who through the law is dead unto the law, lives in the opposition of the righteousness of faith and of works; he, whom the Lord called as apostle, not in the days of his flesh; but from his exalted life in heavenly glory, lives and moves in the resurrection of Jesus Christ; he, whose call was directed to the heathen world, and who was appointed to effect a separation between the synagogue and church, devotes his life to the calling of the heathen to the fellowship of the Gospel. Of these three fundamental doctrines of the apostle, we find (13: 20) only an accidental reference to that of the resurrection. This remarkable silence can, indeed, to some extent, be explained. The apostle, we might say, speaks not of justification only by faith, for it was necessary to warn the Hebrews, not against the righteousness of works, but against apostacy. It was not, therefore, a matter of importance to present the contrariety of faith and of works, but the connection between faith and the promise and the riches it contains, in order to strengthen the exhortation to steadfastness of faith; further, he speaks not of the resurrection, because, passing over the intermediate events, he contrasts at once the self-humiliation of Christ with his highest exaltation, and directs attention to his active interest in our behalf in that

¹ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. Gal. 4.

exalted state; and lastly, he is silent concerning the calling of the Gentiles, because he writes to a church of purely Jewish christians. But this explanation is not at all satisfactory, since where the same range of thought occurs also in the affiliated Epistles to the Colossians, Philippians and Ephesians, they do not so strongly deny the stamp of Paul's mind. In order to understand this, it is necessary that we should ascertain more exactly the degree of indirectness there may have been in the origination of the epistle. For that single reason, it is impossible that it could be a translation, without regard to its flowing language, its play upon words only possible in Greek, its quotations from the Old Testament, made according to the LXX, even with its errors, and its comparative freedom from Hebraisms. If the Epistle had been presented to any one in the Hebrew language, as Clement of Alexandria assumes, the great points of Paul's type of doctrine would have more prominently appeared. We are under the necessity of assuming, that Paul communicated the fundamental thoughts of the epistle to one of his pupils and companions, and that he arranged and prepared the matter independently, yet in such a manner that the apostle could approve and acknowledge the work.

3. To this hypothesis, advocated by Origen, and for which we shall hereafter adduce positive reasons, we give our assent, because such an indirect production of the Epistle through Paul, is relatively far more probable than its origin through any one else. The most improbable view is, that it was written to the Alexandrians by Apollos, whom, as a disciple of John, Aquila and Priscilla, converts of Paul, instructed more fully in the doctrines of christianity, and who labored with success at Ephesus and Corinth, being, according to Acts 18: 24-28 "an eloquent man, and mighty in the scriptures." Luther first fixed on him as author. In a discourse on the Epistles, at Christmas, he says: "This is a strong, powerful and sublime epistle, which moves onward with majesty, and treats of the sublime article of faith concerning the divinity of Christ, and it is a fancy worthy of belief, that it was not written by Paul since it possesses a more ornate style than is usual with Paul." Some suppose that Luke was its author, and others Apollos, whom Luke praises as one mighty in the scriptures in his disputations with the Jews." According to this passage, compared with the remark, (on Gen. 48: 20,) *and if, as I suppose, Apollos,*¹ Luther seems to have derived this view from orally

¹Sive, ut ego arbitror, Apollo.

expressed opinions of some one of his cotemporaries ; or it first through him became the common property of the many, for no writer before his time, is known, who has recorded such a view.¹ The chief ground upon which the hasty opinion expressed by Luther, that the authorship belonged to Apollos the Alexandrian, is further sought to be supported,² is the intimate connection of the Epistle with the modes of viewing, interpretation and expression peculiar to the Alexandrian Jews.— There are certainly various and numerous parallels to our Epistle, to be found in these peculiarities, as may be seen in the writings of Philo, their chief representative ; for example, to the description of the Divine Logos ; to the assumption of an original heavenly world which is our real fatherland, and of an original heavenly sanctuary ; to the doctrine of the true and the all-comprehending high priesthood ; to the reference of the Old Testament ceremonial law to Christ ; to the allegorical interpretation, and particularly also the drawing of conclusions from the supposed significant silence of the scriptures in reference to principles ; to the exegetical phrases of the Epistle ;³ and also to many of its peculiar figures and expressions. Philo, for example, calls the first principles of christian doctrine milk nourishment,⁴ and so does our Epistle, 5 : 12, and the designation of Jesus as “the High Priest of our profession,”⁵ is word for word the same as the designation by Philo, of the Logos.⁶ On this point we may compare *the sacred exercises on the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews by Philo of Alexandria*⁷ of Jo. Bened. Carpzov (grandson of the orthodox Theologian of the same name), and a dissertation of Superint. Grossman, *concerning some traces of the sacred Jewish Philosophy found in the Epistle to the Hebrews.*⁸ In these slight notices we have, however, not overlooked the two great differences, viz : that the Judaism of Alexandria knows nothing of the historical person of Jesus Christ, and as the light in which it views human nature is entirely Pelagian, it embraces the mediatorship of the Logos as a metaphysical divinely ordered re-

¹ Bleek I. p. 249.

² Clericus and more recently Bleek, Tholuck, Credner and others.

³ Ἐρμηνεύεται, τοῦτ' ἔστι, &c. ⁴ νηπία καὶ γαλακτώδης τροφή.

⁵ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν. ⁶ 653, 14. 654, 6.

⁷ Sacrae exercitationes in St. Pauli Epistolam ad Hebræos ex Philone Alex. Helmstädt, 1750, 8.

⁸ de philosophiæ Judaeorum sacrae vestigiis nonnullis in Ep. ad Heb. conspicuis, 1833-4.

lation, and not as an actual fact pre-arranged in revelation and consummated in history. But notwithstanding this important difference, those points of contact in conception, method and expression, are so numerous and striking, that it is impossible that they should be accidental. If we, therefore, assume Apollos, the Jewish christian of Alexandria, to be author of this Epistle, these things explain themselves. And yet neither Carpzov nor Grossman is of this opinion. Carpzov adheres to the tradition of the Eastern church, and explains the Alexandrian stamp referred to, by the fact that Paul came from Tarsus, next to Alexandria the most cultivated city of the East in Greek literature and philosophy, and by the intercourse between it and the Hellenic Jews dispersed abroad, particularly the Alexandrian Jews at Rome, for since the victory of Julius Cæsar in the Alexandrian war, captive Jews were transferred to Rome, and Strabo states that Rome was filled with Tarsenians and Alexandrians. But Grossman, who very properly maintains that there existed an intimate connection between the Alexandrian doctrines and tradition and those of Palestine, considers it improbable that the author of the Epistle was educated at Alexandria, notwithstanding the stamp of this city, which it seems to bear, *for the things which are reported as selected from the tradition of the fathers, agree with Josephus and others of Palestine, but differ from Philo and the Alexandrians.*¹ In reference to what the author states of the giving of the law through the instrumentality of angels, of Moses' contempt of the royal name, and of the relation of the Passover to the passing by of the destroying angel, and in reference to several other things, parallels are to be found with Josephus, but not with Philo, with whom, rather, things are to be found which are contradictory. There is yet another thing through which the authorship of Apollos loses its support.—Not only the Epistle to the Hebrews, but also the acknowledged Epistles of Paul have a close connection with Alexandrianism, as it is to be seen in Philo. He calls the Logos not merely *High priest*² with the predicate *beginning of the order of life*,³ and a *non partaker of sin*,⁴ but he also calls him "*head of the united body*,"⁵ like Paul in the Epistles to the Corinthians and Ephesians, Philo intending by *σῶμα* the natural Kosmos (the universe,) and Paul the church. And not

¹ *Quæ enim ex traditione majorum delibata afferuntur, ea cum Josepho et Palæstinensibus conspirant a Philone et Alexandrinis discrepant.*

² ἄρχιερεὺς.

³ ταξιάρχης τῆς φύσεως.

⁴ ἁμαρτημάτων ἀμέτοχος.

⁵ ὡσαυτεὶ σώματος ἡνωμένου κεφαλῆ, 640, 20.

only Paul, but John also, and in general the N. T. presents numerous instances of a similar kind. We dare not deny this phenomenon, we must seek to understand it. As the Septuagint translation became to the Gentiles the herald of salvation proceeding forth from Israel, so Alexandrianism became the harbinger of the transition of the religion of the Old Testament revelation to that of the whole world. Alexandrianism originated with the effort to extract the kernel of the religion of the Old Testament revelation from its covering of the letter,—of national and of particular history, and to show that this kernel is the union of all that is true among all nations; that it is objective and universal truth, and that it is the highest philosophy. Alexandrianism, indeed, itself became somewhat cosmopolitan, in that it attempted to show the adaptedness of the Old Testament revelation to the world, since it gave too easy a reception to the Grecian, but especially to the Pythagorean Platonic philosophy. That this effort should meet with entire success was impossible, for the true emancipation of the Old Testament religion was not to be expected from a dogmatic speculative development of doctrines by man, but, since revelation had placed itself within the pale of nationality, by a new act of revelation overleaping these bounds, and consisting in this, that the salvation of the world has proceeded forth from Israel, and that this author and messenger of salvation, having become man in Israel, was, as well before as after his historical existence, a person of absolute importance, and bearing a universal relationship, not merely to Israel, but to the whole family of man. But although the effort of Alexandrianism must fall far short of its high aim, it nevertheless, in part, prepared the forms which christianity could appropriate to itself, in order by them to express the gospel, and confirm it by reference to the Old Testament scriptures, before the consummation of that fact in the history of redemption embracing all mankind—before the mystery of the actual incarnation of the Logos. If, therefore, the N. T., and in particular Paul and John stand in such a relation to Alexandrianism, the Alexandrian aspect which this Epistle bears, does not necessarily point us to Apollos as its author. We shall be the less disposed to regard him in this light, when we bear in mind that the oldest Alexandrian teachers, Patänus, Clement and Origen declared the Epistle to be the work of Paul, and not a voice is to be heard in the Eastern or Western churches of antiquity in favor of Apollos.

On the contrary, Tertullian maintains that Barnabas is the author of this Epistle, basing his opinion, as Thiersch suppo-

ses, upon Montanistic tradition. Usher, in his introduction to the Epistle of Barnabas (*Carpzov. 2. 2. p. LXVII*) says with a keen irony, that Tertullian had a Montanistic inspiration (*Montani spiritu afflatus*) when he ascribed the Epistle to the Hebrews to Barnabas, for he is alone in this opinion, and the Epistle of Barnabas, which we possess, is so unequal in rank, that, in order to ascribe the latter, with some show of reason, to Barnabas, we must pronounce the former to be spurious.—The genuineness is in fact very doubtful (concerning its unsatisfactoriness see Hefele in the above named church lexicon) and for the view, that Barnabas is the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, (lately defended by Twisten, Ullman, and in particular Wieseler) there are important and most striking reasons. The Epistle is taken up particularly with the relationship of the priesthood of Christ and the Levitical of the O. T.; but Barnabas was, according to Acts 4: 36, a Levite. A Grecian training we might expect him to have, for he was from Cyprus, and therefore a Hellenist, Acts, 11: 20. It is no objection to this that he was taken for Jupiter, at Lystra, and Paul, on the other hand, for Mercury, because he was “the chief speaker;” Acts, 14: 12, for the poorest public speaker may be the most accomplished author. Moreover, the fact that this Epistle styles itself a “*word of entreaty*,” *λόγος παρακλήσεως* 13: 22 speaks strongly in his favor. But *Βαρνάβας*, the surname which the apostles gave him, Acts, 4: 36, signifies *υἱὸς παρακλήσεως* “*son of consolation*,” probably *בְּרַבִּי* (according to Hefele *בְּרַבִּי* divinely inspired speaker). Further, the original apostolic power, which appears in the Epistle, does not divert us from Barnabas, for he sustained so near a relationship to the apostles, that in the N. T. he is himself called an apostle, Acts 14: 31, (comp. 13: 1, where he appears to be reckoned among the prophets,) and the Pauline character of the Epistle is explained by the fact, that Barnabas was Paul’s friend and companion, and that for a long time, he labored with him at Antioch and on missionary tours. But, notwithstanding all these circumstances, which favor the opinion that Barnabas was the author of the Epistle, we are under the necessity of declaring our dissent from it, for the following reasons. (1.) We are not aware of the existence of such an intimate relationship between Barnabas and Timothy, as that which the author of this Epistle must have sustained towards him. (2.) There is no reliable tradition of a sojourn of Barnabas in Italy, where the author was staying when he wrote; for, the pretence of the pseudo Clementine recognition, that Barnabas preached the gospel at Rome as early as during the life-time of Christ, and

that he made a proselyte of Clement of Rome, bears its falsehood upon its face, and if the church of Milan honors him as its founder, it builds upon an entirely baseless legend. (3.) The rash expression of Tertullian is not to be regarded as a church tradition, but it may possibly arise from an interchange of the pretended Epistle of Barnabas received by us for that to the Hebrews. It is, therefore, presumable that, as Tertullian, as far as we know, no where makes mention of the former, he cites the latter without further notice, as the Epistle of Barnabas.

Having seen that we are not under the necessity of fixing upon Apollos, and that no one in the primitive church thought of him; and also, that the supposition that Barnabas was the author had not any testimony from tradition in its favor, but had, on the contrary, weighty objections against it, we proceed to test the view which claims for Clement or Luke a participation in the composition of the Epistle. Inasmuch, however, as it is ascertained that Clement draws from the fountain of our Epistle, and only because of the approach made in some parts, by his Epistle to the Corinthians to that to the Hebrews, has he been looked upon as concerned in the latter, there only yet remains the view which claims for Luke a participation in its authorship. Eusebius (h. e. vi. 14,) gives us the information, derived from the Hypotyposes of Clement of Alexandria, that the Epistle to the Hebrews, as the latter asserts, is the work of Paul, but that it was originally written in Hebrew, and with special care translated by Luke for Hellenist readers, "in consequence of which, a similar coloring is found in the expression of thought in this Epistle, and in the Acts of the apostles."¹ To this expression of opinion by his teacher Clement, Origen refers, when he remarks that by certain persons *ὑπὸ τιῶν* Luke was regarded as the writer of the Epistle. This, after renewed investigation, appears to me to be the most important and trustworthy testimony of antiquity concerning our Epistle.

Whilst the view, which ascribes to Clement of Rome a participation in this work, turns out to be a mere supposition of Eusebius and Jerome, to whom it looks for authority, and who base it upon the similarity of the two Epistles, Clement of Alexandria expresses not a mere supposition, but, as the connection of his declaration as given by Eusebius shows, what he had received from Pantänus, or, if the latter could not exactly be understood as meant by the blessed elder *μακάριος πρεσ-*

¹ ὁ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν χρῶτα εὐρίσχεσθαι κατὰ τὴν ἐρμῆνειαν ταύτης τε τῆς ἐπιστολῆς καὶ τῶν πράξεων.

βύτερος, what he had received as *tradition of those originally elders* παράδοσις τῶν ἀνεκὰθεν πρεσβυτέρων (s. Credner §. 189.) and he does not first *infer* the participation of Luke from the similarity of expression in the Epistle and in the Acts, but he sets it down as a fact, and points to this resemblance of expression as a result of this fact. If now we compare the writings of Luke with the Epistle to the Hebrews, we become confirmed in the truth of the remark of Clement. Grotius had already, upon the basis of this observation, declared himself in favor of Luke, not only as author, but as independent author of the Epistle; but the similarity of expressions, to which he directs attention (they can be seen in De Wette's Int. §. 163,) can only be of avail as a test. Bleek is right (I. 405,) in declaring that we cannot build the proof of the authorship, or the coöperation of Luke on the agreement in the use of expressions referred to by Grotius. Of greater weight, however, is the similarity of the construction of sentences in the beginning of the Gospel of Luke to that in the Epistle to the Hebrews; as also the equal correctness of language in the Acts; precisely where Luke would write most as an independent author. If Bleek had, by using the labors of Hug; who amongst the moderns has regarded it as highly probable that Luke had some influence in the production of this Epistle, more carefully compared the style of Luke with that of the work before us, he would have found a similarity not insignificant, but surprising, and of the highest moment. The number of expressions in the N. T., exclusive of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which are used *only* by Luke, is considerable, such as: ἐνλαβεῖσθαι, εἰς τὸ παντέλῃς, ἠγούμενες, ἀρχηγὸς applied to Christ which arrested the attention of Grotius; but there are yet many others, e. g. : παρόξυσμός, τελείωσις, πρόσφατος, μέτοχος, ἐπιστέλλειν, ἀλύσιτελής, comp. Luke 17: 2, &c. With these we may enumerate the forms of expression, which are so familiar with Luke in other places, e. g. : ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ὑψίστος, οἰκουμένη, ἀπολύεσθαι, χρηματίζεσθαι, λαλεῖν πρὸς, with a preference in the use of compounded words, as ἐπαισχύνεσθαι, διαμαρτύρεσθαι, and such like. It is particularly worthy of remark, that instead of εὐαγγέλιον Gospel, which does not at all appear in the Epistle to the Hebrews, he is accustomed to use, in connection with ὁ λόγος, such a circumlocution as παρακλησεῶς, the precise expression which recurs in Acts 13: 15; and that, instead of Ἱεροσόλυμα, *Jerusalem*, which the other three Evangelists use, Luke uses Ἱερουσαλημ as does our Epistle. It is hoped, that at another place it will be convincingly shown, how remarkably, in numerous cases, the usage of language in the Epistle to the Hebrews can be illustrated from

the writing of Luke. I, indeed, take for granted with Bleek (Contributions p. 52), that the Gospel and the Acts, in their present form, actually belong, in connection with Paul, to Luke, to whom tradition ascribes them; the ingenious attempt of Zellers (Jahrb. 1848, 4,) to prove that the Gospel and afterwards the Acts first made their appearance in Rome, in the second century, having failed to convince me. If, therefore, the remark of Clement concerning the coloring given by Luke to the Epistle to the Hebrews, confirms itself, and the facts of the case favor the opinion of his coöperation in its production, such as the fact that he accompanied Paul when he was taken captive to Rome (Acts 27 : 2,) and there remained with him (Col. 4 : 14; Philem. 24; ii Tim. 4 : 11); also that he remained with him alone, whilst his second Epistle to Timothy was written, at which time Timothy was entreated to come to Rome before the winter should set in, the tradition that Luke was a co-author of the Epistle, (not indeed, as Clement says, as translator, but, according to the only admissible assumption of Origen, as constructor of the work out of materials afforded by the apostle) will ever remain the most probable account of the origin of this Epistle, which stands in the most intimate relationship to the Epistles of Paul written from Rome, and, in every point of view, belongs to the same period.

If, indeed, the single objection of Bleek, that Luke was a Hellenist, were of itself sufficient to exclude him, we would have used many words to no purpose. But even if, according to Col. 4 : 14, comp. 10, Luke was not of the circumcision, and although the *ἐν ἡμῖν among us*, Luke 1 : 1 appears to confirm it, or at least that he was a proselyte, his other writings still prove that he had a sufficiently deep acquaintance with both Judaism and christianity, to enable him under the direction of Paul, to compose this Epistle. But a yet stronger objection arises against every relation of Paul to this Epistle.—Where were these congregations of Jewish christians to whom the apostle could have stood in so intimate a spiritual relationship, as this author did? This conducts us to a second question equally difficult, the answer to which will have a reciprocal influence upon that of the former. The question is, whither was the Epistle directed?

The order of our examination is somewhat different here from that under the question referring to the author. We first enquire into what the ancient church declares concerning the readers, then, what the Epistle itself says. Between the testimony of the ancient church and the internal evidence lies the evidence of the superscription, *πρὸς Ἑβραίους* to the Hebrews.—

As it respects the testimony of the ancient church, Wieseler is of opinion, that it fixes partly upon the Laodiceans, partly upon the Alexandrians, and partly upon the christians of Palestine and Jerusalem as the persons addressed. But in the passage of Philastrius *haer.* 89, the *ad Laodicenses* probably refers, as Bleek also understands it, not to the Epistle to the Hebrews, but to the Apocryphal one to the Laodiceans, and the view, that the former was written *ad Alexandrinos* to the Alexandrians, is no where distinctly maintained, Wieseler deriving it with too much confidence from the fragment concerning the canon of Muratori, (*fragmentum de canone*). The only view distinctly to be found in the ancient church was, that the Epistle was directed to the Jewish christians of Jerusalem, and of Palestine in general. The fact is not as Wieseler represents it, that Clement of Alexandria, according to Eusebius *h. e.* vi 14, *appeared* to have thought of the Jewish christians of Palestine; Clement, on the contrary, took this for granted, although he was not the first, but ὁ μακάριος πρεσβύτερος *the blessed elder*, as Clement tells us, already explained the absence of the superscription Παύλου ἀπόστολος *Paul the apostle* as caused by motives of modesty, since our Lord was himself the apostle of the Hebrews. That the Epistle was directed to Palestine, the original field of our Lord's labors, is also the meaning of the superscription πρὸς Ἑβραίους. This superscription is, in every view, the most ancient testimony as to the readers of the Epistle, with which the overrated and highly problematic *ad Alexandrinos* is not at all to be compared.—From the period at which we find direct reference to the Epistle, (as with Irenäus and Clement of Alex., and therefore since about the middle of the second century), it comes to us under the name ἡ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολή *the Epistle to the Hebrews* and under no other, and even where the Pauline authorship is called into question, the historical truth of the inscription πρὸς Ἑβραίους is readily taken for granted. As far, therefore, as our eye runs back into the antiquity of the church, the Epistle bears the inscription πρὸς Ἑβραίους, and this inscription is not first understood by Clement, but already in the circle of its ancient teachers, as referring to readers in Palestine. It is quite a different question whether this reference is the only one which is reliable and correct. Wieseler answers, no; we, yes. It is true, that the term Ἑβραίους in itself expresses national origin with respect to the land of residence, as Paul the Cilician Ἑβραίους ἐξ Ἑβραίων Hebrew of the Hebrews, Phil. 3: 5, 2 Cor. 11: 12; further, that in opposition to Ἕλληνοῖσι *Grecians* (Acts 6: 1, 9: 29,) it indicates those who adhered to the He-

brew language as the language of divine service, and in general to national customs; and that, therefore, the term Ἑβραῖοι could also be used in opposition to Ἑλληνισταί out of Palestine, although no passage of this kind, as far as I know, has thus far been pointed out. But it is just as true, that Ἑβραῖοι, where it is used absolutely, designates the Jews of Palestine. This Wieseler denies, only for the purpose of favoring his opposing hypothesis. But it is undoubtedly certain, that for example, the name εὐαγγελίον κατ' Ἑβραίους *gospel to the Hebrews* points to a Palestinian Hebrew gospel, and that passages in which it is expressed that Matthew has written ἐν Ἑβραίοις and has preached Ἑβραίοις, Ἑβραῖοι are those who, where the sense is not self-evident, are denominated οἱ ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ Ἑβραῖοι (Eus. *h. e.* v. 11.) In the N. T. itself, the Jewish christians of Jerusalem and Palestine are, indeed, no where called Ἑβραῖοι, but οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Ἰουδαία ἀδελφοὶ *the brethren dwelling in Judea*, οἱ ἅγιοι οἱ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ *the saints that are in Jerusalem*, also simply οἱ ἅγιοι *saints* 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2 Cor. 8: 4, but should they, according to the analogy of inscription πρὸς Κορινθίους, πρὸς Γαλατας &c., be designated by a single term (as Κορινθιοὶ 2 Cor. 6: 11, Γαλαῖται Gal. 3: 1) it could be only πρὸς Ἑβραίους.

The meaning of the inscription is, therefore, not equivocal. Should we be compelled, upon evidence of the Epistle itself, to seek for its readers out of Palestine, we should have to reject the inscription which does not admit of this supposition. We, therefore, ask the Epistle concerning its own testimony. The features found scattered over its face adapt themselves to the following picture of the church, as that to which it is directed. The church was founded by apostolic preaching, ch. 2: 3, and had existed for a considerable time; for it had already lost through death prominent members worthy of imitation, ch. 13: 7. It had already passed through scenes of suffering, in which, firm in faith and joyful in hope, it endured reproach, persecution and spoiling of goods, ch. 10: 32–34, and bestowed kindness and relief upon the poor and captive, ch. 6: 10, 10: 34. After a past experience, marked by firm adherence to the truth, it has now reached a season of danger, in which it has not yet resisted unto blood—a danger of becoming faint-hearted, and of denying the faith amidst its severe chastisements. This denial of the faith manifestly consists in apostacy from Christ, and a preference for the law of the Old Testament; the prevalence of various and strange doctrines διδασκαί ποικίλαι καὶ ξέναι entertained by the church (13: 9) which yield to the obsolete law, especially that forbidding meats (comp. 12: 16 with 13: 9) or, as others explain it, that of the feasts

of sacrifices, a permanently high value, since, until this time, the church has not advanced beyond the first principles of christian doctrine, and in consequence of this want of progress has fallen into danger of being led into error (5: 12, ff.) Already members of the church, to escape reproach and persecution (12: 3), "forsake the assembling of themselves together," perhaps to appear as if attached to the temple service and steadfast adherents of Judaism. The danger of this apostasy or return to Judaism, already to a certain extent accomplished, constitutes the occasion and groundwork of the Epistle, for, besides the doctrines taught, there are to be seen every where warnings of judgments threatened against apostasy to Judaism, which must be the more terrible just in proportion as the new is more excellent than the old covenant. If, therefore, we take into connection this picture of the circumstances of the church to which the Epistle is directed, and the inscription *προς Ἑβραίους* i. e., to the Jewish christians of Palestine; two important doubts arise, in opposition to which adherence to the opinion that the Epistle was directed to readers in Palestine, and that it was of Pauline origin, seems to be a pure impossibility.—How could observing the commands concerning meats or participation in the temple service be regarded as apostasy in a church at Jerusalem, since the Jewish christians of that city had continued to adhere to the Mosaic law of meats, for during the imprisonment of Paul, according to Acts 21: 20–25, they were the more zealous for the law in consequence of the fact that they were just then contending with foreign churches about the Old Testament ordinances and Jewish privileges. This consideration appears to render the supposition that the Epistle was directed to Jerusalem impossible; for the very thing to which it warns them not to apostatize, constituted, from the beginning, the prevailing and peculiar character of the mother-church.—But if Paul were the author of the Epistle, and warned against Jewish legality, why, throughout the whole, do we not read a single word concerning that high estimation of lineal descent, of Sabbath and Holydays, and of circumcision which is incompatible with the christian principle of saving (*πίστις*) faith. It is indeed uncertain whether *βρώματα* meats (13: 9) refers to the law concerning clean and unclean, or much rather, as Bleek, Wieseler and others suppose, to that relating to meals at sacrifices. But if even the reference to forbidden meats is the more probable, as soon as we compare this Epistle with that to the Colossians, with which there are many points of contact (Col. 2: 16, 17,) it appears very remarkable that the word *περιτομή* circumcision does not once occur in our Epistle, whilst

in that to the Colossians (2: 11; ff.) a circumstantial account is given of what has been substituted in the New Testament for the outward circumcision of the Old. In view of this consideration, it would seem that every thought of Jerusalem and Paul must be relinquished. Wieseler has recourse from them to Alexandria. He supposes that any special controversy against adherence to Jewish doctrines and customs must have been unnecessary with the Jewish christians of Alexandria; for they had a thorough bias of a spiritualistic and Grecianizing tendency; that on the contrary, the caution against a return to the temple service is easily explicable when referred to them, for since the time of Ptolemy Philometor, the Egyptian Jews had a temple of their own, built at Leontopolis by Onias, a priest; who had escaped from Jerusalem, in contrasting which with that at Jerusalem, they prided themselves much; and that this temple and its service, and not that at Jerusalem, is referred to in this Epistle.

But the reasons, which Wieseler produces for this opinion, are all untenable. The Greek style of the Epistle does not divert our attention from Palestine, for independently of the fact that the Greek language had at no period taken root so deeply, and embraced so many countries within its influence, as in the first century of the Roman Empire (Thiersch Versuch s. 53), everything that is strange in style vanishes before the very natural assumption that the author would write his Epistle, designed immediately for the Jewish christians of Palestine, in a language comprehensible at the same time by the whole church. Just as little does the constant reference back to the Old Testament according to the Septuagint, lead us away from Palestine to Egypt. How remarkable, says Wieseler, is this use of the Septuagint, even where it departs from the original text, if the author wrote to the inhabitants of Palestine, where this version had no authority? But this argument destroys itself; for if, at that time, the Septuagint had no authority in Palestine, its constant use in the New Testament, especially in the Gospels, is inexplicable. The recognized authority of the Septuagint, at that time, by both Hebrew and Hellenic Jews, is a fact taken for granted in the use of Scripture throughout the whole New Testament. This is confirmed by the fact, that Josephus has it always in view in his Archæology, and follows it even where it deviates considerably from the received Hebrew text (*e. g.* in reckoning the years of the patriarchs living before the Deluge,) and also that the oldest Palestinian notices contained in the Mechilta and Talmud speak with respect of the Septuagint (Frankel, intro-

ductory studies to the Septuagint, 1841, p. 25, ff.) As neither the Greek idiom, nor the use of the Septuagint in the Epistle leads us away from Palestine, so also its expressions concerning the temple worship do not lead us to Egypt. In the description of the inner temple (9: 1-5) several difficulties indeed do present themselves, which excite the suspicion that the author had only an imperfect conception of it. Difficult and suspicious also is the declaration (7: 27, 10: 11) that the high-priest καθ' ἡμέραν *daily* "offered up sacrifice." Wieseler presents these difficulties in as strong a light as possible, in order to bring the decried author again into credit through the confident assertion, that he did not at all speak of the temple at Jerusalem, but of that of Onias at Leontopolis. This temple, according to Josephus (*Arch.* and especially *Bell.* 7, 10, 3.) was in some things similar, and in others dissimilar to that at Jerusalem. It was like a tower, for it stood upon a foundation of stone, built up sixty feet high. The altar of burnt offering and holy furniture it had, were like those in the temple at Jerusalem, only the golden candle-support was not a candlestick, but it was suspended, like a chandelier, by a golden chain. If now the author of our Epistle had mentioned a golden chandelier, instead of a golden candelabrum, or if it could be shown that the golden altar of incense, as appears according to 9: 3, 4, had stood behind the second veil, these circumstances would have commended to favor, or perhaps have confirmed the supposition of Wieseler; but not the least of the kind can be produced in its favor. There are, however, two things which go to show it to be without foundation. Our author speaks of a most holy place, which contained the ark of the covenant, with the pot of manna and Aaron's rod; the most holy place of the second temple was, however, empty, for the holy furniture belonging to it was irrecoverably lost. From this, Wieseler should have inferred that our author intended to describe neither the Herodian nor the Egyptian temple, but the temple as it was according to the Old Testament law. Besides, during the first century of the Christian Era, the conceit of the Egyptian Jews, but especially of those of Alexandria, for the temple of Onias, had not manifested itself strongly. Onias is said to have justified his building of this opposition temple by Isaiah, 19: 19, but the believing Israelite could not regard it in any other light than a *καθολικὴ* *a chapel*. It is for this reason that in Egypt pilgrimages to Jerusalem were not at any time forbidden, and that its temple never obtained great admirers or defenders; the Jews objected to it, that it stood not on Mount Moriah, and the Samaritans of Alexandria that it was not built

upon Mount Gerizim (Jost. *general history of the Israelites* in two vols., I, 515, ff.) Nor could the Alexandrians even admire it, for they had there that palace-like synagogue, of which the Talmud says, that he who has not seen it, has never seen the glory of Israel, and that at times it contained so great a multitude, that it exceeded twice the number that came out of Egypt under Moses. But their yearly consecrated gifts they brought to Jerusalem, and not to Leontopolis (Frankel p. 186). Philo, the Alexandrian, himself relates (II. 646,) that he once journeyed through Askelon to Jerusalem, in order to offer up prayer and sacrifices in the temple of the fatherland (*εἰς τὸ πατρῶον ἱερόν ἐστειλλόμεν ἐνξόμενός τε καὶ θύων*; see *the history of Hebrew poetry*, p. 206.) When, therefore, we reflect, that there is nothing in the Epistle to direct us to the Egyptian temple; that this had nothing to support its claims but a misinterpreted passage of the word of God; and that even in Egypt, and especially amongst the Jews of Alexandria, it never gained a proper respect and acknowledgement, the supposition of Wieseler falls to the ground.

Still, by showing that this supposition is without foundation, the proof that Jerusalem was the place of residence of those to whom the Epistle was addressed, and that it had a Pauline origin, has not yet, by any means, been completed; both of the above named formidable difficulties still remain to be overcome. An attempt, very worthy of attention, to overcome these difficulties, has lately been made by Thiersch in his (*comm. historica de epistola ad Hebraeos*) historical commentary concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews (Marburgi 1848, 4,) in which he promises at another time to produce the proof, that Barnabas wrote the Epistle, and that with his consent, Paul through the epilogue made it his own. The Epistle, according to the views of Thiersch (vgl. dagegen Versuch zur Herstellung, u. s. w., s. 264,) is to be regarded, not so much as one of caution against apostacy unto Judaism, as one of comfort to the Jewish christians of Jerusalem in their exclusion from the common worship which they sustained at the hands of the rest of their people. The Jewish christians of Palestine very justly regarded themselves as bound to the national law, and only this rejection out of their old religious connexions could first burst the fetters by which they felt themselves bound to the law. This expulsion took place after the death of Festus, (63.) Before the arrival of the new procurator, Albinus, the cruel Sadducean high priest Annas called the Sanhedrim together, and this body, transcending its lawful authority, condemned James, the brother of our Lord, and several other christians, to

be stoned to death, as transgressors of the law. From this time there began a continued persecution against christians, although the Pharisees disapproved of the conduct of their opponents, although the procurator was displeased with the high priest for his unlawful exercise of power, and although king Agrippa deposed Annas after being in office three months (*Jos. Ant.* last book.) Thiersch concludes from the Talmud that the Nazarenes had to endure much from the Jews; particularly in Galilee, at the beginning of the Jewish war, and he thinks that the persecution under Nero, which broke out in the year 64, sufficiently proves that the disposition of the Roman magistrates had, at that time, undergone a change in consequence of false complaints and reports. The particular circumstances of the condition of the christians of Palestine, he borrows from the Epistle itself. It comforts them in the trial in which they found themselves, as they saw that they were cast out of the communion of the temple, and arms them against the danger of a denial of Christ, in that it shows them the dignity of the New Testament church and its worship, by presenting to their view the dignity of its High priest and Mediator; and consequently, how easily they could dispense with the old worship by offerings and the communion of the old Jerusalem. The High Priesthood and sacrifice of the New Testament are so much the subject of discourse, because, whilst they might indeed be excluded from participation in the temple service, it was otherwise with the observance of circumcision, of the Sabbath, and of the rules forbidding meats. Thiersch has sought to substantiate his views by an ingenious allegorical interpretation of the eleventh chapter. His views are the more worthy of attention, because between A. D. 63 (the death of Festus) and 66, (the beginning of the Jewish war) a very suitable historical point of time occurred for our epistle.

We cannot, however, share in the views of Thiersch. For there is not a single word which clearly refers to the occurrence of that expulsion which has been presupposed. How adapted to this purpose is the context of 13: 12, 13. Jesus was forcibly thrust without the gate, to die as a transgressor.—Hence the author might have said: let us joyfully suffer when we too are thrust out; he, however, rather speaks of a willing going forth, and says: *ποῖνον ἐξερχώμεθα πρὸς αὐτόν* “let us go forth, therefore, to him.” But in the second place, 13: 9 contains a warning against doctrines which meddle with the ceremonial of meats, as *διδασκαί ποικίλαι καὶ ζέσαι* “*divers and strange doctrines.*” Thirdly, it is not at all supposable, that Paul should take part in an Epistle, which presupposes the contin-

ued observance of the Jewish law by Jewish christians as the rule, and does not as much admonish them to detach themselves from Judaism, as comfort those who saw themselves forcibly thrust out. But the above doubts against the Pauline origin of the Epistle, and against Jerusalem as the place to which it was directed, are not yet entirely disposed of, by what has been said.

They are, however, removed, when we take into consideration, first, that nowhere in the Epistle does the frequenting of the temple or the observance of Jewish ordinances appear to constitute the essence of the denial of Christ, against which he utters his warning; secondly, that in general, on the question whether the readers should still regard themselves as bound to the Jewish law or not, 13: 9 only can be taken to have an indirect reference to it. If we now reflect, that the whole Epistle nevertheless aims at withdrawing its readers from attachment to the legality of the Old Testament, by exhibiting to them the superiority of the divine service of the New Testament over that of the Old; and at fortifying them against the danger of a relapse into Judaism; which rejects Christ, there must be a special reason for the fact, that nowhere is there to be found a direct condemnation of the continued observance of the Old Testament ordinances, and that nowhere is any thing said of the incompatibility of the keeping of the Jewish law with Christianity. This is a matter of surprise, and it makes no difference whether the Epistle was directed, or whether the church, to which it was sent, was composed of purely Jewish christians or not; the context has always an intimate reference to circumcision, Sabbaths, and other kindred subjects. The author must, therefore, have designedly avoided a direct dispute concerning the observance of the law by Jewish christians, and this design can only be found in the exercise of a wise tenderness towards his readers. And towards what church was such prudent tenderness more demanded by duty and the circumstances of the case, than towards the mother church at Jerusalem, which grew up upon Jewish soil and in a Jewish atmosphere, and whose rupture with Judaism was not to be forced by stormy demands, but to be expected through divine Providence. And should we not entrust such tenderness to Paul, who circumcised Timothy on account of the Jews, Acts 16: 3, and, during his last stay in Jerusalem, so far yielded to the veneration of the church there for the law of their fathers, that he visited the temple and permitted offerings to be made for him; who, in all his apostolic journeys among the Heathen, bore the saints at Jerusalem upon his heart; and who (1. Cor.

9 : 20) says of himself, that to the Jews he had become a Jew, that he might gain the Jews. How such a condescension was possible without a denial of Christ, is explained by our Epistle, which does not come into direct collision with Jewish prejudices, but yet contrasts the Old and New Testament in such a manner, that everything having reference to the law must sink into insignificance before the substance itself of salvation and the surpassing glory of the New Testament. So much the more distinct, however, is the direct warning given against denying Jesus as the Son of God, and as Christ, and forsaking the christian worship. E. M. Röth, who, in a certain Latin essay (*Frankf. a. M.* 1836) has attempted to prove that our Epistle was not addressed to Jewish, but to Heathen christians, namely, to the Ephesians, and was written by Apollos, has entirely misapprehended this important characteristic. If the Epistle had been addressed to Jewish christians, he concludes that it must, above all things, have treated of the Messiahship and second coming of Jesus; for only in these points of faith is Jewish christianity distinguished from Judaism. Apart from the fact, that Röth's representation of Jewish christianity is not historically correct, since he ran astray in Rabbinic literature, precisely that which he omitted to notice in our Epistle, is one of its fundamental characteristics. The relapse, against which it utters its warning, is not a relapse into a Jewish observance of the law which is only indirectly attacked, but into a denial of Christ and his second appearing. At this time, the church of Jerusalem and the affiliated churches of Palestine stood in great danger of this relapse. She had passed through a great persecution, 10 : 32, viz: that which was connected with the martyrdom of Stephen, Acts 8 : 1. About seven years later, James the elder was torn from her, and Herod Agrippa persecuted the christians in order to ingratiate himself with the Jews; Acts 12 : 1, ff. She, therefore, counted martyrs and confessors amongst her *ἡγούμενοι* *rulers*, of whom our Epistle reminds us as of examples 13 : 7. If the chronology of Josephus is more reliable than that of Hegesippus, James the younger had also, perhaps, suffered martyrdom at the time of the writing of our Epistle. The time then present, was indeed not a time of bloody persecution, but yet a time of affliction and of reproach, in which a steadfastness and a fidelity in faith and profession were needed, prepared to resist unto blood. In this fidelity, the apostle, captive at Rome, sought herein to strengthen the distant church, in that he unfolds to them, by the hand of Luke, the heavenly glory of the new covenant.— And should we be surprised that he should urge the Hebrews

to pray for him, that "he might soon be restored to them again." There is to him the same attraction towards Jerusalem, that urged him thither about four years before, although "the Holy Ghost witnessed in every city," "that bonds and afflictions" awaited him there.

ARTICLE III.

THE PROTESTANT PRINCIPLE IN ITS RELATIONS.

Translated from the German of Thomasius, by C. Philip Krauth, Editor of the Review.

WE undertook in a former article, to show how the essential doctrines of our church confessions were either implicitly contained in that of justification, or necessarily followed from it. Designedly did we restrict ourselves to the older confessions, and reserve for special consideration the relation of the Formula Concordiae to them. This is necessary, for it is undeniable that the form of concord is looked upon with prejudice by many friends of Evangelical truth. It may be assumed that it is still viewed in the unfavorable light, in which Plank, in his history of the Protestant faith placed it; and this is not to be wondered at, when we look at the various opinions, which from his time to that of Thiersch, have been expressed about it, and generally, we must add, from an entire misapprehension of the subject. It has been censured both on account of its form, and its contents. In reference to its form, it has been objected, that it wears much more the form of a theological dissertation than that of a confession; and in this there is some truth, at least in regard to the *Solida Declaratio*. The Epitome cannot, with any justice, with its clear and precise form, be exposed to this objection; it lays down its positive and negative positions with so much acuteness and clearness, and maintains so happily the didactic confessional manner, that it leaves nothing, in this respect, to be desired; indeed it surpasses in this the *Augustana*. In the *S. Declaratio*, theological explanation and argument are predominant, and as this obviously does not belong to the confession, as this latter more especially pertains to the *credimus, docemus* and *confitemur*, the reproach mentioned above cannot entirely be removed. Notwithstanding it is not to be overlooked, first, that this defect is remedied by the prefixed Epitome, and secondly, that the *Declaratio* is

designed mainly for theologians, and finally, that the circumstances which gave rise to their composition made an extended theological discussion indispensable. There were a series of controversies, internal and external, in which the church was involved, during the life of Luther, and more fully after his death. Controversies, which embraced very difficult questions, and in which every thing depended upon an accurate statement of the *Status Controversiae*, and the justification of the decision by the necessary proofs from scripture. It is plain that this could not be accomplished without Theology; why should the form of concord be condemned for that which is admired in the apology?

The contents then will furnish the ground for opposition.— In estimating it, every thing depends upon the two questions, first, what importance attaches to those points which the form of concord sanctions; and second, in what relation they stand to the principle of our church and the contents of the earlier symbolical writings, particularly the *Augustana*. On both points, the document itself speaks in the most unequivocal manner. In the introduction, it is repeatedly asserted, that it aims at presenting no new or other doctrine, than is contained in the *Augustana*; the hope is expressed that the elucidation of the litigated points will furnish the proof, that we adhere tenaciously to the Augsburg Confession, and its lucid and christian doctrines. It proposes, then, to be regarded as a repetition (*repetitio*) and an explanation of the Aug. Conf. (*explicitio genuinae sententiae Augustanae Confessionis*.¹)

The disputed doctrines, which their decisions embraced, are characterized as weighty and important matters; they are not, it is said, logomachies (*λογομαχίαι*) or disputations empty and unnecessary, such as arise when one party does not sufficiently understand the other, but grave matters of controversy, and such entirely as, that the views which depart from the truth can

¹The reason for incorporating with our summary of doctrine, the writings mentioned above, viz., the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Schmalkald articles, the small and large Catechism of Luther, is because these have always been regarded as the general and conceded views of our church, and as what had been subscribed by the leading and most enlightened Theologians of the times, and introduced into all Evangelical churches and schools. These all (as before mentioned) were written and published before the controversies amongst divines of the Aug. Conf. had arisen, and as they are considered impartial and cannot be rejected by any of the parties, so no one, who has sincerely received them, can discard them, but must readily receive and submit to them as witnesses. No one can, therefore, find fault with us for reverting to them for illustration and proof of the contested doctrines, and as we make the word of God the sole foundation, so do we use these writings in support of the truth, and as the clear and unanimous exposition to which our forefathers adhered. Solid. Dec. ed. Walch, p. 590.

neither nor ought be borne, excused or defended in the church of God.¹ Upon this supposition, the Lutheran church was fully justified, and indeed bound to proper symbolical decisions in regard to these controverted topics; and if this was done in consistency with the older confessions, so that they were consequences of them, then does it assume the place of a vital continuation of them, and constitutes with them an organic whole. He then, who recognizes them as his faith, cannot without inconsequence, and without contradiction, refuse his belief to the concordia. In order to understand the importance attached by the Lutheran church to these controverted points, it is necessary to recollect the high estimate made by it of doctrine in general. Regarding the internal being of the church as the communion of faith, and the pure doctrine of the Gospel (*pura evangelii doctrina*) as the characteristic of her truth—unity and purity of doctrine were looked upon as essential to the existence of the church. It was assumed as necessary for ecclesiastical union, that there should be unity of doctrine. Unity of doctrine was not restricted to what is now regarded as fundamental, for although there was a perfect recognition of the cardinal significance of the article on justification, there was no approach to an underrating of any doctrine taught in the divine word, or to its rejection by the church; but, on the other hand, the church maintained that every revealed doctrine was an article of faith as comprehended by God's grace, and was entitled to the obedience of faith. To this, great reverence for the word of God, which contains the entire plan of salvation, together with clear comprehension of the inward connection of revealed truth, led. It was not thought that, at our option, we may receive or reject divine truth, without an injury to our reverence for the word of God, and that partial error did not vitiate the entire system; against such views there had been much caution, and it was looked upon as the first duty of the church to preserve its doctrine pure and uncorrupted. It was considered as a high misdemeanor to make any concession either to other confessions, or to its own members. On the basis of these principles union with the Swiss was declined,² and a judgment was formed in

¹Non λογομαχίαι aut de verbis inane, et non necessariae disputationes, quales oriri solent, quam altera pars alterius sententiam non satis assequuta est, sed res gravissimæ sunt, de quibus controvertitur et prorsus tales, ut illius partis, quæ a vero aberrat, sententia in Ecclesia Dei nec possit nec debeat ferri nedum excusari, aut defendi.

²Comp. The instructions of the Protestant deputies to a Convention in Schwabach, that they would not unite with any one that did not accord with

regard to the differences which we have now before us. It follows that great importance was attached to them; justice requires that we should from this point judge the zeal and bitterness with which the contest was carried on. They felt that they were contending for the highest interests, and this claims our respect, though we may frequently regret the spirit displayed. This judgment on these controverted doctrines is not merely subjective, but has its justification in facts. For the points in dispute were such as stood in immediate connection with justification, or with those doctrines which the older confessions had asserted, as we will show hereafter. In regard to the decisions of the formula of concord, their conformity to those of the older confessions, has been universally admitted in the Lutheran church. Not only the eighty-six evangelical princes who adopted it, and the eight thousand ministers who subscribed it, together with the numerous Lutheran churches which subsequently adopted it, are witnesses in its favor, but those who did not subscribe, are likewise witnesses in its behalf. With the exception of the Provinces, which were already Calvinistic, and therefore soon united with the Reformed, who are, as a matter of course, not taken into the account, with this exception, the greater part of the Lutheran magistrates and cities, which declined signature, for instance, Pomerania, Holstein, Hesse Cassel, Anhalt, Nürnberg, Magdeburg, declared themselves, at the same time, in general, satisfied with the Conf.¹ Their objections were unimportant; they particularly avowed their concurrence in the views of Luther in regard to the Lord's Supper. Their exceptions were directed against the article in regard to the person of Christ, not indeed against the thing itself, but the, as it appeared to them, too subtle conception of it, and the manner in which it was brought into connection with the Lord's Supper,² in ad-

them in a true christian faith and maintain one baptism and sacrament.—
Seckendorff Hist. Luth. v. Frick, p. 966.

¹See the satisfactory proofs in Köllner in den Symb. der Luth. Kirch.—
Hamburg 1837, s. 556, 573.

²We communicate some of these decisions from the original documents of Hutter in the Concordia Concors. The Hesse Cassel divines explain in their thoughts upon the article of the Lord's Supper: "De Cæna domini nostri Jesu Christi de qua septimus articulus agit, jam proh dolor ab initio restitutæ lucis Evangelii, ad hoc usque tempus, grave et satis perniciosum certamen fuit. In nostris autem ecclesiis aliter non docuimus, nec deinceps etiam aliter docere statuimus per Dei gratiam, quam quod in vero usu s. Coenæ, una cum pane et vino, verum, essentialia, præsens corpus Christi, quod pro nobis in ara crucis in mortem est traditum, et verus, essentialis, præsens sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui pro nobis in ara crucis effusus est, non tamen externo, naturali, sed interno et soli fidei comprehensibili modo, exhibeatur,

dition, the rejection not so much of Synergism itself, for in regard to that, they were agreed, but several Melancthonian expressions which they received in a different sense. Some considered an additional confession unnecessary, as the earlier ones embraced the substance; others had entirely different views. It must be explicitly noticed, remarks the most recent, learned commentator on these relations, "that a considerable part of those who did not concur, did not decline on dogmatic grounds, but partly from political considerations, voluntary and compulsory, partly from attachment to Melancthon, partly from wounded pride, because they were not active participants, partly because in a particular territory, the persons of most influence were Calvinistic, whilst the greater part of the teachers were favorable to the doctrines of the Formula Concordiae.

sumatur, et percipiatur, a dignis pariter et indignis: a dignis quidem ad fidei confirmationem, et sic ad eorum salutem: ab indignis autem ad iudicium.— Quoniam ergo theologorum, qui (Torgae) congregati fuerunt, copiosa et perspicua hujus articuli explicatio, quantum ad thesin et antithesin attinet, in fundamento cum nostra sententia et doctrina congruit, in declaratione illa acquiescimus."—On the article concerning the person of Christ. "Hodie de hoc articulo ideo controvertitur, quod Zwingliani et Calvinistae hoc ipso et aliis articulis fidei (quales sunt, ascendit in coelum, et sedet ad dexteram Dei) probare se posse autumant, Christum nec verum et essenziale suum corpus manducandum, nec verum et essentielle sanguinem suum in s. coena nobis dare posse. Quamvis autem articulus hic non sit proprium fundamentum et sedes, ex qua praesentia corporis et sanguinis Christi in s. coena demonstratur: sed verba institutionis: Accipite, edite, etc. fidem nobis certam faciunt, quod Christus in vero usu sacramenti hujus nos vero suo corpore et vero suo sanguine cibet ac potet: tamen fundamento huic et sedi propriae non adversatur, uti nonnulli opinantur. Sed quemadmodum verba coenae testantur, velle Christum nobis dare verum suum corpus et verum suum sanguinem: ita quoque hic (nempe articulus de persona Christi) et reliqui articuli de ascensione Christi, et sessione ejus ad dexteram Dei, testantur et confirmant, quod suum corpus et sanguinem suum in s. coena nobis dare possit. Proinde recte ille explicatur, et simul ostenditur veritatem humanae naturae in Christo, ejusque ascensionem in coelos, et sessionem ad dextram patris, praesentiam corporis et sanguinis Christi in s. coena nequaquam impedire. Quemadmodum enim sessio ad dextram patris, ad quam in ascensione sua assumptus est Christus, non intelligenda est de certo aliquo coeli loco, in quem Christi corpus tanquam inclusum et captivum receptum sit, sic ut alibi, etiam quo illud verbo suo destinatur sive ordinatur, esse nequeat, sed de divina omnipotentia et gloria, in qua Christus cum patre suo regnat ac omnia gubernat: ita statuimus et docemus, licet Christus verus et naturalis homo sit et maneat, non tamen propterea sequi, corpus et sanguinem ejus in s. coena non posse distribui et percipi: sed quia humanitas Christi ab aeterno dei filio assumpta, et sic cum deitate ἀδιαίρετως unita est, potius inde sequitur, et irrefragabiliter probatur, quod Christus, tanquam omnipotens et verus deus, ubicunque velit, possit corpore suo adesse: ideoque etiam in s. coena juxta promissionem suam verum suum corpus et sanguinem ad edendum et bibendum distribuere possit."

The Brunswick Divines, together with those of Helmstadt, presented their exceptions at the conference of Rittershausen (Riddagshausen) on the 9th of Aug. 1576, making no objections to the article on the Lord's Supper, but in regard to that on the person of Christ, expressing the desire that the absolute

From this it appears, that it was not everywhere dissent from the doctrines which produced the unwillingness to subscribe. In addition to this, at a later period, it was virtually adopted in the countries and regions in which it had not been, and the ministers of the church ascribed to it a high authority.¹ To this candid judgment, we annex that of one of the most determined opponents, Plank, who took pains to exercise impartiality towards all except the Lutherans, who poured contempt and sarcasm on the entire work of pacification, and knew how to place it in the most unfavorable light; this historian feels himself compelled to acknowledge, "It is almost beyond controversy, that in the formula, in every controverted doctrine, precisely the view was introduced and sanctioned, which was

ubiquity might not be asserted. In the article on the person of Christ it is concluded, that it is necessary, that as the appellatio communicationis idiomatum is by many applied to the first genus, and under that pretext the others are entirely excluded and rejected, that on this account it ought to be guarded at the general synod, whether the opinion was not, that the appellatio communicationis idiomatum was used as a commune genus, under which all three were embraced, and to each one his special definition and appellation was attributed;" at a meeting at Brunswick, a part of them, together with divines from Lower Saxony (from Gosslar, Göttingen, Hannover, Nordheim, &c.,) explain: "We have discovered that, nearly throughout, the formula is word for word, what was before this, a year ago, decided in these churches, and unanimously approved, except some small additions made in the conference at Torgau, which were properly added for elucidation from Luther's writings, and we declare that in the churches we maintain the doctrines in regard to controverted articles as they are set forth in this formula, and therefore coincide with, and are satisfied with this formula; it is our purpose too, by the help of God, to adhere to the form of doctrine, and are resolved not merely in our ministry, but before our christian magistrates so to uphold them, that not only in churches and schools, with the present generation they may be received, but that this deposite may be transferred to posterity."

Remarkable is the decidedly rejecting decision of Holstein through Paul von Eitzen, who gives, as a ground why they need no new symbolical book, the circumstance "because all the controverted articles handled in the new formula, are clearly explained in the old symbols," and as a further proof, the formula of ordination used in Holstein expresses: "I swear fourthly and particularly, that the words of my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, in his holy Supper and Testament, namely, "This is my body which was given for you, this is my blood of the New Testament, which was shed for you and for many, for the forgiveness of sins," I hold and believe truly in the simple true sense of the plain words, namely: that the true actual body of my Savior, Jesus Christ, who gave himself to death for me on the cross; and the true actual blood of Christ, my Savior, which was shed for me, is truly present in the Lord's Supper, and is really distributed in every part of the world,

¹Köllner a. a. O. S. 58I. Vgl. J. G. Walch, *Introductio in lib. eccl. luth. symb. Jen. 1738 p. 732.* Merito pro symbolo ecclesiae lutheranae habetur, ejus quippe, quae Augustanae Confessioni invariatae est addicta. Quamvis enim sint inter nostrae religionis Confessores, qui huic formulae subscribere recusarunt, ipsam tamen doctrinam in ista propositam haud rejecerunt. Non sequitur, ut, qui scripto huic nomen dare noluerit, simul ipsum scriptum ac quam tradit doctrinam veluti erroneam rejecerit. Vgl. p. 722 ff.

most clearly sustained by the Augsburg Confession, by the Apology for it, by the Schmalkald articles, and by the Catechisms of Luther. At most, the article in regard to the person of Christ alone admitted of plausible doubt, whether it was presented in the formula as it had been in those writings; but even here it was not very difficult, by a succession of deductions, to prove that it was involved in them." (Protest. Lehr-

where the Lord's Supper is administered according to the institution of Christ and is received by all who go to the Lord's table, as the Lord's words express. As this doctrine of the Holy Sacrament is explained, in the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Schmalkald articles, and the two Catechisms of our holy Father and Teacher, Luther, which Confession and writings, I hold and believe in this article, rightly and truly, and obligate myself, by this, my oath, by the help and grace of God, to present to my congregation the same true simple doctrine of the Lord's Supper, without perversion and change, and to teach it till my death. Sixthly, and specially I hold and declare that the doctrine of the Anabaptists, and the perverters of the Sacrament, Carlstadtians, Zuinglians, Calvinists, Bezaites, or by whatever name they are, or may be called—in opposition to the necessity and power of holy baptism, and against the true presence, distribution and reception of the true actual body and blood of Christ in the holy Supper, wherever it is properly administered throughout the church, according to the institution of Christ is wrong, false, untrue and deceptive. But I will help to uphold and to propagate, by the grace of God, and the Spirit's aid, the unchangeable, true doctrine and faith concerning the truth and Omnipotence of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the inseparable union of his divine and human natures in the one undivided person of Christ, and the true actual presence of the true body and blood of Christ in the holy Supper." In addition, the opposition of Paul von Eitzen had its origin in pique against Andrea. Hutter says, he had *praeconceptum quoddam animo odium contra D. Jacobum*; which is confirmed by Plank, s. 494.

Comp. on this J. G. Walch, *Einleitung in die Rel. Streitigkeiten der Ev. l. Kirche*, Bd. iv, 450. Löscher *Historia motuum* Bd., iii, p. 262, where there are pregnant proofs. 3, B. Likewise in Zweibrück it was brought about that the Form. Conc. was adopted on the 23d of August, and subscribed in September. The Pomeranians, finally, who were mainly concerned about the Apology of their *Corpus doctrinae*, started, as to the matter, a difficulty in regard to the article on conversion, which grew out of a misapprehension, comp. J. G. Walch *loc. cit.*, but profess themselves satisfied with the article on the Lord's Supper and the person of Christ; only they desired a very copious exposition, as they belonged to the most decided friends and defenders of church orthodoxy. The Pomeranian church order of the year 1563, confesses: "In regard to the Lord's Supper should be taught harmoniously, that we receive in it the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ with the bread and wine, and that the Lord Jesus Christ is present in the Sacrament, not merely with his grace, spirit and power, but really with his body and blood, as the words of Christ express: This is my body, this is my blood which believers receive to life, and the unworthy and impenitent to condemnation."

Further, the Pomeranians in the year 1593 assumed the three articles of the Formula Conc.: in respect to the Lord's Supper, the person of Christ and the election of grace as their standard in the controversies with the Reformed, the whole at a late period comp. Walch *loc. cit.* p. 451, 454.

In regard to the substance of the doctrine, the Anhalt divines alone properly dissented, who were Calvinistic, and the Nürnbergers, who were, in addition, influenced by other causes. This will suffice to establish the position taken above.

begr. vi. 697.) Little as we approve of the manner in which he expresses himself, we wished to direct attention to this acknowledgment, particularly with a reference to those, who regard him as the highest authority, when he treats so slightly, the Formula of Concord.

We propose to develop the double truth uttered before from history. Not that we propose to give a history of those controversies, or even to recount all the points, which the limits of this Magazine could not receive; our purpose is to furnish the evidence in a few leading points. We asserted that the controverted points stood partly in a direct and partly in an indirect relation to the primary principle of the Lutheran church.

The first is true particularly of the controversies before the interim, the second of those which connected themselves with it. Taking up, in the first place, the first series. They were the contests with Agricola, Osiander and the Enthusiasts or fanatics, as they are denominated.

a. In the first, the Antinomian controversies, the relation of the law to the Gospel is discussed. The contradiction, which John Agricola of Eisleben, in the year 1527, expressed against the celebrated instructions prepared by Melanchthon and published by Luther, for the Visitors, to the ministers in the Electorate of Saxony, may have been founded in a mistake. He saw in the manner in which the law was placed in the van, an attack upon the Protestant principle, a denial of Christian freedom and a return to papacy.¹

But the denial that true repentance came from the law, would appear suspicious, and particularly when ten years afterwards he renewed his protest with a more full disclosure of his theory, he which had in the mean time perfected. He did this in a series of propositions (*Propositiones inter fratres*) which he published anonymously in the year 1537.

He here lays down the two theses; 1. repentance should be taught not from the ten commandments, or any law of Moses, but from the sufferings and death of the Son of God by means of the Gospel; 2. the law is not to be taught, neither as the beginning, middle nor end of the righteousness of man. What he means by beginning of righteousness, he explains at once more minutely, when, on the one hand, he asserts, that the law alone reproveth sin and does this without the Holy

¹ Reprehendit, says Melanchthon, quod non doceam inchoari poenitentiam ab amore justitia, quod de legis praedicatione urgenda nimius sim, quod quibusdam locis christianam libertatem laeserim; facit me bis papistam. Sic audio apud amicos. (*Corpus Reform. I. 920.*)

Ghost, and therefore it reproves it to condemnation; on the other hand rejects as erroneous the declaration of Luther, that the principal use and function of the law is to alarm the conscience, that it may more readily know Christ; and how he understands the expression middle and end, appears from this, that he restricts the law to the external works and doings of life and would banish the decalogue from the pulpit to the hall of justice.¹ We see, he not only denies the pedagogical character of the law, in virtue of which it produces the knowledge of sin, repentance and a desire of salvation; he refuses to it the character of divinity. "It does not confer the spirit, it is not deserving of the title word of God." And from this, he further concludes, that it has no commanding power, and that within the bounds of Christianity it is of no authority. Even the passage of the Apostle, 2 Pet. 1: 10. : Give diligence &c., does not please him. For Peter did not understand the nature of Christian liberty. It is not necessary to prove that these views are directly destructive of the formal principle of the Lutheran church, and at the same time its doctrine of the relation of the law to the Gospel, as it is unfolded in the Augsburg Confession and its Apology (see former Article,) is directly contradicted. Just as plainly do their pernicious consequences appear; the result of their reception would be the diminution of the divine holiness and with it the possibility of true repentance; they must nullify the conviction of the necessity of the redemption through Christ from the curse of the law, and finally introduce into the christian life that false liberty, which, rejecting the divine law, discards all divine control and degenerates into licentiousness. All this Luther, in his six powerful disputations against the Antinomians, adduced against Agricola, and the subsequent renewal of the same errors by the pastor Poach of Erfurth, Otto of Nordhausen, and others,² shows how well founded was the apprehension of the great Reformer, that by means of this doctrine,

¹ Luther's Werke. Walch 20. 20. 32. Arnold K. Gesch. 2. 16. 45.

² Poach maintained "that the law, even when fulfilled, had no promise of everlasting life and stood in no relation to eternal life." S. Salig Gesch. der Augs. Konf. III. p. 59—Schlüsselburg Catal. Haeret. VII. 274 ff. *Salus est quidquam extra legem et alienum a lege.* Comp. the Antimonian theses of Anthony of Nordhausen: e. g. "The Christian's best wisdom is to know nothing of the law—Moses knew nothing at all of our faith and of our religion—the law does not belong to the church, but to courts and not to pulpits. The law was not given to Christians so that they should neither be punished nor frightened by it—the law, good works, new obedience do not belong to the kingdom of Christ, but to the world, like Moses and the Pope's dominion

Satan would sweep away Christ, Repentance, Sin and the entire Scriptures, yea, even the Author of the Scriptures, God himself, and expect to introduce the most destructive security, contempt of God, unpunished audacity and impenitence.—The more clearly and minutely the Lutheran church embraced the doctrine of justification, the more decidedly it asserted the insufficiency of the law for salvation and the more boldly it rejected all works, in so far as they were proposed as a condition of salvation, so much the more was it necessary that they should support the divine authority of the law and show its relation to Christian faith and life. Neglecting this, there was a danger of losing on the side of a false liberty, what had been gained on the other. It was a great service rendered by Luther, that with an energy peculiar to himself, he prevented this in the disputation mentioned. He explained how the law was precluded from the work of justification, had indeed nothing to do with it; but it by no means followed that it should not be preached, but on the contrary in a three fold point of view was indispensable, first as an outward discipline, as a safeguard against gross outbreaks of sin; then for the impenitent that they may leave their unrighteousness and condemnation and humbled may seek the peace of God; finally for believers, for in so far as the old man is not fully destroyed, the new man has just started, and in so far as the flesh lives aside of the Spirit of Christ, do they need the continued reproof of the law; and the law must be preached both to saints and to sinners; to the latter, that alarmed, they may learn their sins, their exposure to death and the wrath of God, and thereby be humbled; to the former that they may be admonished to crucify and mortify their flesh, together with the affections and lusts, in order to avoid security; for this takes away both faith and the fear of God, and causes that the last state is worse than the first. (Disput. 5: 42–45.) More indeed — “for as the law was before Christ and condemned us under him, but was silenced and satisfied by the forgiveness of sins and is hereafter to be fulfilled by the Spirit, so it will after Christ be fulfilled in a future life, when at last the creature, as the law requires, becomes entirely new; therefore the law will never be abolished, but remains either to be fulfilled by the damned or ful-

—no man can be saved when the *tertius usus* of the law is true and to be taught in the churches—a believing christian is above all law obedience—believers in Christ, or those that have been born again are deified, are God himself and cannot sin—God has not given you his word that you might be saved by it.” &c. S. Acts and proceedings of the Alb. Colloq. (1568); Wittenberg, 1570. p. 207, 208.

filled in the saved." (II. 45-47.) Thus Luther — comp. Walch, 20, 20. 37 ff.

Did not the Lutheran church pursue the right course in condemning this Antinomianism? Did it not protect its dogma in regard to justification and the Christian freedom involved in it against an imminent and great perversion, in arraying against it the admirable article in regard to the triple use of the law, in which the substance of Luther's positions was embodied? Does not the still prevailing abuse of Evangelical freedom show the necessity of the scriptural definition: the law is the rule and directory, to which the life of the pious is to be conformed: *lex est regula ac norma, ad quam vita pii est instituenda?*

But this is the doctrine of the formula that has been least opposed. *b.* We will now proceed to *Osiandrisism*. (On Osiander compare Wilke, Andr. Osiander's life, doctrine and writings, Stralsund 1844. First part extends only till the year 1530.)

The peculiar view which Andrew Osiander broached in regard to justification, in opposition to the church view, was by many considered, unjustly, as a return to Catholicism. That man was justified by the righteousness of Christ and by faith alone and not by his own works, he did not deny. But justification itself, he did not ground on the atonement, but on the essential righteousness, that is, on the divine nature of the propitiator, and considered its essence as consisting not in imputation of the objective merits of Christ, but in the influx (*Immanenz*) of the actual righteousness of Christ, that is, his divine essence in the believer (*justitia essentialis, essentia divina, divina natura*). Assuredly, this divine taught, did Christ the God man by his life, sufferings, and death (passive and active obedience,) satisfy God for us and purchase redemption, that is the forgiveness of sins; and this is a pure objective act which took place between God and Christ, and had as its objective result the atonement. Every one has part in this, so far as he is by baptism introduced into the fellowship of the mystical body of Christ (his church,) entirely apart from his subjective condition, his appropriation of it by faith: "It is as if an African was freed from bondage, his posterity would be free with him." (Compare Andr. Osiander's Confession in regard to the only Mediator Jesus and his justification. Königsb. 1551. Fol. B. 2.) But this redemption is not by any means our justification. We are righteous not by Christ for us, but by Christ in us, viz.: by this, that his divine essence dwells in us, after we have become members of his body and

have received the pardon of our sins, and this takes place when we receive in faith and with the Eternal Word, (which is only an outward sound) the Gospel, which God has proclaimed to us on account of that objective redemption and the indwelling actual word, which is in the outward, and is the *logos* himself.¹

We are righteous on account of the indwelling of this word, or what is the same, on account of the actual righteousness of the divinity of Christ which dwells in us; not on account of the act of the atonement, not on account of his obedience in his state of humiliation (*obedientia qua legem implevit*), for all this as having transpired long ago cannot justify those who live now, *justos facere*. Not an imputed righteousness (*justitia imputata*), which would in itself be a contradiction, as God could not pronounce and consider, an actual sinner, a righteous person, without a false judgment; but that divine righteousness received by faith, that inhabitation of the Godhead renders righteous.² This God imputes to the believer, on its account he has pleasure in him, and here both meet, making and declaring righteous (which by the doctrine of the church is wrongly explained and separated). For this imparted divine righteousness is a new light and life in men, destroys sin, which has already been forgiven, but still dwells in the flesh, and justifies him actually and truly.

¹ Osiander notices frequently that this reception of the divinity of Christ is through his humanity. *Larg. Conf. D. 3. 6.* What he understands by this, may be best seen by his treatise against Melancthon *Bg. E. u. I.*; but this does not change the matter; justification is constantly based upon the inhabitation of the divine nature.

² *Comp. Grosses Bekenntniss, F. 3.* As the Gospel brings to us the word of God which is God himself and by faith into our heart, soul and spirit, so that we are awakened by it, it likewise displays its power further and justifies us, that is, it makes us righteous in the same degree in which it gives us life; for Paul says in *Gal. 3.*: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law; and powerfully shows with such words, that nothing can justify us, that does not impart life, and whatever imparts life (be it the law or what it may) that justifies us too. Now it is certain that since we are dead in trespasses and sins (*Ephes. 2: 1*) there is nothing that can quicken us, except the word of God, Jesus Christ, who was both God and man. From this it follows irresistibly, that nothing can justify or make us righteous, but the very same word of God, which is God himself and our life and righteousness, namely, Jesus Christ, our Lord, as Paul writes *1 Cor. 1.* On the meaning of the word righteousness, *Fol. H. 2*—According to this it is frequently and nearly through the entire Scriptures, taken for piety. That in this piety, every other virtue is embraced and intended, and in this way we employ it here, when we speak of the righteousness of faith. And if any one would ask what this righteousness and piety are, I answer, righteousness is just that which moves the righteous to do right, and without which he can neither be righteous, nor do right.

For this very reason God considers him righteous, and his judgment is true; the fruit of such a justification is the renewal of man, obedience and good works.¹

This peculiar view of justification excited, as is well known, the greatest attention. The whole Lutheran church arose against it as one man, and attacked it as a perversion of its richest treasure; for as such was the doctrine of Osiander characterized by all the faculties of Theology, ministeriums and individual scholars, whose numerous decisions and responses are yet extant. That it was a cardinal doctrine that was in dispute, *caput et arx doctrinae Christianae*, was the general opinion; even the mild Melanchthon expressed himself to this effect. The starting point of the doctrine of Osiander is an attack upon an external conception of faith; in opposition to this, he asserted that faith produced an actual apprehension, a living union with Christ, and only so far as it did this, justified, and this he exhibited in the most striking manner, with great knowledge of the word of God, more clearly and appositely,

G. 3. Here is now my sincere, correct and clear answer, that Christ, according to his divine nature, is our righteousness, and not according to his human nature, although we cannot find or obtain such a divine righteousness beyond the circle of his humanity, but when by faith he dwells in us, he brings his righteousness, which is his divine nature, into us, which is imputed to us, as if it belonged to us. It is, indeed, given to us and flows from his humanity as the head, into us as his members, and moves us to yield our members as instruments of righteousness to God, as Paul directs in Rom. 6.

O. 3. Christ is our wisdom and righteousness not in virtue of his human but his divine nature. The proof is particularly found in Jeremiah 9, *יִרְקַט יְהוָה*. Compare the argument against the church doctrine Fol. G. 4. On the relation of justification to redemption Bl. B. Through the redemption of Christ did he purchase us this, that God will, through faith, grant us the divine righteousness of Christ, Ps. 32. But Christ's merits in life, suffering and death is not this righteousness. Compare the Confutation of Melanchthon's reply: L. 2. This, I say, is our righteousness, when we are incorporated by faith into Christ, his members and become partakers of his divine nature, as often stated, then is his divine nature our righteousness, and this it is alone and will not admit of any addition, for where God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are, there is endless life, righteousness and glory. This righteousness has been purchased and merited for us by Christ, and must, as it had been lost in Adam, be purchased and merited again by Christ; but this merit obtained through righteousness, cannot be the righteousness itself. It is, after the divine righteousness dwells in us, that the redemption benefits us and forgiveness is realized. a. a. O. T.

¹ In this Osiander is not entirely consistent, in that in the larger Conf. he regards the effect of the indwelling righteousness of Christ upon man, as conducive to his justification, in the refutation of Melanchthon he distinguishes expressly between the two, and repeatedly declares, that the essential righteousness (*justitia essentialis*) in itself, so far as it dwells in us, is our righteousness. Bg. J. and this I regard as his real view, the more as the expression used in the Conf. several times: Righteousness is this, that which makes us do right, he here takes back, and explains in the manner specified.

than many of his cotemporaries; but when he assumed that this was his view and not that of the church, Luther's doctrine concerning faith, and not that which prevailed, this was gross injustice, which tended to much perplexity. Much more objectionable appeared his opinion in regard to justification.—The opposition against the declaratory meaning of the word, the transposition of the church's explanation *justum pronunciare in justum facere* contains an approach to the Catholic doctrine, and although the greater part of his opponents were candid enough not to accuse him of retrocession to Catholicism, they properly object that his expressions are, in any event, even admitting that they have a better sense, perplexing, and well calculated to throw a shade on the Protestant fundamental doctrine, together with the Augustana;¹ further his definition of *justificare* contradicts the Scripture, whilst that of the church has its sanction. But the point under consideration is not merely a point of grammar, but a fundamental difference in the matter itself. Whilst the Scriptures, and with them the church, place justification in the closest connexion with forgiveness of sin, and identify this with that, or consider it as an essential element, Osiander detaches the forgiveness of sin entirely from it; and gives it another location. Whilst further, it brings justification into the closest relation to the fact of redemption, to the sacrifice that the God-man made on the cross, and regards it as the application of his merits, as the appropriation of his obedience manifested in life and death, Osiander destroyed this interior, necessary union, and destroyed the essence of justification, by separating it from its objective ground. By this too, he at the same time, subverted the relation in which it stood to the law, which was fulfilled for us by Christ in his life and death, and in addition, denied the proper connection between the law and the Gospel. Just here may be found the fundamental errors of his system.²

¹Flacius Verlegung des Bekenntniss, Fol. N. 3. "And the view of Osiander will make the Papists impudent, not merely because he makes the Augsburg Confession notorious in all our churches, as if it erred in the prominent article concerning justification, but because he speaks, in the way that they do, in regard to the word *justificare*."

²Comp. the reply of the Hamb. and Lüneb. church. Fol. C. 3. "Negat quidem Osiander, se humanam Christi naturam separare et excludere—et tamen obedientiae et passioni ejus adimit justificationem." Flacius Loc. Cit. D. "Osiander cuts the office of Christ too close, in so much separating atonement and justification. The Scriptures show that the sacrifice of Christ occupies a constant place as a Mediator between us and God, through which we have access to the Father, and receive everything good from him." Just. Menius in his work on righteousness, which is accepted of God, against Osiander G. 4. "Therefore Osiander greatly errs—first, in regard to the of-

What he substituted for justification in the sense of the church, the inhabitation of the divine nature, the divinity of the Son, that is the consequence of justification; but does not take place as Osiander supposed; for although the spirit of Christ does dwell in the justified and regenerated, this subjective indwelling is not a perfect, but a commencing, increasing communion, and its operation in men, righteousness of life, is only a feeble beginning, a *justitia inchoata*, on which it is impossible to found justification before a holy God, who requires a perfect satisfaction and a perfect fulfilling of the law or righteousness.¹ Osiander then does two things; he perverts the entire order² of salvation, and takes all true consolation from

fice and work of the Mediator, that he tears from one another, as if they had no connection, atonement, redemption, forgiveness and justification, which are nevertheless so united, that where one is, there the others must be—one flows from the other, as they are such treasures of grace as the Savior, once for all, by one work, purchased for us; (viz: by his obedience in life and death) and thus Osiander separates justification from the life and death of Christ, which is nevertheless our righteousness; and thus the divine nature from the human.”

Flacius Loc. Cit. Vorw. It might be thought that this error of Osiander was of no consequence, as he brings us directly into treaty with God, without a mediator. But we must have access to God through Righteousness, and treat with him as our father, for he can only receive him as a child, who has righteousness. This, our righteousness, is the obedience of Christ, which he has rendered the law for us; the same treasure imputed to us by Christ, is an instrument and mediator, by which we obtain everything good from God, therefore, whosoever rejects these, but proposes to stand before God and to be righteous as he is in himself—as Osiander says, “the eternal essence of God is our righteousness;” he treats with God without a mediator, and an instrumentality. The same G. 4. If the Son was given us by the Father, and we could become righteous by his essential righteousness, we might have become righteous without the incarnation of Christ, without the obedience of Christ’s sufferings.” In regard to the difficulty of Osiander, mentioned before, that we were not in being whilst Christ lived, Flacius says, F. O.—“Answer, Christ was slain from the foundation of the world; therefore is he slain at the end, and to-day and yesterday, that is: the merit of his obedience and sufferings endures, and will endure from beginning to end, although it was finished in a few hours.” In the same way the Hamburgers. Resp. E.

¹Resp. Hamb. et Luneb. H. Docemus.—hanc justitiam (sc. vivificationem et sanctificationem) fide in omnibus credentibus excitari et in interno homine vires suas exserere: sed haec justitia cum sit tantum inchoata et semper imperfecta maneat, negamus ea nos justos esse coram Deo, et quod possit liberare a justa Dei ira, peccato, morte. So Flacius Loc. Cit. M. The inhabitation of God in us is not justification, but its effect, its reward—is not perfect, and cannot, therefore, justify us before God; perfect will it be in eternity, where the highest union with God takes place.

²Resp. Hamb. et Luneb. J. Prorsus Dei ordo invertitur, posterius priore, prius posteriore loco ponitur; ex effectis et donis conjunctis cum justificatione facit causam efficientem. In the decision of the Court Saxon Theologians, is explicitly shown, that atonement and redemption precede justification, the indwelling of God follows—then it is said—Osiander acts like a driver who puts the cart before the horse.

man, inasmuch as he teaches him, instead of trusting in the Christ out of us and for us, instead of the merits of his sufferings and death, to trust in his inhabitation and operation in us, and to regard this as the state of grace; moreover he came at last to the Catholic doctrine of works, asserting: "Righteousness is that which makes us do right," and by this he weakens either the knowledge of sin which still cleaves to the regenerate and the consciousness of guilt, or he leads the awakened conscience to despair. Just on this practical, truly Protestant argument, the opponents of Osiander lay the greatest stress.¹

On the other hand, we add, Osiander makes subjective renewal and holiness, on which he lays so much stress, impossible; for this grows only out of the merits of Christ appropriated by faith, out of the merits of his sufferings and his obedience; if then, the proper object of faith, the forgiveness of sins purchased by Christ, is removed, it cuts off the life root from that.

But Osiander taught forgiveness, procured by the vicarious obedience of Christ; (see above) and it might appear² as if this accorded with what the church taught in regard to justification, only under another name and in another place. But, it was said in reply, the two were very far apart; for what Osiander called forgiveness, was a something done once for all, that had nothing to do with faith and justification.³ It hap-

¹Fürstlich Sächsische Censur. I. E. There are in this doctrine two powerful obstructions, which lie in the way of the sinner's conscience. The one is, that all men, not excepting the most holy children of God, constantly experience and feel the power of sin more powerfully in themselves, than the new obedience of righteousness, therefore, they are so frequently distressed and unhappy. How could such a sinner's conscience derive consolation from the doctrine of Osiander, which says, "God is not willing to pronounce any man righteous, unless he is so in deed and truth (by his own indwelling;) yea, how is it possible, that the poor sinner's conscience should not be agonized and rendered desperate by such a doctrine? Ebend. Cens. III. M. Our only comfort is, that a foreign righteousness is imputed to us. Comp. Flacius. Loc. Cit. This opinion is not only unscriptural, but likewise injurious to the conscience. For some presumptuous spirits, experiencing a little of the new birth, will presently think themselves demigods. On the other hand, others who are hampered by temptation and doubts, feeling no virtue of the new life in them, will despair; for this doctrine teaches us to rely directly on the new birth, and to trust in the infused righteousness of God. On the other hand, Paul, although he was not conscious to himself of anything wicked, said nevertheless, he was not thereby justified, and considered his righteousness filth, that he might have Christ's righteousness, and thus discriminates the righteousness of regeneration from imputed righteousness.

²This appearance led Plank into the error of believing that the whole controversy was merely a war of words.

³He certainly designed by this, more directly to assert the objectivity of the atonement, in order to separate justification from it as a subjective occur-

pened to man without intervention of the word, without an active appropriation on his part, as likewise without an offer on the part of God, of its own accord, in an inexplicable way, and appeared, moreover, immediately in power through the indwelling of God ; till then it left man under the wrath of God and in sins, and was so in itself a mere nothing, and entirely inoperative. The forgiveness of sin properly, and reception into divine favor, took place further, always in virtue of that immanence of the actual righteousness or divine nature of Christ, which Osiander called justification, not by the imputation of the righteousness which he as God-man, by fulfilling the law, rendered for us, and thus, on this side, his system led to the confounding of righteousness, regeneration and renewing, on the due discrimination of which the order of salvation rests.

These are the leading objections adduced against the doctrine of the celebrated theologian of Königsberg. They show very clearly the utter irreconcilability of it with the Protestant fundamental principle. If this was to be supported, those positions, and particularly the following, must be condemned. 1.) That Christ is our righteousness only in his divine nature ; 2.) That justification means, to make righteous by the inhabitation of the divinity ; 3.) That justifying faith has its object, not in the vicarious obedience of Jesus Christ, but in the actual righteousness dwelling and operating in men. Entirely the same is true, beyond doubt, of the theory of Stankarus, which founds justification entirely on the vicarious obedience of Christ, performed by him as man ; an attempt weak in itself, which in an obscure form conceals indeed a better sense, but as the other extreme of the Osiandrian error, particularly in the objectionable formula, that Christ is our righteousness only in his divine nature, must likewise be discarded. No one will surely deny, that the Lutheran church in the unanimous rejection of both these errors, gave efficiency to its principle.—The positive, which it had to offer, could be nothing, but the most accurate determination of the idea of justification and its connection with the redeeming activity of the God-man. This is done by the Formula of Concord (Art. 3. Comp. Epit. 3.) with the explanation, that the ground of our justification, *totius personae Christi tota obedientia*, more particularly, the obedience is, what Christ in the unity of his person, conse-

rence ; but in this way, on the other hand, he identified the atonement and its effects, forgiveness, in an erroneous way.

quently in the two inseparable parts of his nature (*secundum utramque personam*) rendered as God-man, and with which, in our stead he fulfilled the divine law. This obedience is not restricted to suffering (*obedientia passiva*;) but as the divine will, revealed in the law, embraces the entire life of man, and not merely condemnation, but likewise demands positive holiness, so the obedience of Christ embraces both; it is not only endurance of suffering, but likewise obedience to the law, and only in this way, by rendering satisfaction to the entire will of God, became truly propitiatory. This very obedience was imputed to the believer for righteousness, C. p. 685, 696.—(non ea tantum, qua patri paruit in tota sua passione et morte, verum etiam qua nostra sponte sese legi subiecit eamque obedientia illa sua implevit,) the force of these distinctions lies in this, that they refer the objective ground of our justification to the redeeming activity of the God-man, and are consequently merely a recognition of the fundamental principle of the church. The extension of the obedience to the entire actions and life of the Redeemer, is the result, partly of the doctrine concerning the extent of the law, as it is unfolded in the Apology, partly of the view, that, if Christ is a Redeemer in his entire person, his entire agency on earth must have a vicarious import; because both person and work are inseparable. Although this may not be so clearly declared in the older confessions, it is nevertheless involved in these, and coincides very closely with the views of Luther. Long before the Formula Concordiae, it was the general conviction, and it was only necessary for it to give fixedness to an established *consensus*.—Nevertheless, it was done in such a manner as to be no impediment to future development. Again, the difference between justification and renewing, as well as the intimate connection between both, was placed once more in its proper position, in opposition to the view of Osiander. And when, accordingly, the Formul. Conc. Loc. Cit. explains, if the article of justification is purely maintained, neither what precedes nor follows it can be confounded with it—when, on the one hand it asserts that the inhabitation of the divinity in man is not the *justitia Dei*, on account of which we are pronounced righteous before God, on the other hand, that it follows the preceding righteousness of faith; when it on the one hand asserts, “that the renewing, the commencing righteousness of life, love, new obedience positively do not belong to this article,” it on the other hand most unequivocally declares, that all this must spring from justification as fruit, and emphatically adds: *haec non ita divelluntur, quasi vera fides aliquando et aliquamdiu stare*

possit cum malo proposito; sed ordine causarum et effectuum, antecedentium et consequentiam ita distribuitur:” it has merely repeated correctly the contents of the sixth and twentieth Article of the Augustana, as likewise of the third of the Apology, in addition by the last cited definition guarded it, in the best way against a misapprehension, and very felicitously explained the intimate connection of justification and renewing. In the declaration that the inhabitation of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost is conditioned by faith, is by no means denied, that the Holy Ghost was active before, in the human heart, and produced both repentance and faith (*primum in conversione per spiritum s. fides accenditur*) but merely, that that more complete communion with God does not lay the foundation of justification, as Osiander contended, and so far from doing this, it could only occur in connexion with it. For “forgiveness of sin and the gracious reception of the sinner for Christ’s sake,” make man first an object of divine favor; and place him in a relation to God, in consequence of which he becomes capable of his real, full and constant indwelling. And thus is this definition only another expression for the Protestant doctrine of the relation of justification to renovation. The other points, which were introduced into this controversy, particularly in regard to the inward and outward word, belong to a general tendency, to which we proceed. *c.* This is the mystic, or as it was then designated, the enthusiastic. The peculiarity of this widely diffused system consisted in the depreciation of the external in comparison with the internal, the visible, outward means of grace in opposition to the internally working spirit. It disengaged the agency of the last from the instrumentality of the first, and thus fell into an erroneous spiritualism, which communicated itself to the representations of all other doctrines, particularly the doctrine of the word and the Sacraments, likewise the doctrines of justification, the person of the Redeemer, and the church.

In reference to all these points, it brought the charge of externalness (objectivity) against the church, whilst it passed over into a one-sided (subjectivity) *innerness*. We meet with it in the earlier periods of the Reformation, especially in those enthusiasts who caused, in 1521, so much excitement in Wittenberg. Agricola; as early as the year 1519, had expressed himself in regard to the entire Scriptures, in a manner similar to that in regard to the law; now he writes, “outward things are of no use; the external word is not sufficient for the proper illumination and comfort of souls; anon he starts doubts in regard to infant baptism, and denies the real reception of the

body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist. His flesh can only be spiritually received.”¹

How much further the Zwickauer went is known; likewise how these theories became associated with politics in the case of the Anabaptists;² we restrict ourselves to the theological discussion. This is most fully presented in the statements of a certain Jacob Kautus, which he published in 1527 at Worms. No external word, or sign, or sacrament, further, no external promise has the power, that it can strengthen or comfort the inner man; more strongly the assertion of Thomas M nzer: “The spirit testifies that all the books of the Old and New Testament should be laid aside, and the revelations of the heart should be followed;” the rejection of infant baptism and the spiritual view of the Lord’s Supper, would of course be associated with this.³

Oecolampadius expresses himself substantially in the same way, but with more caution, in the controversial document against the Swabia Sungramma⁴ and was resisted by Luther with all his energy, and rejected in the Schmalkald articles.

¹ Corpus. Reformat, 1, 536. Arnold, Kirch. and K. Hist. 2, 532 ff. Ranke, deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reform, 2, 19.

² Ranke 3, 91. Vgl. Luther’s declaration: “They wish to convert God’s word from corporeal to spiritual, and thereby turn themselves from spiritual to carnal.”

³ Arnold a. a. O. 860, 863, and in the Appendix to part II, where there are copious extracts from Anabaptist and fanatical writings.

⁴ “Christ,” says Oecolampadius, “has given to the outward word no such power, that it should contain his body and bring it into us actually . . . it is otherwise not in the nature of words, that they convey the meaning of things, which had previously obtained in the human mind, an internal conception or word; for what the outward word has more than the sound, it has from the internal mind, and from the interior word. In the same mode the body would actually be in the inner words, or the soul of man, which inner words are more valuable than the outward. True, the device was adopted, that the words “this is my body,” are not historical; for then it would not concern us. But if there be in the words a command and an ordinance of God, let the word of the command be shown. And where there is the appearance of a commanding word, where is the ordinance for the future, that so it must be, as is said in the Prophecies? Therefore, in whatever way the words are turned and placed, they exhibit that they are explanatory words of ceremony at that time instituted by the Lord. How dare we ascribe that to the outward word, that the divine word has incorporated in the external (i. e. that God has united with the outward word the power of his creating word and life?) so even the apostles wished to be considered as nothing, for though planting and watering, they were nothing, but God, who gave the increase. And so it is. In the Scriptures there is nothing about the incorporation with the word (Inwortung.) I know that the apostles declare every thing in their words: But that the things pass to believers in the words, I cannot admit; for the glory is God’s. They suppose the spirit is in the words and cannot be separated from them. O, if that were so, no instruction would be fruitless; the spirit would not be idle. But the internal, constant word, and the external, are as far apart as the law and grace. Now grace is not enclosed in the

But after his death it reasserted itself in many forms. In Osiander as a distinction of the inner and outer word, in which that was brought on, as if in a carriage; the internal is the actual thought of God, the Logos, the Son, the outward the manifestation of the inward, a mere sound; that strikes the ear and then vanishes (Gross. Bek. Bl. F. B.)

In Caspar Schwenkfeld it was most matured, who very nearly resembled Osiander in regard to justification. The outer word is to him a mere sign of the internal; a testimonium of the real life. From the external word comes an external faith on God and Christ, but from the internal a living faith, whereby alone we have intercourse with God in Christ, and know and receive in the heart his divine grace. This inner word is Christ himself; the actual substantial Creative Word; which alone quickens and saves, purifies, enlightens, and nourishes without any external means, instruments and helps. In regard to the Scriptures he says therefore: it extends only to the outer man, and there must be faith, spiritual understanding and an open mind in him, given by God to the elect, that the Scriptures may be profitable to them." In applying this theory to the Sacrament, Schwenkfeld further teaches, that the water in baptism was not the medium for the transmission of the Holy Spirit, but a mere sign of spiritual baptism; on which account infant baptism and the sacrament of water baptism had with him very little value. Consistently with this he teaches further that in the Lord's Supper, the reception of Christ's flesh is not connected with the earthly elements nor imparted by them, but solely by faith; for which reason he ascribes to the bread and wine in the Eucharist merely symbolical significance. Here his peculiar doctrine in regard to the glorified humanity of Christ comes in, or rather, it lies at the foundation of the whole. The doctrine is, that the flesh of Christ born of God (by the incarnation) is actually deified by death, ascension and heavenly coronation, is one with the essence of God and has become what God is, the flesh and blood of God. A *communicatio idiomatum* (com-

law, and as there is spoken, by outward words, so may ceremonies, pictures and sacraments be spoken of. Though indeed the word is more powerful as it is nearer the internal word. Nevertheless, altogether they may not teach anything, to say nothing about doing anything greater. But explanation, exhortation, and reminding is their office. The external word does not give faith; it does not comfort, it does not honor, it does not enlighten; but our inner, secret, heavenly teacher is Christ. . . . Thus, words are, properly speaking, only monitory signs, which stimulate us to seek the things in ourselves, and thus are intimated through the words, not that we may learn the one through the other, but that we say seek the truth in ourselves and thus be taught. Comp. Luther's works, see Walch 20, 770, 772, ff.

pare below) as taught by the Lutheran church, he considered too objective; he contended for a substantial unity of the divine and human nature, a proper deification of the flesh.

And this theory constituted the centre of his system; and upon the communication of this flesh to man the essence of justification, of regeneration, of sanctification, and glorification, depended; the essence of the Sacraments depended upon its inward enjoyment, which, as outward acts and signs are mere emblems of that internal enjoyment is independent of them and depending entirely upon faith.

This theory of Schwenkfeld, which we will not unfold in this place, further, does not stand isolated; it is worthy the characteristic form of a widely spread tendency, which stood in decided opposition to the Lutheran church, and rejected and controverted its doctrines in regard to justification, the word, and Sacrament, the person of Christ, the church and the office of the word, doctrines, against which it had spoken in the most decided manner in the older confessions. (On the person Christ, afterwards.)

What could the Formula Concordiae do less than simply reject these theories, which had in warning examples shown their dangerous consequences, and in opposition to them make known the indwelling of the Holy Ghost in the word, the objectivity of the Sacraments, or in addition repeat what was contained in the old Confession? Comp. Art. 12. Should it relinquish *fundamentum illud religionis nostrae, spiritum sanctum cum verbo praedicato, audito et diligenter conservato praesentem atque efficacem esse*, the ancient solid canon: *Deus interna non dat, nisi per externa*. Well has it done in preserving this; we feel grateful to this day for it!

It has, at all events, sustained the connection with its fundamental principle in opposition to the Antinomian, Osian-drian and mystical tendency; and what of new it has presented is nothing more than a more full explanation and deduction from the old. Thus far no reproach lies against it.

ARTICLE IV.

THE TRANSFIGURATION.

By Rev. C. Porterfield Krauth, A. M., Winchester, Va.

THE most stupendous events our world has ever witnessed have occurred on mountains. The three grandest and greatest revelations of Jehovah's person and counsels were made on Sinai, Tabor and Calvary: the proclamation of the law, the Transfiguration of the Messiah, and his agonizing death. They are spots easily marked; they seem to be separate in a manner from the world; they conduct the mind by a natural analogy toward the heaven to which they point, and they remain eternal monuments erected by the prophetic hand of God previous to the events with which they became associated by indissoluble ties. ¹

Let us ascend that mountain more glorious than Sinai, and yielding only to Calvary in the sacred power of touching the believer's heart. From it has been gleaming down our Savior's lustre through the long night of ages. He has risen from the dead, and the injunction of secrecy has been long withdrawn. Where only the favored three once stood, we can now all stand and behold Christ in the glory of his Father. As it was in prayer he underwent this change, we have the assurance as members of his body, that if we draw near in the same spirit of supplication, we shall not only witness his transfiguration, but shall be sharers in it; we shall be conformed to his likeness, beholding 'the glory of the Lord, we shall be changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.' (2 Cor. 3. 8).²

¹ No one has read the Bible attentively without marking the correspondence between the moral character of its events, and the scenes of external nature in which they occurred; Adam in innocence in the garden, Jacob wrestling by night, Moses in the desert, the earthquake and fire preceding the still small voice, Christ weeping at Kedron and ascending at Bethany; all these show to us that external nature has been adapted to the moral constitution of rational beings. that the love of beauty is a divine element, and that poetry in its true province springs from the highest reason. There are cases in which one poetical argument would transcend in real weight a thousand logical ones.

² "We should remember that these things occurred not only on account of those present, but the whole church should regard herself as a spectator of them. Tu ipse haec cogitans . . . stas in hoc monte, et oculis et auribus, et mente accipis haec manifesta Testimonia."

Melanchthon. Conciones in Matth.

Works, (Wittenberg, 1563.) vol. iii. 484.

But "SIX DAYS"¹ had passed since the Redeemer had declared, that of those, who then surrounded him, some should not taste of death until they saw the Son coming "with power" in his kingdom. From the care with which the Evangelists, who so often neglect the chronological order of events, associate this scene with those words, we can hardly doubt that they stand in intimate relation; an opinion which seems to be placed almost beyond doubt by the language of Peter, (2 Pet. 1: 16, 17.): "We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the *power* and *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of *his majesty* for he received from God the Father *honor and glory*" &c. "in the holy mount." Not indeed that our Saviour's words were then entirely fulfilled, but they were in part defined, in part consummated and an earnest given of the fulfilment of all the rest. It was a pledge of the reality of his highest claims, and a transient foretaste of the most magnificent and abiding developments of his mediatorial reign.

"Jesus taketh Peter, and James, and John his brother."

It is impossible, unless we read the Gospel most carelessly, to avoid noticing, that there was a distinction between the apostles of our Lord as to the position they occupied in his confidence and affection. Though he loved all, and trusted in all, except Judas, (and perhaps even in him for a time), his apostles yet shone around him with varied lustre, "as star differs from star in glory." Peter, James and John, were preëminently favored. They alone attended him when the daughter of Jairus was raised: they alone were present with him at Gethsemene: John's love burned with a pure and steady flame; he lay upon the bosom of his Lord, the loving and "beloved disciple;" and Peter had witnessed a good confession, and the subsequent history of James shows, that he had a heroic spirit:² so that we may look upon these privileges as tokens of honor; although special opportunities are often allowed by God as a concession to peculiar infirmities, and be-

¹ Luke says "about eight days after." He speaks inclusively, the other two Evangelists exclusively.

² "His martyrdom (Acts 12: 1, 2.) took place first among those of the Apostles, cir. A. D. 42 or 44. Clemens Alexandrinus states that the man who brought James before the Judges was so effected with his constancy in confessing Christ, that he declared himself to be a Christian, and was condemned as well as the Apostle to be beheaded." He implored his pardon as they went to the place of execution, which the Apostle gave in the words: Peace be to thee, and sealed with a kiss. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. ii. 9. Compare Luke 5: 10. Mark 13: 3. Froben, Basil. 1557.

come thus an evidence of the sinfulness and weakness of those to whom they are given.

“And bringeth them up, leadeth them up, into an high mountain apart by themselves.”

The prevailing sentiment has been that this mountain was Tabor.¹ No site more appropriate to the scene could have been chosen. This mount was already distinguished in sacred story. It is represented by travellers as one of the most beautiful localities in the Holy Land. To the north-west, through a bend in the hills, are seen the blue waters of the Mediterranean Sea, to the south lies Hermon, whose soft dews have been sung by the Psalmist, and between the two mountains may be traced the brook Kishon; beneath the range of Hermon lies Endor, and not afar off the village of Nain, each celebrated for the raising of the dead by divine power, for purposes characteristic of the different dispensations under which they occurred. On the east appear the mountains of Gilboa, and to the south-east the lake of Gennesareth — mingling the blue tint of its waves with the dark-brown hues of the barren hills by which it is encompassed. Farther on is seen a rising ground, from whence Christ delivered the sermon on the mount; and the whole view in that direction is bounded by the Mountain of snow which is often seen without a spot to break the surface of the dazzling white.² Encompassed with these spots, which will be dear to the heart of men to the end of time, stood that high mount to which the Savior, conscious of what was about to occur, led the three “apart” from the people, “by themselves,” that is, separate from the other disciples.

“He went up to pray,” that what he had been teaching them might bring forth its full fruits, that they might

¹ Other spots have been assigned by some modern commentators, but none of their reasons for abandoning the current tradition seem to be conclusive. Neither the distance from the place in which he had been (Caesarea Philippi), nor the probable existence of buildings, or of a small town on Tabor, more ancient than the Savior's time, are inconsistent with the prevailing opinion. To avoid the inconvenience, at least, of leaving the locality unfixed, we might, with this explanation, be allowed to consider Tabor as the place.— See Bush's Scripture Illustrations, and Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Lit.

² Such is the description given by Maundrell (“A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, at Easter, A. D. 1697,”) and copied almost word for word by Buckingham, (see Bush's Script. Illust. Brattleboro, 1836. p. 134.). The passages cited from Josephus to prove the existence of a town on Tabor in our Savior's time, appear to us to demonstrate just the opposite. Cf. B. J. IV. 1, 8. II. 20, 6. V. S. 37. A. J. V. 1, 22; XIII. 15, 14. Josephus Opera. Paris, (Didot) 1847.

know Him, and the Father through him aright, that the doctrine of the cross might be realized by them in its divine beauty; that they might have grace to forsake every thing for him, and that they might have such a glimpse of the glory of God's kingdom as might be necessary to sustain them in all subsequent trial. "Father glorify thy Son, that thy Son may glorify thee;" and that prayer was answered, for :

"As he prayed, he was transfigured before them ; the fashion of his countenance was altered, and his face did shine as the sun ; and his raiment was white and glistening, became shining, exceeding white as snow ; so as no fuller on earth can white them, and .. was white as the light."

After the prayer came the glory : the exaltation follows the prostration.

The transfiguration shows itself in two general results: 1) Upon the person, and 2) upon the garments of our Lord. Both presented a luminous appearance; that of the garments being diffused through them from the person. The whole person, though concealed by the raiment, partook in the change; the face is especially mentioned, as visible and a concentrating point of the lustre, and even the raiment, like a thin cloud behind which the setting sun is beaming, partakes in the light. He changed from a form, or condition, or outward appearance indicating one condition, into that of another. It does not imply that the essential outlines of his shape, or of his countenance were destroyed, or that he ceased to be truly man. It was a transfiguration, not a transubstantiation.

The term "form" never is used in the Bible to designate essence, but always outward appearance as connected with condition; and to transfigure or transform never means a change in essence. We will not cite passages in which there is a general application of the word "form," but confine ourselves to those in which it is used with reference to the Lord Jesus. "His visage was so marred more than any man, and his FORM i. e. outward appearance, more than the sons of men," "he hath *no form* nor comeliness," "no beauty that we should desire him;" i. e. the corrupt heart shall recoil from him as from physical deformity (Isa. 52: 14. and 53: 2.). "Who being in the form of God, — that is, the glorious condition of Deity — made himself of no reputation, divested himself, not of the essence of Godhead, but only of the display of its prerogatives; and took upon him *the form*, or external condition of a servant" (Phil. 2: 6, 7.). The language of Paul seems to have in it some allusion to the Transfiguration. And after

Christ's appearing, subsequent to his resurrection, first to Mary Magdalene, it is said: (Mark 16: 12.), "And after that he appeared in another *form* unto two of them"—to interpret which of any change of substance, would imply, not that his resurrection body was different in essence from his previous one, but that itself was different in essence at different times.

In the same manner, we may show that the words "transfigure" and "transform" not only never mean change of essence, but are often expressly contradistinguished from it, (cf. Rom. 12: 2., where transformation, or outward exhibition of christian character is expressly separated from "renewing of the mind," and 2 Cor. 11: 13-15). It was not then, that Christ *obtained any new* prerogative, that he then did, what he could not have done at any time or all the time. He simply exercised a prerogative—showed himself in the "form of God." A king may disguise himself in the apparel of the meanest peasant, and thus move unknown in his dominions, but he does not cease to be a king because he has not his crown upon his brow, and his subjects pay him no homage; and if he chooses to put on the marks of his high office, he remains but what he was; and so was it with our Glorious King.

But though this change was one that pertained not to his essence, the Evangelists confess its transcendent character by the manner in which they labor to express it, and the variety of illustrations they employ. They use three adjectives in characterizing its splendor: 1.) "WHITE" or exceedingly radiant (cf. Dan. 7: 9.), like the garment of the ancient of days, and the angels who wear the livery of their king (Matth. 28: 3.), and as he now appears robed in glory (Rev. 1: 14.), and as his victorious people shall be in bliss (Rev. 3: 5.), for his blood renders the garments of his people white (Rev. 7: 14.), as his whole form through which it flowed rendered his own: "*White*" like that courser on which the bloodless victories of the Prince of Peace shall be won (Rev. 6: 2.), like the cloud in which, with his crown upon his head and his sickle in his hand, he shall come to reap the earth (Rev. 14: 14.), and, finally, "white" like that great throne from whose face the earth and heaven shall flee away" (Rev. 20: 11.):

2.) "SHINING" like the orbs of heaven (Dan. 12: 3.), like the face of Jehovah, from the Holy of Holies (Ps. 80: 1. Dan. 9: 17.), like the lustre of the home of God's elect (Rev. 28: 23.), the palace of the Son of God (Acts 26: 13.).

3.) "GLISTERING," flashing out the lightning (Dan. 10 : 6.), rather, indeed, like the electric flush which lights the summer horizon, or the northern lights, than the glâre of the thunder-bolt, or as the beam from the precious stone, or the burning drops in "the clear shining after rain."

But the most expressive terms are not regarded as sufficient by the Evangelists. Deserting their ordinary simple and unadorned phraseology, they seem to labor to express by accumulated language what no language can convey. There are four illustrations by which they strive to give some conception of the supranatural lustre :

1.) "The garments were white as no fuller could white them"; something surpassing all human art — every thing in human raiments either done by man's *art*, or seen by human eyes—miraculous and divine.

2.) "Exceeding white as SNOW." The purest of natural objects furnishes an illustration which human art could not give (Dan. 7 : 9. Rev. 1 : 14.). Snow is the world's image for spotless whiteness.

3.) "His face shone as the SUN." The illustration rises from earth to the sky, and substitutes for the most lustrous of earthly objects the brightest known to us in the universe. That orb for which our planetary system is a tabernacle (Psal. 19 : 4.), emblem of Jehovah (Ps. 84 : 11.), whose light is the joy of the race (Eccles. 11 : 7.), whose lustre shall be given to the righteous (Matth. 5 : 43.), is fitly employed as an illustration of the surpassing glory which crowned the Son of God (Rev. 1 : 16.). Though the shades of night were around them, and it was probably an hour when sleep was resting on human eyes (Luke 9 : 32, 37.), their darkness yielded to something more than day. The wan, and wasted and sad face of the man of sorrows, whose whole life was a propitiation (Matth. 8 : 17.), assumed its proper glory, and :

4.) "His garments became white as the LIGHT." It was the imparted glory of his person. Here illustration reaches its climax. It has passed from all manifestations of brightness to the very essence of it; and neither language nor thought, whether of man or God, can go beyond this, because there is nothing beyond. It is the garment of God (Ps. 104 : 2.), the most perfect image of his essence (1 John 9 : 5.), the nearest creature to his presence (Dan. 2 : 22.), and ever streaming forth from it (Rev. 22 : 5.), fit image of the symbolic apparel of the Son of God revealing himself as he is (Rev. 21 : 23.).

In a word, the whole description runs parallel with the most majestic appearances of Jehovah under the old dispensation. (cf. Habak. 3 : 3, 4, 5, 11.).

“And behold there appeared unto them, talked with him, two men which were Moses and Elias : who appeared in glory, who spake of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem.”

“And behold,” in connection with this change another circumstance conspiring with the moral grandeur of the scene: *“There appeared unto them”* — not a phantom, but a reality (Matth. 27 : 53. Mark 16 : 14.), not a dream but a waking reality, and talked with him two *men*, still men though in glory; not angels — their nature had not been assumed, and this present glory is not for them, not disembodied spirits, but men in the body. These were Moses and Elias; Moses the faithful leader, intercessor and lawgiver of Israel, the man of God, to whom God revealed himself more nearly than to any one under the Old dispensation (Exod. 3 : 4–24, 2.), like unto whom no prophet afterward arose in Israel (Deut. 34 : 10.), “beloved of God and men” (Eccles. 45 : 1.); Moses, whom Joshua (Jesus, Hebr. 4 : 8.) followed is here. Whether his body had been raised again, we cannot positively assert. It is most probable that it was. It is certainly not in conflict with such a supposition, that Christ is called the “first fruits of them that slept” — for the force of that phrase is, that the whole harvest of the dead was consecrated and accepted in him, as the first fruits waved before the altar sanctified the whole. After the painful necessity of preventing him from entering the promised land had been met by his death, God may have raised him again as a reward of his faithful toils. He shares here, at least, in the highest honor that can be given to man; and oh! how great the transition from meeting Jehovah in the flames and terror of Sinai, to the mild and benignant lustre which beams around his Son on Tabor. The law and grace; Moses the servant and Christ the Son; and speaking of the consummation of that which the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh. Moses coming forth from glory, to throw his arm around the cross; can the imagination conceive of a moral sublimity surpassing this?

And scarcely less illustrious is the other personage who appears. The Tishbite, who had been God’s instrument in displaying the power of the resurrection, the fearless reprover of Kings, the dauntless adversary of Baal, and the destroyer of his priests, whose prayers opened the heavens and proved the precursors of his own undying body, which in the chariot of

the whirlwind, swift following the steeds whose wings were flame, was borne to the bosom of God.

“They appear in Glory,” not sorrowing as in the days of their toil and conflict, but with the brightness of their heavenly home about them (Jno. 17: 5, 22; Rom. 8: 18 1 Cor. 15: 43; Col. 3: 4.).

They hold communion with their Redeemer and Master, and speak of the conclusion of that journey, which in sorrow and pain his feet were performing. They speak of his “decease” or Exodus, (antithetical to his *Ἐξοδος* or coming in, Acts 13: 24.), his transition from this world, like Israel departing from Egypt (Heb. 11: 22,) for life is a pilgrimage (2 Pet. I: 15; Heb. 13: 12, seq.). The word here employed is very emphatic, embracing, either directly or by implication, his passion, cross, death, resurrection and ascension.¹ “Which he was about to accomplish,” fulfill, complete or perform. This remarkable word implies, that his death was not *endured*, but voluntarily met, that it was comprehended in his purposes, and in view of its objects, in his desires, that it was essential to the completion of his plans, and that without it prophecy would be unfulfilled. “At Jerusalem,” the place appointed for sacrifice, the spot where the shadows of the old dispensation centred, and which had been the scene of his labors, his prayers and his tears. The cup of her guilt, already full, is soon to overflow, by the act to whose atrocity all human crime finds no parallel (Luke 13: 33; Mat. 23: 37.).

But whilst they speak of his sufferings, they are not mute in regard to the glory which is to follow. Their very presence suggests the home which awaits him beyond the tomb, and their reverence is an anticipation of the homage of heaven, which he had left for the welfare of the world, and to which he was soon to return.

“But Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep: and when they were awake, they saw his glory, and the two men that stood with him.”

This fact would demonstrate that no portion of the Transfiguration is to be regarded as a vision² or subjective impression, even if the whole narrative did not perfectly annihilate such a supposition.

¹Bengelii Gnomon.

²Calvin, though he adheres to the objective character of the appearance of Moses and Elias, yet expresses himself in a way that is to our minds very painful. “Quaeritur tamen verene adfuerint. an spectrum duntaxat oblatum fuerit discipulis. . . . *Quaquam res est in utranque partem disputabilis, (ut*

Their slumber was either the result of bodily ~~external~~ fatigue, or of the collapse after high, strong excitement (cf. Mat. 16), or internal expectation, arising from the manner in which the Savior had withdrawn them (Mat. 26:44.). Nor would it be an untenable ground, to suppose, that they were under that supernatural tendency to slumber, which so often preceded or accompanied divine revelations or events. As natural sleep is designed to brace up the powers to their natural extent, ~~it~~ may the supernatural slumber be designed to invigorate the faculties to an extraordinary degree. In the prophetic trance, there was a development of the highest kind of perception of the inward eye,¹ and the miraculous slumber may have been followed by the same sort of intense consciousness, both physical and intellectual (cf. Gen. 2:21; 15:12; Job. 4:12-16; Dan. 8:18; 10:9.).

“And when they awaked,” under the same divine influence which caused them to slumber. There may have been something connected with the converse of Moses and Elias with our Lord, which was not given to men in the flesh to hear.— Though the good man, in this life, may be quite in the verge of heaven, there is still something beyond (cf. 2 Cor. 12:1-4.). This fact shows that the Transfiguration was not merely designed to instruct and comfort the disciples, but that a part of it at least was designed more for him than for them.

“They saw this glory”—which Moses had begged to see (Exod. 33:13; cf. Ezek. 9:3.), which the dying Stephen beheld (Acts 7:55), and which all saints shall behold (Rev. 21:11, 23.). This glory (Jno. 1:14.), which has already been described, opened upon their astonished eyes—“and they saw the two men that stood with him.”

“And it came to pass, as they departed from him, then answered Peter and said unto Jesus, (Lord, Rabbi,) Master, it is good for us to be here: and if thou wilt, let us make here three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias: not knowing what he said: for he wist not what to say: for they were sore afraid.”

As they were in the act of departing, Peter, wrapt into the glory of the scene, with fear and wonder, and faith, and joy

loquuntur) probabilius tamen est, ipsos vere. &c” On this point too, the great and valuable work of Neander (*Das Leben Jesu Christi*) takes a ground which it is impossible for him to harmonize with the principles on which he so triumphantly every where overthrows the rationalistic and mythical theories. It would be just as easy to interpret the resurrection subjectively, as the transfiguration.

¹ See Hengstenberg's *Christology*.

struggling in his bosom, and in their conflict with his self-reliance, and the remnants of nature and the world, in his heart, making chaos, with a rapture high but undefined, not forgetting the reproof of his officiousness (Mat. 16 : 22, 23), for he says humbly, "if thou wilt," yet with something of the same disposition to interfere in the arrangements presented by God, exclaims, "it is good to be here." Here we are withdrawn from the cold world which hates thee and us, where thy glory has been dimly revealed, compared with its manifestation here; there we had no such near view of thee. Thou hast spoken of dying for us, but we would rather have thee live for us.—Nothing can render thee more glorious than thou art now in our eyes. Surely we are here entered into the true Canaan; the toils and perils of the desert are past. Let us keep a holy festival of tabernacles; it is not needful to go to Jerusalem to keep it, for the presence of the Lord is here, and *here* let us build. Thou hast brought us into such fellowship with thee, and hast introduced us into the companionship of those heavenly ones, so that we may dare to ask thee to permit us to abide beneath the same roof;¹ (cf. Lev. 23 : 33, 34, and Zech. 14 : 16.), or if this may not be, it will be glory enough to wait without and serve our king and his heavenly guests. But Peter saw not the utter folly of what he uttered; the selfishness and pride, and repugnance to the cross which he manifested; but the terror inspired by the sight of the glory, which no man can see in its fullness and live, and that general awe, which the appearance of the departed would inspire, plead the extenuation of his fault.

"While he yet thus spake, behold there was—came, a bright cloud, that overshadowed them : and they feared as they entered into the cloud : and behold a voice came out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased : hear ye him."

Peter had displayed the natural propensity of the human heart; the seeking for a sign, the desire to see the kingdom of God coming "with observation," it is not enough for him to know that the Word is tabernacling among us in flesh, but he wishes always to see the glory in the tabernacle. He has not yet learned to appreciate the moral glory of Christianity; the excitement of the wonderful, the presence of the dead and the translated; this he thinks sure gain over and above the calmer communion with Christ in his lowliness. He wishes to make the special ordinary, thus substituting a craving for novelty for

¹ Peter may have thought of himself as destined in this arrangement to occupy the same tabernacle with his Lord.

the deep grace of a kingdom of God within man. He thus furnishes a true type of zeal undisciplined and unnatural; a zeal which continues to show itself to the present hour, in many, who like him, have just come to the experience that "Jesus is the Christ," and will have him straightway in a tabernacle of their own making, redeeming by a short and easy method, in *their* way. That such an abuse as this of this glorious scene, might find no countenance, that we might know that we are to seek to the living and not to the dead, that we are to look to Christ, and not to the law and the Prophets, that *He* is all sufficient, that Moses and Elias have no right to tabernacles in our world at all, far less by the side of the Son of God, and that till we meet him in glory, the "hope of Israel, the Savior thereof, will continue in some sense to be as a stranger in the land, and as a wayfaring man that turneth aside to tarry for a night" (Jer. 14 : 8), all these rendered necessary the appearance of the cloud, which betokened the presence of Jehovah; and the intimation which came from it. Moses and Elias¹ "entered into the cloud," to teach that, having once departed from this world, the righteous have no further work to do. Having died in the Lord, they are blessed from *henceforth*, and rest from their labors. Our Lord and his disciples remained, for, until the course is finished and the work is done, we are to have no abiding city; no, not a tabernacle which we may call our own. But above all, the voice directed the disciples, and all our race, to the *only mediator, teacher and guide* whom God has given, or will give to our guilty race (cf. Mat. 3 : 17; Deut. 15 : 18, 19.).

The effect of this wonderful completion of the circle of divine manifestation, is thus described: "*And when the disciples heard it, they fell on their faces* (Exod. 19 : 16; Lev. 9 : 24; Ezek. 1 : 28; Dan. 8 : 17; Rev. 11 : 16;) *and were sore afraid* (Judges 6 : 22, 23; 13 : 22; Is. 6 : 5). *And Jesus came and touched them*, to show that he was still in the flesh (cf. Luke 24 : 39,) *and said, Arise and be not afraid* (Dan. 10 : 18, 19). *And when they had lifted up their eyes, they saw no man save Jesus alone.*"

It is worthy of remark that, in its connection, the Transfiguration assists in completing a perfect chain of demonstration in regard to the proper Deity of Christ. We see him as *God* under three distinct attitudes in this miracle, and in the one that

¹ So the Syriac version, and correctly. It was thus they withdrew. The disciples were prostrate. The language implies that the cloud was above them. The examples, in which the same relative pronoun alludes in the same sentence to different persons, are familiar to all Biblical students.

precedes, and that which follows it. We have first, the miraculous multiplication of food (Mat. 15 : 34–38) : secondly, the Transfiguration, (Mat. 17 : 1–8) : and thirdly, the healing of the demoniac (17 : 15–18). In the first, he appears as *Creator*. “This miracle,” says Neander,¹ “formed the very acme of Christ’s miraculous power ; in it, creative agency was most strikingly prominent.” The second, presents him as God revealed in accordance with the nature of unfallen or holy beings ; the third, in the character of *Redeemer*, or as God manifested in accordance with the wants of sinful and ruined creatures. These form the whole of the general methods in which the Son of God could be revealed, and in the very order of time, and of history, which we find marking the divine dispensation.

From this narrative and its connections, we may reproduce then, Creation, Paradise, the Fall (Mat. 19 ; 6), the Mosaic dispensation ; God from the cloud, the Prophets, the Messiah in suffering and glory, the kingdom of Heaven, the Judgment, the Resurrection, the bliss of the eternal world, and this naturally brings before us fully the question :

To what end was the Transfiguration ? What were its uses to the disciples, and what are they to us and believers of all time ?

The great facts of the history of the Son of God, swell into greater significance, as the stream of human events rolls on.—They enlarge with the circle of humanity, and each age may understand them better than the past. There are great principles now considered as unquestioned, lying, to our eyes, upon the very surface which past ages not only did not, but could not understand. All Biblical history is prophecy also, with the shadow of the future clinging to the substance of the past ; presenting the mirror of the church, or of the race in the individual, and revealing not only events, but their order and their causes.²

¹ Life of Jesus Christ, &c., translated from the fourth German Edition, by John McClintock and Charles E. Blumenthal. New York, 1848.

² This fact was clearly seen by the ancient interpreters, and is often beautifully, and perhaps quite as often incorrectly applied. For instance, in regard to the very narrative before us. Hilary (A. D. 570) from the words, “after six days,” deduces a proof that the general resurrection and renovation of the world will take place six thousand years after the creation, a sentiment in which many of the greatest of the fathers concurred, though they did not attempt to establish it by this passage (as for example, Jerome, Irenæus, Lactantius and Augustine). The relation which will be shown (p. 254.) between the Transfiguration and general Judgment, will cause Hilary’s view to appear less forced than it does at the first glance. The Sabbath of a World’s

I. The first fact in regard to the Transfiguration of our Lord, which suggests itself, is that it shows the nature and glory of his person as “only begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father from eternity, God of God, light of light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, of one substance with the Father, who for our salvation descended from the heavens, and became incarnate by the Holy Ghost.”¹ “God and man, equal with the Father according to his divinity, less than the Father according to his humanity,”² “so that there are two natures, divine and human, inseparably conjoined in unity of person.”³ The change of form, the glory, the luminous cloud and the voice that came from it, attested these great doctrines. They demonstrated his identity with that Jehovah who had revealed himself under the old dispensation. God, in manifesting himself to man, must in some way address himself to the senses, which are certainly the only *ordinary* avenues to the soul of man. Hence we see him sometimes in human form, sometimes in flame, as at the bush and on Sinai, sometimes in glorious effulgence, as between the cherubim in the Tabernacle and Temple. Of all these forms, the most frequent was that of the Shekinah or supernatural LIGHT, most fitting as the garment of Him who “is light,” and who would tell his creatures by the very drapery He casts around him, that “in Him is no darkness at all.”⁴ Nor is it possible for us to say, that the highest vision, which either angels or the disembodied spirits of men can have of God, is not *necessarily* connected with such a radiance. We cannot draw, everywhere, the line between what we *now call* matter and spirit, or say, at that wondrous point at which the one melts away and the other appears, that there are not stupendous phenomena, in which the attributes of the two classes of being can be separated by no finite mind, in which the divine contradiction of “SPIRITUAL BODY” shall not be harmonized; for the ultimate principles and powers of matter are as far beyond our reach as those of spirit. As Jehovah utters the final truth which the

Transfiguration shall indeed follow its week of toil. “Der Himmel hat itzo an sein Werkeltages-Kleid, dort aber wird er anziehen sein Sonntags-Kleid.” (Luther).

¹ Nicene Creed. ² Athanasian Creed. ³ Augsburg Conf. Art. IV.

⁴ “When in the little circle of the sun, which from its distance appears no larger than the head of a man, there is yet such an intense splendor that the eyes of men are unable to fix themselves upon it, and after a moment’s glance grow weak, and are suffused with mist and darkness; quid tandem luminis, quid claritatis apud ipsum Deum, penes quem nulla nox est, esse arbitremur?” Lactantius (VI. 2, 2.) Divin. Institut.

human mind can embrace in regard to Himself, when He says, "*I am that I am,*" so can we say, that we only know one absolute truth in regard to *matter*, that it *exists*. We will not pretend to separate the theology from the poetry, therefore, in that sublime address of Milton :

"Hail holy Light, offspring of Heaven first-born,
Or of the Eternal coeternal beam
May I express thee unblamed? since God is light,
And never but in unapproached light
Dwelt from eternity, dwelt then in thee,
Bright effluence of bright essence increate."

In all the revelations of the Deity, the Father was manifested only in the Son. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." This glorious apparel of light is what Paul calls "*the form of God,*" and which he tells us Christ laid aside for "*the form of a servant,*" and "*the fashion of a man.*" Had he moved among men, retaining this token of his glory, there could have been no proper humiliation, no possibility of his being seized "according to the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," that he might be offered as the victim for the sins of the world; the whole character of the dispensation would have been altered, the walking by sight would have been substituted for that of walking by faith, the great wants of humanity would have been wholly unmet, and, as far as its highest objects now known to us, are concerned, the coming of the Son of God would have been vain. There could have been no real discipleship; and that near and tender approach in the spirit of Love which casteth out fear, which we have in coming to God revealed in our flesh, would have been wholly impossible. His first appearance would have inspired terror, like that which actually prostrated his disciples at this time with awe. But reverence would soon have yielded to a vulgar curiosity, and staring would have been first insane to see the wondrous spectacle, and then forever satiated and indifferent.

Hitherto his disciples may be said, in a certain sense, to have seen him only in his lowliness. Whatever he had told them of his deity, was indeed confirmed by miracles, but those intimations were yet comparatively few, and those signs and wonders of the same general class that had been exhibited by former messengers of God. In each of his miracles a single ray of his glory, as it were, shot forth, as a glimpse of sunshine through a cleft in the drifting clouds, but here for a little space,

the whole blackness was rolled back, and his proper and "glorious shape" seems another morn

"Risen on mid-noon."¹

The disciples now saw that the tabernacle of God was indeed with men, they came unto the Holy of Holies in the exercise of that high-priesthood to which all believers are now introduced through Christ, for that veil which was to be rent forever on Calvary, was drawn aside by a gracious anticipation, and Moses and Elias symbolizing, yea, rather actually exhibiting the same truth which the Cherubim showed in type (that the hosts of heaven "desire to look into these things"), there with that true "*Shepherd of Israel*" who led Joseph like a flock, shining forth in his Father's glory and his own, showed that the New Jerusalem had descended from heaven, and that he who is of the seed of David, according to the flesh, is God over all, blessed forever."²

II. As Christ thus marked his Godhead, he attested his power to redeem, which human consciousness, untortured by false philosophy, can never separate from his possession of the "fulness of the Godhead bodily."³ The heart of man cannot rest in a created Savior. Just as instinctively as it draws back from God in his absoluteness on the one side, and asks for him in our flesh, does it demand on the other, that the humanity shall not be absolute, that the Word shall be in the flesh, and that it shall not be mocked by the palpable delusion of mere man working out redemption for man. The thirsting race has gone, too, often to cisterns, which, if not broken so as to

¹ "Locum etiam habere coepit temporalis ille conspectus ejus gloriæ, ut certo constaret etiam quo tempore exinanitus fuit, deitatem tamen suam illi integram stetisse, licet abscondita esset carnis velo."

Calvinus in Novi Testamenti Cathol. Expositio. authore A. Marlorato edit. quinta. Geneva 1593, Folio.

² Of course all this was designed to establish; in the strongest manner, his Messiahship; and so the disciples understood it, as their question, and the way it is proposed (Matt. xvii. 10) imply. So also Peter (ii. Pet. 1: 16).—The centre in which all the other purposes meet, is to be found in the words "Hear Him."

³ Macarius has a very beautiful idea which might easily be associated with the Transfiguration of Christ. It is, that the light on the face of Moses was the appearance of a lustre which had beamed upon the countenance of man in the innocence of Eden, a sort of seal from the hand of God. Man, says Paul, is "the image" and *glory* of God—the true earthly Schekinah. If we consent to the view of Macarius, the glory of Christ on Tabor would be symbolical also of the character of his humanity; and of the nature of his work as the restorer of the original glory of man, as the re-opener of Paradise. It would become a direct token in advance that the second Adam would abolish death and every consequence of the fall. See Macarii Opera. Lipsiæ, 1714. Vol. I. p. 73.

hold no water, were, at least, soon drained by insatiate lips. Stumbling, it must have "the way," dying, it must have "the life." Redemption weaves up the garland of our immortal hopes with the silver thread of Deity; *that* withdrawn, the flowers lie scattered on the ground, and man, relapsing into the brutishness of despair, tramples them beneath his feet. No acts or sufferings but those of the incarnate God will suffice for our redemption. Could God have devised some other scheme to meet his desires, it could not have met our wants, unless man had ceased to be man. The heart of our race is fired then by the scene on the "holy mount," where the Son of God "decked himself in his glorious apparel and appeared in the greatness of his strength," that he might prove that "he spake in righteousness, that he was mighty to save," and that he was fitted "to tread the wine-press of the Almighty's wrath alone."

III. It testified also the *voluntary character* of the sufferings he was soon to undergo. Of these he had recently been speaking with increasing clearness (Matth. 16: 21.). Though Peter had entered more deeply than any of the other disciples into an appreciation of the character of Christ (16: 17.), yet he was not prepared for the doctrine of the cross (22.), and showed plainly that the trial of the faith of the Apostles, in Christ crucified, would be a terrible one. He wishes to strengthen the leading Apostles that they may support the others. He desires that, even in the thick darkness of the mystery of his death, they may know that nothing can prevent his glory and triumph in the redemption of men. They must learn, if possible, that nothing has arisen unforeseen to destroy his plans. Can they suppose that the August Being, whom they have seen transfigured, attended by the highest of the glorified servants of God, with the "excellent glory" of Jehovah blazing around him, and attested by the voice from heaven to be God's beloved Son in whom He is pleased; can they believe that he cannot retain his life, that he *must* endure that worse than mortal anguish, unable to deliver himself, and dying though reluctant to die? It is for these reasons that Moses and Elias speak of his approaching death, and that our Savior renews the theme as they descend the mount, and afterwards selects them, because they have been best prepared for it, to be present at his agony in Gethsemene.

IV. We may suggest farther, that the Transfiguration bore a part in the development of the character of Christ towards "*perfection*," a term in whose employment (sanctioned by

Scripture,) we of course contemplate him as the man and Mediator only. As he possessed a human body which grew in "stature," so he necessarily possessed a human soul which grew "in wisdom." God took upon him human nature, not merely a human form or body, which might be the machine of indwelling Deity. The child grew and waxed strong in spirit, "deriving, as one of our race, his knowledge from the same fountain and in the same way as ourselves" (Isa. 11 : 2, 3.). "It became him for whom are all things and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings," for "though he were a Son, yet he learned obedience by the things which he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all that obey him" (Heb. 2 : 10. 5 : 8, 9.).

The Transfiguration may be said to have brought his two natures into a more perfect intercommunion, and was an outward testimony, that he was not misled by that deep consciousness which as man he felt of the indwelling Godhead. It elevated his humanity, which had consented to forego the privileges which naturally became its own by personal union with the Deity, and to receive, by degrees, by training, what it might have had by intuition, as divine-human. It made him capable of the still more exalted portions of his duty, and the still sterner sufferings which awaited him. This view is corroborated when we remember that, during the agony at the mount Olives, "there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him" (Luke 25 : 43.). It was of these scenes, too, as though they were connected in some way with this glorious proof that he was the Son of God, that Moses and Elias spake. The light, the converse, the voice could not be torn from his remembrance, or their forming power from his character, in the darkest hour.²

V. The transfiguration may be regarded as a foreshadowing of the coming of Jesus in clouds of glory with his holy angels to judge the quick and the dead. The realm of the dead and

¹ Though *τελειόω* in these passages *embraces* in it beyond question the idea of advance to perfect happiness and glory, yet it conveys it as the termination of a development not only of a higher from a lower condition, but also of a greater from a less official fitness, as v. 8. clearly shows.

² O Tabor! not thy snow-born streams;
 O Tabor! not thine orient beams
 So purely flow, so brightly shine,
 As shone that awful light divine;
 Which round the praying Savior flowed,
 To raise the man, and mark the God.

the hosts of heaven were represented by Moses and Elias, the mountain was a figure of that throne "high and lifted up," on which the Lord of glory shall appear, when all other thrones shall be cast down; when a fiery stream shall issue and come forth before him; when the judgment shall be set and the books be opened. The disciples are the representatives of mankind; and the solemn words of the Father:—"Hear Him," intimate by what law the decision shall be made which will separate man from man in that day. The terror which inspires the Apostles shows that the hearts of all flesh would sink in that awful hour if left to themselves;¹ and the reviving touch and cheering command of Jesus, show whence the confidence and joy of that day shall flow to the believer. When they lift up their eyes they see Jesus *alone*, even as the eyes of all saints shall be fixed upon him. Though cherubim and seraphim blaze around the throne, they will be able to see but *one*: "Whom have I in heaven but thee"—"thou art chiefest among ten thousand and altogether lovely."

Their conversation, as they descend the mount, teaches us that the bliss, which shall follow the resurrection, will in part consist in sweet reminiscences of suffering leading to glory. We shall speak of our Savior's toils—perhaps to him, and he may tell, so as to shed glory upon us, before angels and the redeemed, the little, which, by his grace, we were enabled to do and suffer for him.

But there are some who shall be stricken to the earth by his glory, whom no hand shall raise. "They shall look upon him whom they have pierced," and "shall wail because of him;" as from the wounds of the slain Lamb which shall seem to them still unclosed, the intensest light of his glory shall appear to stream.²

¹ "In hoc exemplo proponitur, . . . quod haec humana natura non potest sustinere Dei conspectum. . . . Quia natura polluta peccato, metuit et fugit judicem. . . . Ideo intercessit pro nobis Filius Dei . . . Postea nobis par-citur, quando hunc Filium fide apprehendimus, quando ipse nos contrectat, et dicit: Noli timere." Melancthon Conciones in Matthæum, in the third volume of his Works. Wittenbergæ, 1563.

² "Tunc, trepedi adspicient clavo transfixa trabali
Brachia, et invidiæ tot documenta suæ,
Transfixum latus, quod militis hanserat hasta,
Ultoremque tremet gens scelerata Deum."

From a feeling of the moral connection between the Transfiguration, the Resurrection and the general Judgment, arose a legendary location of the last two events at the scene of the first. "On that hill (Tabor) and in that same place," says Sir John Maundeville (A. D. 1322), "at Doomsday, four angels shall blow with four trumpets, and raise all men, that have suffered death since the world was created, to life; and they shall come in body and

VI. At this point the narrative reveals itself in intimate association with the whole Biblical doctrine in regard to man's immortality.

For, in the first place, it confirms the truth of Christ's resurrection, on which depends all assurance of our own (1 Cor. 15.). We see something of the nature of that glorified body which is to arise from the darkness of the tomb. No objection to his ability to triumph over death and hell can be drawn from his infirmity; because we have seen every trace of human imperfection disappear in a moment, "the mortal putting on immortality."¹

The appearance, moreover, of Moses and Elias shows, that man has a separate waking and conscious existence after death; is neither absorbed back into the Godhead, nor resting torpidly until the last day. It shows that there is a spiritual world, adapted to the glorified bodies of all saints, as it was to that of Elijah and perhaps of Moses; and never have there met in our world three confessors, whose lives taught more sublimely, than did those of these heavenly visitants and our Lord, that, through toil and suffering, the glory of that world is to be reached, and that "they that sow in tears shall reap in joy."

It is principally this use which Luther makes of the Transfiguration, and his remarks in regard to it are so rich and full, that we are sure we need make no apology for their introduction with little abridgment.

"In this history are embraced many things.

1. In the first place is shown the resurrection of the dead and the future glory even of our bodies. For this was wonderful, that Christ was glorified in his body still mortal and subject to suffering, and thus showed the glory of immortality, though still in mortality: What, then, shall it be, when mor-

soul in judgment ... And it shall be on Easter-day, the time of our Lord's Resurrection."

"The Book of Sir John Maundeville," contained in "Early Travels in Palestine," &c. Edited with notes by Thomas Wright. London, 1848.

¹ "As the body was glorified when he ascended the mountain, and was transfigured into the divine glory, and into the boundless light: so also the bodies of the saints shall be glorified, and shall shine like the light. For as the inward glory of Christ so interwove itself with the body and shone forth: in the same way also in the saints the inward power of Christ shall, in that day, be poured forth outwardly upon their bodies As from one and the same fire many lamps are kindled, so also is it necessary that the bodies of the saints which are members of Christ, should become the same as Christ himself." Macarii Ægyptii Opuscula. Ed. Jo. Georg. Pritius. Lipsiæ, 1714. 2 vols. Vol. II. 223.

tality, having been swallowed up, all shall be glory and immortality?

2. In the second place, to this occurrence, so wonderful in itself, is added the appearance of Moses and Elias, who, although they were regarded as dead, showed by that very appearance, that they were not dead, but merely transferred to another sort of existence. They made it clear, too, that the life, into which they had passed from this mortal one, was very different from it. For, in a life resembling this, their existence could not have been prolonged so many hundred years as had passed between their departure from this world and their appearing. Yet here, they not only live, but show that they had really been dead.

3. In the third place, we have these two most faithful witnesses, Moses and Elias, that the dead are not dead, and that the dying pass from this sorrowful and troublous life to a better. Their appearance proved that death is not annihilation. We are taught, therefore, that death is to be despised, for it is a change from the prison-house to glory. We may think of it as a journey, or with the Scriptures call it a sleep. Blessed be God that the darkness, which covered the Gentiles, has been dispelled from us by the promise of eternal life, and by its demonstration through this appearing.

4. In the last place, we see here that sin is overcome. For where death is conquered, sin is conquered; for death is nothing but the wages of sin (Rom. 6.). Sin and death, therefore, being taken away by Christ, we are freed from the power of Satan, and we await, when mortality shall have been swallowed up of life, the brightness of eternal glory, which, in the Transfiguration, Christ showed in his body still passible and mortal.¹”

We may add, then, in conclusion, that the Transfiguration, with its attendant circumstances, furnishes a striking testimony to the truth of the closing articles of the Apostles' Creed: “the communion of saints,² the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the flesh, and the life everlasting.”

¹ Annotationes D. Mart. Luth. in Aliquot Cap. Matthæi, ab autore, non ut ederentur, sed in Amici cujusdam privatum usum, scriptæ. A. D. 1538. In the fourth volume of his Latin works. Jena, 1583.

² “Here we learn, in what way the saints are employed in heaven. It is certain, that those who are in heaven are solicitous for the church and pray for it, as Moses and Elias here speak with the Son of God in regard to his passion and resurrection, and the gathering together of the church.”

MELANCHTHON.

Closely associated with this is the doctrine of the recognition of believers in the eternal world, which some of the old writers deduce from this narrative.

VII. The closing remark, which we shall offer on this part of our subject, is that the Transfiguration presents, in a strong light, the *moral* beauty of the Christian religion. It is a system, whose facts correspond with its declarations and promises (Matth. 16: 28, compared with 17: 1.), in which comparative faithfulness in the use of present grace leads to higher privileges, so that "to him that hath is given more abundantly," in which fearlessness of confession (Peter), tenderness of love (John), and willingness to suffer for Christ (James), are rewarded by most intimate communion with him, and the most certain approach to the contemplation and enjoyment of his glory. It alone conducts us to that height above the world, where, separated from earthly associations and the cares of life, Christ manifests himself unto us as he does not unto the world" (Matth. 17: 1.). The Christian religion invests Christ with his true form, and hallows all that touches him, because that very contact imparts to the meanest object a grace and glory beyond the highest reach of earthly power (Mark 9: 3.). It makes all holy beings, whether on earth or in heaven, members of one family, bound by the closest ties to one another, by their interest in Jesus the common head (Matth. 17: 3.). It condescends to the infirmity of men, and moves them from the stupor of the natural condition to a contemplation of the "glory of God in the face of Christ Jesus" (Luke 9: 32.). In it the Son glorifies the Father, and the Father the Son (Matth. 17: 6.). It gives the spirit of childlike confidence, which casts out fear (v. 7.). It prepares for every trial and shows how affliction can be made to "work out a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory" (v. 9.).

We turn now to a distinct consideration of the second great fact in this narrative: the association of Moses and Elias with the Transfiguration of our Redeemer. A tradition existed among the Jews in our Savior's time, that these illustrious personages would appear in connection with the Messiah. Whether this opinion resulted from some unrecorded prophecy, or was the result of the general consciousness of a moral fitness in their appearing, we cannot stop to inquire.¹ No wide-

It certainly shows that they *may* know one another, though that is not exactly establishing the point in question, which is whether they will. See Osiandri Biblia Sacra (in Luc. 9: 33.). Francofurti, 1611, and Doederlein Institutio Theologi Christiani, &c. Ed. quinta. Noremburgae et Altorfi, 1791. Lib. II. P. II. Cap. II. sec. II. Obs. 5. Doederlein beautifully sums up the main reasons for believing that there will be a recognition on the part of Christian friends.

¹ Cf. Malachi 4: 4, 5, where it is said that Elijah will come before the Messiah, and where they are called on to remember the law of Moses. The

spread popular sentiment is entirely arbitrary, and the fact that they were expected, that the minds of the Apostles doubtless shared in the popular sentiment, would have rendered these the proper persons for this great honor, had there been in other respects a perfect balance between them, and other honored inhabitants of the heavenly world. But apart from this consideration we would say, that,

I. In the first place, their *personal* character marked them as most worthy, among all the Old Testament heroes and saints, of a participation in this glory. "Why," asks Chrysostom,¹ "were they brought upon the scene? Many reasons might be assigned: and in the first place, since the people thought, in regard to Christ, some that he was Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the old prophets, (Matt. 16: 14.); these two, who were the greatest of them, were introduced, that the wide distinction between the Master and the servants might be marked, and that it might be seen that Peter had deserved approval, when he confessed him to be the Son of God (Matt. 16: 16, 17). . . . To all other considerations we are to add, that eminent and illustrious virtue of these men, which furnished an example of what he so earnestly demanded of his disciples. For he had said (Matt. 16: 24.): 'If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me;' for this reason he places those before them who, a hundred times, in guarding the precepts of God, and in watching over the people entrusted to them, had encountered the peril of death: each of them in losing his life had found it (Matt. 16: 25.): each of them had spoken against tyrants with great freedom, the one against the Egyptian king, the other against Ahab. And it was a great thing, that though private men, and without power, they endeavored to rescue the people from idolatry, though encountered by an ungrateful and disobedient spirit, which frequently subjected them to the greatest dangers: and all this, though the one was 'slow of speech, and of a slow tongue:' and the other yet more plain and home-bred, and both complete despisers of that earthly wealth by which men often secure their ends. Moses had no possessions, 'esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches

remarkable facts connected with the bodies of both Moses and Elias, might excite also the expectation, that something remarkable was yet to be accomplished by them, and nothing was more natural to the Jewish mind than to associate them with the Messiah. It is not necessary here to recite the traditions themselves. They can be found in any good Commentary.

¹ In Matt. Homil LVII.

than the treasures in Egypt,' nor had Elias aught but his leathern girdle; and thus was it, even in their old age, for they drew no personal advantage from the favor with which they were regarded by many. For their devotion to the welfare of the people, their strength of mind and constancy, they are introduced as examples: that the meekness of Moses, and the zeal of Elias might be the objects of their imitation: yet were they to surpass them in the spirit of a better dispensation."— When James and John desired to call fire from heaven to consume Christ's enemies, and appealed to the example of Elias, as though this were an inference they had drawn from his appearance on the Mount, the Son of God rebuked them, and said, "ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them" (Luke 9: 54, 56.).

II. A still higher reason for their introduction was, that in their official character, as the representatives of the law and prophets, they might bear witness against Christ's enemies in regard to the purity of his character, the glory of his dispensation, and his position, not only as its revealer, but its sum and centre.

"The Jews had constantly accused him as a transgressor of the law, and had thought him a blasphemer, in claiming as his own, the glory of his Father; they had said: 'This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath.' And again, 'for a good work we stone thee not, but because thou being a man, makest thyself God.' Nothing could better show the invidious character of these charges, of the violation of the law, and of the attempt to claim God's glory, which was none of his, than the appearance of two such strenuous supporters of both. For Moses had given the law; and no Jew could believe, that he would permit the law to be trodden upon, and pay homage to one who was its transgressor and his enemy.— Elias had been zealous for the glory of God, and, when almost every knee had bowed to Baal, remained steadfast; he was the last of men to stand with one who would falsely pretend to be equal with the Father; the last who would obey an usurper. Their appearing, moreover, showed that Christ was indeed Lord of the world of spirits, and of heaven," yea of the quick and the dead, "for he placed in their midst Moses, who had died, and Elias, who without dying, had passed into heaven."¹

¹Chrysostom Hom. in Matthaeum LVII. It is into these two classes Paul divides the subjects of the Resurrection; those who are changed after death, and those who "shall not sleep," but "shall be changed." (1 Cor. 15: 51.)

They appeared further, that the strong antithesis of the two dispensations might be marked, and that the superior glory of Christ's and the transition of the first might be shown.

The hand of inspiration has already drawn at length, the difference of the features of the two economies (cf. Exod. 34, and 2 Cor. 3: 7.), and has shown the surpassing and abiding glory of the second.

Moses and Elias appear "in glory" (Luke 9: 31.), and thus show that the grandeur of their mission arises from its relation to Christ; that they are greatest in serving him, and that their system passed away, not by being destroyed, but by being fulfilled, "for Christ is the end of the law."¹ Their authority was abrogated by two words, forever: Hear HIM, and him alone.² Before these words were uttered, they were withdrawn, and as the dove descended on Christ at his baptism, that none might apply to John, the words that came forth from the parted heavens for him, so here Christ stands alone, that the hand of God may be, as it were, laid upon his head. "*This is my beloved Son.*"

They had spoken, not of the glories of heaven, but of something, in its due time and place, more glorious, even the cross of Christ, and when Christ *touches* the disciples, it continues the lesson of the cross, that is, that the humanity of Christ is the organ of Deity; that nothing divine may in the mediatorial kingdom be separated from the human. It is the *voice*, the *touch*, the reception into his arms, some act of his humanity from which, not a single exertion of divine power recorded of Christ in the Gospels, is sundered. The faith, that touches his garment, will be assured that "virtue has gone out of *him*," to heal every plague; or receiving the bread from his hand, will know that it is the bread of life, because "it is the communion of *his* body." It is this that makes the new dispensation. Moses was not essential to the first, but there can be no christianity without Christ; he is "*the way, the truth, the life*," "no man can come to the Father but through him, and without him we can do nothing." All earthly glory, even the

¹ "Ut ergo rite Moses opera utamur, in ipso haerendum non est, sed danda opera ut per ipsum manu ducamur ad Christum, cujus minister est una cum aliis omnibus." Musculus in Marlorati Cathol. Exposit.

² Melanchthon beautifully employs the Transfiguration of Christ to show, that no weight of human councils can avail against the clear teachings of God's Son.

"Cogites igitur hoc colloquium Dei, Filii, Moisis, Eliae esse *Synodum praecipuam*, in qua de summa doctrinae Evangelii tales personae colloquuntur, audientibus et spectantibus omnibus Angelis, et aliquibus Apostolis quos voluit Deus esse nuncios et testes de hoc colloquio." Opera, III. 495.

highest, that of serving God in the church, can have no value, save that of being laid at the feet of Jesus Christ. When Peter, though he meant it not, seemed to put those most illustrious of men, and most honored servants of God, even for a moment, on some sort of equality with their Lord, the anxious explanation of the Evangelists is, that he "knew not what he said."¹ And for him whose language would seem to put any name, either in earth or heaven, by that of God's Son, christian charity can offer no other apology: "He knows not what he says."

We do not wish to close what we have to say on this wondrous narrative, (whose charm grows upon us), without adding, after the example of the sacred writers, of the fathers, and of the reformers, some practical remarks to the doctrine we have developed. The first is, the analogy between Christ transfigured and the believer. As we receive his baptism, are crucified and buried, as we rise and reign with him, so also are we sharers in the power of his transfiguration. In its power we throw off more and more the form of a servant, and the infirmities of nature; we cease to be conformed to the world, and are transformed by the renewing of our minds. Christ dwells in us, and is transfigured through us, not only forming the soul more and more in his image, but filling the body with the power of his own risen and glorified humanity, whose image shall be the mould of the resurrection. Nor would we reason down, to a mere human phenomenon, that pale lustre which has so often been seen to diffuse itself over the countenance of dying saints, like the first flush of Christ's glory, or the radiance on Stephen's brow, when "all that sat in the council saw his face as it had been the face of an angel."² (Acts 6: 15).

We shall close this article with a few reflections on Peter's words: "Lord it is good to be here." In a high sense, these words were true. It is a precious privilege to witness Christ's glory, and to commune with the spirits of the blest, precious, even here to do so by faith, though the veil is between, and in heaven it will be unutterable bliss.

But christianity has something higher to offer to man than happiness. It offers him *duty*, and teaches him, that toils and sufferings must not be avoided, even for religious enjoyment.

¹ "Praeposturum, ejus votum fuit, quod finem visionis non teneret: deinde stulte aequavit Domino servos. . . . Valde perversum fuit, Eliam et Mosen Collegas fingere Dei Filio: quasi non omnes in ordinem cogi necesse sit, ut solus ipse emineat." Calvin in loc.

² "Then, then, the triumph and the trance begin,
And all the phœnix spirit burns within."

A quietistic rapture, dwelling in contemplation alone, is not the condition to which it would lead man, but it says: "Work while it is day."¹ The enjoyment of Christ must be connected with his service, and the system which would resolve christianity mainly into a series of joyous excitements, is unhealthy and ultimately destructive of itself. And if, in our church relations, we think we see Christ more nearly and gloriously, than those whom we confess to be disciples indeed, but whom we yet regard as at the foot of Tabor, and not with us, on the top, let not this nurse in us that exclusive and sectarian spirit, which would make us wish to rear our tabernacles, to keep Christ and his nearest servants wholly to ourselves.— Christ will neither be Lutheran, Presbyterian, Episcopal nor Methodist, but "He will be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him who filleth all in all."

Peter would spare Christ; but Christ came to suffer, and the scriptures must be fulfilled. Peter would spare himself; but there was a sharp and glorious probation through which he was to pass; a gospel to be preached by him; souls to be delivered, a martyrdom to be undergone. There was a home higher than the mountain top, where the "rest remaineth," and a longer and harder path to reach it; the bleeding feet of the Son of God were first to trace it, and many bleeding feet were to follow, that it might become more and more distinct and easy to pursue in all coming time. There is no communion with Christ so high, that patient duty and suffering will not lead us to a nearer one.

The language of Peter proves too, that our purest longings may be mingled with selfishness, may be inconsiderate and cruel. Will he keep others from seeing Christ? Will he keep the Savior from his glory, delay his entrance again into heaven, that these sinful mortals may gaze in his brightness? Will he keep the saints from returning to their bliss, and all the hosts of God from rejoicing in the tidings that the sorrowing pilgrim has almost reached the end of his journey, and will enter the starry portals laden with the trophies of a world's redemption, and "leading captivity captive?" Ah, he is revealing the secrets of many hearts, of mine, and perhaps of thine! Why, when friends in whom Christ is glorified, are departing,

¹ "Peter loving a contemplative life (*θεωρητικὸν γε ἀγάπῃσας βίον*), and desiring more to enjoy its happiness, than to endure the trial connected with the service of others, uttered these words: 'It is good,' &c. But since love 'seeketh not her own' (1 Cor. 13: 5) the Savior declined that which seemed good to Peter."

do we hang so fondly on their accents, and say : “stay with us, it is good to be here ?” and when riven from us, why will memory so often look backward where faith should look forward ? Why do we think of the parting pressure of the hand, the last words of love, the dying moan, and not of the crown, the communion with Christ, their eternal repose and our reunion with them ? Why, with desolate hearts, will we continue to stretch our hands toward the home of their rest, and cry, come, come back to our arms ? Blessed be God that he will not hear our cruel prayer ; blessed are the departed, that we cannot recall them from their joy, or wound their hearts by the knowledge that we are willing to destroy their bliss ! No, it is not good to be here ! We know not what we say.

ADDITIONAL ILLUSTRATIONS.

I.

CHRYSOSTOM very happily applies the Transfiguration as a token of the glory of believers in heaven. After having spoken in the most rapturous strain of their exalted condition, he says : “But lest you should suppose that all this is but a glitter of words, let us go to the mount where Christ has been transfigured : let us contemplate him shining with that great splendor, even though he shows not the whole splendor of the world to come. For in it he appeared not so exactly to exhibit heavenly things as they are, but with an adaptation to the capacity of his disciples, as the words of the Evangelist show. For what says he ? He shone as the sun (Matth. 17 : 2). For the glory of incorruptible bodies emits not such a light as this corruptible body ; nor such as could be looked upon by mortal eyes ; but there is need for incorruptible and immortal eyes to contemplate it. But on the mount he opened to them such a brightness as they could bear without the loss of sight ; nor yet could they sustain it but fell upon their faces. Tell me, I pray you, if any one should lead you into some magnificent abode, where all were sitting clothed in garments interwoven with gold, and in their midst should point out one whose vesture and diadem seemed compact of precious gems, and should promise to enrol you in their number, what would you not do to obtain the fulfilment of such a promise ? Open now your eyes, and gaze upon that scene, not trodden by men of this kind, but by those more worthy of noon-day glory, and of all that is called majesty ; not by men only, but by those who far surpass men, angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities and powers. For of the King himself we cannot speak : so much does his beauty, glory, majesty and magnificence pass all language and all understanding. Tell me, shall we forego such benefits, that we may escape toil for a brief time ? Were it necessary to die a thousand times daily, yea, if hell itself were to be borne, that we might behold Christ coming in his glory, and might be numbered with the saints ; would it not be well to endure them all. Hear what St. Peter sayeth : “It is good for us to be here” (Matth. 17 : 4).

For if he, when he had seen a dim image of the future world, at once renounced all things for the joy of such a vision, what shall be said when the perfect verity shall be before us, when the courts of the heavenly palace shall be open, and we shall look upon the King himself, no longer darkly, nor in a mirror, but face to face, by sight and not by faith?"

Chrysostomi Paraenesis sive Adhortatio ad Theodorum Lapsium I. Opera I. 292. (Parisiis, Ad. Migne. 1842).

II.

JEROME intimates his belief, that Moses arose from the realm of the dead, and appeared in his own body. He thinks, too, that the object of the Transfiguration was to give to the Apostles "a sign from heaven," to increase their faith, though he had denied it to the Pharisees. Another opinion has been that the appearance of Moses was like the corporeal manifestation of angels.

III.

The Transfiguration powerfully sustains the doctrine of the Evangelical church in regard to the person of Christ. "As fire penetrates glowing iron, permeates, embraces and fills the whole of it with its substance, and is perfectly united with it, without confusion of substances; and as the soul is placed in the body; so the Logos assuming true human nature, and in true humiliation, shines in it entire; and the nature assumed, or as it were, kindled by that light, has been united with the Word. For in this way and in such a form Christ appeared in vision to John (Rev. 1); since the fulness of the Godhead dwells in Christ bodily (Col. 2). Thus (Matth 17) in the transfiguration, rays of divine glory shone forth from his body, and Luke 5: 6, and 8, divine virtue went out from him."

"The Son (Heb. 1) is called the brightness of the Father's glory, to wit: as "light of light," and the light shone from his body (Matth. 17, Acts 9.). Hence Justin takes this similitude, as the light first born, created on the first day, was afterwards united on the fourth day with the solar body, becoming incarnate as it were, and forming one sun, one light; thus may we speak of the divine nature of Christ which was eternal, uniting itself to the human which was formed in time, thus composing one person, who is at once Son of God and Man."

Chemnitz de Duabus Naturis in Christo. (Witebergæ, 1623): 25, 29.

IV.

One of the most remarkable controversies that ever arose in the Christian church, was connected with the light on Tabor. The Hesychasts or quietistic monks on Mount Athos, a sort of compound of Quaker and Mesmerist, held that "there was a light in the soul which could be developed in connection with a bodily glory, by sitting in retirement and gazing in holy meditation on the pit of the stomach. When asked what kind of light it was, they said that it was the glory of God, such as had appeared at the transfiguration. Barlaam, who was a hunter of heresies and had gone on a labor of love, searching for them like Dr. Syntax after the Picturesque, attacked this custom and doctrine, which soon found a defender in Palamas, subsequently Archbishop of Thessalonica. It was found necessary, in order to end the contest,

to hold a council at Constantinople (A. D. 1341), in which the Emperor and Patriarch presided. Barlaam was condemned and compelled to fly from Greece. The first point of dispute was now laid at rest; but the controversy was renewed on the question: "Whether God dwells in an eternal light distinct from his essence, and whether this was the light seen by the disciples on Mount Tabor. The Barlaamites denied this, Palamas maintained it, and eventually triumphed, and his tenet "finally took its place, after a series of solemn deliberations, among the dogmas of the Oriental Church."

See Buddei Isagoge. II. c. vii. § vii. Mosheim, Cent. xiv. p. 2. ch. v. Waddington, ch. xxvi. Fleury, l. xcv. s. q. Schröckh's Kirchenges. Th. 34. 433—449. Guericke, (6th ed.) II. 347.

ARTICLE V.

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, OR HISTORICAL REMINISCENCES, DESIGNED TO MEET THE ANTAGONISTIC TENDENCIES OF OUR AGE AND COUNTRY.

By Rev. J. N. Hoffman, Pastor of the Evang. Luth. Church, Carlisle Pa.

CHAP. I.

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

§ 1. HER WRONGS AND DIFFICULTIES.

ALTHOUGH all religious societies have experienced more or less opposition in the world, yet the Evangelical Lutheran Church, above all others, has met the most formidable, protracted and unrelenting hostility. This may be accounted for, in a great measure, on the ground of her priority, prominence and importance; on the ground of her extent, power and merit; on the ground of her doctrine, learning and adherence to the Gospel. That which is insignificant, powerless and without celebrity, elicits no envy, excites no alarm, occasions no opposition. The immense, indisputable and characteristic advantages of the Lutheran church, would naturally alarm the fears of a Godless world, awaken the jealousy of petty sects, and draw forth the opposition of the less favored religious fraternities. Accordingly we find, that from the commencement of her struggle with the Papacy, she has encountered a general, secret and open resistance; in every age she has met with opposition from individuals, governments and sects, and the most artful schemes have all along been employed, to limit her influence, injure her character and destroy

her usefulness. Though persecuted, she was not forsaken; wounded, she was not overcome; crushed, she was not destroyed. Her borders might occasionally have been contracted, but the inextinguishable vigor of her life was only the more concentrated; an occasional repulse she might incur, but she gathered strength from every defeat; a storm of desolation might pass over her, but when the dark cloud had been dispelled, it but revealed a purer sky, a more healthy atmosphere, a more vigorous life.

As these statements refer exclusively to our own country, we cannot detail the continued, repeated and severe sufferings which the church endured in Europe, not only from Papists but also from so-called Protestants. Passing over all previous injuries, we simply allude to a most gross outrage inflicted upon her, by the King of Prussia, in our own times. The king is professedly a member of the Reformed party, which was comparatively small in his kingdom. Without any regard for the rights of the Lutheran church, he undertook to alter the religion of his subjects, to prescribe new articles of faith, and by coercion, to unite the two confessions in one ecclesiastical organization. Most of the Reformed readily acquiesced in the arbitrary scheme of the king; but the great body of the nation, which belonged to the Lutheran church, endeavored to avert a change which violated their faith; but they found no sympathy in the king and his hired ministry. The Reformed could lose nothing by the change, and were therefore more favorable to the union.¹ But to Lutherans, nothing less than the truth of the Gospel was thereby jeopardized. By means of honors, distinctions and reward, a few leading men were brought out to favor the union.² Those Lutherans who resisted, were either fined, imprisoned or deprived of their living. Many suffered the greatest hardships, rather than abandon their faith; some languished in want and

¹ It is a significant fact, that the Reformed in Europe, as well as many in this country, are more favorably disposed to the union, than the Lutheran. This, however, is the natural tendency of a system, not only fluctuating in itself, but affording no satisfaction to its friends. He that is fully persuaded of the truth of his religion, will offer up his life, before he abandons it. What confidence can a person have in the truth of his system, who is ever ready to abandon it for another? Truly a *significant* fact.

² We might mention some great names of personages, who for the sake of courtly favor, high stations and dignities, were led to favor that unhallowed union, which a modern divine of Europe implored them not to contract, over the remains of the sainted Luther. These very men seem to mourn over the desolations of Zion, even whilst they seem to be utterly unconscious of the fact, that they, themselves, contributed to such results. Witness the recent statement of *T'holuck*, on this subject.

poverty; others went into voluntary exile, and even came to America, where they found spiritual as well as civil liberty. Among eight thousand churches, about seven thousand were exclusively Lutheran.¹ All these churches, with all their church-property, were taken from the Lutherans. Unbelievers, rationalists, graceless men, who could cringe and fawn upon royalty, and sacrifice the truth and the church for the sake of a living, took possession of the churches, as the reward of their base treachery. A system of doctrines was introduced, altogether at variance with the received standards. This system was so lax, vague and unscriptural, that the most lamentable results soon followed, so that the nation at large became infidel in principle, and sunk into vice and sin. For many years, this system of persecution and proscription had been carried on; whilst all true Lutherans, as believing christians, protested against it, but protested in vain. At a later day, however, the king found that he had been fighting against God, that all his schemes would fail, and that if he persevered, it might endanger his own life. As he found that he could not command the consciences of men, contrary to the word of God, he again gave the Lutherans a bare permission to preach; but up to this moment persists in the gross injustice of withholding their churches and church-property from them. This instance, among many others, is here introduced, only as an example of what Lutherans have suffered, from various sources, in the old world.

Whilst the wrongs of the church in the old world proceeded both from civil oppression and religious bigotry, her difficulties in this country were chiefly occasioned by the latter. No other religious society has suffered in the same manner, and to the same extent, as the following condensed description will show.

At an early period, we lost whole congregations and churches. This occurred in relation to the first Lutheran churches, established by the Swedes, in the east. The Episcopalians asked permission to preach in those churches, which permission was granted to them, in consequence of the want of English ministers in our church; only, however, as a mere temporary arrangement, and without any suspicions on the part of the honest Lutherans of that day. Soon, however, the Episcopalians found means, first to secure the members, and afterwards to bring the property into their possession. Several of these

¹ "Theologisches Votum eines Juristen." We have not the means to specify the number of Lutherans in the Kingdom of Prussia, previous to the union. It would be interesting to have a statistical account published, of the number of Lutherans in the various provinces of the old world.

churches are yet in existence, and are held by that denomination, and no doubt constituted no small portion of that basis, on which there was subsequently reared, the imposing fabric, which forms the present strength of that society.¹

In other instances large congregations were scattered, and valuable property wrested from the Lutheran church,² by shameless impostors under the garb of Lutheran ministers. By assuming the name, and professing the doctrines of the church, they found access to our congregations; by the most finished designing knavery, they imposed upon the ignorance of the people, and soon manifested principles which subjected them to the excluding sentence of the church whose name they dishonored.

The prevalence of the English language, and the want of English ministers in our church, became a fruitful source of difficulty and injury. In some instances the introduction of the English language created contention and division. Vast numbers of the descendants of German Lutherans, being either imperfectly acquainted with the German, or too vain to speak the glorious language of their ancestors, abandoned the church, and united with some other denomination, as pride, policy or interest dictated. This occurred especially in several of our large cities, where the exclusive pride of aristocratic society, attracted the vanity of rich Germans, causing them to conceal their origin, discard their language and abandon all their former associations. The opposition of the Germans to English preaching, in some instances, excluded a sufficient number to form the basis of separate congregations, among other societies.—Many different churches were built up by the continued defection of our members through this cause. In this manner our loss was formerly very great; though at the present day, the difficulty is mainly obviated, as we are now enabled, by means of our theological seminaries,³ to supply our churches, to some extent, with qualified and efficient English ministers:

¹ If we examine the present condition of the Episcopal church, especially in our large cities, we will find, that many of her most prominent and efficient members, have been reared and trained in the bosom of the Lutheran church. Much of their success in this country may be ascribed to the previous culture, which many of her members received in the Lutheran church.

² e. g. in the city of Baltimore, where the first, largest, and most valuable church was wrested from Lutherans, by foreign adventurers.

³ Although a religious institution had previously existed in the north, yet little had been done for the church in the middle States; until the Theological Seminary and College at Gettysburg, Pa. were established. From that period the church assumed a different character. And whilst we cheerfully admit the zeal, industry and piety of our German forefathers, previous to that period, as laying the foundation for a more efficient development, yet it cannot

Another peculiar, powerful yet unaccountable circumstance, frequently encouraged a separation from our church. This was nothing else than foolish prejudice and even contempt respecting the German, in regard to his intellect, character and religion. Because he could not accurately pronounce, or correctly speak the English language, he was regarded as an ignorant boor, whilst his reviler never suspected the fact, that his own total ignorance of the German, would, on the same principle, subject him to a similar charge.¹ Because he had been accustomed to a different mode of life, different habits and dispositions, from those of the more wily Englishman, he was at once condemned as an unworthy character.² Because his modes of thought, habits and feelings in religion, were more free, open and public, than those of the designing and practiced professor, he was at once pronounced destitute of religion.³ We can scarcely account for the strange prejudice that generally prevailed. Such was its power and influence in popular society, that the children of wealthy Germans were ashamed of their Teutonic origin, and for the sake of avoiding the prevailing sentiment of scorn or ridicule, did not hesitate to sacrifice every consideration of birth, language and religion.

It gives us but little satisfaction, also, to state, that at the very time, when Lutherans first required English preaching; at the very time which marked a turning point in the church; when the feelings of many prominent men were not yet alienated from the church, and when thousands of valuable members and their descendants, who now constitute the glory of other sects, could have been retained and secured; at this very time *we were destitute of the men, whom the emergencies of the age required.* The first pioneers of Lutheranism, some of whom preached in five different languages, and who could submit to any toil and make any sacrifice for the cause of Christ, had ended their labors, and obtained their reward.—

be denied, that a new, and more active element of life was infused into the church, by the institutions of the General Synod. From that period, a more active piety prevailed; and whatever may be said in regard to those institutions, it will remain an indisputable fact, that the length and breadth of the church has experienced the salutary influences, *proceeding* from that source. And though, we may regret certain tendencies, simultaneously developed there, yet, we hope, and have reason to believe, that ultimately all will terminate in the prosperity of the church.

¹ See the chap. on Characteristics of the Germans.

² See *The religious character of the Germans.*

³ See Characteristics of Germans.

(These chapters are to follow).

Many of their successors lacked the prerequisites to continue the work. Some, through opposition to English preaching; were glad to see the most valuable members desert them, who desired the English, so that they might not be troubled with their importunities. Others were too much engrossed with the world, to submit to the humble work of building up the church; and the men were wanting, who, in the spirit of their master, were ready to labor, suffer and endure all things, for the sake of the Gospel of Christ. A few, who were sensible of this state of things, and deplored the condition of the church, made some efforts to remedy the evil; but meeting with little support, their best designs were frustrated. In this manner, the favorable period passed away, and the loss became irreparable. We do not feel disposed to analyze the motives, or examine the inducements, which withheld or prevented the relief, when it was so pressingly urged. It is a period, in the history of our American church, upon which we might drop a tear, to blot it forever out of the records of time!

But the severest injuries and heaviest wrongs, which the church endured, arose from sources yet to be specified. And first, we notice the constant, diversified and peculiar exertions of proselyting sects. These wild, erratic and antagonistic societies, surrounded us on all sides, assaulted us in every conceivable form, and assumed every possible character for the sake of effect. It was deemed meritorious to turn a Lutheran from his church; to make him a proselyte was to convert him; to change his church-relations was a passport to Heaven.— They appealed to the lowest passions of the ignorant; they flattered the cupidity of the worldly; they awakened the prejudice of the contracted. Their leaders, ignorant of theology, unacquainted with history, and puffed up with self-sufficient pride, gloried in being uninstructed by man, in being taught immediately by the Spirit of God, and in a kind of special inspiration, that rendered them so superior to “college-bred” or “man-made preachers.”¹ The holiest ties of nature were vi-

¹ When we first entered the ministry, our greatest difficulties arose from the efforts of itinerants, who continually strove to limit our influence, by representing us as a “*man-made preacher*,” as “*college-bred*,” &c.; whilst they gloried in being instructed *immediately* by the Spirit; that they could preach without human *learning*, and that all who were not qualified in the same way, were “unconverted” and “money-preachers.” But, what changes time will produce! The very men, who formerly denounced all intellectual improvement, so long as they were destitute of means to found institutions of learning, so soon as they were able, established their colleges, and adopted those very means, to qualify their ministry, which they had formerly deprecated. As a natural consequence, nothing more was said of “college-bred”

olated, the sanctuary of domestic life invaded, and the rights of man despised, to gain their ends. When they succeeded in causing strife among others, they sang songs of praise; the separation of husband and wife, as one or the other was proselyte, was but obeying the behest, not to be unequally yoked; the tears of the church were the marks of their triumph. We have seen them laugh in the pulpit, when the ignorant, in fanatical excitement, crowded the altar. Their worshipped idol was *self*; their controlling genius, was religious bigotry; the consequence of their unhallowed course, was moral ruin and desolation. The Germans and their descendants, being an honest, industrious and prosperous people, whose moral worth and religious tendency of soul were undisputed, these were eagerly sought after, hypocritically caressed, and gladly received. The Lutheran church was regarded as common prey; each sect endeavored to secure the largest portion, whilst they often quarreled among themselves, in the division of the spoils. Like as Pilate and Herod became friends in their common opposition to Christ, so we have known two distinct sects unite in a crusade for proselyting purposes; though it generally terminated in a quarrel, at the winding up of the ridiculous farce, each claiming the greatest number of converts. The means that were occasionally practiced, would at the present day, scarcely be credited. The most wily schemes, cunning arts, and deep-laid stratagems, (“*μεθοδεία*,” Eph. 4:14) were employed to create doubt in the mind of Lutherans, in reference to their doctrines, experience and church-relations, to cause divisions in our churches, and proselyte their members. To assail the character, motives and piety of our ministers, was to preach the Gospel. Their piety was often graduated by the strength of their lungs; whilst ignorant, vulgar abuse, synergism and anecdotes, constituted the sum total of their preaching. This picture, horrible as it appears, is not exaggerated. In some respects, the delineation is even beneath reality, as it applies to the state of things some twenty-five years ago. Recently, however, this difficulty is also vanishing. Some of those sects have essentially changed their *modus operandi*, and

preachers, after their own institutions had been established. The christian philosopher learns an important lesson from these facts!

¹ Although we cannot furnish a parallel to the case mentioned by Schiller, in his “*Abfall der Niederländer*,” of a Reformed minister, who paid certain women to feign themselves sick, in order to be cured by him in a miraculous manner, yet we have witnessed scenes equally degrading, and equally disgraceful, which were professedly enacted for the sake of turning certain prominent members from their church.

as a necessary consequence, are declining in a correspondent degree. Other sects are rapidly going into an unavoidable decay, as the intelligence of our church advances, and her inherent energies are called into active exercise. And the great and solemn truth, is beginning to be recognized, that "every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up," Matt. 15 : 13 ; whilst our own church is beginning to realize the promise of her Lord : "Fear not, little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."

But among all the injuries which the church has suffered, the greatest, the most continued and general, arose from the misrepresentations of our doctrines, proceeding from some of the most prominent persons and denominations of our land.— And whether these misrepresentations proceeded from ignorance, policy or enmity, in every case they are inexcusable and disreputable. Although the church has ever strictly adhered to the acknowledged essentials of religion ; although her sublime Confession has all along been received as the exponent of her faith, and although the historical details of more than three centuries attest her fidelity to the truth of the Gospel, yet all this has failed to silence her gainsayers. The church at large has been traduced ; her ministry denounced, and her doctrines perverted. At the very time when they were drinking from the pure fountain of the church ; when they were profited by her unequalled literature, they essayed to cloud the stream whose transparency surprised them. To give but a single instance, among many others ; who does not know with what pertinacity, how repeatedly and generally, the church has been charged with holding the absurd doctrine of *consubstantiation* ? In vain have we repeatedly, publicly and energetically protested against the charge ; in vain have we declared that this doctrine never was taught, believed or tolerated in the church, that it was irreconcilable with our symbols, and rejected by our ministers ; in vain have we appealed to the history, the whole history of the church, to the testimony of a large number of Lutheran divines, and even to the writings of prominent theologians of Germany, who were *not* in connection with our church ; all this united testimony was disregarded ; and although we can refer to the declarations of historians from the origin of the controversy,¹ to prove the contrary, yet to the present moment the slander is extensively promulgated. Nu-

¹ See *Magirus*, *Widerlegung*, &c., 1592, pp. 17, 153.

Vide præsertim, *Bucer's* account of a conference between himself and the preachers of Zurich, in 1533, in which this doctrine is decidedly rejected at that early period, as utterly inconsistent with our Confession.

merous books are sent forth into the world, whose pages are disgraced by repeating the calumny. The charge was made and published in Europe, by *Edgar*, in his "Variations of Popery," a work which contains some truth, mingled with much one-sidedness and historical inaccuracy: and the American editor of this work, Mr. Sparry, did not hesitate to repeat the miserable tale. And, what is more astonishing still, this work was recommended to Lutheran readers, by the so-called "—— Observer"!! Who is not acquainted with the strange misstatements and errors, respecting our doctrines, which are contained in "Buck's Theological Dictionary"? From this obsolete production, which in a former age of intellectual dearth, was extensively circulated, the people are startled to learn, that the church, that very body, which has struggled most, suffered most, accomplished most, against the Roman Hierarchy, differed least from the Papacy. In the compends of *Goodrich*, and in a number of minor catch-penny productions, the same errors and perversions are retailed, whilst their authors and publishers thereby afford a painful lesson of the effect of religious bigotry, leading them to sacrifice truth, and propagate error.

The same want of moral honesty and sincerity, is exhibited in the unwarrantable liberties, which the translators and publishers of German works have assumed. It was not enough, that they published misrepresentations in their own works, but they must needs so mutilate the productions of Germans, as to make them correspond with their own; just as though the whole church in this country, was either too ignorant to discover the trick, or too imbecile to expose and resent the imposition. Whilst it was found expedient to make the public acquainted with the superior literature of the Germans, it was deemed important also to prevent the effect, which their profound theological research would have, in opposition to the views of translators, publishers, and those like them in sentiment and feeling. In some instances, when German works were translated, which could not possibly be curtailed or altered without destroying the whole production, care was taken,—if those works contained any thing in opposition to the views of the author and his sect,—to caution the reader, either in a wordy preface, (which afforded abundant proof that they were incapable of understanding the author), or in numerous marginal notes, in which they spoke of the matter, as though their own opinions were infallible.¹ And in order to be certain of

¹ See "*Knapp's Vorlesungen*," where the translator attempts frequently to

their intended end; they would insinuate, in the most artful and covert manner, their suspicions, as regards some of the author's opinions! In the translation of other works, not only sentences, but whole chapters were omitted, because they contained a defence of doctrines, contrary to the translator's opinions, which defence, the translator was unable to refute, and therefore withheld it from the public.¹ In some instances, it was deemed politic, not only to omit essential parts of the original author, but also to make such alterations and additions, as entirely to conceal or alter his meaning.² And not a few of these productions of German mind are so completely changed by wilfulness or ignorance, that in many instances the sense of the author is utterly obscured, and even entirely perverted.³ In the absence of means to counteract influences so numerous and general, a settled prejudice was produced against the church; and, in this manner she suffered serious injuries.

convict the author of error, and tries in his notes, to prevent the impression, which on certain prominent topics, the author's investigations might make; whilst in some instances, he entirely mistakes the meaning of the original.

See also "*Neander's History of the Church*," during the three first centuries, translated by *Rose*, who as a strict Episcopalian, makes a feeble attempt to confute the author's views on the subject of *Bishops*; and, to destroy the author's influence, in an indirect and covert, yet perceptible manner, insinuates, that because certain essential doctrines are not so prominently exhibited, the author *might* not be strictly orthodox.

Now if these works are worth the translation; if they contain important investigations, why not give them to the public, without note or comment? Why warn and guard the reader against their views? Are all readers incapable of judging, and have the translators alone, the right and the qualification to decide? We hesitate not to say, that such a course is not only *unjust* to the author, but a *fraud* upon the public.

¹ Such was the case with "*Sartorius' Christologische Vorlesungen*," in which an entire chapter on the Lord's Supper, is omitted.

² Who does not know what "*Mosheim's Church history*" has suffered in the hands of his bigoted translator, *McClaine*? We will not waste time, or even paper, to detail the discreditable bigotry, and miserable imposition of the author.

³ To give an instance of the *littleness* of mind of which some men can be guilty, we refer to the translation of "*Schiller's thirty year's war*," by *Morrison*. Here we not only find numerous omissions, additions and alterations, but also unmistakable proofs of a religious prejudice, that entirely perverted the meaning of the author. The term "Reformed," is generally rendered *Calvinist*, especially when it could be done so as to confer honor upon the latter. He often changes "Lutheran" into "Evangelical" or "Protestant," and vice versa, so as not only to obscure the sense, but if possible to misrepresent the Lutherans. In some instances, in which *Protestant* or *Evangelical* is employed in the original, in connection with something unfavorable, he invariably translates them Lutheran, so as to throw the odium upon the latter alone, to the exclusion of the Reformed! And such is the general nature of the translation, that a reader, not acquainted with the original, would receive impressions, diametrically opposite to those, which would be occasioned by reading the German.

Nor did English writers pursue a more generous and honorable course. The works of English ecclesiastical historians, both foreign and American, with few exceptions, contain numerous historical and doctrinal statements, which are inaccurate, and calculated to exhibit the church in a false light.— This applies, among others, to D'Aubigne's history of the Reformation. Whenever the course of history does not bring him into conflict with his favorite opinion, he *tries*—amidst unmistakable French levity¹—to be correct. But when he comes to a statement of the developments of history, in regard to matters in which he had taken sides, he ceases to be correct, fair and impartial. His whole representation of the sacramental controversy, bespeaks a mind that was fettered and trameled by sectarian bias.² A German critic, after having given a favorable view of this work as a whole, says of this part of his history, that he displays a more profound knowledge of the Swiss reformation, and especially of the French, than of the German; and that he is not only utterly unhistorical in exhibiting the French Reformation, as occurring simultaneously with that of the German, but also treats of the former with an undisguised partiality; that there cannot be imagined a more superficial, vague and bagatelle-like delineation, than he has given of Luther in the sacramental controversy, not particularly because his representation is Reformed, but because it is a mere schoolboy affair, and exhibits the whole matter in the light of a mere *bagatelle*.³

The general *result* of these varied, numerous and general misrepresentations, may easily be imagined. A settled and very extensive antipathy toward the church prevailed. German authors, whose language and writings were not understood, were suspected.⁴ German theology was cried down,

¹ Which his exulting endorsers of the East, who were glad to avail themselves of his misstatements, have designated *a lively, active evangelical spirit*. Alas, how much we miss the profundity of thought, the dignity of language and strict conscientiousness of German writers.

² As an instance of his want of truthfulness, he says that even Seckendorf, the great apologist of Luther, admits that Luther was of a stubborn, unyielding disposition. In referring to the passage in Seckendorf's history, I was surprised to see the very opposite statement. Seckendorf, referring to Maimburg, a Catholic writer, who wrote against Luther and the Reformation, says: "nor is it true, *as Maimburg says*, that Luther was of a stubborn" &c. Such a blunder, in one professing to be a historian, is unpardonable. Other historical inaccuracies could be specified.

³ Guericke and Rudelbach's *Zeitschrift*, 1849.

⁴ Even a late Sabbath School book, entitled "Letters on Ecclesiastical history," speaks of Germany as the country "where infidelity has had her stronghold." Now why single out Germany, whilst among other nations infidelity

German ministers regarded as rationalists, and the whole Lutheran church was exhibited as greatly corrupted. In short, the idea prevailed, *that Germans were the authors of the prevailing infidelity in Europe and America, and that the Lutheran church, as connected with German Theology, was generally affected in the same way.* One of the most recent statements of this kind, which we quote for its gross vulgarity and unhistorical character, taken from an ephemeral periodical of the East, that shall remain *nameless*¹ here, that it may not be disturbed in its repose of *insignificance*, is the following : “Unless all associations be imaginary, AND ALL HISTORY A LIE, *the doctrines of grace cannot long abide, where the bodily presence is maintained in any form.* Either they will fall suddenly away, *as in the Lutheran church,* or (and this is the more natural course,) they will be thrust down, smothered and killed outright, by the influence of a succession of issues from the doctrine of the presence.”

This daring, blundering extract may serve as an example of the learning, elegance of diction, and moral sentiment, which have been enlisted against us, in this dishonorable crusade.

Now, in opposition to the general opinion before described, and reiterated in the preceding extract, we will refer to some historical data, which will afford another proof that a guilty person will sometimes endeavor to divert attention from himself, by shifting the blame upon another. We will not enter into any argument on the subject : we will simply adduce facts, together with their authorities ; these shall speak for themselves ; shall testify in behalf of the church. God knows, that we do not bring these things to mind, out of a mere love of controversy, or through religious bigotry. We have been so long abused, misrepresented, injured : long have we endured it without complaint, without an answer. And as the very opposite is true, that neither rationalism, Socinianism nor infidelity arose in the church, or even in Lutheran countries ; as the very sects who continually reiterate these charges, are represented by authentic history as the fountains from which these poisonous exhalations arose, it is not right that the public should be misled, or that the innocent should suffer. If the follow-

originated and still exists ? Is Germany more infidel than France ? Did not infidelity originate and prevail in England and France ? Why not mention the Netherlands, Poland, Switzerland, &c. It is in this manner that Germany and the Germans are constantly vilified, whilst Reformed nations more infidel still, are not mentioned.

¹ Simply stating the fact, that the Editor professedly belongs to the German Reformed Church.

ing statements are sad and painful, let it be remembered, that they are UNDISPUTED FACTS, *again forced into notice by continued, unprovoked and unrelenting hostility.*

In the first place we remark, that the prophetic ken of Luther foresaw and predicted the necessary results of those systems, which occupied a position in contrast with his own churchly stand-point. A certain historian remarks: "Luther perceived that the view of the Lord's Supper, which represented it as a mere act of remembrance, would, as a necessary consequence, at last terminate in the rejection of the essentials of religion."¹ Other writers refer to these fears of Luther, as increasing to the end of his life. "In the latter part of his life the apprehension became vivid in his mind, that the representations of Calvinists respecting the Lord's Supper, would prepare the way for that system, which we at the present day denominate rationalism, but which Luther regarded as downright infidelity."²

Let us now examine whether the prophecy of Luther was verified. Impartial history shall furnish the answer; first, in regard to the earliest appearance of gross error, and then to the origin of those anti-christian tendencies which subsequently became more general in Europe.

In the Palatinate, the Lutheran doctrine had prevailed at an early period. Soon, however, Frederick II. and especially Frederick III. of the Pfaltz, both of whom had become converts to the Reformed religion, began to oppose the Lutheran and advance the Reformed church. As the latter prevailed, error ensued; and history specifies the cause and the effect. "The Elector Frederick, of the Palatinate, was soon to find that this view (the Calvinistic), among men who were not thoroughly penetrated by religious sentiment, would readily become the occasion of positive ungodliness. For, as it cannot be denied, that *in this doctrine, the influence of reason predominates* to a far greater extent than in that of the Lutheran, it was not at all strange, that this influence would usurp authority also in other matters. Accordingly, we find that the *divinity of Christ*, and in consequence, the doctrine of the *Trinity*, were secretly attacked by the Palatine divines."³ It is singular that all historians, few of whom can be charged with any partiality to the church, agree in this representation. "It is remarkable," says a modern writer, "that immediately after

¹ *Leo*, Lehrbuch d. univ. Geschichte, b. 3, p. 145.

² *Marheinecke*. Kirch. Gesch.

³ *Leo*. Lehrbuch d. univ. Gesch. B. 3, p. 318.

the introduction of the Heidelberg Catechism in the Palatinate, a tendency arose, which not only opposed the Lutheran view of the Lord's Supper, but also proceeded to attack the divinity of Christ, and the Trinity," &c.¹ So peculiar and confined to anti-Lutheran systems, were these defections from the truth, that the charge was openly preferred, "that Calvinism opens the way for Arianism and Muhammedanism;"² and that the going over to Calvinism would naturally lead to the rejection of the divinity of Christ.³ The instances which furnished the proofs for these historical representations, and which led the historian to assert, that "the opposition to the faith of the church * * * had found a home (Freistatt) in *Reformed* countries,"⁴ because as numerous as they were notorious. So undisputed was the fact, that another writer declares: "I do not at the present time know a single Arian, who had not before been a Calvinist;" and after mentioning the names of a number of persons who had renounced the latter for the former view, he adds: "therefore, if any one desires to escape Arianism, let him shun Calvinism."⁵ Among the number of those, whose erratic course is above alluded to, we mention the case of *A. Neuser*, as one of peculiar note. He had been a somewhat prominent preacher in Heidelberg, but having exposed himself to danger on account of his Arian heresy, he fled to Constantinople, *and became a Turk*.⁶ From this place he wrote to D. Gerlach, that he had been led into error through Calvinism, and cautioned others to avoid that system.⁷ The undisputed, undeniable testimony of history, thus demonstrates that the first appearance of heresies after the Reformation, arose in Reformed countries; and all unite in ascribing it to the same cause. In Geneva, the Palatinate, the Netherlands, France, Poland, and other places, in all of which the Reformed system prevailed; these consequences followed.

¹ *Guerike*, Kirch. Gesch. vol. 3, p. 553, sixth ed.

² *Andrea*, disp. "Quod Calvinianismus viam aperiat Arianismo et Muhametismo."

³ *Henke*, Kirch. Gesch. vol. 3, p. 545

⁴ *Hase*, Gesch. p. 463.

⁵ *Gerhard*, disp. "Nullus nostro tempore mihi notus factus est Arianus, qui non antea fuerit Calvinista Igitur, qui sibi timet, ne incidat in Arianismum, caveat Calvinismum."

⁶ *Guerike*, vol. 3, p. 553, note.

⁷ *Magirus*, "Widerlegung des Sapienisten," &c., p. 62. Neuser wrote to Gerlach, among other things: "Qui vult vitare Arianismum, caveat Calvinismum."

We do not wish to be understood as preferring charges; we merely quote undisputed, notorious facts. Nor do we assert that such errors were sanctioned by the Reformed church.— We wish merely to prove, that the reiterated charge, that the Lutheran doctrine leads to such “*issues*,” is false, and that indisputable history exhibits a different source.

Having thus shown the *origin* of these errors, in the age of the Reformation, we will now proceed to exhibit their source, in a later period. And here again, we are led to a similar result.

The gross errors which began to prevail in Germany in the latter end of the seventeenth, and commencement of the eighteenth century, had a foreign origin, and actually arose in Reformed countries. The speculations of a few windy philosophers never could have affected the soundness of Lutheran theology, had not powerful influences from abroad, which first took hold of men who were in authority, and who afterwards aided the more efficiently to spread the poison, by their name, station and power, operated against the faith. “The writings of innumerable deists, who arose in Reformed England; in the end of the seventeenth, and beginning of the eighteenth century * * * began to be circulated in Germany, about the middle of the eighteenth century, in German and French translations.”¹ Here we have the introduction of error from other than German sources. But even this gross deism of England, would not have generally prevailed, had it not been sustained by a new phase of error from a different source. “The trifling, frivolous French deism of the eighteenth century, infected, far and wide, the higher classes of the Germans.”²— Now that infidelity was once introduced, it unhappily found a powerful advocate in Frederick the great. This monarch was surrounded by French infidels, such as Voltaire, Maupertius, d’Argens, La Mettrie and others, and by their combined influence, the poison soon rapidly spread. Such was the origin of the infidelity that prevailed in Germany. It will be seen that it did *not* arise in the bosom of the Lutheran church, but was introduced from Reformed sources, sustained by infidels from Reformed countries, and aided by a monarch, whose dynasty adhered to the Reformed religion.

If any additional proof were needed, we might refer to the present religious condition of countries, almost exclusively

¹ *Guerike*, vol. 3, p. 478. Vide et Henke, vol. 9, p. 487, seqq.

² *Ibid.* vol. 3, p. 479.

Reformed. Let us commence with England, and having witnessed the effects of her infidel productions, let us pass over into France, and observe that frivolous, volatile nation almost universally given to infidelity ; then let us pass through Holland, the Netherlands, Hungary, the Palatinate, Poland, until we light upon Switzerland ; then let us examine the condition of Heidelberg and Geneva ; and, as we pause in this theatre of Calvin's fatalism, and Servetus' horrid death, let us turn a brief look to Bremen and Berlin, and the dark shades in the gloomy picture are completed ; we have testimony sufficient, that neither Lutherans, nor Lutheran countries, nor the Lutheran religion, produced the sad "issues" so frequently charged against us. If such a charge had been founded in fact, and if other systems of religion possessed an inherent antidote against the prevalence of error, why is it that the very seats and head-quarters of those systems, first produced heresy, and have since presented a deep-rooted opposition to the Gospel ? In 1817, the theologians of Geneva, could boldly venture to forbid their candidates for ordination, to maintain the union of the humanity with the deity of Christ, and to command them not to preach respecting original sin, and the operations of divine grace.¹ In the same year, the rabble of Geneva, in their furious madness against the truth, uttered the horrible imprecations : "A bas Christ, á bas les religionnaires ! á mort ! á la lanterne !" Such an extreme of blasphemy, no Lutheran country ever yet produced. In Lausanne, a liberty-tree was erected in 1845, as the signal of vulgar opposition to Christ, as the rabble exclaimed ; "behold here the tree of liberty ; be still about your Christ."²

We again remind the reader that it gives us no pleasure to advert to these facts. But when false charges are so long urged against the church, to our great injury, it is a matter of duty and conscience, to state the actual truth. And if these facts seem somewhat tart, let it also be remembered, that we have been forced to bring them up in self-defence, so that our opponents have themselves to blame. These are melancholy reminiscences, rendered still more so by the superadded fact, that for almost a century, religious bigotry has striven to divert attention from itself, by holding up and exaggerating the imagined defects of the church. Nor should these developments of human nature be overlooked in the history of our race, as they will afford additional illustrations of the truth of the Gospel,

¹ *Guerike*, vol. 3, p. 594.

² *Ibid* vol. 3, p. 597, note.

not only sustaining the doctrine of human depravity, but also, magnifying the grace of God, in devising means for the Redemption of a race so corrupt and guilty.

Such were the wrongs which the church has endured in this country; such the difficulties she encountered, and such the obstacles she had to surmount. A person not acquainted with the result, might naturally exclaim; such formidable, continued and powerful influences, must have overwhelmed the church! But, was this the issue? In the face of all her wrongs and injuries, she has not only escaped annihilation, but gradually triumphed over every obstacle. Her very sufferings nerved her energies, fired her zeal, and ennobled her character. In defiance of sectarian bigotry, prejudice and enmity; her symbols have been maintained, her doctrines promulgated and her borders extended. Her historical *moment*, missionary enterprise and unparalleled literature; her noble champions, her glowing poetry, her ascetic theology, have been the exhaustless sources from which others have drawn; have become the wonder of the knowing, though they often strove to destroy the fountain, after they had slaked their thirst. And, at the present time, the church has assumed a character, and is putting forth an energy, that, aided by her historical, indisputable advantages, she looks forward to a development, extent and influence, that will place her, where she ought to be, in the very centre of the sacramental host of God, as the mighty standard bearer, in the struggles of Zion.

ARTICLE VI.

PAUL GERHARD.

By John G. Morris, D. D., Baltimore, Md.

SUCH frequent allusion has been recently made to Paul Gerhard in various journals, and so many of his incomparable hymns have been translated into our language, that an introduction to the nearer acquaintance of this "sweet singer of Israel" may not be unacceptable to the lovers of sacred poetry.—Besides this, there is evidently a growing disposition to become more familiar with the illustrious men of our church of the olden time, and that man would render an eminent service who would reproduce their portraits in life-like colors and

set them before us in all their brilliant array. What a gallery of distinguished worthies! What a *Walhalla* of the great and good and wise of the three last centuries!

As a theologian, a preacher, and above all, as a sacred poet, Paul Gerhard will be remembered and revered, by the Lutheran church and all other German communions, in all ages and in all lands. Uncounted numbers of pious worshippers are every Lord's day edified by the singing of his hymns "in the great congregation," and multitudes are daily encouraged in their most holy faith by the private reading of these admirable productions.

Gerhard is more to the German churches than Watts or any other poet to the English. His hymns are more numerous and not less spiritual. They are less liable to dilution and adulteration, and are ingrafted into the very constitution of German worship. We might dispense with Watts quietly, but a revolution would be necessary to exterminate Gerhard. There are other German sacred poets, and of the highest style of excellence, it is true, but Gerhard is the mighty master, before whom they all bow in reverential submission.

He lived in troublous times. From his twelfth to his forty-second year, the bloody Thirty years' war desolated the fairest portions of Europe. Fire and sword, famine and pestilence laid waste her proudest cities and ruined her most fertile provinces. The tocsin of war sounded terribly all over the land, and death and destruction followed in the train of the infuriated foe. Protestant and Catholic were arrayed against each other in the deadly fight, and as is usual, in all religious wars, the unholy strife was carried on with the most unrelenting barbarity.—But there was another contest that raged most violently during the life of Gerhard. Protestants were engaged in virulent controversy among themselves. Lutherans and Reformed were discussing in most unamiable temper the hair-splitting distinctions of their respective creeds. It was not alone the Professors in their chairs, nor preachers in their pulpits, nor writers in their books, but the common people themselves, who were carrying on this logomachy with the fiercest acrimony. The most rancorous hate, the most bitter malignity, the most vulgar personal and denominational abuse, characterized this controversy. The whole Protestant church of Germany was in a blaze, and all the alienation of feeling and the disruption of fraternal ties usually attendant on violent theological warfare, were universally felt.

One may well suppose that this was not a period suited to the gentle spirit of Gerhard, but he lived through it all and

was even compelled to take no inconspicuous part in it. In the seasons of deepest dejection, he would grasp his harp and sing as David did, to lull the tumult of his soul and soothe the anguish of his wounded spirit. His deep piety for a long time seems to have protected him against the perils of the word strife of the schools. He never lost sight of the only star that guides the believer to the haven of peace and never elevated mere scholastic orthodoxy above holiness of heart and life. It may be also, that foreign influences were exerted upon him, and that the reading of Arndt's True Christianity, which had just then appeared, preserved him from the contamination so rife around him. But a poet is not apt to be dragged down from the summit of Parnassus into the dirty arena of theological strife. His soul disdains such inharmonious pursuits. He dwells in another atmosphere and holds communion with more refined spirits.

During the whole Thirty years' war, Gerhard was without a pastoral charge. He was over forty years old before he had the care of souls. He gained his subsistence by teaching and spent his leisure hours in writing poetry. The horrors of war, the sufferings of his countrymen and the afflictions of Zion were fruitful themes for his pen. He regarded the war as a judgment of God on the guilty nations, for they had degenerated into the licentiousness of the heathen.—In flowing numbers, sweet as angels' voices, he calls on the people to turn their hearts to God. Like the prophet Joel, he warns them against still greater evils, and when at last, the storm is over—the thunder of artillery no longer reverberates through the land—the conflagration extinguished and peace again scatters her blessings all around, the poet breaks forth in most enrapturing strains. He calls on the people and the church to snatch their harps from the willows and send aloft a shout of praise to the God of their deliverance:

Wohl auf, und nimm nun wieder,
Dein Saitenspiel hervor,
O Deutschland! singe Lieder
Im hohen vollen Chor.

During this period of suffering, Gerhard was himself often in personal peril. It was after escaping imminent danger on one occasion that he wrote that beautiful hymn,

Wach auf, mein Herz und singe,
Dem Schöpfer aller Dinge,
Dem Geber aller Güter
Dem frommen Menschenhüter.

Every remarkable event of his life was the occasion of some admirable poetical effusion, and all so pious, so lovely, so divine. He was in constant intercourse with God, and the more gloomy were his prospects, the more profound was his confidence and the more bright his hopes of heaven. The greater his need the nearer was he to God.

After untold anxieties and sufferings in being driven from place to place and earning a poor subsistence, he at length found a comfortable situation as private instructor in the family of Berthold, an officer of state in Berlin. It was a pious family, the children of which had been trained in the fear of the Lord. Gerhard was now a happy man. — He had a home among those who sympathized with him as a christian, and appreciated his talents and labors as a poet. There was one member of the family, who especially harmonized with the tenderest emotions of his heart. An accomplished poet and a handsome, intelligent young lady dwelling under the same roof are apt, it is said, to betray extraordinary sensibility towards each other in a very short period. Love and poetry are intimately associated.

Frederick William, the great Elector of Brandenburg, had taken a decided stand on the Reformed side of the theological discussions of the day. The majority of his subjects were Lutheran, and they were mortified to desperation, to see the Elector and the Court promoting the cause of the Reformed with all their influence and authority. Reformed professors were appointed to vacancies in Lutheran theological Faculties, and other unmistakable evidences of the Electoral preferences were given. Gerhard, as a strict and conscientious Lutheran, regarded all this with fearful apprehension. He was nearly forty years of age, and was as yet nothing but a bachelor candidate. He feared that the probabilities of success in Brandenburg, under such a government, were but small; and how could he expect to consummate his most ardent wishes and establish a home for himself? He daily saw one before him who would adorn a palace. Anna Berthold was lovely in his eyes. Besides possessing uncommon attractions of person and mind, she was truly pious. The Scriptures were her daily companion, and she had an extraordinary gift of prayer. She was a dutiful and affectionate daughter, and a pattern of every filial virtue. She was not indifferent to the constrained attentions of the poet, but could he, a poor man — a dependent preacher — a destitute instructor of a lawyer's children, aspire to the hand of his patron's daughter? — here was a struggle — a season of extreme solicitude! — It was a poet in love — a

christian poet, whose passion was moderated and refined by high christian principle, but the emotion was still strong as death. But he submitted to God. He looked beyond this life and revelled in the anticipations of a blissful eternity.—About this time, he was also severely afflicted by sickness, and amid these multiplied anxieties, he wrote that incomparable hymn :

Warum sollt ich mich den grämen, &c.

It was thus that almost every circumstance of his life drew forth some beautiful hymn. His feelings naturally flowed out in verse of the most tender character.

Fierce temptations often assailed him — “the pains of hell gat hold upon him—he found trouble and sorrow,” and who but Gerhard, in such a state of mind, could write that most noble composition,

Schwing dich auf zu deinem Gott,
Du betrübte Seele,
Warum liegst du Gott zum Spott,
In der Schwermuths-Höhle?
Merk'st du nicht des Satans List,
Er will durch sein Kämpfen
Deinen Trost, den Jesus Christ
Dir erworben, dämpfen.

But we are not to suppose that all his hymns were of the same melancholy tone. Joy and gladness often filled his pious soul, and he warbled forth his extacy in most thrilling song. His *Lob- und Dank-Lieder* speak the fervid emotions of his grateful spirit, and they impart to the reader a portion of the same blissful feelings. The most profound gratitude, the most ardent love, the most cheering hope fill his heart. Penetrated with these emotions he hails the advent of the church, in that imperishable hymn :

Wie soll ich Dich empfangen,
Und wie begegn' ich Dir ?
O aller Welt Verlangen !
O meiner Seelen Zier ?
O Jesu, Jesu, setze
Mir selbst die Fackel bei,
Damit, was Dich ergötze,
Mir kund und wissend sei.

The coming of the Savior, with the benefits of his redemption, is represented in most glowing language, — the poet's soul glows with fervor as he hails the rising of the Sun of Righteousness on a darkened world.

The Thirty Years' War had terminated. Peace was proclaimed. Dilapidated churches were rebuilt — exiled pastors

were restored—vacant parishes were filled—schools were reëstablished—trade and commerce revived—agriculture was resumed, and yet there was no station found for Gerhard. All his attempts to gain a place were fruitless. His heart was cast down, but to this circumstance we owe that excellent hymn:

Ich hab' in Gottes Herz und Sinn,
Mein Herz und Sinn ergeben, &c.

Never were pious resignation to God's will—complete subjection to His sovereignty—perfect patience under disappointment and sorrow more beautifully and impressively uttered than in that hymn. We do not think it possible for human language to express a more thorough acquiescence in the decrees of Providence. This was the character of Gerhard's piety, and to be in all things of the same mind with God, is the perfection of piety.

He did not in vain admonish himself to patience. Daylight begins to appear after a long night of gloom,—the horizon is streaked with the first blush of the morning—the hill tops are gilded with a roseate hue,—hope comes to the bosom of this mourning son of song.

But, before we accompany him in this new career of life, let us take another view of him as a church poet. Until now, his hymns were accidental and personal. They were occasioned by the times, and were the breathings out of his own religious experience. They were such as every poetical genius writes in the retirement of his closet, and which are never designed to see the light or be published to the world. But Gerhard was to become the sacred poet of his own and of future times.

The Papal church, since the fourth century, had possessed a rich treasure of hymns. Many of these are of the most exalted and refined character—deeply spiritual and full of poetic unction. But they were all written in the Latin language, and of course unintelligible to the common people. The priests alone sang them at the altar, and the people were not edified by these sacerdotal solos. It was the Reformation by Luther that restored this department of public worship to the church. The language of the people became the language of the church, and when Luther published his own hymns, in an incredibly short time, all the Evangelical churches resounded with their melody. The arches of the old cathedrals reverberated the joyful sound as it went up from thousands of happy worshippers, who were not prevented by false delicacy or natural imperfection of voice, from giving full vent to all its force. Luther's hymns were also sung in the private resi-

dences of the well conditioned citizens and in the cottages of the poor peasants. Every where was heard the voice of the singers, for their tongues were loosed by the power of the truth. The church invited the nations to join the anthem of praise, and cried out, "O come, let us sing unto the Lord a new song; Let us heartily rejoice in the strength of our salvation." The nations heard, and as the chorus came sweeping over the land, they joined their voices, until it became universal.

Other men, such as Weisse, the Hermanns, Selnecker and Ringwaldt, had written hymns before Gerhard, which were extensively used in the churches. Gerhard revered his poetical brethren of the church, and was influenced much by the deep pathos and elevated piety of their church songs. Some of his most exquisite compositions are evidently founded on some of theirs, but in style, in metre, and in every thing else external, they could no longer be models for him. Whilst they were natural, popular, and suited to the times, they were, in many instances, disjointed, unmelodious and rough. Gerhard made a wonderful improvement in smoothness of versification, in purity of style, in beauty of language, and in propriety of figure. Whilst there was more art, there was no less of nature than in his predecessors; he was more ornamental, though no less popular; he was more refined, though no less vigorous; he was more melodious, though no less spiritual. The improved times called for improved church hymns. He labored for Zion as a poet, even if Providence did not open a way for him as a pastor. Though he afterwards labored as a preacher, yet it is Gerhard the poet whom we especially know. As his reputation as a sacred poet rose, the Lutheran ministers of Berlin now began to appreciate the attainments and poetical genius of the obscure private teacher. They particularly admired his strong adhesion to the Lutheran confessions in those days of presumed, if not real, persecution. They gave him an occasional opportunity of preaching in their pulpits. He became popular as a preacher, for he was now well known as a poet, but his godly life contributed more than all, to gain for him the respect of the people. In all these things he probably anticipated an approaching change in his outward circumstances. His clerical friends all encouraged him with hopes—he needed encouragement, for he was now forty-four years of age, and still a homeless candidate. But he did not despair. He trusted in God, and wrote the hymn,

Ich singe Dir mit Herz und Mund,
Herr, meines Herzens Lust—

This time his hopes were not destined to be disappointed—his persevering confidence was to be rewarded. A vacancy occurred in a neighboring town, and the magistracy of the place requested the Ministerium at Berlin to recommend a suitable person to fill it. They unanimously recommended Gerhard without his knowledge, and he was elected.

We may well imagine with what feelings he received this call. After twenty years of patient waiting and trouble, his object was at last gained—his mind was at peace, and he gave utterance to his feelings in a beautiful hymn.

On November 18, 1651, he was ordained, and on that day signed the following declaration in the Ordination Book:—"In the name of the Holy and Indivisible Trinity,—I confess and declare that the doctrine which is embraced in the unaltered Augsburg Confession and its Apology, in the Schmalkald Articles, in the Catechisms of Luther and the Form of Concord, is established distinctly and firmly on the foundation of the Scriptures, and that, by God's help, I will adhere unchangeably to this faith to the end of my life."

With this confession, which was made with the most profound sincerity, he entered on the discharge of his clerical functions, at Mittenwalde. He had exalted views of the responsibility of his office, which in that day was no sinecure in the Lutheran church. The Sunday sermons required an uncommon degree of preparation. It was necessary that they should bear the marks of mature study, and the taste of the times demanded that they should be of a full hour's duration. No baptismal, funeral or matrimonial service was performed without the accompaniment of a long discourse. The communion was administered every week. The communicants were numerous, and every one of them had a private interview with the pastor. The young people were catechised twice a week, and besides all this, numerous pastoral visits to the sick and others, were to be paid. We can hence, have some idea of the multiplied labors of Gerhard in the first year of his ministry. He had not much time to indulge his natural inclination to poetry, but still, genuine poetical talent cannot be altogether suppressed by outward circumstances. There are few or no poets by nature, who ever wholly break their harps or hang them on the wall. Gerhard occasionally sung in the midst of all his pastoral engagements and anxieties, and by degrees, the latent poetic fire burnt forth in all its original vehemence.

With all his fame as a poet—with all his popularity as a preacher—with all his attainments as a theologian—with all

his strong trust in the Providence of God, he still felt there was something wanting to complete his happiness. He felt uneasy—he looked around him and within him for the cause. He could find none; at length he came to the conclusion that it was his solitary life, and if he had one to share his anxieties, he would be perfectly happy. Anna Berthold was still unmarried, but could he, a clerical bachelor of forty-five, expect to gain the hand of the young lady of twenty-three? After long deliberation, and prayer and trembling, he succeeded. Then came forth that splendid paraphrase of Prov. 31, in which the wise man characterizes a virtuous woman. Gerhard has put it into beautiful verse, and Anna was the model.

He was married on February 11, 1655. He conveyed his bride to his humble home, deeming himself the happiest man alive. His apprehensions that the youthful bride would encounter many inconveniences and privations in the confined limits of his village parsonage, were realized. Her husband's numerous engagements often left her in dreary solitude, and she longed after more congenial society than the place afforded. Gerhard observed her disquietude, and sought to cheer her melancholy spirit by striking the wires of Zion's harp. He wrote an ode suited to her state of mind. She recovered her cheerfulness, and discharged all her domestic duties with a lively assiduity, and was in all respects a perfect pattern of a christian housewife.

But domestic sorrows were also allotted to Gerhard. The happiest family is also called on to mourn. The loveliest earthly Paradise also bears briars. The death of his first born overwhelmed him with grief. We have no hymn referring particularly to this melancholy event, for it doubtless required all his faith and time, by prayer and exhortation, to support the crushed spirit of his wife.

There were other sources of uneasiness and anxiety. His increased expenses—a small income—the dejection of his wife, together with unpleasant official relations to his colleague, weighed heavily on his mind. These, and other difficulties grew daily. Anna saw no hope of relief—she anticipated the severest privations—she went about mourning all the day.—Gerhard preached consolation, and quoted that beautiful passage, Ps. 37: 5. "Commit thy way unto the Lord: trust in him also, and he shall bring it to pass." Full of this sentiment, he retired to the garden, and there, under an arbor, wrote that well-known hymn,

Befiehl du deine Wege.¹

¹ For a good English translation of this hymn, see this Rev. No. 5, p. 135.

It consists of twelve stanzas, each beginning with a word of the scriptural passage. The whole is most admirably managed. He brought it in—read it to the disconsolate wife, and no wonder she was comforted. It expresses the most complete submission to the divine will, and the fullest confidence that God would send deliverance from all their sorrows.

On the evening of the same day, a messenger delivered to him a large sealed letter from the magistracy of Berlin, the very sight of which greatly alarmed the nervous and sensitive Anna. Gerhard broke the seal and read it. It was a call to the diaconate of St. Nicolai in Berlin! He re-read it with tears—all his anxieties about support were now at an end. In the rapture of his heart, he said to his wife, “see how God provides!—did I not say, ‘commit thy ways to the Lord!’”

But he did not rashly accept the call. It was only after much deliberation, that he yielded to the solicitations of the magistracy, and in July, 1657, he removed to Berlin. Fervent prayer, deep searching of heart, and self-abasement characterized his entrance on the duties of his new station. It was then that he wrote that sweet hymn,

Ich weiss, mein Gott, dass all' mein Thun, &c.

He moved among a people who loved him—his colleagues revered him—the whole christian community respected him. The first five years were passed without any extraordinary trials. He was, however, afterwards deeply afflicted by the loss of several children. Every father will feel the full force of the following stanza of a hymn, written on such an occasion.

Ach! wie muss doch ein ein'ges Kind
Bei uns auf dieser Erden,
Da man doch nichts als Bosheit find't,
So hoch geschonet werden.
Wie hitzt, wie brennt der Vatersinn
Wie giebt, wie schenkt er alles hin,
Eh' als Er an das Schenken,
Des Ein'gen nur will denken.

During this period, he appears to have written many of his finest compositions, and to have attained an extraordinary celebrity.

But the lute of song was not the only instrument on which he was called to play at Berlin. There was another which he was compelled to grasp. It gave out no sweet sounds—it breathed forth no melodious notes. Its tones were rough, discordant, unmusical. It was the war trumpet of the polemic.

The relations of the Lutheran church in Brandenburg, were, at that time, peculiar and critical. Gerhard was devoted to her

interests with all his heart. The difficulties with the Reformed had not diminished. The Elector favored the latter, and many of his measures were regarded by the Lutherans as oppressive, and restrictive of the liberty of conscience. Thus, for instance, Pomarius was for a time suspended from office for a sharp attack on the Reformed Court Preacher, Bergius, and was at last totally discharged and exiled, for a sermon against the Reformed faith. All this, and more that might be mentioned, only tended to establish the Lutherans more firmly in their creed. The theological war raged most fiercely—the churches resounded with most unlovely anathemas—the pulpits were the arena of a furious gladiatorship—the presses groaned under the weight of the *heaviest* books, and the whole country was in a heat of polemical wrath. After many futile proclamations to peace on the part of the Elector, one of which even forbade his subjects to study at the Lutheran university of Wittenberg, he at length ordered a conference to be held between the Reformed and Lutheran Theologians of Berlin and Cologne, on the Spree. Gerhard took an active part in it.—The conference met. There was much parleying, and even dodging, before the preliminaries were settled, and much cross and bush fighting after the contest began. It was a long time even, before they determined which point, precisely, to fight about. The doctrine of the Lord's Supper was finally hit upon. The combatants entered the arena—the signal was given—the contest raged fiercely for a while—blow succeeded blow, but after all, for the most part, it was blows in the air. There was more noise than pain—more words than wounds. They finally agreed to stop the discussion, and mutually vowed, that whilst each party would most pertinaciously adhere to its dogmas, yet that they would show each other all christian respect, and most heartily desire each other's salvation! With this they might have been contented, but it was not only peace which the Reformed desired—it was union, and the Lutherans were expected to make concessions. This occasioned another long discussion. The Elector became impatient, and he took no pains to conceal his displeasure with the Lutherans. They did not yield, and even the electoral displeasure could not bend their sturdy necks. Gerhard was a prime combatant in all these various and protracted controversies, and during this period, we see but few hymns from his pen. Can there be any thing so uncongenial with poetic inspiration, as acrimonious, theological controversy? The war finally terminated, and like most others of a similar character, each party was only the

more firmly convinced of the truth of his position, and the less inclined to love his dissentient brother.

Gerhard's theological writings, which this controversy elicited, are said to display a masterly exhibition of the Lutheran system, associated with extensive learning, vast comprehensiveness of view, acute discrimination, and wonderful polemical skill.

He had leisure now for the more special discharge of his pastoral duties. His new born son, Paul Frederick, gladdened his heart—but he was not without domestic troubles. His father-in-law's death deeply afflicted him. After a season of tranquility, the ecclesiastical horizon again began to be covered with portentous clouds. The Lutheran clergy trembled, for an edict was issued by the Elector, forbidding the clergy, on pain of deposition, from charging any of their brethren with false doctrine—from condemning opposing parties—from deducing any mischievous result from positions maintained, and he ordered, moreover, that exorcism in baptism should be left to the choice of the parents of the baptized child.

This edict was manifestly aimed at the Lutheran clergy, and of course, it occasioned among them a general alarm. They saw that their liberty of conscience was invaded, and they held it to be their conscientious duty to maintain the purity of their doctrine, and hence, also, publicly to refute false doctrine, and by proper and logical inference, to show its dangerous results.

Gerhard, and most of his clerical brethren, were in a dreadful predicament. They did not wish to disobey their lawful sovereign, nor, on the other hand, could they respect the edict, which they regarded as manifestly against the word of God. In this state of alarm, they presented an humble petition to his electoral grace, beseeching him to allow them now, as formerly, unrestricted liberty of conscience, and to grant to the Lutherans, the same privileges which even the Romish church enjoyed. The petition was contemptuously thrown aside, and an order was at the same time issued, that every man of them should bind himself by a written pledge, to follow out the edict, on pain of dismissal from office. Many clergymen of the country signed the declaration—many others hesitated long.—The Berliners would not decide for themselves, and asked the opinion and advice of the theologians of Leipzig, Helmstadt, Jena, Wittenberg, Hamburg and Nurnberg.

The opinions of these learned men were various. The scruples of the Berliners were not removed. In the meantime, they sought to escape the pledge by silence. But the Elector was not to be put off—he was not that sort of man. He heard

of their asking foreign theologians whether they, his subjects, should obey his laws, and this enraged him. He conceived that herein they showed mistrust and disobedience. He was not to be trifled with, and immediately ordered the recusants to appear before the Consistorium, there to deliver up the recorded opinions of the foreign theologians, sign the declaration, or be deposed. Two days after, the order was somewhat modified. Only two of the recusants were ordered to appear—time was given to the others for consideration, but final disobedience was to end in dismissal. On the appointed day, two of them were cited. Gerhard accompanied them! They could not say, as Paul said on an analogous occasion, “no man stood by me.” The aged Lilius, and the unyielding Reinhardt refused to sign, and they were deposed. Gerhard and the others were threatened with the same punishment. Notwithstanding the alarming example made of Lilius and Reinhardt, they determined not to sign. They declared this to the magistrate, and besought him to use his influence with the Elector, to have the two deposed ministers restored, without signing the pledge. The magistrate interceded. The clergy, at the same time, presented a petition, promising also to send, in a few days, their conscientious scruples, which they humbly hoped, the Elector would respect. A curt, repulsive reply was given, and even the declaration of their scruples, sent in, a few days after, was ungraciously received.

Naturally much alarmed at this, they renewed their petition and promised to refrain from all severe crimination of their opponents and made such other concessions as the edict required. In a word, they yielded. They were not prepared at that time to lose their places, their bread, and, probably, their lives for their theological dogmas.

If the Elector had been impartial in this affair, he might have been satisfied with their acknowledgment. But he was not. He was pledged to one of the parties, and was as bigoted in his faith as were the Lutherans. Still the business had to be settled. The deposition of two worthy ministers had created much excitement. It was regarded as a direct attack against the liberty of conscience, and, particularly, as an assault on the Lutherans. The people complained that the Reformed faith was to be forced on their consciences, and that the Lutheran worship was to be obstructed and changed. These complaints became so loud and general, that the Elector felt compelled, by a public proclamation, to dispel these apprehensions of his subjects, and to justify his conduct towards the two expelled ministers. This encouraged the magistracy and citi-

zens to renew their petition for the restoration of these men. The Elector granted it so far as to give Lilius further time for reflection, but as for Reinhardt, who was the prime disturber of the church's peace, he was exiled on the spot, and the others were to hold themselves in readiness to sign. Reinhardt left the country, and his former colleagues in vain, once more, declared their peaceful intentions.

The Electoral legislature now interfered and besought His Grace to exercise moderation. They brought up various acts of the government, that seemed to justify the course of the clergy. Measures were adopted in concert with the Elector to settle the dispute, but they could not agree upon the exact mode. In the mean time, the Council or Legislature adjourned. The Elector went to Cleves and thus the matter was left undecided.

Gerhard had determined from the beginning, not to sign the declaration. He now hoped to escape it altogether, but when he reflected on the resolute character of the Elector, he was still full of apprehension. He looked forward with dread to the time, when he, like Reinhardt, should be turned away without a home, or bread or hope.

Some time after this, the aged Lilius was induced to recant, — he signed and was restored. The Elector, in his letter to the Consistorium, particularly designated Gerhard as one of the most obstinate, and ordered him to be cited. He appeared and was informed of the Electoral will, — sign or suffer. He refused. Though charged with contumacy, eight days were allowed him for deliberation. At first, he accepted of the proposition, but immediately after, said that he had considered it long enough and would not change his mind! In the name of the Elector he was deposed, and Paul Gerhard ceased to be the minister of St. Nicolai!

We need not be in doubt, how he received this long threatened blow. His confidence in God was not shaken, but how could his sickly, desponding wife, endure the disaster? A general sympathy was felt for him, — the people were overwhelmed with grief at the thought of losing such a gifted pastor as Gerhard. They united with the town councils in a petition in his behalf. The petition was forwarded to Cleves. The Elector replied that he knew nothing about the remarkable piety of Gerhard, for which he was so highly extolled in the petition, — he only knew that he was an obstinate, stiff-necked Lutheran, who would not sign himself and influenced his colleagues to follow his pernicious example, and that he did not regard this as any evidence of piety, — he must sign or quit the country.

The publication of this reply alarmed and excited the citizens. They met together and consulted. They renewed their most earnest petition. It was unkindly received. The Elector charged the petitioners with sedition, exaggeration and even falsehood, and he forbade the officer to hand in any other petitions from that quarter.

All access to the Electoral favor was now hemmed up. An application from the Council even met with similar treatment. Nothing was left for Gerhard now, but for his congregation and numerous friends to show their sympathy, and by their liberality to secure him against want. Thus deposed, what was he to do? He turned again to his long neglected harp, and once more tuned its strings and sang, if possible, more sweetly than ever.

Eleven months were thus passed. His friends in the meanwhile, gathered round him, and he did not suffer, at least, for the necessaries of life. — The Elector returned to Berlin.— He sent for the magistrate, and ordered him to reinstate Gerhard!! He even sent his own private secretary to inform him of the fact, which was an act of extraordinary favor and condescension. The joy was general, and Gerhard was the only one who did not participate in it. Although he resumed a portion of his official duties, he would not take upon himself the whole. He feared the Elector was under a false impression of his position, and that he had changed his views with regard to the Form of Concord, for he would not purchase his restoration at the expense of even suspected change of principle.—The result of the whole affair was, that Gerhard could not conscientiously re-enter on his office with the conditions annexed by the Elector. His fate was now decided,—he took leave of his attached people, and retired again into the privacy of domestic life.

An edition of his hymns was published, and it is likely that he derived a portion of his support from that source. He continued to write, and maintained the same simplicity—the same accommodation to the popular feeling and comprehension, that distinguished him from the beginning. He sustained a truly national character, whilst the secular poetry of the Germans of that day was an affected imitation of foreign models, full of conceit, exaggeration and bombast.

His congregation could not be persuaded to give him up. They still hoped to have him restored, and hesitated about calling a successor. Thus he lived, beloved and honored by his congregation and admired by the whole christian population of Berlin.

He was soon called to part with his beloved Anna, and this was the severest trial of his life. — In the meantime the Elector had relaxed the rigors of the edict, but it was still not satisfactory to Gerhard and he could not avail himself of the Electoral favor.

He was afterwards permitted to accept a call from Lübben, though in his sixty-second year; he was not kindly treated at this place, and after seven years of anxiety and toil among an ungrateful people, he died in peace on the 7th of June, 1678. He had lived a pious and godly life, and he has left him in his incomparable hymns a monument more durable than brass.

ARTICLE VII.

LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY. The death of Otto Von Gerlach, which took place at the close of the last year, excited universal regret amongst the friends of Evangelical religion, in his Fatherland. He was a truly pious and able minister of the New Testament. His Commentary on the Old Testament was unfinished at the time of his death, but the remaining volume will be prepared by a competent hand. A very interesting biographical sketch of this eminent servant of God is contained in the December number of Hengstenberg's *Evangelische Kirchen Zeitung*. Otto von Gerlach was born in Berlin, April 12th, 1801, and died in December, 1849. The narrative in Hengstenberg closes thus: "G. after he reached maturity was not more than twice seriously ill, and both times, contagion from attending the sick was the cause. Consequences of the first of these attacks threatened his physical frame, which had thus far been vigorous, very seriously, and indicated death. He returned from a long sojourn in Silesia, during the Summer, in which he associated, with the care of his health, benevolent agency, in a condition not improved but worse. Heavily oppressed, he felt his end certainly approaching, but nevertheless employed himself in new labors for the winter. Notwithstanding his affliction and the positive prohibition of his physician, he yielded to the desire to appear in the pulpit on the 20 p. Trin.—after a long absence from it. With more than usual life, fire, he preached on the wedding garment, without which no one can be admitted to the marriage supper of the Lamb. But zeal for the house of God broke him down; he returned home exceedingly ill; three days afterwards he died. *Voluit, quiescit*, this may be his Epitaph: his be the rest which he regarded and sought as the highest good! His heavenly Father has given him rest from his toils."

The April number of the *Studien u. Critiken* contains the following articles:

I. Aristotle's sensuous theory vindicated; a contribution to Christian Apologetics, by Dr. Roth, of Schönthal: II. On the Development of the System of Morals in the Reformed church, by Dr. Schweitzer, of Zurich; a second contribution on the subject, bringing the history from Amyraldus to Wolf: III. The Exodus of the Israelites from Egypt to the Red Sea; a critical dissertation by Professor Stickel, of Jena, with a map: IV. The Exegesis of Acts 10: 35, 36, by E. Pfeiffer: V. Exposition of Romans 5: 6, seq. by J. A. Kunze: VI. Review of Solomon's Temple, by Bähr: VII. a Review of Nevin's "Mystical Presence," by Ebrard: VIII. The Original Relation of the Church to the State within the limits of Evangelical Protestantism, by Dr. Daniel Schenkel. 2d article.

The January and February numbers of *Harless' Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche* have been received. The January number contains, 1. a Contribution to Christology, which is a defence of his views, by Dr. Thomasius, in answer to objections made by Dr. Liebner, in a notice of his articles on that subject in former numbers of the *Zeitschrift* — afterwards published in a separate volume.

2d. A short History and Estimate of the value of the different editions of the entire works of Dr. Martin Luther. This we consider a highly useful article, now that the works of Luther are so much sought after. We will endeavor to present it hereafter in our review as a guide to those who may desire to obtain the works of the immortal Reformer.

3. Some contributions to the article: "Die innere Mission und ihre Stellung in der Kirche," in the November number of the *Zeitschrift*.

The contents of the February number are, 1st. Thoughts on the Word and Sacraments; 2. Defence of Protestant Missionaries; 3. The Sect of Irving; 4. The Irvingites, "or we are not Protestants;" 5. Theological Aphorisms. This to us is decidedly the most interesting of our German religious periodicals. Dr. Harless, recently called to fill the place of Court preacher at Dresden, once filled by Spener, is known as an orthodox and pious divine — decidedly symbolical in his tendencies. A powerful preacher and an eminent biblical critic, he occupies, at the present moment, a most attractive position. All eyes are turned to him and much is expected of him in his new sphere of labor. The successor of Von Ammon, who followed Reinhard, he may be expected to exert an influence in favor of orthodoxy and vital piety, which could have had no encouragement under his rationalistic, predecessor and were exposed to powerful counteractions under the more orthodox, able and excellent Reinhard.

The Co-editors of the *Zeitschrift* are Dr. J. W. Fr. Höfing, Dr. Gottfried Thomasius, Dr. J. Chr. K. Hoffmann, Professors of Theology in Erlangen.

The first volume of Hengstenberg on the Apocalypse has been published and come to hand. It is a stout volume, containing 632 pages. The second volume will appear during the current year. The first forty-eight pages are taken up with discussing the time at which it was written; and the author unhesitatingly ascribes it to the reign of Domitian near its close, the author, of course, John the Apostle. The work is much less combined with exegetical material than we expected, although it presents all the results of the

most thorough learning, and can be read with the deepest interest, by the intelligent layman, as well as by the learned divine. Bengel is a great favorite with the author and is frequently cited by him, though his views of the Apocalypse are essentially different from Bengel's. It cannot fail to be highly satisfactory to all who have not determined that they must find each important event of history foretold in this wonderful book. It is a book for the heart as well as for the head. We shall anxiously look for the remaining volume, and then may furnish an extended review of the whole. In the meantime, we can recommend it to those who desire something good on a too much neglected portion of God's word. K.

Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie u. Kirche. The first No. of this able Review for 1850, contains a more than usually varied collection of articles. The first, by Superintendent *Dr. Frantz*, is a notice, based upon the Minutes of their proceedings, of the Conference of the members and friends of the Lutheran church, held at Leipzig on the 29th and 30th of August, 1849. This article is highly satisfactory, giving a clear view of the proceedings in question, and exhibiting the life and spirit with which the Lutheran church is now exerting itself for its own re-organization throughout Germany.—The second is a lecture by *Dr. Fr. Delitsch*, upon the relation of the prophecy in Isaiah 52: 13—c. 53. to the connected prophecies of the Old Testament which proclaim a Savior.—The third Article from the pen of *Dr. Rudelbach* bears the title, "*Statechurchism and Religious freedom. A historical view of the past and of the future, with an application of the same to the present state of the church.*" The sins of the state against the church are here set forth in a masterly manner, and the natural inference in favor of the liberation of the church from the tyranny of the state unhesitatingly drawn. The fourth Art. by *Rev. Karl Ernst* is upon "*The church and church power. Thoughts on the present projects for new church constitutions; drawn from the confessions of the church. For Lutherans.*" At this we had not time even to glance, though the title is attractive enough.—The fifth Art. by *Rev. J. F. Seeberg*, is "*Rahab, or the lie of necessity, a contribution to Katechetics, founded upon Jos. 2. Heb. 11: 31. and James 2: 25.*"—The sixth is an antiquarian notice of some Manuscripts in the library of the Prince of Oettingen, by *T. F. Karrer*.

The bibliographical notices have their usual variety and piquancy. The contents of the second No. for 1850, are as follows:

I. *Essays*; 1) By *A. G. Rudelbach*, Statechurchism and religious freedom, Historical retrospects and anticipations: with their application to the present circumstances of the church. No. II.

2) By *L. Wolff*. On Presbyteries; a Synodical Address.

3) By *W. Münchmeyer*. The dotation of the German Lutheran church in relation to its doctrine and its progressive reformation.

4) By *C. P. Caspari*. On the Syro-ephraemitish war under Jotham and Ahaz.

5) By *Fr. Schöving*. Old Testament exegesis. Exodus iii, 21 etc. xi, 2—xii, 35 etc.

II. *General Bibliography of the latest theological literature.*

III. *Church questions and decisions*; 1) By C. F. Caspari. On Pistorius' views in opposition to baptism by Rationalists.

2) By J. Diedrich. For self-examination.

2. *Theologische Studien u. Kritiken*. This periodical appears with great punctuality. We received its third No. from Germany before most of the Reviews in this country for the corresponding quarter had made their appearance. It is superfluous for us to say that it still maintains its well-established reputation as a theological journal. Its contents are the following "*Essays* :

1. *Lücke* : friendly reminiscences of Dr. W. M. L. de Wette.

2. *Creuzer* : on new contributions to Jewish history from Greek historians.

3. *Schweizer* : the development of ethical philosophy in the Reformed church.

And the following "*Thoughts and observations* :

1. *Laufs* : on St. Paul's discourse before the Areopagites, Acts xvii, 22–32.

2. *Böttcher* : addenda to the "Exegetico-critical gleanings from the O. T."

3. *Mertz* : Appendix to the Review of Dr. Bähr's Temple of Solomon.

4. *Müller* : A narrative of occurrences at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530.

A Review of Malon, on the author of the book "De imitatione Christi," by von Bähring.

The *Ecclesiastical* department contains an article by *Heppe*, on the character of the German Reformed church and its relation to Lutheranism and to Calvinism.

Dr. Hagenbach has published his "*Discourse at the funeral of De Wette*" (Rede bei der Beerdigung des Hrn. Dr. u. Prof. W. M. L. de Wette). Basel (Schweighäuser). 8. — The third part of *Hävernick's* "*Handbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das alte Testament*," prepared by *Dr. Keil* of Dorpat, made its appearance last year from the press of L. Heyder at Erlangen, VIII and 52 opp. 8vo. price 2 Thl.—The prolific pen of *Rudolph Stier* has also sent forth two new exegetical works on the *Proverbs* under the titles "*Der Weise ein König*," (pp. 305.) and "*Die Politik der Weisheit*" &c. (pp. 146.) both from the press of Langewiesche in Barmen.—The third edition of *Dr. Tholuck's* "*Alte Testament im neuen Testament*," is published by Perthes in Hamburg—the whole work has been re-written.—The distinguished geographer, *K. Ritter*, has published the discourse which he delivered before the Scientific Association of Berlin on "*Lynch's Expedition to the Dead Sea*," under the title, "*Der Jordan u. die Beschiffung des Todten Meeres*," pp. 38. price $\frac{1}{3}$ Thlr.—*W. Löhe* publishes his ideas upon church-government in a work entitled, "*Aphorismen über die neutestamentlichen Aemter u. ihr Verhältniss zur Gemeinde*." 140 gr. S. 10 Ngr.—*L. F. W. Stier* writes upon the same subject, "*Die bevorstehende Umgestaltung der evangelisch-protestantischen Kirche*."—A new edition of the writings of Justin Martyr, superintended by J. C. T. Otto, has been published by Mauke in Jena, under the title of "*S. JUSTINI Philosophi et Martyris Opera quae feruntur omnia*."—Wiegandt of Berlin is publishing a new edition of St. Bernard's works (*S. BERNARDI Opera omnia*. Tom. I. *De Consideratione libri V*. Curante C. F. Th. Schneider.) 126 pp. small 8vo. price 15 Ngr.—An autobiography of the celebrated *J. Val. Andreaä*, edited by F. H. Rheinwald, has made its appearance under the following title: "*Jo. Valent. Andreae Vita ab ipso conscripta, ve Autographo*" etc. nunc primum edidit F. H. R. cum Icone et Chirographo Andreano." From the press of Schultz at Berlin—price 1 Thlr. 18 Ngr.—*Bengel's* son has published a new edition of his celebrated father's well known "*Gnomon*," under the following title: "*D. JOH. ALBERTI BENGELII Gnomon Novi Testamenti*," etc. "*Editio tertia per filium superstitem*" etc. *adjuvante Johanne*

Steucl. — Prof. Piper has edited the “*Evangelisches Jahrbuch für 1850.*” The contributions are from the pens of such men as Arndt, Becker, Henry, Heubner, Krummacher, Lange, Neander, Ranke, Ullman, &c. which ought to be a sufficient guaranty for its general excellence. It consists chiefly of biographical sketches of distinguished christians from the age of St. Paul to that of Martin Luther, written in a popular style. Svo. price, 4 Thlr. R.

Geschichte der deutschen National-Literatur von A. F. C. VILMAR, 4te Auflage, Marburg, 1850.

This admirable work, on the national (poetic) Literature of Germany, has, in a very short time, reached its fourth edition, the last of which, published in four numbers, has just been completed. A few general references will exhibit the character of this work.

The author reduces the Literature of the Germans to three distinct periods. The first embraces the *most ancient* (aelteste) poetry of the nation, commencing about the middle of the fourth, and terminating about the middle of the twelfth century. This period includes the conflict of the ancient national life of Germany, with the genius of Christianity, until the latter triumphed over and penetrated all the elements of German life. It is distinguished by a very ancient, remarkable and truly excellent translation of the Bible, by *Ulfila*, a Bishop of the western Goths. This translation was long held in veneration, forming the basis of subsequent improvements of the German tongue. It had become obsolete and unknown during the dark ages; and was in modern times again made public, through the efforts of German antiquarians. This period likewise gave birth to a number of national songs, detailing in true epic style, the noble and heroic deeds of their chiefs, and forming the foundation of similar productions in succeeding ages.

The second period, which he terms the *old* (die alte zeit), begins in the middle of the 12th century, and ends in 1624. The distinction between the poetry of these two periods is striking, affording an interesting view of the advancement of society in civilization, the arts and sciences. Whilst the national songs of the *most ancient* time exhibit man under the influence of nature, furnishing a natural transcript of his real unsophisticated character, they display also much beauty and pathos. They paid no attention to rhyme or measure, but were accustomed to introduce as many words as possible in each line, commencing with the same letter; as e. g. in a more modern poet:

“Friede dir, freudiger Frost der Nacht
Blinkende blanke Blume des Schnees.”

By this kind of alliteration, most of this ancient poetry is marked. But in the second period a marked change occurred. Christianity had now penetrated and modified the general character of Teutonic life; and consequently all their productions, no less than their individual character, experienced an important modification. There is less nature, less of the magnificent and heroic, but more art and regularity, mingled with the elements of a more advanced civilization. This period embraces that distinguished, unequalled and exciting Epic, the so-called Nibelungenlied. This “Epos,” which in many respects equals, and in some exceeds the Iliad of Homer, the author describes at large, furnishing us with a detailed history of the startling, terrible incidents recorded in it. It is the grand poem of Germany. We shall prepare a translation for publication. Numerous other poems and fragments of poems are referred to, as the work of this period.

The third period commences 1624 and comes down to 1832, including the real classic period of German Literature. But as this period is more generally known, we need not enter into special description of it. We might add much that is interesting on this subject, and trace some of the characteristics of German life, at the present day, to the ancient habits of that people. Perhaps, however, some one better qualified, will hereafter afford us a more complete and special description of this excellent work. J. N. H.

THE
EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. VII.

JANUARY, 1851.

ARTICLE I.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT OF CHRIST, AS IT IS
PRESENTED IN THE SYMBOLICAL BOOKS OF THE EVANGELICAL
LUTHERAN CHURCH.

By Rev. Charles F. Schaeffer, D. D., Red Hook, N. Y.

THE venerable Reinhard, who was one of the brightest ornaments of the Church, and whose virtues and learning exerted a commanding influence in his day, delivered a discourse on one occasion, while he held the office of Court-Preacher in Dresden, which, unexpectedly, led to a protracted controversy. According to the admirable custom of Lutheran pastors in Europe, he preached a sermon on the anniversary of the Reformation in the year 1800, which specially referred to the history and the doctrines of the Church. It was his object to show, in this particular sermon, that the Church is indebted for her existence principally to the restoration of the doctrine of the free grace of God in Christ — a doctrine, long obscured, or entirely suppressed by Popery. His sovereign, by the advice of his Privy Council, directed that one or more copies of this noble discourse should be delivered to every church or congregation in his dominions, and significantly admonished the public teachers of religion to proclaim in their sermons, or when they visited the sick, or when they gave religious instructions to the young, the fundamental doctrines which this sermon discussed, namely: the free grace of God in Christ, justification by faith alone, the insufficiency of human virtue,

&c. During several subsequent years, numerous pamphlets or small volumes were published by different writers, of whom some advocated the doctrines of Reinhard and the Church, while others violently assailed them. The fidelity of the historic and doctrinal statements which he had made, was not impugned, but the doctrines themselves were unwelcome, and their philosophic truth or consistency with human reason was absolutely denied by the foul spirit of Rationalism, which still controlled many pulpits and professors' chairs at that period, and which was irritated by the renewed homage that was paid to the truths of the Bible and the Symbolical Books of the Church.¹

The eminent man, whose distinguished position in the Church, as well as the lustre of whose abilities and personal character gave additional importance to the controversy, which he was, however, far from having designedly provoked by his sermon, makes one remark in the latter, of which the following is the substance: While our Confessions of faith (Symbolical Books) introduce very numerous subjects, and copiously discuss the causes which rendered the Reformation necessary, still, their chief subject (Hauptinhalt) is the doctrine of the text, Romans 3 : 23—25, viz., that man is justified and saved by grace, without merit, through faith in Christ alone. He, then, illustrates the power and fidelity of Luther in pro-

¹The remote cause, which led to the delivery of this celebrated sermon, was peculiar. A bookseller of Leipsic, named Dyk, had submitted to Reinhard the manuscript of a catechetical work, with the expectation of receiving a recommendation which would increase the sale. To Reinhard's surprise, when he examined it, no reference whatever to the grace of God in Christ, as taught in the third chapter of Romans, was made in this catechism! He gave Dyk a written statement respecting this unpardonable omission, and, in accordance with his custom of committing to writing all homiletical ideas which occurred to him in the course of his studies or his experience, by which the *themes* of his sermons became remarkable for their variety, he was led, incidentally, as it seemed, to record among his materials for sermons the well-known proposition which formed, soon after, the theme of this sermon. (Poelitz — Reinhard n. s. Leben &c. II. p. 164). All the members of cabinet of the sovereign were present when it was delivered, and, so profound was the impression made upon them, that they immediately issued the "rescript" by the authority of their master to which we have referred above. This procedure distressed Reinhard exceedingly, as we learn from his letters to Schatter and Sarwey, not merely from the personal consideration, that many might suppose him to have suggested this course himself, with unbecoming vanity, but chiefly, because, on principle, he says, that he "never could approve of the issue of rescripts by the government which related, not to church discipline, but to points of faith." Still the uncommon sensation created throughout Germany by the publication of this sermon, produced many happy results. The joy which he experienced on finding, that Evangelical truth possessed such vast numbers of decided friends, consoled him alike for the mortification inflicted on him by this act of the government, and for the contumelious language in which his adversaries indulged.

claiming and adhering to this doctrine, and laments, in touching expressions, the indifference with which many regarded it in his day.

While the "orthodox churches" around us, adopt many of our leading views in reference to this general subject, there are certain features of the doctrine of the Atonement of Christ which are peculiar to our Church, and which do not re-appear in the Confessions of others. But if the doctrine of the mediatorial work of Christ, in its whole extent, is, according to Reinhard, the very life of Protestantism, or rather, of scriptural orthodoxy, we cannot consent to sacrifice one jot or tittle of it, for every portion must be of inestimable value. A high degree of importance, consequently, attaches to the question: *What are the doctrinal views of the Evangelical Lutheran Church respecting the Atonement?* The answer, which we propose to submit, will, incidentally, notice certain variations in the creeds of other ecclesiastical bodies. As our object is simply to set forth the form in which this doctrine appears in our Symbols, we shall omit the proof-passages from Scripture, which are presented in every respectable theological treatise on the subject, and are here assumed as well-known. Our present design does not require us to notice the philological aspects of the subject (*καταλλαγή, ἀπολύτρωσις, at-one-ment, &c.*), nor will our limits permit us to enlarge on the necessity, extent, &c., of the Atonement.

Briefly expressed, our doctrine of the Atonement is the following: The effect of sin, both original and actual, was, not only to render man guilty, but also to leave him utterly incapable of obtaining salvation by his own works. Now Jesus Christ, who was both God and man, as our only Mediator, by his vicarious obedience to the law, and by his vicarious sufferings and death, offered, in both natures, a full satisfaction to divine justice; the effect of this atonement was a reconciliation between God and man. No merits or satisfactions, besides those of Christ, can have any efficacy in securing the pardon of sins: neither are they necessary, since the work of Christ was completely performed, when he made an atonement for man according to his two natures, and as well by his whole life as by his sufferings and death. By the grace of God, the benefits of this atonement are freely offered to all men, and are imparted, in all their fullness, to those who repent and believe. "Scripture teaches us, that the righteousness of faith before God consists alone in his merciful, that is, his gratuitous reconciliation, or in the remission of sins, which, through grace only, and solely on account of the merit of Christ the

Mediator, is given to us, and apprehended or received only through faith in the promise of the Gospel." F. C. p. 689.¹ This "merit" of Christ is equivalent to his perfect obedience to the law, both in his life and his death, involving also the idea of his sinlessness, and gives him a claim to blessedness which is transferred or imparted to the believer.

The following quotations from our Symbolical Books, founded on both the Latin and German copies, set forth our views still more fully. "Our churches teach that — — Christ, truly God and truly man, who was born of the Virgin Mary, truly suffered, was crucified, died and was buried, in order that he might reconcile the Father to us, and be a sacrifice not only for original sin, but also for all the actual sins of men." Augsb. Conf. Art. III. See also Art. IV. "This (doctrine, viz., that God is propitious to us on account of the satisfaction of Christ, and not on account of our fulfilling of the law) is taught by Paul, Gal. 3: 13, when he says: 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us,' that is, the law condemns all men, but Christ, by suffering the punishment of sin, while he was himself without sin, and by being made a victim for us, took away that right (or claim) of the law, so that it may not accuse and condemn those who believe on him, because he himself is the propitiation for them, on account of which propitiation, they are regarded as just." Apology, p. 93. "The death of Christ is a satisfaction not only for guilt, but also for eternal death." *ibid.* p. 190. "The remaining portions of this article (i. e. Art. II. of the Apostles' Creed) set forth — — what it cost Christ — — to gain us — — namely, that he became a man — — and besides, suffered, died and was buried, that he might make satisfaction for me, and bear my guilt, for which I should have suffered, and that, not with gold and silver, but with his precious blood." Large Catech. p. 494.

Our doctrine is adequately expressed, not simply by the term "vicarious death," but by "vicarious obedience or satisfaction" which comprehends the former. A "vicar," is "in a general sense, a person deputed or authorized to perform the functions of another; a substitute in office." (Webster). A vicarious *act* is one that is performed by one person in place of another. Thus Christ as our substitute or vicar, fulfilled the law, and

¹F. C. is the usual abbreviation of the name of the *Formula Concordiæ*, which the Germans have always called *Concordienformel* or *Eintrachtsformel* in their own language, and for which we prefer, in English, *Concord-Formula* as possibly a more exact rendering than *Form of Concord*, which is a neater term, but a less faithful version.

suffered the punishment of sin, whereby he satisfied the justice of God. Hence, our Symbols say: "Christ made satisfaction for our sins by his death." Augsb. Conf. Art. IV. "We teach that the sacrifice of Christ dying on the cross, was sufficient for the sins of the whole world, and that we do not need any other sacrifices (such as canonical satisfactions, masses, pilgrimages, fastings, &c. imposed by the church of Rome), as if that one sacrifice were not sufficient for our sins." Apol. p. 201. The following passage, (a translation of the combined Latin and German), is one of the most important: "Two things belong to a Mediator and Propitiator. First, a word or promise of God, from which we may learn with confidence that he will have pity on all those who call on him through this Mediator, and that he will hear them. (Here various appropriate Scripture passages follow, John 16 : 23, 24, &c., and the popish doctrine of the invocation of saints is rejected — the symbol proceeds): Secondly, that the merits of this Propitiator should be set forth as a satisfaction for others, who should consequently partake of them by a divine imputation, in such a manner that they may thereby be accounted just or righteous as fully as if these merits were personally their own. When a friend pays a debt which another owes, the latter is freed from the debt by the payment of his friend, as fully as if it were his own act. Thus, the merits of Christ are given and imputed to us, so that we are accounted righteous by our faith in his merits, when we believe in him, as if these merits were our own." Apol. p. 226. The Church, consequently, believes that Christ's perfect obedience is accepted in place of our own, and is imputed to us, but only when we exercise faith, and come to God through Christ. Without a genuine change of heart, the merits of Christ, according to our Church, are not imputed, and do not save the impenitent from eternal death.

We possess, however, additional developments of the doctrine of the Atonement, which, if we are faithful to the cause of truth, we can never consent to suppress. The strong attachment of the Lutheran to the Symbolical Books is produced chiefly, it is true, by their own intrinsic value, as a body of pure and unadulterated truth; still, their claims on our reverence, merely in a historical point of view, are also very powerful; their agency, in deciding important doctrinal questions connected with the Atonement, and in restoring internal peace to the Church, cannot be too highly appreciated. It is self-evident that two doctrines which contradict each other, cannot both be true. Now when only one of these is openly profess-

ed, or when neither is elevated to the rank of an article of faith, we may easily account for the silence of any special Creed on that particular point; hence, the earlier creeds of the Church (the three ecumenical Symbols), which were prepared previous to the Reformation, are exceedingly brief. Even the Augsburg Confession, to which many inconsiderately desire to restrict us, confines itself chiefly to the points of faith to which the circumstances of the times had given special importance. But when the minds of men are powerfully urged to investigate truth, and leading spirits propose new views, others often arise who refuse their sanction to these novel dogmas. When such new views affect established doctrines, and either confirm or contradict them, they cannot be dismissed merely with a smile of acquiescence, or a frown of disapprobation. If two statements are found to be antagonistic, one of which is certainly false, and if the Church really possesses an infallible guide in the Scriptures, or if she sincerely values truth more than error, she cannot allow a dangerous error to prevail without contradiction. In the course of time, as the doctrine of the Atonement was more profoundly studied, it was contemplated in various aspects in which the ancient Church had never been invited to consider it, and, while many of these new views were wisely adapted to explain divine truth, others threatened to undermine the whole structure of the Christian faith, unless they were promptly and sternly disavowed. New theological terms were also gradually introduced, expressive of a certain orthodox or heterodox form of faith, and the Church was compelled to discriminate between them, or permit a looseness of doctrine to become prevalent, which would have soon obliterated all the marks by which truth is distinguished from error. Such conflicting views were not only published after the earlier periods of the Reformation, but were loudly and tenaciously maintained by their respective adherents as essential portions of religious truth. The Concord-Formula here rendered the Church inestimable service, by examining questions of vital importance, which had not been previously investigated or decided in the earlier symbols, and by maintaining the unity and consistency of our holy faith. While we, therefore, regard the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Smalcald Articles, and the Small and Large Catechisms with undiminished reverence, we bless God that, in his gracious Providence, he permitted the Church to receive, in addition to these precious writings, the admirable Concord-Formula, which, while opposed by the unbeliever, and undervalued by the latitudinarian, will ever be regarded

by the Lutheran as the crown and glory of the Symbolical Books. As an illustration of our meaning, we refer to the decisions of this Creed respecting the *active* and *passive* obedience of Christ, and his mediatorship in *both* natures.

Previous to the age of Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, who died, A. D. 1109, theological authors had introduced the most discordant views respecting the atonement of Christ ; the established and recognized tenets of the Church were as often obscured or virtually suppressed, as they were illustrated and confirmed. At length, Anselm published the celebrated work entitled: *Cur Deus homo*, in which he presented a system better defined and more logically framed than any which had yet appeared, as well as distinguished by clearer views than any previous theological treatise had proposed. As our own Church-doctrine has been somewhat influenced by the Anselmic theory, without, however, sanctioning all its specifications, we present its leading features. They are the following: —

The honor and majesty of the infinite God had been outraged in an infinite degree by sin: the harmony of the plan, according to which he governed all things, had been disturbed: his authority had been practically denied when man sinned. His justice could not remit the punishment due to sin without receiving satisfaction;¹ by this word, originally applied by Tertullian (who died A. D. 220) to the atonement of Christ, Anselm understood a rendering to the justice of God of all that was due to it, in order to restore the violated honor of God and the harmony of the universe, which depended on the full recognition of God's sovereignty by every creature. The position in which man had placed himself by his sinful course admitted of no relief which his own acts could afford: the penalty which he justly incurred was temporal and eternal death; he could perform no good works that would be capable of atoning for his sin, of releasing him from the continued operation of the penalty, and of restoring him to divine favor, since obedience or the most faithful practice of virtue was simply a duty which he, as a creature, already owed to the Creator: he could expect relief neither from a fellow-mortal, since each individual of the human race was worthy of death, nor from an angel, since every *creature*, however holy and ex-

¹Our older theologians thus define the word: "*Satisfactio est actus officii sacerdotalis, quo Christus, ex decreto divino, consummatissima obedientia, activa et passiva, justitiæ divinæ, peccatis hominum læsæ, satisfacit, in laudem justitiæ et misericordiæ divinæ, et acquisitionem nostræ justitiæ et salutis.*"

alted in rank, is still a finite being and possesses no excellence or power in his own right: even an angel could not offer an atonement to the offended majesty of the infinite God which would be an equivalent for the offence committed, and would, without leading to his own perdition, fully restore fallen man. Now Christ, as God himself, could, as an infinite being, offer an expiation for infinite guilt, and, as man, he was capable of suffering death, and could also enable men to appropriate to themselves the merits of the sinless man, Christ Jesus. The reward to which he was, as man, entitled on account of his merits or obedience, and with which, as God, he could dispense, remained to be imputed to the human race.

Two different developments of this theory were subsequently presented by the Thomists and the Scotists. The former, agreeably to the views of the "angelic doctor" Thomas Aquinas (who died A. D. 1274), maintained that the satisfaction rendered by Christ, being *per se* of infinite value was more than sufficient, or more than divine justice could demand, and that it constituted a source of superabundant merit, but that, nevertheless, it contemplated original sin alone, while it left to men the work of atoning for their actual sins. This appendage to the Anselmic theory, adopted by the Dominicans and subsequently by the Jesuits, was virtually sanctioned by the Council of Trent, which, by its acts, afforded so many evidences of the absurdity of the claims of Popery to infallibility. The Scotists, espousing the views of the "subtile doctor" Duns Scotus, (who died A. D. 1308), and sustained by the Franciscans, denied that the satisfaction of Christ, which they also referred simply to original sin, was infinite, and held that while Christ merited salvation for himself by shedding his blood, and while that blood was sufficient for man's salvation, still, it was sufficient, not by its own infinite value, but because God was satisfied with it and *accepted* it as a sufficient atonement. The Arminians adopted the Scotistic view, and held that the merit of Christ was indeed only sufficient in part, but that God has accepted it as a full satisfaction; and this view is probably held by the Methodists. Their text-book (Watson's *Theol. Institutes*) presents the doctrine in these terms: "The death of Christ, then, is the satisfaction *accepted*; and this being a satisfaction to *justice*, that is, a *consideration* which satisfied God &c." Part II. Ch. 20, p. 271. "The only true sense of the sufferings of Christ being a full equivalent for the remission of the punishment due to the guilty, is, that they equally availed to the satisfying of Divine justice, and vindicating the authority of his laws, that they were equivalent, in

the estimation of a just Governor, in the administration of his laws, to the punishment of the guilty ; equivalent, in effect, to a *legal satisfaction*, which would consist in the enforcement upon the persons of the offenders of the penalty of the violated commandment." *ibid.* p. 272. The influence of the system of Grotius, which teaches an acceptance on the part of God, of an insufficient or incomplete atonement as a sufficient atonement is discernible in this representation. Many fatal objections may be made against the minuteness and boldness of the Arminian scheme, on which it is not, however, necessary to enlarge.

All these refinements of doctrine, which, frequently, terminate in sophistry and positive error, are calmly avoided by the Lutheran Church, which, in contradiction from the frivolous and heterodox opinions of many earlier writers, adopts, in conformity to the written word, several of the leading views presented by the Anselmic theory in their simplest form. Without presuming to penetrate the mysteries of God, or attempting to define a mode in which the death of Christ satisfied the justice of God, she rigidly holds to the fact, that a satisfaction *was* made, and discards all the additions with which Popery and the sects that arose after the Reformation, burdened the pure Scripture doctrine. The Church simply says: "These are required and are necessary to salvation, namely, the grace of God, the merit of Christ, and faith" &c. F. C. p. 687. But there were other points of vast importance, which the Church *has* decided in the Concord-Formula, to two of which, peculiar to her creed in their fullness and beauty, we have previously made an allusion. We distinguish between the *active* and the *passive* obedience of Christ: the former is a *legal* satisfaction, and consists of Christ's most perfect fulfilling of the law in our stead ; the latter, or *penal* satisfaction, is his most sufficient and voluntary endurance, in his vicarious death, of the penalties which man deserved. We subjoin the following extracts: "That righteousness which, before God, is imputed to faith or to believers, through grace alone, is, the obedience, suffering and resurrection of Christ, whereby he satisfied the law for our sakes, and made expiation for our sins. For since Christ was not only a man, but God and man in one undivided person, he was as little placed under the law, as he was subject to suffering and death, that is, as to his person, since he was the Lord of the law. Hence, his obedience, by which we mean not only that which he rendered to the Father in the whole course of his sufferings and in

his death, but also that by which, for our sakes, he voluntarily subjected himself to the law and fulfilled it, is imputed to us for righteousness, so that God, on account of this full and complete obedience, (which Christ actively and passively, or by works and sufferings in his life and death, rendered to his heavenly Father for our sakes) forgives our sins, regards us as just and righteous, and bestows upon us eternal salvation. His righteousness is exhibited to us by the Holy Spirit, through the Gospel and in the Sacraments, and is applied and appropriated by faith, &c. F. C. p. sq. 684, 685. "And thus our faith looks to the person of Christ, in as far as he subjected himself to the law for us, bore our sins, and, when he went to the Father, rendered a complete, absolute and most perfect obedience to his heavenly Father for us most miserable sinners, from his most holy birth to his death. By which obedience on his part he covered all our disobedience which adheres to our nature and its thoughts, words and works, so that our disobedience is not imputed to us unto condemnation, but through grace alone, for Christ's sake, is pardoned and remitted." F. C. p. 697. Traces of this emphatically Lutheran doctrine occur in several Reformed Symbols. The *Heidelberg Catechism* contains the following: "He is our Mediator, and by his innocence and perfect holiness he covers before the face of God my sins, in which I was conceived." Ans. to Qu. 36. The *Formula Consensus Helvetica*, Can. 15 and 16, discriminates still more clearly, and claims that both the active and passive obedience of Christ are given and imputed *to the elect*. This Confession, prepared by J. H. Heidegger of Zurich, in connection with F. Turretin of Geneva, and, at one time, extensively adopted, contains the following very sound statements: "rotundo asserit ore Spiritus Dei Christum sanctissima vita legi et justitiæ divinæ pro nobis satisfecisse, et pretium illud, quo empti sumus Deo, non in passionibus duntaxat, sed tota ejus vita legi conformata collocat. Morti autem vel sanguini Christi Redemptionem nostram vendicat haud alio sensu, quam quid is per passiones consummatus est. Atque ita quidem ab extremo illo terminante et nobilissimo actu, sine quo salus nostra constare non potuisset, quique omnium virtutum speculum fuit lucidissimum, denominationem facit, ut tamen a morte vitam anteactam neutiquam secludat." Calvin himself (Institutes, Book II. Chapt. xvi. § 5.) accords with us, in the following terms: (we copy from Allen's translation,) "Now in answer to the inquiry, how Christ . . . procured a righteousness to render him favorable and propitious to us, it may be replied in general, that he accomplished it by the whole course

of his obedience. This is proved by the testimony of Paul, (Romans 5: 19, Galat. 4: 4, 5, are here quoted) . . . Yet more precisely to define the means of our salvation (Allen does not here render the original with precision: *Scriptura tamen, quo certius definiat modum salutis, &c.*) the Scripture ascribes this in a peculiar manner to the death of Christ. . . . Yet there is no exclusion of the rest of the obedience which he performed in his life: as Paul comprehends the whole of it, from the beginning to the end, when he says that ‘he made himself of no reputation,’ &c. Phil. 2: 7, 8,” &c. Even Robert Barclay, the celebrated apologist of the Quakers, in his well-known “*Theol. v. chr. Apologia*,” of which he published an English translation in 1678, incidentally mentions the *integra obedientia* of Christ as a part of his work in connection with his *mors* and *passiones*. The peculiarities, however, of the Quaker doctrine of the Atonement we have no room to explain. They cannot be reconciled with our views.

The church of Rome does not distinctly recognize the “active obedience” of Christ, (Koellner, *Symb. d.-kathol.-Kirche*. Vol. II. p. 315), and the Arminians, who, like Episcopius, regard Christ not as the Lord of the law, but merely as its subject, positively disavow it. Hence the Methodist Watson (*Theol. Inst. Part II. Chapt. 20. p. 271*), who seems to be ignorant that any others besides “the Antinomians¹ connect the satisfaction of Christ with the doctrine of the imputation of his *active* righteousness to believers,” grows eloquent while he unfolds the Arminian theory and directs against a shadow those weapons which might be used with fatal effect against his own system. The Church-doctrine which widely differs from that of the Arminians, and, consequently, of the Methodists, teaches that while through the death of Christ, we are released from guilt and punishment, at the same time, through his virtue or obedience to the law during his life, as imputed to us, we are qualified to receive the reward of life eternal. It is established on passages like Matth. 5: 17; John 4: 34; 8: 29; Romans 5: 19; 8: 3, 4; 10: 4; Phil. 2: 8; 3: 9; Heb. 10: 7. The violence of the Socinians, Arminians and Rationalists, in impugning this doctrine, either accomplishes nothing, or is more destructive than it was designed by some

¹The gross errors of the Antinomians are rejected in Art. 6 of the Concord-Formula. See also, *ibid.* p. 714, (“Luther writes against the Antinomians” &c.) For an account of the Antinomian controversy, of Agricola, and of the firm position occupied by our Church in opposition to the dangerous views of the so-called Antinomians, we refer to the article of Thomasius in the last No. of this Review, p. 222 sq.

of them to be; that is, either the arguments directed against the imputation to the believer of Christ's *active* obedience are unsound, or they apply with equal force to the imputation to the believer of Christ's merits in any other sense and rob us of all hope of salvation through him. For, can we really assign an isolated position to his death, and divest his sinless life, his obedience, or his fulfilling of the law of all value? Without these essential features of his work, could his mere *suffering* of death constitute the work which he came to *do*? The apostle Paul, who regarded the incarnation and obedience of Christ, as parts of his mediatorial work, in his enlarged view of divine truth, comprehends even the resurrection as a part of that great work by which man is reconciled to God: Christ—he says, Rom. 4: 25,—was raised again for our justification. Commentators are agreed that our justification, in the theological sense of the term, is not the result exclusively of the resurrection; the apostle views *all* the obedience of Christ as mediatorial in its character, and this view alone will give harmony and power to various expressions that would otherwise appear to be either indistinct or contradictory. Thus, in the next chapter, he ascribes our justification to Christ's "blood," ch. 5: 9, and, in the following verse, our salvation to his "life." Thus, too, the earlier Symbol. books, adopting the more usual phraseology, give special prominence to the death of Christ; but before their completion, it was felt that this language did not express the *whole* truth, according to the strict requisitions of systematic theology, and hence the Concord-Formula presented the whole theory in its full development, in appropriate terms, and in strict accordance with the teachings of the Scriptures, and also with all the statements of the earlier symbols.¹ As the New Testament, with its more glorious revelations, beautifully harmonizes with the Old Testament, so the F. C., with its fuller statements, admirably explains and confirms the former Confessions. Since the active obedience of Christ, without his death, would not have been a full atonement, and since the latter constituted the most solemn feature of his whole work, the reasons for which a special importance is assigned to it in many passages of Scripture and of the Symb. Books may be easily understood, while such passages by no means intend to deny the meritorious character of other parts of his great

¹ Those writers who have vainly labored to discover a contradiction between the F. C. and the earlier Symbols on this point, have, in some cases, been influenced by motives as dishonest as those which actuated Strauss (*Leben Jesu*) in his unholy work of imagining contradictions between the several narratives of the Four Evangelists.

work. The Saviour could not have said: "I have *finished* the work," &c. John 17: 4, if it had not been even *commenced*—his active obedience had really been the beginning of that work, and its completion on the cross was near and certain when he uttered those words. A similar use of terms frequently occurs; for instance, if the five books of Moses are often called the "law," which is a distinguishing feature, still, that term does not deny that those books also contain history, doctrine, &c. Or if our church in France and elsewhere, as contradistinguished from Calvinistic or Reformed Protestants, is called the 'Church of the Augsburg Confession,'—a name which our older theologians often employed—such a designation is merely historical in its nature, implying that the A. C. was the first symbol of the church in point of time, by which Lutherans were known, and does not deny the validity or parity of rank of later Confessions. Precisely as the "children of Abraham," John 8: 39, are called the "children of Israel," the church of the A. C. might, with great propriety, be called after one of its most glorious treasures, *the Church of the Concord. Formula*. Thus, while the sufferings and death, or passive obedience of Christ, sustains our hopes, we gratefully appeal to his active obedience also, as a ground of our acceptance with God. *Christ is all our own*—his whole course was propitiatory in its nature, and the great work of the Atonement was not commenced, but "finished" on the cross.

We, further, believe, that Christ is our Mediator according to *both natures*. On our church-doctrine of the "two natures, the divine and the human, inseparably connected in the unity of the person," (A. C. Art. III.) it is not necessary to enlarge here, since it is well understood and acknowledged by orthodox denominations. While Osiander of Königsberg maintained, that Christ was our righteousness only according to his divine nature, his colleague Stancar held, that it was simply according to his human nature that Christ was our righteousness.¹ As a question of so grave a character, if left undecided,

¹ For a very clear exhibition of the Osiandrian errors, we again refer to the translation which the Editor of the Ev. Review furnished in the last No. (Oct. 1850, p. 225 sqq.) of an article by Thomasius. The freedom with which the latter expresses himself respecting the great work of G. J. Planck (Gesch. d. protest. Lehrbegriffs, 6 vols.) "who took pains to exercise impartiality towards all except the Lutherans," (p. 220), merits the attention of those who "regard him (Planck) as the highest authority, when he treats so slightly the Formula of Concord," (p. 222), and *who imitate him*. Köllner (Symbolik, I. 589), also, who respects the F. C. even if he concurs with Planck in supposing it to be "behind the age," remarks: "Planck ist nicht parteiisch gegen Catholiken und Reformirte, aber — gegen die Lutheraner!" He admits the high historic value of Planck's work, but laments the influ-

would have perpetually occasioned controversy, and cast a shadow on our faith, the F. C. here again introduced harmony and order; both opinions were rejected as erroneous, and the following positions, resting on the divine word were assumed by the church: "The sense in which Christ, in this question of justification, is called our righteousness, must be carefully noticed. Namely, our righteousness is founded neither on his divine, nor on his human nature, but on his whole person, since he, as God and man is our righteousness alone in his entire and most perfect obedience. For, even if Christ had been conceived of the Holy Ghost and born without sin, and in his human nature alone had fulfilled all righteousness, and yet had not been God, true and eternal, such obedience and suffering of his human nature could not be imputed to us for righteousness. And again, if the Son of God had not been made man, his divine nature could not be our righteousness. Wherefore, we believe, teach and confess, that the obedience, as a whole, of the whole person of Christ, which he rendered to the Father for our sakes, even to the most ignominious death of the cross, is imputed to us for righteousness. For his human nature alone, without the divine, would not have availed, by obedience or suffering, to satisfy the eternal and omnipotent God for the sins of the whole world. The divine nature alone, without the human, could not have performed the part of a Mediator between God and us, [being incapable of dying.] But since, as it was stated above, the obedience of Christ was not one nature alone, but of the whole person, it is therefore a most perfect satisfaction and expiation for the human race, by which satisfaction is rendered to that eternal

ence of his prejudices, by which he was led to do injustice to the Concord-Formula, and prevented from understanding the conduct of that noble man and profound theologian, Jacob Andreä, whom he flippantly terms the "lusty concord-maker from Suabia." On p. 586 Köllner gives references to some passages in Planck, which betray his jaundiced and sarcastic spirit. — We may here add an anecdote illustrative of the sagacity with which Luther could at once read the character of an individual. Andrew Osiander was remarkable not only for his varied learning, but also for his eloquence, but he was ambitious, obstinate, and even scurrilous in debate. It is said, that, on one occasion, when Luther had heard him deliver a discourse in Marburg, he turned, at its conclusion, to Melancthon and said: "Osiander has a proud spirit: he will cause much trouble in the Church after my death: bear this in mind, for you will live to see it." The prediction of Luther, like his doctrines, was absolute truth. — Francis Stancar, Professor of the Hebrew language in Königsberg, who had been commissioned by Albert of Prussia, to effect a reconciliation between Osiander and his opponents, unfortunately, divested himself of the character of a peace-maker, and adopted the passions of a partisan. He was led by the excitement of controversy to express doctrinal views diametrically opposed to those of Osiander, but equally unsound, and, ultimately, withdrew to Poland, where he died.

and immutable divine justice which is revealed in the law. That obedience is our righteousness," &c. F. C. p. 696. "We therefore reject these errors: I. That Christ is our righteousness before God, according to his divine nature alone; II, That he is our righteousness according to his human nature alone," &c. *ibid.* 697. "Christ is our Mediator, Redeemer, King, High-priest, Chief Shepherd, &c., not according to one nature, whether human or divine, but according to each nature," &c. *ibid.* p. 773.

These explicit declarations of the church are essential to a fair statement of the Lutheran doctrine, and while we heartily receive them, we do not apprehend that, at this late day, any sound scriptural exhibition of the doctrine of the Atonement will have any other result than that of establishing them.

All who recognize the authority of the Christian religion, alike acknowledge, that God possesses claims on man, and that the influence of Christ on our relations towards God have been salutary in the highest degree; but expressions less general and indefinite than these are, do not meet universal approbation. The Socinians differ widely from all others who confess Christ. In their view, Christ occupies the position of a wise and benevolent law-giver, whose death, merely as a demonstration of his sincerity and elevated principles, was quite a subordinate feature of his great work, or of his merits, for these, as they allege, properly consisted in the pure doctrines which he taught, and the holy example which he gave. Regarding Luther and his creed, doubtless, with the feelings which Rabshakeh expressed in reference to king Hezekiah and his creed, they declare our whole doctrine that Christ made a satisfactory atonement for our sins to be "fallacious, erroneous, contrary to Scripture, and very pernicious," (*Cat-Rac.* p. 268), and Christ's title to our gratitude arises solely from his doctrines, his example, his willingness to die, and his benevolent intentions; thus, while they profess that they regard his death as an event of vast importance, because it led to his own glorious resurrection, still, they divest it of its propitiatory character. If their peculiar system places them in the attitude of aliens, we can scarcely claim a greater affinity with the Greek Church. The Confessions of this communion admit, it is true, that the death of Christ was a propitiation, but they vitiate the truth by the adoption of erroneous views, which differ from many of those of the church of Rome only in being less unblushingly avowed. The latter adopts a system full of contradictions. The papist, discarding our own views, believes that the merit of Christ is actually superabundant, and

on it founds his whole lucrative system of indulgences ; again, while we believe, that by the influence of the merits of Christ, the guilt of both original sin and actual sins is removed in the case of the true believer, the papist, misguided by his lax views of human corruption, and by his Pelagian sentiments respecting human ability, limits the operation of Christ's atonement to original sin, and holds that, in the case of actual sins, our own merits or satisfaction must be added to the work of Christ, in order to win pardon for us. Such views were set forth by the Council of Trent, Sessio XIV, Cap. 8, and tended to establish the meritorious character of good works. It was, indeed, in reference to this point, in connection with canonical satisfactions, that, even in the earliest periods of the Reformation, our church came in conflict with the adherents of the Pope. While the Arminian, like the Papist, denies the entire efficacy of Christ's atonement, he rejects the remedy proposed by the latter ; the deficiency in the merits of Christ he supplies by assuming, that God received an imperfect atonement as equivalent to a full satisfaction for our sins, and leaves our objection unanswered, that, if, according to his principles, immutable justice might dispense with a large portion of the labors and sorrows which Christ endured, it might be content with even a less satisfaction than it did receive, or indeed, demand none at all.

While the orthodox Reformed Churches generally adopt our views respecting the sufficiency of the Atonement, a limitation of a peculiar kind is introduced into the Confessions of those which are governed by Calvinistic influences. The Westminster Confession, Chap. XI, 3, teaches, indeed, that "Christ, by his obedience and death, did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified," &c., but, nevertheless, it teaches that only those whom God has predestinated, are effectually called to salvation by Jesus Christ, (X. 1), and expressly says: "Others not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come to Christ, and therefore cannot be saved," *ibid.* X, 4. Such views are foreign to our system. The Episcopal Church,¹ originally governed by Lutheran influences, adopted, as far as it

¹ "But, as the government (of England) needed the support of the Protestants, so the Protestants needed the protection of the government. Much was therefore given up on both sides ; an union was effected ; and the fruit of that union was the Church of England. — — The man who took the chief part in settling the conditions of the alliance which produced the Anglican Church was Thomas Cranmer. — — Saintly in his professions, unscrupulous in his dealings, zealous for nothing, bold in speculation, a coward

ventures to speak, our doctrine, in Art. 31, of the "Thirty-nine Articles" in the following terms: "The offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone," &c. This seems intended to be a fuller statement than the Second Article contains. In the same article, and in the fourteenth, this confession also agrees with our own in rejecting the "Sacrifice of Masses" and "works of Supererogation." These portions have been transferred to the Methodist "Articles of Religion," and are adopted by the followers of Wesley without any change. Still, the two sects of the Episcopalians and the Methodists occupy positions which are left unguarded in a surprising manner. Our own views are so fully defined, and our whole system is so complete, so harmonious with itself, and so purely scriptural, that if many in Germany departed at one time from the faith, the conservative influences of our Confessions tend, by the blessing of God, to restore the purity of doctrine; the day is not far distant, when the reproaches now cast on the Church in Germany, will cease to be even partially deserved, and when the church will render practical honor to our Symbols by the victory of the orthodox faith which they will achieve. But when the meagre creeds of other religious bodies, like the "Thirty-nine Articles," are once abandoned, their feeble cry will never be effectual in reclaiming wanderers; interpretations of Scripture, that are new and false, but agreeable to human pride, will prevail and remain permanently, owing to the absence of the counterbalancing influence of sound and full confessions of faith. Hence

and a timeserver in action, a placable enemy and a lukewarm friend, he was in every way qualified to arrange the terms of the coalition between the religious and the worldly enemies of Popery. To this day the constitution, the doctrines and the services of the Church, retain the visible marks of the compromise from which she sprung. She occupied a middle position between the churches of Rome and Geneva," &c. Macaulay's History of England, Chap. I. — This historian, who seems to us to be making an effort to conceal the sarcastic mood in which he writes on the origin of the Episcopal Church, (its doctrines made to depend on policy, &c. and not on the decisions of the Bible!) omits, in the rapid sketch which he gives, all reference to the Lutheran source, from which proceeded the only elements of health and vigor possessed by the offspring of the *mésalliance* described in these extracts. Possibly, it occurred to his mind, that the child of parents brought together, not by holy affections, but by selfish interest, having, late in life, been taught the Catechism by Puseyism, and furnished with no better clothing than "rags of popery," might well draw forth expressions of pity rather than of indignation, when it amuses itself by consigning its "dissenting brethren to the uncovenanted mercies," &c.

when a general defection from the faith occurs in any church except our own, it is not probable that such a church will easily return to the religion of the Bible; the rays of light which it does possess will be extinguished by new sects, such as our church cannot possibly bring forth. We can, in our day, as little expect miracles in the moral as in the physical world. The husbandman, who casts away the seed which the Lord gave him, will find no good grain growing by a miracle in the field which should have been cultivated by his own labor and care.

The Baptists, whom we have not hitherto introduced, seem to maintain so little union among themselves, except in the fact that they *immerse* or *dip*, but never *baptize* in the Scriptural mode, that, as we might have *à priori* expected, they have no sympathies with us. Indeed, the few points of affinity which might, with some labor, be discovered, are lost in the chasm opened by their exclusive spirit between themselves and others.

It is difficult to define the position of the very numerous Congregational churches of New England, &c. The "Independent," published in New York, one of the ablest periodicals of the Congregationalists, in a recent article (August 1, 1850), denies that their churches, at least in New York, "have any common symbol or standard of faith. . . . Each Congregational church has its own confession of faith, as is true of most of the churches in New England. But, (adds the writer from whom we quote,) there is a *quasi* symbol of the churches at large in the Articles of Faith of the General Association of the State (of New York)." This symbol, consisting of fourteen Articles is then given in full. The following, appropriate in this connection, is Art. 7.: "The Lord Jesus Christ, who is both God and man in one person, has, by his sufferings and death, made a complete atonement for all mankind, and thereby laid the foundation for the offer of a free and full pardon, which is made indiscriminately to all, on the condition of repentance for sin, and faith in Christ." Even if we were disposed to give a favorable construction to this "foundation" &c. and to withdraw our objections to a term (foundation) so loose that even consistent Socinians readily adopt it, (for there is not, apparently, an allusion to 1 Corinth. 3: 11, where Christ *himself* is said to *be* the foundation) still, we would be deterred, when, in Art. 9, we are told that "God has, in the covenant of redemption, given to Christ *a part* of mankind, who were from all eternity predestinated" &c. The Scriptural doctrine of the Atonement, disrobed of its splendor, here ap-

pears so insignificant, and is so plainly vitiated by its admixture with Calvinism, as to compel us to adopt the conclusion, that New York and New England Congregationalism is essentially at variance with Lutheran principles. We sincerely regret this circumstance. The admiration which we, otherwise, entertain for this body of Christians is justified by the distinguished position attained by many of their pastors, the high rank to which many of the professors of their colleges and theological seminaries have risen, as teachers and authors, and the streams of benevolence which have flowed from their churches.

Indeed, none of the religious denominations to which we have referred, present the doctrine of the Atonement in a form so fully developed, and so strictly Scriptural as our own.— Their creeds are so general, so indefinite, so fearful of adopting emphatic language, that they present divine truth in a diluted rather than in a concentrated form. We regret, that all those to which we have had occasion to refer, are invariably characterized, either by the introduction of erroneous views that produce unsoundness in the whole doctrine, or by the omission of essential features, the effect of which is to destroy its integrity. Happily, our own creeds, which at an earlier period enlightened the Protestant world, still remain as guides and examples. Let us be faithful to them, and thank God for them. It would indeed be a “day of trouble and of rebuke” (Isaiah 37 : 3) in the history of the Church in America, in which those who are prepared to receive the creed of the Bible with unprejudiced and intelligent minds, and who have *actually read* the Concord-Formula, would begin to speak of it in unfriendly and disparaging terms.

The limits, however, which we assigned to this article, have long since been reached — and, indeed, we could not pursue this subject without entering the bounds of doctrines (justification — predestination, &c.) which, from their importance, claim a more extended notice, than our space permits us to give them. The present remarks, may, however, serve to exhibit the value, not merely of the earlier symbols, but also of the Concord-Formula, which cannot be disrupted from our established Creeds without essential loss. Our fellow-Christians of other names we love; we live in delightful union with them; our harmony in social life, in benevolent operations, &c. is perfect. We are not, however, so completely controlled by a morbid desire for “union,” as to suppress a single doctrinal statement which our Confessions contain. If the Church, according to the representations which we have given, seriously

differs from many religious denominations, even *they* could scarcely ask us to promote "Christian Union" by abandoning a truth which we prize as a gift of God. Let concessions come from those who arose long after our system was developed and proved to be, in all its features, God's own truth. Let these concessions come from those who first created *disunion* by the introduction of doctrines, which, because they were unsound, necessarily entered into conflict with our own. We would expect no favorable results from any "Evangelical Alliance" of different sects, which would require the Lutheran Church to abandon any of her doctrines. Could God's blessing rest on any plan of union which would demand of the Church even nothing more than *silence* respecting any part of the very truth, which, through his servant Luther, he restored to the world in all its divine fulness and splendor? Can any one of our Symbolical Books be abandoned without a sacrifice of God's truth? We may well tremble for the ark of God, when unholy hands begin to despoil it of its consecrated treasures. There is solemn truth in the words of Nicholas Selnecker, one of the associates of Chancellor Andreaë in preparing the Concord-Formula for publication, even if the vernacular idiom of his day and its orthography were more homely than they are in our age: "Wir können dessen gewiss seyn, dass, so lange man in diesen und andern Landen, Kirchen, und Schulen über dieser *Bekänntniss und Erklärung*, so in dem Christlichen Concordien-Buch verfasst, halten wird, so lange werde auch Richtigkeit in Gottes Wort, oder in der Lehre, ohne Schwermerey, neben anderm Seegen Gottes, bey uns seyn und bleiben. So bald aber von demselben richtigen Bekänntniss wird in geringsten abgesetzt werden, dass auch Gott, der uns diese grosse Wolthat noch zu letzt erzeiget hat, von uns absetzen, und allerley Lästörung und Schwermerey unter uns einreissen lassen werde."

ARTICLE II.

ANTIQUITY; AND THE CHURCH-FATHERS.

By Prof. H. I. Schmidt, D. D., New York.

THE propensity of mankind to go to extremes finds ample scope for exercise in the present age, in which, both in the field of speculation and in the multiform pursuits of active life, the spirit of unrest, of daring enterprize, of reckless experiment, of headlong action, of boundless covetousness, pre-

vails in all the affairs of men. The excessive activity displayed in our age, in every human concern, is productive both of good and of evil results; but to examine and discuss these is not our present purpose. The greatest evil connected with the developments of modern "progressiveness," is the ultraism in thought or theory, and in practical affairs, every where exhibited in men's style of living, in politics, in literature, in religion. The church feels to her innermost centre the effects of what the present century fondly regards as its great and imperative law of progress: a law conceived to be organic to the living and the coming age; — and that she has derived some great benefits from its influence on the mind and life of man, it would be foolish to deny. Whether these benefits are really to be sought, where men generally imagine that they find them, is a point open to question, but not to be here debated. But, whatever advantages the church may have derived from the supposed progressive tendency of the age, no thoughtful mind can doubt, that the same cause has inflicted upon her unspeakable injuries. As all is not gold that glitters, so neither is every movement which, with great parade, bustle and noise, announces as its motto: "go ahead," necessarily, or justly, to be regarded as progress. Men, who make too much haste to climb a slippery steep, are very likely to slip backward two, or even six feet, to every step they venture forward; nay, are very apt to lose their footing entirely, and to arrive, with most awkward dispatch, at the bottom, instead of at the top, of "the hill of difficulty." And furthermore, every extreme movement in one direction will inevitably provoke and produce its extreme opposite. Thus has it been in the church in divers respects that might be specified. We shall instance only a few. The excessive rigors of Puritanism, in sundry particulars, evoked the laxities, confessional and disciplinarian, of Unitarianism, whose religious mantle is wide enough to cover and shelter almost every variety of liberal opinion, nearly every shade of latitudinarian doctrine. The frigid torpor and slothful formalism of the Anglican establishment gave rise to certain fanatical developments, operations, and movements, which have swept, like a tornado, over the churches of our own land, in which a stagnation, that had gradually supervened, demanded a violent commotion for the purification of the vitiated elements. The same is true as respects the subject, which at present more particularly claims our attention. The inflated and self-sufficient spirit of ultra-protestantism, which held nothing sacred of which it could not perceive the *quomodo* and the *cui bono*, of which it could not explain the rationale,

and point out the utility, has presumed to condemn utterly the wisdom, to reject entirely the authority, of antiquity: to cast away that reverence and deference which are due to the early fathers of the church, to deny the sacredness and value of forms and institutions which have come down to us from the olden time, and to set up for itself in the exercise of unbounded congregational independence, to the total denial and abrogation of all authority in the church and her divinely appointed ministry; and this extreme of Protestant liberalism has led, in the church of England, and the Episcopal church of this country, to the extreme opposite developments of Puseyism, to an excessive regard for whatever is ancient, and an absolute, unquestioning submission to the authority of tradition and of the church. Here, as elsewhere, the right and safe path lies in the middle between the two extremes: "in medio tutissimus ibis." The claims of enlightened reason, the prerogatives of private judgment, when modestly urged and temperately enforced, are not to be authoritatively set aside, and haughtily scorned, under the pretence, that antiquity has long since settled what we are to believe and practice, and that the human understanding must, without inquiry, acquiesce in the decisions of the church, and bow submissive to the authority of her dignitaries, resigning to them the right of defining for all others the rule of faith and practice. But equally wrong and pernicious is the opposite assumption, so popular, and so generally acted upon at the present day, that the church and her ministry have no authority beyond what each individual, in his self-sufficient wisdom, may be willing to concede, and that the symbols and institutions of antiquity, the opinions and decisions of the fathers of the church are of no account whatever to the free inquiries, the mature thinkers, the profound theologians, the acute reasoners, the intelligent and liberal christians, of this enlightened age; that it matters nothing whatever to us, what those who lived in the days of the Apostles and in the ages immediately succeeding, declared to be the doctrines, the usages and the discipline of the church. That such is really the position of the great mass of Protestant christendom, will, however strongly we may be thought to have stated the case, plainly appear to every reflecting mind, which attentively reads and candidly weighs the views that are published, week after week, by the periodical religious press. The subject presents itself to us under a variety of phases, each of which it would be interesting minutely to examine, and separately to discuss. But there is one general view of it, which has of late found many staunch adherents,

and some very strenuous advocates in our own church, and which is therefore to us of special interest. It has been avowed in various forms, and proclaimed in divers connexions, and is becoming so imperious, dictatorial and overbearing, that to pass it by entirely unnoticed, might bring upon those, who are known to differ from its advocates, the charge of pusillanimity. We shall refrain from specifying any particular sources whence our information is derived, and merely state, in general terms, the position which has been, of late, so broadly and strongly taken.

It is contended, then, that, at this advanced stage of human culture, the views of the church-fathers are of no importance or weight whatever, and that altogether the authority of antiquity is null: = 0: it is maintained, gravely and solemnly asseverated, that the meanest capacity in the church of the present day has a clearer insight into divine truth, a more comprehensive and better understanding of the great doctrines of the Gospel, than the fathers could, by any possibility, have possessed; and finally, to give antiquity its coup-de-grace,—its deathblow, it is strenuously insisted, that we, who live in this enlightened nineteenth century, are the fathers, whereas those who have heretofore surreptitiously borne that appellation are, in reality, the children, fit only, if now living, to sit at our feet, and to drink in the lessons of wisdom that flow from our lips, and are distilled, like dew, from our patent steel-pens. This we conceive to be a fair and moderate statement of the views, of late so often and so broadly advanced, in various forms, in divers connexions, and for sundry purposes. In accordance with this opinion, those, who take a different view of the subject, those who acknowledge and admire the learning, and respect the wisdom, and render deference to the judgment of the fathers, are either ridiculed as anile weaklings, or summarily denounced as Puseyites. It would be more to the credit of these wise scholars of the nineteenth century, if, in the place of ridicule and denunciation, they were to use argument, and, by furnishing evidence that they have studied and comprehended the writings of the fathers, show that they really understand the subject, respecting which they so positively affirm.

Ere we proceed to any further discussion in the premises, we have yet two statements to premise: 1, for reasons which will be obvious to most of our readers, we shall, in speaking of the fathers, have regard not only to those ordinarily and strictly so called, but specially also to those of our own church,

to Luther and his coadjutors, and, at the same time, pass in review the claims to consideration belonging to antiquity in general. 2. For the view which has been stated to prevail extensively at the present day, relative to the subject under consideration, we have never seen any other reason whatever given, save this, that we live so many centuries later:—that, in addition to the knowledge possessed by the fathers, we have the advantage of the accumulated stores, of the ever-progressing discoveries of eighteen centuries:— that we must, of necessity, know more and understand better, than ever the fathers did or could, simply because the world is so much older now than it was in their day, and because the discoveries of science, made since their day, are already immense and constantly increasing. If any other argument has ever been advanced in behalf of the opinion which we are to examine, we frankly acknowledge our ignorance of it: we have never seen any. And we do not know that we can do better than to commence our discussion, by taking this argument, in respect of its logical value, as our first point.

We have never seen any proposition more susceptible of the *reductio ad absurdum*, than this which is advanced by recent writers against the authority of the fathers, or of antiquity in general. Let then our readers bear in mind that, according to the logic of our modern dialecticians, views of divine truth, of Scripture-doctrine, are valuable, worthy of consideration and deference, just in proportion as they are remote in their development from the age of the fathers, and that the least cultivated minds of the nineteenth century must necessarily be vastly superior in intelligence and wisdom to the strongest minds, the brightest intellects, the most learned heads of antiquity, simply and solely because they live eighteen or fourteen centuries later than the latter. The argument is complete in itself: it speaks for itself: it needs no further expansion; and we are ready for the inferences which may legitimately, nay which must be consistently, deduced from it; or rather, for the consequences which must inevitably result from its strict and consistent application. Let us then apply. The Unitarianism of New England is, by its advocates, strenuously asserted, and with much ingenuity and learning argued, to be the only correct scheme of gospel-truth, and possessed of the only sound and just principle on which the Scriptures of the New Testament can be correctly interpreted. This wonderful discovery, however, belongs to the eighteenth century, in which the human mind had not yet acquired all the lights which illumine the current century; and as it may, therefore, be re-

garded as somewhat behind the age, we can no longer venture to commend it to the acceptance of those whose views we are ventilating. Following, therefore, in the wake of human progress in wisdom and enlightenment, we again advance a step, and plant our foot on another grand and glorious discovery in the realms of truth. American Universalism, as it is well known to our readers in all its monstrous distortions of truth, and its utter repudiation of sound principle, is a child of the nineteenth century, and is, by its friends and advocates, declared to be directly and faithfully derived from the sacred Scriptures. They maintain, that until their illustrious leaders undertook to enlighten mankind, christians were deluded and gulled by stupid fire and brimstone theorists, blind leaders of the blind; and that their sagacious and profoundly learned divines alone understand how to interpret and expound correctly the word of God. According to the doctrines of those who repudiate the authority of the fathers, these Universalist expositors of the sacred oracles are worthy of all possible respect, credit and deference—at least until some new grand modern discovery has again superseded theirs—for do they not claim to be the only true exponents of the accumulated wisdom of ages,—and do they not live eighteen centuries later than Ignatius, Polycarp and Tertullian, and about fifteen later than Jerome and Augustine?

But this new grand discovery is not awanting:—indeed it has been made so many years ago, that Unitarianism and Universalism are quite old-fashioned and obsolete, and that we only wonder why the next great forward stride in human progress has not long since been taken. We would humbly suggest, as the only probable explanation, that human ingenuity and wisdom “can no farther go.” However this may be, the discovery here spoken of was made by a great German philosopher; and it was arrived at by profound study, by the keen inspection, analysis and classification of facts, by the acute critical examination of historical records, and by sagacious induction from one of the most magnificent foregone conclusions ever concocted by a human brain; and it is this: that the Gospel-history is a myth; that Jesus Christ is a mythological phantasm, constructed and conglutinated out of sundry vague and floating traditions; that miracles are impossible, and that the great scheme of human redemption is all a piece of trumpery patchwork, fit only to cover and make comfortable the infantile ignorance of the early church-fathers, and utterly unworthy the regard or notice of the intellectual Goliaths and

Samsons of this enlightened age. Here then is a discovery calculated to throw the admirers of modern enlightenment and wisdom into convulsions of delight and ecstasy. Its grand defect is, that it is only negative: it has been reached by a process of demolition and destruction. We stand, therefore, all agape, ready to take at a gulp the next grand development of the learning, and wisdom and intellectual power of the nineteenth century; to wit, the promulgation of an entirely new system of religion (provided we are really to be allowed any religion at all, which is by no means probable), which shall sweep every vestige of christianity from the face of the earth, and conduct mankind to the summit of intelligence, of moral excellence, and of sublunary bliss. According to the principles laid down by our opponents of the fathers, we are bound to receive, and to glory in, all these grand discoveries of modern times, and to look, with eager expectation, for still greater triumphs of the modern mind. We are bound to go forward with the spirit of the age; and the farther we get away from the fathers, the better. We are not dealing unfairly with those whose views we combat. They have laid down, without qualification, a broad principle, by which they judge, a general criterion according to which they estimate the relative importance and value of the ancients and moderns: for the sake of argument we grant them their postulate, and merely apply it as it must be applied. If they intend to maintain the ground which they have taken, that intelligence and wisdom necessarily increase in proportion to remoteness from antiquity, and that, at the present day, the meanest capacity has a clearer and better understanding of the great truths of religion than the fathers can have had, merely because we live eighteen or fourteen centuries later than they did, it is perfectly evident that they are in quite as awkward a predicament as those who go to the opposite extreme, and who accept and believe any and every doctrine, however erroneous or absurd, merely because it is some sixteen or seventeen centuries old, and because it was promulgated by one of the early fathers, or sanctioned by some old pope. Both, in order to be consistent, are equally bound to endorse the various developments either of antiquity, or of modern times, according to the position which they have respectively taken. But to do this is, as we have already seen, purely an outrage upon conscience and common sense, and involves, not one absurdity, but any conceivable number of absurdities. And therefore no such position will ever be taken by any calmly reflecting, unbiassed man: it can be taken only in the heat of party-spirit, and of controversy.

And we know very well that we shall here be met by a most earnest disclaimer. Those who so utterly repudiate the authority of the fathers, and regard with such intense and unqualified admiration the superior intelligence and wisdom of this enlightened and progressive century, will tell us, that they accept and approve the discoveries and progressive developments of our brilliant age, only inasmuch as they are evolved upon a true and sound basis, and go forward in a right direction. But what do this disclaimer and this declaration amount to? Obviously to a simple and total abandonment of the ground which they have taken against the fathers. For, let it be remembered those shocking opinions, those monstrous doctrinal developments, which we have called upon our anti-patristic friends to accept and endorse, in accordance with the broad principle, which they have, again and again, openly avowed, are all claimed to be the only just and true and sound results of correct Scripture-interpretation, or, in the last mentioned instance, of the only proper estimate of the Scriptures themselves, and of contemporaneous history. If then modern philological criticism and modern speculation and dogmatism can make the Sacred Word say any and every thing that sectarians, heretics, or philosophers please, how are we to determine whether men *are* on the true foundation, and advancing in the right direction? How are we to convince errorists, how are we to obtain the conviction ourselves, that our principles of criticism, that our hermeneutics, our doctrinal expositions, are sounder, more worthy of acceptation and deference? Simply by an appeal to antiquity, and to the *ὁμολογεῖν* of the church from the apostolic age; by a careful study of archaeology in its various departments — of things as familiar as their household furniture to those much despised and reviled ancients — nay, of the very writings of these contemned fathers, as among the most important aids in the exposition of the Scriptures. For what else is criticism¹ but a close, searching, often painfully laborious study of things ancient; of ancient languages, of ancient history, of ancient manners, and customs, and institutions: what is it, but the cautious and judicious application of knowledge, of facts obtained, of principles or rules derived, by means of such earnest and faithful search and inquiry after things, with which those whom so many moderns affect to despise, were, from their very position, intimately acquainted even from childhood; with respect to which we na-

¹ Considered as dealing with the Sacred Scriptures, with the Greek and Roman Classics, &c.

turally and necessarily expect them to impart to us much valuable information ; in the study of which we must, whether we will or not, take them as our instructors and guides.

Thus then the opponents of the Fathers, by the disclaimer and avowal which we suppose them to make, are encroaching upon the ground which *we* occupy ; and as *they*, by their own showing, have no right to be here, we must beg them to take themselves off from *our* premises, until they shall have abandoned the unlimited proposition, with which they seek to annihilate, at a blow, the authority of the fathers.

We have thus shown, that the sweeping proposition so stoutly maintained, of late, by a number of writers in our midst, is clearly susceptible of the *reductio ad absurdum* ; that, whatever *may* be alleged against the fathers, the argument, which these modern dialecticians advance against them, is, at all events, good for nothing. If it proves any thing at all, it proves vastly too much : if it really have the weight which is claimed for it, it lays those who employ it, and rely upon it, under obligations to receive and endorse all the contradictory and conflicting developments and results of what is so loudly vaunted as modern enlightenment and progress. The opponents of the fathers need not tell us, that they are not willing to do any such thing : we know that very well. But while they profess to adhere to their unlimited proposition, we have a right to hold them to it, and shall insist upon their keeping to it faithfully. Until they openly renounce it, we shall expect them to keep it for better or for worse, with all its legitimate offspring. We flatter ourselves that we have already done something more than expose the absurdity of their reasoning ; but the point here referred to must be reserved for further discussion on a subsequent page. Our object, thus far, has merely been to show, that the proposition advanced and defended by our misopatrists is false in theory. Their reasoning, brought into a syllogism, stands thus : People who live fourteen or fifteen or seventeen centuries after the Fathers must, of necessity, for this reason and no other, know vastly, incalculably more than the Fathers could by any possibility know, concerning the sacred Scriptures and the doctrines of the Gospel ; we live so many centuries later than the Fathers : therefore we know incalculably more than the Fathers could have known. Handsomely done, to be sure ; but, the premises being wrong, the conclusion, of course, goes for nothing.

But, if the sweeping proposition which we are now considering is false in its theory and its reasoning ; *it is equally false*

in its assumed facts. Let us examine it from this point of view ; and, as the argument, if it were worth any thing, would apply to antiquity in general with equal force as to the christian fathers, we shall take the liberty to inspect it in this comprehensive scope. And here it will be found that our antiquity-contemning friends are, like a certain British statesman, indebted to their imagination for their facts. It is then assumed to be a fact, indisputable and impregnable, that we moderns are so vastly in advance of the ancients, so immeasurably superior to them in knowledge, wisdom, skill, and savoir vivre, that to institute a comparison is quite preposterous, and that to acknowledge and submit to the authority of the ancients in any thing, would be a degree of imbecility, an extent of childishness, not to be tolerated for one moment. Still we venture seriously to propound the question, whether this assumed superiority of the moderns has any real foundation in fact? And, whatever admissions we may be disposed hereafter to make, we shall, for the present, be presumptuous enough to answer the question by a general denial, and to put a query in return: *In what particulars* is the present century superior to antiquity? Dropping all figures of rhetoric, which are very good in their place, can you give us the Arabian figures, the tangible specifications? We should really like to see your catalogue of modern perfections. But, let us proceed to specifications, and come to particulars, and gather up such facts as history affords. Let us begin with general affairs. First, then, does the present age better understand, and more successfully apply, the science of government, more effectually practise the art τὰ πολιτικὰ πράττειν, than did the ancients? So far as our own democracy, with its fearful and growing corruptions, is concerned, we have only to reply, that we had better wait a while longer before we quite make up our minds as to our superiority to the republics of Greece and Rome: the less said about the matter at present, the better. As for the governments (so called, we presume, by courtesy) of South America, Central America, and Mexico, really we must be excused from even looking at them. But, if we go to enlightened Europe, what enrapturing exhibitions of the art of government shall we there discover! In England with its pampered aristocracy, its down-trodden working-classes, its hideous mass of pauperism, and its Ireland: in Spain with its ridiculous court, its contemptible factions, and its inextricable confusion: in France, with its countless experiments, its numberless political isms, its unprofitable revolutions, and its dandy President: in Bavaria with its Lola Montes loving sovereign:

in Austria with its Metternich and more recently with its Haynau: in Prussia with its religious intolerance and its constitutions in paulo post futuro: in Russia with its knout-administering autocrat ruling over hosts of lying and gambling nobles, and millions of abject serfs: in the Papal States, the so-called centre and capital of Christendom, of whose delectable administration of the principles of government the Westminster Review published, in 1845, a most astounding expose. We could thus instance other governments of Europe, or go into interminable details relative to the shocking abuses, and corruptions, and oppressions of those which have been instanced; but we have neither space nor inclination to expatiate on a subject so extensive and so nauseating, and shall leave it to our readers to strike the balance between Solomon and others at Jerusalem, Solon, Pisistratus, Aristides, Cimon, Pericles and others in Athens; Augustus, Trajan, the Antonines, Theodosius and others at Rome, among the ancients, and our modern worthies, whether sitting upon thrones, or in congress assembled. But we shall be told that, if we have not perfection, we have progress. As regards our own country we shall have discretion enough to say nothing. As respects Europe, we there see two great tendencies: monarchism — absolute monarchies, with their standing armies, and their swarms of rapacious officials, restored, reëstablished: is this progress forward or backward? Radicalism, Socialism, Red-republicanism, repudiating religion and every genuine virtue, aiming at the subversion of social institutions, order and happiness, at the overthrow of the church, at the introduction of anarchy, and the establishment of savage life with all its license: — is this progress? Then from all such progress may we be effectually preserved and delivered!

But again: perhaps the present century has immeasurably outstripped the ancients in training the young: in its knowledge and application of the principles of education. On this subject we have books, octavos and duodecimos without number; and if actual education in practice were at all commensurate to the amount and size of the books written *about* it, a naughty child, a disobedient, refractory, disorderly youth, would deserve a place in some great museum, as a *rara avis* in terris. But, alas for education! We have no space to bestow upon Europe: those who desire to enlighten themselves may do so by reading in Vol. I. of Menzel's German Literature, from p. 279 to 352. As respects our own country we admit, that there is an immense amount of *teaching* going on in colleges, academies, and common schools; but when we inquire concerning

education, the education of home, the education effected by public sentiment and the countless influences abroad in society : when we consider that we are nominally a christian people, professing to reverence and obey the word of God, we are filled with amazement and sorrow. It is, indeed, admitted by all soberminded observers, that, if we except those families in which the duties enjoined by religion are truly respected and conscientiously observed, there is very little real education among us ; that parental and every other species of authority are rapidly declining, or already down to zero ; that we have no more children and youth, but that babies jump at once into man and womanhood ; and that, at least, a little gentle moral suasion must be employed in place of the ancient *patria potestas*. The consequences of this general recreancy to the most important of domestic duties are manifest on every hand. We have unspeakably more respect for the educational principles and methods of the ancient Jews, of early Greece and Rome, and of some other nations of antiquity, than for the pitiful moral suasion-operations of the present day, which, as we constantly see with our own eyes, and hear with our own ears, are treated with universal and deserved contempt by those, upon whom they are designed to be brought to bear. We do think, that our modern progress-men might derive some benefit from studying the writings upon education of Xenophon, Aristotle, Plato, Pythagoras, Cicero, Seneca and others. But above all, let the extravagant admirers of the present age and its immense superiority over the ancients, inquire whether the manner in which the early church carried out the principles of education inculcated by the Bible, was not vastly more effectual, more beneficially effectual in the production of most delightful results, than the loose and feeble methods now in vogue, and whether it would not be better to restore, in the place of our modern moral suasion, the good old rules of Solomon respecting the efficacy of the rod.

But again : shall we be told, that at least and at all events *in philosophy*, modern times are immeasurably in advance of antiquity ? By no manner of means. If in politics and education there is positively desperate confusion, surely in philosophy the age outbabels Babel. The fact is, that the modern systems, which are almost innumerable, are, in a great measure, little more than rifaccimentos and expansions of the many conflicting systems of the ancients : among them even the atomic theory, which has, of late, been making so distinguished a figure, is to be found, in all essential principles, in the physical doctrine of Epicurus. We are prepared to render

all due honor to Lord Bacon, that prince of empiric philosophizers, who exposed the barrenness and fallacies of former methods of reasoning, and taught men *how* to think, but constructed no system of philosophy. Through the rigid application of his inductive method, in physics, in natural science generally, and in psychology, the moderns have made real progress, far beyond all the discoveries of the ancients. But as respects positive results, this progress is predicable, as we shall hereafter insist, chiefly of the detection, elucidation and classification of the facts and laws of the material universe, of the discovery of mental and moral phenomena, and of the distinction, definition, and classification of the various faculties of the human mind, according to their different operations, as indicated by the consciousness of the inquirer directing his observation inward, or eliminated by generalizations derived from phenomena observed in a multitude of other individuals—in the race at large. But, regarding philosophy as the science of the absolute, we can only say with Menzel: “There are many systems of philosophy, because there can be no philosophy, that is, no philosophy absolutely valid; and these systems are merely methods of philosophizing, because they are made what they are, not by the end, but by the means.” And here we should really like to know, what modern philosophers have accomplished more than the ancients, in the actual attainment of positive, and permanently satisfactory results. That their speculations have an immense value as explorations, as expanding and illumining the world of thought, as revealing the emptiness of many stately structures, and as tending to set aside many obsolete notions, and to settle a multitude of preliminary principles, we are not in the least disposed to deny. But if they have really settled, better than ancients, the great aims which it is the aim of philosophy to solve, how is it that system constantly and rapidly follows system, each proving its predecessor wrong; and that the last system which electrified Europe, is the most outrageously absurd, the most infamously blasphemous of all? We cannot here afford space for even a glance at the ancient schools; but if the great thinkers of antiquity failed, as they certainly did, to attain those great ends which the philosopher is ever striving after, and if this has really been any better accomplished by the moderns, we should like our despisers of antiquity to put the finger upon the system, in which these positive, and satisfactory results have been reached and promulgated. Do they find then in the Rationalism of Des Cartes,—in the so-called Ethic of the pantheist Spinoza,—in the Rationalism or Optim-

ism of Leibnitz,—in Kant's philosophical method, called the critical philosophy,—in the rigid Idealism of Fichte,—in Schelling's Identitäts-system, or philosophy of the absolute,—in Hegel's Encyclopedia of the philosophical sciences,—in the mysticism of Görres,—in Locke's philosophical sensualism,—in Hume's skepticism,—in Reid's Inquiry into the human mind on the principles of common sense? We have named only a tithe, only the most prominent of the modern systems, of which the three last mentioned scarcely pretend to be systems of *philosophy proper*; if those of the ancients are dry cisterns, those of recent times are hard rocks, against which we strike in vain, hoping that streams of positive, satisfactory truth will gush forth. They all have a certain value, greater or less, as tentative experiments: but, when the old and the new are weighed against each other, as respects positive, substantial and permanently valid results, the scales, we fancy, stand pretty well poised.

There are other departments of science, in respect of which it would be easy to show, that the contemptuous sneers, with which the trumpeters of modern superiority are wont to speak of the ancients, are equally misapplied; but we must forbear. It remains, however, to turn the tables, and to insist upon what every scholar knows, to wit: that in sundry branches of science and art, in various departments of human culture, in divers arrangements, institutions and pursuits, connected with the interests, the rational enjoyment and the adornment of this earthly life, the ancients were immeasurably superior to the moderns, and have served the generations which succeeded them, and will serve all coming generations, as models. We cannot enter into detail, however tempting the theme: we must be content with a few hints. As respects physical training and corporeal exercise, their methods were in the utmost degree effectual, whereof the results achieved are conclusively demonstrative: their plan for the public education of youth deserves the serious attention of modern republics: in eloquence, in historic writing, in poetry of every description, they are unrivalled models for all succeeding ages, originating and perfecting what others can only imitate, and hope to approximate: in several of the fine arts, especially architecture and sculpture,¹ they remain unequalled, having attained that ab-

¹ We are well aware of the extraordinary skill which the Greeks attained in painting and music; but we advisedly omit naming these arts above, because in painting they scarcely equalled, in life and brilliancy of coloring, the moderns; and because we know very little concerning their music. The

solute perfection, which cannot be excelled and belongs to them alone; and it is well known that they were highly skilled in several arts which passed away with them, defying all subsequent attempts to re-discover them. And when it is borne in mind, that classical studies are the chief element in modern liberal culture; that, for centuries past, the most gifted and accomplished scholars have devoted, and still continue to devote, their lives to the critical and profoundly searching study, the elaborate explanation and elucidation of the writings of the ancients; that the most illustrious characters in the republic of letters were either students and commentators of the Greek and Roman classics, or fitted, by a thorough and loving study of their writings, for their own attainment of literary distinction, the manner in which many modern writers presume to talk of the merits and authority of the ancients, becomes positively ludicrous.

But it is time that we turn to what at present more particularly concerns us, the falsehood of the allegation, that modern theologians, nay the meanest capacities in the church of our day, do really possess a clearer and better understanding of the doctrines of the Gospel, than did the Fathers of the Church. This assumption is one truly monstrous, involving sundry (as we have seen) absurdities, and some downright abominations: it is one that can be soberly advanced only by those who have some theory to support, some foregone conclusion to bolster up, like that which we are now considering, viz: that we must, of necessity, be more knowing and wiser than the Fathers, because we live so many centuries later than they. Now we are, by no means, of the number of those who value institutions, and adopt opinions or doctrines, for no other reason than because they are old, redolent with the odor of antiquity: we are resolved to abide by the Scriptural rule, to "prove all things, and *hold fast* that which is good;" and we are not at all disposed or anxious to deny that the church-fathers were liable to err, that some of them fell into serious errors, and ran into various speculative and practical vagaries. But, while we admit this of the fathers, their opponents have effectually deprived themselves of the right of making any such admission relative to modern theologians and christians; if they adhere consistently to their unlimited propositions, they must hold, that among the superlatively enlightened moderns,

effects ascribed to it are altogether wonderful, so that the conclusion is reasonable that, both in melody and harmony, the Greek musicians had acquired uncommon power and skill. But we forbear to mention in the text any thing respecting which we have any doubt.

errors in doctrine and practice are nearly or quite impossible. If they cannot hold this, we cannot see what their sweeping propositions, and the many arguments based upon them, are good for. And we can hardly keep serious, while we ask them, whether they are prepared to approve and accept *all* the dogmatical systems, *all* the expositions of Scripture, of *all* the theologians, of exalted or of mean capacity, of the nineteenth century: or, if not, whether they will point out, by name, that one particular modern theologian, whose every opinion concerning doctrine and practice, they are willing to endorse? Where and who is the man? Is it Bretschneider, De Wette, Ammon, Reinhardt, Paulus, Röhr, Fritzsche, Olshausen, Ullmann, Umbreit, Schleiermacher, Twesten, Guerike, Neander, Tholuck, Hengstenberg, Feuerbach, Stier, Harless, Rudelbach, or any other distinguished person? Really, when we consider all the different directions here represented, and remember that intelligence and wisdom increase in proportion to remoteness from the fathers, the whole affair appears so extremely ludicrous, that we must do violence to our muscles, in order to maintain a becoming gravity.

But, granting that the Fathers fell into errors, some into gross errors, and that the early church was sometimes distracted by sad and pernicious heresies, we venture to suppose, that the Socinianism, the Unitarianism, the Universalism, the Rationalism of modern times are not exactly orthodoxy, notwithstanding the immense superiority, in knowledge and discernment, of our times over the first four centuries; and when we consider the gigantic growth, and the Herculean powers, of the modern intellect, we cannot help wondering, that there is not, if not more orthodoxy (for this would really be unreasonable to expect), more originality and ingenuity in the heresies of our day, than we can discover in them. The wonder is, that, if the Fathers were such desperate simpletons, the superlatively acute and immensely learned heretics of modern times should not have succeeded in contriving any thing really new, any thing essentially different from the inventions of the early errorists; nay, that the difference is, as respects acumen, shrewdness and ingenuity, all in favor of the ancients. Unitarianism has its prototype in Arianism: Universalism was invented, in the third century, by Origen: the Rationalists, who criticise where they should meekly learn, who want to know the why and wherefore of every thing, who speculate where they ought to believe, who doubt and quibble and cavil, until they either metamorphose or nullify the entire word of revelation, had their worthy and far superior forerun-

ners in the Gnostics, the reasoners and philosophers, the constructionists and system-builders of the early church. If we had room to spare, this list of parallels might be greatly extended.—But we proceed. If it be true that we, because we live in the nineteenth century, must necessarily be immeasurably in advance of the Fathers, nay, that the meanest capacity in the church of the present day cannot help but have a clearer and better understanding of the word of God than they, we must again call upon those who so strenuously assert and maintain such things, to put their finger upon those doctrines and precepts of the Gospel, which we have so much better comprehended, so much more consistently obeyed. We know very well, that our superiority is asserted in a general way, as embracing, doubtless, the whole compass of religious truth and duty. But we are unreasonable enough not to be satisfied with such broad and sweeping statements: we want specifications: we ask for our distinguished excellencies “a local habitation and a name.” Where then lies our superiority? Do we better understand the language, the Greek of the New Testament? This we humbly venture to doubt, seeing that it was the vernacular of the Greek fathers, and perfectly familiar, from childhood, to the Latin fathers. Do we better understand the great, fundamental, saving truths of the Gospel? This we cannot believe, seeing that even the most strenuous despisers of the Fathers cannot adopt the Augsburg Confession, or any other modern Creed, and vastly prefer the Apostles’ Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the symbolum quicunque, notwithstanding that these were drawn up by those indocile ignoramuses, those pitiful drivellers, the early Fathers. Do we better understand and administer the discipline of the church? We are still full of doubts, and even venture to suggest that the church of the present day might be a great deal better for re-introducing some of the disciplinary principles and practices of the early church. Do we better understand and perform the great duties of our profession? Is our faith more intelligent and vigorous, our hope brighter, and our charity larger and warmer and more self-denyingly active, than were those of the early christians? Go, ye who would presume to assert any such thing, go read the history of the early church, read Coleman’s *Christian Antiquities*, and then hide your diminished heads in shame. Now, if our superiority is not to be found in any of these particulars, where are we to look for it? What does it all mean? We think we can tell, but we shall reserve our explanation until farther on. We have, at present, yet to notice the sweeping assertions which have called forth the pre-

sent article, in their application to the fathers of our own church. It is these whose authority it is, in the present juncture of affairs, more particularly the object of our self-eulogists to contemn and depreciate: it is to these that they are more immediately interested to apply that unlimited proposition, that we moderns must, in the necessity and nature of things, be superior to the Fathers: that the meanest capacity in the present church must necessarily have a better understanding of the truths of religion than they could possibly have had. Is this true in fact? As this has been so strongly asserted, and as the onus probandi rests, of course, upon those who make assertions, we are much inclined to do no more than call upon the panegyrists of the moderns, to prove what they say; and we cannot but think, that they would be rather puzzled to bring their demonstration to the Q. E. D. Yet, for obvious reasons, it will not do to dismiss the subject without a few more words. As our opponents have never distinctly informed us, whom we are to regard as the fathers of the Lutheran church, we are left to conjecture; and we suppose that the prominent and influential theologians from Luther down to the authors of the *Formula-Concordiæ* are meant. Is it true, then, that modern theologians, nay the feeblest minds in the church of our day, know and understand better what the word of God teaches, than Luther, Melancthon, Chemnitz, Brenz, Andreae, Chyträus, and the other distinguished Lutheran worthies of the sixteenth century? To this question, so far as regards the meanest capacity in the church of the present day, no man of sane mind will expect a serious reply. To modern theologians we shall hereafter concede as much as we conscientiously can; but we totally deny that the great scheme of salvation, the prominent and fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, and the word of God in general, are understood one iota better by modern Biblical scholars, than they were by the leaders of the Reformation. If it were otherwise, the great value which is still, and justly, set upon the writings of those men, could be characterized only as a monstrous instance of human infatuation. If their writings are much less known than those of recent divines, the reason simply is, that they are either written in Latin, or in an antiquated style; but still more, that, the moderns give us duodecimos to read, the fathers of the Lutheran church, who did thoroughly whatever they undertook; published ponderous folios or quartos, which are explored by few who are not intent upon writing books themselves. But it is a noteworthy fact, well known to those who are conversant with both the early and the later Lutheran

literature, that modern theologians, either of exegetical, dogmatical or practical works, are often greatly indebted to the writings of those much contemned fathers, and that they draw largely upon the stores of learning and thought deposited in the bulky tomes of the sixteenth century. They are considered public property in a very peculiar sense, in that it may be plundered without acknowledgment. We recently met a striking instance of this kind, where we least expected it.

But we greatly doubt whether we should ever have heard any thing about the immeasurable superiority in intelligence and theological learning of modern theologians and church-members generally, over Luther and his co-adjutors and immediate successors, were it not, that so many Lutherans in America have virtually forsaken the creed of our church, and, more particularly, denied and utterly renounced certain articles which it contains. To defend, or in any way discuss these, cannot, of course, be our purpose here. And we only remark on this subject, that there is nothing of which we are more certain than this, that many of those who are so violently opposed to our symbolical books, do not understand the articles which they controvert, and have little or no knowledge of the standards of our church. And still further, if the fathers really were, in comparison with us, such rude and ignorant creatures, that they ought to be called the children and we the fathers (as has been generally asserted), it must be regarded as a most astounding phenomenon, that in Germany, that favorite abode of vast and profound learning, many of the deepest and soundest thinkers, of the most illustrious scholars, of the greatest theologians of modern times, of the present day, have been and are rigid adherents of the Symbolical books of the Lutheran church, strictly loyal to the unaltered Augsburg Confession; and that they have devoted, and continue to devote, their best abilities to the defence, and the clearer and fuller unfolding of the doctrines which they set forth as the doctrines of God's word. And we must frankly acknowledge, that between these eminent and excellent men, and those who have so valiantly taken up the cudgels against the unaltered Augsburg Confession, a comparison cannot, in our estimation, be for one moment thought of.

Ere we proceed to other and more general considerations, we shall state but one more objection to the unlimited proposition so confidently advanced respecting the claims and authority of the fathers, and that is, that those who advance it have no faith in it themselves. Of course we do not question their sincerity in uttering the opinions which we are contro-

verting: we number the contradiction, which we discover between their theory and their practice, among the many inconsistencies in which human life abounds. It is by their actions, by their conduct, that men are to be judged; and so judging, we perceive a remarkable discrepancy between men's avowed opinions relative to the subject in hand, and their constant, habitual practice. If not among mankind in general, yet certainly among those who make pretensions to a liberal education, there seems to prevail a sort of superstitious veneration for antiquity, with which we cannot cordially sympathize; and among writers of every description, ancient authorities, the older the better, are in constant and great demand. Authors of books, writers for periodicals, orators who figure at anniversaries and other occasions, even lawyers and legislators, rejoice exceedingly when they can bring forward, in support or illustration of their views, quotations from ancient writers: with these they would give authority and weight to their arguments, point and force to their rhetoric, and commend their opinions to favor and acceptance. And the farther back they can carry us into the dim vista of centuries past, the more confident and exulting are they. So extensive and inveterate is this propensity to refer and defer to the ancients, and to enlighten moderns with the wisdom of hoar antiquity, that it is almost a matter of congratulation, that the works of the Phœnician Sanchoniathon have been lost, and still more so, that the *cacoëthes scribendi* did not prevail in the time of our original progenitor; for, if he had written books, and they had actually come down to us, there is reason to apprehend, that modern books would be made up, in a great degree, of quotations from them.

Modern theologians manifest the same propensity to show, that they know something of the fathers, to appeal to their authority, and to cite their opinions; and we discover among writers in our own church, however much they may glory in the independence of this progressive age, a decided tendency to defer to the authority of the early reformers, and to pile quotations upon quotation from their writings, in support and confirmation of their opinions. From this practice, to which we shall be the last to object, our strenuous opposers of the Fathers are as little free as others. In confirmation of this assertion, we shall, without specifically pointing to the immense amount of evidence abounding on every hand, refer only to the article beginning *Evangelical Review*, Vol. I. No. IV. p. 524. And we would only say, in dismissing this part of our subject, that, until the practice of those who profess to con-

sider the fathers as utterly unworthy of consideration, because of their inappreciable inferiority in sagacity and learning to ourselves, is more consistent with the theory which they so boldly advance, and so zealously uphold, we must be excused from accepting *them* as infallible authorities in the premises.

We think that we have fairly shown, that the propositions, which have latterly been so often and so confidently urged, with a view to depreciate the Fathers, and especially those of our own church, are paradoxical and absurd. But if it be asked, whether we intend utterly to deny that the present century is in any respect in advance of antiquity, or of the period of the Reformation, we must, of course, disclaim every such preposterous design. We readily admit that there has been, and is, a great deal of progress. But we doubt whether much that is claimed to be progress, deserves to be so regarded; and the question arises: in what respects are modern times really in advance of antiquity? A question to which, in some particulars, the answer is easy, in others by no means so quickly found: to be found only by acute and searching investigation, close and discriminating comparison, and profound reflection; and to which we have neither time, nor space, nor ability, to do justice. We shall therefore content ourselves with a few general observations. And we contend, then, that while the immense progress of modern times cannot be denied, it is *mainly* to be predicated of the external affairs and arrangements of domestic and social life, that it is *chiefly* manifested in certain mechanical and operations; in sciences aiming, at the discovery of the objects, phenomena, relations and laws of the material universe; in extensive and wonderful conquests over external nature, and in multiplied and successful processes of rendering these discoveries and conquests subservient to the common interests of this earthly life, to our physical comfort and enjoyment, to the advancement and extension of commerce and wealth, to the increase of luxury and effeminacy. However alluring the theme, we must forbear expatiating on the discoveries and achievements of modern astronomy, chemistry and other natural sciences, which are indeed great and wonderful. But, while we are by no means insensible to the impulse which these have given to the human mind, to the vast enlargement of the field of thought and speculation, to the glorious contemplations on the power, wisdom and goodness of the Creator, which they are calculated to call forth, and which they ever will excite in religious and devout souls, we must, as these are considerations that do not really belong here, persist in maintaining, and, not having space for argu-

ment, must be content with asserting, that the evidences of human progress are chiefly and most strikingly discernible in physical results and temporal affairs; in achievements which betoken, indeed, the wonderful ingenuity of men, but which tend rather to diminish than to increase the real and substantial happiness of our race. Mechanical operations and manufacturing processes are vastly multiplied, extended and expedited; time and space are all but annihilated by the power of steam and the mysterious agency of electro-magnetism; all tending to improve and adorn the external life of man, and to promote and render universal a certain kind of civilization or refinement, at the expense, often, of the higher and better interests of mankind. Very much doubting whether even Chemistry and French genius have succeeded in rendering the modern cuisine at all superior to that of Lucullus and other Roman epicures, we find the most obvious proofs of modern progress, in the enormous facilities of locomotion, and in the immense extent and detail of manufacturing operations. It is necessary here to look at the subject without reference to the purifying and elevating influences and effects of christianity, whether directly on its true friends, or indirectly on society at large: leaving, therefore, these out of view for the present, and looking at mankind simply as unaided by, or refusing the aid of, revelation and the powers of that world whence the revelation comes, we venture to assert, that, in the inward life of the soul, in its displays of active vigor, in its habitual aspirations, objects, desires, pursuits and exercises, in its knowledge of itself, of its interests and destination, in all that pertains to man's higher and spiritual being, there has been—there is—no improvement; and that, if any change there be, this appears, from the contrast produced by the beauty and purity of christian life, to be in many things for the worse.

We are not forgetting the printing-press, nor the immense diffusion of knowledge, and the elevation of the masses in intelligence, which it has effected; but this again is a point which does not really concern us here. We are speaking of the learned world (for we suppose that the marvellous superiority of the meanest capacity may now be left out of view); of the alleged superiority of modern over ancient scholars and thinkers, and that too only within a given sphere; so that the enlargement of the *compass* of knowledge does not properly enter into consideration: we speak of quality, not of quantity; of depth and height, not of breadth or extension; and we have already denied that the modern mind is really more

active, more powerful, more sagacious, more piercing or more soaring than the ancient.

There is, however, one subject, with regard to which there has been, and still is, great progress: we mean the reference which is had, the respect which is shown, in literature, and in the arrangement and management of all the great concerns of human kind, to man as man, to the interests of the people, to those of every member of the great brotherhood. The day is gone by, when, in social organizations, in legal codes, in the administration of government, the claims and interests of the few who wore crowns, or held patents of nobility, or constituted privileged classes and castes, were first and perhaps solely considered, protected, provided for and secured, while the masses were looked upon as creatures essentially inferior, as drudges fit only to toil and sweat for their masters, and bound to be thankful that they were permitted to live at all, and to eat their coarse food by special favor of their lordly superiors. In this respect a mighty change has come over the world's aspect; and the human being as such, is asserting his claims, and vindicating and securing his just rights. The civilized world is moving on rapidly to universal democracy. However much there may be in this change, that calls for grateful acknowledgment and heartfelt rejoicing, it is by no means all good, nor altogether tending to happy results. The opinions, principles and tendencies now at work, and spreading, and more and more developing themselves on the European continent, are well adapted to excite serious apprehensions, and the scenes which have been, and still are, witnessed there, are but dim shadows cast before by coming events — premonitory symptoms of anarchy, disorganization, and atheistic experiments. Can any who reflect be blind to the extreme tendencies that are more and more distinctly and violently exhibited in our own land? Let us not forget that extremes meet; and that, when one extreme is reached, it requires but one desperate plunge (and how often has this been made) to reach at once the very climax of the other. And let us not forget either, that the democratic experiment is not new, but old: that it was tried among the classic nations of antiquity, and that among them it failed, because it wanted a real and healthy substratum — that one and only foundation on which a democracy can long prosper, or even exist; that is, a true religion and a sound morality. And while, therefore, we admit that, as respects the concerns and interests of man as such, of each individual as a representative of a race, not a class,— of universal man, there is, at present, much progress of some

kind, we most decidedly contend, that all that is right and good in this movement, right and good in any of the affairs of society, is due to christianity alone; — to its direct operation; and to its indirect influence upon those who scorn its blessings and its hopes. And if the present developments of society are to result in real and permanent good, they must be baptized, vastly more than they now are, with the spirit of our holy religion.

And here we turn away from these general considerations to that part of our subject which demands our special attention, the Fathers of the church, and of ours in particular. It can scarcely be made out to be our duty to state, what it is that we claim for them, in what sense and respect we would reverence and honor them, to what extent we would receive their opinions; and submit to their authority; for our proper business has been to show how absurd and preposterous is the position which has, of late, been so decidedly taken with regard to them. Yet we intend, ere we close, to express, somewhat more fully, our positive opinion of their merits and claims, and we may introduce what remains to be said, with our promised attempt to account for this modern crusade against the venerable Fathers of the church. There are two causes to which it may be ascribed.

I. The spirit of independence, of self-sufficiency and of innovation, which so strongly characterizes the present age, in all its views and measures relative to every interest and institution of social and civil life, has for a long time betrayed its presence and activity in the church also, by an increasing disrespect and contempt for whatever is ancient and long established; by a restless itching for, and pursuit of, novelties; by rationalistic speculations about the doctrines and practices of the church; by audacious criticism of the Sacred Word; by lax notions respecting the sacraments, and the marriage relations; by a philosophical tone of preaching, and by the reckless formation of parties or sects, for reasons of little or no account. The age is ever boasting of its progress. This progress, however, consists in a great measure in a growing license of thought and action; in giving human nature, no matter how perverted and corrupt, its own way, even in childhood; in cutting loose from the recollections, the associations, the relations of history; from the opinions, principles, institutions and usages of the past; in starting new theories and trying new schemes: in short, the age has virtually declared its independence of the past, and to "Young America," "Young England," "Young Germany," "Young France," and other

young existences, the present is important only as the teeming womb of the future. Our limited space forbids our expatiating on this most important subject. We cannot but regard the spirit that rejects the experience and wisdom, that repudiates at pleasure, and for the behoof of modern inventions, the doctrines, institutions, practices and establishments of our forefathers, that eschews all real, vital historic connexion with the past, and sets up, in self-sufficient independence, for itself, as one of extreme and irreverent infatuation. There is not a little of this spirit manifested in the church. But whether exhibited in social, civil, political or ecclesiastical relations and affairs, men will discover by and bye, after abrogating and destroying until nothing old is left, that they have acted like persons who, having ascended some great height, have then thrown down the ladder which helped them to their elevation; and they may find it necessary hereafter, in order to regain their footing on terra firma, to take a tremendous leap, which will rack their every bone and muscle,—their entire organism to its centre.

II. It is a common occurrence in courts of justice that lawyers, when a witness comes forward with evidence that bears with fatal effect upon their client's case, endeavor to discredit the witness, by picking flaws in his character, by representing him either as incompetent, or unworthy of belief. The same thing has often been observed in the church. We know of one distinguished theologian, who occupied, for a long time, a very conspicuous station in the American religious world, and who, when it suited his purpose, stoutly maintained the genuineness of certain reputed epistles of Ignatius, and, when some other object was to be attained, utterly rejected them as spurious. We doubt whether we should ever have heard much about the comparative ignorance and the puerile incompetency of the early fathers, if they did not bear decisive evidence to sundry points of doctrine and practice, which are distasteful to the present hyper-enlightened age. Still less do we believe, that we should ever have heard, within our own church, one word about our immense superiority over the leaders of the Reformation, or have ever been seriously told, that we are, in fact, the fathers, and they the children, and that the meanest capacity of the present church has a clearer insight into the doctrines of the Gospel than they could have had, were it not for a few articles of the Augsburg Confession, which were firmly believed and most vigorously and ably defended, by the Fathers of the Lutheran church, but which are renounced and utterly repudiated by the friends and adhe-

rents of "American Lutheranism," as "exploded dogmas," finding no "favor among the free-thinking, practical, common-sense people of the United States." If we were only willing to immolate on the altar of American Lutheranism, built, not very long ago, with untempered mortar, those very articles in which some of the most prominent characteristic features of genuine Lutheranism are portrayed; if we would only consent to abandon our Confession to the tender mercies of "the free-thinking, practical, common-sense people of the United States," to be mangled and expurgated at their option and discretion, there would doubtless at once be an end of all declamation about the ignorance and childishness of our venerable fathers, in comparison with our maturity and immensely superior intelligence. This point will be briefly resumed ere we conclude. For, although it is high time to bring this article to a close, we have yet, according to promise, a few things to say, respecting both the early fathers, and the fathers of the Lutheran church, as also on the subject in general. We again distinctly deny, that we claim for the early fathers, or those of the sixteenth century, any absolute supremacy in the church, any absolute authority to determine what shall, and what shall not be, the doctrines and practices of the church; but neither do we claim the right for ourselves, wantonly, or without the most cogent reasons, to dissolve, at any point, our historic, our confessional connexion with them. We regard them as fallible men, who were liable to err, and who did err, some more and some less. Hence we do not receive their confessions, their opinions, their expositions, their practices, without judging of their soundness, truthfulness and fitness, by bringing them to the test of God's word, whose authority we, of course, regard as paramount: but, having so tested and proved them, and not found them wanting, we mean to adhere and cling to them, through good and through evil report, "und wenn die Welt voll Teufel wär!"

We do not believe doctrines, or adopt practices, *merely because* they are old, and have been handed down from hoar antiquity; for we know full well, that there are old errors and old abuses, as well as new. But we regard the position, in our day so often taken, that we must necessarily be immeasurably in advance of the fathers in the understanding and interpretation of the Scriptures, merely because we live from fourteen to eighteen centuries later than they, as superlative and unadulterated nonsense. The apostolic fathers, were instructed by the apostles themselves, and they read the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, and heard their oral

instructions, in their own vernacular tongue ; and they again taught those who afterward took their places, in that same language, which was then the medium of learned and literary intercourse throughout the greater part of the Roman empire ; and if we, to whom this language has long been among the dead, and who depend upon the aids furnished by generations of laborious critics, really understand the sacred writings so much better than they could, with all the advantages of viva voce teaching and explanation from those whose knowledge is not open to question, they must indeed have been unparalleled paragons of incorrigible indocility, and doltish stupidity. In our humble estimation the early history of the church exhibits them in a far different light from that in which many moderns are so fond of viewing them. We have freely admitted their liability to err. And, while we find but little to condemn among the apostolic fathers, we frankly concede, that those who came after them did fall into divers, and sometimes grievous, errors ; that they gradually introduced needless, sometimes mischievous practices ; that they gave strange, imaginative, and sometime very absurd expositions of the Sacred Word, and that they propounded sundry fantastic and erroneous opinions ; but, we defy any man, we care not how well read he may be, to point out among the opinions, the speculations, and the exegetical expositions, published by the ancient fathers, any thing more outrageously absurd, more contemptibly silly, than the specimens, which can be pointed out, in rank, rich, luxurious abundance, in the works of our modern, excessively learned and accomplished rationalists.

The admissions that we have made are true of individual fathers, in their private capacity, but only in a very small degree of the early church, acting in her collective authority, in ecumenical councils. But all this we are not to ascribe to their stupidity and ignorance (which, if we moderns really are immeasurably superior to them, must have been monstrous indeed), but to the extraordinary circumstances and influences of their times. Let it be remembered that, in their day, Christianity, that pure and holy child of heaven, had but recently entered our world ; a world divided between Judaism, and every species and modification of paganism, and wicked and corrupt beyond the power of rhetoric to describe ; that Judaism had sunk into degeneracy and obstinate and fanatical addictedness to human inventions ; and that the pagan world was the theatre of childish superstition, aside of lax indifferentism and contempt of all religion, of philosophical speculation and skepticism, of many and conflicting philosophical

systems, of gloomy or wildly fanciful oriental theories, and withal boundless licentiousness, and that all these existing and prevailing and deeply-rooted elements were the bitter enemies of christianity: let it be remembered that from among these the christian church had to obtain, — to wrest by force of reasoning and persuasion, her materials, and that of her newly converted members, few, if any, were likely to get rid, immediately, of all their long cherished errors; and that opinions of every sort and shade were brought, greatly modified no doubt, but not eradicated, into the church: let it be borne in mind that all these conflicting elements, agreeing among each other only in their hostility to christianity, were roaring, and beating, and surging, like tempest-tossed billows, against the church from without; and, as it was impossible to exclude entirely their influence from their pale, producing fermentation, excitement, collisions within; opening the door to the inroads of error, and preparing the way for heresy. At this present time we can form no conception of the immense agitation, and the convulsive efforts, produced in the minds of men by the introduction of christianity, that heavenborn regenerative, fructifying, renovating principle and power of a new life, which was to revolutionize the world. “I came not to send peace, but a sword.” (See Matth. 10: 34. sqq.) Our readers are familiar with the early history of the church, and we must be brief. We only ask: is it to be wondered at that errors and wild notions crept into, and were brought to light in, the church? Would it not be a wonder if the result had been otherwise? Considering that the early christians — the early fathers — were but fallible men, is it not a wonder that, amid, and under so many distracting and corrupting influences, she maintained, to the extent that she did, her purity and integrity? And are the Fathers to be tried and condemned upon other principles than the men of our day? If the ecclesiastical dignitaries, writers and developments of our day, were judged and sentenced in the same summary and sweeping fashion, in which those of early days are dealt with, what would become of them? Are there no errors, no heresies, no abuses and corruptions in our day? We confess that in the many conflicting theories, and isms and heresies of our day, that in the bigoted and fanatical adherence of certain sects to certain doctrinal views, and non-essential institutions or usages, in the credulity and gullibility exhibited by the numerous followers of divers fanatics and impostors, and in the multiplied distinctions in doctrine and practice, each claiming to be *the* truth, and *the* right way, we can discover no evidence of the mon-

strous superiority of the present age over that of the early fathers; and when we ask: *where* is it? Echo answers where?

While, therefore, we claim neither supremacy, nor infallibility for the church-fathers of the first four centuries, we shall, in spite of ridicule and contemptuous sneers, cling to them with tenacious grasp, as to the most important section in that great historic chain that connects us with the apostolic age, and binds us to the corner-stone of the temple of our faith: we shall ever remember them with gratitude, and speak of them with reverence, as the first heirs of that glorious inheritance, which, bequeathed by the Eternal Word, and dispensed by apostolic hands, they so conscientiously and zealously administered, so vigilantly guarded, and so faithfully transmitted to coming generations. However much some, or many, of them, may have erred in their individual opinions and efforts, they were, in the main, men of splendid abilities, of pure intentions, of fervent piety, of lofty integrity, and of holy zeal; and in their collective capacity, as the oft-assembled fathers and guardians of the infant church, they conferred upon posterity incalculable benefits, by watching over the purity and for the preservation of the genuine apostolic writings,—by recording the history, chronicling the experiences, the struggles, trials, conflicts and triumphs of the early church,—by settling and defining, amidst clashing opinions, amidst the strife and contentions of parties and sectaries, amidst the assaults, the stratagems, the calumnies and revilings of the originators or adherents of truculent or plausible heresies, the true orthodox faith of the church universal, in venerable symbols which have stood the test and the shocks of ages, and still stand, profoundly venerated as noble monuments of their clear-sighted sagacity, their comprehensive understanding, their staunch and unflinching honesty, and their simple, humble, mighty, scriptural faith. They are to us the intelligent and upright interpreters of that wonderful age, in which christianity, represented at first by a little handful of obscure men, gradually fought its way, with the peaceful weapons of truth and righteousness, to the shop of the artizan, to the study of the philosopher, to the halls of the noble, to the turreted battlements of the chieftain, to the throne of the Caesars, to the empire of the world; and we could better spare any portion, or the whole, of the church's history previous to the Reformation, than theirs. We acknowledge, once again, their errors and defects: we cannot bow to their authority in matters of faith and practice, no more than to that of any other man or set of men, without a candid appeal

to the word of inspiration ; but there is a *vast* amount of matter, of incalculable moment to the church, with respect to which we do and must appeal to them as to our only informants, as to honest, sincere, right-meaning men : we hold them in profound respect as the frank and dignified historians of the church,—as the able expounders of her faith,—as the learned expositors of the Scriptures,—as the earnest, the eloquent, the mightily convincing and persuading preachers of the word,—as the strenuous advocates of the unity of the church,—as the fearless defenders and apologists of our holy religion ; who encountered the subtle philosopher and foiled him, the bitter and malignant Jew and converted him, the corrupt and vicious heathen, and turned him from his idols and abominations, to the love of the Savior and the life of holiness ; who carried the message of salvation to the ends of the earth, and laid down their lives for their faith among wild beasts, in loathsome dungeons and at the stake. And when we look at the self-complacent spirit of this self-lauding age,—at its rationalistic subtleties of speculation, at its sectarian distractions, and its many other pitiful developments, we say : honor to the great, the noble, the glorious old fathers !

And now, a word more about our superiority to the Fathers of our church. We shall, of course, say nothing more about the ridiculous assertion, that, in respect of religious truth, the meanest capacity in the church of our day must necessarily be more intelligent than the heroes of the Reformation : we are almost ashamed that we have noticed it at all. But as respects the learned world, the theologians of the present day, the expounders and commentators of the Sacred Scriptures, the opinions which are here controverted are entitled to more attention ; not because we consider them correct, but because there is some truth mixed up with a large amount of mere semblance of plausibility. We begin then with frankly admitting, that in philological criticism generally, and of course in Biblical criticism under any of its appropriate aspects, there has been great progress made since the days of the Reformation, and still continues to be made. This fact is so notorious that it needs no proof. But even here, with what sad qualifications must our admission be burdened. It is, of course, in Germany, that the science of criticism and its application to ancient writings, and those of the Scriptures in particular, has been brought to its greatest perfection : so much so that the critical labors of other countries deserve, with some honorable exceptions, but little consideration. But what have been its

results? Wherever it threw off its allegiance to the orthodox faith of the church, its respect for the direct, simple, obvious meaning of the language of Scripture, what arbitrary and impertinent principles has it not developed, and with what reckless and audacious effrontery have they not been applied to the Sacred text of both the Old and the New Testament, so that, (not to go into any farther specifications), the Book of Isaiah is a piece of patchwork — and the work of a pseudo-Jesaias, containing nothing about Christ, nor any real prophecies at all; and the Gospel of St. John was never written by St. John, but is a spurious production of later times! — Have not living orthodox Lutheran theologians of Germany, characterized the modern criticism of the gospels as “criticism run mad?” Those who are not acquainted with the wild antics, the desperate processes, and the shocking results of what in Germany is termed the “Higher Criticism,” will find ample information respecting it, and rich illustrations of it, in the Introductory treatises given by Dr. J. A. Alexander, in the volumes of his admirable Commentary on Isaiah. We cannot better describe this modern system (the marvellous superiority of which does not seem to meet with much recognition or appreciation among the eulogists of the powers and efforts of the modern mind), than in the following words of Rev. Dr. Schmucker: “In Germany, where infidelity has assumed its most learned type, neologians have frittered away the sense of every passage that opposed their views, by the unhallowed theory of accommodation and other false principles of exegesis; and, following the guidance of their higher criticism, falsely so called, have rejected one book after another from the sacred canon, until they have divested of all claim to inspiration, the whole, or nearly the whole of those Scriptures, which Paul affirms were given by inspiration of God.” (Evangel. Rev. No. VI. p. 151. sq.) The Doctor says on a subsequent page, [p. 171.] “At last, after passing through various fluctuations in the neological schools of Germany, this science has settled down on the principles of common sense, designated the *historical interpretation*, which will not, we think, soon be again shaken. It is now admitted, that in making a revelation to men, in order that it might be intelligible, God must necessarily use language in the sense in which it was understood by those to whom it was addressed; and that the Scriptures must therefore be interpreted on the same principles, which are applied to uninspired human compositions.” This is unquestionably true of the truly evangelical theologians of Germany, the greater part of whom are staunch adherents of the Augs-

burg Confession. But we would ask whether this adoption of the principle of "historical interpretation," is not merely a return to the simple, common-sense, reverent and devout method of commenting on the Scriptures, pursued, as far as their facilities permitted, by the fathers of the Lutheran church? We do, indeed, readily admit, that great progress has been made in the science of criticism, because the knowledge required, the resources demanded, by the critic, have, by the studies and researches of successive generations, been greatly augmented and multiplied; and because increased skill has been the result of long experience and much practice. But we totally deny that this progress and these results have had any effect upon the amount or clearness of the knowledge possessed by the theologians, of the great body of religious truth — of the great fundamental truths of the Gospel. The results have been important, principally in respect of minute particulars; in settling many vexed questions of secondary, or subordinate importance; in removing doubts; in determining disputed points; in clearing up obscure passages, — often in throwing light upon what was already clear. But we deny that they have added aught to the great body of what the evangelical church has ever held as the truth of Scripture; and we positively assert, that the general tenor and meaning of the Scriptures, the saving truths of the Gospel, the fundamental doctrines and the nature of the holy sacraments of our divine religion, were as accurately, as clearly, as fully and as thoroughly understood by the fathers of the Lutheran church, as by any theologian of modern times. And those who assert, that we understand all these things vastly better than they did, are herewith challenged to prove their assertion true, and to point out the doctrines which are so much better understood by us; and if they point us to certain articles of the Augsburg Confession, so offensive to the friends of "American Lutheranism," we are not alarmed: we know that great numbers of our American clergy have revised their modern opinions, and have returned, or are returning, to the broad doctrinal platform derived by our fathers directly from the Scriptures, so that we have on our side a host of the most profoundly learned theologians of modern times, firmly devoted to the Augsburg Confession.

We are deeply convinced, that the tendency to dissolve all vital, and practically fruitful historical connexion with the past (in which all modern life has its root), and to disregard, wherever it is convenient, the *ὁμολογεῖν* of the church from the earliest ages, which is so often and so extensively exhibited in

our day, involves many most serious and momentous considerations, and is attended with a variety of disastrous consequences, of which some have already come to maturity, whereas of others we see only the beginnings. But upon all these we cannot here expatiate. We ascribe these manifestations to that spirit of independence, of self-complacent free-thinking, and self-sufficient freedom to choose, to reject, to say and to do, whatsoever seems agreeable or expedient, which characterizes our age, and which proceeds, without scruple or hesitation, from one innovation to another. Of this we have a sufficient illustration in our own church. First, the standards of the Lutheran church are virtually, practically abandoned; next, explanations are given, and theories set up, to justify this abandonment: then, in order to justify the whole proceeding, a new sort of Lutheranism is invented, under the title of "*American Lutheranism*;" ample liberty in all things being implied in the adjective "*American*;" and now, with what specific object in view we know not, another new title is promulgated, to wit: "*Our American Lutheran church of the General Synod.*" Thus is the law of progress kept in operation. But against all this, we have this one serious objection to urge, that Lutheranism is neither a chameleon, nor a figure of gutta-percha, nor a weather-cock. Lutheranism is a fixed fact, a downright positive something, an actual, veritable, distinctly defined entity, portrayed and defined in its own symbol; and it is purely impossible for us to conceive how a church rejecting Lutheranism can be Lutheran. We have indeed been recently informed by one, whose authority on all subjects connected with *American Lutheranism* is paramount, that "we pay due respect to our ecclesiastical ancestry, and secure sufficient doctrinal uniformity, when we declare our belief, that the Augsburg Confession, the mother-symbol of Protestantism, presents a substantially accurate exhibition of the fundamental articles of God's Word." This declaration could be readily, and ex animo subscribed by Christians of any denomination, and has therefore nothing at all to do with the distinctive characteristics of the Lutheran church, especially as we are, at the same time, distinctly notified, of "the abandonment of the doctrine of the real or bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist, by the vast majority of the Lutheran church both in Europe [?] and America?" We might as well say: "We pay due respect to the great Mediator and his Apostles, and secure sufficient doctrinal uniformity, when we declare our belief that the New Testament presents a substantially accurate and complete exhibition of saving truth,

only we must be allowed to disbelieve and reject the doctrine of Christ's Divinity, and of the Atonement, and any other doctrine which, although taught by the New Testament, does not correspond with *our* systems. We know, indeed, that the New Testament is God's Word, while the Augsburg Confession is a human digest and expose of christian doctrine. But this momentous difference does not make the inconsistency one iota less in the one case than in the other: and moreover, Unitarians, Universalists, and other heretics show, that it is quite the fashion to talk and act in this way in the present superlatively enlightened age. We would not imitate their example: we would scrupulously eschew all such proceedings. And as we are by no means prepared to accept the proposition, that modern theologians understand the great and glorious doctrines of the Gospel vastly better than our ecclesiastical ancestors, we are content to believe as they did, and to stand upon that broad and noble platform, constructed from and with the truths of God's Holy Word, by the learned, the wise, the devout and devoted heroes of the Reformation, the illustrious fathers of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

ARTICLE III.

THE SILENT INFLUENCE OF THE BIBLE.*

By Rev. J. Few Smith, A. M., Professor in the Theological Seminary,
Auburn, N. York.

IN addressing such an audience as I see before me, it can scarcely be necessary to adduce arguments to prove that it is our duty to distribute freely the Holy Scriptures. That point, surely, will be readily admitted by all. Neither am I called to pronounce a panegyric on the Bible. The Bible needs no eulogy. Like the starry heavens that shine down upon us at night, while exhibiting their own attractive splendors speaking silently forth the glory of their Maker, the Bible is all glorious in itself, and glorious in the story of its origin. Bearing the impress of the Deity, it is radiant with his effulgence. The Word of God, it needeth not the praise of human lips.

* This article was originally delivered as an address before the Bible Society of Pennsylvania College and Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, in 1849, and is now published by request, and without alteration.

Yet while neither argument nor panegyric may be necessary, we may, by seizing upon some important principles deeply seated in human nature, and some grand features of the Holy Volume, and some illustrative facts in its history, and contemplating these for a little time, find our convictions of duty deepened, and perhaps feel our hearts leaping forth with zeal for an energetic, and diligent doing of that which we ought to do.

It was a noble declaration of a noble mind: "I can scarce think any pains misspent that bring me in solid evidences of that great truth, that the Scripture is the word of God, which is, indeed, the Grand Fundamental. And I use the Scripture not as an arsenal, to be resorted to only for arms and weapons to defend this, or that party, or to defeat its enemies; but as a matchless Temple, where I delight to be, to contemplate the beauty, the symmetry, and the magnificence of the structure, and to increase my awe, and excite my devotion to the Deity, there preached and adored."¹ Such a declaration is as replete with wisdom as with noble sentiment. The word of God is indeed "an arsenal" in which the friends of Truth may be furnished with armor for the combat with the legions of Error and Falsehood. But more beautifully is it to be regarded as "a matchless Temple": — a fitting place for meditation, and for worship—admirable, indeed, for its "beauty and symmetry and magnificence of structure" — but most to be visited because therein a sweetly subduing influence settles on the turbulent spirit, and the fires of unholy passion become extinguished, and the anxious questionings of the soul are answered, and it is lifted up in devotion to the Great and Benevolent God. Not as a code of laws, not as a history of past transactions, not as a record of wonders, not as the utterance of the awful voice of Jehovah, not simply as an authorized announcement of the way of life, is the Bible most preciousy regarded; but as the token of Divine Love, as the expression of the heart of the Great God, as the winning message of a loving Friend, as an influence drawing the soul to that Friend, leading it in the way of life, and filling it with sublime and loving aspirations after holiness and devotion to Jehovah. There is a *Silent Influence* proceeding from the Holy Book, powerful and productive of various and vast results; an influence felt by all who read it, and extending itself through them to others who never look upon its opened pages: an influence which gives

¹ The Hon. Robert Boyle — quoted in Anderson's *Annals of the English Bible*.

light to man, which gives understanding to the simple, which even now is transforming the character of nations, and giving a new face to the world. To some remarks on this subject, *The Silent Influence of the Bible*, I wish now to invite your attention. This influence presents itself to our view under three aspects: The *Intellectual*, the *Moral*, and the *Religious*. Each of these shall receive some notice, while the last will claim our more particular attention.

It is one of the most striking, and most valuable characteristics of the Bible, that it is *the Book of mankind*. It is both designed, and prepared, for all people, and for all classes of people. In it God addresses the whole human family: and as a parent speaking to his household seeks to adapt himself to the comprehension of each member of the circle, so is the word of God made to suit itself to the wants and the conditions of all. This is preëminently true with regard to its religious instruction: but it is also true in a general sense. The most intelligent mind, and the most cultivated taste may find in the Bible sources of information, means of mental discipline, of intellectual improvement, and of literary cultivation. The scholar may be delighted with its strains of poetry, its beautiful imagery, its terseness of expression, its richness of thought, its glorious themes of contemplation. The student of human nature may derive instruction from its historic records, its simple narratives, its faithful delineations, its searching revelations of the working of the heart. The inquirer into the history of our race, may be furnished with most ancient records, and even though he may not fully acknowledge its divine original, may at least derive light from it: bowing to it, however, as God's own word, he is led to fountains of historic truth such as are nowhere else to be found. The civilian has herein unfolded for his study a code of laws and a system of government of high antiquity, and of peculiar interest; while he also has much light thrown upon the state of jurisprudence and general civilization among various ancient nations, whose influence the world still feels. While for all these classes, in the perusal of the Sacred Volume, there is exerted an influence tending to the expansion of the mind, and to the cultivation of purity and strength, and proper elevation of literary taste. No man, indeed, whatever be his religious sentiments, has fulfilled the duty of a scholar, who has not read the Bible either in the original, or in his own tongue: and no man can read it carefully without finding in it a source of intellectual improvement—without feeling its influence silently exerted in his mind. Ample testimony is borne to this fact by

men of every department of cultivated mind, and of every variety of opinions. The Bible is a book for the scholar. He cannot be without it — not only because its language and its sentiments are now interwoven into the very frame-work of all civilized society, but also because of the important and excellent influence which it may exert on his own intellectual character. And I would commend to all who, in connection with the literary Institutions of this place, are aiming at literary proficiency, these words of Sir Thomas Browne: “I do believe the Holy Scriptures to be the word of God; yet were it of man, I could not choose but say it was the singularlest, and superlative piece that hath been extant since the creation; were I a pagan I should not refrain the lecture of it, and cannot but commend the judgment of Ptolmey that thought not his library complete without it.” *Religio Medici*, p. 55.

And to this let me add the language of one of the greatest of men of our own day, an honor to our country, the venerable Adams: “I speak as a man of the world to men of the world—and I say to you, Search the Scriptures. It is a book which neither the most ignorant and weakest, nor the most learned, and intelligent mind, can read without improvement.” Nor can I forbear reciting the oft quoted words of the distinguished scholar and jurist, Sir William Jones: “I have carefully and regularly perused the Holy Scriptures, and am of opinion that the Volume, independent of its divine origin, contains more sublimity, purer morality, more important history and finer strains of eloquence, than can be collected from all other books in whatever language they may have been written.”

But it is in view of the millions of our race whose education is comparatively neglected that this intellectual influence of the Bible is most valuable. It should be remembered, however, in this connection, that every cultivated intellect exerts an influence upon the uncultivated mass; so that what tends to the cultivation of one affects the whole. Facts clearly show that a Bible-reasoning community is more intelligent, that it carries a more elevated tone of thought and judgment, more correctness of taste and perception, is, on the whole, in a higher intellectual condition, than a community in which the Bible is unknown or neglected. The *preaching* of divine truth, the services of the sanctuary which usually accompany a free distribution of the Sacred Scriptures, do their part for the production of this effect. But independantly of these, and of the education of the Sabbath School, which itself is due to the Bible, the silent influence of the Bible in cultivating the taste,

and elevating the thoughts, and enlarging the comprehensions of the masses of men, is undoubtedly very great. The Bible is a grand Teacher of the community. It is the Schoolmaster in the family. It is a most potent friend and promoter of the great cause of Popular Education. None can be its reader, or frequently hear it read, without intellectual profiting. And while this will in all probability be found true of all communities in which the Bible is read, in whatever language, it is peculiarly true of the English Bible. No book, probably, does more to give correctness and beauty of expression to the language of the millions who speak that tongue. Abounding in apothegms in pointed maxims, in beautiful and apt illustrations, with a sweet simplicity throwing its charming character over the whole, and yet with a strength and forcefulness unsurpassed, it is well adapted to form the general style; while its wondrous and lofty themes serve to interest and expand the general mind. The story of Scotland, and of Puritan England and America, amply establishes this point: while the records of German Literature and German History will tell us how much the Bible given to the people by the great Reformer, in their own nervous and rich language, accomplished at once for the general improvement, and how it even now exerts its formative and salutary influence.

But the *Moral Influence* of the Bible is of still higher significance. I need not stop to speak of the morality, which the Bible teaches, as the purest, and best adapted in the promotion of human good, that the world has ever seen. What else should we expect from Him who is infinite in purity and wisdom? How should the streams flowing from such a fountain be otherwise than bright and healthful, and pleasant to the soul? And what shall we look for from a people by whom this Bible is read, and who are brought under its influence? May we not expect to see them improved in all that pertains to individual and social welfare? and do not facts sustain this expectation?

The Bible is the friend of virtue, of good order, of domestic happiness, of liberty, and in favor of all these it is continually exerting its influence. Wherever it has gone it has proved itself the Reformer of the Morals, and a blessing to men. It rebukes all evil. It opposes a restraint to passion. It sternly reproves selfishness. It inculcates benevolence and brotherly kindness. It is an enemy to vice, and to all that disturbs the peace of society, or the happiness of mankind. And its history clearly shows, that it has ever exerted a most benign in-

fluence on the communities in which it has been found. Often times, unaccompanied by any aid, dispersed among the people, like leaven hid in the meal, it has quietly wrought great changes, not only in individuals or in families, but in whole neighborhoods. It has ever been a light in the dwelling, and a glory and blessing to the nation, and to it the cause of human liberty, and human good is incalculably indebted. The truth of this will be most strikingly exhibited by a glance at some facts. We need not resort for our illustrations to contrasts between Heathen and Christian lands: nor need we go back to the ages preceding the Reformation, during which the Bible was to the millions of the people a sealed book, and even to the large majority of those who presumed to be professed teachers of its doctrines was unknown. After the Reformation the Southern nations of Europe, for the most part, resisted the introduction of the Sacred Scriptures among the people, while in the North their circulation was favored.— Even at the present day the grand distinction between Protestant and Catholic nations lies in the fact, that the one excludes the Bible, while the other gives it to the people: or rather one gives the word of God mingled and defiled with human traditions, the other, in its purity. Now it is found that in the Bible reading nations there is and ever has been, more liberty, more elevation of the people, more general comfort and happiness, and more general intelligence, as well as a higher regard to the laws of equity, of benevolence, of social kindness, than in those nations which are ignorant of God's Word. The Bible has served, and is serving, to break down the tyranny of the Monarch, of Feudalism, and of Priestcraft. It elevates the people. It enforces the great principle which lies at the foundation of sound government, *the Equality of Rights*, and teaches that government is intended for the general good of the nation, and not for the aggrandizement of the few. It makes the people feel their strength, and leads them to assert their rights. While at the same time it promotes good order, makes a nation law-loving and obedient, and opposes itself to wars. To sustain these remarks you may contrast Germany with Spain and Italy, or even Protestant with Catholic Germany— or Scotland with Ireland. Spain has obstinately refused to allow the Bible to come among the people—and what a scene does she present? Scarce a nation on the earth so low in consideration, and so slight in influence as she—torn with internal distraction, in almost constant anarchy, with an impoverished people, and a tarnished name abroad. Scotland, rich in the Bible, has long been noted for the morality and intelligence of

her people: while poor Ireland, with all her native resources, and all the inherent excellence of her people, enshrouded in ignorance and cursed with oppression, has been the prey of designing men; has exhibited the fierceness of savages; even now writhes in wretchedness and is stained with most revolting crimes. Of Italy the lament might long have been, "How has the mighty fallen! How art thou destroyed, O thou renowned city!" A new life seems now to be stirring her cold form. The principle of popular rights seems to have forced itself an acknowledgment. Strange scenes have been enacted within the ancient city, and strange voices heard — scenes which might stir the blood of a Brutus or a Rienzi, and make a Borgia or a Gregory tremble — and although we may not fully understand the much lauded Pius, we trust that in this movement will be found the germs of Italian liberty, and noble elevation. But it is worthy of careful observation, that within the past few years there have been circulated in Italy a number of copies of the Holy Bible as received by Protestants: and while we may not be able to trace directly to these any of the new popular opinion, and recognition of popular rights, yet I doubt not they have been silently exerting their influence; and to these Bibles and to others that shall follow them must the lover of human liberty and human improvement, look, with hopeful eye, for the regeneration of Italy. If we look to Great Britain and America, we shall find the history of the silent moral influence of the Bible deeply interesting. The first English translation of the Sacred Scriptures, that of Wickliffe, remaining in manuscript, could not be extensively read because the copies of it were comparatively few. Yet that had its important and excellent influence. — Voices were lifted up in its behalf even in high places. It cast into the British soil a germ of life which has never perished. And I do not hesitate to express the opinion, that to the English Bible are Great Britain and America very greatly, if not mainly, indebted for their large liberty, and grand national characteristics. But for a long time the influence was silently working in England. The translation by Tyndale was among the first printed English books: but all the authority of the crown and the hierarchy opposed its introduction among the people. Yet it went among them, despite of persecution and of martyrdom, and it was silently working in many homes and many hearts. It was concealed from the search of those in authority, and thus numerous copies were handed down from father to son.

“Fierce, whisker’d guards that Volume sought in vain,
 Enjoyed by stealth, and hid with anxious pain ;
 While all around was misery and gloom,
 This showed the boundless bliss beyond the tomb ;
 Freed from the venal priest, the feudal rod,
 It led the suff’rer’s weary steps to God ;
 And when his painful course on earth was run,
 This, his chief wealth, descended to his son.”

“The highly prized treasure, read often in the dead of the night, was concealed under the bed, in hay-lofts, or in out-houses ;” and in one case—“a diligent search being made for all suspicious books”—“a gentleman sent for a bricklayer, and built up a wall in his chamber against the place where all his books were, and so inclosed them in security from the danger of being taken, preserving them for himself against better times.”¹ And so by means of its silent influence, the people were made to be in advance of their rulers ; and when the latter openly threw off the Romish yoke, they found a nation ready to rejoice in freedom. And as the light of Divine Truth was more widely diffused, and clearly perceived, the principles of civil liberty were more fully realized, and Britain advanced then forward to her present high degree of glorious freedom. The influence of the Bible was seen in her noble-hearted Puritans, and converted a rebellion into a revolution pregnant with most happy issues. It was seen in the colonists who came to these western regions, and sought and found “freedom to worship God.” It is seen in our free Institutions—in the foundation and the pillars of this great Republic. It is seen in the general intelligence and love of order of our people. It is clearly to be discerned in the footsteps of our Puritan and subsequent ancestry, and in our revolutionary struggle. And it makes the striking contrast between our happy Republic, and the neighboring States of Mexico, and South America. Here are brought into close contact a nation with the Bible, and a nation without it, and the most careless and most prejudiced observer cannot fail to be struck with the vast difference between the two.

An equally remarkable and striking illustration of the moral influence of the Bible is furnished us in the contrast between the French Revolution of 1793, and the English and American Revolutions ; and also by the admirable resistance in Britain and America to the demoralizing influences of the French commotion. France was a wild scene of passion, of fierce rioting, of blood and carnage. *She had no Bible among her*

¹ Annals of the English Bible, Vol. II. p. 304.

people, and they raged with unbridled licentiousness, and wrought terrific misery. In England, it is true, the king was brought to the scaffold, and a civil war raged. But no such scenes of lawless violence and foul rioting were there enacted. All was conducted in the firmness and steadfastness of stern principle, deluded, it may have been, for a moment, mistaken, and perhaps turned somewhat aside by the mighty ruling of one ambitious mind—yet ever keeping liberty with Constitutional Law in view. And in our own country we have the noblest example of a Revolution conducted without excesses—of liberty working out her triumph, while yet bowing herself to her guardian law. And to what are these excellent characteristics to be largely traced? And what was it that enabled Britain, (and to some extent the remark will apply to our own country), so successfully to resist that tide of infidelity in religion, and radicalism in politics, which, acting in France both as a cause and a consequence of her bloody Revolution, seemed threatening to sweep away the people into a like gloomy vortex? It was the Bible—the Bible read among the people. Noble champions were raised up to defend the Bible: but it was doubtless the Bible itself, known to the people and read by them, that formed under God their great barrier and strong defence. Here let me quote the language of a recent English writer:—“Throughout the eighteenth century there had risen not one French mind of sufficient power and skill to gainsay and resist, so as to check the tide of Infidelity. No, it spread over the people, and swept all before it into one common ruin. And why? *The people in France* HAD NOT READ THE SCRIPTURES FOR THEMSELVES. A *ceremonial* religion, though supported by immense wealth, had proved to be no barrier. On British ground there was a difference. Her skeptics in succession, had every one of them, been looked hard in the face. From Herbert down to Hume and Paine, they had been fully met, exposed and overthrown; while Deism, false Philosophy and boasted human Reason, were not only tried by appeal to the oracles of God, but scrutinized as to their moral tendency, and found wanting. But why all this? or rather, why successful to whatever degree? We hesitate not to reply that there is but one answer. *The people in Britain* HAD LONG READ THE SCRIPTURES FOR THEMSELVES.”¹

But I am dwelling too long on this point. Did time permit it would be interesting to illustrate it still farther: ad to trace the moral influence wrought through the instrumentality of

¹ Annals of Eng. Bible, Vol. II. p. 582.

the British and Foreign Bible Society, and our own beloved institution of a later date. The Bible is the noblest safeguard of a free people. The friend of human liberty, it is equally the enemy of licentiousness. It will elevate the mass while it enforces the supremacy of law. Its whole history has been the history of a benign influence, blessing mankind, advancing civilization, subduing barbarian rudeness and tyrannic oppression, nourishing all the sweet graces of domestic love and social kindness, purifying society, and promoting virtuous living and general refinement.

I come now to speak of the *Religious Influence* of the Bible—and this is the grandest aspect of our subject, and one to which no human mind can do complete justice. With its religious influence, its moral influence is closely connected, and indeed, upon it is greatly dependent. The Bible teaches us the *true Religion*, the religion of God. It is a light from heaven shining upon the path in which man gropes in darkness. It is the voice of an angel saying to the anxious multitudes who are crowded around the altar bearing the inscription, “*To the Unknown God,*” “whom ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you.” It alone makes known unto us the true God, and Jesus Christ whom He has sent—in the knowledge of whom standeth Eternal Life. The Bible alone points out to man the way of life. The Bible alone tells how JEHOVAH may be worshipped — how sin may be forgiven. The Bible alone assures us of immortality — answers the questionings of the soul—gives credible promise that the soul’s anticipation of a coming judgment shall be realized — tells with authority of heaven and hell—and points to the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world. The Bible alone meets the wants of man and satisfies his desires. The religion of the Bible—the religion of God in Jesus Christ, is bread to the hungry, is water to the thirsty soul. It is the oil and wine poured by the good Samaritan into the wounds and bruises of the poor wayfarer. It is the Balm of Gilead that heals the soul’s thirst. It is the staff of the aged. It is the guide of the young. It produces peace, begets patience, endues with courage, inspires with hope. It enriches the poor, and is to the rich man more precious than all his wealth. It is a religion for this life — a religion for eternity—a religion for the soul. And as such, intended for all men, proceeding from the God and Father of all, it is adapted unto all; and in the blessed Book, is God’s most glorious plan of saving men set forth, in language so plain that all may understand, and on terms so gracious that none need perish.

“O how unlike the complex works of man,
 Heaven’s easy, artless, unencumbered plan!
 No meretricious graces to beguile,
 No clustering ornaments to clog the pile;
 From ostentation, as from weakness, free,
 It stands, like the cerulean arch we see,
 Majestic in its own simplicity.
 Inscribed above the Portal, from afar
 Conspicuous as the brightness of a star,
 Legible only by the light they give,
 Stand the soul quickening words: “*Believe and Live.*”

When we pause for a moment to consider this aspect of our subject we are overwhelmed with its magnitude. When we regard the human race as sunk in sin, yet every man immortal—when we see the millions bowing to grievous and debasing superstitions, toiling under the burdens of this life, and hurrying to eternity to meet a tribunal at which they must plead guilty,—and then behold in this precious volume the means of lifting them up from the depths of sin, of giving them peace and contentment under the cares of life, and especially of delivering them from condemnation, and preparing them for a happy immortality—how can we estimate its value or find language to speak of its importance to mankind. Select one individual out of the countless multitudes of human beings to whom to apply the benefits of the Holy Book, and let that one, if you choose, be taken from the mass whose lot is poverty and toil: and marking the blessed influence of the Bible in this one case—seeing it giving patience, and resignation, and cheerfulness to the soul, ennobling the character, making life glad with peace of mind, and joy in believing, and sustaining with the bright hope of “a treasure in the skies:”—and then letting the mind run on to contemplate that treasure, rich and everlasting:—just think of the millions on millions who have been, and may yet be made partakers of the same blessings; and of the millions on millions now without the Bible; and say,

“Shall we whose souls are lighted
 With wisdom from on high,
 Shall we to men benighted,
 The Lamp of Life deny?”

But let it be remembered that it is of the *Silent Influence* of the Bible that we are speaking; that is, of the influence which it exerts in itself without the aid of oral teaching, or the written expositions of men. And this is of special importance to a society, whose great business it is to circulate the Holy Scriptures “without note or comment.” The great fact

is not overlooked that God has appointed "the ministry of reconciliation," as the instrument for the conversion of sinners; that it has pleased Him "by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." Neither do we forget, that it is the province of the Holy Spirit to renew the heart of fallen man, and bring him to his God. But it is a fact of the utmost importance, and affording the highest encouragement for zealous perseverance in the work of disseminating the Word of Life, that the Bible itself, without external aids, is often the means of producing conversions—of transforming the servants of sin into children of the most High God. It carries with it a power which, silently exerted, is deeply felt. We need not speculate with theologians about the inherent power of the letter of the Sacred Volume, nor discuss the question, whether the Holy Spirit invariably accompanies the written word. It is enough for us to know that the Bible, alone, in its simplicity, without the preacher or the expositor has led men unto God in Christ. Facts abundantly testify to this. Instances of such a nature have probably come under the observation of many of us.

I have seen a man of intelligence and uprightness, reading for years his Bible, and escaping from the snares of the adversary, deriving silently and gradually therefrom his convictions, his penitence, his faith, his devout obedience.

I watched the dying of an aged man who had long read the Bible, yet refused to give up his sins; and who had often scoffed at its holy teachings: and I marked in the yielding of his soul, in his acknowledgments almost unwillingly given, and at last in the trembling outstretching of the hand of faith, a striking testimony to the silent working of the Holy Word.

A young man of talents, and bright promise, yet without a proper faith in Christ, was arrested by disease; and in his bed of suffering the Bible became his teacher, and by degrees his chief companion; and it made all his bed in his sickness, and flung the light of heaven over his departing soul.

How often has a single passage of the Holy Volume fixed itself in the mind and worked silently and powerfully there! How often has the reading of one of the Gospels wrought mighty changes! Is not the silent influence of the Bible remarkably evinced in the numbers who, reading it secretly, were enabled by the strength which it afforded, to endure the pains of persecution, some of them even unto death? Nay, was it not the reading of the Holy Volume which, under God's grace, lifted Luther out of the depths in which he might otherwise have remained? Did not the perusal of the Holy Book kindle a fire within his soul, which burned and blazed until

Europe and the world saw the light and felt the heat? And was it not a fitting and noble return which he, Bible-enlightened, and by the Bible set free, made to God, in giving the Bible unto his countrymen, that it might likewise burn in their souls, and be to every household a pillar of fire for their guidance and defence?

It is related of the noted Earl of Rochester, whom one of his biographers describes as "a great wit, a great sinner, and a great penitent," that, "Reading the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, he was convinced of the truth and inspiration of the Scriptures, the Deity of the Messiah, and the value of his atonement as a rock on which sinners may build their hopes of salvation. On that atonement he rested, and died in the humble expectation of pardoning mercy and heavenly happiness."

The following incident is related upon good authority:— "Mr. Robert Aitkin, a bookseller of Philadelphia, was the first person who printed a Bible in that city. While he kept a book-store, a person called on him, and inquired if he had Paine's "Age of Reason" for sale. He told him he had not; but having entered into conversation with him and found that he was an infidel, he told him that he had a better book than Paine's "Age of Reason," which he usually sold for a dollar, but would lend it to him, if he would promise to read it: and after he had actually read it, if he did not think it worth a dollar, he would take it again. The man consented, and Mr. Aitkin put a Bible into his hands. He smiled when he found what book he had engaged to read, but said he would perform his engagement. He did so: and when he had finished the perusal, he came back and expressed his deepest gratitude for Mr. Aitkin's recommendation of the book, saying it had made him, what he was not before, a happy man; for he had found in it the way of salvation through Christ. Mr. Aitkin rejoiced in the event, and had the satisfaction of knowing that this reader of the Bible, from that day to the end of his life, supported the character of a consistent christian, and died with a hope full of immortality."

A distributor of a Bible Association in the State of New York, "called at a house where he met with an angry repulse. The man of the house was full of 'cursing and bitterness;' he would not suffer a Bible to be left at his house. 'If left any where,' said he, 'it shall be left at the barn.' 'Very well,' the distributor meekly replied, 'I do not know that I could select a better place for it: our blessed Saviour once lay in a manger!' He went quickly to the barn and deposited the sacred

treasure in a safe place, with much prayer that it might bless even him who would not allow it to remain in his house. The man struck with the unexpected reply of the distributor, was led to think of his own rashness and guilt, and especially of the Saviour's Birth-place. After two or three days his distress became so great, that he went out to the barn in search of the rejected volume. He turned to the passage which records the circumstances connected with the Birth of the Redeemer, and wept, and, it is hoped, repented, and consecrated himself to God through faith in Christ. 'The once spurned book now found a place, not only in his house, but its truths were received into his heart and controlled his life.'

Many more facts of this kind might easily be mentioned, showing conclusively, that there is a wonder-working power in the Holy Bible. Let me call your attention to two others, similar in their character to these already stated, yet possessing some peculiarities. The first opens to our minds a view of the immense amount of good that may be accomplished by means of a single copy of the Scriptures.

"A Romish Catholic Priest lived in Yucatan, about the end of the last century and near to the British Settlement, who was in the habit of reading and preaching from a Spanish Bible, which somehow had fallen into his possession. He was forbidden to do so, but persevered, and was cast into prison, where he was left to die. His old house-keeper got his Bible, read from it to the villagers and young people, who assembled around her on the feast days of the church. She not only instructed them, but was often sent for by the dying. The Bible was left to a young woman who was the pupil of this house-keeper, and who with others, when advanced in life, came seeking books from Mr. Henderson in Belize. Discovering an instructed mind, and unusual regard for the Scriptures, inquiry was made, and the preceding facts came out in explanation. Here was a Bible passing through three generations, and blessing each, and yet for fifty years, the good it had done was unknown beyond its immediate hearers."¹

"The late Rev. Dr. Corrie, Bishop of Madras, was formerly the Chaplain of Allahabad. At that time there was no Hindostanee version of the Scriptures; and it was his custom to translate, on small bits of paper, striking passages of Scripture into that language, and every morning distribute these papers at his door. Twenty years after, he received a communication from a Missionary at Allahabad, who informed him that a per-

¹ Day Spring, April 1847.

son in ill health had arrived there, and that he had been to visit him. He had come to see his friends and die among them, after an absence of more than twenty years. The missionary had visited him there several times, and was so astonished at his knowledge of the Scriptures, and his impressions of its great realities, that he put the question—"How is it, my friend, that you are so well informed in the Sacred Scriptures? You have told me that you have never seen a Missionary in your life, nor any one to teach you the way of life and salvation!" And what was his answer? He put his hand behind his pillow, and drew out a bundle of well worn and tattered bits of paper, and said: "From these bits of paper which a sahib distributed at his door, whom I have never seen since, have I learned all. These papers which I received twenty years ago, and have read every day, till they are thus tumbled and spoiled are passages of Scripture in the Hindostanee language, from them I have derived all the information on eternal realities which I now possess. This is the source of my information; thus I have derived my knowledge."¹

What testimony, my brethren, does God bear to his word! How has he blessed it! What encouragement have we here for labor! What a power resides in the Holy Volume! And in view of its silent influence, of its most blessed effects, may we not exclaim, in the eloquent language of another: "What sort of Book is this, that even the winds and waves of human passion obey it? What other engine of social improvement has operated so long, and yet lost none of its virtue? Since it appeared, many boasted plans of amelioration have been tried and failed; many codes of jurisprudence have arisen and run their course and expired. Empire after empire has been launched on the tide of time, and gone down leaving no trace on the waters. But this Book is still going about doing good—leavening society with its holy principles—cheering the sorrowful with its consolations—strengthening the tempted, encouraging the penitent, calming the troubled spirit, and soothing the pillow of death. Can such a Book be the offspring of human genius? Does not the vastness of its effects demonstrate the excellency of the power to be of God?"

Such, my hearers, is the Bible: and such its influence: so rich in blessings, so precious to the soul. What lover of his country will not aid in its distribution? What lover of mankind will not seek to give it to all the world? What christian

¹ *Ib.* p. 43.

heart is not filled with desire that all men may partake of the royal gift—earth's solace, and the guide to heaven?

Such is the Bible; and daily, hourly are we drinking from the rich streams of its blessings. It is to us the ark of God's covenant. It is the Shekinah in our tabernacles—the visible token of God's presence with us. Oh let us not forget our indebtedness, nor fail to make thank-offerings unto Him who gives it to us!

Such is the Bible; wherever it goes silently, but powerfully exerting its happy influence—expanding the intellect, purifying the morals, elevating the character, solacing the woes, breaking the fetters of mankind; strengthening liberty with the support of law; throwing away the burdens of superstition and idolatry; allaying the fears of awakened conscience, and guiding perishing souls to everlasting salvation.

We have this Bible—but oh! how many millions of our race are destitute of it!

In 1834 it was estimated that the whole number of Bibles in the world was not more than *Twenty* millions. If we suppose that the yearly issue in the world, for the last fourteen years, has averaged *five* millions, which is probably a large estimate, we should have the amount of ninety millions. But this amount must be very considerably reduced by an allowance for books worn out, or otherwise destroyed. Supposing the number, however, at present, in the world to be ninety millions, and estimating the population of the world at one thousand millions; we behold nine hundred and ten millions of our race, immortal as we are, destitute of the Word of Life—that word which alone tells of Jesus Christ! Or supposing, which is far from being the case, that the Bibles were distributed one to each family, taking five as the average number of the family—there would then be one hundred and ten millions of families, or five hundred and fifty millions of souls without a Bible!

I need not detain you by speaking of the heathen nations who bow down to idols, and are sunk in the worst forms of superstition; where woman is treated as a brute; where the car of Juggernaut rolls over its deluded victims; and the widow is burned at the husband's funeral pile, and children are thrown into the muddy stream, or buried alive in the earth; where weary pilgrimages are performed, and poor burdened human beings torture their bodies for the sake of their souls.

But the estimate just made presents us the startling fact, that there are millions nominally christian, and living in civilized lands who are without the Bible! Oh what a call on Christ-

ian benevolence and activity! It is altogether probable, that the number of inhabitants in Great Britain, and the United States would be fully equal to the whole number of Protestant Bibles in the world — certainly, if to this number the people of Germany be added, the amount will fully equal that of the Bibles.

But we may come still nearer home — and while the cry for the Bible comes to us from crowded China, and teeming India, and the mountains of Palestine and Persia, and France and Italy are opening avenues for its entrance among the people, our land is full of waste places! Yes! this land, so much blessed, and so much owing to the Bible its blessedness, contains thousands of families destitute of the Bible! It is estimated that the annual issue of Bibles and Testaments in our land, is about equal to the annual increase of our population. But of this issue a large part is exported to other lands. Besides there is the constant demand arising from the wearing out and loss of volumes. So that the supply is far from equaling the demand. Had the American Bible Society sufficient funds, it might readily double its issues, and yet not be able to meet the wants of the people. But it must be remembered, that the work of the Bible Society is not simply to furnish Bibles to those who apply for them; but also to seek out the destitute and offer them the Bread of Life—to bring the Holy Word before the minds of many who would otherwise never see it, and be unblessed by its precious influence. Various motives deter the destitute from seeking a supply; and it becomes our business to present the supply in their own homes. It has been found that the work of exploration and distribution must be repeated once in *five* years. Many persons are inclined to think that there is no destitution in their immediate neighborhood: but investigations often show this to be a mistaken opinion. Unless a thorough exploration and distribution have recently been made in this borough and vicinity, I doubt not you will find many in need of Bibles among you and around you. An agent in Massachusetts, the home of the Puritans, and a centre of light, says: “In one place I found a family married eight years which had never a Bible, and seven others within one mile *where the minister said there could be no destitution.* Prominent persons in all the towns were very confident I should find no families destitute near there. But in visiting I found such in every town, and almost in every neighborhood; some under the droppings of the Sanctuary, and in densely populated streets.” Of your own State it is said: “Notwithstanding Pennsylvania was reported

as supplied in 1845, still we find the demand for the Word increasing every year. Those counties that were supplied in 1843-4 are now engaged in a re-supply, and find large destitutions. In Fayette County, 688 families were destitute, and supplied; and over 4,000 youths were supplied with the New Testament. This County was supplied in 1843. In addition to the 688 Bibles disposed of in that County to families destitute, over 800 copies were sold to families requiring additional copies. In Green County over 400 families were found destitute and supplied. In Warren County were found 300 families destitute out of 1500 visited, equal to one-fifth. These are fair specimens of the destitutions where investigation is made. And this too in those Counties which were supplied in 1843 and 1844. Facts like these teach us that we have no stopping place in the Bible work. Supply a County thoroughly the present year, and if the County is explored even the succeeding year, a considerable destitution is found."¹

But my own interest in the subject is causing me, I fear, to weary my audience, and I hasten to a conclusion. The course of thought which we have pursued makes it abundantly evident, that the Bible-cause appeals to us by every motive of patriotism, philanthropy, benevolence, and Christian duty. If there be any cause worthy to awaken an interest, and enlist our sympathy, and call out our liberal contributions, it is this. In this cause all may unite. In this work of the Lord differences of name and sentiment may be forgotten. Around this Holy Ark, the different tribes of Christian Israel may arrange themselves with their several banners, yet feel themselves to be but one people, and sing one song of praise to the Redeeming God. In aiding this cause all may unite in fulfilling the mission of the Lord Jesus, in the proclamation of glad tidings to all the world. Do you need an *argument*, my hearers? Here is one simple, and incontrovertible. The Bible is God's blessing to mankind — the Book of life-giving influences to the world. You have the Bible; millions of your fellow-beings have it not. How plain, how solemn, how imperative your duty! Do you need *incitement*? Think once more of the blessings of the Bible, and of the destitute; and while your own table is covered with the Bread of Life, will you not throw some crumbs to the hungry? To use a beautiful figure, though not the language of another: while the manna falls thickly around your camp, and the pure water from the smit-

¹ Am. Bible Society Report, 1847, p. 125.

ten rock refreshes your souls, will you not remember the parched and famishing wayfarers in the wilderness, and bid them welcome to a share in your blessings? "Freely ye have received: freely give."

Do you ask for *encouragement*? It is abundant. Good has been done. Every Bible is doing good. Every person, who contributes to this cause, is doing a most noble work of goodness. Find your encouragement in the influence you may thus be able to exercise for the benefit of your country, for the good of your fellow-citizens, and your fellow-men. Find it in the contemplation of the silent influence of each copy of the Sacred Volume, which you may be the means of placing in the hand of a destitute fellow being. Find it in the consciousness of doing good. Find it in the anticipation of a glorious future. All who, with a proper love to God, and in the spirit of the blessed Volume, aid in sending it forth throughout the earth, shall participate in the gladness of that day, when the ransomed of the Lord shall come to Zion; when earth's miseries all finished, earth's darkness all dispelled, the King, even He who once, though He was rich, for our sakes became poor that we through his poverty might be made rich; the King shall sit upon his holy hill of Zion, and around him shall be assembled all his faithful ones, and pointing to this and that abode that was blessed by His Word, shall say, "Well done, ye blessed, inasmuch as ye did it unto these, ye did it unto me."

May the hearts of all present be favorably disposed towards this good cause, and may the Society here convened be blessed with extensive usefulness, through God's abounding grace.

AMEN.

ARTICLE IV.

THE CIRCUMSTANCES ATTENDING THE FIRST ADMISSION OF THE GENTILES INTO THE CHURCH.

By the Rev. C. W. Schaeffer A. M., Germantown, Pa.

THE Acts of the Apostles not only record the practice of the first preachers of the Gospel, it also develops various principles, which both belong to the foundation of the church, and mark its progress in all subsequent times. The agency of the Holy Spirit, the power of prayer, the nature and efficacy of entire

consecration, on the part of the Lord's people, are ruling features of that interesting history.

The conversion of the Gentiles and their admission to the privileges of the Church of God, peculiarly connected, as it is, with the interests of the church in all ages and amongst all people, might be considered as deserving special attention. The prophecies of the Old Testament, concerning the Gentiles, had been so numerous and diversified, that nothing but the partial blindness of Israel, we suppose, could have prevented them from entertaining a general expectation of the speedy accession of all nations to the kingdom of God.

The directions given by our Lord to his Apostles, appear to us to be so plain and simple, that we might have expected to see the Apostles, without any further communications from above, going forth to the lands of the Heathen, and in the exercise of their ministry adding men and women every where to the Lord. Yet, the remarkable events, so full of Divine agency, that opened the door of faith to the Gentiles, show how slow the Apostles were to understand, and how backward to execute the will of God respecting the Heathen.

In the series of events thus referred to, the first is the conversion of a man who, possessed of a cultivated intellect, yet marked by bigotry and strong passions, had rendered himself notorious by the malignant persecutions with which he followed up the disciples of Jesus. The connection of his conversion with the purposes of God respecting the Gentiles, is distinctly presented in the communication made to Ananias of Damascus, Acts 9, and in the commission given to Saul himself. Acts 26. "He is a chosen vessel to bear my name before the Gentiles and Kings," "to whom I now send thee, to open their eyes and turn them from darkness to light," &c.

In this event two things are manifest. It was brought about, not by the ordinary operations of Grace, but by an extraordinary interposition of Divine Power; and its avowed object was the accomplishment of certain specific purposes in the Gentile world. By this event then, the chief agent for commencing and carrying on the work of gathering in the nations was secured.

Two other circumstances yet remained, the proper disposal of which, on the part of the Head of the Church, seems to have been necessary, in order to turn the zeal of the laborer, thus secured, to good account in the conversion of the Gentile world. The first was, that the spirit of inquiry should be awakened in the breasts, at least of some of the Heathen themselves — the other, that the Apostles should be set free

from their exclusive Jewish prejudices, and become willing to admit the Gentiles to the Church, upon the ground of faith alone.

As the necessity for a laborer was met in the person of Saul, so the circumstances just referred to were disposed of, in the persons of Cornelius and Peter respectively.

That there were other Gentiles whose minds were as open for the reception of the truth as was that of Cornelius, need not be questioned. The Holy Spirit saw proper to bring him forward as the first fruits of the Gentile world.

Cornelius is introduced to us as a Roman centurion; it may be, a Roman, at least an Italian by birth. His profession as a soldier, and his official dignity as the commander of a considerable body of Italian troops, might be considered as inconsistent with the possession of a devout and humble spirit. Accordingly his evangelical inclination, which under any circumstances would have been interesting, must be regarded, on this account, as the more illustrious. The Spirit of the Lord had a work to accomplish for his own glory in the Church; and before that Spirit the crooked is made straight, and the rough places become smooth. In spite of all the hindrances to piety, by which he must have been surrounded, Cornelius was nevertheless a man of deep and long-tried devotion.

As we believe, that God, in drawing men towards the truth, generally operates upon their minds by the use of means, it would be interesting to know the agency by which the mind of Cornelius was at length led into his state of anxious inquiry. What these means were we do not pretend to determine. But it is remarkable, from what various quarters, the Providence of God had long been operating so as to prepare the Gentile world for the reception of the Gospel. From all of these possibly, from some of them certainly, the mind of Cornelius was reached.

(*a*) Neander, in his *General History of the Church*, has given a clear and interesting account of the influence of the Platonic Philosophy, in turning the attention of reflecting Gentiles to things heavenly and divine. It was one of the principles of this Philosophy, that man was not a transient apparition, but a being destined for a higher development; and, that the present life was but a stage preparatory to a loftier existence. The Platonists were prone to hunt up, in the preceding history of humanity, traces of a commerce between heaven and earth, and the idea of a divine revelation, conveyed to man, under many diversified forms, was one most

agreeable to them. As a result of this philosophical system, there was felt every where, the necessity of some revelation from above, that would convey to inquiring minds that peace, which the former conflicting systems of Philosophy and Religion had never been able to secure. Even Porphyry, the zealous defender of the old religious systems, as quoted by Neander, has asserted this in his collection of ancient oracles, prepared by him as the basis of a better theology. Referring to this production he remarks: "the utility of such a work will be best understood by those, who with painful anxiety, have longed for some divine revelation, which, by its faithful communications, might give them peace from trouble."

As a tangible illustration of these mental conflicts, by which reflecting men had their attention directed towards the faith of the Gospel, the history already referred to, has given us a quotation from the Clementina. Though a mere romance, the work may be regarded as a fair representation of many scenes of real life; and though belonging to the second or third century, it is equally trust-worthy, as an exposition of the mental conflicts of earlier ages.

The author of the Clementina has thus related the experience of Clement, a member of a noble family of Rome:—"From my early youth I was perplexed with doubts and anxieties of mind, of which I understood not the source. Shall I be annihilated in death, and entirely forgotten? When was the world made, and what existed before the Creation? What shall be after the end of the world? Shall there be some state of existence, of which it is now impossible to conceive?—Ceaselessly followed up by such perplexities, I was so tortured, that health and spirit began to fail me. But I knew not then, what I afterwards discovered, that in these anxieties, I had a faithful leader, by whose agency God was conducting me to eternal life. Under these circumstances, I often envied those who seemed to enjoy the bliss of ignorance. Troubled by such anxieties, from my youth, I sought to relieve my mind by attending upon the schools of the Philosophers.—There, however, I saw nothing but the building up and tearing down of principles. One while the immortality of the soul was proved; again its mortality was demonstrated. Thus borne hither and thither by every wind, my confusion was ever increasing, and I sighed deeply in the bitterness of my soul." Clement resolved then upon visiting Egypt, the land of mysteries and of spiritual apparitions; but was deterred by the calm suggestions of an intelligent friend. In this state

of mind he heard the preaching of the Gospel, and it came home to his heart, in demonstration of the Spirit and of power.

This, though we may esteem it as but an imaginary case, may nevertheless be regarded, as upon the whole, a faithful account of many cases in real life; and in this manner the very barrenness and insufficiency of the religious systems of the Gentiles, was used as a means to prepare the way for the entrance in of the Gospel. This was the asking and the seeking that must precede the receiving and the finding.

Of course, in the absence of direct testimony upon the subject, we cannot determine whether Cornelius was or was not exercised in this particular manner. It is sufficient, however, to know that many thoughtful and serious minds among the Gentiles were, during the Apostolic age, directed in this way, towards the reception of the Gospel.

(b) An influence favorable to Christianity flowed also from the frequent residence of the Jews, and the wide diffusion of Jewish theology, in the lands of the Gentiles. Those who belonged to the sect of the Pharisees were especially active, and with great success, in making proselytes to the Jewish faith. Some learned men have distinguished two kinds of proselytes, which distinction, though not warranted by Scripture history, may yet be found convenient. These are 1) the proselytes of Righteousness or Justice; 2) the proselytes of the Gate. The proselytes of Righteousness were those Gentiles who, upon embracing the Jewish faith, had been circumcised and adopted the whole ceremonial law of the Jews. In many cases, they gave themselves up without reserve to Jewish superstitions and fanaticism, and became the blind followers of their own blind guides. These proselytes were often the most malignant enemies of Christianity, and were found, by those Christians who encountered their rage, to be as the Lord described them, twofold more the children of hell than their preceptors themselves.

The proselytes of the Gate, on the contrary, formed, upon the whole, a more promising class. Acquainted with the Sacred writings of the Jews, they adopted many of the most important doctrines of the Scriptures without becoming Jews themselves. Having heard of the promised Messiah, they shared with others in an anxiety to see him; and as they had not been blinded by the prevailing prejudices of the Jews, they were the more open to the approaches of the Gospel. These were the devout men, and the men who feared God, to whom the Scriptures refer, as belonging not to the house of Israel but to the Gentile world.

Such also was the character of Cornelius as described by the historian. His faith in God and in the Providence of God, had ripened into fervent and importunate prayer; whilst the truth he had already embraced served only to increase his hungering for a fuller revelation.

Thus the Spirit of the Lord had been operating, through the ministry of the ancient prophets, to break up the fallow-ground of the Gentiles, and prepare them for receiving the good seed of the Kingdom of Heaven. Those holy and venerable men who, by their living ministry, had so often sought alas, so often in vain, to restore the wanderings of Israel, and to lead them in the way of truth, though now dead were yet speaking. Their words were at length, in the very spirit of the Gospel, going out into all the world, and every one of them was still echoing among the nations, the cry that had but lately arrested the attention of Israel, "prepare ye the way of the Lord make his paths straight."

(c) An additional channel of approach to the Gentiles was opened by the direct preaching of the Gospel to the Jews, in their own land. That same Providence which had led many of the house of Israel beyond the limits of their own land, and so used them as bearers of an awakening light to benighted nations, also conducted many strangers and foreigners to take up their abode within the inheritance of the holy people.

Established in Judea, mainly, for civil or military purposes, they were, of course, cognizant of all events, the general importance of which was such as to arrest public attention or to influence the public mind. The Gentiles were there, and shared largely in the scenes of the Crucifixion. There, 'tis said, Pilate and Herod made friends. It was true, also, in a larger sense, viz. of the nations they represented. Jews and Gentiles were one in the indignities they heaped upon the head of the Son of God. They were one in the tardy acknowledgment of his worth. Jews decently disposed of his remains, and Gentiles, in the moment in which he breathed his last, pronounced him the Son of God (Mark 15: 39). Why, then, should they not be one, at least, as hearers of the Gospel which was afterwards preached in his name?

Simultaneously, therefore, with the annunciation of the doctrines of the Gospel by the Apostles of our Lord, to the house of Israel, many of the Gentiles also heard the strange tidings; and as they possessed human sympathies, and shared with the Jews in human interests, they would be likely to feel, as did the Jews, the entrance of the word into their hearts.

We have undoubtedly evidence that such was particularly the case with Cornelius. The Apostle Peter, whilst preaching to him, speaks of the Gospel as a matter that had already been published throughout all Judea and Galilee, and as a matter, with which Cornelius himself was, in a measure, acquainted. (Acts 10: 37.) He enjoyed, at least, some of the crumbs that fell from the Master's table; and in a mind capable of relishing these, the taste of them must only have begotten a desire for more.

Thus, then, by a remarkable variety of agencies, proceeding from the schools of Philosophy, the writings of the Prophets, the frequent intercourse between Jews and Gentiles, both at home and abroad, the Providence of God was preparing the nations for the reception of the Word, and opening the door for its entrance in among them.

'Tis looked upon as a wonderful illustration of Divine Providence, that the wants and necessities of society have, of late years, brought to light and developed means and materials of human comfort and happiness, which, unless these necessities had existed, might still have remained imbedded in their original darkness. The distant and remote operations of that Providence, harmonize perfectly with its later developments; and what was done in secret, in former generations, is now revealed, as having been wisely ordered, because necessary to its present purposes. Were we to say, it is no less an evidence of Divine Providence, that means and agencies were put to work, at remote points, and at early periods, among the Gentiles, the effect of which was to incline many to receive the truth of God, as soon as it should be ready to be revealed to them, we should thus suggest an analogy that might be fairly insisted upon as the very expression of truth and soberness.

As we have seen, the chief agent for operating among the Gentiles was already secured. In this manner also, and by these various causes, the minds of many were so affected as to be willing to give heed to the things he might have to say. Another circumstance, however, remained yet to be provided for. It was all important that the Church should open its doors, and be willing to admit the Gentiles upon the ground of faith in Christ alone.

The Apostles and Christian brethren were entrusted with weighty responsibilities in the church. It was therefore necessary that they should be made to see, and fall in with the designs of God on behalf of the Gentiles. Their feelings, as Jews, in favor of the law and institutes of Moses, were so strong, that they might be fitly described as prejudices. They

knew the promises given to the Gentiles; but they looked upon those promises only through the medium of the Mosaic law; and in their opinion, the conversion of the Gentiles to Christianity had, of necessity, to be preceded by their conversion to the Jewish faith. To admit the Gentiles as such to the Church would, they supposed, be practically throwing contempt upon the ordinances and precepts which God himself had given to the Fathers, and they would not endure the thought of increasing their own numbers, by admitting any immunity from the rites and duties of the Mosaic law. Their system, therefore, contemplated the conversion of the Gentiles to the Jewish faith first, and their introduction to the Christian Church afterwards, not as Gentiles but as Jews. So stoutly were some, not a few, inclined to insist upon this, that after the Apostles had long been laboring with success among the Gentiles, they were often hindered in their work by the interference of the so-called Judaizing Christians, who boldly proclaimed to the Gentiles that unless they would adopt the law of Moses, unless they would be circumcised they could not be saved. (Acts 15: 1.)

The fact of the admission of Cornelius to Christian fellowship by the ministry of Peter, astonished, seems to have shocked the brethren and Apostles in Judea; and when Peter went up to Jerusalem they hesitated not to reprove him for holding fellowship with men who had not been circumcised. Peter, in his defence, acknowledges the apparent reasonableness of their objections. He intimates what they well knew, that he himself had entertained the same opinions once; but he continues to rehearse how he had been directed by a vision and a voice from heaven to abandon them, — in short, how he was convinced, that to carry out these views in the administration of the Church would be nothing less than fighting against God. (Acts 11: 1–17.)

The Apostles then themselves, in their subjective views of the Gospel, were decided in their disposition to insist upon the observance of the Mosaic law, as a condition, without which the Gentiles could not be admitted to the fellowship of Christ. A divine communication was necessary to relieve them of this error; and Peter was the person to whom that communication was directly given.

The agency of Peter, in this important operation, harmonizes well with the whole development of his character, as discovered in other portions of his history. He stands chief among the three who witnessed the glory of the Transfiguration. He was first among the twelve to answer the question,

“Whom do ye say that I am?” He was most prominent among them that planted and watered when the Pentecostal increase was bestowed; and who but he should be expected to go forward under the Divine guidance and take a position among the Gentiles, to which others would be, for a season, afraid even to follow him?

A divine Revelation, however, was necessary to make Peter himself willing to admit the Heathen to the blessings of the Gospel, and such a Revelation was granted to him.

In the prosecution of his ministry, Peter had gone down to Joppa, a city of note, upon the Eastern shore of the Mediterranean Sea. It was there that Dorcas, remembered and lamented in death for her alms-deeds and benevolence, had been restored to life through his agency. After this event, many of the inhabitants believed in the Lord. Such was the demand of inquiring souls for his instructions, and such the success of his efforts that he continued there many days.

During those days of diligent and successful labor, Peter was also much engaged in devotion. He labored as though every thing depended upon himself; he prayed, as though nothing could be accomplished without the blessing of God. On a certain occasion, about mid-day, he went up to the house-top, his mind deeply and anxiously agitated about the spiritual interests of all that region, and even of the regions beyond. In the scenes through which his mind was hurried, there were both Jews and Gentiles before him. The conversion and admission of both to the faith and privileges of the Gospel, could hardly fail to engage his attention. The course to be pursued with converts from the house of Israel was plain, not so the mode of dealing with converts from heathenism. His early, steadfast views, and all his Jewish education, urged him to require of them a complete and cordial submission to the ordinances of the law of Moses. But was this required by the Gospel? Had it been so determined by the Master himself? Was it expedient or proper for him to assume and combine the several distinct offices of a minister of the Gospel and, literally, a minister of circumcision? Were facts such as to indicate that so-called proselytes of Righteousness would become zealous followers of Jesus? It would be a mournful undertaking to reject a Gentile convert, who, though sincere in his faith in Jesus, should be unwilling to adopt and submit to the law of Moses; but it would be a fearful attempt to admit such a man to the household of faith, in a way that should practically set at nought the Divine and venerable ordinances of the ancient household itself.

Thus swayed by violent conflicting impulses, the mind of the Apostle at length composed itself and sought relief in prayer. Meanwhile he became very hungry, and would have eaten; but the meal not being as yet prepared, he continued for a season under the cravings of appetite. Both body and mind being thus in a state of anxious suspense and longing, he fell into a trance or ecstasy, and so beheld a vision, the character and bearing of which, had a remarkable congruity with the existing condition both of his body and his mind. Hunger had pressed him, and so in his vision he saw a supply of food to satisfy it. But the character of the food was not such as would be likely to be suggested simply by the dreams of a hungry Israelite. His mind, his spirit had been perplexed concerning the admission of the Gentiles, as such, the unclean in connection with the house of Israel, into the privileges of the kingdom of God. Like Isaac he had seen the fire and the wood, and it was this that troubled him about what he did not yet understand, the bringing in of the sacrifice.

Thus, as the peculiar form of the vision was made to correspond with his bodily state, its spirit and character had a similar relation to the condition of his mind. Accordingly he saw a collection of all manner of beasts of the earth, let down in a vessel from heaven. Hereupon a voice was heard saying, "rise, Peter, kill and eat." His answer was just such as might be expected from a strict and conscientious Jew. The voice responding, informed him, that God had cleansed the unclean, and that henceforth he should no more despise or refrain from that which the law of Moses had taught him to regard as common. And, because the thing was established, this was done thrice, and the vessel was received up again into heaven.

The active mind of Peter began at once to ponder upon the meaning of the vision. At the same time the messengers from Cornelius arrived at the house, inquiring for him. The Spirit leaving him, afterwards to discover the relation between the vision and the present inquirers, bade him go with the men doubting nothing, because the Lord had sent them. Before his arrival at the house of Cornelius, his mind was made up, and he became satisfied of it as being the will of God, that he should no longer consider any Gentile as common or unclean.

Arrived at the house, he began, without delay or hesitation, to open up to Cornelius and his friends, the unsearchable riches. The Jewish converts, who accompanied him, were astonished as they saw that the Divine Gift of the Holy Ghost was bestowed upon these Gentiles; and all, with one accord agreed, that, Gentiles though they were, they should be at

once admitted by the administration of Baptism to the privileges of the kingdom of God.

Thus the way was at length opened. An act which Providence had long been contemplating was now performed; and its blessed influences would continue until the way of the Lord should be known upon earth, his saving health among all nations. Nothing now remained but for the rest of the Apostles and brethren of note to be satisfied with this act of Peter, so as to throw wide the door of faith to the Gentiles.

The account given them by Peter, at Jerusalem, was such as to silence all their objections; and when they heard it they held their peace and glorified God, saying, then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life.

During the progress of these events Saul had been in comparative retirement at Tarsus. The time having now arrived for the regular prosecution of the work in which he had been chosen to act as a chief agent, we might reasonably expect to see him brought forward into the field of labor. Nor is that expectation disappointed. The interesting events in the church at Antioch occasioned a demand for his presence. There, in connection with Barnabas, he labored a whole year with great success, and from that point he directed his footsteps to the remote cities and regions of the Gentiles.

The truth which the foregoing discussion seems to illustrate is, that though the duty of the Church appears to have been made sufficiently clear by the testimony of the Divine Word, yet it was further necessary that the Head of the Church himself should, by specific developments of his providence, open the way and raise up instruments for the performance of that duty. We have seen that providence displayed; we have seen how individuals and classes of men, how Jews and Gentiles are alike the subjects upon which it operates; we have seen how it makes the learning of the world, and the bounds of men's habitations, and the social commerce of families and kingdoms, all subservient to the execution of its purposes. It is the wide-spread, the varied, the universal, the continued superintendence of Him who filleth all in all.

Now it would not be considered fanciful, were we to say that these same elements or circumstances are no less necessary, at all times, to the successful publication of the truth throughout the world. Laborers, who are themselves men of God through sanctification of the Spirit, must be raised up for the word. A certain degree of interest and concern for their own welfare should be realized amongst the heathen them-

selves. The church, too, that holds the lively oracles, should be ready to greet with acclamations of joy the children of every clime, who, believing in Christ, shall bow before the living God, and wait for the coming of his Son.

These elements, it may be said, do exist at present; yet, when their proportions shall have become regular and full-grown, then only can men begin to look for a general gathering in.

ARTICLE V.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. BROOK'S OVID.

PERHAPS no subject at this moment, not even the great question of Human Slavery, occupies more attention than the Education of the People. In our own State, and in the States immediately North and South of us, conventions have very recently assembled to discover, if possible, a solution to this most important problem: "How may the youth of our country best be educated?" and great labor and thought and eloquence have been engaged in the enquiry. Well were they all employed could a plan be devised that should fully satisfy the wants and wishes of the community; for the education of the young is second in importance only to the paramount enquiry, the question of all questions for immortal beings: "What must we do to be saved?" and subsidiary even to that. For if it be true, as it undeniably is, that Christianity is the religion of enlightened man, it will follow that one of the best means to advance Christianity is, to fit mankind for the comprehension of a scheme which even the angels desire to look into.

But apart from the consideration of what is expedient for the people at large, there is a question of scarcely inferior magnitude: What education is fitted for those who have time to devote to the object? What is the best education *per se*? For the masses the instruction must necessarily be confined within narrow bounds; but there is a favored minority on whom the providence of God has bestowed the power to choose the good and refuse the evil, whose duty it will be to give tone to the community in which they are placed, who will be expected to take the foremost places in the onward march; for every gift of God involves a solemn responsibility in its use. What is for them the best discipline of mind? How shall they best be trained? Now it has again and again been de-

cided by the all but universal suffrage of those whose opinions are entitled to respect, that the wisdom of man has yet devised no instrument of education of equal efficiency with the *thorough* study of the classical languages; and we lay particular emphasis on the word *thorough*, that we may be understood to take a firm stand against the miserable systems of study made easy, so prominent among the quackeries of the age. As in physical education, strength is not to be acquired by luxurious sloth, but by vigorous exercise, by calling every muscle into play, and rendering every fibre tense; so in the culture of the mind, power of intellect is the meed of strong exertion. Stretch forth thy hand, said the voice divine, to the man whose withered arm was hanging powerless by his side, and, in the effort to obey, strength was given to him.

In early years, before the reasoning faculties are awakened, the child's memory is in full exercise, and the power of acquiring language seems greater than at any subsequent period of life. How soon the infant learns to prattle in its mother tongue! Nature herself seems to point out the early years of life as the most propitious for the study of language; the labor of committing grammatical formulæ, so irksome in after life, is then little felt: if parents and teachers would make the proper use of this unmistakeable indication, an advancement might be made, a sure position gained; then, as the higher powers of the mind gradually developed themselves, they would not be withdrawn from their legitimate objects; the whole mental education would thus be in harmony with nature, and we might reasonably hope to find among ourselves more frequent examples of that ripe scholarship for which our European kinsmen are renowned over the world. As it is, very few among us attain any competent mastery even of Latin, and still fewer of Greek; by far the more important language of the two, both from its intrinsic power and beauty, and the value and extent of the literature it embraces.

But here we are met by a danger of no small magnitude, against which it is the duty of the christian teacher to guard with the utmost solicitude. Whilst it is desirable, that youth should be made familiar with the great masterpieces of Classical Literature which have challenged the admiration, and received the suffrages of generation after generation, it has always been felt and lamented that the whole tone of these writings is heathen, in many parts directly hostile, and almost everywhere foreign to the teachings of the Gospel; a consideration which has made many pious men, from Gregory the Great to the friends of Adam Clarke, forbid the study. That

this apprehension is by no means groundless, the writer has experienced in his own person; for most assuredly he left school with a far better understanding of the heathen mythology, than of the Christian scheme of redemption; and he has no reason to suppose his case worse than that of most boys of his age; nay, it was probably better than that of many, for he was well acquainted with all the historical and narrative portions of the Scriptures, with all that boys can learn by continued reading with little or no explanation; he was early trained to respect God's Holy day, was a regular attendant in the sanctuary and not especially inattentive to the teachings of the pulpit, albeit, for the most part, beyond his comprehension. These were no small advantages; but we wish to impress on our readers that, notwithstanding all these advantages, the diligent and systematic instruction of the school-room being heathen rather than Christian in matter and tone, the natural result was, that what was rigorously and laboriously inculcated, made, for the time, the deeper impression. To such teaching, unquestionably, much of the practical heathenism of Europe in the last century is to be attributed; when, to say nothing of the ribald scoffers of France, for whose skepticism the inexcusable blending, by an apostate church, of apochryphal legends with the books of Holy Writ may be pleaded in extenuation, in Protestant England men, of cultivated intellects and philosophical minds, were found in the ranks of unbelievers; to such teaching it was owing that the thoughts of David Hume, even on his death-bed, were of Charon's boat, and that Charles James Fox

“When best employed and wanted most,”

passed from the scene of his earthly renown with the verses of the 4th Æneid in his ears, instead of the good tidings of great joy. This was, in great measure, the cause of the stoical torpidity of the English church, till aroused by the trumpet voices of the Wesleys and Whitfields; a torpidity hardly exceeded by that of the Italian churchmen in the days of Luther, when the sincere German monk was so deeply shocked at the impious hypocrisy of his fellow priest at the altar. True, the superior morality of England enforced more outward decorum; but our readers may judge what was the character of the instructions of the school-room, when, not many years since, a clergyman, and Head Master of a public Grammar School, while his congregation were expecting him in the pulpit on a Sunday morning, was found in his study reading Sophocles.

The question then returns upon us: What is to be done to remedy this great evil? To give us the inestimable advantage of a study, which has been mainly instrumental in forming the powerful minds of the great men of century after century, freed from the acknowledged dangers that surround it? How shall the christian scholar, and especially the christian minister, be educated? How shall the safe course be found between the shoals of ignorance and the rocks of infidelity? That such a way there is, is abundantly evidenced by the piety and learning of which, thanks be to God, the Christian Church has never been altogether destitute.

In the first place, we would earnestly recommend a total change of the text books for the earlier years of the school course. It is of very little consequence that the books used by the tyro should bear the impress of the Augustan age; and Southey well remarked, that our pigs are more rationally treated than our children. "I am sometimes inclined to think, that pigs are brought up upon a much wiser system than boys at a grammar school. The pig is allowed to feed upon any kind of offal, however coarse, on which he can thrive, till the time approaches when pig is to commence pork or take a degree as bacon; and then he is fed daintily. Now it sometimes appears to me, that, in like manner, boys might acquire their first knowledge of Latin, from authors very inferior to those which are now used in all schools, provided the matter were unexceptionable and the Latinity good;—and that they should not be introduced to the standard works of antiquity, till they are of an age in some degree to appreciate what they read." The suggestion, important even in relation to *Æsthetics*, becomes of a thousandfold more weight, when viewed as a religious one. While it is of little moment that the books, read in the earlier years of education, should be irreproachable in style, it is precisely at this period of incalculable importance that they should be irreproachable in matter. Nor is there any necessity for continuing the present custom. Ample selections of unexceptionable passages might be made even from the classical writers, and were we to exclude entirely all heathen writings, the early Christian literature furnishes abundant materials, as well in verse as in prose; and we are right glad to find that the attention of more than one branch of the Christian Church has been turned to this most interesting question. "With what propriety," asks the Principal of an Episcopal Institution in the preface to a little compilation intended partially to remedy the evil, "With what propriety do baptized youth spend years at the languages and never learn

a syllable of sacred Latin? Why should they be so familiar with *Tityre tu patulæ*; or *O Venus Regina*; and be entire strangers to *Te Deum Laudamus*, or *Veni Creator Spiritus*?" And that very little would be lost, even in style, by attention to Sacred Literature, is evidenced by many beautiful hymns in this little volume. We would gladly extract, in evidence of the assertion, Melanchthon's Hymn De Angelis, but it is rather too long, and we select in preference St. Ambrose's Morning Hymn:

Jam lucis orto sidere
Deum precemur supplices
Nostras ut ipse dirigat
Lux increata, semitas.

Nil lingua, nil peccet manus
Nil mens inane cogitet:
In ore simplex veritas
In corde regnet caritas.

Incepta demo fluet dies.
O Christe, custos pervigil,
Quas sævus hostis obsidet
Portas tuere sensuum.

Præsta diurnus ut tuæ
Subserviat laudi labor:
Auctore quæ te cepimus
Da, te favente, prosequi.

Superba ne nimis caro
Menti licenter imperet
Carnis domet superbiam
Potus cibique parcitas.

Deo Patri sit gloria
Ejusque soli Filio,
Sancto simul cum Spiritu,
Nunc, et per omne seculum.

And such a text book as we contemplate might be made much more attractive and interesting to the juvenile mind, than the heathenized books at present in use, as it would consist of matter within their comprehension and in harmony with the best lessons of the home, the school and the church. Nor are we advocating mere experimental novelties, but simply a return to the wholesome mode of teaching of ages long past, when the school was watered by the droppings of the sanctuary and students were

“Not the mere children of these forward days,
But mild eyed boys just risen from their knees.”

These suggestions, it can be scarcely necessary to repeat, have reference only to the earlier years of study. When the pupil

has acquired a stock of words and familiarity with the structure of sentences, there can be no substitute for the classical authors. But we contend that the great benefits which are to be looked for from familiarity with works stamped with the approbation of so many centuries, will be much more certainly attained when their study is associated with high intellectual pleasure, instead of mere dictionary drudgery, and repulsive task work, ill understood and studiously forgotten. Had Lord Byron been thus taught, we should never have witnessed in his case the anomaly of a man of his poetic temperament being disgusted with the sweet odes of Horace, and, more than probably, this early training might, under the Divine blessing, have been the means of giving a totally different direction to his poetic fancy, and his great powers might have been employed in celebrating the praises of the God who bestowed them.

But it may be said, if these heathen writings are after all to be studied we shall gain very little by the delay; that we shall at best but somewhat diminish an evil which ought to be totally eradicated; and we shall probably be asked how we propose to purify these corrupted streams, and convert a poison into nutriment. This must in some measure be the work of the class-room, and the christian preacher should always be anxious to impress his class, not only with his finer apprehension of the peculiar beauties of his author, but with his reverence for the great truths of religion; and many a passage in the heathen writer, perhaps by the very force of contrast, will minister the occasion. There should be neither asperity nor gloom, but a wholesome, cheerful, religiousness should pervade all his instructions. In addition to this the Church needs christianized editions of all the school Classics. Not merely expurgated editions;—no mere omission of obscene passages will reach the seat of the disease. All such passages must be carefully excided, and the knife used with unsparing hand. This is but a small part of an editor's duty, yet even this is sometimes shamefully neglected. We have at present before us a copy of Horace prepared expressly for the use of schools, by an editor of great name and reputation, in which all the feculent impurities of the writer, that had been removed by previous editors, appear to have been carefully replaced. Nor do we wish a constant repetition of religious ejaculation, whether there is a peg to hang it on or not; but we would have and we must have, at all appropriate places, a decided Christian tone given to the editor's comments. We do not know many books which will illustrate our mean-

ing; nay we hardly know one except the recent edition of Ovid, by the learned President of the Wesleyan Female College, of Baltimore; with a few remarks on which, we will leave the whole subject to the serious reflections of the friends of Christian Education.

Possibly had we been asked, which of the Roman Poets would present the greatest difficulty to a religious editor, we should have instanced Ovid. Virgil's purity of character would render the work of christianizing him comparatively easy, and in the midst of the Epicureanism of Horace there is an ever-recurring memento of the brevity of life, like the skeleton at the Egyptian festival, which cannot fail to touch a sympathetic chord in the human heart, and awaken solemn and wholesome thoughts. When in Terence Chærea pretends to justify his fault by the example of the divinity,

Ego humuncio hoc non facerem ?

it seems a sort of *reductio ad absurdum*, and kindles at once in our minds the idea of the miserable falsity and delusion of the pagan religion. But with Ovid the case appears to be different; for, even where his dark cosmogony runs parallel with Holy Writ, charmed with the beauties of his immortal verse, we sometimes find it difficult to carry along with us the thought of the vanity of the matter. Yet Ovid can be ill spared from the class room, for, although no poet is more deeply tainted with the inherent vices of heathenism, none has sweeter verses or more captivating narrations. At the close of an article we will not dwell on the pictorial embellishments of the book, though engravings have great power to awaken the attention both of young and old; nor on the varied learning the editor has displayed. These things are good, very good, but we have seen them in other editions and other writers, and had the book no weightier merit it would have drawn no commendations from us.

The editor, himself a poet, and exhibiting throughout a cultivated taste, keenly alive to poetic beauties, has thoroughly illustrated his author by parallel passages from other writers modern as well as ancient: indeed sweets are culled from the whole field of literature. This is a peculiarity and a very important one. We have never been able to understand why, while Homer and Virgil are so assiduously taught, little or no notice should be taken in the class-room of Milton and Shakespeare. But this is not the great peculiarity which gives the book its chief merit in our eyes. It is, that every thing is measured by the standard of Divine Truth, and that a strain

of unobtrusive piety, like a silver thread, runs through the whole commentary.

While the classic mythology is fully exhibited, and a better understanding, we are confident, of the ancient faith may be attained by a perusal of the introductions to the several fables, than from a laborious study of the whole pantheon; we have nowhere seen a line that could mantle the cheek of modesty herself. We have indeed observed a line where the *callida junctura* is not sufficiently observed, and the measure halts in consequence. We refer to line 34 of Jupiter in Dianæ Formam; and we mention it, not in the spirit of censoriousness, but that the editor in his next issue may make the very slight transposition which will set the metre on its feet again.

Superum petit æthera victor.

And while in the mood for finding fault we may as well call attention to a curious error in the note on *Immedicabile vulnus*, page 62, which reads as it now stands, an incurable wound is to be *inflicted* with the sword; a reading so entirely incongruous with the remainder of the paragraph that it is marvellous it should have escaped the proof-reader.

We have given this book high praise, and in our own justification we would gladly make large extracts from it, but our remarks have already run to greater length than we contemplated. We must content ourselves with a single passage and it shall be a brief one. One of the shortest of the passages we had marked for extraction will be found on page 52, and it may illustrate our meaning and exhibit the character of the commentary as well as longer portions. It is the note on *Eratrum gratia rara est*, in which the editor remarks: "How unnatural is the variance of the members of a common origin and a common heritage. How strongly are we reminded, by this sentence, that the first blood shed was that of a brother by a brother's hand.

Behold how good, and how pleasant it is, for brethren to dwell together in unity. Psalm cxxxiii. 1.

But when the earth was stained with wickedness,
And lust; and justice fled from every breast
Then brethren vilely shed each other's blood." CATULLUS.

We have then an Ovid which we can put into the hands of the youth of our schools with entire confidence, and we believe that its extensive use in our Academies and Classical schools would be of inestimable benefit; convinced as we are

that it is calculated, under the Divine blessing, to minister at once to the improvement of the intellect, the taste and the moral and religious sentiments.

But there are other authors to be read, and we would gladly see Virgil, and especially Horace, similarly edited, and if this matter can be presented to the Church of Christ in an aspect in any degree commensurate with the importance it wears to our own mind, the want will not be suffered to remain long unsupplied; and when our Classical books are all enlisted in the service of Religion, we may hope to find our school education in harmony with the true interests of the immortal beings who assemble in our class-rooms; and perhaps the Christian Teacher may less frequently feel that sickness of the heart which often oppresses him, when he measures the little he seems able to accomplish, with the heavy responsibility that rests upon him.

ARTICLE VI.

CHURCH-FEELING IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

By church-feeling is meant the attachment which we have for our own denominational christianity, her doctrines, usages, institutions and benevolent efforts. This feeling is natural. It grows out of the impressions and associations of childhood and youth, as well as the matured reflections and judgments of manhood. It is akin to the attachments of home and family, our native place and the land which we call our own. The man, who has no proper feeling for home and country, who does not love the scenes of his childhood, as far back as memory will carry him, the fountains and streams where he slaked his thirst and along whose banks he wandered, and the woods and mountain sides where he roamed unrestrained, inhaling the refreshing breeze, that man is deficient in one of the most important elements of character. He wants sensibility. He wants heart,—church-feeling is of the same character. It grows up with home scenes and associations, the catechism, the church-edifice, the music, and, above all, the soul-stirring truths uttered from the sacred desk which awakened conscience and gave a new direction to the character and life: and it is matured in the deliberate and hearty approbation of the doctrinal basis and symbols of the church. The want of this feeling betrays a deficiency much to be regretted.

For this feeling is virtuous. It is to the church what patriotism is to the country, and is the more noble in proportion to the necessities of the church; so that a man would scorn to leave his church because he was offered a more lucrative or influential position in another, or because there was not bestowed upon him the degree of attention and respect which, in his own judgment, his talents deserve.

This feeling stands opposed, 1st, to church adoration or the substitution of the church for Christ. An attachment of this character is idolatrous. We have no patience with men who can see no farther than their own church; who shut out the light of the sun in order that they may be illuminated by a wax taper, only so that it be a church taper; whose benevolence and love are all circumscribed by the limits of the church; who see neither beauty nor excellency in any other denomination; who acknowledge neither the ministry nor the ministerial acts of any other church, but, with a hardness of heart which is dreadful even in the conception, give all others over to the uncovenanted mercies of God. It is a subject of profound gratitude, that the uncovenanted mercies of God are infinitely above the tender mercies of these bigots.

This feeling stands opposed, secondly, to that maukish sentimentalism and pretended liberality, which would make no distinction in the churches of Christ and would have them one; which would hold world conventions and confound creeds and break down the distinctive doctrines which form so many hedges of the truth, that christian charity may have an unobstructed flow into the hearts of all. This would constitute the church in general, without discipline and without doctrine, to which, alas, too many already belong. These are the electicks, who see nothing to admire at home and every thing abroad; whose expansive liberality will lead them across the ocean to sit in solemn convention with Unitarians and Universalists, and give the right hand of fellowship to the deniers of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures and the sanctification of the Sabbath, and, at home, make war to the knife against their own persecuted brethren, who flee from the ecclesiastical tyranny of their own land to find an asylum in ours. We admire the charity which, like that of the Savior and his Apostles, will lead to sufferings and death for the salvation of the world. It is heavenly and divine. But we would not forget that the Gospel must first be preached at Jerusalem and to the Jews, and then the Gentiles should be evangelized. God forbid that we should touch, with the softest down of our pen, to injure that charity which

rises in divine beauty and excellency far above the faith of miracles and the benevolence of complete self-consecration. We would condemn only its semblance, the earth-born, ambitious, erratic meteor, which shines here and there fitfully, and which would claim to be the sun which sheds its steady radiance over the whole earth to invigorate and fructify.

This feeling stands opposed, thirdly, to that narrow selfishness which confines its charity within the limits of the congregation. This may be appropriately called the congregational feeling. Sometimes it extends itself as far as State lines and, within this sphere, will operate favorably. But beyond this there is no church for them. Church extension, the institutions of the church whether literary, theological, or benevolent, what have they to do with them. This feeling may be strikingly illustrated by the benevolence of that wealthy church-member who would give largely to erect a steeple, build an organ, paint the exterior and fresco the interior of the church edifice in the most beautiful and costly manner, whilst the appeal of a church, too poor to sustain itself, in a neighboring county was met by a flat denial.

Now church-feeling is opposed to all these. It looks with interest upon all christian denominations, but with deeper interest and more intense affection upon its own. It does not worship the church, and with an exclusive bigotry, regard all others as abandoned to destruction, but it admires the stately and venerable edifice, erected in troublous times, amid the contentions of the Reformation and the persecutions of tyrants. It admires its scriptural doctrines and well constructed creeds, and, whilst it does not pronounce them faultless, finds less in them to condemn and more to admire than in others. It looks upon all parts of the church with interest, and, uninfluenced by State lines, sectional, synodical, or congregational feeling, it prays for the church, ministry, congregations, missionaries, literary, theological and benevolent institutions, and gives liberally wherever there is the greatest need. Thus, having begun at Jerusalem, it will extend its sympathy and aid to all other Christian denominations, in the spirit of the most enlarged liberality.

This feeling, I have said, is natural, and belongs to the nobler part of our nature. It is also useful, and to it may be traced much of the effective benevolence of the age. It has been operating, with great success, in other denominations. The secret of success of other denominations over us, in their church extension, is to be found in this feeling. Their attachment to their own church is so great that they are willing to

labor, to pray, and to make sacrifices for her; and, whilst extending the borders of their own church, they lose nothing of that exalted charity which seeks the welfare of the whole world. What is the reason that the Presbyterian, Congregational, Episcopalian, Methodist and Baptist denominations have extended themselves so rapidly in this country? Is it to be found in the purity of their doctrine and their exalted morality? Some of them are highly antagonistic in doctrine, and, in morals, perhaps but little difference is discernible. We suppose that the doctrines of the Lutheran church are more scriptural and consistent than those of any other branch of the Church of Christ. Yet our progress in church extension is not to be compared with the least favored of those mentioned. Are they more wealthy? By no means. Neither are they more intelligent, except, perhaps, the three former. Do they possess more piety, more of the Spirit of Christ? We cannot entertain the thought. There is, in proportion to our numbers, in this country, as much profound, humble, scriptural piety as you find in any of the churches of Christ. There is a great want of church-feeling, and this is the secret of their success and our deficiency. It is by no means unusual for our ministers to neglect the benevolent operations of our own church for the purpose of promoting some other charity. Large collections have been taken, and much interest felt in our churches for the cause of Tract and Missionary associations under the control of other ecclesiastical denominations, whilst no interest has been manifested in the extension of our own church, or the increase of her ministerial and ecclesiastical efficiency. No doubt other denominations are pleased to witness this liberality and praise it publicly, whilst in secret they laugh at our simplicity. The Episcopal church carried on the farce of calling the Lutheran, the German Episcopal, and the Episcopal, the English Lutheran church, until the charm has ceased, or they have become ashamed of it. Whatever the folly or the sin or both may have been, they have built up some noble christian churches out of the material which Lutheranism furnished. But we have wandered from our subject. We asserted that this feeling is useful. God has divided his church into families, for wise purposes. Affection burns most intensely and brings forth its richest fruits amongst those with whom we have daily intercourse, and whose sentiments and feelings harmonize with our own. This affection becomes feeble in proportion as it is widely extended and as it reaches those less congenial. Precisely thus is it with church-feeling. The different denominations exist that their affections may burn most

intensely and efficiently within the sphere in which God has placed them. When a church becomes over-grown, it must break up into fragments, that it may retain its activity and aggressive power. The history of the church in this country sufficiently illustrates this point.

Now church-feeling calls into exercise and developes the resources of the church for the glory of God and the good of man. Why have I been born and baptized and reared in the Lutheran church? That I should become a Methodist, or Baptist, or Episcopalian? By no means, else I would have been born and reared in one or the other of those communions. Surely the Providence of God placed me where I am, and his Grace is displayed in the communion in which I have been born as powerfully as in any other; for wheresoever His Gospel is preached in its purity, there are witnessed the trophies of his redeeming grace. My being born in the Lutheran church is not a matter of chance. There must be some reason for it. It is, that in it, under the instructions of the Gospel there proclaimed, under its discipline and church government I may glorify God in my body and spirit which are his. I am placed in this church, that I may promote its highest welfare, elevate its piety, intelligence, charity, and zeal. God has placed me here, that I may aid with all my powers to develope its resources, and make the church aggressive, not on our christian brethren, but on the world, that the world may be brought in willing subjection to the Prince of Peace. I trust that the time has gone by, when one Christian church will feel, that, in her aggressive movements, every other may be lawful plunder. — Thus we can see wisdom and goodness in that arrangement by which the church is distributed into denominations holding the same faith, baptism and Lord and Master, warring against the same common enemy, and looking for the same eternal rest and the same crown of righteousness in the world of glory. I will not presume to say, that there may not be powerful reasons to induce a change in the ecclesiastical relations of a minister or layman. I confess that, whilst I can see reasons to induce ministers from other denominations to desire to enter into our church, I can see none sufficiently powerful to induce a man, who desires to be eminently useful, to leave it. Such are the necessities of our church, in all its branches, that a devotedly pious man could hardly be induced to leave it for any reason whatever. It is true that all men do not view objects from the same standpoint and through the same medium, but to us, who live within the sound of the piteous voices which proceed from souls

earnestly praying for spiritual instruction, and who behold the tens of thousands who are wandering as sheep without a shepherd, there is no field of labor, in this country, more necessitous and more promising in abundant harvests.

The great advantage of this church-feeling is, to unite and concentrate the energies of a single denomination, and give it a direction where it will tell to the greatest advantage for the interests of Christ's Kingdom. All men cannot think alike, on all subjects. Every denomination is persuaded of the conformity of its creed with the doctrines of the Bible. It is duty, therefore, to disseminate these doctrines, and, under this peculiar aspect of divine truth, to contend with the great adversary of souls. Under no other can we contend with the same freedom or efficiency; with none are we so well acquainted; under any other standard, we proceed to the battle as did David with the armor of Saul. He could use the sling and the smooth stones of the brook more efficiently than the sword and the spear of the heavy armed soldier. Besides, this church-feeling seems to be necessary for the purity as well as the efficiency of the church. Love for the church will lead its ministers and members to watch carefully over the purity of her doctrines, inasmuch as her power and respectability will depend, in a large measure, upon the conformity of her teachings with her standards. It will lead to an anxious desire to promote her spirituality, intelligence, and, in one word, every thing which will promote her intellectual and moral power.

It follows from all this, that church-feeling leads to the desire and prayer for pure, profound and heart-searching revivals of religion. It puts forth constant and well-directed efforts for the increased number and efficiency of the ministry, for the distribution of books both doctrinal and practical, especially the Bible and well-selected tracts and biographies. It labors for the spread of the Gospel at home and abroad by means of foreign and domestic missions. In a word it is the spirit of Jesus manifesting itself in the form of Lutheranism, Presbyterianism or any other aspect of divine truth, and thus wielding the power which it possesses for the glory of God and the good of man. Now it will be manifest to every unprejudiced mind, that this feeling is by no means sectarian in its character, and is perfectly consistent with this oneness of the body of Christ. That church, which boasts that it is always and every where the same, is not as closely or as cordially united in its parts as are the different denominations of evangelical Protestant Christians, in the spirit and oneness with which they seek the glory of God and the happiness of man.

Now, I assert that this church-feeling is wanting in many sections of our church and among not a few of our ministers and congregations. This condition may be explained, in part, by the proximity of an overwhelming influence of another denomination more learned and respected, and partly, by neglected or a one-sided, improperly directed education. It is too true, that some portions of our church have little or no sympathy with it. They are unacquainted with her doctrines, and do not preach them; they have introduced the forms and ceremonies of other churches instead of their own; they encourage the schools and colleges of other denominations, rather than those of their own, and although they may belong to the General Synod of the church, their connection with the church is regarded rather as a matter of accident or convenience, than an expression and earnest of their devotion to its highest welfare. Whilst this state of things does undeniably exist, we have no disposition to find fault or to censure, we would rather endeavor, by argument and persuasion, to produce a different state of things, assured that the Lutheran church possesses, in her doctrines, church government and discipline, the elements of the highest degree of efficiency, and that the only things needed to call out that efficiency, is a proper degree of church-feeling.

The question then presents itself, by what means can we excite this feeling for the church? I reply, *by education*. 1st, *Family*. 2d, *Congregational*. 3d, *Academical*. 4th, *Theological*. We have arranged these topics in the order of time, rather than that of logical connection.

1. *The family*. It has been correctly asserted, that the family is the nursery of the state, and that a community of well-regulated families must necessarily be a well-regulated community. The family is the nursery of patriotism, justice, high honor, politeness, morality and piety. Home impressions are necessarily the most powerful and permanent, because they are made under influences most favorable to produce them, viz. : Parental authority, filial affection and subjection, with the constant pressure of precept and example. The teachers of youth have a lively perception of this, in their efforts to eradicate vicious, and to create virtuous habits in their pupils. With equal truth may it be said, that the family is the nursery of church-feeling. The question is not unfrequently asked, why such and such denominations are so much attached to their church. You never hear them condemn their ministry, or institutions, and they never wander from their church, to receive religious instruction elsewhere. The

answer to the question is to be found in the education of the family. They are taught the doctrines of the church out of the catechism, they are conducted to the house of God whenever opened for religious instruction, they are taught to venerate her ministry, her institutions and her history, and thus, they grow up, both with a profound attachment to their own denomination and the Church of Christ in general. A truly Christian management of the household will lay the foundation for this feeling. The morning and evening service, the song of praise, the religious instruction of the family, especially on the Lord's day, all contribute powerfully to secure the desired end. It is true, the influence of the services of the sanctuary is very defective in many families, because they are instructed so seldom by a minister of their own denomination; perhaps once in three, four or six weeks. This will exert a chilling influence even upon well-directed family efforts.—When these latter do not exist and the family attends the ministerial instructions of other denominations, or none at all, during the intervals of the preaching of their own minister, it is not to be wondered at, that the people have no proper church-feeling. The only remedy is, increased efforts in the family and the multiplication of the ministry. Need I say then, that it is the duty of parents not only to train their children to intelligence, industry and virtue, to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, but to educate them in the doctrines of the church, by means of the catechism which should form a constantly recurring Sabbath exercise. They should take their children with them to the house of God, and teach them there by example to be devout, attentive and prayerful. They should introduce into the family the literature of the church, and in their benefactions, they should give the preference to the benevolent societies of the church. Thus, training the children from infancy to love the church and labor for her welfare, there would be formed a union of feeling and effort which in its results would be most happy.

2. *The congregation.* Passing by many considerations which suggest themselves in this connection, I proceed to consider congregational education, as a means of correcting the evil under discussion. The pastor of the congregation is ordinarily the most influential person in it. He ought to be the most intelligent and pious. His comfort and success will depend much upon these qualifications. His example and his instructions from the sacred desk give tone and character, on almost all subjects, to the people among whom he labors. He

possesses, therefore, the power of awakening and directing the feeling, whose importance we are endeavoring to illustrate. He can, if he will, call into exercise a sectarian or a congregational feeling. He can lead his people to neglect the highest interest of the church, with which he stands in ecclesiastical connection, and direct their contributions into another channel. He can neglect the catechetical instruction of the children, teach doctrines at variance with the standards of the church, and thus unlutheranize the congregation in doctrine and ceremony, as far as his influence extends. But, what is his duty in this respect? Why is he a minister in the church, if it be not to promote the glory of God by means of the doctrines, ceremonies and institutions of the church? Unquestionably it is his duty to promote the highest welfare of the church in every honest way. He is bound to teach the doctrines of the church which, by his position, he has declared to be more consonant with the word of God than those of any other church. He ought, in a proper manner, and at a suitable time, to point out what is distinctive in those doctrines, so that his hearers may understand their doctrinal position and church relations. The much neglected, but ancient and highly useful practice of catechizing the young should be diligently pursued, not for the purpose of receiving them into the church by confirmation after a particular course of instruction, but in order to indoctrinate them in Christian truth, so that they may be led to repentance and salvation. If possible, congregational schools should be established under the supervision of the church-council, and instructed by godly teachers. The literary, theological and benevolent institutions of the church should be the subjects of prayer and precept and effort before the congregation. Statedly and frequently should facts and arguments be presented to the people on these subjects, and their duty be pointed out and enforced. More than this as ministers of the Gospel of Christ, we should so conduct ourselves in the church and before the world, so should we preach and lecture and visit from house to house, that God may be glorified, and the church be honored through our instrumentality. Thus will the congregation be edified and that attachment to the church be formed which is necessary to her highest usefulness.

3. *The Academy.* Under the term Academy, we include the academy in its ordinary sense and the college. Here the education, commenced in the congregation, may be carried forward under influences equally favorable to the promotion of church-feeling. The time was, and it is not distant, when

there were neither colleges nor preparatory schools under the influence of the church. Our young men who desired a liberal education, were compelled to resort to the literary institutions of other denominations, and there they formed attachments to other churches, and were led to undervalue and despise their own. This will answer the query, why so many of the intelligent young men of our church seek other ecclesiastical connections and even leave our ministry for that of sister churches. The same facts, though not so numerous and striking, are true of the other sex, for whose instruction, alas! no provision, thus far, has been made by the church. The funds of the wealthy could not be more productively invested for the church than in the endowment of a first rate female school, in some central position in Pennsylvania. The difficulty in the way of the education of our young men is now obviated, so far as the existence of colleges can remove it. It is natural and reasonable to expect, that ministers and people of the church will patronize their own institutions. Here they are placed at once under church influences; and if there is any power in associations and friendships in the same church connections—if there is any value in the doctrines and usages of the church, they have them here. I can see no reason why the young men of the church should not be educated in the institutions of the church: Shall we neglect our own and sustain those of other denominations? Shall we build up others at the expense of our own? I trust no such sentiments will animate any considerable number of our people. But it may be alleged, that other literary institutions are superior to ours, and that our young men should enjoy the highest literary advantages. Without entering into an argument on this subject, we will admit, for the present, that there are literary institutions superior to ours. What conclusion should we arrive at from this startling admission? That we should elevate the character and efficiency of our institutions, as we value the reputation of the church, and as we hope to retain in it and to develop the talent and resources which she possesses. In what way can our Institutions be elevated in character, and become permanent in influence? As far as we can see, only by the concentrated coöperation and support of the ministers and members of the church. Do you suppose that other denominations care for us or our institutions? Only so far as general benevolence and christian charity lead them to desire the success of every useful enterprise. They have their own institutions to sustain, and, they understand too well their commanding influence to undervalue them, by withholding pa-

tronage to bestow it on others. Who will condemn them? I will not. Their language to us is, "go forward and develop your own resources with the means which you possess, and you will not fail of success." We unite with them in the sentiment, and, whilst we would not reject either their students or their money, we would feel ashamed to ask them for one or the other. The church in Pennsylvania alone has the ability to sustain Pennsylvania College, far more than the Methodist or Presbyterian churches have to sustain their colleges. Whatever the character of this institution may be, and it is not without a good name, the church in Pennsylvania has the ability to elevate it to a position of excellency unsurpassed by any literary institution in the land. Why has she not done it? Why not increase her library, her philosophical apparatus, her instructors, her pupils and her funds, until nothing more could be desired in the way of excellency, The writer asserts, and he does it advisedly, that if this were accomplished, more would be effected for the permanent reputation and influence of the church, than by any other agency with which he is acquainted. The same may be said of the other literary institutions of the church, in their respective locations. To secure this desirable end, one would naturally look for coöperation to the intelligent and influential in the church, to the ministers and their people, who value education and understand the importance of elevated literary institutions to the highest welfare of the church.

Very appropriate and useful would it be for the ministers of the Gospel to preach stately on the general subject of education, and its influence on the church and the civil institutions of the land, and direct attention to the importance of our own institutions. Thus, by our united efforts, we would secure an amount of influence and importance for the church which will be sought for in vain in any other direction.

4. *The Theological Seminary.* As a centre of influence for the church, in almost every aspect of the subject, perhaps the Theological Seminary occupies the first place. It is the greatest wheel in the theological machinery of the church. It operates not only once or twice and then ceases, but is constantly at work, both directly and indirectly, moulding and fashioning the theological sentiment of the ministers, and through them, of the people. This influence is strikingly exemplified in a sister church, which has wheeled about during the last ten years, and is now firing large and small guns to sustain a doctrine which it formerly condemned. The Theological Seminary, in order to develop and perpetuate a proper

church feeling, should teach the doctrines of the church as contained in her symbols. If others are substituted, which may be regarded as eclectic in their nature, or the doctrines of other churches, or subversive of our symbols and opposed to them, then it follows necessarily that the Seminary becomes the greatest enemy of the church, which it professes to uphold. The doctrines of a few individuals, and not the doctrines of the church, are taught. The character of the church insensibly undergoes a change, and after the lapse of some years, it will be found that she has completely shifted her ground. Thus a designing man, who occupies a place of influence in the Theological Seminary, and is ambitious to become distinguished, has it in his power, unless the Directors are intelligent and vigilant, to produce a revolution in the church which may never be suppressed. The only remedy in such a case, is a return to the standards of the church which are fixed and immovable. It is in the Seminary where the doctrines of the church are exhibited in their logical connection and symmetrical proportion, where they are supported from Scripture reason and history, and where her form of government and ceremonial services are presented in their proper connection, that the loveliness of the church appears. Here, if any where, then, ought to be church-feeling: here, where the beauty and strength and excellency of the church are seen, as from an eminence, if any where, there must be enthusiasm in her behalf.

Church-feeling in the Seminary will be greatly promoted by the intelligence and piety, not only of the Professors, but by that of the young men who congregate in the halls of theology. They act and react on each other. The piety and intelligence of one stimulate the piety and intelligence of others. Christian affection and loveliness are thus cultivated. The ministers of the church thus have confidence in each other and the communion of their choice. They labor in the vineyard of the Lord from love to God and love to the church. These feelings they carry with them and develope in their congregations, and thus the church becomes more united and harmonious in doctrine, feeling and action.

Y. S. R.

ARTICLE VII.

THE SYMBOLS.

By Rev. J. N. Hoffman, Pastor of the Evang. Luth. Church, Carlisle, Pa.

THE question respecting the Symbols of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, a feature of which has been recently discussed by several writers, is not one of recent origin. Even independent of the historical developments and profound investigations of the "mother country" on this subject, its vital importance has engaged the attention of Lutheran ministers in this country for many years. And this interest in the subject has received a new impetus, by all the late historical results in the Church in Germany; which, without controversy, have demonstrated the sad effects of a lax system of doctrine, and consequently tended to lead the most pious and talented ministers to change their position, and to advocate the necessity of a strenuous adherence to the symbols of the church. This fact I will hereafter demonstrate. In the mean time, it was distinctly perceived, and readily admitted, by Lutheran ministers in this country, that a subject so intimately blended with the whole past history of the Church, with her very life and existence, would imperiously demand a prospective investigation. In this manner, the flames had been slumbering in their smothered concealment for many years, and only needed a proper occasion to cause them to burst forth with resistless power. For a season, the influence of name, age, station, learning &c. might restrain the ardent longings of the immortal mind; but by this very self imposed restraint, the inextinguishable energies of the soul gathered firmness and vigor, until, aided by experience, learning and other agencies, it obtained sufficient confidence in itself, no longer to be enslaved by the dictates and authority of others, but to come forth in the publication and defence of the truth. Such a period has arrived. And hence, instead of seeking the occasion of the recent discussion, in any separate event of late years, we must go farther and examine the deep causes which long since have operated to produce these results. We will recognize the origin in prior developments; and especially *in the pressing wants of the soul; and, consequently, in the irresistible tendency of the human mind, dissatisfied with the empty husks of a subjective spiritualism, and longing for the more "substantial" food of objective power and life.*

It appears to me, that those who object to the authority of the "Symbols," have not considered the consequences to which their opposition must lead. These consequences, though scarcely recognized at the moment, will develop themselves in all their ruinous effect, when too late to apply a remedy. Will not the attempt to render our Confession unpopular, weaken the attachment of our members to the church? By suggesting a doubt in respect to the truth of any of its doctrines, or by exciting opposition to its binding authority, the result will not be limited to this document, or the doctrines contained therein, but extend themselves to the whole Church. And whilst we are thus alienating the minds of our people, and destroying their confidence in their "Symbols," other denominations, pursuing a wiser policy, run away with our best members; and whilst they openly applaud our supposed liberality, they secretly laugh at our weakness.

In the discussion of this subject we meet the old, oft-repeated and popular sentiment: "The Bible — the Bible alone is all-sufficient!" We cannot conceal our surprise, that men, who profess to be acquainted with the past history, and the present state of the Church, should repeat this idea, in its popular signification, in opposition to the Confessions of the Church. Have they forgotten, that in all ages, the most erratic heretics, appealed to the Bible in the same way? Are they ignorant of the fact, that all the petty sects of the present day, appeal to the Bible as the source of their errors; that one of the most recent prophets claims for the "Church of God," established by himself, the Bible as its sole foundation, the correct interpretation of which was reserved for him? This principle, however correct in itself, is calculated to mislead and divide. And is the Church, together with her progressive history, so entirely separated from Christ, that in the ages of her development, there should be no practical result, worth our attention? Is the Church no longer under the guidance and control of her glorious head? Has He not fulfilled his promises in her living history? If He has; if he is still directing and sustaining her; if, for eighteen hundred years, his Spirit has animated, guided and enlightened her, and thus led her forward in the development of her power, her knowledge and her experience, then we ask, has the Spirit of God, dwelling in the Church, produced no results during all this time, meriting the attention of christians? Has he lived and operated in her all this time without producing any development, any knowledge, any experience? Is her amount of suffering; her advancing culture; her ardent prayers; her various experience

and manifold productions— is all this of no moment to us? Would it be wise, in an aged, experienced christian, to disregard all the results of his labors, prayers and experience, all the leadings of Providence, the teachings derived from the example of others, with all the advantages flowing from a long life of christian zeal;— would it be wise to reject all this, and to go back to the imbecility of inexperienced youth? Truth is immutable, invariable, eternal. The Bible cannot be improved. But has the experience and learning of the Church, afforded no additional light in the interpretation of the truth? Have not results been produced, in correcting the religious views of mankind, and in bringing the truth into a regular well-defined system, which may be regarded as fixed and irrefutable? Nay! since I have begun to ask questions,— would the opposers of Creeds, themselves have a church, in which they could stand, and from which they could derive a support, but for the existence and influence of these very Creeds? And does it not seem ungrateful, after an individual is taken up into any organized association whatever, for the purpose of sharing the benefits connected therewith, if whilst he is realizing those benefits, he labors to injure the organization, by a public opposition to its laws? He was made acquainted with the laws before he entered it; and if he disagreed with them, he ought not to have concealed the fact, or attempted to become a member.

The question respecting the correctness of the doctrines of the A. C., is entirely distinct from the present enquiry concerning its authority in the Church. Nor can the former, in any manner, aid in deciding the latter. If the correctness or incorrectness of its doctrines is to decide, the argument may be employed on both sides of the question, and the advantage would evidently preponderate in favor of those who advocate its binding authority. For, whilst its opposers acknowledge that a *majority* of its doctrines are correct, and only a *few* incorrect, it is also found that the opposers themselves are in the *minority*; and that the Church at large, during three centuries, has received the *whole* as true. Thus in receiving the A. C. in its normal authority, we are not only sustained by the Church, as such, and consequently by a large majority in all ages, but even by the acknowledgments of its opposers, that most of its doctrines are true. If this, therefore, is to be an argument at all, it certainly opposes those who reject the authority of the A. C.

Nor can the peculiar form, in which the question has hitherto been discussed, bring us to any satisfactory result. The

question, whether the Lutheran Church in this country has ever acknowledged the binding authority of the A. C., involves many other points, which must first be settled, before the original question can be determined. We would have to enquire, by whom such an acknowledgment is to be made? What person or persons possess sufficient authority to render such an act permanent and obligatory? Are individuals, or congregations, or Synods, or the General Synod, or all of them together, required to unite in some final expression of opinion on the subject? If so, would any such acknowledgment, made even under the most favorable circumstances, be received as valid and final; and would the succeeding generation receive it as such? These and other matters would have first to be decided, the moment we deny the original authority of the A. C., and it is easy to foresee the confusion, strife and ruin that would ensue from such a course.

Thus it will be perceived that the foregoing procedure cannot bring us to a definite conclusion on the subject. The matter must be (as it already has been) settled in a more authoritative and substantial manner. We are happily not destitute of such a decision. The ultimate arrangement is no longer in our hands. It has been finally settled *by the authoritative action of the LUTHERAN CHURCH*, anterior to, and irrespective of the establishment or even existence of our Church in this country. And it cannot be controverted, *that under such a presupposition, the Lutheran Church was founded in America.* That policy, therefore, must be doubtful, if not pernicious, which would unsettle and disturb, what has long since been determined, not by the arbitrary and ever-varying opinions of individuals, but by the Scriptures and the Providence of God, through the medium of the practical life and progressive development of the Church of Christ. The *divinely-human* result, of the indwelling of the Spirit in the Church, is embodied in the *Augustan Confession*. This is the authorized charter of her rights—the product of her historical life. The very existence of a Lutheran Church in this country, is a proof and illustration of such a previous arrangement. If such a document as the A. C. did not exist, who would have ever heard of such a Church? To oppose this sacred instrument, or to strive to diminish the confidence of our members respecting it, is certainly a fearful and responsible task.

But no feature connected with the general question, appears to me to be more loose and untenable than the so-called “po-

sition of the General Synod.” I will in charity suppose that its advocates have never examined the consequences to which it essentially leads. To receive the A. C. “as substantially correct,” involves an absolute absurdity—as will be seen hereafter. Better far, that the whole should be rejected, as among the exploded dogmas of a scholastic age, and buried among the rubbish of the “dark ages,” than to adopt a position involving so much inconsistency, and leading to consequences so serious. The following *three* aspects of said position will illustrate the foregoing remarks.

First. What doctrines of the A. C. are, or are not “substantially correct?” Has this ever been determined? If not, then we might be at some loss which to receive and which to reject; and, I greatly fear, there might be some diversity of opinion. If it has not been determined, who is to decide; what authority is to designate the true, and point out the false? Has any power been delegated to any individual or association possessing *admitted* authority to decide the question? If not, then we ask, which are the fundamental, and which the non-fundamental articles? Here is a difficulty. Either must the matter be determined by an acknowledged, authoritative tribunal, or that decision must be left to the subjective and arbitrary judgment of separate individuals; one or the other. “Entweder, oder” — there is no escaping the alternative. Is it replied, that those should be received which agree with Scripture? But this only shifts the question without answering it. For, who is to judge which agree, or do not agree with Scripture? As there might be differences of sentiment here also, we are as much at a loss as ever. Thus, it will be seen, what difficulties must ensue, by rejecting any part of the A. C. before a definite rule is furnished equally authoritative and symbolic, to decide all controverted points. Nor is this all:—

Secondly. Do you say, in reply to the foregoing queries, that the doctrines of our Creeds, which are erroneous, are those respecting the Lord’s Supper, Private (*not* “auricular”) Confession, Baptismal regeneration &c.? You say that these should be rejected. Beware! Have you considered the principle involved in all this? Have you not perceived, that you are thus maintaining the very principle you condemn in others? You censure the advocates of the A. C. for wishing to subject the human mind, and to bind the conscience to human authority, instead of making the S. S. the only rule of faith. You object to this; and, what do you propose as a substitute? — *your own separate, individual opinion!* You reject the authority of the A. C.; and what do you put in its place?—

your own arbitrary judgment! You wish a rule; but that rule is not to be the well-trying, long-established, acknowledged standard of the Church, but your private, subjective opinions. How then can you object to Church-authority, and oppose those who advocate it, when you are adopting the very same principle, only in a more arbitrary manner? Are you not in this very manner usurping an authority over the consciences of men? Are you not substituting private authority in lieu of the authority of the Church? How then can you consistently charge others with designing to bind the conscience to the “exploded!” doctrines of the sixteenth century, when you are but carrying out the same principle, though without the same authority and security? Is it wise to abandon the authority of the Church, for the authority of an individual; or, to reject the established doctrines of the former, for the fancies of the latter? On which foundation are we likely to be most secure? The one is long established, tried, irrefutable and immutable: the other even independent of its individual, and therefore less permanent character, cannot last longer, than the lifetime of the individual. Is then the Church to adopt your opinions, while you live; only to change them when your successor chooses to preach a different doctrine? This would really be usurping authority with a vengeance. And would it not be highly honorable for a whole Church, to have no settled doctrines, but to be at the mercy of every one who might assume the authority of being a leader in Israel?

Besides, in pointing out the doctrines which you suppose should be rejected, will you find no opposition? Will they be satisfied with your selection? If you make your selection the guide for others, and require them to put your construction upon the A. C., would they not have greater reasons for objecting to your principles, than you have to object to the A. C.? The only alternative then that remains is this: either you must make your private decision the authoritative rule—by which you usurp dominion over human conscience—or, you must give the others the same latitude and liberty, in reference to the doctrines of the A. C., which you claim for yourself. The fallacy of the former I have already demonstrated; the sad results of the latter I shall now exhibit.

Thirdly. Do you deny that your opinions are to decide, but that each one has the right to decide for himself? You say that you receive the A. C. as “substantially correct,” and you give the same right to all others. Now, as the broad and convenient phrase, “substantially correct,” is not strictly defined; as it is not determined what part of the Creed falls into

this category and what part is excluded, it must be left optional with each individual, to apply it as he pleases. This you are bound to do, according to your own principle. You chose to reject the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, Confession &c.—but others, adopting your own principle, but differing in sentiment, may contend that the specified doctrines are correct, and in their place may reject others. According to this convenient scheme, you have no right to dictate to them, or prevent them from rejecting any other doctrine of the A. C. You choose to select the above mentioned doctrines; another may receive them as true, but reject the divinity of Christ, the plenary inspiration of the S. S. &c. How will you prevent this? You do not desire to bind their consciences. You will not receive the A. C. in its full extent. Therefore the doctrines you reject, cannot be a rule for others. They, having the same right with yourself, may select their doctrines as well as you, and if they choose to believe what you reject, and to reject what you believe, you have no power to prevent them. In this manner, different persons, under the vulcan shield of this *substantial* scheme, may reject any of the doctrines of the Confession. This is another result of a principle which must in the end prove destructive.

Do you reply that the doctrines you reject are not essential or fundamental, but that the others are. This, however, instead of settling the difficulty, actually increases it. For now we have two points to settle instead of one. On the one hand, some may regard the doctrines fundamental, which you reject. And this is actually the case. There are many excellent and learned divines, who regard especially the doctrine of the Sacrament, as contained in the Confession, as fundamental. And, remember, according to your own principle, you cannot dispute the point with them. On the other hand, there are those who deny those doctrines which you receive (at least some of them) to be essential. How will you escape these issues? How will you decide them? If you deny that the authority of the A. C. reaches the case, you will acknowledge that your own private judgment is still less available. In short, "the stand-point of the General Synod," on this subject, is a complete and ridiculous nullity.

Under these circumstances, what must be the tendency of the position which I have described? The silent but certain operations of a system so loose and uncertain, will display themselves when the evil is beyond all remedy. I shall not contribute, by any influence I may possess, to an issue that will undermine the foundations of our beloved Zion!

All those arguments against the symbolic authority of the A. C., drawn from the supposed duties, privileges and liberties of separate members or congregations, will be found more specious than solid. The presumed rights of individuals to change or modify articles of faith, are contingent and depend upon a variety of circumstances, some of which are decisive and final. The correct conception of the nature of the Church affords an additional illustration in support of the binding authority of the Augsburg Confession.

ARTICLE VIII.

EFFECT OF THE ADOPTION OF THE FORMULA OF CONCORD UPON THE LUTH. CHURCH AND LUTHERAN THEOLOGY.*

Translated from the German of Dr. G. J. Plank, of Goettingen, by Rev. Benjamin Sadtler, A. M., Shippensburg, Pa.

THE very name of the Formula of Concord proclaimed the design of restoring that harmony of sentiment among the Lutheran theologians, which had been disturbed by a series of contentions, that had broken out among them after Luther's death. If possible it was even to secure harmony for the future. It was to present an instrument of peace having for its design, not only the settlement of all previously existing controversies, but likewise the removal of all occasion and material for others in future. As far as human foresight and measures could secure that object, in addition to a uniformity in her faith and practice, the internal peace of the Lutheran Church was to be guaranteed for all coming time. But how could any one, who even admitted the absolute attainability of this object, deem it possible, in view of the manner in which the composition of the Formula was undertaken, that its design could be accomplished. Yea, that as much as its primary design could be met by it, and even a temporary peace be secured among the theologians.¹

Harmony was to be attained by a majority of the theologians

* This article is extracted from the "History of Protestant Theology from the adoption of the Formula of Concord to the middle of the eighteenth century." By G. J. Plank, D. D. Goettingen, 1831.

¹ Vid. History of the origin and composition of the Formula of Concord in my history of Protestant Theology from Luther's death to the introduction of the Formula of Concord. Bk. ix. x. vol. iii. pp. 269-690.

uniting in the rejection and condemnation of certain doctrines and opinions that had been declared inconsistent with the pure and genuine Lutheran system. This majority was actually secured; but, in part, by means that operated in a very uncertain manner; those means were actual compulsion. But even if they had proceeded in a perfectly upright and open manner, and consequently could cherish the hope that this majority of the theologians would always remain united; even then there remained a highly important minority in opposition to it, whose accession would now become much more doubtful than before. Thus, in the plan of the originators of this harmonizing process, one feature was the forcible suppression of this minority in case it should come to the worst. This minority consisted principally of those theologians, whose opinions had been condemned in the Formula, and who had thereby been published as apostates to the pure Lutheran doctrine. Its very publication declared that they ought to be excluded from communion with the Lutheran Church, or rather this excision was actually embraced in it. It was hoped that this fact would operate powerfully enough to frighten them into an adhesion; or if it should not operate thus, it could, at least in the case of particular individuals, be made to receive its proper significance from those of their princes, who had taken an active part in this harmonizing work. Experience soon taught, in a very disagreeable manner, that this hope was by far too extravagant, and occasion was even given for the fear, that through it, the whole Lutheran Church might have been brought into a very critical condition.

It is true, that little was to be apprehended from several of those dissenting parties, with whom controversies had hitherto been maintained, and whose opinions had been condemned in the Formula. This resulted, partly from the fact that their originators or champions had died in the interim, and with them the adherents and proselytes which they had gained in various places; and partly, because they had withdrawn themselves into obscurity, and had thus been lost to observation. This event could the more readily occur, as, excepting in some particular limited spheres, and these but for a time, they had never been very numerous.

In this way we may probably account for the disappearance of the Osiandrists and Stankáristis, together with the followers of the Antinomian Agricola and the Flacian Substancists, who had embraced the nonsensical opinion of their oracle Flacius, that hereditary depravity was the substance of man. In the ardor of that zeal, into which they had wrought them-

selves in their controversies, and which had not yet quite abated, or perhaps to justify that zeal of which they began to be ashamed, a separate article was devoted to each of these parties, in which their errors were forever proscribed in the Lutheran Church. In reality these errors never had found entrance into the Church; they had only gained a temporary importance from the senseless virulence with which they had been attacked and defended, and from the commotions which, in consequence, had been raised in several places. There always was an overwhelming majority of the theologians against them; there was therefore no reason to dread the opposition or the protests which their adherents might offer to the sentence of condemnation which was now pronounced against them, in the name of the whole Lutheran Church. The same might be said of the adherents and friends of that good fanatic Schwenkfeld, who had likewise received their sentence from the same source—a sentence which, for various reasons was as wise as just. They had already left the Lutheran Church of their own accord, and would certainly never have returned to her fold, even if they had not been condemned. On the other hand the peculiarities by which they were distinguished, forbade the idea that they could proselyte to any important extent.

In reality, therefore, it was not necessary to take such particular notice of the points in which these persons had diverged from the truth, in that new act whereby genuine Lutheran orthodoxy was to be fixed for all coming time, by a solemn declaration on the part of the whole church. By all the divisions which were opposed to the Flacian error in relation to human depravity, to the novel language of Osiander on the subject of justification, to the useless antitheses in which the Antinomians had presented the Law and Gospel, and to the vagaries of Schwenkfeld, nothing important was gained. It never had been at all doubtful, at least to the overwhelming majority of the Lutheran theologians, what was pure Lutheran doctrine on these subjects. Long before the appearance of the Formula they had pronounced upon them. The very fact of the general opposition which had been arrayed against these opinions, proclaimed in the most unequivocal manner that they were not regarded as Lutheran. Hence the composers of the new Formula only reiterated the judgment, which had been generally and decisively uttered against them long before, and, in opposing their decision to the opinions of those sectaries, there was not even a single new modification made in the form of presenting these doctrines.

The most that can be claimed is, that the theological usus loquendi in reference to these points, was more narrowly guarded and more accurately determined; but as far as the attainment of the object more immediately sought after was concerned, their labor was in vain.

On the other hand, there were two other points, that were regarded in a different manner, and to which the authors of the Formula ascribed greater importance. It may even be confidently maintained, that it was for their sake the whole of this work of concord was more immediately undertaken and consummated. During the life-time of Luther, it was somewhat doubtful, in reference to these two points, what should or could be regarded as the teaching of the Protestant Church. After his death, the controversies, to which they gave rise, made the matter but the more doubtful. It has become a question whether, on the doctrines of hereditary depravity, freewill and grace, the first more rigid dogmatic form which Luther had adopted in his earlier writings, or the milder form into which Melancthon subsequently moulded them, was to be received as the authorized teaching of the Protestant party. What was yet more questionable, was whether all of the distinctions which Luther had once adopted as the exhibitions of his own individual faith, in relation to the Lord's Supper and the person of Christ, were likewise to be regarded as essential parts of the general creed of the Protestant Church. This had not only become debatable; but there were very strong reasons for the uncertainty. Through the influence and respectability of its authors it was positively determined in the new Formula, that, in reference to both these points, they would and should adhere to the unaltered views which Luther had presented. By this means the creed of the church received a fixedness, in which it had previously been deficient. In so far, therefore, something new was added to the theology of Protestantism, for it could be regarded as something new, that what previously had been left undecided now became fixed. Yet, from this very fact originated all those disastrous and distracting consequences, not only to our theology, but likewise to our church, in her outer and inner relations.

In reference to the first question, which related to the proper dogmatic form of the articles on original depravity, freewill and grace, it was really uncertain whether the decision of the Formula was not actually against the majority of Protestant theologians. The milder theory on these subjects, which Melancthon had already maintained in the second principal edition of his *Loci*, had unquestionably been received by the

majority of them, even during the lifetime of Luther. Perhaps but few were conscious, that, in doing so, they had departed from the genuine Lutheran view; at least all of them could not distinctly show where the one diverged from the other. But even those, who, with a perfect and clear understanding of the facts in the case, acknowledged to themselves the variation of the view of Melanchthon from that of Luther, found justification for their course in Luther himself. Luther could not but know, and did know it right well, that Melanchthon had mollified his hard Augustinism in these doctrines; for he had done it with the most unreserved openness, and at times and under circumstances that could not fail to make the modification more striking and, consequently, to give it the greater publicity. Luther perseveringly retained his own language, in reference to these tenets, and, upon more than one occasion, plainly intimated that he had not abandoned his own views; yet he never publicly opposed the new view of Melanchthon; he never betrayed any sensitiveness on the subject, nor did he express his disapprobation because Melanchthon had ventured to diverge from his own dogmatic form. Certainly from all of this the other theologians of the party could justly draw the conclusion, that Luther did not desire to prevent any of them from adopting Melanchthon's view. They were justified in believing, that he did not view the difference in the opinions as being of such moment as to wish to bind their convictions to his own. They were justified in believing, that in pursuing the course they did, they were not rendering themselves guilty of any departure from the fundamental idea of the doctrine. Added to this, it was known that all of Luther's colleagues at Wittenberg, even during his lifetime, had adopted the milder theory of Melanchthon; when the fact is considered that certainly the greater part of the Protestant theologians had been educated in the Wittenberg schools; in addition when this is regarded that, as already intimated, to many it was perhaps quite unknown that they had departed from the true opinion of Luther; how, in view of these circumstances, can one yet doubt, that about the time that Luther left the stage of action, certainly there was a decided majority for the teaching of Melanchthon? This same conclusion must be adopted from the fact, that four full years elapsed after Luther's death, before even the party of zealots, that had already been formed, before the Amsdorffs and Flacius who, already at that time, had rendered themselves conspicuous as enthusiasts for the pure teachings of the departed Lu-

ther, or rather had constituted themselves a party in opposition to Melanchthon, made the difference of opinion about these articles a subject of controversy. They were perfectly well acquainted with the fact that this difference existed, for the Amsdorffs had murmured about it even during Luther's lifetime, and had repeatedly urged the old man himself to join issue with Melanchthon on account of it. Besides this, abundant opportunities had been afforded to themselves to commence an immediate controversy on the subject, or at least to publish how far a deviation from the pure Lutheran doctrine had taken place; as Melanchthon and his friends at Wittenberg, did not find it at all necessary to conceal the departure. If therefore they nevertheless suppressed their choler, what could have been the motive but the fear that they might not find the majority of the other theologians of the party disposed to exchange again the milder dogmatic form, which Melanchthon had adopted, for the more rigid one of Luther?

This is confirmed by many of the fluctuations the synergistic controversy exhibited during its progress.¹ This controversy was waged in reference to these differences, and it must be admitted as undoubtedly certain, that it was during its continuance, and during the subsequent disputes with Flacius about his singular views of hereditary sin, many of the contemporaneous theologians became involved in scruples of conscience because of their departure from the genuine Lutheran dogmatic form. This fact these controversies exhibited to them, and they were thereby led to become more favorably disposed to the forsaken view, and even to re-adopt it. It is most certain, however, that this was not the case with all. The number of those continued to be considerable who persisted in maintaining, that the authority of Luther's name should not deter them from preserving a dogmatic form which Melanchthon had introduced into their schools, during Luther's lifetime, and that too without his approval. What, therefore, must have been the inevitable effect of the decision of the Formula of Concord upon these?

'Tis true these theologians constituted no peculiar, or at least formally organized party. They had no longer any leaders or spokesmen, since the professors chairs at Wittenberg had come to be occupied with nothing but opponents of Melanchthon. They were scattered among the mass of the others. There was therefore no reason to be much concerned about the

¹ Vid. History of the synergistic controversy, *ibid.* Bk. III. Chap. vi-xiv. Vol. I. pp. 553-590.

oppositions which they might create against the new Formula; for, at least in those places where the Formula had found favor with the ruling powers, they could easily be silenced. Yet even though they should be silent, who could hope that they had yielded to the decision made, from full and genuine conviction. This could not be expected from a single one of those who had exchanged the milder dogmatic form of Melancthon with Luther's more rigid one, with a clear and distinct knowledge of their diversity. It was hence to be expected, that there would always be a number of disaffected ones left, and even among those who had been forced to adopt the new symbol. From this source even greater detriment might accrue to Lutheran theology, at least eventually, than from the most violent protests which were filed against the Formula from other sources.

The decision of the Formula in reference to the second point in dispute, was the cause of an evil of another kind, which not only affected Lutheran theology, but the whole Lutheran Church. The question, whether, in relation to the Lord's Supper, every opinion that at any time Luther had entertained and published as his own private view, or only what was contained in the Augsburg Confession and its Apology, was to be received as the Protestant Church view, had been a continual and almost sole question of dispute among Protestant theologians since Luther's death, or more accurately since the year 1552, when Joachim Westphal resuscitated the sacramentarian controversy. 'Tis true, these new zealots for the pure Lutheran doctrine, on the subject of the Lord's Supper, would not admit that they contended simply about that one point; but maintained that they had arrayed themselves against the Calvinism which had been sought to be introduced in a secret manner, into the Lutheran Church, instead of her own teaching. This suspicion might not have been unjust as far as many an individual theologian was concerned. However that may be, they could make but the one point the subject of controversy, and the dispute always terminated upon it. This was the case already with those conducted with Hardenburg in Bremen, and in the commotions which Hesshuss originated in the Palatinate.¹

Those theologians, whom these zealots suspected of a secret leaning to the Calvinistic doctrine on the Lord's Supper, had always declared in the most emphatic manner, that they were

¹ Vid. History of the renewed sacramentarian controversy. Ibid. Bk. VI. Chap. i-xii. Bk. VII. Chap. i-xii.

ready to acknowledge a true and actual presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament, in the very language in which the whole Protestant Church had confessed it in the Augsburg Confession. Not satisfied with this, they desired and demanded, that they should rest the Lutheran real presence of Christ in the sacrament upon the very same grounds as Luther; because the language of the Augsburg Confession, particularly as altered by Melancthon, could only too easily be construed to teach a mere Calvinistic presence. This could not well be denied, nor that the language of the Augsburg Confession had often been used for such a purpose. Yet, admitting all this, it was still more than doubtful whether it afforded a sufficient justification for a demand of such a kind and such comprehensiveness.

These zealots insisted, that the only proper representation of the pure Lutheran doctrine on the subject of the Lord's Supper, could be given in the unaltered language of the tenth article of the Augsburg Confession, and then only in combination with the clause condemning all dissenters, which Melancthon had omitted. So far they might have gone with some appearance of justice. They soon took the unequivocal and undisguised ground, that in order to be genuinely Lutheran, on this subject, it was necessary to think of the body of Christ as being present because of its ubiquity. This, of course, involved the necessity of adopting the hypothesis of Christ's bodily ubiquity. They based their system upon the assertion, that Luther had believed in only such a presence of the body of Christ in the sacrament as presupposed its ubiquity. They ventured to draw the conclusion from this, that every one that rejected this view must necessarily have abandoned the Lutheran real presence. They hence constituted a belief in the doctrine of Christ's ubiquity, the test of genuine Lutheranism. But what did this involve but the demand, that the doctrine of the real presence was to be received in precisely that form and with all of those distinctions, which formerly had pertained to it in Luther's individual conceptions? Upon what ground could they base such a demand?

This much was true, Luther had once endeavored to prove his view of the bodily presence of Christ in the sacrament from the hypothesis of his ubiquity, or rather to answer some objections of his opponents to proofs drawn from this source. Yet he had done this only in one of his earlier controversial articles against the Swiss. It must be admitted he never formally abandoned the hypothesis; and who could ever expect Luther to do that? Yet the fact that he never made any

further use of it, but continued during the whole of his subsequent life, as he had done from the very commencement of the controversy, to draw his principal proof for the corporeal presence from the words in the institution of the sacrament;—this fact would seem at least to show that the hypothesis of Christ's ubiquity had lost something of its importance in his eyes. But were we even compelled to concede that he always continued to ascribe to it the same importance; even then it could at most be regarded as his own private view. It was adopted by scarcely any of the other theologians of his party; not even by one of his associates in the sacramentarian controversy, which was maintained during his lifetime. In addition to this, it had been adopted in none of the public confessional writings of the new church; neither in the Augsburg Confession, nor its Apology, nor in the Smalcald Articles. It had not therefore as yet attained the dignity of being regarded as a doctrine of the Lutheran Church. With what appearance of justice could they now pretend thus to avow it or to make it such? Even if the pretext of these zealots had been well-founded in truth, that in no other way could the line of distinction be drawn between those who respectively maintained the Lutheran or Calvinistic view of Christ's presence in the sacrament, and, that in no other way could the latter be prevented from shielding themselves behind the language of the Confession; even then they would have had no right to pursue the course adopted. Granted it were a fact, that the language of the Confession did not exclude the Calvinistic view of the real presence, and that it had often been made to teach no more than that view; yet the Lutheran Church through her regular representatives, and Luther himself frequently during his lifetime, had declared that they were prepared to regard all as brethren in the faith who would adopt the Augsburg Confession as their own. They had made this declaration after the most mature deliberation, with the wisest reference to the well known relation of every other creed to their own, and with the most considerate and forbearing moderation towards those relations. Who, therefore, could be authorized to make more stringent demands?

But it was not even founded in truth, that this new touchstone was absolutely necessary to discover whether some crypto-Calvinist might not have professed to find his own views in the language of the Augsburg Confession. It was unjust to suspect those theologians of a secret inclination to the Calvinistic view, who chose to employ the language of the Confession as altered by Melanchthon; for it was a settled

point that even it could embrace the true Lutherauce presence. Even if those theologians declared, that they were determined never again to adopt the clause condemning all dissentients, which Melanchthon had expunged from the article on the Lord's Supper, even this did not involve the necessity of their having adopted the Calvinistic view. It simply would indicate their unwillingness to pronounce judgment of condemnation upon others, and not their own apostacy to Calvinism. To secure a certain assurance, that they yet retained the Lutheran exposition, it was by no means necessary to compel them to adopt the hypothesis of Christ's ubiquity. If they had but asked the question, or induced to them to declare, whether they received the bodily presence of Christ in the sacrament because the words of the institution taught it; this would have decided the fact, whether they had any other than the Lutheran view. They would have been authorized to do that, as Luther had uniformly made the words of the institution the basis of his opinion. It had likewise been publicly declared by the whole party on more occasions than one, and had thereby become the avowed teaching of the Lutheran Church. But just as soon as they insisted that no one could adhere to the pure Lutheran view of the Lord's Supper who did not adopt the hypothesis of his ubiquity, their procedure involved the bold demand, that that hypothesis should be recognized as the teaching of the Lutheran Church. For this they had not a shadow of right, as it admitted of proof that it never had belonged to the Creed of the Church, and, at furthest, had only at one time composed part of Luther's private belief, whilst it was doubtful whether even this always continued to be the case.¹

Regardless of these facts the authors of the Formula of Concord proclaimed, as a doctrine of the Lutheran Church, that Christ, in his human nature also, could make use of the divine attribute of omnipresence. At the same time they were

¹ This point is developed most ably and convincingly in a publication, which appeared in 1582, with the following title: *The very language and teaching of the Augsburg Confession, and Apology, as also of their re-issue, and of the Frankfort farewell address, on the subject of the Sacraments, and especially of the holy Eucharist; with impartial testimonies of Dr. Luther, written apart from the sacramentarian controversy, appended; in answer to the calumnies of some turbulent persons who, in violation of truth, have proclaimed that in the states and dominions of the illustrious and noble Prince and Lord, John Casimir, Count Palatine, of the Rhein &c., a doctrine has been taught on the subject of the Lord's supper in conflict with the Augsburg Confession: written for the benefit of weak consciences, led astray by such reports. Compiled and re-published in a succinct form. Neustadt on the Hardt. Quarto.*

cunning enough not to refer his bodily presence in the supper primarily to this hypothesis; yet they let it be distinctly understood, that it could not be omitted in defending the Lutheran view against the objections of Calvinists. From this it naturally followed, that whoever did not receive it or regarded it as superfluous, could have no claim to the possession of the Lutheran view. Besides, as they, at the same time, declared the adoption of the Formula and subscription to it, should be regarded as the only evidence of true Lutheranism; what could be its only consequence, and what its operation, not only in reference to individual dissenters, but to the whole Church?

The party of pretended enthusiasts for the pure Lutheran doctrine, who had digested this plan, in reality to secure for themselves a constant domination in the church, by means of the Formula, could not themselves have regarded it as possible to induce all, who dissented from them on the subject of the Lord's supper, either by persuasion or compulsion to adopt it. The situation of the greater part of these dissenters, was essentially different from that of the most of those, whose imputed errors were condemned for the first time in the Formula. The most of the latter had really departed from Luther's doctrine, or at least from the mode of exposition and expression current in the church. They themselves were conscious of this departure, and, whilst they could scarcely be expected willingly to subscribe to their own condemnation, they would be compelled to admit, that there were plausible reasons to charge them with such departure. At the same time, they might not concede to their opponents the right to condemn them for it. If, therefore, it was announced to such, that they could no longer be regarded as being in fellowship with the Lutheran church, provided they retained their views; such a course would not seem to have been altogether improper, because by their views they had already separated themselves from the church. Because of the very fact, that they had, virtually separated themselves from the decided majority of the Lutheran faith, there was not much to be feared from a formal declaration of their excision. How entirely different, on the other hand, was it with those who were accused of a departure from the pure Lutheran faith on the subject of the Lord's supper? They never had purposed departing from that doctrine on the subject which the Lutheran church had professed in her public Confession. The greater part of them perhaps did not as much as know, that their view lacked an idea or a distinction that had ever belonged to Luther's individual opinion. Those, however, that did know

it could justly appeal to the fact, that they never had departed from the faith of the church as she had published it. Even if there were some, who, in addition to this, were aware that, by the rejection of that hypothesis, they had approached somewhat nearer to the Calvinistic view — yea, even if many had had the design of actually approximating to that view — they might have been sincere in the belief that the church never had wished a wider separation from it. What, therefore, would be the consequence of striving in the new Formula of Concord to impose upon such men, in the shape of the hypothesis of Christ's ubiquity, a distinction in reference to the doctrine of the Lord's supper, which, according to their most positive convictions, was neither tenable, nor capable of proof, nor had ever been a doctrine of the church?

This alone could be the result, and this alone was the result, that not only a number of individual theologians but also a number of whole churches, which had hitherto belonged to the Lutheran party, gradually approximated nearer to the Calvinists, and soon formally and fully united with them. In the year 1580, at the time of the publication of the Formula, there were but two churches, in Germany that had positively declared themselves for the Calvinistic doctrine on the Lord's supper: that at Bremen, and another at Neustadt, on the Hardt, in that part of the Palatinate which had come into the possession of the Count Palatine, John Casimir, and where he had his residence. At the close of the century however, and therefore, within the next twenty or thirty years, perhaps fully one-fourth of all the Protestant churches in the empire had given in their full adhesion to this party. This was such a natural consequence, that it could not fail to follow. Already during the preliminary negotiations, which had been conducted before the publication of the Formula, on the subject of its adoption, the ministers of a number of churches, as for instance of Hesse Cassel, of Nassau, of Anhalt, and of Zweibrücken, had declared, in the most positive manner, that they never would submit to having the hypothesis of Christ's ubiquity forced upon them, neither as a collateral idea in the doctrine of the supper, nor as a distinctive idea of the doctrine of the person of Christ. Yet these very churches, in part declared just as decidedly, that they had every disposition to retain and profess the true Lutheran presence of Christ, as contained in the language of the Augsburg Confession, and that too of the unaltered edition.¹ It was thus they suffi-

¹ Vid, Vol. III, Bk. x, Chap. v—viii.

ciently legitimated themselves as true members of that church, that had adopted this confession as her own, and hitherto had made nothing else than its reception the condition of her communion. In the Formula, however, faith in this ubiquity received the stamp as an article of the Lutheran Church creed. They proclaimed thereby that all that did not adopt it, were no longer members of the Lutheran Church. It was soon loudly maintained, that they could no longer participate in the advantages of the religious peace which had only been concluded with the Lutheran party. They were told to their faces, that they could be regarded as nothing more than Calvinists; yea they were even generally distinguished by the name Crypto-Calvinists. What, therefore, could be more natural than that disaffection and bitterness, and, at the same time, prudence and self-defence should lead many of them to throw themselves fully into the arms of the Calvinists, and actually transform them into what they had previously, with the greatest injustice, been proclaimed?

It thus happened, and that too in the natural course of things, that the very party which they had desired more particularly to suppress by means of the Formula of Concord—that the Calvinistic party, now for the first time obtained such a footing, that the continuance of its existence was secured forever in Germany. This was the unfortunate consequence which primarily accrued to the Lutheran Church from the movement. On the other hand, her theology secured this advantage, that, for a century and a half, it remained fixed to the point to which it had been bound by the Formula.¹

[¹ We are aware that the attempt has been made, by some recent writers of a certain school, both in Germany and this country, to invalidate the testimony of Dr. Plank as to the baneful influence of the adoption of the Formula of Concord upon our church. We feel bound, for the present, simply to state, that such attempts have been made in the very face of impartial history and undeniable facts. It is beyond controversy, that it was rejected not only by those principalities that subsequently became Reformed, but also by many states and kingdoms that never deserted the Lutheran standard; and in some other cases it was robbed of its binding authority, in less than a half century after it had been formally adopted.] TR.

ARTICLE IX.

REFLECTIONS ON THE CONDITION OF THE NORWEGIAN CHURCH.

REMINISCENCES OF A VISIT TO THAT COUNTRY IN 1847.

Translated by the Rev. B. M. Schmucker, A. M., Martinsburg, Va.

ARTICLE II.

AT the time of my visit, the public mind was just becoming tranquil after a violent struggle, which, as it involved their doctrinal confession, was conducted with an acrimony, that convinced me that great religious inflammability as well as a decided religious life was to be met with in Norway. This consideration increased with my longer sojourn in the country. The contest had been waged by the laity against the clergy; the leaders of the still existing religious associations of the laity which had been commenced by Hans Hange, on the one hand, and a number of the most influential of the Norwegian Theologians on the other being engaged in it. It arose from a measure of the government. The abridgement of the Exposition of Luther's Smaller Catechism, by Erik Pontoppidan, which had been in common use, being found no longer suited to the wants of the church, a committee of three members was appointed, by the government, in 1839, to prepare a new edition with suitable amendments. After three years, the task committed to them was accomplished, and, on the 14th of July 1843, a royal mandate appeared which enjoined the introduction of the new edition of the Catechism in the schools, in the instruction of the candidates for confirmation, as also in the usual catechetical exercises of the clergy. The amended edition had many advantages; it may deservedly be said that the committee were cautious in their alterations. The only material alteration was in the answer to the question concerning Christ's descent into hell. Pontoppidan had stated that its design was, that Christ desired to exhibit the victory over Satan which he had obtained by his death; the amended edition added to this, that he might preach the Gospel to the spirits which were in prison, with a reference to 1 Pet. 3: 18, 19. 4: 6. The only verbal alteration which at least might be misunderstood, was, that where in Pontoppidan's Catechism among the things which are plainly to be avoided as sinful or likely to lead us astray, the luxuries of life, even though of spirit-

ual nature, are mentioned by name, in the revised edition there is a general expression; every thing which fosters the lust of the eyes, the lust of the flesh and the pride and luxury of life was substituted for it. We would naturally expect that its publication would not be permitted to pass silently by. The Catechism was scarcely published, until it proved a fire-brand thrown among the congregations. Within the jurisdiction of many of the Provosts a decided disturbance arose, excited and directed for the most part by the followers of Hange, who thought they were especially called to be watchmen of Zion to maintain the Lutheran Confession inviolate. The general indignation was directed against one, who, of all the clergy had been the greatest favorite, as a writer, with the people; to whom, as he himself informs us, many bore witness that he had exerted a blessed influence on a multitude of souls; whose writings, and especially his "Manual of Devotion for general use," attained (in seven editions,) a more than ordinary circulation—Wilhelm Andr. Wepels. The fact that he had hitherto been the most widely popular as a writer, was the reason that he was now held responsible for the alterations introduced in the new edition, although he was not its editor. Wepels received a number of verbal and written communications, and thus the strife commenced. Some of these were letters with the signature of the authors, who, perplexed by the insinuations of his enemies, in their unbounded confidence in him, besought, in the greatest consternation, that he would explain the step which had caused these charges. The rest, much more numerous than the former, were anonymous pieces, in which he was loaded with the most silly accusations, and called a teacher of error, a forerunner of Antichrist and a servant of Satan. But it did not end here. Large meetings were held and prayer unceasingly offered to the Lord of the Church, that he would not permit so novel, false, and pernicious an error to enter the church, and pollute the unsullied bride of Christ. In many congregations it was unanimously decided, that hereafter no one should be allowed to use any of the writings of the traitor to the Church, and any who continued to use the "Manual of Devotion" by Wepels, were under the ban of public censure.

This feeling, however, was not universal, but was only manifested where the Hangian influence was strongest, especially in the spheres of action of those who considered themselves as the legitimate successors of Hans Hange, on whom, as upon the Prophet of old, the mantle of their predecessor had fallen, as at Drammen, Kongsberg, Frederikshald, Trondhjem,

and in many rural districts. But those who were discontented on account of the alterations which had been made, feeling that great injury might be caused by them, were not satisfied with this agitation. There was still danger that the congregations would be compelled to adopt the Catechism which they now disliked. The matter was brought before the Storting, the highest civil authority in the land, and thus became a national concern. Wepels, in the name of the committee which had been attacked, and of the highest authority in the church which had appointed it, and also in behalf of the ministry to which he belonged, as well as in self-defence, published a defence of their course. This work, entitled, *Public explanation to my fellow christians of my views and published statements concerning Christ's descent into hell, and the possibility of a saving change after death*, was published at Christiana, 1845. The course of argument which he followed in it cannot, of course, be shown here. We can only say, that in the first part he proposes to establish the accordance of the views he had expressed concerning Christ's descent into hell with the Scriptures, to answer the objections made on account of the dangerous practical tendencies of the doctrine, and to establish their agreement with the apostolic creed publicly acknowledged in baptism, and the symbols of the Ev. Lutheran Church, to which they had been obligated in confirmation. In the second part he repels the charge of novelty made to his doctrines. I cannot forbear to introduce here an explanation of the worthy author which well deserves consideration, furnishing an example which many of the clergy of Germany would do well to follow. "As a minister of the Ev. Lutheran Church of Norway," says he, "I am bound to them (namely the Symbolical books, among which the Formula Concordiae does not hold a place), by a solemn oath, so that if I can no longer subscribe to them, but am compelled by conscientious convictions to reject their teachings, it would be my imperative duty to resign my office. For I could never ease my conscience with the false pretence, that I had only obligated myself that my teachings should be accordant with the symbolical books, in as far as these were accordant, (i. e. in as far as I considered them accordant,) with the Bible, as a pretence which renders all confessional obligation an unmeaning form, and indeed scarcely of greater significance than an obligation to the Koran, or any other book. If, therefore, my explanation of the Scriptures should be at variance with the symbols to which I have been solemnly obligated, I must either discard those explanations, or resign my position in the church.

But the Augsburg Confession, which explicitly comes into question, allows, God be praised, greater freedom in the exposition of the Scriptures, and thus far I have never felt the limits which it sets too narrow. And so long as I do not reject any part of these symbols, I can safely differ from any of the Lutheran divines, and even from Luther himself, where I find that he has been mistaken, so he himself has said, and is so clear as to need no proof." Such a declaration is truly worthy of a Norwegian divine; it is firm and honest, and clearly shows the position which many of the most distinguished Norwegian clergy assume, at the present time, in relation to the symbols.

Almost simultaneously with Wepel's defence, which was throughout much in the same tone, appeared a publication of his opponents, in which, for the first time, they entered minutely into the consideration of the points in dispute, and brought against the committee the charge that they made broad the narrow road that leadeth to heaven. It appeared anonymously, but was evidently the work of one of the followers of Hange, and it soon was considered as a declaration of war of the whole party against Wepels. The latter published a brief reply, in which the friends of Hange are specifically designated as his principal opponents. The contest began to be waged between distinct parties, and instead of drawing to a close seemed to be but rightly enkindled. A publication appeared at Frederikshald in 1845, not anonymously as before, for Wepels had taken exception to that in the other, but with the name of the author, Ole Nielsen, attached. The readiness in the use of the pen displayed in this treatise by a layman, and one not of the educated class of the community was astonishing, and can only be accounted for by the very thorough and excellent parental training, and home culture of the agricultural class, which often produces more favorable results than the most judiciously organized system of public instruction. It would be interesting, as well as profitable to follow the truly excellent thoughts of the Norwegian farmer, furnishing, as they do, an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the religious views of the Hangean party, but this would require a more extended account of the contest than accords with our present purpose to furnish. I can only say, that the work lays great stress on the doctrines of a universal priesthood, new birth, making a belief in them an essential pre-requisite to a proper understanding of the Holy Scriptures, that it abounds in allegory, and contains also many happy illustrations of Scripture. Written in a style which the people could

readily understand, and which they loved, it obtained an extended circulation, and assisted not a little to increase the popular excitement against the new Catechism. In 1847, again there appeared another pamphlet—a mere reprint of Pontoppidan's views on the condition of the soul after death, edited, not as before by one of the uneducated mass, but by a man of cultivation. It seems to have been intended to exert an irenical influence—it accomplished, however, but little. Neither party was satisfied with it. The excitement continued constantly to extend, so as to excite serious apprehension. Wepels was attacked by a severe and dangerous illness which brought him near to the grave. To what extent the troubles of the times contributed to heighten it, cannot, of course, be determined; there is but little doubt that his anxiety of mind delayed his restoral. In the mean time, the excitement which had arisen among the people, and by which many of the steadier part of the community had been carried along, could no longer be ignored by the government. The Hangean party had obtained a power and influence in the congregations of Norway which could not be overlooked, and the less, because many had given in their adherence to it, who would otherwise be indisposed to have any connection with it, but who apprehended real injury to the Lutheran doctrine from the further circulation of the altered edition of Pontoppidan's Catechism. Petition after petition for the withdrawal of the royal imprimatur from the new edition was sent in, the clergy were compelled by their congregations to discontinue the use of the work provided by the committee, to be employed in the schools, and the instruction of catechumens, so that the government was compelled, not indeed entirely to recall the appointment of the book,—for that would have been contradicting themselves—but to modify the ordinance of July 14th, 1843, which had aroused so fierce a storm. The use of the old edition of Luther's Catechism, with Pontoppidan's exposition, had been allowed by the royal decree until the close of the year 1848, this limit was removed by a new decree, and as pastor Wepels informed me, with his approval, it was for the future allowed each congregation with their minister to decide, which of three Catechisms should be employed in the instruction of the young; the *Catechismus plenus* (Larger catechism) of Erik Pontoppidan, or the old abridgment, or the amended abridgment. In vain were the opposers of the new edition besought not to overlook or reject the advantages of the whole on account of a single part; in vain were they reminded, that if they believed the doctrine of a possible conversion after

death to be unscriptural, they need not understand Christ's preaching to the spirits in prison to be a preaching of repentance, but an annunciation of wrath and judgment. A distrust of the orthodoxy of the Catechism had extended itself widely, and was hard to be removed from a people whose sincere, honest, truth-loving spirit hated all accommodation, and all many-sided representations. Perhaps scarcely a third of the country churches, and not all in the cities had introduced the new Catechism, although the Society for the diffusion of religious books, at Christiana, had spared no effort to extend its circulation, having distributed an edition of five thousand copies, partly gratis, and partly at very low prices.

The public strife began, therefore, gradually to cease. Congregations were contented with the privilege secured to them of determining which catechism should be used within their bounds. Such was the posture of affairs at the time of my visit to Norway. The Storthing seemed to be concerned almost entirely about the interests of the people and of the clergy, and to be strangely negligent in their attention to religious ecclesiastical affairs. The excitement, which had so lately filled the souls of the Norwegians, was doubtless still vibrating within. Even Wepels seemed scarcely as yet to have become entirely tranquil; it must have been especially painful that his influence as an author, which had been so extensive, had suffered a severe blow. But I must confess, that although he received much personal abuse, although the troubles which enemies and sickness had caused had but lately passed over his head and may have whitened his locks, yet did he not once give utterance to a severe or embittered judgment concerning his opponents. With pity—a smile playing in his countenance—he related some examples of the suspicions which had been raised concerning him, that many simple souls literally trampled before him and his writings, as though they were real personal tempters, going about seeking to lure their poor souls into the snare of destruction. He informed us with evident pain, that the friends of Hange, who had hitherto been so ardently and constantly attached to him, some of whom had even been among his intimate friends, had now forsaken him, under the influence of a few extreme, spiritually conceited leaders, who were honored by their followers with the title of Prophets, who were esteemed and lauded as martyrs to the good Lutheran cause, and who succeeded, among the less independent members of their party, in casting suspicion on his conduct. But this was all he allowed himself to say concerning them.

If we turn for a moment to review the contest through which we have passed, there are three aspects of it which strike us as worthy of notice. It bears decided testimony, that in the Norwegian church there courses a life, a truly active christian life, especially among the laity; for most of the people took part in it, some as acting, others observing, some assaulting, others suffering. And this life — the second inference — has lately taken a decidedly confessional direction, so that the Norwegian church pre-eminently deserves to be considered as the most zealous for the confessions, for the arguments urged with greatest force against Wepels views all resolved themselves into this, that the heroes of the Lutheran confession, first of all Luther, and then Pontoppidan, the Gerhard of the Norwegian church, had taught differently. An important practical result of the struggle, which may hereafter be of the greatest significance, — the third aspect to which we would direct attention, was, that the congregations and laity had obtained a voice in determining the doctrines which should be taught in churches and schools, or at least could now venture to express their opinion clearly and decidedly. But it is evident that the contest could never have secured this, if the first factor, the community of believers, raised up by Hange and other lay-preachers, and drawn into close union with each other for mutual edification, had not already become an important, influential element in the state.

A question here arises which will lead us to a closer examination of the condition of the Norwegian church. *How did lay-preaching obtain so great an influence, that it ventured to make such decided resistance to the most eminent clergymen of the established church, and even against a work which had been undertaken in obedience to a royal command, and which appeared accompanied by a royal mandate enjoining its use, as to secure the removal of the mandate against the will of the administration, and of the larger part of the clergy, and to raise such obstacles to its execution as to nullify its legal force.* In answering this, we will be led to see the advantages and the disadvantages of the Norwegian church, and may perhaps discover a plan by which the latter may gradually be removed. The causes, which enter into the explanation of the inquiry just made, seem to be fivefold. The religiousness of the people in general, their history, the character and condition of the lay-preachers the relation sustained by the clergy to their congregations, and the very limited participation in the affairs of individual congregations, and of the national church, which has been allowed the laity.

The principal source of the effectiveness and influence of the Norwegian lay-preachers, or as they call themselves, confessors, lies in the *religiousness of the people*. The declension of religion and morality, and a rapidly increasing worldly spirit, are still the cause of frequent lamentation, especially among the clergy. Yet, I believe I am warranted in the statement, that the Norwegian, or Scandinavian in general, shares with the German the honor of possessing an extraordinary capacity, and an eager preference for the spiritual and divine, and therefore has part with him in the important mission, too often claimed for the German people alone, of being the principal instrumentality in the realization of the kingdom of God on earth. We need not go back to the times which preceded the introduction of Christianity into Scandinavia for the proof of this statement, although they would furnish abundant testimony clearly to demonstrate the deep religious feeling of the northern people. Their mythological system, like that of the southern nations of antiquity, was earthly and sensuous. But while the Hellenic system sunk gradually into a lower sensuous life, instead of conforming the latter to a higher world, the Scandinavians constantly strove to purify theirs from every thing evil, imperfect and earth-born in its nature. An elevated moral earnestness, though at times rude and impetuous, runs through their mythology. While the southern nations made their gods mere representatives of their own life, the Scandinavians endeavored to copy the life of their gods with a reverence which amounted to slavish fear. Even the most unimportant occurrences were made to bear some relation to the supersensuous world. In short, the classic mythology was in subjective dependence on man, but the Scandinavian mythology seemed to have no such dependence on the spiritual nature of man, but rather directed him, for their original religious inclinations had given their mythological system a position so external to themselves, that it seemed to be an independent objective power, exerting a reflex influence on them. It is probable that the susceptibility to the elements of the Asiatic (Indian) religious notions, which the aboriginal Scandinavians exhibited at the time of the immigration of the demi-gods from south-east, (Asia, probably India, Persia, Caucasia) must be attributed to these original religious inclinations. We might also refer to the despotic power which, from their religious prominence alone, those demi-gods succeeded in obtaining over the early Northmen, by the air of mysteriousness in which they invested themselves. We cannot now more than allude

to the immovable fidelity with which the Scandinavians clung to their Odin religion, and the decided energy, arising from this devotion, with which they so long resisted the introduction of Christianity, and the tenacity and steadfastness with which, when once gained to its cause, they have maintained it. We can only adduce some of the evidences which the present furnishes. We may mention *the universal reverence shown for the Holy Scriptures*. A religious feeling among a christian people manifests itself in a careful attention to the specific demands of Christianity. This reverence for the Bible was still manifest, even in times of scepticism and unbelief, and no one ventured publicly to express his scornful ridicule of God's Word. How different the case in France, England and Germany, at the same period. *An eager desire for reading*, especially books of a religious character, is a necessary consequence of this religious spirit, although in later times, since their political condition has excited a deep interest among the people, it must be conceded that a strong predilection for works of a political cast has been manifested. The Society for the distribution of religious books, established at Christiana, states, in its late report, that between 1826–1841, they have distributed 125,000 vols. (catechisms, books of devotion, and instructive narratives and treatises,) in part gratuitously, in part at prices merely covering the expense of publication; so that, if equally distributed, each family might have obtained a copy. In connection with this desire for religious reading, there is manifested a decided preference for such books as present religion in its connection with the mysterious, with miracles, and God's immediate revelation to man, showing a sympathy with the remains of Romish or even Heathen superstition, still here and there to be found. Even though such lamentable manifestations of religious preference seldom appear to the public in print, their influence is still exercised by traditions transmitted from generation to generation, especially among the mass engaged in rural pursuits. But exhibitions of religious consciousness in so imperfect a form occur but seldom, and always among the less cultivated portion of the nation. And can we be astonished at it among a people whom nature has largely endowed with a love of the marvellous, whose power over the imagination, the long night and twilight of its continuance has tended to strengthen? When this is taken into the account, we will not be so much astonished, that about ten years ago, they yielded implicit credence, and gave in their adherence to a man who claimed to have been honored with an immediate revelation from God, and who showed by his whole

course, and the performance of his duties—he was a sacristan—that he was incapable of intentional deception. Lew Hansen Sener—to give a brief sketch of the movement—sacristan at Praestegjeld, after attending to his usual devotions, lay down to sleep. “I had not slept long,” he narrates, “until I thought I saw a man of wan appearance, clothed in white, enter the door and seat himself on a chair by my bed-side. I trembled, was afraid to breathe. He calmly drew a paper from his pocket and handed it to me, saying, I am sent by God to show you this paper. On the paper were written the following verses (which we may thus translate,): As long as thou dost earnestly root out all sin from thy heart and soul and mind, I will never free thee from the pains of hell. But when thou findest delight in renouncing all lust, without reserve or concealment, I give thee my promise to sustain and assist the soul which has no power out of me. Then shalt thou with joy experience how kind a God I am. Be faithful, watch and pray on earth, and when thou diest, thou shalt be admitted to a place at my right hand.

* * * * *

As I read these verses, I felt an inexpressible joy; the messenger arose and passed out of the room. After he left I awoke, being much agitated, and immediately wrote down the verses, not a little astonished that I, who never before or since have attempted any thing of the kind, should be writing verses.” The good man did not know how he could turn this event to a better purpose, than by relating it frequently, connecting excellent reflections and admonitions with it. He was listened to with much believing attention by the people, and thus, although intellectually a weak instrument, was the means of doing good to many. I have narrated this occurrence, though in itself unimportant, as it appeared to me to show the capacity of the people, (for the sacristan was one of the lower classes,) to be the subjects of religious influences, and also themselves to exert such influence. If we would seek further evidences of the religious disposition of the Norwegian people, we might refer to the continued existence of a strong church-feeling, of which we have had exhibitions within the present half century. There are many families in which the festivals, which the church authorities have without reason stricken from the list of ecclesiastical days, are still religiously observed. I mention only holy Dreikönigsfest, which is still observed in the family as carefully as Christmas, although it has not been recognized by the church since 1770, and the portion of Scripture appointed to be read for the day, was never admitted into the list

of the Gospels and Epistles. It is interesting to attend public worship on the Sabbath in the country. All around the church-gates we see, especially on the festivals, or occasions of confirmation, a great bulwark of carriages, two wheeled vehicles, in which the catechumens have been conveyed from two or three miles to the church, and in the house many mothers with their small children, from whom they could not be separated so long and have brought with them rather than remain at home, and after service we see them gathering on and around their vehicles, under the shade of the dense fir trees, partaking of their simple meal. As I witnessed these things I could not but feel that though the poor people have that bread, whereof if a man eat he shall never hunger, they do not obtain it without sacrifices. Notwithstanding these local disadvantages, the churches are generally well attended. Do not these things show an interest in religion and the church, though frequently they are owing to legal enactments? If we now cast a glance at the higher classes of the Norwegian people, which of course are not a fair representative of the people in general, we cannot fail to perceive strong traces of religious feeling, although its influence is confined to narrower circles, and many are given up to religious indifference. The religiousness of this class of the community finds a beautiful expression in the silent influence of a number of highly cultivated, noble females, whose names are well known in Norway, whose talents are devoted to the advancement of the interests of Christ's kingdom, whose labors in behalf of christian aims are untiring. They have been exerting themselves to do good by word, by the press, and by deed. The Eugenia Institute for the education of neglected female children, owes its existence to one of these ladies. Another has beautifully and effectively set forth the Christian principle, for families of higher cultivation, in published dialogue between a mother and her daughter. A third, by her simple but impressive religious poems, (among others Bible stories,) has reclaimed many a wanderer to the ways of truth. We might also mention as another proof of the religious disposition of the nation, the fact that the principal organ of public information, the Morning News, frequently gives a more prominent place to pieces of religious poetry than to political events. Could the editor of a German paper venture on such a course without making himself the object of general dislike, or even ridicule? Even the officers of the State, who for a time maintained an indifferent, or an inimical position toward the church and the cause of religion in general, have forsaken it, and are assuming a more friendly, or at

least more tolerant relation toward the clergy and active members of the church, although it is difficult to decide whether much of this change must not be attributed to the influence of popular religious feeling on them. Those, who have mingled freely in the circles of Norwegian officials, must be impressed with the conviction that the poisonous influence of modern German speculative exegesis and pseudo-critical trifling, has been as yet but little felt in these northern regions, and I venture to prophecy that any attempt to introduce into Scandinavia, the artificial religion of pure reason, which is inculcated with so much energy in southern Europe, will meet with insurmountable difficulties in the sober moral earnestness, and, above all, the deep religiousness of the Norwegians. If there were nothing else to sustain me in the assertion, the susceptibility to the influence of the lay-preachers, and especially of Hauge, which was shown by the majority of the agricultural population, would suffice; and the very existence of lay-preaching is a sufficient proof of the more than ordinary religious capacity of this people. The fuel was furnished in their national individuality, to which it was necessary only to apply the spark, and their whole nature would glow with the holy fervor of a living faith in Christ; nothing could therefore be more natural, than that the Haugean movement should extend with wonderful rapidity, and produce the most striking results. And when once such an awakening to repentance and faith had been aroused, it became necessary to enter into new and closer combinations for the maintenance of the newly awakened life of faith; and this was the more needful, as at that time the shepherds seem almost entirely to have been asleep, and to have left the folds to care for themselves. The sermon and Sabbath was almost the only communication between clergymen and their congregations, and when we remember the spirit of the men by whom these sermons were read, we can readily conceive that they exerted but little cohesive influence. As we would naturally expect, these combinations began to gather round the men by whom they were originated, and the guidance of their occasional meetings was given over entirely into their hands. A necessary result of this plan of action was, that the lay-preachers and leaders of prayer-meetings, among whom Hans Hauge held a prominent place, obtained great authority over the mass of those who had been awakened by their preaching.

Thus lay-preaching, and the exercise of religious influence by the laity became an important element, before the clergy awoke from their slumber, and obtained a decided advantage

over the regular administration of religion through the church. Those whose religious character was active and sincere, felt more aroused and edified by the simple, artless; but earnest, energetic exhortations of a lay-preacher, especially of Hauge; than by the barren, dry results of writing—desk-labor, which were usually heard at the places of public worship. A large part of the nation, therefore, beheld their efforts with delight; although, on the other hand, the strangeness of lay-preaching gave offence to many, and aroused, here and there, opposition, which however gradually diminished as the blessed results of their efforts began more clearly to appear. It was still possible, when Haugeanism had not cut itself entirely loose from the church, but was accessible to a kindly christian influence on the part of the clergy, to regain the alienated lay-preachers and their followers, by an acknowledgment of previous neglect, and a judicious course toward them, and by causing the pure word of God to be declared again from the pulpit, in patience, love and humility. But instead of this the clergy thundered from the pulpit at the impostors, false prophets, conceited fanatics, and even went so far as to employ the arm of civil power against “the disturbers of the public peace.”—They misunderstood the high purpose for which they were raised, they discouraged and repulsed the peace-loving members of their churches hungering after the bread of life, and they did it in a manner so little accordant with the spirit of love, that they had well nigh caused a separation from the church, which the correct views of Hauge and his adherents alone prevented. They have caused, to a great extent, the unhappy relation which not only the followers of Hauge, but the friends of lay-preaching in general still sustain to the truly evangelical clergy, manifesting, as they do, a spirit watchful, hesitating, suspicious, rather than full of confiding trust. The persecutions to which Hauge and some of his adherents were subjected, not only brought his party in a position extraneous to, and distrustful of the constituted authorities of the church, if not even inimical to them, but they excited the sympathies of the whole nation for the injured christians, and gave them an increased importance and influence in spiritual things. By taking these circumstances into view, in connection with the religious susceptibility of the Norwegian people, we can understand how the movement of the lay-preachers came to obtain so great an influence.

ARTICLE X.

SEARS' LIFE OF LUTHER.

THE LIFE OF LUTHER; *with special reference to its earlier periods and the opening scenes of the Reformation*, By *Barnas Sears, D. D.* PHILADELPHIA: *American Sunday School Union, &c.*

THIS work made its appearance nearly a year since, and we are therefore surprised that it has not before this been noticed, (so far as we are aware), either in the newspapers of the Lutheran Church, or in the *Evangelical Review*. Both the literary standing of Dr. Sears, and the auspices under which the book is published, (the *Am. Sunday School Union*), would seem to call for something of the kind. Apart from this, however, the book has merits of its own to commend it. It is got up in a very handsome style, both internally and externally—is a stout volume of nearly 500 pages 16mo., very handsomely bound in embossed and gilt muslin, printed in a clear type upon excellent paper, and with numerous wood cuts, ornamented initials, vignettes, &c. executed in the very best style of the art. We have met nothing printed in this country that has given us higher satisfaction than these pictorial illustrations. The portraits both of Luther and of his wife, the latter especially, are very fine. The maps also, one of the “*Journey from Mansfield to Magdeburg*,” and the other, “*from Erfurt to Wittenberg*,” are very satisfactory, and throw great light upon the historical narrative.

Dr. Sears also has performed his part of the work in a manner highly creditable to him both as a writer and as a scholar. He has evidently studied his subject well, both in the original and latest authorities, and upon the spots rendered memorable by the deeds of faith and acts of moral heroism there performed. The opening chapter is a very fair specimen of this, and we give its first paragraphs as a sample of the tone and manner of the book generally:

“Some twenty-five miles northwest of Leipsic is situated the old town of Halle, on the Saale. From this town, the road running to the west, after crossing a fertile plain, leads to a romantic spot, at a distance of ten miles, where the hills of south-western Saxony begin to rise, and the flat lands, extending all the way from the Baltic Sea, reach their termination. There the road, passing between two beautiful sheets of water,

the one fresh and the other salt, enters a vale, with ranges of vine-clad hills on either side, which become wider and wider; till, at the distance of nearly ten miles, it contracts again, and the heights that bounded it converge and form the varied and pleasant scenery of Eisleben, once the capital of the county of Mansfeld. As the traveller enters the town, he leaves, on the left, before proceeding very far, the house where Luther was born, now converted into an edifice for the accommodation of an orphan school. In the same quarter of the city a few rods to the east, is St. Peter's church, where, according to the custom of the times, the boy was, on the very next day after his birth, baptized and christened Martin, as that happened to be St. Martin's day. This circumstance is highly characteristic of the religious sentiments of that age. The senses and the imagination were employed, more, perhaps, than the heart, in the service of religion. The infant child was to be brought at once, in imagination at least, into connection with a saint; and it was believed that an association of the name would be adapted to awaken in him a corresponding association of ideas. The font, which was used on that occasion, is still shown to the curious traveller."

Here, however, we already see indications of the writer's sectarian (Baptistic) views, which disqualify him from doing justice to various aspects of Luther's life. He does not regard *infant baptism* as a usage of *the church*, but merely a "custom of *the times*." No greater sympathy has he with Luther's views of the other sacrament, so that we are not much surprised that here he ceases to defend, and scarcely represents with ordinary fairness, the course and conduct of his subject, going, on the other hand, into a labored defence of Carlstadt. "For three centuries," says he, "Carlstadt's moral character has been treated somewhat as Luther's would have been, if only Catholic testimony had been heard. The party interested has been both witness and judge. What if we were to judge of Zwingle's christian character by Luther's representations? The truth is, Carlstadt hardly showed a worse spirit, or employed more abusive terms toward Luther, than Luther did toward him. Carlstadt knew that in many things the truth was on his side, and yet in these, no less than in others, he was crushed by the civil power which was on the side of Luther." * * * * "The most important difference between him and Luther, and that which most embittered the latter against him, related to the Lord's Supper. He opposed not only transubstantiation, but *consubstantiation*, the real presence, and

the elevation and adoration of the host. Luther rejected the first, *asserted the second and third*, and allowed the other two."

These are truly singular statements for a professed historian to make. "The party interested has been both witness and judge"! This means, of course, that Luther's judgment of Carlstadt has been received by all the world, without examination, as finally conclusive against him. Now we know, that this has not been the fact in regard to any of Luther's opinions, and least of all have they been so received in regard to Carlstadt, who has had an abundance of defenders and apologists both in his own day and in ours. Witness Zwingle, and Oecolampadius, and nearly every English writer who discusses this subject. But how desperate the case is, we may judge from the admissions which even Dr. Sears, his latest defender, is here compelled to make. "But Carlstadt was also a mystic, following the inward light. *Hence his sympathy with the Zwickau prophets.* He was a singular compound of Zwinglian, [this is an anachronism] Lutheran, and Anabaptist ingredients." p. 362. And even this poor compliment is too favorable a statement. D'Aubigne's statement is the uniform voice of history. "Carlstadt even went further than this; he began to announce his contempt for studies; and the old professor was heard recommending his class, from his chair, to return home, resume the spade and the plough, and quietly cultivate the earth, since it was in the sweat of his brow that man was to eat his bread."! Hist. Ref. III. 279 (Kelly's Transl.) Nor can any thing be more unjust than Dr. Sears' presentation of Carlstadt (p. 361) as a defender of the Scripture canon against Luther, when it is well known that in 1520, in his book *De canonicis scripturis*, Carlstadt expressed his doubts as to the genuineness and authority of the five books of Moses. See Guericke K. G. III, p. 84.

It is almost superfluous for us to say that the declaration, that "Luther asserted the doctrine of consubstantiation" is a gross misunderstanding, not to say misrepresentation of his doctrine. Dr. Sears, as a man who has studied theology, ought to know better, even if some who call themselves Lutherans and profess to teach the doctrines of the Church, either for the purpose of casting odium upon the faith they should defend, or out of the most inexcusable ignorance, countenance the application of this term, which it has ever rejected, to the eucharistic doctrine of our church. As Lutherans we protest against the appearance of such statements in the publications of the American Sunday School Union, which are professedly for the

benefit of all evangelical christians. This misrepresentation is found in another work issued by that society, ("Sketches of Church-history," if our memory serves us as to the title, but which, unfortunately, we have not just now at hand,). How can Lutherans be expected to coöperate with an institution publishing statements which they regard as so injurious to them? But we have no doubt, that this thing has been done inadvertently, and that the society will correct it as soon as it is properly brought to its notice, which will, we trust, be done without delay.—But to return to Dr. Sears:

He does Luther equal injustice in the representation which he makes of his course in reference to the "War of the Peasants," as it is commonly called. Here (p. 363) he says: "Against the peasants, who on the one hand, were driven to desperation by the oppression of their rulers, and, on the other, were intoxicated with the new ideas of liberty which had just begun to be proclaimed, Luther wrote and spoke in terms of unmitigated severity. He was a better theologian than politician. * * * But that he should proclaim doctrines subversive of all principles of freedom, and be the means of riveting more firmly the already galling chains of despotism, and of exciting the despots to a bloody revenge, is a matter of regret, if not of wonder," So far is this from being a correct statement of Luther's course in this matter, that it may almost be said to have been diametrically opposite. D'Aubigne correctly says (III, 322,): "Luther thought with Melanchthon respecting the revolt, but he had a heart that throbbed for the sorrows of the people. He showed himself highly impartial on this occasion, and spoke the truth frankly to both parties. He first addressed the princes, and more particularly the bishops. "It is you," he said to them, "who are the cause of the revolt; it is your declamations against the gospel; it is your guilty oppression of the little ones of the Church, that have driven the people to despair. . . . Dear lords, for the love of God abandon your resentment, treat reasonably with these poor people, as with drunken and misguided men. Allay these troubles by gentleness, lest there issue from them a conflagration that shall lay hold on all Germany. *Amongst their twelve articles there are some that are just and equitable.*"

That Luther's ideas in regard to civil government were in advance of his age, we might show even from these addresses to the peasants, which are declared by Dr. S. to be "subversive of all the principles of freedom, and to rivet more firmly the already galling chains of despotism." Here is the remedy

which he proposes for the evils in which society was then involved: "Therefore my advice would be, to select several counts and gentlemen from among the nobility, and from the [free] cities several counsellors, and to have them in a friendly way investigate and settle the affair. And you lords here should come down from your haughtiness, which you will, at any rate, be constrained at last to do, whether you will or not. You should *abate your tyranny and oppression*, that the common people also may have air and space to breathe." See Meurer's Life of Luther, p. 311.

But that he urged the suppression of the revolt by the most prompt and severe measures, no one, who has any knowledge of human nature or any regard for civil government and the rights of property, can for a moment doubt. Promptness and severity were the only remedies that could be applied, and were, in the end, true mercy. The ferocious passions of the people had broken loose. Anarchy was about to upheave society from its foundations and sweep away all the institutions of society. A sanguinary mob was taking upon itself all the functions of legislator, judge, and executioner. How were these disorders to be checked? how was the march of this army to be arrested? All experience shows that there is no remedy at once so efficacious, and in the end so merciful, as that of Napoleon, when he closed the bloody drama of the first French revolution, by stationing his battalions at the head of every street, and sweeping them not merely with powder, but with ball, until the spirit of anarchy was quelled.

The peasants and Anabaptists, it is well known, anticipated in 1525, the bloody deeds of the French revolution of 1790, and the wild dreams of the Socialists and Communists of our own day. Besides this, led on by Münzer and Storch, and encouraged by Carlstadt, they claimed a divine right, scriptural authority, and direct inspiration and revelation from heaven, in favor of all their disgusting practices and horrid atrocities. Carlstadt became their convert, and even Melancthon was in doubt whether these deluded dreamers, fanatics and impostors might not be sent from God and illuminated by his Spirit! It was necessary, therefore, not only firmly to fortify men against these errors, but to encourage them boldly to resist the impious plans of those who pretended to act in the name of God. Hence it was, that Luther now so strongly asserted the divine origin of civil government, the duty of citizens to obey magistrates or civil rulers, and the right and duty of the government to enforce obedience, especially for the suppression of mobs and anarchy.

As to his inculcating "the doctrine of passive obedience," it would be very difficult to show, how his teachings differ from those of Christ and his Apostles. "Christians," says he, "do not fight for themselves with the sword, nor with guns, but with the cross and with suffering; just as their leader Christ does not wield the sword, but hangs upon the cross. Therefore their victory does not consist in having power, or superiority, or in ruling; but in inferiority and weakness, as St. Paul says in 2 Cor. 10: "*The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God.*" Christ has said, "*He that taketh the sword shall perish by the sword,*" and Paul, "*Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. The powers that be, are ordained by God. Whosoever resisteth the power (government), resisteth the ordinance of God.*" Rom. 13: 1-7. Five years after, his views were thus embodied in the Augsburg Confession, Art. XVI., than which it would be difficult to find any expression of sentiment upon this subject either more judicious or more scriptural: "Concerning *civil affairs* they teach, that . . . christians ought to obey their magistrates and laws, except when they command that which is sinful, for then they should obey God rather than men. Acts 5: 29."

It must also be borne in mind that M \ddot{u} nzer and the peasants proposed to promote the Gospel and establish the Reformation by the sword, and it is against this idea mainly that Luther directs his argument. Their other grievances, he expressly says, he leaves to civilians and men versed in worldly affairs. But such a mode of propagating the Gospel we would not tolerate either in peasant or in noble. And who can doubt that in this he was right, and that this is not only the scriptural doctrine, but the only one in accordance with which the rights of conscience can be secured? If one party may use force, so may another. But the religion of Christ is not one of force, but of reason; not of hatred, but of love; not of injury, but of good works. It cannot, therefore, be promoted by the sword, which its great Author expressly disclaimed and rejected. And in this Luther imitated him. When, therefore, the peasants professed to be carrying out Luther's views, it was not only natural but proper, that he should utter his disclaimer, and protest in the most energetic and decided manner possible. But to return to Dr. Sears' book:

Whilst we take these exceptions to it, we still, as we have already said, find much in it to admire, and could therefore wish that the "*Committee of Publication*" for the American Sunday School Union had more carefully exercised its revisory

power in striking out these and various other objectionable and unjustifiable statements. Were it not for these, we should most cheerfully and gladly recommend the work to our readers, not only as a lively narrative, but as altogether the best presentation, in the English language, of the earlier life of Luther, and, on that account, particularly worthy of being put into the hands of children in our Sunday Schools. But as it is, we should be very sorry to have our young people form their estimate of many of Luther's doctrines, and of various important passages in his life from the book before us. We must also add that even if these errors were corrected, Dr. Sears' work is rather one for the scholar and man of critical research than for the general reader, much less for children. A good life of Luther for the young still remains a desideratum in the English language.

W. M. R.

ARTICLE XI.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

The recent progress of Astronomy ; especially in the United States. By Elias Loomis, Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy in the University of the City of New York, and author of a course of Mathematics. New York, Harper & Brothers ; 1850.

WE have read a considerable part of this book with much interest and pleasure. The author says of it in his preface : " This little volume is designed to exhibit in a popular form the most important astronomical discoveries of the past ten years." It begins with a full account of the discovery of the planet Neptune, and of all the points of interest connected with this newly detected inmate of our section of the universe—this our long concealed fellow traveller through the realms of space. This portion, and that which treats of the comets, are all that we have actually read ; and taking these as fair specimens of the book, we cannot doubt that it will be welcome to all, who, without being astronomers, take an interest in these studies and their important results. To all such we most cordially commend the volume, as one most agreeable and useful, discussing with great clearness and ability a great variety of subjects embraced by the science of astronomy,

English Grammar.—The English language in its elements and forms, with a history of its origin and development. Designed for use in Colleges and Schools. By William C. Fowler, late Professor of Rhetoric in Amherst College. New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St., 1850.

THIS is a stout 8vo volume, of nearly 700 pp., a most formidable affair for an English Grammar. But Prof. Fowler has here measurably done for the

English language, what Grimm, Schmitthenner, and others have long since amply done for the German : he has supplied what, among teachers and students, has long been a deeply felt desideratum ; and we, for one, should not object to a much larger book. But even the one before us can be used in schools only in judicious selections, to be made by the instructor. Every page of the work affords evidence of the author's rich scholarship—of extensive research, profound study, and careful thought. It is divided into eight parts, as follows :—Part I. The origin and history of the English language : II. The Phonology of the English language : III. Orthographical forms in the English language : IV. Etymological forms in the English language : V. Logical forms : VI. Syntactical forms in the English language : VII. Rhetorical forms in the English language : VIII. Poetical forms : These parts are divided and subdivided into a great number of chapters and sections, and the whole concludes with a treatise on punctuation. The work contains a large amount of most important and interesting historical matter ; its definitions are clear, accurate and comprehensive, free from those queer absurdities which have so long disfigured English grammars : its discussions and deductions are logical, sound, and most satisfactory : its illustrations are copious, apposite, and in themselves interesting : its multiplied details are rich in linguistic facts, principles, and relations, and the arrangement and connection of all the parts in the production of one great systematic whole, are admirable. The book has already been introduced in a number of colleges : it ought to be carefully and thoroughly studied in all the colleges and higher schools of our country. We have often observed with profound amazement, the ignorance exhibited by college graduates of the origin, the forms and principles of their own language. The publication of Prof. Fowler's work will hereafter deprive such ignorance of all excuse. We hope it will be speedily introduced in all the higher seminaries of learning, as the only truly complete and philosophical grammar of the English language extant.

Elementary Sketches of Moral Philosophy, delivered at the Royal Institution, in the years 1804, 1805, and 1806. By the late Rev. Sydney Smith, M. A. New York. Harper & Brothers. 1850.

THOSE of our readers who have any acquaintance with the writings of the late Rev. Sydney Smith, will readily conceive that the present volume partakes largely of that peculiar tone of thought and criticism for which he was so greatly distinguished. Many of the subjects discussed in these lectures have not, abstractly considered, any very direct or obvious connexion with moral philosophy, however important and influential their relations to man's moral nature and culture unquestionably are. Our author treats them with his accustomed power and sound sense ; develops and exhibits facts with great clearness and precision ; unfolds and illustrates principles, and sets forth their various relations, with striking sagacity and great acuteness of speculation ; chastises the follies of the skeptics and other perverse theorists with all his caustic wit, and wonted severity of sarcasm ; treats the absurdities, errors and vagaries of mankind, either with good humored banter, or with stern rigor ; and altogether presents to us a work full of sober and sound reflection, calculated both to entertain, and to instruct and profit. The work

is introduced by a highly commendatory letter, written by the celebrated Lord Jeffrey, a few days before his death, and is every way worthy the careful attention of all sober-minded and thoughtful men.

Life and letters of Thomas Campbell. Edited by William Beattie, M. D., one of his executors. In two volumes. New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1850.

It is now six years since the mortal remains of the illustrious poet whose name is written above, were deposited in their last resting place in Westminster Abbey. Many years before his death he obtained from his most intimate friend, Dr. Beattie, a conditional promise, that he would be his biographer. Of this compact his friend was gently reminded by the poet when on his death bed; and in order to enable him to perform, in a fitting manner, the duty thus imposed upon him, every document necessary for that portion of his history which belongs to the public, was placed in the worthy Doctor's hands. The result is the two beautiful volumes which now lie before us. As regards the manner in which the biographer has discharged the kind office which he consented to assume, there can, we think, be but one opinion. Admitting, even, that there is here and there a little more diffuseness than is necessary, we have found no details in the book, however minute, that we should wish to see omitted; and of the editor's faithful industry and good taste in the use of his copious materials, there cannot be the slightest question. To him the preparation of this work was truly a labor of love, the result of which must be highly satisfactory to all the admirers of the author of "The Pleasures of Hope," of "Gertrude of Wyoming," &c. &c. It will undoubtedly prove an unperishing urn on that "monumentum aere perennius," which the poet has himself erected in his immortal works. It consists, indeed, in a great measure, of Campbell's own correspondence, not only presenting the most beautiful specimens of epistolary writing, but opening for us a window to look deep into his generous spirit, into his noble and loving heart. Whether we consider it as a tribute to his genius, or as a portraiture of his character, public and private, social and domestic, moral and religious, the work is one of intense and fascinating interest. The American edition opens with a letter to the publishers from Washington Irving, in which our distinguished and amiable countryman presents some pleasant personal reminiscences of Campbell, which, however brief, give an additional charm to this very delightful book. Let those who wish duly to appreciate, and to see ample justice done to an illustrious poet, much misunderstood and often misrepresented, procure Dr. Beattie's elegant volumes.

The Shoulder-knot; or sketches of the threefold life of man. A story of the seventeenth century. By B. F. Tefft. New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1850.

THIS work is the production of a distinguished clergyman of Cincinnati. The story, although there is a strong infusion of fiction, is authentic, being founded on certain well-known events connected with the reign of Louis VIII, and the personal history of his queen, Anne of Austria. The story is told, in general, with great clearness, elegance and power, although not free

from defects as regards the connexion of events, the unity and continuity of the plot. But, whatever may be the merits of the narrative itself, the author desires it to be regarded as of altogether subordinate moment. It has served him solely as the medium for the conveyance to the public of certain opinions—of serious thoughts—of carefully elaborated views, respecting man's threefold life—the physical, the intellectual and the spiritual—both in his present state of probation, and in the world to come. For the utterance of these opinions the person selected is the great Lord Bacon, and he is here made to discourse words of deep wisdom and of solemn meaning to man in his relations to God and eternity. This more important portion of the work is written with great power, with strong feeling, and not unfrequently with deep pathos and stirring eloquence. The earnest spirit and the pious fervor which pervade these parts of the book, strongly commend it to the attention of thinking and serious readers.

Dr. Johnson: His religious life and his death. New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1850.

THERE is in every man a large share, greater or less, according to his own character, of what Carlyle calls "Hero worship:" we would rather designate it as a feeling of intense admiration, and of profound reverence for men whom we esteem great and good. There have been on the stage of human life, a good many men, towards whom we acknowledge that we cherish this feeling, deep, fervent, and lasting, in our inmost soul. And there are not many in respect of whom it is stronger and warmer, than the great and illustrious subject of the memoir named above. We have not had time to read through the work before us: we have glanced through it, and read sundry parts with care and attention, and we gratefully receive it as another tribute to the genuine greatness, the sterling worth, and exalted excellence of Johnson's character. We needed not this testimony to raise our estimate of one, whose vast influence in literature and in society was exerted only for good, but we are thankful for whatever serves to confirm and establish our exalted opinion of his true greatness, and his eminent goodness, and to invite the admiring attention of men to an example like his; and of such evidence we have a full and generous exhibition in the present work, which is more particularly designed to portray his moral and religious character. It is well known that Johnson had some strong prejudices; but we see in the volume before us, that in their active manifestation they were controlled by a liberal and humane spirit, and tempered by an unaffected benevolence, and a comprehensive charity, whilst for all hollowness, meanness, unbelief and wickedness he had nothing but unsparing severity. Aside of the principal subject, the work presents a great number of interesting anecdotes, and a large amount of attractive and valuable information. To all admirers of Samuel Johnson, to all who delight to contemplate eminent illustrations of the power of truth over the heart and life of man—of distinguished examples of sincere piety, of consistent virtue and unfeigned benevolence, and of a devout regard to the will of God, in life and in death, we cordially commend this interesting and instructive volume.

The history of Darius the Great, by Jacob Abbott; with engravings. New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St.

HERE is another volume of Abbott's Historical Series. The only serious fault we have to find with these volumes, so attractive and instructive to the young, so interesting to all lovers of history, is, that the style is not only frequently inelegant, but sometimes even positively ungrammatical. With so skilful a writer as Mr. Abbott, such blemishes can arise only from inattention; and although of no vital importance, they ought to be studiously avoided by one who can write so well. The present volume exhibits, in an eminent degree, the pleasing and substantial characteristics of its predecessors. The style is, in general, easy and appropriate, the narrative flowing, abounding in striking incidents, and instructive details, and interspersed with apt observations and profitable reflections. These beautiful and exceedingly interesting volumes cannot fail to delight and benefit both young and old.

The Autobiography of Leigh Hunt, with Reminiscences of Friends and Contemporaries; in two volumes. New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1850.

LEIGH HUNT'S name has long been familiar to every man of letters. He is now an old man, and his long career as a votary of literature, but especially his intimate relations, during many years, to a goodly number of the most distinguished literary men of his day, render him not only an object of interest, but a depository of many choice recollections, so that his autobiography written in his easy and sprightly style, with much frankness and a great deal of quiet humor, cannot be other than deeply interesting and attractive.—Throwing aside his wonted self-complacency, and the absurd oddities which he has so often paraded before men's eyes, he has here produced a work which will doubtless be read with extreme delight by all who have any familiarity with the literary developments and characters of the last fifty years.

And we are only sorry that we are obliged to burden our praise of this production with some weighty qualifications. The serious reader will expect in vain to find in it those sober views of life which the Scriptures inculcate. It is brimfull of exceedingly interesting and delightful reminiscences, personal, political and literary; of sparkling conversation, of scintillating wit, and of piquant anecdote; but of its philosophy of life, cheerful indeed, but purely Horatian, and of the glimpses which it affords of the author's tone of thought and principle—of his own innermost life—we have not received the most favorable impression. Treating, as it does, of almost every variety of subjects, even theology comes in for its share of discussion; and here we have been simply disgusted. In religion, Hunt seems to belong to the school of Godwin: he is a Unitarian, and worse than this, a strenuous Universalist. He writes well on other subjects of general interest—on subjects which he understands: but on this great theological subject he is superlatively ignorant; and the flippancy with which he, again and again, utters trite commonplaces on universal salvation as the necessary effect of God's infinite love, and the dogmatical impertinence with which he declares that every church which desires to continue in existence, will have to renounce the doctrine of eternal punish-

ments, and adopt what he terms "cheerful views in religion," are purely silly, ridiculous and nauseous. But we think our readers need not fear that the work will do aught to commend these opinions to others: as already intimated, it contains nothing on the subject but the most trite and shallow commonplaces, long familiar to every American man, woman and child, that reads religious and other newspapers. Bating these drawbacks, we readily concede, that this is a most charming work. Leigh Hunt's character and position, personal and literary, may be justly described as many sided; and his pleasant gossip about himself and many illustrious contemporaries; the easy grace with which he performs the duty of cicerone among circles and scenes not open to the million, his bonhomie, his quaint but genial humor, his kindly and generous spirit, and, as before said, his ample store of delectable reminiscences, and of rare and pleasant anecdotes, render this autobiography one of the most agreeable books that we have seen for a long time.

A Second Book in Greek; containing Syntax, with reading lessons in prose; prosody and the dialects, with reading lessons in verse, forming a sufficient Greek Reader, with a Vocabulary. By John McClintock, D. D., late Professor of ancient languages in Dickinson College. New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1850.

MOST important and valuable aids for the acquisition of the ancient languages have been, of late years, furnished by American scholars. Among these Dr. McClintock holds a distinguished rank. In the present work he has supplied an appropriate sequel to his "First book in Greek," which has had a most favorable reception. There is nothing novel in the method of teaching Greek here adopted, for in all its essential features, it has long been most successfully pursued by other classical scholars. We consider the superiority of this method to the drudgery to which, in our young days, we were subjected, as fully established; and Dr. McClintock's books are certainly to be ranked among the best in that class of improved school-books, which display as much as any thing else, the progress of the age. We commend these books to the careful and candid consideration of instructors, persuaded that they cannot fail to win the approbation of all competent judges.

NUMBERS 4 and 5 of Southey's life and correspondence have been received. They are rich in biographical narrative, and in a great measure filled, like the preceding numbers, with the poet's own charming letters to his friends and family. Those written during his visit to Holland are peculiarly interesting. The more we read of this life of Southey, the more do we respect his character, and revere his memory. He was not only great and distinguished in various walks of literature: he was a generous, noblehearted man, possessed of a most delicate sense of honor, and full of genuine, active and self-denying benevolence; and more, he was a truly good man, a serious and devout christian, living ever with the solemnities of death and eternity in view, and maintaining a deep and fruitful sense of his duty and accountability to the Judge of all the earth. While we cannot sympathize with his high-toned church principles, we discover even here a just liberality, and that charity which does not behave itself unseemly, which thinketh no evil, and

hopeth all things. His profound respect for religion, and his steadfast and consistent piety, eminently and honorably distinguish him among men of letters; and we rejoice to observe, that similar examples are, of late, becoming more frequent in the literary world.

A Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament. By Edward Robinson, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Biblical Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New York; Author of "Biblical Researches in Palestine," &c. A new Edition, revised, and in great part re-written. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1850.

As respects this work, it seems scarcely necessary to do more than inform the theological world, that the author has himself prepared "a new edition, revised, and in a great part re-written." Dr. Robinson is so well known as a Biblical scholar, and a profound critical philologist, that his name on the title page, is alone the most satisfactory recommendation that any work in sacred literature can have. The present new edition of his excellent lexicon has been handsomely got up by the enterprising publishers, and to be sought needs only to be known. The learned author has bestowed years of research and assiduous labor upon its improvement: it would be impossible to prepare a Greek and English lexicon of the New Testament on a more thorough-going and comprehensive plan than his, without overburdening it with superfluous matter, and rendering it needlessly expensive. After exhibiting in the preface, the plan of the work, he says: "to the execution of which (the plan) the author has unweariedly and repeatedly devoted the best powers of many of the best years of his life; with what success, the theological public must judge. We are quite prepared to bear witness to the complete success with which the plan has been executed: we know of no similar work in the English language, that could bear a comparison with the one here offered to the American theological public.

The Country Year-Book; or, The Field, the Forest, and the Fire-side. By William Howitt, Author of "The Book of the Seasons," "Rural Life in England," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1850.

THE author of this work says, in his modest preface: "The following work is the result of many years' delightful enjoyment of the country, and observation of life and scenery," . . . "in this volume is comprised an abundance of matter illustrative of the pleasures and pursuits of human life in the country—in the field, the forest, and by the fire-side." The author's observations on those suggested by, and adapted to, the different months of the year, so that we have them arranged in twelve sections. Howitt is well known as one of the most amiable and agreeable writers in our language; his writings betray a genuine love, and an intense enjoyment of nature; and the genial and devout spirit which has characterized former productions of his pen, and invested them with a peculiar charm, is equally conspicuous in the present volume. His rambles through the country are not confined to England, but carry us over a considerable portion of Germany; the reflections suggested to his mind by the several months are characteristic of a true

and religious poet ; he introduces us to a variety of interesting characters—the old and the young squire ; the village school-master ; the English farmer and his household : the gamekeeper and his satellites ; the local sects (Mucklockites, Bryonites, Thornites, Roeites, &c.) of England, and their preachers ; with many other pleasing portraitures. The book is full of entertaining incident, of amusing anecdote, and of interesting illustrations of national character, manners and customs. We took up the volume in order to examine it sufficiently to enable us to write a suitable notice of it, but we found its attractions so great that we could not lay it aside, until we had read, in detached portions, the greater part of it ; and we assure our readers that they will find it one of the pleasantest volumes ever penned by William Howitt ; and those who are acquainted with his writings will admit that this is no small praise.

Health, Disease, and Remedy, familiarly and practically considered, in a few of their Relations to the Blood. By George Moore, M. D., Member of the Royal College of Physicians, &c. &c. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St., 1850.

WE think that, in general, little or no good comes of families having and reading books on disease and its treatment : it usually sets the imagination to work, and leads to mischievous experimenting with medicines. But, while we think that medical books ought ordinarily to be banished from the family circle and the fire-side, we would except from the proscription, the work before us : it is written with so much prudence, judgment, good sense and wisdom, that it cannot possibly do any harm ; and it communicates a great deal of interesting and valuable information, just calculated to excite salutary-thoughtfulness, and proper caution and care, without alarm or needless anxiety ; and to induce regular and wholesome habits, without awakening that timid concern about one's diet, and other matters connected with health, which often opens the door for the introduction of the very evils that we wish to avoid. The author is as much distinguished for common sense as for professional learning, and his book will be a valuable acquisition to individuals and families.

Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Chalmers, D. D., L. L. D. By his Son-in-Law, the Rev. William Hanna, L. L. D. In three Volumes. Vol. II. New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St., 1850.

THE second volume of the life of Dr. Chalmers is before us. It contains the narrative of his settlement and career of labor in Glasgow, probably the most laborious and extensively useful, and most brilliant portion of his life, so steadily and faithfully devoted to the service of the Great Master. To clergymen, therefore, and to mature minds generally, this volume will doubtless, be more interesting than the first : to sober christian readers it cannot but possess a deep and absorbing interest. We are eagerly expectant of the concluding volume, in which we are to follow that great master-spirit to the close of his toils and endurances on earth.

George Castriot, surnamed Scanderbeg, King of Albania. By Clement C. Moore, L. L. D. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chestnut St. 1850.

WE are glad to see that our esteemed friend, Dr. Moore, has once again, in his green old age, resumed his pen, to narrate to us the stirring life and the splendid achievements of the renowned Scanderbeg: the work could not have fallen into better hands than those of so ripe and accomplished a scholar as the author. Castriot was a most remarkable man; and, notwithstanding the skeptical neglect and disrespect of the disingenuous Gibbon, his illustrious name and deeds will ever be recorded with admiration on the page of the impartial historian. Our author's materials have been chiefly derived from Lavardin's Translation of the great work by Marinus Barletius, in thirteen books, "De Vita et Gestis Scanderbegi," written betwixt 1450 and 1467. The life is written *con amore*, and exceedingly well narrated: and to those who delight in reading of stirring incidents, daring enterprises, and brilliant achievements,—in this instance those of a christian prince combating for his paternal crown and the liberties of his country, against the treacherous Sultan Amurath and his immense armies—the volume will afford, not only most luscious entertainment, but also valuable information.

A Pronouncing German Reader, to which is added: Method of Learning to read and understand the German Language, with or without a Teacher. By James C. Oehlschläger, Professor of Modern Languages in Philadelphia, and Author of a Pronouncing Dictionary of the English and German Languages. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chesnut St. 1850.

IN this volume Professor Oehlschläger renews the of-repeated attempt to enable students to acquire a correct pronunciation of the German language without the aid of a teacher. We doubt whether the experiment can ever lead to very satisfactory results. We must, however, do the Professor the justice to say, that his method exhibits more judgment and skill than any other that has come under our observation. The pronunciation, however, takes up only 42 pp. of the volume, which numbers 254 pp., and which, as a reader for students, is truly admirable: the selections are exceedingly appropriate and delightful: the vocabulary, at the end, is just the thing for those who, in studying a language, treasure up in the memory every word as it occurs. The book cannot fail to be acceptable and useful.

Select Orations of M. Tullius Cicero: with Notes, for the use of Schools and Colleges. By E. A. Johnson, Professor of Latin in the University of the City of New York. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chestnut St. 1850.

THIS edition of *Select Orations of Cicero* claims, as its chief merit, to present a new and improved text, for which purpose the editor has availed himself of

the results attained through the labors of Orelli, Madvig, Klotz and others.— He gives us, accordingly, “the text of Orelli, as revised by him subsequently to his edition of the entire works of Cicero,” except in the orations “for Marcellus and for Milo, which are not found in Orelli’s edition. The text of the Milo is a reprint of that of Madvig; and that of the Marcellus, of that of Klotz.” To the admiring reader of Cicero, any real improvements in the text, resulting from the searching investigations of German classical scholars, must be highly welcome. The notes are exceedingly ample, and are almost exclusively drawn from the productions of German scholarship, those given in Arnold’s edition being retained in full. The editor has spared no pains in the performance of the duty which, at the request of the publishers, he had assumed: and we do not doubt, that both instructors and students will find this volume a most effectual aid to the attainment of “true and accurate scholarship.”

First Greek Book; on the Plan of the First Latin Book. By Thomas Kerchever Arnold, M. A., Rector of Lyndon, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Carefully revised and improved by Rev. J. A. Spencer, M. A., Professor of Latin and Oriental Languages in Burlington College, N. J. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chesnut St., 1850.

ARNOLD’S Books for instruction in the Latin and Greek languages are already so well known, and so highly appreciated, that they can scarcely require any additional commendation: we certainly know of none that are better. Professor Spencer has introduced, in the present edition, sundry valuable additions and important improvements: “he has amplified the earlier Lessons and Exercises; added simple and clear explanations where they seemed to be needed; inserted ‘Questions,’ rather as suggestive of what may be, than as expressive of all that should be asked; has referred frequently to Kühner’s valuable Grammar for fuller elucidation of difficulties or peculiarities &c.”—The whole plan of the work, and its execution, are equally excellent, and we almost envy the young of the present day their school-books, so far superior to those which introduced our budding intellect to the treasures of classic lore.

ERRATA, IN THE JULY NUMBER, VOL. II.

- Page 2d, 18th line from above, insert *Maryland*.
 “ 5th, 8th line from below for straightest read *straitest*.
 “ 22d, 8th line from top, for Maunday read *Maundy*.
 “ 182d, 2d line from top, read *nonfundamental*.

OCTOBER NUMBER.

- Page 242, 1st line top, for *the* read *like*.
 “ 250, 11th line from below, after staring insert *crowds*.
 “ 262, 8th line from below, for *in* read *on*.

JANUARY NUMBER.

In the article on Norwegian Church for *Hange* read *Hauge*.
 Other errors can be corrected by the intelligent reader.

THE
EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. VIII.

APRIL, 1851.

ARTICLE I.

UNITY OF ORIGIN OF THE HUMAN RACE.

By Prof. M. Jacobs, of Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.

WE have never entertained a single doubt as to the origin of man. We have always regarded the Sacred Scriptures, in reference to whose statements on the subject before us some minds profess to have found difficulties, as unequivocally teaching, throughout their whole extent, that all human beings have descended from one original pair, Adam and Eve.

In early life, we read with a high degree of satisfaction Dr. Stanhope Smith's "Essay on the figure and complexion of the human race." Since then, the subject of the modifying influences of extraneous causes, of which some, at least, are not well understood, producing striking diversities and varieties among men, has continued to be, to us, one of considerable curiosity and interest. The recent discussions, in the public journals, both of this country and of Europe, relative to the unity of origin of the human race, and especially the publication, within a short period of each other, of several papers, by Dr. Morton, in Silliman's Journal; of the admirable work of Rev. Dr. Bachman, of Charleston, S. C.; of that of Rev. Dr. T. Smyth of the same city; and of several papers in the Christian Examiner, by Prof. L. Agassiz, on the same subject, have contributed greatly to increase that interest in our minds, as well as to excite, as we perceive, the attention of the more

intelligent portion of the public in reference to this question, as one of no ordinary importance.

In the progress of the discussion, the question has successively assumed several different forms, of which we shall confine our attention to but two. I. Does the human family consist of more than one species? II. If it consists of but one species, has it, in all its various branches and diversities, descended from a single or from many original pairs; or from communities created in different geographical centres? If these two questions be satisfactorily answered, the whole subject will be set at rest.

To many, these enquiries will, no doubt, appear to be quite superfluous. The subject may, to them, seem sufficiently plain, requiring no labored course of argumentation to enable them to make up their minds. They feel perfectly satisfied themselves, and wonder that a doubt should ever have arisen in any mind exercising common sense, and willing to be satisfied with the same amount of evidence here that they require in other things. And we confess, that we have sometimes felt like offering an apology to our readers, for the present attempt to place, before their minds, a condensed statement of the discussions had on this subject.

Our apology, however, is to be found in the fact, that some minds, under peculiar circumstances and influences, have entertained doubts as to the common origin of the human race, and given publicity to these doubts, in a manner calculated to unsettle the opinions of others. They either entirely deny the authority of the Bible on this, which they claim to be a purely scientific question, or, whilst they profess to entertain the highest reverence for it, strangely attempt to compel it to teach the plurality of origin of men.

Were it not for a melancholy defect in human character, which makes it ready to receive and to be governed by error, the promulgation of such views would do but little harm, as there would be but few to embrace them, and they might be permitted to die unnoticed. But as every opinion, directly at variance with the plain and obvious teachings of the Bible, if entertained at all, is fraught with incalculable mischief, inasmuch as it undermines its authority on all other points, upon which it professes to speak; and as erroneous views upon this subject involve in impenetrable mystery the whole subject of human depravity, and human redemption through Christ, and thus ignore the sum and substance of all the teachings of the revelation of God to men, we deem it highly important, that the slender foundation, upon which the advocates of a diver-

sity of origin of men have built their opinions, should be exposed.

On a former occasion,¹ we attempted to show, in as short a compass as possible, "the consistency of the teachings of Geology with those of Revelation." It is our design in the present article, in like manner, again to show that Revelation and Science are perfectly consistent with each other, when properly understood and interpreted.

Without stopping seriously to notice some absurd notions advanced, in the heathen mythologies, concerning the origin of men, and since, with but little variation, repeated by a few moderns, founded upon the most discreditable views of man's spiritual and intellectual nature; such as, that he arose from the lowest form of animal life, gradually, by a law of development, up through the monkey to be what he now is, we proceed to state the objections to the common origin of the human race made by men, some of whom stand high in science and general intelligence.

I. Does the human family consist of more than one species?

1. We ask, first, *what does the Bible teach* in reference to this question? In Gen. 1: 26-28, the creation of the race of man is announced in general terms: in chapter 2: 7, the first man, Adam, is mentioned as formed, and placed in the Garden of Eden; in 18: 20, of the same chapter, an account of the creation of Eve is given; and in chapt. 3: 20, it is said: "And Adam called his wife's name Eve; because she was the mother of all living." "All living" can, certainly, mean nothing less than the whole human family, and connects itself at once and inseparably with Adam and Eve, as the only progenitors of the race. To maintain that they were the progenitors of only one branch, and that there were other progenitors for other branches of the human family is equivalent to declaring that the Sacred Scriptures, in the most obvious and natural meaning of their language, teach falsehood.

2. Besides, in the history of the fall of Adam and Eve, the evident design is to explain the mode of the introduction of sin into the world, or the manner in which man became depraved and brought upon himself the fearful evils of sin.—Numerous other passages declare, that from Adam and Eve, thus fallen, was inherited, by descent from generation to generation, the same fearful and melancholy characteristic. As "the whole world lieth in wickedness"; as "there is not a

¹ Evangelical Review, January 1850.

man that liveth and sinneth not;" as the character of depravity belongs to every man and woman without exception; this itself shows their common origin, and proves the Scripture representation to be true. The plain, common sense view of the whole of Scripture teaching is, that it refers the origin of all human depravity to Adam's sin, (Romans 5: 12, 19), and death, to which all are subject, as its penalty. Any other supposition is a reflection upon the Author of Revelation, who would thus lead men, for whose benefit the revelation is professedly made, into error instead of truth. The existence of Sin, is an enigma upon any other supposition than its introduction through Adam. If there was a plurality of parental pairs, then each sinned after creation, or God must have created them with depraved natures, which again is a reflection upon His character.

3. Again, the history of the atonement runs parallel with that of sin. The promise was made to Adam and his posterity. In the seed of Abraham *all* the nations of the earth were to be blessed. The Scriptures do not teach that any provision was made, but for the descendants of Adam. But a free salvation is to be proclaimed to all mankind, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," Mark 16: 15; and this shows them to be of one race. It comes to all, and finds them precisely alike in their moral character and wants, and it shows itself alike adapted to effect a cure, and prepare them for eternal life. Indeed, it seems to us to be perfectly unaccountable, how an unprejudiced mind can sit down, and in the light of history, and of experience, and of the Bible, study human character, and not acknowledge the perfect truthfulness with which it mirrors forth every human heart, and the alike adaptation to all of the Gospel plan of salvation; and that from beginning to end, on almost every page, directly and indirectly, it intends to teach that *all men* are descended from Adam and Eve, the first and only original pair. And, the unanimous understanding has, until recently, been, that such are the things which are there designed to be taught. When Paul declared to the Athenians, that God had "made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth," Acts 17: 26, he manifestly intended to declare, that they were not, as they vainly supposed themselves to be, a people of more exalted origin than others, but that they descended from the *same parentage*, stood in the same relations to God, and had the same interest in the messages of the Gospel, which he was proclaiming to them. They could have understood him in no other sense; for it was the very

object of his address, to correct in their minds, a notion somewhat similar to that of some moderns, who maintain that *one blood* only means one nature or kind, without involving a common parentage.

4. We come next to enquire, *what are the teachings of science*, in reference to this subject? In the accumulated observation and experience of many generations there is frequently to be found, on some subjects, as there manifestly is on this, a vast amount of connected knowledge to which we cannot, in a general sense, deny the name of science. Accordingly we find, that the almost universal opinion of all mankind, savage as well as civilized, in all ages and countries, has been, that all men have descended from the same first pair; diverging, in the infancy of the race, more or less rapidly from the normal type, so as to give rise to all the diversities in stature, figure and color observable in the different tribes and nations of the earth. So steady and uniform has this opinion been, that it has been almost regarded as an axiom; requiring no proofs to produce conviction. The similarity, not to say almost identity, in their physical, moral and intellectual constitution, is so closely correspondent, even in the minute details, whilst the diversities are confined within such narrow limits, that, if even we had no professed history of the origin of man, the conclusion irresistibly produced by the slightest examination, is precisely that which we have named. The Sacred Scriptures only make definite what would, without them, be indefinite and uncertain. We feel no hesitation in asserting that no one, who has not some favorite theory to support, some prejudice to gratify, or some other special object to accomplish, will be inclined to any other opinion.

5. Amongst the moderns, we believe, Voltaire was the first to call in question the unity of the race. Believing that the Scriptures unequivocally taught, that Adam was the great progenitor of the family, and that from this basis they evolved the doctrine of the native depravity of all men, of the redemption by Christ, and of the judgment to come and its rewards and punishments, which formed their sum and substance, he eagerly sought, upon this ground, to cast discredit upon them, and to show that their teachings could not be relied upon. He professed to see, after examination, sufficient grounds for asserting, that the Negro was not of the same original stock with the white nations; but that he constitutes a distinct and inferior species. His followers, (we do not mean to say, that they are or have been all such in his cheerless infidelity, although we must be allowed to express our regret to see them

in such company,) when pressed with the argument derivable from the nature of species, which is, that fertility is an evidence of, and sterility an evidence against the identity of species, asserted that the descendants of a mixed parentage of white and black were short-lived, and, though fertile to some extent, gradually became extinct. And when satisfactory proof was furnished, that neither were they short-lived, nor less fertile and enduring than the average of men of pure and unmixed races, they changed their ground, and tried to prove, that in other departments of nature, allied species produced a fertile offspring, capable of being perpetuated as a distinct and intermediate race; and if hybrid animals and plants could be perpetuated as independent races, fertility was not a test of species, and therefore the human family, though no difference is observable as to fertility however mixed the parentage, may consist of several distinct species. But how signally they have failed in this attempt may readily be seen.

On the strictly scientific part of the question, Dr. Bachman has met those, who either deny the authority of the Bible, or that it covers the ground, with a most triumphant argument, in his work entitled, "The doctrine of the unity of the human race examined on scientific principles." Too much praise cannot be bestowed upon this work, for its clearness and sometimes elegance of style, for its well arranged and striking statements of facts, and for its most convincing and unanswerable arguments. We have read a considerable portion of it several times, and, we are free to confess, it was with increased satisfaction. After reëxamining the objections of some of his opponents, it appears to us that he has not left a single one unanswered.

Acknowledging our indebtedness to him, for a large portion of the materials which we intend using, we shall endeavor to present the scientific argument for the unity of the origin of the human race, as it has successively presented itself to the public, under its different phases. In passing, we must remind our readers of a distinction, strenuously insisted on by Agassiz, and to which there can be no objection. By *unity of origin* is meant, that all men descended from *one original pair*; by *unity of race* is meant, that they are one in nature or blood, being physically, mentally and morally the same in all essential respects; it remaining yet an open question whether they may or may not have descended from a single or plurality of ancestral pairs. The unity of the species, as necessarily involved in the former, will, therefore, occupy our attention in the first place.

6. "*Species* embraces all such individuals as may have originated from a common stock. Such individuals bear an essential resemblance to each other, as well as to their common parent, in all their parts."¹ Thus any number of stems of Indian corn (*Zea Mays*) are so many individuals all of the same species, having descended from the same parent stem, from which evidently no stem of wheat or barley could ever have originated. This is, without doubt, the common sense and general idea of species in the organic world, and until men were desirous of supporting a particular theory, no modification of this definition was deemed necessary. This is what experience and observation, by which alone we gain our knowledge of the individuals of the animate world and learn to classify them, almost infallibly teach us. By a closer observation of those individuals of the animal kingdom which have thus had a common origin, we notice, that they "resemble each other in dentition, and general structure, that in wild animals, as a general rule, they must approach the same size; but that in both wild and domesticated animals they must have the same duration of life, the same period of utero-gestation, the same average number of progeny, the same habits and instincts; in a word, they belong to one stock that produce fertile offspring by association."² Go whither we will, wheresoever we meet with men, however diverse the circumstances under which they live, we find them possessing these common characters, by most of which they are as widely distinguished from all other individuals of the animal kingdom as they are identified with each other. "The characters, moreover, which distinguish and separate them as a species from all other animals are as distinct and infallible as are those which form the genera."³ In anatomical structure; in the number and arrangement of the muscles; in the organs of respiration, digestion, and circulation; in the temperature of the blood; in the period of gestation; in longevity; in their powers of speech; in the faculties of their minds; in their modes of recording and transmitting their thoughts; in their capabilities of improving the knowledge which they derived from their ancestors; in their use of fire, and in their structures, formed for protection against atmospheric influences; in the diseases and ailments to which they are subject; in their possession of a conscience, which approves when they do right, and condemns when they do wrong; in their belief in the existence of a God,

¹ Wood's Class Book of Botany, p. 27.

² Bachman on unity of human race, p. 19. ³ Ibid p. 10.

who rewards the virtuous and punishes the guilty; and in their hopes and fears, both in reference to the future of this life, and the future of a world to come; all the various branches of the human family, though living under a great variety of circumstances, are alike.¹ An identity in but a few of these particulars, we think, ought to be sufficient to produce conviction, and how much rather when it exists in so many!

7. *Varieties.* It is, however, not to be denied, that striking and permanent differences exist among the different branches of this family. These diversities are so striking, as at once to arrest the attention of the most careless observer. They principally consist in the color of the skin, the form of the hair, the form of the face and countenance, and in the size of the brain. Seizing upon these characteristic differences, naturalists have sought to distribute the family of man into different races; some have included them in two, the white and the black; others in five: the Ethiopæan, Caucasian, Mongolian, American, and Malay races; and others in eleven. These, the advocates of the unity of origin of all, have looked upon merely as varieties of one and the same species, having originated under the difference of circumstances in which different families were placed, in the early history of the race; whilst the opponents of the doctrine of the unity of their origin have tried to elevate them into so many species, each of which had a separate and independent origin.

The Ethiopæan, or Negro race is black and has crisped hair; the European white; the Mongolian olive; the Malay brown; and the American copper-colored. In the last four the hair is mostly straight, inclining, in many cases, even among Europeans and their descendants, to curl, and in the last three it is uniformly black, with a decided tendency to be coarse in the last. But that *color* cannot form the ground of a specific distinction is evident, when we consider that it is not uniform in any of the above named races. The middle and Northern Europeans are, indeed, fair-skinned; but a very marked difference is already observable in Southern France, Spain, Italy, and other countries lying on the Mediterranean. The *rete mucosum*, the seat of color, is there considerably darkened; whilst the Arabs, Fellahs, Egyptians, Hindoos and some other Asiatic families which are descended from the Caucasian stock, the same from which the fair nations of Europe are descended, are almost black. Nor is the Negro race uniformly black.—The inhabitants of the Atlantic coast on the west of Africa,

¹ Bachman u. h. r. pp. 24—29, and 147—8.

are considerably darker than those who dwell farther inland ; and those of the elevated central portions have less of what is considered the strong negro feature, differing but little in color, hair, or physiognomy from the Egyptians. "Most of them have well formed skulls, long faces, handsome, even Roman or Aquiline noses, thin lips and agreeable features. The negresses of these nations are as finely formed as the men, and are, with the exception of their color, as handsome as European women."¹ Nor is the form of the *hair* of the Negro a better ground of specific distinction. In several of the other races, even among the whites, there is in the hair of many individuals and of whole families so strong a tendency to curl, as to be impossible to keep it straight, and this peculiarity often descends to many generations. The difference between their hair and that of the Negro, is only one of degree and not of kind. Nor are the form of the nose, the elevation of the cheek bone, the size of the lips, and the position and form of the eye any better criteria for founding a specific distinction. In none of these respects is there entire, or even approximate uniformity in what are regarded the same races. There is, on the contrary, the greatest diversity. There is also a gradual shading of colors and features, and other characteristics of the one race into those of the other. Thus, on the one side of China towards the primitive seat of the white race, (Northern India,) "the Mongolians assume another appearance ; they resemble somewhat the Caucasian type. But towards Indo-China we have also a transition from the Malay-an type into the Caucasian, as we have from the Mongolian type into the Caucasian farther North. If, moreover, we take the trouble to compare the different African tribes, we shall observe that there are as great differences between them as between the inhabitants of Asia."²

The form and *size* of the *skulls* form, moreover, not the slightest ground for specific distinction. Drs. Tiedeman and Morton, the former of Europe, and the latter of our own State; have investigated this subject with much zeal and patience. They have measured the capacities of as many of the skulls of the various races as they could collect, and made a careful comparison. "The brain of the negro," says Prof. Tiedeman, "is upon the whole quite as large as that of the European and other human races. Many anatomists have incorrectly asserted

¹ Bach. un. hum. r. p. 226.

² Agassiz, in Christian Examiner, July 1850, p. 125.

that Europeans have a larger brain than negroes.”¹ From the measurements of Prof. Morton, it would appear that “the Negro skull was less than the European, but within one inch as large as the Persians, Armenians, and Caucasians, and three square inches larger than two branches of the Caucasian race, the Indostanic and the Nilotic.”² An inspection of the tables of Professors Tiedeman and Morton, “will satisfy us of the utter futility of any attempt to divide the races of men into different species by the size of the brain.”³

Moreover, if we make any of the above named differences a ground of specific distinction in man, why should not we apply the same principle to other animals? If with Voltaire we should make the negro a separate species, because his *rete mucosum* is black, and the Albino, whether descended from black parents or white there being Albinos in all the races, another species, because in his the coloring matter is either entirely wanting or it is transparent, and because his hair is white and eyes red; why, when one hog is white and another from the same litter is black, should we not make them of different species? “The ferret and English rabbit have produced albino varieties, which have been propagated for more than a hundred years; the dark colored fluid under the skin has given way to a white, transparent, and almost imperceptible fluid;” the same has taken place with the rat, the mouse, the duck and other animals: but “we have not made new species of the ferret, the rabbit, the rat, or the mouse, because they have produced permanent varieties that are white.”⁴ Upon none or all of these grounds can we find a specific distinction among men. Accordingly, those naturalists, who advocate a plurality of races and also of species, are by no means agreed among themselves as to the number, for the obvious reason, that no line of demarcation can be drawn, by which the several species may be separated. And we are free to say, that the diversities existing among the different families of men, are neither as numerous nor as striking as those which are known to exist among some inferior animals, which are undeniably of the same species.

8. *Fertility inter se of the different varieties of men.*—Not only have the different varieties of men the most striking common characteristics, physical, mental and moral, leaving scarcely room for the shadow of a doubt as to their specific identity; but they carry with them, in a remarkable degree, the fundamental idea of species, which is, that they produce

¹ Unity of hum. r. p. 226. ² Ibid, p. 229. ³ *ibid*, p. 229. ⁴ *ibid*, p. 32.

with each other a fertile offspring, capable of being perpetuated, independently of association with either parental line, which never is the case with the offspring resulting from the association with each other of merely allied species. This point requires a separate and extended elucidation.

“It is a long-established and undeniable fact, that all the races, in every age and in every country, produce prolific offspring in their association with each other. The Caucasian, Mongolian, African, Malayan, and aboriginal American, all are affording us the most convincing evidences of this fact. In this manner, many new intermediate races have been produced on the confines of Asia, Africa and Europe, and, within the last two hundred years, a new race has sprung up in Mexico and South America, between one branch of the Caucasian and the native Indian, together with no small admixture of African blood. In the U. States, since the first settlement in Virginia, in 1607, the two extremes of African and Caucasian have met and produced an intermediate race. We know them to be fully as prolific, if not more so than the whites, where their constitution has not been impaired by dissipation. We will not stop to enquire whether this race is equally as long-lived as either of the originals; but even here we find no difficulty, as no one will be disposed to deny the fact, that some races of the pure Caucasian, Mongolian and African families are more robust and longer lived than others. The facts, however, are undeniable, that all these half breeds are prolific with each other, and we can point out the descendants of at least five generations, both in Carolina and New York, where there has been no intermixture with either of the original varieties; and they are to this day as prolific as any of the other races of men. We are aware that labored articles have been written to show, that the descendants of the two races, especially those between the Caucasian and African, in process of time, become sterile. We believe, however, this argument is virtually abandoned. The learned researches of Dr. Morton, (*Crania Americana*.) will, we think, set this matter for ever at rest. The accounts, scattered throughout his learned essay, of the many intermediate tribes of nations that have derived their origin from an admixture of Mongolian, Malayan, American, Caucasian and African blood, are calculated to convince all who have hitherto entertained any doubts on this subject, that not only these widely separated, but all the varieties in the human species produce, in perpetuity, an intermediate and fertile progeny.”¹ In Africa there is a mixed race descended

¹ Bachman on Unity of Human Race, pp. 115, 116.

from the intermarriage of negroes and Portugese; on the Orange river in South Africa is the growing tribe of the Griquas, resulting from the intermixture of the original Dutch settlers and the Hottentots; and several races resulting from the intermixture of Africans, Spaniards, and Portugese are found in South, as also in North America; in all amounting to upwards of five millions of souls.¹ To so great an extent, indeed, has this process of intermixture of races been carried, in almost every part of the world, that it is scarcely possible now to find any that has remained perfectly pure. And yet the fertility of the human family has not thus been in the least impaired.

These facts being clearly understood and incontrovertible, what were the advocates of the plurality of species of the human family to do? Man in all his associations remained fertile, but it was believed, and in a manner considered as settled, that sterility belonged to the hybrids or the descendants of two allied but different species among all other animals. Was man an exception to the general law amongst animal natures, or did it still admit of a question whether hybrids among other animals were or were not sterile *inter se*? If it could be shown in the last case that hybrids were fertile, it might yet be true that man consisted of a plurality of species. Amongst those who addressed themselves with great diligence to exhibit to the world, that in numerous cases hybrids were produced, which remained fertile for an indefinite length of time, and sought to produce the impression, that thus new races were formed, and consequently, that the varieties in the human family might have been the result of such intermixture of several originally distinct human species, was Dr. Morton, who presented his researches to the public through Silliman's Journal, in a paper whose object was to show, "that different species of animals are capable of producing together a fertile offspring, and therefore hybridity ceases to be a test of specific affiliation." Its title is: "Hybridity in animals considered in reference to the question of the unity of the human species." This paper, when it appeared in the above named Journal, we read with considerable interest and attention; and we confess that we were not a little surprised with some of the cases which he cited as well ascertained facts, but had not ourselves the means of disproving or setting them aside. He did not certify to any of them as having come under his own observation, but gave them upon the authority of others, who had gathered them

¹ Bachman on Unity of Human Race, p. 117.

from times remote and countries distant. Coming from a person of so high a standing in his profession and in the world of science, his paper necessarily attracted much attention, and gained not a few believers. Of the merits of this paper we shall say nothing upon our own authority; but we take pleasure in stating that all the cases of supposed fertile hybridity there adduced have been ably met and disproved by Dr. Bachman. We hesitate not in saying that, in our opinion, he has brought to the subject the very highest degree of qualification to enable him to express a reliable opinion. Having been passionately devoted to the study of the natural history of animals and plants from early youth; having had his attention much directed to the discrimination between species, with the description of many of which he has favored us in his numerous publications; having bestowed much time, both in this country and in Europe, in these investigations, and in making experiments numerous and satisfactory upon the subject of hybrids, he was eminently qualified to bring the question to a final decision. He has given the results of his varied experience, and of his studies, thus protracted through many years, in his work on the "Unity of the human race," already cited. We earnestly recommend our readers to peruse that work. It is a storehouse of facts on an interesting subject, presented in a most interesting manner, so much so, that a scientific friend remarked to us that the work had to him all the charms of a novel. He there has taken up *seriatim* the cases adduced by Dr. Morton, and shown that the very existence of some was more than doubtful, that others rested upon vague statements of unreliable writers, and that in no case was the fertility of hybrids among themselves shown to be probable beyond the first generation. We may sum up the results of Dr. Bachman's extensive investigations in a few words: "Two species of animals, that are nearly allied, sometimes produce sterile hybrids," such as the mule between the ass and the horse. "This occurs but seldom, and generally by human intervention, confinement or constraint. In rare instances this progeny is fertile when coupled with the original *stock of either parents*; and in a few cases these hybrids have been known to propagate, under these conditions, for two or three generations, when they became sterile; but we have no case on record, where a single new race of animal or bird has sprung up from an association of two different species."¹ But as all the races of man are mutually fertile amongst each other, and their

¹ Bach. Un. Hum. R. p. 26-7.

mixed descendants among themselves *ad infinitum*, we are driven to the conclusion, that all these are but varieties of the same species.

9. *Whence then these varieties?* Are we warranted to believe, that varieties so great and striking could have arisen in the progress of descent, in a single species, under the varied circumstances in which man is placed? We answer yes. We may here again draw illustrations from the laws of animal nature, by referring to the history of the inferior orders as well as to what is known of man.

Observation teaches us, that plants and animals, in their *wild* state, seldom run into varieties; although there are some striking cases of these. Thus in a limited district in S. Carolina, the scarlet azalea (*Azalea Calendulacea*) has produced double flowers, and at another point in the same State the *Azalea Nudiflora*, has exhibited the same phenomenon.¹ From a multitude of cases in the animal kingdom, we will cite a few: The common wolf (*Canis lupus*), which has extended itself over a considerable portion of the Eastern and Western Continents, in high northern and elevated regions is white; in the temperate regions of Europe and America it is gray; in Florida it is black; and in Texas it is red. It varies not only in color, but also in size, form, and skull in different localities; yet there are individuals which link the whole together in one series, so that naturalists are obliged to admit, that this widely roaming animal, which changes its form and color at every remove to new regions is one and the same species, existing under almost numberless varieties.² And so also "several species of squirrel, the white-footed mouse, the fox, and the Virginian deer, whose geographical ranges, like those of man, are wide and extensive, have greatly varied in color, size and form from their original types."³

But animals subjected to a *state of domestication*, have shown a very great tendency to run into varieties so numerous and so great, that could we not trace them all up to a common stock, we should almost feel compelled to describe them as new species. This is eminently the case with the dog, the horse, the cow, the hog, the sheep, and several species of poultry, "which have become the companions and benefactors of man, by contributing to his sustenance and comfort." From the Newfoundland down to the little lap-dog, we have almost an endless variety of form, size, and color; with hair varying from the long and curled of the spaniel, on the one hand, to

¹ Bach. Un. Hum. R. p. 139.

² Ibid, p. 122-3.

³ *ibid.* p. 11.

the short and straight of the coach dog on the other ; and possessing a very great diversity of disposition, habits, and adaptation. And yet we are compelled to include them all in one species ; and they are known to have originated in their companionship with man in his varied circumstances and conditions. The horse, also, whose primitive stock we yet find roaming in the wilds of Tartary, has passed into numerous varieties. The diminutive Arabian horse, the Shetland poney, the fleet English racer, and the gigantic Holland dray horse present striking peculiarities in form and size. The same may be said with regard to the other domesticated animals. Many of the most striking varieties can be traced to the time and place of their origination. They sprang up under the inspection of man, and afford the most irresistible evidence of the fact, that, under new circumstances, changes occur in the secretions or other functions of the body by which striking peculiarities are produced. In a similar manner, we see peculiarities arising in man when placed in new circumstances. Thus we see striking national characteristics, which enable us, at first sight, to distinguish between people though geographically near. And what is more common than family and individual peculiarities, serving to distinguish their possessors from the rest of men !

10. These varieties among animals are also *permanent*. They do not originate in one generation and pass away in the next. This is an established law in the whole living world. Varieties never revert to their originals. New varieties may spring up and *take the place of others*, but the original is never reproduced when once there has been a departure from it. Still the law is such, that the departure of the successive varieties cannot run indefinitely from the specific norm, so as to lose their specific characters. The divergencies are confined within moderate limits.

Applying these principles to man, who is capable of adapting himself more, probably, than any other animal to a change of condition and circumstance, and who is more susceptible of receiving impressions from them in his bodily functions, we may suppose, that his *most striking* varieties were not long in developing themselves, and that these, becoming permanent, only admitted of modification from new and subordinate diversities springing up under the new circumstances in which he was placed. The commonly received opinion may even be the most correct one, which is that there was a marked difference among the sons of Noah, which, becoming permanent in their respective descendants, continued to characterize the great families of men afterwards. In these families, subor-

dinate varieties may have sprung up, from time to time, thus giving to the world the face which it has hitherto worn. This view, to say the least, is not improbable, as even in the present comparatively permanent state of the world, when man has run through nearly all the changes of which he is capable, we often find the most striking differences in the children of the same family, just as we also often find among the young of the same parents in the inferior animal world. All that is necessary to perpetuate a variety is to keep it alone, or free from admixture with others. Whensoever, therefore, the differences in the family of Noah originated, and from whatever cause, it was sufficient to produce the state of the world which followed, if each branch kept by itself for several generations. And if the *greater* diversities among the lower animals have originated in the same species, in the progress of time, under the variety of circumstances in which they were placed, how much rather may not the *less* have originated in the family of man amidst his more extended migrations, and the varied changes of his condition physical, civil and moral, to which he was exposed.

What may be the precise nature of the causes which are operative in the production of varieties in the animal and vegetable kingdom, we are not in the present state of our knowledge able to say precisely. Nor is it necessary to the validity of our argument that we should be able to do so. The *facts* remain unaffected, although we should not be able to assign a single cause. We are, however, notwithstanding that much obscurity and uncertainty yet prevail, able to go a considerable way in accounting for the production of many of the modifications in the forms of animals and plants, to which they are subject. If it should be said, on the one hand, that God miraculously impressed upon men those distinctive differences which characterize the different races and their varieties, we would say, in reply, that such possibly might have been the case; but that it is not at all probable, since some of the varieties are traceable to the time and place of their origin, whilst in the other orders of animate nature we see them even yet, here and there, arising. And if the varieties in other animal races have resulted from causes now in operation, we are justified in the conclusion, that such has been the case too in all that distinguish men from each other; for it is contrary to the uniform mode of procedure of God, that he should miraculously produce results, which might be brought about by the ordinary operation of second causes. It seems to be a great law of nature, that living beings are susceptible of impressions

from external physical influences which sometimes leave permanent results. According to this great law, man's corporeal, and, through it indirectly, his mental and moral nature receives impressions from changes in his outward condition, and reciprocally, which manifest themselves in important distinctive features.

That *climate* holds an important rank among these modifying influences no one can doubt. By climate we do not mean merely temperature, with its annual range, its fluctuations and pauses; but also the relative quantity of moisture; the ratio and duration of rain and drought, of cloudy and clear weather; the elevation above the sea level and consequent density of the atmosphere; the position relative to land or water, mountain or plain; the nature or fertility of the soil; the purity of water, that most important necessary of life; and whatever may affect the healthy and vigorous performance of all the bodily functions. Climate does not, therefore, depend solely upon latitude or elevation above the sea level. It may vary much within small geographical distances, whilst it may, on the contrary, remain nearly the same over extended districts of country.

Observant persons have noticed, that a variation in one or more of the above characteristics of climate has often produced important changes in the condition of the body; in its health and vigor; and in keeping up or destroying its normal state. Such influences, operating upon the impressible infant subject before and after birth, must, by continuing through successive generations, at some particular stage, show themselves in some permanent result, leaping forth, at once as it were, before the world. Thus, of the common Pea fowl; yet existing in great numbers in a wild state in India; so much admired for the unsurpassed beauty of its plumage; and found on the pleasure-grounds of England and the Continent, under a variety of colors, white, spotted, brown, black, and Albino, the japanned variety suddenly appeared in Lord Brownlow's numerous breed of common white and pied, and also in two other similar cases, and, what was remarkable; to the extinction of the previously existing breed.¹ Similar facts might be adduced in reference to the Guinea fowl, the Norway and black rat, the common mouse, and others, in which varieties suddenly appeared among the young brood. These facts show how suddenly and unexpectedly varieties spring up in

¹ Bachman u. h. r. p. 112.

particular circumstances and localities, and, when once formed, increase so rapidly as to cause the extinction of the previously existing varieties. Thus one variety, which in its nature is permanent, may be replaced by the springing up of some new variety better adapted to the new circumstances in which that previously existing may have been placed. A variety springing up in a particular locality becomes indefinitely permanent there; and if removed to any other locality will also remain permanent, unless a new variety, better adapted to the conditions, should, in the process of time, arise and replace it. We may be allowed to refer to several other curious instances to show the influence of locality. In Hungary there is not, in a space of forty miles, any variety of the hog except the solid-hoofed; the same variety has recently made its appearance on the Red River, in the distant west, where it is multiplying faster than the other breeds, which it will soon entirely replace. It was not brought thither as such, but arose there, and it was a matter of surprise to the inhabitants, that the same phenomenon had presented itself on the Eastern Continent. This shows, too, how varieties, diverging considerably from the specific type, may be perpetuated.¹ In Holland originated the *large dray* horse, now so common and useful in our country; in Opelousas, in Western Louisiana, low and marshy like Holland, the cattle have, without a change of stock, within the last thirty years, produced a variety of immense size, with a peculiar form, and enormous horns like the cattle of Abyssinia; and before them all the other breeds have disappeared.² Whether the moisture of these localities has had any important influence in developing great bodily magnitude, we are not prepared to say.

Looking at the natural history of man in the light of these facts, we are satisfied that climate has exerted a most important influence in producing modifications of his physical nature. Accordingly, in the old world, where tribes and nations have occupied the same seats for centuries, we see a considerable correspondence between the varieties of men and identity of climatic conditions. The inhabitants of the torrid zone are brown or black, except where elevation and moisture produce a modifying influence. The tropical Africans are black, the extratropical inhabitants of South Africa are of a considerably lighter shade, and those of the elevated and well-watered portions of even tropical Africa are much fairer and better proportioned. All over that continent where population is nearly

¹ Bachman on unity of human race, p. 128. ² Ibid p. 181.

permanent, there is found to be a gradation of color, form and feature, showing incontestibly that climate, as already defined, exerts a most striking effect upon the human constitution. The inhabitants, moreover, of the temperate and subinsular climates, as is that of Europe, are white or but slightly colored. The inhabitants of the arctic districts of both continents: the Samoyedes of Siberia, the Laplanders of Northern Europe, and the Esquimaux of N. America, living under the same general physical circumstances, present the same general features.¹ The same may be said of the birds and fishes existing under similar conditions. And thus, if we deemed it important to enter into a detailed comparison of the whole globe, we should find that the same climatic conditions are always attended with a general correspondence of physical features in the population, if it has not been comparatively recently brought thither, by migration from regions differing considerably in these respects. In those regions, which have not been overrun by conquest or migration, the types remain permanent; in others less so because of the more frequent replacing of one population by an other, and their frequent intermixture. We may further refer to the case of the Jews, as a remarkable illustration of this branch of our subject. That people, which have, for more than a hundred generations, remained separate—unmixed with other tribes and nations—and lived substantially under the same moral conditions, with the same habits and modes of life, have nevertheless been modified, in their physical characteristics, in every region to which they have migrated. In Europe, they possess the color, and, to a very great extent, the other characteristics of the several white nations, among whom they dwell; in Western Asia they are olive-colored; and in India they are deep brown. Like a stream within a stream whose waters refuse to commingle, they have remained distinct from all other people, at once an exemplification of the fulfilment of prophecy, and an illustration of the existence of diversity in unity, resulting from causes which have alike impressed themselves on the whole human family and given origin to its numerous diversities.

But it is urged as an insuperable objection to our ascribing the external differences among men to climatic influences, that some races, without the least change in their distinctive peculiarities, may be traced through parts of the world which are most dissimilar, and *vice versa*.² The white nations, for ex-

¹ Agassiz in *Christian Examiner*, July 1850, p. 124.

² *Ibid*, p. 123.

ample, have spread nearly over all Europe and America, with but a slight modification in their characteristics; and the African tribes have furnished the United States, South America, and the West India Islands with a vast population of their unfortunate descendants, who have not for two centuries lost their negro characteristics. To this we would reply, by reminding the objector of the fact or rule already presented: that although new varieties may arise in new circumstances, these varieties never revert again to the original, but possess a degree of constancy which approaches permanency. No matter what the circumstances may have been, under which these varieties arose, the white, and the negro remain substantially what they are, let them go whither they will. We however deny the absolute permanence of varieties in new situations. Without making any special reference to the known and striking national features of the nations of Europe and their descendants in America, we maintain that the negroes of our country, present very marked departures in many respects from their progenitors who were first brought to our shores. "In form, in feature, and especially in skull, a very striking departure from the original type is perceived. We have still some hundreds of native Africans remaining in South Carolina, known by some of them yet presenting the tattoo they received in Africa. They belonged to tribes the progenitors of our negroes. They present such striking peculiarities, when compared with our negroes of unmixed blood, that have been born in this country, and are three or four generations removed from their African forefathers, that we have, for many years past, been in the habit of detecting their origin at a glance."¹ We assert without fear of contradiction, that if the negroes were to remain unmixed for several more generations in the United States, they would present still greater departures from their ancestral type; showing the modifying influence of the new conditions in which they live.

But we do not wish to be understood as referring the physical peculiarities of the different varieties of men solely to climatic conditions. Others may be mentioned, which in some cases have exerted a more powerful and rapid influence than these. The influence of poverty and want and their opposites, influencing the condition of the body of the parent and the child from generation to generation; the effects, on the one hand, of care and debasing passions, and, on the other, of cheerfulness, and contentment, and buoyant hope and what-

¹ *Bach. Un. Hum. R.* p. 215.

soever affords a healthful stimulus to the mind, display themselves in the powerful impression they make upon the body. If any class of causes, such as these, are found to be operating on a population, for a series of years, in one direction, we shall not fail to see their transforming influence. "A remarkable illustration of this fact is found in the natives of some parts of Ireland. On the plantation of Ulster, and afterwards, on the success of the British against the rebels of 1641 and 1689, great multitudes of the native Irish were driven from Armagh and the south of Down into the mountainous tract extending from the Barony of Fews eastward to the sea; on the other side of the kingdom the same race were exposed to the worst effects of hunger and ignorance, the two great brutalizers of the human race. The descendants of these exiles are now distinguished physically by great degradation. They are remarkable for open, projecting jaws, with prominent teeth and exposed gums; and their advancing cheek bones and depressed noses bear barbarism on their very front. In Sligo and northern Mayo, the consequences of the two centuries of degradation and hardship exhibit themselves in the whole physical condition of the people, affecting not only the *features*, but the *frame*, and giving such an example of human deterioration from known causes as almost to compensate, by its value to future ages, for the suffering and debasement which past generations have endured in perfecting its appalling lesson. Five feet two inches upon an average, pot-bellied, bow-legged, abortively featured; these spectres of a people who were once well grown, able-bodied and comely, stalk abroad into the daylight of civilization, the apparitions of Irish ugliness and Irish want. In other parts of the island, where the population has never undergone the influence of the same causes of physical degradation, it is well known that the same race furnishes the most perfect specimens of human beauty and vigor, both mentally and bodily."¹

Amongst the lower animals there is, moreover, a transmission of instincts and disposition from one generation to another. A state superinduced by the art and care of man is, to a certain extent, found to characterize the variety afterwards. Thus the young hatched, by a bantam hen, from the eggs of the common quail, were found, by Dr. Bachman, not to become reconciled to their foster-mother before the expiration of two weeks; but in the course of time they attached themselves so much to him, that they came into his study and took hold of the

¹ Smyth's Unity of Human Races, p. 79.

pen with which he was writing. On the following spring, eggs from these domesticated birds, were placed, together with some from wild birds, under the same hen. When hatched, the young from the former were nearly as gentle as common chickens, whilst those from the latter immediately darted off into the shrubbery and were lost. The same difference obtains likewise with the young of many other birds and animals; each succeeding generation becoming more gentle than the preceding. There is, in some cases, a difference even in the nature of the food upon which the young will feed. Dogs inherit the propensities, habits and dispositions, taught their parents, and hence we have pointers, setters, shepherd's dogs, &c., which perform the actions or office required of their parents, almost without any training. And if the effects of education become hereditary among the lower animals, why may we not suppose, that many of the national characteristics and diversities of races, which are now fixed, were at first the result of culture, habit, and employment, and gradually from generation to generation became permanently impressed?¹ The effects of state of society, of habits of living, of intellectual and moral training, and of disposition, are, we believe, far more potent in producing physical and other peculiarities in masses of men, than is generally conceded. And this is our answer to the position of Professor L. Agassiz, who endeavors to prove, that the diversities among men are primitive, by a reference to the case of the aborigines of America. He asserts "that they belong to the same race, from north to south; that the primitive inhabitants of central tropical America do not physically differ from the primitive inhabitants of the more northern and southern regions; and that in this case we have the greatest uniformity in the character of the tribes of an entire continent under the most different climatic influences."² According to Dr. Morton's own showing, upon whose investigations Prof. Agassiz seems to have placed unlimited reliance, there are, however, considerable diversities, of color at least, among the Indian tribes. Still, they bear a very strong resemblance, or a striking family likeness to each other, and this may be accounted for, by the fact of the great similarity of their habits and mode of living.

We therefore feel satisfied, that there are secondary causes sufficient in operation to have produced all the shades of diversity among men. When we bear in mind, that animals in a state of domestication are far more prone to run into varieties

¹ *Bach. un. hum. r.* pp. 196-200. ² *Christian Ex.* July 1850, p. 126.

than the same in a wild state, we are forced to the conclusion that the effect is the result of the artificial circumstances in which they are placed; whether as to food or habit or training or all together we may not be able to tell. Why then deny a less effect on man, who lives in greater extremes of condition and circumstances, than those in which other animals live? Although we may not be able to assign the precise causes in operation in each case, and therefore may admit them to be to some extent obscure, we are yet not willing to refer the diversities among men to a miraculous influence, or to assume that God effected by the exertion of a direct agency in them results, which it is conceded flow from secondary influences among other animals.

So numerous and conclusive, however, are the arguments both from Scripture and from Science in favor of the unity of the human species, that this point is now generally conceded. We come, therefore, to the second question which we proposed in the beginning.

II. If the human family be of one species, did all descend from a single pair? Or were men created in masses or communities, with constitutions, forms and habits adapted to the different geographical ranges in which they were placed?

We refer our readers to Prof. L. Agassiz as the principal advocate of the latter view. He professes to find insurmountable difficulties in the common view, which refers the whole species to a single pair. Whilst he admits the general unity of all men, their identity of physical and moral nature, so that they may be said to be of "one blood," equally endowed with the same superior mental and spiritual powers, possessing the same moral qualities, sustaining the same relations towards God, and placed under the same conditions as to a future world of rewards and punishments, he denies the unity of their origin, and maintains that the differences which we notice among the different races, were impressed upon them by the Creator himself, and are therefore primitive and independent of physical causes.¹

He denies that the supposition of the creation of one first pair would account for all the facts; and further, that the assumption of several first pairs; as for example, one as the progenitors of the Negro race placed somewhere in Africa; another as the progenitors of the Caucasian race or the races of lighter color placed somewhere in the highlands of Central

¹ Christian Examiner, July 1850, pp. 134, 135.

and Western Asia; and a third as the progenitors of the Mongul race placed in Eastern and Northern Asia, would prove any more satisfactory; but that the human race possessed a "primitive ubiquity," having been created all over the earth, on continents and islands in numbers sufficient to form communities, and possessing all those physical differences which would at once adapt them to their several localities.

His first argument for the primitive ubiquity of man is derived from analogy, or from the law according to which, he conceives, plants and other animals have been distributed over the globe.

Let us then try to follow him in the steps of his argument, and examine each carefully, to see whether or not it is well taken.

1. If we look at the results of geological investigations, it is satisfactorily ascertained, that the history of the earth may be distinguished into seven¹ or more distinct periods, during each of which a characteristic fauna and flora prevailed, differing almost invariably specifically, and to some extent generically, from each other. Those of one period lived and flourished for many generations, and, perishing by some great convulsion followed by a new condition impressed upon the planet, were replaced by others. The races of plants and animals which now exist are but of recent origin, and form the last link in the chain of succession.

2. The animals and plants of the earlier geological periods were more extensively diffused over the globe than during the later, those in widely differing latitudes and longitudes being more nearly identical than at present. Thus, the plants which contributed to form the coal beds, though widely distributed, are mostly of the same species. In like manner the same species of animals were found widely distributed. This is regarded by geologists as a proof of great uniformity of climate and other physical conditions of the globe. During the later periods greater differences are found to have existed, as well as a more confined range of species, showing a greater diversity in the climatic conditions of the globe.²

3. Again, at present, as during former geological epochs, some species of animals and plants are, in their natural state, found only in particular geographical districts, and others in others. This has led to the conclusion that they were, at first, created only in those districts in which they are now found.

¹ *Evangelical Review*, January 1850.

² Agassiz in *Chr. Examiner*, March 1850, pp. 185-6.

But this is by no means certain, as some species might have become extinct in some districts, either because of unfavorable climatic conditions, or because of the increase of other species, just as new varieties often increase at the expense of the old. On this we do not, however, insist. As it is believed that all could not have migrated from a common centre, and arranged themselves in different districts as they are now found to be; and as with their present constitution they could not have existed together, even for a short time, under the same climatic conditions, or many of them have passed from one region to their present localities without the most serious consequences, geologists have contended that, instead of the "prevailing opinion, which ascribes to all living beings upon earth one common centre of origin, from which it is supposed they, in the course of time, spread over wider and wider areas, until they finally came into their ultimate state of distribution,"¹ the supposition, that they originated at many different centres, would be more accordant with facts. The same opinion is now entertained by most men of science, in reference to the present world; and we are compelled to state, that we think it highly probable that the first animals and plants were not all created in one district. Still, we must be allowed to say, that the common opinion is by no means impossible, or necessarily at variance with known laws. Southern species are known to have been gradually adapted to higher northern latitudes and severer climates; and northern species, pressing, each year, after the change of seasons, have been gradually found to flourish in lower latitudes.² We are by no means certain, that the peculiar adaptedness of the different species to different localities and climates may not be a result impressed on each by physical causes. But we will not only wave all objections, but declare our adhesion to the views thus far above expressed. We will admit, that many animals, with a limited geographical range, perish when removed to other latitudes, and that, therefore, they did not all originate in the same district.

4. But when Prof. Agassiz goes farther and asserts, that the various species of animals and plants originated simultaneously over the whole geographical area through which they range, and that man and other species capable of existing under a great variety of circumstances and climates sprung up, as it were, out of the earth, every where with diversities to suit

¹ Agassiz in *Chr. Ex.* March 1850, p. 181. ² *Bach. Un. H. R.* p. 274-5.

their various circumstances, we are not disposed to follow. He says: "For instance, *lions*, which occur over almost the whole of Africa, over extensive parts of southern Asia, and were formerly found even over Asia Minor and Greece, must have originated primitively over the whole range of these limits of their distribution. We are led to these conclusions by the very fact, that the lions of the East Indies differ somewhat from those of Northern Africa; these, again, differ from those of Senegal. It seems more natural to suppose, that they were thus distributed over such wide districts, and endowed with particular characteristics in each, than to assume that they constituted as many species; or to believe, that created any where in this circle of distribution, they have been gradually modified to their present differences in consequence of their migration."¹ Why then ought we not to regard the *perches* of the Rhine and Rhone but varieties of the same species? The common wolf, found over a large portion of both continents, existing under considerable diversities, he also considers as having originated in a similar manner; and the same he regards as true in reference to all other organized beings, to which mankind cannot have formed an exception. "Men must have originated in nations, as bees have originated in swarms."² This, it will be perceived, is making an immense assumption. If it were even true, that bees originated in numbers, it would not, therefore, follow, that they originated in more than one swarm, much less over the whole of the world in which they are found; nor that mankind originated in nations, the conditions of their existence and reproduction being strikingly dissimilar. A whole swarm *might*, be necessary, although we conceive not, to the multiplication and perpetuation of the species; but the same cannot be said in reference to man. It is by no means necessary that he should at first have existed in nations to fulfil his destiny.

Being compelled to admit the specific unity of mankind, he yet strenuously adheres to their *primitive* diversity. Unwilling to admit that the theory of one primitive pair was sufficient to account for all the facts, he clearly saw, that the theory of four or five primitive pairs would be in reality beset with just as many difficulties; he therefore had no alternative but the adoption of his theory, for which he seeks a support from some general law.

5. Accordingly he asserts, "that Adam and Eve were neither the only nor the first human beings created." This he seeks

¹ Chr. Ex. March 1850, p. 190.

² Ibid, July 1850, p. 128.

to support by reiterating the old infidel objection to the Bible, which represents Moses himself as intimating, that Cain wandered among foreign nations after he was cursed, that he took "a wife from the people of *Nod*, where he built a city, certainly with more assistance than that of his two brothers."¹ It is hardly necessary to remark to the intelligent reader of the Bible, that the "land of *Nod*" has no reference to the "land of a wandering people," but means the land of *his wandering*. As to his wife, she no doubt was one of his sisters, of whom there may have been many, (Gen. v. 4.), and the intermarriage with whom was no crime under the circumstances. If it formed a part of our present discussion, we might mention many reasons why these intermarriages, which were allowable and necessary in the infancy of the race, were afterwards prohibited by the Divine Lawgiver. And as to the city, who does not know that every small village, the residence of some headman or chieftain, often denominated king, was dignified with the name of city in primitive times? Cain was no doubt looked up to as a chief, by his descendants, of whom he must have seen many before he died, and by the aid of whom he built the city spoken of. We may just as well here refer to another circumstance, sometimes referred to as proving that the earth was always covered with a numerous population. It is, that Nimrod, the great grandson of Noah, became the head of a band, and built cities on the banks of the Tigris and Euphrates, and therefore he must have met a population there, of which he, by the power of his personal qualities, soon made himself chief. Now it is to be observed that this ignores the design and existence of the flood. Its design was to check the growing depravity of mankind, by cutting off all except righteous Noah and his family. Consequently, if the Bible means any thing, it means that no human being was left alive, with that exception, and that the flood prevailed wherever man was to be found, but no further. We are then shut up to Noah and his descendants, of whom there undoubtedly was already a large population in the days of Nimrod, certainly enough to build such cities as Babel, Erech, Accad, and Calneh may at first have been; and which were "the beginning of his kingdom."

6. Agassiz further asserts, that the account given in Genesis chiefly relates to the history of the white race, with special reference to the history of the Jews!² and that no reference is made in the Scriptures to the inhabitants of the Arctic zone,

¹ Chr. Ex. March 1850, p. 185.

² Ibid July 1850, p. 138.

of Japan, of China, of New Holland, or of America.¹ Now here we have an admission, that Adam and Eve were the progenitors of the Jews, and of the white race in general, which are of Caucasian stock. The white race, then, was not created as a nation, but it descended from a single pair. Is not this, at one stroke, destroying the house which he has sought to build? It is, indeed, admitting every thing. But the latter part of his assertion is not true. See Gen. ix. 18 and 19, and x. 5, 25, and 32. The inhabitants of China and Eastern Asia are alluded to under the name of Sinim, and the nations of Africa under the names of Cushim, Lubim, &c. But we have not room to follow these objections any farther. It is sufficient to say, that the primary varieties of the human form and color are properly but three, the Caucasian, Ethiopian, and Mongolian, of whom the progenitors were severally Shem, Ham and Japheth.

Upon the general subject of Agassiz' theory we have several remarks to make.

1. We totally deny the assertion which he and others make, that the diversities existing among the different species of the lower orders of animals are not as great as those existing among the different races of men.² To carry a point they have gone and in the face of facts, magnified a thousand fold the slight diversities found among men, and held every shade of color, or variation of feature, limb, or hair, up to view as some distinguishing mark, whilst they have carefully overlooked far greater diversities in the lower animals; and thus they have tried to reason us into the admission of a plurality of origin. Physical causes could never have produced such diversities, say they, whilst they are obliged to admit that they have produced even greater than these. In Angora, a region of Asiatic Turkey, for example, nearly all the animals, whether existing on the mountains, or in the valleys, become singularly changed. The English rabbit, after a few generations, has ears twice the original length, pendant and reaching to the ground, and with a downy silk-like fur. The goat acquires a long silky-hair from which the finest stuffs are produced.³ One well established fact of this kind, and there are thousands nearly as striking, is worth every thing. It is wilful blindness, for any one, in the face of such facts, to assert, that ascribing to physical causes the power to produce important changes in animals, is ascribing to them more power than to the Creator,

¹ Christian Examiner, July 1850, p. 111. ² Ibid, p. 118.

³ Bachman on Unity of Human Race, p. 204.

and most of all, such professed reverence comes with an ill grace from one who, to support his theory, distorts and denies the plainest teachings of the Bible.

2. That animals and plants, even if we admit, as we are prepared to do, that they originated variously in different provinces, were created in large masses or numbers, so as at once to stock the earth, to clothe its whole surface with verdure, and to make it teem with animal life in some measure as it is at present, is not only highly improbable, but absolutely contrary to the laws according to which the Creator accomplishes his designs in the physical and moral world. We every where see, that he employs no more means or agents than are necessary fully to accomplish the design in view. When he would make provision for the feeding of animals and insects, we admit that it was necessary to create more than one stem of those plants which are fed upon by herbivora. This was necessary, as well to preserve and perpetuate the species as to afford present food, and to make provision for a rapidly increasing stock of animals. If the earth had at once been stocked with its present ratio of animals, then we admit the necessity of the present ratio of vegetable life. But we deny the first and consequently also the second. Multiple individuals of plants were no doubt created, but only as many as were necessary to meet the wants of the case. The same must also be said of animals. The carnivora, it is admitted, could not abstain from food until the herbivora had sufficiently multiplied both to afford food to the former and preserve their own species.¹ The latter were, consequently, necessarily created in larger numbers than single pairs; but yet not beyond the necessities of the case. We are warranted in these conclusions by the narrative in Genesis 1: 11, 20, &c. ; where "God said, Let the earth bring forth grass" &c. and "Let the waters bring forth abundantly" &c. ; as if the appropriate existences sprang forth from each element according to the wants of the new creation. But of man God said, "Let us make man in our image" &c., making him an exception in the mode of his origination. But be this as it may, God undoubtedly provided for the wants of every species of animals in proportioning all things to their several necessities, but no more. It was not necessary that the earth should at once be clothed with verdure, that large communities of animals should exist; for both would be accomplished soon by their rapid increase according to the ordinary laws of reproduction. A single stock of grass, or wheat, we know, is in several years multiplied by

¹ Chr. Examiner, March 1850, p. 189.

millions, and the increase from a single pair of animals is almost incredible in a few years, as evinced in the multiplication of particular varieties of our domestic animals.¹ And as to man, his mission was "to multiply and replenish the earth;" this language is addressed both to Adam and Eve, and to Noah immediately after the flood. What sense would there be in such language if, according to Agassiz, men were created in nations and the earth consequently replenished at once, without any special fruitfulness? It was, besides, not necessary to his well-being that man should exist immediately in masses. He could not, indeed, be happy without society, and therefore Eve was soon formed as a companion for Adam; and greater happiness than *they* enjoyed has probably never since fallen to the lot of any of their posterity. The increase of their descendants was sufficiently rapid to accomplish all the designs of God in man's creation.

3. The theory of Agassiz is, moreover, at war with another law. Whilst we think we see sufficient reasons for believing, that God created *different* species in separate localities; "as far as our knowledge extends, the *same* species of animal or plant is not created at different localities. All our quadrupeds, birds, reptiles, and even our plants in the temperate regions of America, are found to differ from those in every other part of the world."² The resemblance is often very strong, but the species most nearly allied all differ, with the exception of those that have been transported and have become naturalized. The general law seems to be as follows: The animals, which are confined to narrow districts, are found, from their structure, not capable of performing extensive migrations or overcoming great obstacles imposed to their progress, or from their nature are not capable of enduring a great change of physical circumstances; whilst the animals, which are found extensively distributed, have either great powers of locomotion by which they are enabled to follow the changes of the seasons, or are capable of adapting themselves in a short time to a great variety of circumstances. Among the former we may enumerate the Opossum, which is not to be found east of the Hudson river, which barrier it has never ventured to cross; and the common ground mole is found only east of the Rocky mountains, which it cannot pass, whilst another species occurs west of them in Oregon.³ Among the latter we may enumerate the Swallow, whose migrations are adapted to the change of season, and the Beaver, which is capable of migrating both by land and

¹ Bach. Un. Hum. R. pp. 283-4. ² *ibid*, p. 250. ³ *ibid*, p. 264-5.

water, and which is found, without a shade of difference, throughout the whole of North America and Europe.¹ Upon these principles we may explain, why the Rhone, the Rhine, and the Danube each has a different species of perch;² the rivers emptying their waters at widely separated points, these fish cannot make the transit from one to the other, but remain in the localities in which they were at first created; and why others are found so extensively distributed. Many species of fishes and plants have been spread abroad by birds which carried and discharged without injury to their vitality the spawn of the former and seeds of the latter.³ Those animals which are more impressible by external circumstances, migrate more slowly, and sustain, in their change of locality, greater modifications in their physical-characteristics. Thus the common wolf, whose geographical range is nearly equal to the cosmopolite man, furnishes quite as great varieties in his different localities as are to be found among men. The process of gradual migration has actually, of late years, been witnessed in the red fox, whose southern limit, until of late, was Pennsylvania. When, about forty years ago, some individuals were taken from New York to Carolina, the transition was too sudden and they gradually perished. But soon after, the same fox made its appearance in the more elevated portions of Virginia; its migrations continued until, a year ago, it was found in Georgia, without any loss of its activity.⁴ And here, too, we might cite the hundreds of cases of animals and plants which, by the aid of man, have been transported and perfectly acclimated. The theory of Agassiz is, in fact, opposed to all our experience, which is, that we find one species of animals spreading itself abroad by migration, and that too from one district and not from many. History and tradition lead us to the same conclusion in reference to man. To this we will presently turn our attention.

4. If we adopt Agassiz' theory, we must also adopt the absurd and horrible conclusion, that God made men as they now are with all their physical, civil, and moral differences; some he created as savages, others as barbarians, others as civilized, others as enlightened, and all as depraved, thus making God the author of characteristics and qualities, which are manifestly to a great extent, the result of man's own actions. We have the strongest reasons to believe, that in the infancy of the race, although men were not enlightened in the modern sense,

¹ Bachman *Unity of hum. r.* p. 267. ² Agassiz in *Chr. Ex.* p. 192.

³ Bachman *u. h. r.* p. 253.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 274.

which must be regarded as a result of christianity, none were savage or barbarians. These low conditions of humanity have resulted from the fact, that men have given to the physical, the ascendancy over the spiritual part of their nature, and have thus degraded themselves to the condition of mere physical beings; like the beasts of the forest — leading a roaming and precarious life. If, therefore, with Agassiz, “we have no positive record of a people having migrated far, and found countries entirely destitute of inhabitants,”¹ we do not consider it “evidence of the primitive ubiquity of mankind upon the earth,” but rather of the tendency of men to escape from the restraints of religion and of society, to locate themselves where they can live as free as the air, and thus to satisfy the desires of their corporeal at the expense of their intellectual natures.

5. What, however, is the information which we may derive relative to this interesting subject, from history and tradition? These trace the various races of man, as well as the domestic animals, and many of the vegetables he cultivates for his food, to central Asia. This, of course, refers to the post-diluvian population. Where Adam and his immediate descendants were placed, is not capable of being precisely determined. We are, however, “warranted in believing, that man drew his first breath of life in a climate so mild, that existence could be supported and enjoyed without clothing.”² Taking this for granted, the question arises, what were the form and color of our first parents? It appears from an examination of ancient skulls, that the exact original type of the post-diluvians no longer exists; and it is highly probable, that the primeval men were of some shade of brown, intermediate between the extremes, not as light-colored as Europeans, yet not so dark as the African; and that the former is as much an improved as the latter is a degenerate race.³ The African family will be found to be as old, if not older than the European, and at one time to have been highly civilized. But we have insensibly slid into post-diluvian history.

Of a general deluge, in which the whole race of man except one single family were involved, there are found traditions among all nations; among communities the most enlightened by science and literature, as well as tribes the most savage; preserved, amidst all their wanderings and vicissitudes of external circumstances, from the most remote antiquity down to the present time. These traditions, though differing,

¹ Ch. Ex. July, 1850, p. 132.

² Bachman, p. 155.

³ Ibid. pp. 156-7.

as we might expect, in some of their details, nevertheless substantially coincide with the Mosaic account of that same event. This itself is not only corroborative of the truth of the Bible, but also not an unimportant testimony in favor of the common origin of all nations.

From the Bible account of the deluge, confirmed by other indirect evidence, we are led to the conclusion, that the ark, in which were preserved the progenitors of the present world, rested on the mountains of Ararat; not on the top of the double peak now called Ararat, which being exceedingly steep, and extending above the region of eternal frost, would have been entirely unsuitable as a place to issue forth from the ark; but on the flanks or among the elevated vallies of the Taurus, or Hindoo Koosh chain, which formerly went by the name of Ararat. It is more than probable, that the resting place of the ark was somewhere between the Caspian Sea and the Himnelah mountains. There the family of Noah found a lodging place on the fertile lands of Tartary, and thence, when the population had considerably increased, they began to diverge.¹ As Western Asia was, probably, the principal seat of the antediluvian population, and the deluge extended no farther than the human race, the ark may have been drifted a considerable distance from the south west, to lodge not on, but among the eastern branches of the Hindoo Koosh chain. It is remarkable, that this is the region from which tradition and history trace the migrations of man and the animals which he has domesticated.

It appears, that for several generations, the descendants of Noah dwelt near together, enjoying the fruits of the soil and the increase of their flocks. Nimrod, the great grandson of Noah, fond of the chase and of a daring and adventurous disposition, soon however gathered around him congenial spirits, with whom he wandered towards the fertile valley of the Tigris and Euphrates; and colonized them there, laying the foundation of several cities and the beginning of a kingdom. A little later, in the days of Peleg, a formal separation of the descendants of the three sons of Noah took place, Gen. 10: 25.

The family of Ham, or the Negro race, took a southern direction; spreading into India, where there are yet remaining indubitable evidences of the early existence of that race,² and whence they passed through Sumatra into the islands of Borneo, New Holland, New Hebrides, Feejees, &c.;³ but more

¹ Pye Smith's *Scripture and Geology*, p. 387; p. 207; Gen. 11: 2.

² Smyth u. h. r., p. 62. ³ Williams' *Miss. Enterprise*, p. 451.

especially spreading into South Western Asia, and thence into Africa. The original inhabitants of Canaan and adjacent countries, were of the posterity of Ham; as also were those of Egypt, in which, according to recent researches, they were established at a very early period. On the plains of Shinar it was, that the followers of Nimrod, probably joined by others of the family of Shem and Japheth, and led on by that ambitious leader, resolved to build a city and a tower to prevent their dispersion abroad over the face of the earth. Of the cause of their subsequent dispersion, however, as mentioned in the Bible, we find a remarkable confirmation in the singular fact, that the affinity between the ancient Egyptians and Hindoos was most minute in every important particular, *language excepted*. Prichard also affirms, "that traces exist, among *the most distant* nations of Africa of ancient connection with the Egyptians."¹

The family of Japheth, or the Mongolians, took a Northern and Eastern direction, giving rise to the various tribes of ancient Scythia, whose descendants constitute more than one half the present population of the globe, and thus Japheth has been *enlarged*, (Gen. 9: 27). In their northward migrations, some were at first acclimated to the severe climate of Siberia, and thence they passed westward, subject to the same physical conditions, through Northern Europe, into Greenland and Northern America, and peopling those inhospitable regions with tribes under the names of Simoyedes, Laplanders, and Esquimaux. Pressing towards the East they peopled Japan, China, and adjacent countries, and passing down to Southern Asia, forced the Ethiopian race south-eastward into the Australian islands, where they are yet a separate race. And when for want of room, they must extend their borders, they gradually passed into the Polynesian Islands, (Gen. 10: 5,) in the middle latitudes, and over Behring's Straits, on the the north, into America. But of this we shall say more hereafter.

The family of Shem, or the Caucasians, retained a central position, remaining in the region in which they issued from the ark, increasing rapidly, and receiving the permanent impress of its climatic conditions. Expanding their borders with their increasing numbers, they first moved principally towards the west, taking possession of the countries before occupied by the family of Ham, (Gen. chap. 11.); but some of them, too, migrated into Hindoostan, there also pressing before them towards the East the members of the first named family. Thus,

¹ Pye Smith Script. and Geol. p. 270.

between the Mongolians on the North and North-west, and the Caucasians on the West, the Negro race of India was forced into the position it now occupies. Gradually the Caucasians spread through Western Asia into Greece, and the countries lying on both sides of the Mediterranean; taking possession of Egypt, Lybia &c., and pressing their Negro pioneers into the middle and Southern portions of Africa. This westward migration was much accelerated by the predatory and warlike propensity of their Mongolian neighbors, who, under Ghengis Khan and Tamerlane, swept like a whirlwind over Asia, establishing themselves in Turkey, and threatening Europe with desolation. Accordingly, Europe has been filled with Caucasian tribes, pouring themselves westward in a broad stream between the Mongolians on the North, and the Ethiopians on the South, blessing every country with their superior energy, industry and intelligence.

6. These three families, it is believed, will embrace all the varieties among the human race. But neither of them, in the majority of its individuals, will agree with what has been given as its type by some naturalists. These have drawn the characteristics of the Ethiopian race from the most deformed tribes of Negroes, and thus produced a caricature; those of the Caucasian from a few models of exquisite beauty, and thus drawn a portrait to which the millions of Europeans and others belonging to that race would not even approximate; and those of the Monguls from the polar tribes, whose form and features have become permanently abnormal because of the rigor of the climate, and to which the large majority of Japanese and Chinese, who confessedly belong to the same family, are striking exceptions.¹ These three families are, moreover, so closely connected with each other, in many of their historical relations, that we never lose sight of them, as we ascend the stream of history, until we see them all safely lodged together in the Ark. And so gradually do the peculiarities of the one fade into those of the others, that it is easy to find individuals in each, which, if they were not known to be of unmixed race, might be regarded as belonging to one or the other of the rest. 'Among the nations of our own Island,' says Pye Smith, 'and where there can be no doubt of an unmixed English descent, we meet with heads and faces, whose forms, externally at least, approach to the Mongolian, Negro, Hottentot, Patagonian, and Australian; and in the blackest tribes of the heart of Africa, are found heads, whose fine proportions might

¹ Bach. un. hum. r. pp. 270, 271, and 303.

vie with the Circassian or Grecian specimens."¹ The lines of distinction, which have been given as perfectly separating the several races, must, therefore, be regarded as so many imaginary lines drawn to suit the purposes of theorists.

But we have said, that the Mongolian race has spread itself through the Polynesian Islands, and also projected itself into America, and given to it its aboriginal tribes. The polar family, consisting of the Simoyedes, Laplanders, and Esquimaux, are acknowledged, even by Agassiz, to be one and the same, and they are undoubtedly Mongolian. Thus, then, the Esquimaux are Mongolians. The earlier opinions held concerning the peopling of America, were that the various aboriginal tribes were Asiatics, whose progenitors came across by Behring's Straits and the Aleutian or Fox Islands. This opinion has been controverted, and the writings of Dr. Morton have well nigh succeeded in persuading the public, that such could not have been the case, and that the Indians were autochthones or originally and separately created in America. Notwithstanding the authority of his great name, there are some, among whom we mention Dr. Bachman, whose opinion on such a subject is worthy of the highest respect, and Dr. Pickering of the U. S. Exploring Expedition, whose extensive reading and knowledge of species, increased and perfected by the favorable opportunity he enjoyed for comparison and examination during his long voyage, entitle his opinions to more weight than those of any other American writer relative to the question before us, who see sufficient reasons for coming to the conclusion that America derived its original inhabitants from Asia.²

Between the Kalmucs of Siberia and the Esquimaux of N. America there is the closest resemblance; and these tribes are found frequently crossing Behring's Straits from one continent to the other.³ The natives of the two continents on the coasts of the north Pacific Ocean are alike skilled in the use of skin canoes, with which they venture fearlessly on long excursions by sea. The group of Aleutian islands is, moreover, inhabited by the same class of population, so that it is difficult to say where that of Asia *ends*, and that of America *begins*. And Dr. Pickering says, that while "To persons living on the Atlantic shores, the source of the aboriginal population seems mysterious, and volumes have been written upon the subject, had the authors themselves made the voyage of the North

¹ Pye Smith, *Geol. and Script.*, p. 272.

² *Bach. Un. Hum. R.* pp. 272 and 301.

³ *Wrangell's Polar Expedition*, and *Bachman u. h. r.* p. 273.

Pacific," as he had done, "I cannot but think that much of the discussion might have been spared."¹ "We have also on record many evidences that the North Pacific was navigated by the Japanese in days of antiquity."

In countenance, language, modes of life and shades of color, the great mass of the Mongolian family and the various tribes of American Indians bear a striking resemblance. The form of nose, position of eye and eyebrow, width between cheek bones, &c., given as characteristic of the Monguls by Dr. Morton and others, are found to be by no means general, but rather exceptions to their actual characteristics, and only belonging to the inhabitants of the polar regions. If many of the Mongolians from Asia were to be found among the American tribes they could not be distinguished from the latter as a different people. From Greenland down through the whole of America we recognize, with the exception of some tribes on the Western coast of California, Mexico and South America, one great family as acknowledged and contended for by Dr. Morton and Prof. Agassiz, and exhibiting the strongest marks of belonging to the Mongolian family. Having been pressed by their increasing numbers, and probably by intestine strife and the love of adventure and the chase, they precipitated themselves in large numbers into North America, taking with them the dog, their constant companion and the only domestic animal found with them when first discovered by Europeans, and then spread themselves southward as invited by a milder climate and an abundance of game.

In the meanwhile, emigration from the Eastern continent was pressing towards the same country through a different channel. It is asserted that the inhabitants of the numerous islands of the Pacific, in the middle latitudes called together Polynesia, bear a marked resemblance to the Malays. In form and color, traditions, customs, language in which many words are either the same or only slightly varied, and in the fact that they have the same varieties of domestic animals, they bear a strong similarity to each other, and render any other supposition than that the said islands were colonized by the Malays of the continent wholly improbable.

But who are the Malays? They are undoubtedly a branch of the great Mongul family, either pure or slightly mixed with the Hindoo branch of the Caucasians, and modified to a moderate extent in their external characteristics by the effects of their geographical location. These by voluntary migra-

¹ Bachman on unity of human race, p. 302.

tion, and by contrary winds and currents were carried gradually farther and farther eastward, even contrary to the trade winds, until they populated all those islands, and reached the western coast of America in California, Central America, and Peru, where they established themselves in regular communities and attained to a considerable degree of civilization. Williams, in his *Missionary Enterprise*,¹ discusses this subject at considerable length, removes the most weighty objections to his views, and shows how the steps of their progress eastward might have been taken. He adduces instances of irregular winds, especially in February, blowing for days together from the N. W. and W., which have driven the boats of islanders hundreds of miles out of their course, and one in which *he sailed sixteen hundred miles due east* in a few days. We have, moreover, sufficient evidence that there was a time when these islanders, and the Malays in general possessed a higher state of civilization than they do at present; that their boats were of a superior order; that they had considerable skill in their management, and that they by means of them performed extensive voyages. This would be consistent with the known fact, that the early inhabitants of Mexico were civilized, and the probability that they brought with them their knowledge of architecture, of working the metals, the arts of embalming their dead, and of other peculiarities, from the Eastern continent.

There are several points connected with this interesting subject yet remaining, such as the analogy of languages, and the similarity of arrow heads and various other implements in use among the various tribes of men in the earlier periods of society, calculated to strengthen, if possible, the argument in favor of the common origin of all men. But we have already occupied more space than we designed, and therefore must bring this paper to a close. Leaving these points, for discussion, to others who have more leisure, and more abundant materials at hand, we bid adieu to our readers, asking their indulgence for deficiencies occurring in an article prepared under the pressure of numerous other duties.

¹ pp. 450-459.

ARTICLE II.

VOCATION OF THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH.

By S. S. Schmucker, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg.

THE term *vocation* (vocatio) has from time immemorial occupied a position in the nomenclature of Systematic Theology, in application to individual sinners, to designate that invitation given to the unconverted, by the Holy Spirit through the means of grace, to repent of their sins, and accept the offers of mercy on the conditions prescribed in the gospel.¹ But what do we understand by the vocation of a *church*? To this question we shall, in the premises, endeavor to present a generic solution, and then carry out our idea to its specific details, giving a tangible and visible form to the abstract conception.

In a recent number of the Review, we presented our convictions on the subject of Church Development in general; and arrived at the following results: *That those points of doctrine, experience and duty in the Christian religion, are unchangeable, which, in the judgment of the great mass of the Protestant churches, are clearly revealed in God's word, and as far as thus revealed; whilst all not thus clearly determined, all in regard to which a diversity of opinion exists between the different Evangelical churches, are less certain, and are proper subjects for amicable, fraternal discussion and progressive development.* The points which this rule furnished as fundamental and unchangeable, are those enunciated by the Evangelical Alliance of all Protestant churches, held at London in 1846, and re-affirmed by the Synod of our church in Maryland, namely: 1, The divine inspiration, authority and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures; 2, the right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the Scriptures; 3, the unity of the Godhead and the Trinity of Persons therein; 4, the utter depravity of human nature in consequence of the fall; 5, the incarnation of the Son of God, his work of atonement for sinners of mankind, and his mediatorial intercession and reign; 6, the justification of the

¹ Thus *Calovius*: Vocatio ad ecclesiam est infidelium extra ecclesiam positurum ad ecclesiam per verbum et sacramenta a Deo ex gratia dispensata, efficax adductio.

sinner by faith alone; 7, the work of the Holy Spirit, in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner; 8, the divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the obligation and perpetuity of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; and 9, the immortality of the soul, and the judgment of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteous, and eternal punishment of the wicked. These fundamentals stand acknowledged by Protestant Christendom, as so many imperishable pillars of the church. They constitute a zone of light encircling this glorious edifice, seen and admired by all, who do not close their eyes on its benignant rays. On the other hand we maintained, that the appropriate and *extensive field for church development, lies only in nonfundamentals*, in points not clearly determined in the records of inspiration; and that within these bounds the church is developed numerically, geographically, ritually, juridically, exegetically, theologically, and economically.

As the development of the church is confined to nonfundamental aspects of truth, and to points not clearly settled in Scripture, it follows that the special vocation of every portion of the church, must lie in the same field, and be circumscribed by the same metes. It is only in regard to points left undecided in revelation, that we can expect to find the lessons of instruction in the book of Providence, inculcating the propriety of change or amendment. In the progress of this development in nonfundamentals, the particular circumstances and incidents of the phenomenal experience of different churches, will be found to vary. The character of the population, belonging to a particular branch of Christ's visible kingdom, may elevate or reduce the intellectual and literary standard of her ministry, and by consequence that of the ministrations of her sanctuaries. The institutions with which any particular church started in her career, may have derived a peculiar character from the government under which they were adopted, and from the historic influences amid which she was formed. Where arbitrary power has for ages ruled the civil destinies of a people, the management of her ecclesiastical and even domestic affairs, will exhibit a correspondent impress. Even the constitutional peculiarities of particular controlling individuals, who organized the elements thrown into chaotic disorder by the commotions of ecclesiastical revolution, may be traced in the creations to which they give being. Who does not recognize the rigid, disciplinarian tendency of Wesley's mind, in the entire system of government and discipline still retained by that efficient and extended portion of the church of Christ?

Or the regal origin and aristocratic bias of the Church of England, in the strict gradations and conservative tendencies of her episcopal hierarchy; or the lingering habits of subjection to civil superiors, in the consistories and superintendencies of Germany, notwithstanding the strong Congregational convictions of her leaders as to primitive Christianity?

Whilst, therefore, the grand vocation of all portions of the Christian church, is to conform their institutions to the word of God, and to "let their light so shine before men, that they may see their good works and glorify their Father who is in heaven," the history of each individual cluster or denomination of churches, may be peculiarly adapted to inculcate some special lessons of instruction. The general vocation of the Lutheran church, in which all other churches participate with her, we at present pass over; and direct our attention to special duties inculcated by Providence, not on our friends in Europe, but on the *American Lutheran Church*. And when we speak of the American Lutheran Church, we intend not only those Synods now connected with our General Synod, together with the mother Synod of Pennsylvania, by which the General Synod was mainly formed, and to whose influence numerical and theological, the Constitution of that Synod chiefly owes its enlightened and apostolic features; but also all other Synods and individuals, who have acquired a proper consciousness of their concrete existence in this free country, and who sympathize with the circumstances of our times and free institutions. Nor is this designation applicable only to those born in our midst, although they constitute the great mass of our church. We are proud also to number in our ranks many excellent and enlightened, and some learned men, who left the land of our fathers dissatisfied with the civil and ecclesiastical condition of things, and having been conducted by the hand of Providence to this Western world, have not only learned to love the freedom and wisdom of our well-balanced civil institutions; but have also attained a consciousness of the fact, that one grand part of the vocation of the American churches is, to throw off the shackles of traditionary, patristic and symbolic servitude, and availing themselves of the liberty secured by the divorce of church and state, to review the ground of Protestant organization, and to resume the Scripture lineaments of Christianity. Yea, we number men of high standing amongst us, who, under the evangelical influence of our liberal ecclesiastical arrangements, have gradually cast off the impressions of a perverted and neological education, and cordially adopting

the grand fundamentals of Gospel truth, stand forth in defence of evangelical but enlightened Christianity: men, who aim to improve our church not merely by a recurrence to the principles of the Reformation, but also by going higher and drawing from the very fountains of sacred truth and love, whence the reformers themselves derived those streams that refreshed and enlightened the benighted and priestridden nations of Europe: men, too enlightened and well acquainted with the whole field of theological science, to suppose that the three eventful centuries since the Reformation, had made no progress in knowledge, had reflected no light upon the path, on which the church is to travel onward to her appointed destiny.

In Germany the church is still hampered by her relation to the State, to which the majority of the truly pious unwisely cling. She has thus been prevented from settling down on the improved results of a scriptural development, which would have dictated the separation of the fundamentally orthodox from every species of neologians. Had the church in Germany been separated from the State, and all the pious united into one church, adopting merely the three ancient creeds, the Apostolical, the Nicene and the Athanasian, and required a rigid bona fide assent to them, with a scriptural system of church discipline; the divine power of the Gospel would not only have soon given preponderance to this emancipated and apostolic church, and spread her influence over the whole land; but she would actually have possessed far more doctrinal purity than at present; for now every form of heresy from the mildest Semipelagianism to the rankest Socinianism and Deism, Communism and Pantheism, are found within her pale. And should even the Augsburg Confession and Heidelberg Catechism have been added, with the express proviso, that any person holding the tenets of either of these symbols, or a selection from both, should be regarded in good standing in the renovated church, all insuperable difficulties would have been removed. A separation would thus be effected between the neologians and orthodox, distinct churches would be organized, and experience would soon prove, that the neological religious consciousness sits too loosely on the mind, to urge its subjects to a voluntary support of their ministry; whilst the friends of Jesus would there, as in our own country, in England and Scotland, give a moderate though adequate support to those ministrations of the sanctuary, with which they believe their salvation closely connected. But hitherto the attachment to state establishments, conflicting pecuniary interests, and the lingering spirit of sectarianism, have

frustrated this happy result. From the bottom of our hearts we say, both in regard to Germany and our own country, *Faxit Deus feliciter!*

But in our own happy land, in which all can worship God unmolested, under their own vine and fig tree; in this asylum for the oppressed of all nations, this heaven-appointed theatre for the free development of man in his social, civil and religious interests, our church, standing on her high vantage ground should review the past, carefully ponder the lessons it teaches, and maintain a position, which, whilst it is firmly based on the fundamentals of the Gospel, adds only those peculiarities of our ecclesiastical ancestors, which have generally commended themselves to the enlightened, orthodox, and pious portions of our church, and vindicates a rational liberty on all other points. What are the great landmarks of this position, how it can best be secured, and in how far it has been attained by our General Synod, are points which will be more clearly perceived in the progress of our discussion.

I. Since, as eldest sister of the Reformation, our church was first to profess the grand Protestant principle of exclusive, infallible authority of the Bible, in antithesis to tradition and human authority, and yet was prevented from carrying it out to its legitimate sequences; it is part of her vocation to complete the work so happily begun.

The sufficiency of a revelation from heaven, without the auxiliary light of tradition is the natural corollary of its divinity itself. The very reason which rendered the one necessary, implies the invalidity of the other. If uninspired human teachings had been reliable, as sources of new truth, a revelation would have been superfluous. Hence the fact, that God inspired holy men of old to speak as the Spirit guided them, seems to establish the insufficiency of mere uninspired human deduction. But this word of revelation being admitted as divine, its own declarations must forever settle this point. The same inspired Apostle who declared all Scripture to be divinely inspired, (*θεόπνευστος*) and able not only to subserve some purposes of the man of God, but to make him "*perfect,*" thoroughly furnished, not only for some, but "*for all good works;*" has also explicitly pronounced the holy Scriptures competent to teach us the supreme and vital interests of man, "*able to make us wise unto salvation.*" Whilst he warns us to beware of any and every teacher, even if it were an angel from heaven, who should preach any other doctrine than that taught by

himself, (and contained in his epistles), and whilst he pronounces the curse of God upon him; the disciple whom Jesus loved, in the book placed last in the canonical collection, whether last written or not, adds the fearful menace: "if any one shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book." Since, then, it is evident that God designed his revelation to be as complete as it is infallible, to be the standing and only certain guide to his church in all ages; we urge the inquiry upon every ingenuous mind, upon every true disciple of our blessed Master, and especially upon ministers of the Gospel, what should be our unflinching determination on this subject? Certainly that, which the noble minded Luther and his Spartan band of coadjutors adopted, to adhere to the word of God in opposition not only to angels and devils, but to popes, cardinals and councils, whenever in our judgment, they come in conflict with this divinely authenticated voice of Heaven. "No man (said Luther) can or ought to doubt, that every thing contrary to the commands of God, whether it be living or dying, taking a vow or becoming free, speaking or remaining silent, is to be condemned, and by all means to be abandoned, changed and avoided. For the will of God must be supreme, and must be done in heaven and on earth. *Math. 6: 10.*" And if the professions of any man were ever put to the test, Luther's were at the memorable diet of Worms, when summoned to recant his doctrines before that august court of the empire. His truly sublime answer, synonymous with that of the apostle's to the Jewish Sanhedrim, and given when he expected it would cost his life, has for three centuries been the subject of admiration to the civilized world: "Except I can be convinced by clear and conclusive reasoning, or by proofs taken from the Holy Scriptures, I neither can nor will recant; because it is neither safe nor advisable to do any thing which is against my conscience. Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise; God help me! Amen." The same principle he has expressed in various parts of his works. One or two passages must suffice. "Hitherto," says he, "all cases which arose concerning true and false doctrine were referred to a council, or to the pope at Rome, or to the universities, which were to be umpires. But these are not Gilead, they have misled and deceived us. — But the Holy Scriptures pronounce the decision, as to whose instructions are correct or erroneous. For although the Holy Ghost instructs every one in his heart, so that he knows what is right; it is still necessary to resort to the Scriptures, in order to prove the accuracy of our views. It is the Scriptures which decide whether our faith is

correct or not. Therefore we can look for no farther evidence either of the fathers or councils; but must adhere exclusively to the clear declarations of Scripture.”¹ Again, “God’s word is the only certain rule which cannot deceive us.”² Once more: “The right of free judgment we must retain, so as not to suffer ourselves to be bound indiscriminately by what the councils or fathers have taught: but we must make this difference, if they have decided and appointed any thing according to God’s word, we also receive it, not on their account, but on account of the same divine word, on which they rest and to which they refer us.”³ Here, then, we have a distinct avowal of the paramount and exclusively infallible authority of the Scriptures, an avowal in direct conflict with the oath which he had taken when he was created Doctor of Divinity, in which he had solemnly sworn “to obey the church of Rome and not to teach any doctrines condemned by her.”⁴

And shall it be supposed that he, whose sublime principles thus elevated him above the fear of emperors and kings, and cardinals and popes, contended against popes and bishops only to occupy their station himself, and wield a similar authority? That he who was so evidently guided by the fear of God, when contending against the decrees of councils, the authority of the fathers, and the bulls of popes, did so in order that men should bow to his opinions and make him the subject of similar idolatry? No, he neither did so himself, nor did others attempt it during his lifetime. It was not until more than a quarter of a century after his death, that *not the church* or body of believers; but some *secular princes* usurping authority not confided to them by God, together with some learned and excellent, but mistaken theologians, undertook to prescribe a doctrinal test to ministers in general, and thus dictate to them not only the general and fundamental doctrines of Christianity,

¹ Luther’s Works, Walch’s edit. vol. 3. p. 754.

² Vol. 1. p. 1854. ³ idem vol. 11. p. 631.

⁴ As this oath is a literary curiosity, we subjoin it in the original, for the gratification of our learned readers: “Ego juro Domino Decano et Magistris Facultatis Theologiæ obedientiam et reverentiam debitam, et in quocunque statu utilitatem universitatis, et maxime Facultatis Theologicæ, pro virili mea procurabo, et omnes actus theologicos exercebo in mitra, (nisi fuerit religiosus) vanas, peregrinas *doctrinas, ab ecclesia damnatas, et piarum aurium offensivas non dogmatisabo, sed dogmatisantem Dn. Decano denunciabo intra octendium, et manutenebo consuetudines, libertates et privilegia Theologicæ Facultatis pro virili mea, ut me Deus adjuvet, et Sanctorum evangeliorum conditores. — Juro etiam Romanæ ecclesiæ obedientiam, et procurabo pacem inter Magistros et Scholasticos seculares et religiosos, et biretum in nullo alio gymnasio recipiam.*” Lib. Statutorum facultatis theol. Academiæ Wittenberg. Cap. 7.

but an extended detail of particulars, in one case at least, commanding the belief of a doctrine from which Luther had receded, the ubiquity or omnipresence of Christ's body! Yes, let it ever be remembered that Luther himself was no symbolic Lutheran, and that this whole system of minute confessional servitude, was riveted on the church long after Luther and Melancthon had been translated to a better world.

But although these two distinguished servants of Christ, guided by their supreme reverence for the Bible, accomplished wonders in casting off the major part of the errors and prejudices of their Romish education; they did not live to complete the work, nor had they power to introduce all the reforms, the necessity of which had become clear to their vision. They were therefore alike too wise and too humble, to desire the stadium of their attainments to be the *ne plus ultra* of reform. Against the practice of designating the church of the Reformation by his name, Luther protested in the most energetic manner, alledging it to be a repetition of the Corinthian sectarianism, condemned by Paul. "The papists," says he, "may well have party names, because they are not satisfied with the doctrines and names of Christ, and desire also to be popish. Then let them be called after the pope, who is their master. *But I am not and will not be any one's master.*" Yet it was not only against this abuse of his name, that the noble-hearted Luther protested; it was far from his desire that his writings should be invested with binding authority on his successors. "If any person," said he in the latter part of his life (1539), "desires to have my writings, let him by all means not suffer them to interfere with his study of the Scriptures themselves, but treat them as I do the papal decrees, and the works of the sophists, that is, though I occasionally look into them to see what they have done, or to take an account of the history of the times, it is not for the purpose of studying them, as though I must act according to their views."¹ "I have no catalogue of my works, and not even all the books themselves, and I would much rather that men would read the Bible alone, instead of my works."² And finally he says, "Read my books, compare them with the writings of our opponents, and both with the Scriptures, and then judge them, according to this touchstone."³

It is therefore the duty of Christians of the present day, and especially of this favored country, where liberty of conscience

¹ Preface to his German Works.

² Letter to Ursinus.

³ Luther's Works, 3d vol. p. 256.

is our birthright, to act on the noble principles adopted by these reformers, and to reduce them to practice in those cases also, in which their Romish education prevented them from doing so. It is the special vocation of the American Lutheran church to forsake, as she has done, those remnants of Romanism and also those ante-papal superstitions which the church of Rome had borrowed from the earlier fathers, and which the first reformers failed to renounce. It is our vocation to cast off all regard for the authority of the fathers, Nicene and Ante-Nicene, Romish and Protestant, excepting what justly attaches to them on account of the intrinsic force of their arguments, or their character and opportunities as witnesses of facts; for no point in patristic theology is more fully established than the numerous and serious aberrations of even some of the earliest so-called fathers from the truth of God. Yea, it is certain, that the whole of them as a body are not more reliable as expositors of Scripture, than the same number of respectable authors in the different evangelical churches of our day. It is our duty to do as Luther did, to look up through the long vista of antiquity to the era of the apostles, and from that high standpoint to form a scriptural judgment not only of the corruptions of Rome, but of the doctrines and practice of all past ages. Had Luther acted on the principles of many now bearing his name, he would have founded his Christianity and the organization of his church on the basis of his great theological favorite, *Augustine*. He would have selected some one or more of his works, either that entitled "*De Civitate Dei*," in which he defends the Christian religion against the heathen, or more probably his "*Enchiridion, (or Manual) ad Laurentium, sive de fide, spe et caritate liber*," in which he gives an account of his doctrinal views and those of the church. This he would have made symbolical, pledging himself to abide by its contents for life, and binding all who united with his ministry to the same production. And this church he would have baptized as the *Augustinian church*. But no, Luther had not so learned Christ. He could discriminate between inspired and un-inspired writings, between the books of God and those of men. Whilst, therefore, he avowed his assent to the three ecumenical creeds, the Apostolic, the Nicene and the Athanasian, which are confined to fundamentals, and are very short, he never adopted as binding any extended creed, nor suffered any human productions to deprive him of that liberty conceded by the word of God. He continued through life to improve his views of doctrine and duty, by the light of Scripture, and in the most emphatic language inculcated on others the obligation

to do likewise. That he was intolerant to Zwingli and his followers, belongs to the imperfections of the age and of the man, not to his general principles of action. *Temporum culpa fuit, non ejus.* And were he still living we doubt not, he would hurl his denunciation at the intolerant Ultra-Lutherans of our day, as he did at Carlstadt and Zwingli of old, only, by this time, in milder phrase.

How completely our General Synod has fulfilled her vocation in this respect, is evident from the fact that she makes no reference to the fathers ancient or modern, thus leaving them all to stand on their intrinsic merits as theological authority, and as witnesses to historical facts; whilst the former Symbolical books, after having pronounced the fathers fallible, nevertheless cite their views and arguments in multitudes of cases.

II. *As she has experienced the baneful effects of transfundamental and very extended creeds, it is her vocation to correct the evil.*

We have seen that Luther never desired any of his publications to be binding on others. Still farther was any disposition of this kind, removed from the mind of the unassuming Melancthon. All those publications of theirs, which were afterwards made symbolical, were composed and published for other purposes. How then did it happen, that these publications assumed so unexpected a character? The true state of the facts in the case is, we think, given by Dr. Köllner, in his *Symbolik*.¹ "The Symbolical books (as they are afterwards styled,) were at first merely an expression of what *was* believed, and afterwards they became the rule of what *must* be believed. But when, and how this was first done, by public authority, it is very difficult to determine. The traces and evidences of it are often fallacious; because cases in which such a subscription to a creed was merely requested and voluntarily given, may easily be adduced as cases in which the subscription was commanded. It however appears to be true, that some individual symbols had so much authority attributed to them, as to be recommended as rules of faith and of instruction, and in some instances also commanded, long before the formation of the Form or Concord," (which was *half a century* after the publication of the Augsburg Confession). "Nevertheless, this does not appear to have occurred every where at the same time, nor in the same manner; nor does the principle of binding men to the symbols, seem to have

¹ Vol. I. p. 106, 107.

been a universal and prevailing one, prior to the formation of the Form of Concord in 1580, or before the prevalence of the controversies which originated from its formation. But a change took place about the time the Form of Concord was composed, and on account of its formation and after it. Prior to this time, some cases had occurred of oppressive coercion in matters of faith, and of compulsory adoption of the symbols as a rule of faith and instruction; but afterwards they became more numerous." These positions Dr. Köllner sustains by numerous authorities, which even fix the precise time, when, at different places, the custom of demanding assent to these symbols was first introduced. It seems evident, therefore, that the habit of ascribing normative or binding authority to these books, though in a few instances it was done at an early day, was of gradual growth, and did not become general for *half a century after the Augsburg Confession was published* and used as an expose or profession of faith, and *many years after the death of Luther.*

It was the mistaken impression, that a general introduction and more stringent exaction of assent to these books, and the fabrication of another determining the several disputed points left free in them, would secure peace, that led to the formation of the Form of Concord, and to the imposition on the church, of the whole system of symbolic oppression. Whilst we deny the wisdom and dispute the Scripture authority of the political rulers of a country to impose any, much less such extended confessions of faith on their subjects; we nevertheless do not doubt the upright and benevolent intention of the Elector Augustus of Saxony, and of John William Duke of Weimar, in ordering their principal theologians to Altenburg, to deliberate on the best method of terminating these disputes; nor of the Duke of Wurtemberg, and of Julius, Duke of Brunswick, in imposing on the distinguished James Andreae of Tübingen and his associates, the duty of preparing the Form of Concord, which was finally adopted, and together with all the other symbolical books, made binding in their territory, June 25th, 1580. Nor do we hesitate to concede the purity of those distinguished divines, who cordially coöperated in this work. That diversity of opinion existed among the followers of Luther, on different points of nonfundamental importance, is historically certain; and when his death removed that restraint, which his personal influence and energy of character had imposed on them, they gave free utterance to their opinions. A very large proportion of the divines rejected Luther's view of

the bodily presence in the Lord's Supper, and coincided more or less with that of Melancthon. It is also certain, that their wily enemies the Catholics, were employing these differences as arguments to urge upon the Emperor the revocation of the treaty of peace of 1555, which limited toleration to those, who worshipped according to the Augsburg Confession.¹ This was, however, only a pretext, and would not have induced the Emperor to venture on such a step, until political reasons inclined him to it. When this contingency actually did arise, about forty years afterwards, the forcible extinction of Protestantism was attempted by fire and sword, although the Form of Concord had driven from the bosom of the Lutheran church, the great mass of those who could not embrace all the peculiarities of the Augsburg Confession. We strongly favor the opinion, that the adoption of a liberal platform, by uniting the two great branches of the Protestant church, or rather by preventing in a great degree the schism itself, would have presented so formidable a front, as to have prevented the "Thirty years' War."

But that the adoption of the Form of Concord, and with it that unreasonably extended symbolic system, however well-intended, was a mistaken step, is evident from various considerations. It may justly be objected that the Scriptures have furnished us no confession of faith, an omission that was certainly not accidental, if their inspiration be conceded. Nor have they conferred authority on any one, to impose such a yoke upon the church, or to abridge her liberty in nonessentials. The only grounds which justify the adoption of even a short creed, are to exclude fundamental errorists, those who deny that Jesus is the Christ, or reject any other vital truth of the Gospel, and to produce uniformity sufficient for harmonious coöperation. Accordingly, during the golden age of Christianity, under the guidance of the Apostles and their successors, the church for three centuries had no other creed than that termed the Apostolic and then the Nicene Creed. It was the opinion of the Nicene fathers who framed that creed, that its specifications were sufficiently ample for all practical purposes. Athanasius, himself the Coryphæus of the orthodox party in that council, thus unequivocally expresses their conviction: "Ἡ, γάρ ἐν αὐτῇ παρά τῶν πατέρων κατα τὰς θείας γραφὰς ὁμολογηθεῖσα

¹ The fourth article of the treaty was in these words: Attamen ceteri omnes, qui alteri prænominatarum harum binarum religionum (that is, the Lutheran and Catholic) non sint adhærentes, sub hac pace non comprehensi, sed plane exclusi esse debant." For Zwinglians and Calvinists there was no toleration in this treaty.

πίσις, ἀντάρχης ἐστὶ πρὸς ἀνατροπὴν μὲν πάσης ἀσεβείας, συστάσιν δὲ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἐν Χριστῷ πίσεως.¹ (For the faith avowed in it by those fathers in conformity to the word of God, is sufficient for the subversion of all impiety and for the establishment of all godliness, and of the faith in Christ.) The Emperor Zeno also wrote an epistle, urging all the discordant parties to unite on this creed, promising in that event to hold communion with them, and added that *the church should never receive any other symbol than that framed by the Nicene fathers.*² But whilst the above-named considerations justify these brief summaries of faith, and a moderate extension of them, so as to exclude all subsequent fundamental errorists; they by no means establish the propriety of that vastly extended collection of symbols adopted by the Lutheran princes some time after Luther's death, which deprived that church of all reasonable liberty in points of minor importance.

That our view of the inexpediency of such extended creeds is just, may also be inferred from the circumstance that the major part of all these Lutheran symbols was rejected by one or more of the Lutheran kingdoms, even when they did not in all cases dissent from the doctrines taught in them. Indeed, as *Dr. Hase* justly remarks: "*the Augsburg Confession is the only one of them all, that was received throughout the entire Lutheran church.*" Yet strange to tell, some of our native Americans exhibit less love for their liberty of conscience, than the subjects of the regal and despotic governments of the old world! I. The *Form of Concord* was rejected by the *kingdom of Denmark*. "The king though invited to adopt it refused to do so, by advice of his clergy, who disapproved of it, because peace and unity of doctrine prevailed in his dominions, and he feared its introduction would *create strife and divisions*. So bitterly was the king himself opposed to it, that he took the copy (decorated with pearls and gold) which had been sent to him from Germany and cast it into the fire."³ It subsequently acquired more popularity, but was never publicly acknowledged as symbolical.⁴ The *Kingdom of Sweden* did not receive the form of Concord, nor concede proper symbolic authority to the other symbolical books, except the Augsburg Confession. Still at a later period (1593), the *Form of Concord* received a tolerably formal acknowledgment,

¹ Evag. Lib. III. c. 14. ² Taylor's Liberty of Prophecy, p. 72.

³ Köllner's Symbolik, vol. I. p. 575, 576.

⁴ Baumgarten's Concordien-buch, p. 184, 185. Mosh. Eccles. Hist. vol. III. p. 155, Dr. Murdock's edit. ⁵ Hutterus Redivivus, p. 116.

(ziemlich förmlich Anerkennung).¹ It was also rejected by *Hessia, Pomerania, Holstein*, (for more than half a century), *Anhalt*, and the cities *Frankfort, Speier, Worms, Nürnberg, Magdeburg, Bremen, Danzig, &c.*² II. *The Smalcald Articles* were rejected by the Lutheran church in Sweden and Denmark. In Sweden the Symbolic books generally are now regarded as an authorized explanation of the Lutheran faith; yet the Symb. books of the Danish church, lately published, like those of the Swedish church in 1644, (entitled Confession of the *Swedish* faith, approved by the council of Upsal in 1593,) contains only the so-called Apostles' Creed, the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, and the Augsburg Confession, to which the Danish Confession adds the Smaller Catechism of Luther. Both these collections exclude the Smalcald Articles. Guericke's Symb. p. 67, and his History, first ed. p. 807. III. *The Apology to the Augsburg Confession* was denied official symbolic authority, by Sweden and Denmark. Guericke sup. cit. IV. *The Larger Catechism* of Luther was denied formal symbolic authority in Sweden and Denmark. Guericke sup. cit. V. Even *the Smaller Catechism* of Luther was not received as symbolic in Sweden. Yet in both these kingdoms these Catechisms are highly prized, and the Smaller, if we mistake not, is used for the instruction of youth. Guericke, p. 113. Here, then, we behold the judgment of about one half of the different Lutheran kingdoms and principalities of Europe, announced in the most unequivocal and emphatic manner, in opposition to this extensive system of symbolic restriction; given too when these parties were fresh from the scenes of the Reformation, and warm in the principles by which that glorious moral revolution had been achieved. Surely, these lessons of instruction ought to be heeded by the friends of reviving Lutheranism in Germany, and still more by those in this country who were "born free," but some of whom, from a zeal for Lutheranism, sincere we doubt not, but mistaken, seem disposed to sell their birthright.

Again, the infelicity of this Procrustean symbolical system which was completed by the Form of Concord, is demonstrated from its having *cost the Lutheran church a large portion of her ecclesiastical territory*, estimated at *about one-fourth of all her churches in Germany!* It drove off two numerous classes of persons, those who believed in the real presence as Luther did, but with him also rejected the ubiquity of the Savior's glorified body; and those who agreed with Melancthon on

¹ Guericke's Symb. 2d ed. p. 112, 113. ² Köllner, p. 577.

the Lord's Supper, as well as on some other topics, but wished to remain in the Lutheran church, as Melancthon had done.

Had the civil rulers and their theologians been satisfied with the Augsburg Confession, and conceded liberty on all points left undecided that symbol, the Reformed church would probably never have gained a foothold in Germany. In 1580, when the Form of Concord was proclaimed, there were but two Reformed congregations in all Germany, namely those of Bremen and Neustadt. But such was the unpopularity of this book, that in consequence of it and other related causes, in thirty years about one-fourth of the Lutheran churches in Germany had gone over to the Reformed communion. If it be objected, that the peculiar views of Luther on some points would have been abandoned, if they had not been stereotyped in a creed, and conformity to them been exacted by the civil authority; we reply, this would not have been the case to any considerable extent. But if any of the peculiar views of Luther, should prove unable to sustain themselves in fair and equal conflict on the ground of reason and Scripture, the presumption would arise, that they are destitute of scriptural foundation, and on Luther's own principles, ought to be abandoned. The exaction of the Form of Concord, however, robbed the church of her liberty on many points not decided in the Confession of Augsburg, and thus drove thousands away from the Lutheran communion, either because they could not conscientiously adopt all the specifications of the new symbol, or if they did believe them, regarded it as unjust to condemn their brethren, and eject them from the church, because of non-essential differences of opinion. Indeed, had Luther and Melancthon lived at that time, they would both have been excluded by this creed from the church which they founded, the former for not believing the ubiquity of the Savior's body, and the latter for rejecting that and several other opinions affirmed in it; for as the distinguished historian, Dr. Stäudlin justly observes: "This creed made binding the doctrinal system of the rigid Lutherans; which *went beyond the doctrines of Luther himself*, (*welche selbst über Luther's Lehren hinausgegangen waren*), and took cognizance of all the controverted points, which had previously been discussed."¹

In confirmation of our position we shall advance the testimony of but two historians. Touching the effects of the Form of Concord, Dr. Henke says: "But the most lamentable consequence of the book of Concord was, that whilst the

¹ Stäudlin's *Universal Geschichte der Christlichen Kirche*, p. 308.

number of *new Reformed churches* was constantly increasing in Germany, (for previously there were but two; namely in Bremen and in Neustadt on the Hardt), the mutual sectarian hatred of both Protestant parties was visibly increased, their interests were divided and their mutual security jeopardized."¹ And the celebrated Lutheran historian, Dr. Plank, in his excellent and able *History of Protestant Theology*,² thus distinctly sustains our position: "This alone could be the result, and this alone was the result (namely of the adoption of the Form of Concord), that not only a number of individual theologians but also a number of whole churches, which had hitherto belonged to the Lutheran party, gradually approximated nearer to the Calvinists, and soon formally and fully united with them. In the year 1580, at the time of the publication of the Formula, there were but two churches in Germany that had positively declared themselves for the Calvinistic doctrine on the Lord's Supper.—At the close of the century, however, and therefore within the next twenty or thirty years, perhaps *fully one-fourth* of all the Protestant churches in the empire, had given in their full adhesion to this party. This was such a natural consequence that it could not fail to follow. Already during the preliminary negotiations which had been conducted before the publication of the Formula, on the subject of its adoption, the ministers of a number of churches, as for instance of Hesse Cassel, of Nassau, of Anhalt, and of Zweibrücken, had declared in the most positive manner, that they never would submit to having the hypothesis of Christ's ubiquity forced upon them, either as a collateral idea in the doctrine of the Supper, or as a distinctive idea of the doctrine of the person of Christ. Yet these very churches in part declared just as decidedly, that they had every disposition to retain and profess the true Lutheran presence of Christ, as contained in the language of the Augsburg Confession and that of the unaltered edition.—It thus happened, and that too in the natural course of things, that the very party which they had desired more particularly to suppress by means of the Form of Concord, that the Calvinistic party, now for the first time obtained such a footing, that the continuance of its existence was secured forever in Germany."

Assuredly, then, the fact that this extended symbolic system drove from the Lutheran church in Germany one-fourth of all

¹ Henke, vol. III. p. 464.

² Page 19, 20, 21, and also p. 420 and 421 of this Review, where the entire passage will be found.

her congregations, and was rejected by one-half of the kingdoms and principalities constituting the great Lutheran brotherhood, whose history fills so large a space in the annals of Europe during the last three centuries, should lead those amongst us, who have, without the most careful and extensive examination of the subject, eulogised this Form of Concord, to reflect. We know the impartiality of Dr. Plank has been called in question, but it is in vain. The undeniable facts of history establish his positions. It will not be supposed, that all those kingdoms and principalities rejected those books out of love to them, and refused to concede to them symbolic authority because they thought them fully deserving of it. And that they did reject them cannot and will not be denied. The testimony of Dr. Plank is, therefore, true, and facts will bear out the distinguished historian, Dr. Schroeck, in his honorable tribute to the merits of Dr. Plank: "The history of the Form of Concord, published by Anthon, deacon at Schmiedberg, in Electoral Saxony, is elaborated from the best of sources with much industry and accuracy. But here, also, as in the history of the antecedent controversies, *Dr. Plank has surpassed his predecessors* in acute penetration and impartial judgment."¹

That this extended symbolic system was a mistaken one, is further evident from the fact, that it *failed to exclude disputes and differences from the church* even where fully adopted; and infused greater acerbity of spirit into those controversies which occurred. Who that is acquainted with the history of those times, does not know, that whilst the adoption and enforcement of the Form of Concord and other confessions, decided what should thenceforth be regarded as authorized Lutheranism on many minor points which had before been left free, thus giving greater fixedness and detail to the symbolical system; it nevertheless failed to alter the convictions of those, whose views it condemned. Some of the very princes and theologians who had advocated its formation, were dissatisfied with it when finished. Such was the case of Julius Duke of Brunswick and his theologians. "In Saxony itself says Dr. Mosheim, not a few detested in their hearts, that Formula which they subscribed with their hands, holding fast the doctrines which they had received from Melancthon and his friends." On the accession of Christian I. they aimed at the rejection of the Form of Concord, the omission of exor-

¹ Schroeck's Kirchengeschichte, Vol. iv, pp. 648, 649. "Aber auch hier, wie in der Geschichte der vorhergehenden Streitigkeiten hat Herr Consist. Rath Plank, durch eindringende Scharfsicht und unparteiische Würdigung seine Vorgänger übertroffen."

cism in the Form of Baptism, and in general the dissemination of Melancthonian views. As to the century immediately following the adoption of this extended symbolical system, the distinguished historian just cited, employs the following language: "During this whole century (the 17th), the Lutheran church was *greatly agitated*; partly by controversies among the principal doctors, to the great injury of the whole community; and partly by the extravagant zeal and plans of certain persons, who dissiminated new and strange opinions, uttered prophecies, and attempted to change all our doctrines and institutions. The controversies which drew the doctors into parties, may be fitly divided into the greater and the less; the former such as disturbed the whole church, and the latter such as disquieted only some parts of it."¹ False as is the charge of the Romish Stanislaus Rescius, that the Lutheran church had in less than a century given birth to two hundred and seventy sects,² there is but too much truth in the gloomy picture drawn by that master of ecclesiastical history Dr. Mosheim. Of similar import is the testimony of Dr. Henke. "The Form of Concord, says he, much rather gave rise to new cases of discord. Papal divines rejoiced, and ridiculed as well this peace measure, as the contentions which it was designed to settle, but which it only aggravated." Indeed the bare enumeration of these controversies, the *Melancthonian* or *Crypto-Calvinistic*, the *Zwinglian*, the *Calixtine*, the *Synergistic*, the *Helmstadian*, the *Pietistic* controversies, together with those concerning the *Ubiquity* or *omnipresence of Christ's body*, and the *Hypostatic union* of the two natures in Christ, and many others, will suffice to establish the position we affirm, whilst they stand as lasting monuments of the futility of extended creeds, either to prevent controversy or to promote unity of sentiment. Yea instead of casting oil upon the troubled waters, this extended symbolic system, did but agitate the church the more, and divert her attention alike from her spiritual growth within, and from efforts to continue her extension without. The extent and engrossing character of these intellectual conflicts, may be read in the fact, that on a single one of these disputes, the hypostatic or personal union of the two natures in Christ, about

¹ Mosheim, vol. III, p. 157 of Murdock's ed.

² In his *Tractatus de Atheismis and Phalarismis Evangelicorum*, p. 327. Köcher, p. 213.

two thousand works were published,¹ and that distinguished servant of Christ, Augustus Hermann Francke, was formally charged with thirty heresies!! Numerous other testimonies might be adduced, to prove the augmented intensity given to these controversies by the adoption of these symbolic books; but it is self-evident to every intelligent mind, that when a controverted topic is made the subject of symbolic decision, and the divines holding one opinion are in danger of losing their living and of seeing their families robbed of bread, the discussions will acquire a double violence from the self-interest, necessarily involved in the result.

Finally, the inaptitude of this extended symbolic system is loudly proclaimed by the fact, that even in those countries which did receive all these books, not only the neologians, but *the great majority of those who adhere to the fundamental doctrines of the Bible, have renounced the symbolic authority of these writings, and regard them as in many points defective exhibitions of divine truth.* In not a single kingdom or principality of Germany, is unqualified assent to them any longer required. On this subject let us again listen to the testimony of Dr. Köllner, Professor of Theology in Leipsic, an author whose statement of historical facts cannot be successfully impugned. In his recent work on Symbolics, he says:² “That these symbolical books actually teach the doctrines of the Scriptures, is confessedly a point disputed not only by many, but by a majority of the ministers of the church.”—“The truth seems to be that the prominent doctrines of Christianity are undoubtedly taught in these symbols, such as the depravity of man, the necessity of Redemption through Christ, and of pardon and justification solely by the grace of God. But these fundamental truths are expressed in a manner, which, whilst it may perhaps accord with individual passages of Scripture, is inconsistent with its general tenor, and fails to distinguish the outward form of the Revelation from its inward kernel.” And again, “It may as well be openly acknowledged and affirmed for the benefit of the church, that *there are but few divines, who yet believe and teach the views of the symbolical books; and of these some are prejudiced fanatics, and others, however orthodox they profess to be, give their own interpretation to these books.*”³ “Under these cir-

¹ “Atqui hinc sexcenti, quid dico sexcenti, bis mille libri conscripti sunt de communicatione idiomatum, de unione hypostatica, &c. *Elementa Theol. Dog.* Vol. II. p. 93,

² Vol. I. p. 146. ³ *idem.* p. 148.

cumstances it is evident, that these books can no longer serve as a rule of doctrine :”¹ “For not only have the rationalists abandoned them, the leading champions of orthodoxy have also deviated from them, such as Doederlein, Morus, Michaelis, the venerable Reinhard, Knapp, Storr, Schott, Schwartz, Augusti, Marheinecke, Hahn, Olshausen, Tholuck and Hengstenberg.”² That our prominent divines in this country within the same period have done the same, such as Drs. Endress, Lochman, H. A. Mühlberg, and the great mass of our divines now living, and of our church during the last quarter of a century, we fully established in our *Vindication of American Lutheranism*, in the Lutheran Observer during the past year. It was therefore natural that the Synod of Pennsylvania many years ago ceased to require a pledge of conformity to any of these symbols; as we also proved in the vindication referred to, by the testimony of two highly respectable divines still spared to the church, and as we know personally since thirty years, when we were licensed by that body. Still, to be without any other symbol than the Bible, was manifestly a defect, and how did the General Synod, believing it such, and feeling herself called to furnish a remedy, fulfil her vocation? She did it, we reply, in a manner, evincing alike her consciousness of the progress of theological science, and the scriptural development of the church, as well as her respect for her ecclesiastical ancestry; in a manner, we venture to affirm, that has commanded the respect of all enlightened divines of other churches, and has been signally blessed of God for her own enlargement and improvement. She required unqualified assent to the Bible, and an assent to the Augsburg Confession, as a substantially correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Bible. She did it by establishing her Theological Seminary on the same doctrinal basis, not for the purpose of teaching the Symbolic system of the sixteenth century, for her leading members had all relinquished some of its features; but as her Constitution, adopted in 1825, just a quarter of a century ago, explicitly declares, to prepare men to teach, not all the doctrines or aspects of doctrine in the Augsburg Confession, but the “*fundamental doctrines;*” and not those aspects of doctrine which might be considered fundamental peculiarities of that Confession, but “the fundamental doctrines of the Scriptures,” those aspects of doctrine which christians generally regard as fundamental truths of *the word of God*. Or, as the same idea is expressed in another clause of that

¹ Köllner, p. 147.² idem. p. 121.

Constitution, the design of the General Synod in establishing her Seminary at Gettysburg was, "to furnish the church with pastors, who sincerely believe and cordially approve of the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures, as they are *fundamentally* taught in the Augsburg Confession."

Such is the enlightened position of the General Synod of our church. After ages will, we doubt not, bestow upon her that tribute of admiration, which leading spirits in all denominations now concede to her; but which some of her own beloved and esteemed sons seem unable to appreciate. And here it may not be amiss to utter a few words in reply to some strictures on Theological Seminaries by a recent writer on *Church-Feeling*. If, as his previous mention of Pennsylvania College renders probable, he refers to the Theological Seminary in the same place, we reply that undoubtedly the Symbolical books of any institution and church, should be taught by those connected with them; and this we are happy to know is faithfully done in our Institution. We would also remind that writer of what he seems to have forgotten, that the Symbolical Books of any institution, Synod, or General Synod, are those books which they have adopted, and avowed as their rule of faith; and that the Symbolical books of the General Synod and the Seminary at Gettysburg are the *Bible*, and the *Augsburg Confession*, as a *substantially correct exhibition of the fundamental truths of the Bible*. To this the professorial oath of office in the Seminary adds a similar *fundamental* assent to the two Catechisms of Luther. This doctrinal basis of the Seminary is secured from change by legislative charter, and by a provision for appeal to the Supreme Judiciary of the State. Now, these doctrines always have been and still are fully and faithfully taught in this Institution. The Professors believe and teach the same doctrines now, which they have taught for thirty years, and for the purpose of teaching which they were elected to their present important stations; and we may add, the very same doctrines, which that writer himself has preached for twenty years and still preaches! For them to inculcate on their students the obsolete views of the old Lutherans, contained in the former symbols of the church in some parts of Germany, such as exorcism, the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, private confession, baptismal regeneration, immersion in baptism, as taught in Luther's Larger Catechism, &c., would be to betray the confidence of those who elected them to office, and to defeat the design of the Institution, not one dollar of whose funds was contributed by Synods or individuals professing these views.

Nor is it correct, if our institution be intended that the views of individuals and not of the church are taught in it. The doctrines taught are substantially those presented in the Popular Theology, and that these are the prevailing views of our church in America, we clearly established in different articles on American Lutheranism,¹ during the last year. We now merely add the testimony of two respectable divines, then omitted. The first is the Rev. *Dr. Morris*, who is extensively acquainted with the views of our church, and in his Introduction to Dr. Kurtz's "Why are you a Lutheran," affirms: "Dr. Schmucker's valuable "Popular Theology," has contributed much to remove wrong impressions from the minds of many intelligent readers, and the Lutheran Observer with its extensive circulation still continues to exhibit us in a true light." The other is *Rev. Dr. Baugher*, President of Pennsylvania College. With the exception of several minor shades of doctrine, in which we are more symbolic than he, we could not ourselves in so few words, give a better description of the views taught in the Seminary than that contained in his "Abstract of the Doctrines and Practice of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Maryland," presented to his Synod, in which the points of symbolical differences are disposed of in these words: "We believe the Scriptures teach, that there are but two sacraments, viz.: Baptism and the Lord's Supper, in each of which truths essential to salvation are *symbolically represented*. We do not believe that they exert any influence *ex opere operato*. Neither do the Scriptures warrant the belief, that Christ is present in the Lord's Supper in any other than a *spiritual* manner." And again, "Luther's Larger and Smaller Catechisms, the Formula Concordiæ, Augsburg Confession, Apology, and Smalcald Articles, are called *in Germany*, Symbolical books of the church. We regard them as good and useful exhibitions of truth, but *do not receive them as binding*² on the conscience, except so far as they agree with the word of God." "We believe in the reality of revivals of religion, and regard them as a source of the richest blessings to the church." There seems, therefore, to be no ground of apprehension as to our Seminary, since the doctrines of *our* symbols, and the *prevailing* doctrines of our *American church*, are here faithfully taught.

With brethren entertaining the views of Scripture doctrine, and the symbolic position here attributed to our church, we

¹ See Lutheran Observer for 1850.

² The italics in this quotation are ours, to show more clearly the points of agreement.

delight to coöperate. It is true, several respectable divines of our church have, within the last few years, devoted more attention to these Symbolical books and urged others to do so. To this we make no objection. We have spent probably more time in their perusal than these brethren; yet we shall be very slow to believe, that after having studied and preached the Bible for fifteen or twenty years, they will now suffer themselves to receive, under the guidance of these symbolical books, doctrines, which, after so long a search, they had failed to find in the word of God. Yet should they even change their views of doctrine, we can still live in harmony with them, if they are willing to let us continue to teach in peace what they themselves formerly inculcated, and what we have always taught, and what we were appointed to teach.

In view of what has been advanced, the symbolic position which the General Synod has adopted, in fulfilling her vocation, may be reduced to three features, viz.: 1. She has declared against the extended symbolic system of the former ages of our church. 2. She has avowed the necessity of a brief creed, to exclude fundamental errorists from her pale; and 3. She has adopted the Augsburg Confession, as to fundamentals, for this purpose, as well on account of its intrinsic excellence, as its important historical associations. With this, we for ourselves, are fully satisfied. We believe this position, so signally blessed of God, to be truly apostolic, and well calculated to extend the borders and improve the doctrinal purity and spiritual character of our church. Yet there seem to be some few ministers even in the General Synod, who appear not to trust either themselves or others with so much apostolic liberty, though it is much less than the church enjoyed for four centuries, yea, so far as doctrine is concerned, for a thousand years after the apostolic age! If it is deemed advisable to gratify this yearning after human creeds, we would propose the adoption of the following system:

1. *The so-called Apostles' Creed.*

2. *The Nicene Creed.*

3. *The Augsburg Confession*, so far as its doctrinal articles are concerned: with one single clause annexed, stating that its teachings on the following doctrines shall not be regarded as binding, but belief or rejection of them be left to the conscience of each individual, viz.: the real presence, baptismal regeneration, private confession and absolution, "Ceremonies of the mass," the personal and condemning guilt of natural depravity, prior to moral action.

This arrangement would cover the differences existing in our church, and allow a rational liberty in investigating the Scriptures on these controverted topics, whilst it would exclude all errors, and sufficiently distinguish us as a denomination. It would unite in harmony all portions of our church, except those, who not only implicitly adopt all the errors and obsolete views of the Symbolical books, but are also unwilling to coöperate with such as cannot conscientiously follow their example. Even the Scandinavian churches, recently established in our North Western States, could probably unite with us, as some of them, at least, whilst adhering to the Augsburg Confession in general, propose to reject some of its provisions, such as private confession and absolution, as also some of the usages of their fatherland, the wearing of the gown, the burning of candles on the altar by day, and the churching of women.¹ "In short they propose to restore the *church system to the simple, pure and evangelical position, that it undoubtedly occupied in the times of the apostles and the first Christians.*" This is exactly the truly enlightened, the exalted position of our General Synod. We hail with delight the coöperation of these noble Northmen, and of all others who labor in the same spirit, and bid them a hearty God speed; assured that in that great day the inquiry of the Master will be, whether we have conformed our doctrines not to the writings of Luther, but *to the tuition of his own inspired word.*

In a subsequent number of the Review, we may perhaps resume the subject, and consider the vocation of our *American Lutheran Church* in several other aspects.

ARTICLE III.

ECCLESIASTICAL STANDARDS.

By G. A. Lintner, D. D., Schoharie, New York.

IN this age of progress, when there is such an evident tendency to innovation in the doctrines and order of the church, it becomes the duty of every Christian to acquaint himself with those standards, which the Church has instituted, as safe-

¹ See Mr. Langland's political and religious paper, termed *The Democrat* issued at Racine, Wisconsin.

guards for the purity of Christian doctrine and fellowship; and, if necessary, to vindicate them against the aspersions of their opposers and enemies. In the Lutheran Church, we have standards, which have always been acknowledged by the great body of our community, as setting forth those doctrines and principles, by which, as a Christian denomination, we are known and distinguished. *Mosheim*, our Church historian, who was well acquainted with the general sentiment prevailing among our churches, in regard to our standards, makes the following declaration: "It has been scarcely possible, to introduce any change into the system of doctrine and discipline, that is received in that (Lutheran) church, because, the ancient Confessions and Rules, that were drawn up to point out the tenets to be believed, and the rites and ceremonies that were to be performed, still remain in their full authority, and are considered the sacred guardians of the Lutheran faith and worship."¹ He makes this statement, when speaking of our church in the 18th century, and after having noticed its introduction into America. His testimony, therefore, as to the authority and sacredness with which our Confession and standards were regarded, applies to our church in this country, as well as in Europe. *Dr. Schmucker* tells us in his *Popular Theology*: "The Lutheran Church in the United States, which contains 1050 churches, and 48,000 regular communicating members, has, indeed, *always* regarded the Augsburg Confession as the authorized summary of her doctrines, but has not required any oath of obligation to all its contents."²

Although our church in the United States has never made a formal acknowledgment, that we have adopted the Augsburg Confession as our Confession of faith, it has always been so understood. It has been so regarded by other denominations. "The Augsburg Confession of twenty-one Articles, is the acknowledged standard of faith for the Lutherans, wherever they are found."³ "The Lutheran system of faith is the Augsburg Confession."⁴ "The Lutherans adopt as their standard of faith the Augsburg Confession."⁵

It was not necessary that we should make a formal acknowledgment of the Augsburg Confession as our standard of faith. It was the acknowledged standard of the Lutheran Church when it was first instituted in this country. It was so

¹ Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. Phil. Edit. Vol. VI. p. 18.

² Schmucker's Pop. Theol. And. Edit. 1834. p. 41.

³ Encyc. Rel. Knowl. App. p. 1259.

⁴ Marsh's Eccl. Hist. p. 291. ⁵ idem. p. 378.

considered by the founders of the American Lutheran Church, and we, their successors, have always acted on the principle, that we have an ecclesiastical standard ; and the recent attempts to remove this impression, upon the ground that we have never *formally declared* our adherence to the Augsburg Confession is a mere subterfuge, to cover an untenable position. I repeat, we have our standards. This is a fact which admits of no controversy ; and the question is not, whether we have a Confession of faith, but whether we shall *adhere to* and *maintain* it, against the attempts that have been made and are still making, to repudiate and set it aside.

The writer of this article, is one of those who believe, that it is the solemn duty of the Lutheran church in this country, to remain true to our church standards — and this sentiment he has cherished for years. With him it is no new discovery. It was one great reason, which led him more than twenty years ago, to favor the formation of the Synod, to which he now belongs, and which, he is happy to say, has taken the true position in regard to this matter, and has uniformly and firmly maintained it. As we look on the progress of our church in this country, and the developments connected with it, we feel convinced more every day, that if we would avoid the dangers which threaten us, and accomplish the good we desire, we must faithfully adhere to our ecclesiastical standards. Not that we would set up these standards in the place of the Bible, or clothe them with an authority to which any enlightened and conscientious Christian would be unwilling to submit. By our ecclesiastical standards, we mean, that summary statement, or declaration of those Christian doctrines and principles of fellowship, which we believe are taught in the Bible, and which bind us together as a religious community ; and in such a community, we hold, that a Confession or Creed, whatever it may be termed, setting forth our belief, worship and fellowship, according to our views of Bible truth and Christian duty, is indispensable to our preservation and purity as a Church.

On this point we have something further to offer, which we will present in as brief a space as the subject will allow. We shall notice in the first place, some of the objections which are usually urged against Confessions and Creeds, and then proceed to show their utility and importance in the present state of the Church.

The first objection against Creeds, which we shall notice is, that they are *not necessary*. The opposers of Confessions of faith, are for abolishing all religious tests, as useless incum-

branches. "Let every one," say they, "follow the Scriptures and his own conscience. They are a sufficient rule—we want nothing more to direct us." Now this sounds very plausible, and appears quite reasonable, but it will not bear *close examination*.

Let us look at it for a moment.—Suppose the State were to act on this principle. Suppose our legislators, whom we choose to make laws for us, were to say, we will pass a general statute that every man shall obey the Constitution and do right, as the supreme law of the land and his conscience direct, but we will pass no special laws to prevent men from committing crimes. We will put no interpretations upon the Constitution and exercise no authority to carry out its provisions; what would be the effect? Could the State be preserved? Could such a government stand? Could the people be kept in order, and their peace and happiness be secured under such a state of things? Who does not see that such a government could not exist. It must destroy itself, and the people soon would see, that such liberty, unrestrained by necessary and wholesome laws, must lead to the subversion of all civil liberty, order and happiness. There would be no laws to restrain conspirators against the peace and well-being of the State; and there are conspirators in the church as well as in the State, that must be restrained. If not, they will ravage and destroy it. And how are they to be restrained? By the church exercising that authority, which God has given to it, for its own preservation — by setting up her standards against these enemies, and preventing them from introducing corruptions, and heresies, and disorders, destructive to the souls of men; and it is just as unreasonable for the enemies of the church to be opposed to such standards, as for the enemies of the State to find fault with the laws, which the government has enacted, to prevent crimes. In both cases, there is a necessary restraint for the public good — a restraint under wholesome laws — laws, which the wicked are always ready to oppose, but with which good men never are dissatisfied. The wicked are opposed to good laws, because they stand in the way of carrying out their evil designs; and when they are opposed and counteracted in these designs, they are ready to raise the cry of oppression and persecution; they are deprived of their liberty; and there is just as much consistency in this, as if a thief or robber were to complain of the doors of the sheep-fold not being thrown open, that he might exercise the liberty of coming in and scattering the sheep.

The opposers of Confessions and Creeds further say: "We receive the Bible, the word of God, as the only unerring standard in religion. We take *that* for our guide." So do we.— We hold that it is supreme in all matters appertaining to religion; that it teaches all the essential doctrines of salvation. And we hold further, that it is *proper* and *necessary*, that those doctrines should be embodied in a Confession of faith, by which we may give our *testimony* before the world that we do *believe* those doctrines. This is what the Bible demands. It demands that we should "hold fast the form of sound words," 2 Tim. 1: 13, and "contend earnestly for the faith, which was once delivered to the saints," Jude 3. This is every Christian's duty. He is bound to give a *clear* and *decided* testimony to the *truth*. This is one of the great ends for which God has instituted his church on earth; that she might bear witness to the truth. How is this testimony to be given? By making a general declaration: "I believe the Bible to be the word of God, and I receive that as the standard of my faith"? There is scarcely an infidel in the land that would not be willing to make such a declaration, and many *do* make it. It is a declaration, so entirely equivocal and unsatisfactory, that almost any one can make it. It does not answer the purpose of a *direct* testimony to the truth. It has no definite meaning. Ask the *Trinitarian* what he means when he says, he believes the Bible. He will tell you, that he believes the Bible teaches that Jesus Christ is *true God*, who existed from all eternity, the Creator of all things. Ask the *Unitarian* what he means by this declaration. He will tell you he believes no such thing. He believes that Jesus Christ is a *mere man*, and possesses none of the essential attributes of Deity. Ask the *orthodox Christian* what the Bible teaches in relation to the *atonement* of Christ. He will answer, that it teaches a real sacrificial atonement, performed by the Savior of sinners, in their stead, as their representative and substitute. Then ask the *Socinian*, how he understands the doctrine of the Bible in relation to this point. He will say, that Christ gave himself as a sacrifice, only to establish the truth of his doctrine, and furnish an example to believers.— Now these persons differ so widely in their views of what the Bible teaches, that they can never agree. Indeed they do not hold to the *same Bible*. The Bible of the *Trinitarian* is so different from that of the *Unitarian*, that when they speak of the Bible, they do not mean the same thing. Had the church no other standard than the broad platform, upon which Trinitarians, Unitarians, Socinians, Universalists and Arians could

meet, and hold fellowship, she might as well give her testimony to the truth — she might lift her voice for the *Bible* — but it would be like the “trumpet giving an *uncertain sound*.”

In the next place, it is urged against creeds that their advocates wish to control and bind the consciences of men. This is an unfounded charge. We wish to exercise no such authority. In this country we have no law, or ecclesiastical standard compelling men to subscribe articles of faith, or do any other religious act against their consciences. Every man's conscience is left perfectly free. Every individual has a right to choose for himself, whether he will unite with us or join another denomination. If he unites with us, he ought to be *agreed* with us in sentiment. We do not suppose that any honest and conscientious man would *wish* to join us, unless he was willing to have it *understood*, that he was *agreed* with us—and if so, we think, we have a perfect right to ask him to make a *declaration* to that effect. This is all we ask; and in this we exercise no arbitrary power. We compel no man to do any thing against his conscience. We impose no tests, and require no pledges further than we deem right and proper for brethren, who are agreed and wish to dwell together in unity. Every man has a right to judge for himself in matters of religion. This is a sacred right, and we do not interfere with it. We exercise it ourselves, and are willing that others should exercise it. We consider it necessary to have a creed, setting forth the fundamental principles of that faith in which we are agreed. This is our right. Now, if any man wishes to unite with us, we propose to him this creed. We wish him to *examine* it, and if it *agrees* with his views and feelings we are willing he should join us. If not, he cannot be associated with us—and surely he has no reason to complain. We leave him to his own private judgment. We do not interfere with his rights. He is at liberty to join any denomination he pleases—only we say, he shall not *intrude* upon us contrary to what we conceive to be our right. •

It is also said by the opposers of creeds that we wish to put them in the place of the *Bible*. We know of no Protestant church that has ever done this. The Lutheran, Reformed, Episcopal, Presbyterian and Methodist churches, all have their Confessions of faith; but they hold them *subordinate* to the word of God, which in all Protestant churches is considered supreme. They are designed only as *declarations* of the truths revealed in Scripture. They are not even considered as authoritative declarations, any further than they are supported by Scripture. All authority is contained in the Scriptures,

and declarations of faith can neither *take from* nor *add* any thing to that authority. They are only intended to declare what we believe to be the *import* of the word of God in relation to points of Christian doctrine and ecclesiastical polity, which we deem necessary, and such declarations we conceive we ought to make, not only in justice to ourselves, but also to others who have a right to know what we believe and teach.

And now, having noticed several of the most important objections which are usually urged on this subject, we shall proceed to state our position; which is, *that Creeds and Confessions are proper and necessary in the church, to test the doctrines and principles of those who are admitted into fellowship.* And our first argument to establish this position we draw directly from the Scriptures.

- The Scriptures do require a test:¹ “Beloved believe not every spirit, but *try* the spirits whether they be from God.” (1 John 4: 1.) Every one who desires to preach the Gospel to the people with the sanction and authority of the church, must be *tried*. He must give evidence that he is called of God to this work. And that this relates to doctrine as well as practice, is evident from what the Apostle says in another place: “Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the *doctrine* of Christ, hath not God. If there come any among you and bring not this *doctrine* receive him not into your house.” (2 John 9: 10.) “Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the *doctrine* which ye have heard, and avoid them.” (Rom. 16: 17.) These passages are plain and direct. We know, some say, they do not apply to churches; they refer only to individuals. We cannot admit this interpretation; but even admitting it, they certainly show, that it was right in individuals — that it

¹ In an article published in the *Evangelical Review*, by a distinguished Professor in one of our Theological Seminaries, it is asserted, that “Confessions and Creeds are not enjoined in Scripture.” We regretted to see this declaration, coming from one, for whose opinions we have always cherished a high respect. If by this declaration is simply meant, that there is no *express command* in Scripture, enjoining Creeds and Confessions, we would not consider it so very objectionable; though even in that sense, we question, whether there is sufficient ground for such a sweeping declaration. But if this assertion is intended to convey the idea, that there is no *authority* in the Scriptures for Confessions of faith, it is an unwarrantable and dangerous assumption. It would tend to remove from the church, all the safe-guards, which the wisdom and piety of ages have thrown around it. And surely the learned Professor would not wish to favor such a result. And yet such will doubtless be the construction which many will put on his language in that article. His assertion will be peculiarly gratifying to the opposers of Creeds, in view of his position. They will quote it as authority, and use it as an argument *against* all Confessions of faith.

was their *christian duty* to prove the doctrines and principles of men, before they placed confidence in them, and received them into fellowship; and if individuals had this right — if it was their duty to exercise it — the church certainly should exercise it, since the preservation of a whole church from false teachers and deceivers, is so much more important than a single individual.

Errorists corrupt and injure the church. St. Paul, speaking of them to Timothy, says: “And their word will eat as doth a canker, of whom is Hymeneus and Philetus, who concerning the truth have erred.” (2 Tim. 2: 17.) If the error of these men, who taught that the Resurrection was past, did eat as a canker, and overthrew the faith of some, what must be the effect of some of the errors which are propagated in our day, such as denying the divinity of Christ, and the personality, and divine influences of the Holy Spirit? Will such errors, where they are tolerated, build up the church? Will they add any thing to her development in those principles, which are necessary for her growth and prosperity? No, they will rend the church, encourage her enemies, and bring dishonor on God and religion. And is it not the duty of watchmen on the walls of Zion to guard the church against such evils? There can be nothing more clear than this duty. Let ecclesiastical councils and judicatories beware how they neglect it. They dare not give their sanction to the admission of men into the church, whom they conscientiously believe to be unsound in doctrine, or corrupt in principle.

Our next argument in favor of our position, is, the church has always had a *form of doctrine*, showing what she considered necessary for the union and fellowship of her members. St. Paul speaks of such a form, in his Epistle to the Romans, and he exhorts Timothy, his beloved disciple, to “hold fast the form of sound words,” which he had been taught. Although we have no account of Confessions of faith, formally drawn up and authenticated in the days of the Apostles, there is good reason to believe, that the church had her “form of doctrine,” and articles of faith, which were generally received and acknowledged by Christians as their bond of union and fellowship.

The history of the Church shows a constant succession of creeds. The *Apostles' Creed* was introduced as early as the third century. Some writers are of the opinion, that it was used even at an earlier period. This creed was soon succeeded by others. In the fourth century we have also an account of the celebrated *Nicene creed*, published by the Council of Nice,

against *Arius* and his followers; others followed. These Confessions and Creeds were deemed necessary by the early Christians, to preserve the church from the opposition and corruption of its enemies. So also, during, and after the Reformation, the Protestant churches of Germany, Switzerland, England, Scotland and Holland, found it necessary to give to the world their Confessions of faith, in order to give a true statement of their doctrines, and defend themselves against the false charges that were brought against them. As Christians have always considered it their duty to make an *open profession* of their faith; so the church has also deemed it necessary to set forth her doctrines in her *public confessions*. In the best and purest days of the church she had her Confessions, and as long as she continues her warfare on earth, she will find them necessary as a protection against her enemies, and rallying points for her friends.

If the church had no enemies to contend with—if she were in no danger of being corrupted, she would need no creeds. The Apostles' Creed became necessary to shield the church against the corruptions of that age. The Nicene Creed was introduced in consequence of the errors of *Arius* and his adherents. The Confessions of the Waldenses were called forth by the corruption and wickedness of the times. The Augsburg Confession, the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, and the Westminster Confession, were all published at times, when the church was in danger of being corrupted by the prevailing systems of error and infidelity. We can see no way in which the church can be preserved from the evil influences to which she is necessarily and constantly exposed in this world, than by establishing scriptural tests, and faithfully adhering to them. Whenever the church has been left unguarded by such tests, or when they have not been faithfully observed, corruption has taken advantage and rolled in like a flood. In this way the churches of Geneva, of Germany, of Switzerland, and even some of the orthodox churches of our own country, have been overrun by Rationalism and Socinianism; and is there not reason to fear that more of our Protestant churches are preparing for the same fate.

It has become quite popular, of late, to declaim against the power pretended to be usurped by the church, to denounce every act of scriptural and wholesome discipline, as oppressive and tyrannical, and even to ridicule the exercise of any thing like authority, that is legitimately vested in the church. Every young aspirant after distinction must set himself up for a reformer. He must raise his voice against creeds, and come out

in favor of liberty. The church must be purified — her antiquated notions must be laid aside — her former usages abandoned — the old barriers must be broken down, and the track must be cleared for trains of error and heresy to come in, and if they are charged with as many destructive ingredients as the Trojan horse, they must be admitted, and the church run the risk of an explosion. And for whose benefit are all these changes and new experiments to be made? For the consistent, faithful, conscientious and devoted Christian? For those who adorn the doctrine of God their Saviour with a well-ordered life, and holy conversation? Do they call for these changes? No; these alterations and changes must be made to please the fancies of persons of *unstable minds* and *loose principles*. They are the people who call so loudly for the abolition of religious tests, and ecclesiastical standards. They want the liberty to come into the church and preach the Gospel without being questioned about their *faith*. It is for their sake, that we hear so much of the tyranny of church authority, and they receive and encourage all this declamation against Confessions and Creeds, for it saves them the trouble of searching for the truth and becoming established in it. They may become Christians, and be even qualified to preach the Gospel without going through the *old form* of preparation, by diligent study, prayerful meditation, and faithful and persevering application to the truth. They will hasten into the churches where they can have all this liberty, and after they are admitted, they are for granting still greater liberty, and throwing open the door still wider for the admission of all manner of kindred spirits. Thus the church will be in danger of being overrun with sects and divisions — inundated with false doctrines and teachers, and becoming a reproach.

Let us not be accused of raising a false alarm. There is an influence at work, which seeks to obliterate every distinctive feature in our ecclesiastical system, an influence which seems determined upon subverting the old foundation, on which our fathers rested, and forming a new basis, sufficiently wide to embrace all the loose and discordant materials that can be gathered under this new system. And this is the system, that is to be put in the place of that consistent and well ordered system, established in the days of the Reformation, and which God has so signally blessed and prospered. Men have advanced so far in the "Spirit of the Age," that they can no longer be benefitted by the knowledge and experience of past ages. They have grown so much wiser than their fathers, that they can furnish us with erudite articles on the antiquated

errors of "Patristic Theology." And when we hear them discoursing on the "advances in science, and the varied developments" which have turned the fathers of the Reformation into children in our day, we are almost disposed to ask, whence cometh all this wisdom, which has raised our modern theologians so far above the fathers, that now, they can "stand on their shoulders?" Surely, this age must have taken rapid strides in "Church development," if we are prepared for such an elevated position. Could one of those fathers be permitted to visit the earth, he would doubtless be astonished to see, what improvements we have made, and how he is thrown in the shade by the light of this advancing age. We speak of this disposition to undervalue the labors and services of the founders of our Protestant Churches and institutions, because, we regard it as one of the evidences, that we are verging into that new system of theology, which casts off all respect and reverence for antiquity, and acknowledges no standard, but the "spirit of the age." And when we are threatened with such indications, is there no cause for alarm? And does it not become the duty of the friends of the Church, who love her principles as embodied in our ecclesiastical standards, to defend their principles, and seek to maintain them?

There is reason for christians in our day to examine well the foundation on which they stand—to be firmly rooted, and grounded in the truth. For *this* only, with the help and blessing of God, can secure them against the strong temptations, and evil influences of the times. Perhaps, there never was a period, when the prince of darkness was so fully transformed into an angel of light, to deceive, if possible, the very elect, and lead them away from the faith and hope of the Gospel. There certainly never was, in the Providence of God, a louder call for the churches to remain steadfast and immovable on the foundation which God has laid in Zion. That foundation is true. The truth, which God has revealed in his word, is eternal and unchangeable, and that truth, which we regard as the basis of our faith and hope of salvation, is, as we conscientiously believe, set forth in our ecclesiastical standards. Let us adhere to it with that firmness and perseverance, which our duty to God and the Church, and the circumstances of the times require.

We love liberty as much as any man, but we do not love that liberty, which would cast off all the restraints of just and wholesome authority, and trample on the order and institutions of God's holy temple. We abhor such liberty, and pray God, in his infinite mercy, to deliver us from it.

God has founded his Church on a *rock*, and if we are faithful he will not suffer it to be moved. The principles, for which we contend, are the principles which He has always recognized in the preservation of his Church in all her trials and conflicts — which He has owned and blessed, wherever they have been faithfully maintained. Let us adhere to those principles, and never lose our confidence in them, by whomsoever they may be opposed. They have passed through many fiery trials, and come out of every one of them like gold when purified in the fire. And so shall all advocate those principles, if they remain true to the cause. It is good for us to be tried — it is necessary for our purification and preparation for heaven. Our fathers passed through much greater trials than we have ever seen—but, notwithstanding, they stood fast in their profession. Let us follow their example, by continuing steadfast in the truth, and transmitting to our posterity, pure and uncorrupted, the doctrines, and institutions, and ordinances of Christ.

ARTICLE IV.

REFLECTIONS ON THE CONDITION OF THE NORWEGIAN CHURCH.

REMINISCENCES OF A VISIT TO THAT COUNTRY IN 1847.

Translated by the Rev. B. M. Schmucker, A. M., Martinsburg, Va.

(Concluded from page 434.)

THERE is also a third source from which this influence springs, *the character of the present lay-preachers*. Their character has been formed by the circumstances amid which they have arisen. They have been won to the cause of Christianity, in a great degree, by the influence of Hauge, in part by reading his writings, by the accounts still in the mouths of many of his labors, by the members of his society and their preaching, and in part by the reading the Holy Scriptures, to which their attention was called by the movements of which he was the life and soul, by which they have been led to self-examination, repentance and faith, and prepared to become “Confessors.” But, although Hauge was the originator of the movements from which the whole system of lay-preaching has arisen, they have not all belonged to his party. A dis-

inction must be made between the independent members of the great brotherhood who term themselves Hauge's Venner (friends), and the lay-preachers of the present time, properly so called. The former are generally stationary, conducting private meetings, confining their preaching for the most part to those of their own persuasion, and only at stated times; they are also the heads of the combinations of the laity for mutual edification, one friend of Hauge distinguished by gifts, knowledge or position, succeeding another in regular succession in the office. Their position is much like that of the exhorters in the Würtemberg Pietist societies, suited more to the encouragement of Christians, than the awakening of sinners; they are held in great respect, and sometimes profess to be the subjects of immediate revelations from God. The authors of both the treatises against Wepels were "Confessors." They assert with great confidence, that they enjoy the enlightening influence of the Holy Ghost. I cannot here omit some remarks of one of these men, connected with the Haugian brotherhood, contained in a treatise against Wepels, as characteristic of the class. "In presenting myself," says he, "as one who correctly understands and explains the word of God, let no one suppose that I have obtained this enlightening by my especial power in prayer. I cannot, also, give myself the credit of having so prayed, that I have been heard by reason of the merit of my prayers. But, that God has nevertheless given me understanding in this thing, I cannot deny, and woe to me, if I were inclined to do so. He has given me far above my desire or comprehension. He has filled this poor weak vessel with his good spiritual gifts, for which we praise, thank, and laud his holy name, forever. Amen." So firm a conviction of having been favored by God with especial grace and light, connected with a really commendable acquaintance with the Scriptures, and a life worthy of the Gospel, must give these men a controlling influence over many less independent minds. And a personal connection with the departed Hauge, or at least a thorough acquaintance with his writings, added to the authority of their sermons. But the position of the lay-preachers, who were not in connection with the brotherhood of Hauge's Venner, was entirely different. They were less dependent on the authority of Hauge, yet in their personal position and mode of preaching they resembled him much more than did the preachers within the circle of his friends. They were itinerant, they arose sporadically—there had been an entire dearth for some time—they were generally men of active feelings, vivid imagination, ready perception, men of natural ora-

torical power, of the rural population, who had been powerfully awakened out of a condition of stupid religious indifference, or of careless sensuality, and brought into a state of grace, and who felt under obligation to arise as witnesses to the truth, and tell to the world what they had experienced of the righteousness and grace of God. Their preaching, therefore, was of repentance, directed for the most part to the unawakened, those dead in trespasses and sins; their meetings were occasional and accidental, and always as public as possible. They usually obtained permission of the regular clergy, who ordinarily received invitations to attend, which were, however, seldom accepted. When a lay-preacher came to a place where he thought it advisable to hold a prayer meeting, he either went around himself, or sent his friends through the community to announce a meeting at an appointed time, which seldom continued less than two hours, and was often held two or three times a day in one place. Their form of worship was very simple. The meeting was usually opened with a hymn, (Hauge's party had published a hymn-book for their own use), which was succeeded by prayer, after which the text was read, usually a passage from the Scriptures and a postil, (Luther's, Arndt's, Spener's, and occasionally Hauge's were used), the text was then explained, as the talent and experience of the preacher enabled him, often with special application to those present, and the meeting concluded with prayer and singing. This plan of procedure in their meetings is natural and calculated to prevent mere rambling babbling, and on that account preferable to the plan pursued in many German prayer meetings, where the reading of a postil is not attended to. But it was not only the arrangement and propriety of these devotional meetings which attracted hearers. The greatest attractive power was *the prominent individuality* of the preacher.—Two of the extreme northern districts of Norway, Nordland and Tronhjem, have sent forth some among the most prominent of these men. I can only mention two of the most eminent, Nils Œptun, a landlord, and Elling Eielsen. The former was mild and gentle, full of love, burning with zeal “to serve his Master till his latest breath, and to laud his righteousness so long as his tongue cleaved not to the roof of his mouth.” From the time of his conversion he may be truly said not to have laid aside his pilgrim staff until the close of his life. He visited all the important places in his fatherland, especially in the southern districts; and after having meekly, uncomplainingly borne the contempt of the laity, and the disparaging misrepresentations of the clergy, was permitted to close his life in

peace on his own estate in 1835. The other was an impetuous, energetic, even turbulent character, according to the representations of one of his friends, who was burning with eager desire to bring souls to Christ, and strove to reach the heart in as direct a way as possible. Eielsen was born not far from Æptun's home, at Nordmør, in the diocese of Tronhjem, was younger than Æptun, and aroused by his preaching and his example, and with all the energy of youth had struggled through the contest with sin, pride and the lusts of the flesh, to repentance, humility and self-denial. He manifested an extraordinary acquaintance with the Bible, so as to be able to repeat whole chapters from memory. His exhortations, often in the form of prayer, to repentance and imitation of Christ, made a deep impression. But on the other hand, like all who preach repentance, without respect of persons, especially when not regularly appointed to the work, he did not fail to arouse much enmity. What Eielsen accomplished by his energy, and the power of his exhortations, and more than all by the earnestness of his manner, full of the clear consciousness of the great work which he had arisen to perform, others of gentle nature, who equally felt themselves called to preach, effected by the affectionate interestedness with which they directed their exhortations to their brethren. Elling Eielsen, perhaps influenced by the reasonable conclusion, that a period of intense activity in the preaching of repentance and conversion must necessarily be followed by one of deadness and inactivity, departed for a new, hitherto uncultivated field of labor in America. He had scarcely gone, when another preacher arose, Mads Veffning, a youth of sixteen years, son of a landlord in Nordland. Although he enjoyed only the most meagre instruction in his birth-place, an out of the way place in the district of Nordland, he manifested extraordinary talents, and when but a child was accustomed, as a personal friend testifies, to explain God's word to his brothers and sisters, in a manner simple but striking, with much accuracy, and acquaintance with the Scriptures. He portrayed the depravity of the human heart so intelligently, that it may be said the angels in heaven never had cause to rejoice over his conversion from sin to God. It must have been an interesting sight to behold the youth with clasped hands, his eyes uplifted to heaven, standing by the table on which lay the opened Bible, with a crowded audience, hanging upon every whisper, with tears flowing from their eyes; old gray-haired and stalworth men sitting at the feet of a child. Mads Veffning felt it his duty to commence to travel, generally going in company with a pious

fisherman from Nordland, Torsten Rendahl, who laid aside his employment as fisher to become a fisher of men. The interest which young Veffning excited often attracted preachers to their company. They attended his devotional meetings, and were so charmed with the unassuming, child-like, earnest but gentle, interesting character of this farmer's son, that they occasionally accompanied him on his journeys. The worthy pastor at Christiansand, Paul Iürgens Dybdahl, formed a particular affection for him; he took him to his house, and prepared him to pass the examination for the degree of arts, so that he could study theology. His travelling companion, Torsten Rendahl, was hurried from his earthly labors by a tragical accident. He intended to accompany a friend, who was about to go to Denmark and Germany, as far as the limits of Norway. At a town where they passed the night, and held a prayer meeting as they were desired, he became exceedingly unwell. In the dusk of the morning, instead of an excellent remedy which he had brought with him, he took by mistake a large dose of a very virulent poison which was in a similar phial, that had been given to carry to an invalid in Drammen, and was to be taken in exceedingly minute doses. The effect was so severe, that no antidote which the physician, who was obtained immediately, could administer would relieve him; the unfortunate man yielded up his spirit in great agony, but with uncommon resignation, (1844). When his friend took leave of him, he said feebly, but with entire composure, "I feel that I am going home; I have left undone much which I ought to have done; but God will forgive me, for Jesus' sake; remain faithful to him that we may meet again hereafter." As the members of the family whose guest he was, who were watching with him at night, were about to light the taper which had gone out, he said: "It is needless; truly I have the light of life." He heard wonderful music, and quieted the attendants who supposed he was hearing unearthly sounds. He rose up, asked who was standing at the door, smiled, sunk back and expired.

I have introduced these circumstances, related to me by personal witnesses worthy of entire credit, because they prove, that these lay-preachers are not mere self-righteous, conceited boasters, who are greatly concerned about the repentance and salvation of others, but not their own. No, the majority—for those cited are merely examples of the class—are plain unassuming men, naturally gifted, characterized especially by deep moral earnestness of religious character, who have been aroused, either by the personal influence of such men as Hauge, Œptun,

Eielsen, or by reading the word of God, often by a single passage which has served to kindle a flame in their hearts, or by some afflictive event in God's providence. These men, among whom are a few fishermen and mountaineers, have laid hold, with the whole fullness of an earnest soul, with the whole power of the will, and with the whole energy of the understanding, on the Gospel of the grace of God, in Jesus Christ, toward every penitent sinner. They have thus become partakers in so rich an experience and hope, so ardent a love toward their fellow men, and above all to Christ, that they could not do otherwise than go and declare to others, as best they could, what the Lord had done for their souls, in order to rouse them to seek the like experience. On this account they seldom preached upon any subject which had not an immediate bearing on the Christian life; they entered into the discussion of no speculative questions; when the Scriptures had decided a question they referred to its teachings, when they had not, they declared that God for wise reasons had remained silent; and although the second coming of the Lord was a subject to which they frequently adverted in their sermons, they refrained with true Christian propriety from attempting to decide the time of his appearance. In this they differ from the leaders of such meetings in Germany who often introduce theosophic discussions in their sermons. On the other hand, by constantly insisting on repentance, they are eminently exposed to the danger of overlooking the alone justification of the Gospel which is by faith, and that of free grace; and again the energy with which they demand sanctity in the believer disposes them to give to minute particulars an undue importance, by no means belonging to them, thus setting up a new law, forgetting that where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. We heard e. g. of instances in which smoking was inveighed against as a sinful lust of the flesh. And the renouncing of the world and all the sinful lusts of the flesh, is often so explained by these lay-preachers, that every care for external things, as neatness in dress, and comfort and nicety in domestic arrangements was to be striven against as the result of vanity and pride. In short, that external physical things ought to be looked on with entire indifference, because our spiritual interests were of so much higher importance. There is in this a contracted distinction between the internal and the external, which overlooks their near relation to each other, which most frequently appears among those who are wanting in cultivation, whose sense of the beautiful has never been developed, and who have enjoyed few oppor-

unities for its exercise. And this is especially to be lamented in Norway, where, particularly in the lower classes, there is a great want of cleanliness and neatness, which may often have tended to give them a surly expression of countenance, and which, as I was told by one who had made himself familiar with the lower classes, not unfrequently gives occasion to domestic discord.

What we have said will suffice to show, on the one hand the great influence, independent of the church and the state, which the lay-preachers have obtained, and on the other hand the necessity of the exercise of a watchful care, on the part of the regular clergy who are less exposed to one-sidedness, over his part of the spiritual edification of their congregations. It would not be the exercise of a proper care on the part of the clergy, to treat the labors of the lay-preachers with repelling contempt or suspicion, or to assume a hostile relation to them, to forbid or disturb their assemblies, or, if that cannot be done, to employ every opportunity to resist their influence, and even use the pulpit to oppose them. Such a course would only serve to aggravate the evil, and to embitter the lay-preachers against the established church and its ministers, or at least to alienate the congregations from their appointed pastors. And the people would still have all their sympathies with those preachers who live in their midst, belong entirely to them, and declare to them the Gospel in the love of it, in a simple and impressive manner; especially would the Norwegian people, who, since the period of their civil emancipation, have looked with suspicion upon every authority external to themselves, though it were the constituted clergy of the established church. Such a course is not only unwise, but also unjust; for what right, in the sight of God, have the clergy who confine their activity to their necessary official acts, their sermons at appointed times, their other regular ministerial duties, to deny to their fellow christians, who in addition to the stated services of the church, feel a strong desire for other religious meetings, and a more active christianity, the privilege of enjoying them? But however unwise and unjust such a course may be, it has been pursued but too often in Norway, and has tended not a little to sever the bond which bound the congregations to their clergymen, which has never been too strong; and to increase the influence of the lay-preachers, which it was intended to destroy; a result which can be of no advantage to the interests of the church. Of course, the more distant and feeble the relation between the regular, appointed shepherd and his fold, the more will they be disposed to follow after other shepherds

who labor with more untiring devotion for their welfare, and this feeling will be the stronger and more decided the more truly religious the fold are, and the more lively their sense of the necessity of experimental piety. That such is the case with the Norwegian people, we have seen. The more entirely a congregation yield themselves to the guidance of others than their appointed pastors, the more will they become estranged from the latter, and advance in a course, which must finally lead to a separation. In Norway matters have not yet reached this extreme ; separation has not yet resulted. But examples are not wanting, which discover a sad defection in the devotion of congregations to their pastors. I mention only the urgent, renewed complaints made from every quarter by the clergy, for the last forty years, that the numbers of the congregation have not paid the accustomed remuneration, but that their gifts have become fewer and fewer. A commission was appointed by the government, (Nov. 13th, 1843), to regulate the support of the clergy who were to endeavor to change to a fixed salary the support which has hitherto consisted in part of freewill-offerings. Does not the existence of such a necessity show clearly enough a sad change of the beautiful relation of mutual confidence and love between ministers and their congregations, into one legal and compulsory, and becoming neither to the ministry, the congregation, the church, nor the kingdom of God? They are beginning of late to see, that the only means of preventing the alienation which, has arisen between the ministry and the most worthy members of their congregations, from becoming a total rupture, is to manifest a greater toleration and kindness toward the lay-preachers. Public opposition has for the most part been laid aside, especially by the more eminent and decidedly evangelical clergymen, and they have even condescended so far as to occasionally to attend their devotional meetings. But before the one-sided, and therefore injurious influence of the lay-preachers and exhorters can be brought to exert a healthful beneficial tendency, the clergy must do still more. It is confessedly more difficult to regain love, respect and confidence than to lose them. And after these *conditiones sine quibus non* of beneficial effectiveness, which if not entirely gone have been greatly diminished, are regained, the clergy can no longer maintain a passive relation to the demand for extraordinary religious activity : they must, to a certain extent, become co-workers in it. In short, the distant relation of the pastor to his flock is without doubt one principal cause of the excessive importance of the lay-preachers among the people, and this

excessive, one-sided influence is prejudicial to the healthful evangelical christian life of the congregation and church. On his account the most appropriate and important object to which the attention of the Norwegian clergy can be directed, is the restoral of that unity of life and feeling between them and those committed to their care, which formerly existed in apostolic times between the apostles and those to whom they gave the charge of the congregations, and which may never, from the earliest times, have properly characterized the Norwegian church. But before the restoral can become possible, they must devote a much larger portion of their time and energy to the pastoral duties of their calling than they seem hitherto to have done.

The Norwegian clergy, whose acquaintance I had the pleasure of making during the brief period of my stay in that country, inspired me with great respect for them; their hospitality, the kind cordiality of their welcome, the moral dignity with which they preside over their households, which were often large, the affability they exhibited toward their domestics—the glebe in Norway is often large—and toward their church-members, their earnest apprehension of their high calling, and their relative intellectual cultivation, all lead me to esteem them highly. But I cannot deny that the question often presented itself, what pastoral care do they exercise? The larger part of my sojourn there was spent in intercourse with the clergy. I spent eight days at a time at their houses, in the country, and yet I did not know a case in which a visit to the sick was made, and only twice that regular visits were received from church members. It must of course be conceded; that I did not thus accidentally meet with favorable opportunities of judging, that on account of the remoteness of their scattered dwellings it is difficult for the members to visit the parsonage, and that circumstances do not occur every day in which pastoral advice is needed. But on the other hand the congregations which I visited were very large, larger than the largest in Würtemberg; and in Norway clergymen are employed by their congregation as counsellors in temporal affairs, and I think both the cases alluded to were of that kind; nor are there any week-day services in the country, at which anxious souls can find direction and encouragement. It would naturally be expected, that this privation would increase the necessity of private visits to the clergy. I was strengthened in my conviction by the answer I received to the question: whether pastoral visits to the houses of the members, and especially the

sick, were made. "Very seldom," was the answer; "usually only when we are sent for." And when the house is at all distant, a carriage must be sent, which is much oftener done for a physician of the body than of the soul. If pastoral activity is any where of importance, it is in Norway, among a people who consider extraordinary efforts as of so great value. These efforts can only be secured in three ways, either mediately through persons standing in connection with the ministry and possessing their confidence, or immediately, by frequent meetings for devotional purposes, conducted by the clergy, in which greater personal care for souls can be exercised, or by visiting from house to house. The plan of mediate care, which would be peculiarly applicable in the extended pastoral districts in Norway, has been found useful in a peculiar provision in their school system. I refer to the itinerant schools. Each pastoral charge is divided into districts, each district having an itinerant teacher, each district is subdivided into sections, i. e. smaller divisions containing a few families in which instruction is successively given for a period of two months. During the two months which the itinerant teacher spends in each section, he is entertained on the different farms, according to a specified arrangement, so as to stay about a week at a place. These school-teachers, whose position is very arduous, and by no means lucrative, are selected from the lower class of the community, usually chosen by the minister out of the body of learning youth, for their capacity or other advantages, and frequently instructed by him and prepared for their work. Even though some of them pass a year or two at a teacher's seminary, of which there are five, in order to complete their education, the pastor has already set influences to work, which will continue to exert their power after their seminary course is ended, for they generally enter the seminary after their eighteenth year, when their character is pretty well formed. When, therefore, pastors have secured a talented pupil, whom they have selected as a teacher, and to whom they have given thorough instruction, not only in the elements of Christianity, the contents of the catechism, and an elementary acquaintance with the Scriptures, and the outlines of the history of the church, but above all have reached his heart, and made him conscious that he is called to confess the Lord before young and old, by word and deed, and to strive to bring souls to Christ, they have secured in such a teacher an efficient help in that great work to which their life is dedicated, they have sown seed in the congregation which, in its own time, will spring up and bear blessed fruit. And these school-

teachers can often accomplish much which pastors are unable to effect. Their example, when they are actuated by the spirit of Christ, must exert an excellent influence on those families in which they sojourn for a time, and their words spoken in season, reach the hearts of parents and children, and leave a favorable impression even after their departure.

The immediate personal labors of the clergy must ever be, confessedly, of the first importance. But there are two modes in which his pastoral care may be exercised. The one, extending through smaller circles, by prayer-meetings. There are, it is true, peculiar local difficulties in this plan in Norway. In a part of Denmark, where these are not so great, they are frequently held, and well attended. In Norway individual clergymen have adopted the plan with success. At certain seasons of the year it is certainly inconvenient to attend them, but in the summer, and through much of the winter they are accessible without much difficulty. If the attempt were made, no doubt enough of hearers would be found. But beyond all dispute, the mode of pastoral effectiveness, which the Norwegian church requires, is that of personal visiting, not so much of the members at the house of the pastor, as of the pastor at the house of his parishioners. For the former will be made with freedom only by those between whom and their pastor there is an intimate personal acquaintance, which is not so readily formed. Unless pastors visit each member of their congregations at their houses, they will not ordinarily be brought together except at confession previous to communion, and, therefore, but once or twice a year, unless on occasions of the performance of some ministerial functions. So limited an intercourse cannot enable him to understand their character to any great extent. And how can he exercise a proper care for souls without a personal acquaintance? Pastoral visiting, on the other hand, will enable him to give pointedness and power to his discourses, and make them exert a blessed influence. It will lead him to a more careful search into his own heart, and a more thorough examination of the Holy Scriptures, in order to remove the doubts, and meet the difficulties with which those under his care have in confidence come to him. It also frequently affords him an opportunity to notice the mode of life of different families, to prevent domestic dissensions, to promote filial obedience, to remove obstacles to proper education, and by various means to gain the affections of old and young; and when once the affections have been secured, the way is opened for extended pastoral influence. Such pastoral labor within the family would exert a most blessed in-

fluence, not only on individual families, making them become ecclesiolas in ecclesia, but also on the church. This is especially true in Norway, where the family relation still to a great extent maintains its original importance, as above all other relations; where each family forms a little state, occupies a separate district, and is to a greater or less degree confined within itself, on each of which a peculiar impress is stamped, which is handed down with the homestead from generation to generation, forming an important element in the wider relations of the church and the general state. But if this intimacy between the pastor and his flock, produced by visiting from house to house, would in Norway be attended by results so eminently to be desired, the injury which would result from the neglect or imperfect employment of this means would be proportionately great; and this the more easily explains the existing want of friendly mutually confiding intercourse. Pastoral visits, however, should not become a mere duty, required by law, performed with reluctance or aversion, as is unfortunately too much the case in the excellent ecclesiastical arrangement of family examinations in Sweden. But if they are to accomplish any thing they must be the conscientious results of the pastor's love to Christ and Christians. But it may be suggested, that such advice is much more easily given than adopted. Would it not be laborious, if frequent, for the pastor to travel round his charge, calling on the members of his flock? Would he not be exposed to the liability of meeting now and then with an unkind reception, of casting his pearls before swine? May we not, however, with perfect justice meet these questions by others? To the first, we may say: Should a Christian minister consult his convenience, or a slight expense, in a question of the performance of the solemn duties of his office? and the expense would not be great, for he would almost invariably be kindly received, and often meet with free-will offerings of love. And to the second: who can know that in this or that family, though esteemed irreligious, a word in season from the Scriptures may not prove an inestimable blessing, effecting perhaps more than all the preaching to which they had listened? And would not these visits afford an opportunity of reaching those who, from spiritual indifference, or even enmity to the cross, absent themselves from public worship, and by a kind and respectful demeanor in the midst of their families tend to remove the prejudices, often false, entertained against the Gospel and its ministry? Pastor Stockfleth, who was a faithful shepherd to his scattered flock in Lapland, who made visiting their huts an important part of

his duty ; who did not refuse to enter their dirty, smoke-stained house of earth, and to partake of the humble fare to which they were accustomed ; who searched all out with incredible pains and labor, was admired, and his course lauded by the Norwegian clergy, and approved by the government. Would it not have been the highest honor, which could have been conferred on Stockfleth's old age, to have seen his brethren in office filled with his views, and each striving to carry them out in his sphere of labor? But it might be alleged still farther, that the habit of visiting would take him away too much from the parsonage where his presence is often necessary, and in case of extreme illness he could not be found immediately. But he would seldom be so far removed, that he could not be reached by a messenger in a short time. And in addition, there is usually, at least in the more important charges, a resident vicar who could act in the pastor's stead. But it is objected, once more, that it is demanding too much of men whose duties, both in the country and in cities, are sufficiently numerous to add one so onerous. To a clergyman to whom his office is life, salvation, all, nothing can be too onerous which he can possibly perform. It is true that a great deal is demanded of the clergy in Norway, especially in the country. The German clergy have often complained of the labor of the civil duties necessary in their office ; but they would be ashamed of their complaints, were they to compare their duties with those of pastors in Norway. It would be out of place for me here to enlarge on the sphere of duty of the clergy, but this much I may venture to say, that many of their purely civil duties had better be performed by some other officer within the precinct, by the bailiff, sorenskriver, or magistrate. Can we think otherwise, when we are informed that it is the duty of the country clergy to make out lists of the electors and taxes for the Storthing election, to keep an account of all church, school and almshouse property, and to furnish certificates of their having been produced in Norway for all goods exported to Sweden. But even the labors necessarily connected with the pastoral office might be greatly lightened. To this end there is necessary above every thing else an increase in the number of the parishes. On account of the sparsity of the population, scattered over a wide extent of country, parishes have, and always must have a large areal extension. So that when the number of inhabitants within a single parish is nine or ten thousand, it must, under the existing circumstances, embrace an immense area. It is true that in the larger parishes the duties are divided between the pastor and his vicar,

but many of them cannot be divided. His civil duties and such as are connected with the administration of the parish necessarily devolve on the pastor. According to a sketch of the condition of the Norwegian church, which appeared in the *Church Messenger*, in 1846, in which this difficulty was strongly set forth, the relative position of the clergy in Norway, Sweden and Denmark, is as follows: In Denmark each parish embraces three-fifths of a square mile and twelve hundred souls, in Sweden seven square miles and two thousand souls, and in Norway seventeen square miles and thirty-five hundred souls, not reckoning the vicarages. There are 336 parishes and 317 clerical offices in Norway, a country containing 5750 square miles, and 1,250,000 inhabitants! Exertions have been made of late to remedy this defect, and different plans have been proposed, though the government has as yet adopted none of them. Some have proposed the erection of the existing vicarages into distinct parishes; others desire to increase their number and extent; others again desire the present arrangement retained, and propose to remedy the deficiency by creating vicars of the Provost, that is, ordained clergymen who shall labor under the direction of the Provost, have their usual residence in the larger parishes, and who can be called on by the district clergy to perform service in especial cases, and who shall receive stated salaries. All that has been done thus far by the ecclesiastical authorities, is that a few churches have been built which have not been given to any of the settled clergy, but were made filial churches, and in a few instances parishes have been divided, which on account of the expense has seldom been done.

Even though this important defect, which has tended not a little to diminish the spiritual influence of pastors over their flocks, were removed by the coöperation of the king and the Storting, or by a special ecclesiastical body of representatives from the clergy, or partly from the laity, it would still be a question whether the influence of the ministry over the people for their spiritual good would be increased; whether the popular religious movements which arose out of the church, or at least were beyond its control, could again be brought within the sphere of church life. There would certainly be much greater possibility of the performance of all ministerial duties than has hitherto been the case, although every thing would depend on the course of the clergy themselves. But however favorable the latter might be, it would not in my opinion suffice to secure the desired end. The fifth circumstance, which I mentioned above as entering into the explanation of the

preponderant influence of the lay-preachers, must also be altered.

A more extended participation in the control of their own business, and in the general interests of the national church must be allowed the congregations. The laity must be granted a living interest in the weal or woe of the individual congregations, and of the church in general; and that not only those who hold civil office, as has hitherto been the case; because the religious duties of an office will almost invariably be made to give way to the civil, and be performed as a mere matter of business without any proper sense of their importance. But if any evil befalls the church, the blame is always laid to the mechanical transaction of its business by lay-men who felt no interest in it. But there has in late years been a decided improvement in this respect in the members of the ecclesiastical commission. Pastor Wepels informed me, that lately in managing the concerns of the church and schools, clerical counsellors had been employed by the commission, and that its civil members had commenced to make themselves better acquainted with the necessities of the church. But, however much this may be the case, such a plan cannot satisfy the majority of the non-clerical members of the church. A change of the constitution is demanded on all sides, and even some of the clergy occupying high stations, are expressing a desire for it. Bishop Ahrup, of Christiana, in a pastoral address for last year, to the clergy of his diocese, desired an expression of their opinion as to the convention of a general synod. But before a radical change of constitution is attempted, the power which each parish formerly had in the administration of the pauper, school, and church matters, should be restored to them, and increased. I refer particularly to the institution of the so-called assistants (*Medhjælper*). They are lay-men, chosen from the members of the congregation, to assist the pastor in the care of the schools, and in their duties as almoners, and in the *censura morum*. They should be elected by the canons of the chapter, but are often appointed in the country by the *Prövosts*, and in cities by the magistracy. But as the *censura morum* became less necessary, and even the Sunday-police restrictions were removed, the office diminished gradually in importance. And even in the control of the schools and almonry, their influence has by degrees been lost, so that at present, the office is little more than a sinecure. If now, the election to this office were given into the hands of the church members, and its jurisdiction so extended, that they should obtain a voice in the higher judicatories of the church,

have the oversight of the execution of the ecclesiastical laws, and the enforcement of discipline, from the lowest resort in cases of marriage, and be made to coöperate with the clergy in the charge of the schools and church-property, it would give the congregation a larger share in the administration of its concerns. If in addition, the members of a congregation were allowed to participate in the election of their pastor, even if they had nothing more than a veto power, and this power might either be exercised by them directly, or as in the circumstances of their condition might be preferable, through their representatives, an important step would be taken toward a more thorough reformation of the church-organization. And this would also tend to introduce a new consideration in the appointment to parishes, to which far too little attention has hitherto been paid in Norway, a greater regard to experimental piety, and evangelical purity of faith and heart. The ecclesiastical commission have hitherto taken but two requisites into consideration in their appointments to clerical posts, age, and proficiency in acquirements; and experience has proven that a regard to these alone cannot protect congregations from mere hirelings, whose object is the honor of men or filthy lucre, as the position in which many truly evangelical clergy are placed toward the constituted authorities of the church abundantly proves.

Such are my reflections on the evangelical Lutheran church of Norway, in so far as I have been at liberty to express them here. May they serve to direct the attention of the German sister church to its northern sister! The Norwegian church, like the German, is in a process of ferment. If its development should be accomplished with the same peacefulness, caution and freedom as did the Norwegian state thirty years since, both internally in its spiritual relations, and externally in its constitution and missions, a glorious future is in reserve for it.

ARTICLE V.

PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE.

PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE had its origin in the wants of the German portion of the community. A Theological Seminary, under the auspices of the Lutheran Church, having commenced operations in Gettysburg in the year 1826, it was soon discovered that another Institution was necessary, in which young men, designed for the Christian ministry, might receive Academic training. Accordingly, in June 1827, a classical school was established, under the direction of D. Jacobs, A. M. and in 1829, a Scientific department was connected with it, under the care of his brother, the present Professor of Natural Science. In the Summer of 1829, the plan of the Institution having been enlarged, the name was changed to that of the *Gettysburg Gymnasium*. In consequence of the death of Rev. D. Jacobs, whose qualifications seemed so well adapted to the station, to which he had been invited and whose brief career justified the formation of high expectations, in reference to his future success, in November 1830 its classical department was vacant, except by temporary supplies, until April 1831, when Rev. H. L. Baugher, A. M. was appointed to take charge of that department.

As the number of students had considerably increased and the prospects for more extended usefulness were very promising, it was deemed expedient to place the institution on a more permanent basis by enlarging its operations and organizing the Gymnasium into a Collegiate form. Application was, therefore, made to the Legislature for a charter, which was obtained in April 1832; and during the ensuing Summer, on the 4th of July, the Institution was organized, under the title of *Pennsylvania College*, the Hon. Calvin Blythe delivering on the occasion an appropriate address. On the same day, the Patrons of the College assembled and selected the following

Board of Trustees.

Hon Calvin Blythe, *Prèsident*; J. G. Morris, D. D., *Secretary*; J. B. McPherson, Esq., *Treasurer*; Hon. A. Thompson, LL. D., J. G. Schmucker, D. D., D. F. Schaeffer, D. D., J. C. Baker, D. D., B. Kurtz, D. D., S. S. Schmucker, D. D., E. L. Hazelius, D. D., C. P. Krauth, D. D., Hon. D. Sheffer,

Rev. C. F. Heyer, M. D., Rev. A. Reck, R. G. Harper, Esq., Hon. T. C. Miller, J. F. McFarlane, Esq., Rev. J. Ruthrauff, Rev. J. Medtard, Rev. Emanuel Keller, Rev. A. H. Lochman.

In the evening, the Board of Trustees met and organized the following

Faculty.

S. S. Schmucker, D. D., *Professor of Intellectual Philosophy and Moral Science*; E. L. Hazelius, D. D., *Professor of the Latin Language and Literature*; H. L. Baugher, A. M., *Professor of the Greek Language and Belles Lettres*; M. Jacobs, A. M., *Professor of Mathematics and Natural Science*; J. H. Marsden, A. M., *Professor of Mineralogy and Botany.*

Whilst we record the early history of the College, we cannot too strongly express our obligations to those who, from the very beginning, toiled for its advancement, and with a noble perseverance labored, through difficulties and discouragements, to uphold its interests and advance its welfare.

In consequence of their duties in the Theological Seminary, Doctors Schmucker and Hazelius, having consented to aid in the instruction, only until other appointments could be made, in the fall of 1833 the Institution was enabled to dispense with their services, which had been kindly and gratuitously rendered, by the election of C. P. Krauth, D. D., of Philadelphia, to the Professorship of Intellectual and Moral Science. In the Spring of 1834, Doctor Krauth was appointed to the Presidency of the College, and at the commencement of the Winter session was inducted into office. Subsequently the corps of instructors was filled by the appointment of W. M. Reynolds, A. M., who had, for some time previously, been officiating as Principal of the Preparatory Department, to the chair of Latin Language and Literature.

During the Winter of 1833-4, through the efforts of Hon. Thaddeus Stevens, the enlightened patron of education, and, at the time, a member of the Legislature, an appropriation of eighteen thousand dollars was secured for the College from the State. This donation at once dispelled all fears with regard to the success of the Institution. It was a day of great rejoicing, when the intelligence reached Gettysburg, that Governor Wolf, who from the first evinced a deep interest in the Institution, and recommended, in his message to the Legislature, appropriations in favor of the Germans, had signed the bill. The students celebrated the joyful event with illuminations and music, and all felt that a new era had commenced.

This appropriation enabled the Trustees to erect an edifice more suitable than the Academy for the enlarged operations of the school. In the year 1836, the building was commenced, and in the autumn of 1837 it was sufficiently advanced to admit of its occupancy by a part of the students.

Owing to the increasing prosperity of the Institution and the annual appropriation of one thousand dollars, for several years, granted by the State to this, in connexion with the other colleges of the Commonwealth, the Trustees determined to extend the facilities for the acquisition of knowledge by the appointment of additional instructors. Accordingly in the autumn of 1838, Rev. H. I. Schmidt, A. M., was elected Professor of the German Language and Literature, History and French. In 1843, Dr. Schmidt, having received a call from the North, this professorship became vacant; M. L. Stoever, A. M., who had, for some time before, been at the head of the Academical department, was appointed Professor of History, and instruction in German was, as previously, again given by one of the other Professors, until the Winter term of 1844, when Rev. C. A. Hay, A. M., entered upon the duties of that department. In the Spring of 1845, the number of instructors was still further increased by the appointment of H. Haupt, A. M., as adjunct Professor of Mathematics. In the fall of 1847 Professors Hay and Haupt tendered to the Board their resignations, the former, that his time might be entirely devoted to the Theological Seminary, the latter to accept a more desirable appointment in another direction. The duties to which these gentlemen attended, were then, as formerly, performed by the other Professors. No other changes in the Faculty occurred until 1850, when Dr. Reynolds withdrew, to accept the Presidency of the University at Columbus, Ohio, and the department of Latin Language and Literature was assigned by the Board to Professor Stoever. The Presidency, during this year, also became vacant, by the election of Dr. Krauth to the chair of Biblical Philology and Ecclesiastical History in the Theological Seminary of the Lutheran Church, Gettysburg. The resignation of the President was an occasion of deep regret not only to the Trustees of the College, but to all who had been brought into official relation with him, and the history of the Institution, during his able incumbency, furnishes an unerring proof of his fidelity and success as a presiding officer.— Doctor Baugher, who had been a Professor in the College from the time of its organization, was chosen as successor, and F. A. Muhlenberg, A. M., of Lancaster, Pa., was elected to the vacant Professorship of the Greek Language and Literature.

Vacancies in the Board of Trustees, since the first Board was constituted, have been supplied, at different times, by the following individuals: W. G. Ernst, D. D., Rev. D. Gottwald, T. Stevens, LL. D., D. Gilbert, M. D., T. J. Cooper, Rev. J. Oswald, Rev. B. Keller, Rev. J. N. Hoffman, C. F. Schaeffer, D. D., S. Fahnestock, S. H. Buehler, F. Smith, Esq., D. Horner, M. D., Rev. J. Few Smith, Hon. M. McClean, Isaac Baugher, Rev. C. W. Schaeffer, C. A. Morris, Rev. F. W. Conrad, Rev. J. Ulrich, D. H. Swope, Rev. L. Eichelberger.

The Institution has now been chartered nineteen years. Its progress, during this time, has been such as to gratify the most sanguine expectations of its friends. The annexed table will show the average number of students in attendance, during the last fourteen years:

Year.	Number of Students.	Year.	Number of Students.
1837	104	1844	142
1838	123	1845	148
1839	141	1846	193
1840	158	1847	176
1841	189	1848	144
1842	175	1849	133
1843	130	1850	142

The provision at present made for instruction and the extent of the course may be seen in the following list of instructors and their respective departments: H. L. Baugher, D. D., *President and Professor of the Evidences and Ethics of Christianity, Intellectual Philosophy and Rhetoric*; Rev. M. Jacobs, A. M., *Professor of Mathematics, Chemistry and Mechanical Philosophy*; M. L. Stoeber, A. M., *Professor of History, Latin Language and Literature, and Principal of the Preparatory Department*; F. A. Muhlenberg, A. M., *Professor of the Greek Language and Literature*; D. Gilbert, M. D., *Lecturer on Anatomy and Physiology*; H. Montanus, *Instructor in German and French*; M. Valentine, A. B., and C. J. Ehrehart, A. B., *Tutors in the Preparatory Department*.

As the present closes the first administration of the College and forms a kind of landmark in its history, let us inquire how far the objects, contemplated by its benevolent founders, has been accomplished, how far the expectations, originally cherished, have been realized? Have the wishes of those who commenced the enterprize, and labored from the beginning for its advancement, been attained? Have fruits accompanied the effort, equivalent to the labor expended, such as to justify the anticipations of its friends? We reply, there is no reason for

dissatisfaction ! The little acorn, that was planted a few years ago, is spreading its umbrageous branches far and wide, beneath which many find refreshing shelter. Pennsylvania College does occupy an honorable rank among the literary institutions of the land, and has secured the favor of an intelligent community. From this fountain streams have gone forth to gladden the city of our God. Although not in existence a score of years, about fifteen hundred young men have enjoyed the advantages of instruction afforded by the institution, who are distributed through the country, possessing public confidence, occupying positions of honor and usefulness, and discharging with ability and fidelity the responsible duties of society. In almost every state of the Union, and even in distant climes, its representatives are to be found, making an impression upon the community and exerting an influence for good. Of those who have entered upon active life, nearly all, we believe, are answering the wishes of friends and fulfilling the expectations of their *Alma Mater*. Scarcely one has fallen by the way, forfeited the trust reposed in him or shown himself unworthy of his literary parent. From this source, all the professions have received accessions of strength, usefulness and honor. At the bar of justice, pleading for injured innocence and invoking the penalty of the law upon the offender, her sons are to be found. At the sick-bed, exposed to disease and surrounded by death, the ministers of the healing art may be found, whose first lessons were received in Pennsylvania College. But the primary object with those, who originated the enterprize, was to bring cultivated intellect into the service of the church, to furnish facilities by which men might be thoroughly educated and fitted for the ministry of reconciliation. It was hoped, that the mind here educated might be sanctified, that the benign influences of religion might be infused into the science and literature, communicated within these halls—that here many men might be qualified to go forth as heralds of the cross and use their influence to rescue other souls from ruin and be their guides to glory !

But in order that we may ascertain what proportion of the young men, educated in the College, have been induced to devote their energies to the service of the church, we will refer to the graduating classes, saying nothing of the many, who, having pursued a partial course in the Institution, are now faithfully laboring as watchmen in the vineyard of the Lord. The first class, three in number, was graduated in 1834 ; of this number one is in the ministry. In 1835 out of a class of eight, four are in the ministry. In 1837, there were four graduates,

two are in the ministry. In 1838, there were six graduates, four were for the ministry. In 1839, there were fourteen graduates, all of whom prepared themselves for the ministry except two. In 1840, there were six graduates, three of these devoted themselves to the ministry. In 1841, there were eleven graduates, all are in the ministry except one. In 1842, there were thirteen graduates, all of whom are in the ministry except one. In 1843, there were eleven graduates, of this number seven are in the ministry. In 1844, twelve were graduated, of these seven have entered the ministry. In 1845, there were four graduates, of these one is in the ministry. In 1846, there were fourteen graduates, of these seven studied with a view to the ministry. In 1847, the graduating class embraced seventeen members, twelve of these have consecrated themselves to the work of the ministry. In 1848, there were thirteen graduates, seven of these are designed for the ministry. In 1849, there were ten graduates, one-half have the ministry in view. In 1850, the graduating class consisted of eighteen, the largest class that has yet left the Institution, of this number thirteen are preparing for the Gospel ministry. Here, then, are *one hundred and sixty-four* graduates, *one hundred and eight* of whom are either in the ministry or preparing for it.

With these facts before him, may not the late President rejoice, that during the period he presided over the interests of the College, it was made the instrument of so much good, that it accomplished so much for the church, under whose auspices and for whose special benefit it was established; that it realized so fully the ardent wishes of its pious founders and transcended so far their most sanguine hopes! May not the friends of Pennsylvania College be encouraged and inquire without fear of contradiction, where is there another Seminary of learning, that, in proportion to the number educated, has sent forth so many ministers of the Gospel, so many who are laboring to bring souls to Christ? The Institution has already contributed to impart an impulse, which may yet move millions of hearts towards God! If the smiles of Heaven continue to rest upon her, still greater results, than have yet been achieved, may be expected.

The question here arises, if Pennsylvania College has done so much for the church and its influence is so greatly and so extensively felt, has it not strong claims upon the church? The Institution needs the sympathies, the assistance, the contributions and the prayers of those, for whose advantage it was founded. We have seen, that its importance to the ministry cannot be too highly estimated; that here the youthful mind

is developed under the influence of those sacred truths, which we value above all price; that here is exerted a power, designed to elevate the character of the church, and to furnish those, who minister at her altars, with that knowledge so essential to success. Should not the church realize its importance, be interested in its prosperity, be willing to increase its power and extend its influence? Although the College is regarded as the property of the church, it has received comparatively little from the church. Scarcely any thing has yet been done towards its permanent endowment. Much remains to be accomplished, to enlarge, strengthen and enrich this Seminary of learning, to conduce to its comfort and usefulness, to increase its facilities for the communication of knowledge, to render it worthy of its position and enable it to fulfil its high destiny. Additional buildings are to be erected, professorships founded, scholarships established, the philosophical and astronomical apparatus extended, the shelves of the library filled with thousands of volumes and the number of students quadrupled! How easily might some wealthy friend erect a spacious fire-proof library or a convenient chapel to be devoted exclusively to the religious exercises of the students. How readily could some one, at an expense of one thousand dollars, present the Institution with a telescope, the want of which has, for a long time, been seriously felt; or for the purpose of promoting sound scholarships establish a fund, which would produce one hundred dollars, to be applied as a premium forever and paid to the most successful student in the respective departments in each class, that is graduated. How many of ample means in the church, who are under obligations to the College, might, at their decease, in making a testamentary disposition of their property, make the Institution, at least in part, their legatee and thus by their laudable liberality transmit their names with honor to posterity. Why has not the same public spirit, the same desire to do good, the same zeal for the promotion of knowledge and the extension of the church, which operated so powerfully upon the minds of others, influenced those, to whose sympathies Pennsylvania College so urgently appeals? Established as the Institution was to confer special advantages upon the descendants of Germans, designed as it is to furnish them with unusual facilities, ought it not, then, to be an object of their peculiar favor, upon which their munificence should be exercised, their wealth lavished? Why should they not be stimulated to good works by the actions of others and imitate the noble example of the Bartletts, the Phillipps, the Abbotts and the Lawrences, who have contributed so largely

to the endowment and maintenance of our Eastern institutions and by their princely liberality erected a monument *ære perennius*, which will be forever and most gratefully remembered? What a saving influence might they thus diffuse, and when their bodies were mingled with the dust, their memory would be blessed, being dead they could yet speak! We believe, if the appeal were properly made, the object properly set forth and the necessity of the case presented, there would be a prompt and willing response. Although the institution is by no means sectarian — neither the church, under whose auspices the enterprise was commenced, exercising any ecclesiastical supervision over it, nor its privileges for the acquisition of knowledge restricted, but most cordially extended to all, who may be disposed to embrace them — yet founded as it was to promote the interests of education within the bounds of the German church, it must mainly look to individuals of Germanic origin for patronage and favor. If the eight hundred congregations in Pennsylvania, New York, Maryland and Virginia, upon which the College has peculiar claims and within whose limits the effort might be confined, could be impressed with the importance of the subject, and would each contribute one hundred dollars, eighty thousand dollars could at once be raised and the College placed on a permanent foundation. Who can calculate the benefits that might thus be conferred, the reflex influence, that would be exerted upon the church itself? Unless we fail in our duty, Pennsylvania College, in the Providence of God, will perform a great work, accomplish much good, will bless the church, furnish our land with literature and science, purified by the power of the Gospel, and become a memorial, which will continue for ages, instructing and influencing generation after generation until the end of time.

R.

ARTICLE VI.

RHETORICAL STUDIES.

By Professor J. Few Smith, A. M., Auburn Theological Seminary.

Eloquence a Virtue ; or, Outlines of a Systématique Rhetoric. Translated from the German of Dr. Francis Theremin, by William G. T. Shedd, Professor of English Literature in the University of Vermont. New York: John Wiley, 1850.

Elements of the Art of Rhetoric ; adapted for use in Colleges and Academies, and also for Private Study. By Henry N. Day. 12 mo. Hudson, Ohio. 1850.

WHOEVER will read the works whose titles are placed at the head of this article, will be at once convinced, that Rhetoric is not a mere artifice of the sophist, and that rhetorical studies are worthy of the earnest regard of the Christian minister. We cannot doubt, that there still linger in the minds of not a few good men prejudices against the pursuit of such studies ; prejudices born of the fear that they serve but to foster feelings of vanity, of regard to display, and attention rather to the form and outward appearance, than to the body and spirit of a discourse. Nor can we hesitate to admit that such prejudices are to a certain extent legitimate. Rhetoric has been too often treated as if it were a mere collection of artificial precepts, a contrivance by which the speaker might gain dominion over the hearer. It has been contemplated from a low point of view. Its true character as a science, and its true province as an art, have been alike misunderstood. Comparatively few have investigated it thoroughly, and treated it philosophically, and developed the inner vital principle which alone leads us to a proper understanding of its nature, and mastery of its power. Instead of laying hold of the formative principle, the essential idea which "both excludes and includes," and working outward systematically, they have been contented to work at the outside. Hence have resulted systems of Rhetoric partial, incomplete, erroneous ; compilations of the rules of the criticism, treating of Grammar as *Æsthetics*, rather than philosophic, systematic treatises of Rhetoric. And from these one-sided views, on the one hand, and from the unworthy assumptions, and ignoble aims of sophists and their kindred on

the other, have originated the prejudices against Rhetoric. And against such views of Rhetoric objections may reasonably arise. If it teaches nothing but words, if it has no worthy guiding principle, and aims at no good end, it is deserving of all the reproach which has been cast against it, from the days of Socrates until now.

But Rhetoric properly regarded merits no such reproach ; it is worthy of careful study, and will be found to involve principles of high worth and extensive influence. It is based on certain ultimate truths of human nature ; it is confirmed and built up of facts in human experience ; it is under the control of moral principle.

And just here it is worthy of remark to how great an extent we are indebted for our best treatises on Rhetoric, those which treat it philosophically and systematically, to *Christian ministers*. It were not difficult, indeed, to show a recognition of the moral element in the best of the ancient treatises ; but it certainly is not an insignificant fact, that our best modern works are productions of ministers of the Gospel, decidedly evangelical, we believe, in their sentiments, and in the tone of their piety. We would simply mention as illustrations, the works of Campbell and Whately, in Great Britain, and that of Prof. Day, whose title we have prefixed to this article ; while the well known profound treatise of Schott, and the work of Theremin before us, will serve to show what German theologians are doing for this cause. Indeed to Germany we are indebted for the most profound investigations of the subject. In this, as in many other cases, her students seem to have penetrated to the very heart of the matter, and brought out the germ, the life-principle of the system, which a more practical turn of mind enables us to apply ; or they have stricken out theories which, though defective or erroneous, have served to awaken thought, and put the mind on such a course as eventually to arrive at the truth. On this point Prof. Day has elsewhere expressed views, which we are glad to quote as confirming our remarks. After enumerating certain prominent German works, of which he says, "if we are satisfied with none of these views of the art, we must yet admit in all these discussions an earnestness of endeavor, a care and labor of investigation, a precision and force of reasoning, worthy of a true philosophical spirit, and rich in promise as to ultimate philosophical results," and adds : "We should esteem it a most hopeful sign, if in the whole range of English literature of modern times, a solitary work could be found, characterized by the spirit which appears in these and other recent German pro-

ductions. While, both in Great Britain and in the United States, the broad field of secular eloquence, in both its departments deliberative and judicial, is thrown open by our free political constitutions, inviting every generous patriotic spirit to the most assiduous culture of oratory — a field almost entirely closed to the German, and even the field of pulpit eloquence is in these two countries more open, more extended, and more inviting than in Germany, yet it now seems probable that from German divines will proceed the first philosophical conception of Rhetoric, and just theory of Eloquence. We say *German divines*; for it is a fact worthy of notice, that the recent developments in the theory of Eloquence have been made chiefly from the side of homiletics, or the department of sacred oratory.”¹

In the work now before us entitled, “Eloquence à Virtue,” the author endeavors to show, that Eloquence throughout is a moral procedure; that it is governed by ethical principles. He asserts that only as it is thus viewed can a systematic course of Rhetoric be possible; and proceeding on this theory he gives us the outline of such a system. Whether the reader will agree with him or not — and we presume that many will, as we do, dissent from some of his views — his work certainly possesses the merit of being a consistent philosophic development of his main idea, and his general position we believe to be fully sustained.

We propose to give a brief abstract of his reasoning, with a view of calling attention to it. For we believe that such a work cannot be attentively read without profit by the worthy candidate for the Christian ministry. One such little treatise which goes to the bottom of things, which brings to light the governing principle, and by clear strokes indicates its course of control, one such treatise carefully studied is worth a dozen volumes of mere compilations of rules and directions.

After some introductory remarks exhibiting the importance of the endeavor to discover the fundamental idea of Eloquence, and so to place the study of Rhetoric on a sure basis, he proceeds to show the affinity of Eloquence on the one hand with Philosophy, and on the other with Poetry, and then to distinguish it from both. Having advanced thus far, he is prepared to define his position:

“Production,” he says, “in Poetry and Philosophy is a species of activity, which may be denominated the isolated, or that which retreats into itself again. For it simply unfolds an

¹ Bib. Repos. Vol. V. (1849) p. 192.

idea, and in this process has no other end but this Idea and its unfolding. That which has been formed in this way can, indeed, like all that exists, exert an outward influence; yet it never owes its origin to the design of exerting such an influence.

“There is another species of activity which always aims at an outward change, either in the sentiments and conduct of men, or in the social and family relations, or in the civil and ecclesiastical. Now to this species of Activity—the sum total of which constitutes Social Life—Eloquence also belongs, and it is so entirely implicated in the circumstances existing at the particular time, that even in thought it cannot be separated from them. For although it is easy enough, in the case of a tragedy of Sophocles, to contemplate it as something existing for itself, and to think of it as separated from all the civil relations of the poet, such a separation in the case of an oration by Demosthenes cannot be so effected in the least degree. Nothing in it is an isolated piece of art; nothing can be torn out from the web of circumstances in which it was spoken; only in connection with these does it constitute a unity, which again was nothing but an *act*—a point in the political career of the orator. When the ancient orators appeared, their discourse was an action in the strictest and most common signification of the word, an action that was none the less worthy of the name, and none the less powerful, because they made use of speech instead of limbs, weapons, or other instruments. Nay, even in our unrhetoical times, if one were to regard the discourses of a sacred orator as a series of little separate pieces of art delivered every Sunday, every body certainly would protest against such a view, and demand that his orations be regarded as individual attempts to influence his hearers,—as individual acts in the discharge of his calling; whereby they would also become lost in the sum total of his social influence. But since all the influence of man in his various relations is, or should be, under the guidance of the moral law, the practice of Eloquence,—inasmuch as it is in reality influence of this sort—can be subjected to no other than Ethical Laws. Eloquence strives to produce a change in the sentiments and conduct of other men; the question after its fundamental principles, therefore becomes changed quite naturally into this: What are the laws, according to which a free being may exert influence upon other free beings? And the answer to this question can be derived only from Ethics.”¹

¹ pp. 14 — 16.

Eloquence is thus brought within the domain of Ethics, and its fundamental law is asserted to be an Ethical Law ; and in this sense *Eloquence is a Virtue*.

“But in saying that Eloquence is a virtue, it is by no means meant that a certain degree of moral excellence is enough in order to Eloquence, and that all that is usually derived from Art, Learning, and Science, can be dispensed with. It is only meant that the arrangement and definition of that which Eloquence derives to itself from these different departments, belongs peculiarly to Ethical laws ; but this is the very thing that is demanded of a highest fundamental principle. Who, for example, would deny that the imagination is the highest law-giver for the painter? And yet no painting can be completed by the imagination alone. There is needed, besides, mechanical skill, knowledge of colors, of perspective, of anatomy, of history ; the imagination as the highest fundamental principle merely determines how each of these knowledges and abilities shall be applied. In like manner means of various kinds are necessary to the orator, according to the different relations which he sustains, and according to the different ends which he proposes to himself, which are to be obtained only by study and practice ; but that which determines where, how, and in what degree, each of the existing means shall be applied is the Ethical law to which belongs every judgment regarding our relations, our ends, and our social influence. So that here} the moral law does not merely point out the time for the action, leaving the guidance of the action to another principle, as would be the case in the practice of any particular art ; but Eloquence, in all its various forms, is nothing but the development of the Ethical impulse itself.”¹

We have now before us the main position of our author ; and thus far we are prepared to sympathize with him, and can already perceive the value of such a position, the dignity and interest which such a fundamental idea at once gives to the whole study and art of Eloquence. And does not the theory commend itself to our regard? Let us see if it can be maintained.

“The orator has plans and designs which he would realize, and to this end he must first overcome the sluggishness of indifferent minds, and give them an impulse to action ; and secondly, he must overcome those who openly oppose, and carry them along with him. But he has no compulsory authority at all over the minds of others ; he is not a lawgiver

¹ pp. 17, 18.

who ordains the relations of men, and thus gives them direction in a mediate yet sure and irresistible manner; he is not a ruler who leads a whole people hither and thither because he has control over the possessions, life, and standing of every individual. He stands upon a perfect equality with those upon whom he would exert an influence; and since his relation to them insures him no open authority over their freedom, he may not surreptitiously obtain it in any secret manner; he must respect their freedom, and neither by exciting their emotions nor deluding their understandings, deprive them of this prerogative. The hearer, who is carried away, must at the same time act independantly also; and while he follows the will of the orator, he must not merely believe that he is following his own will, but must actually follow it. But how is the solution of such a difficult, and as it would seem insoluble problem, rendered possible? From the fact that there is something altogether universal and necessary which all men will—something which they must will from their moral nature; from the fact that the true freedom of man is constantly striving after the realization of certain ideas, which can be enumerated, and distinctly pointed out. The orator, therefore, has satisfied all the requisitions of morality, as soon as he has carried back his present design to one of those ideas which every individual of his hearers wishes to realize. For, in this way, the freedom of one man is not destroyed by the influence of another upon him; he only fulfils from an impulse from without, what he is constantly seeking to fulfil from an inward impulse. The highest law of Eloquence, therefore, is this:—the idea which the orator wishes to realize, is to be carried back to the necessary ideas of the hearer.”¹

We think that there is here a most important fundamental truth. It is the great glory of true Eloquence to sway the free minds of independent men—to bring men, who think and feel and will for themselves, to think and feel and will with the orator. He who is ensnared into an action, who is deluded and led blindfold by his passion, is not, obviously, an independent, thinking, willing agent—and it is no glory for the orator thus to spread a snare in which to catch the feeble and unwary. And there *must* be in every man certain ideas which form the basis for an appeal, and an action in behalf of the truth—and without regard to which no worthy triumph can be obtained. Men may, indeed, sometimes by the power of Eloquence be led to wrong action—but even then, as our

¹ pp. 19, 20.

author has elsewhere remarked,¹ the orator contrives an appeal to these very principles — Error appears to them in the garb of truth, and seems for the time to satisfy the demands of these fundamental ideas; and to leave them free in acting. And so even in its perversion is seen the evidence of the Ethical character of Eloquence.

The next step is to ascertain what are these “necessary ideas.” “Ideas, generally, are productive thoughts, which impel to production and action, and are themselves the germ of that which is to be produced, as well as the rule by which its form is to be constructed.”² He resolves these “necessary practical ideas, which are to be met with in every man,” into these three: — the Ideas of Duty, of Virtue, of Happiness; “and freedom consists only in following these ideas unconditionally.”

“It is plain now, in what consists the first duty of the orator. The hearer, while he is borne along, is nevertheless to remain free, and through the whole of his oration the orator is to carry back the idea every where present in it, to the necessary ideas of the hearer. He in this way shows them how, in order to fulfil their duty — in order to elevate themselves to virtue — in order to promote their happiness, they must also realize his propositions; how the ideas of Duty, of Virtue, of Happiness, of themselves necessarily produce this very disposition, necessarily impel them to the very conduct to which he would urge them. In this way, the orator not only respects the freedom of the hearer, but while he seems to overpower and utterly subject him, raises him, through the enlivenment of his ideas, to the very highest grade of an independent self-consciousness.”³ But these necessary ideas of Duty, Virtue and Happiness, in their development among men in their social connection, “obtain a stricter determination, a wider unfolding, and consequently another name.” “There are, however, two relations among men which have the common aim to render easy the realization of practical ideas, and which have both been established by God, the one in a supernatural manner, the other by a necessity of nature. The first is the Church; the second is the State.”⁴

In the State, the civil Law comes in the place of Duty — the Ethical Idea of Happiness becomes changed into the striving after the well-being of the State; and Virtue, coming into notice only so far as the highest good, to the production of which it is disposed and suited, also promotes the well-being

¹ Page 36.

² p. 20.

³ p. 22.

⁴ p. 23.

of the Commonwealth, is called Merit. "Civil Law, the Common Weal, and Merit, are consequently the necessary ideas by which every member of the state as such is guided in his conduct; and the first duty of the orator, if he is dealing with his hearers as members of a state, consists in showing them how, through the execution of that which he proposes, Civil Law will be obeyed, the Common Weal will be promoted, and Civic Merit will be acquired."¹

But these necessary ideas, in order to have a perfect unfolding, must be regarded in a higher light than that in which they are seen when shut up in their earthly relation. "They acquire their higher dignity only through religion, and through their reference to the Deity."

"In the church, a divine institution and under divine guidance, the human reason cannot be regarded as the highest lawgiver; God alone is the Supreme Lawgiver, who speaks to us through his natural word in the conscience, and his revealed word in the Gospel, and gives us a rule of conduct; what, therefore, this commands in a particular instance, is not merely Duty, (an idea that carries man back no further than to himself merely,) but the Will of God. Furthermore, when the christian contemplates that disposition of the soul, which is constantly applying itself to good works, and is able to perform them, he cannot possibly stop at mere Virtue; for this denotes that degree of moral perfection to which man can raise himself — which he can attain by a constant struggle with sin. But the Christian knows of something higher: he beholds moral perfection as it reigns, without struggle, and without conflict, in the Divine Being; and hence this perfect condition of the soul can, for him, consist only in resemblance to God, or since the invisible God has become man, and has lived and acted in human relationships, in resemblance to Christ. Happiness, again, he cannot possibly seek in a series of states and conditions, each one of which renders the production of the highest good, easier in the next following; instead of this, his eye pressing forward into eternity beholds the final goal to which this series conducts — namely intimate union with God or Blessedness; he, therefore, as his guiding idea, chooses this alone, which is the goal, and not Happiness which conceived of in its highest ethical purity can yet constitute only the way to this goal. Hence when an orator contemplates himself and his hearers as members of the Church, his first duty consists in bringing the Idea which he would impart to them, into

connection with the ideas which he must necessarily presuppose in them; and these, according to the foregoing, are the Will of God, Resemblance to God, Blessedness. If no one of these is prominent in a sermon as the point from which every thing is viewed, so much is certain at least—the sermon does not belong to the sphere of Eloquence.”¹

From these fundamental principles the author's system is now developed. And his treatise is an interesting illustration of Rhetorical and Logical Unity; the leading idea is every where present, and every step in the process is brought under the guidance and control of the Ethical principle.

“The orator, in this moral striving to connect his particular ideas with the universal and necessary ideas of his hearers, is liable to meet with obstacles of three different kinds. First, there are the obscure and undeveloped conceptions which the hearer forms of the nature of things, whereby he may be prevented from recognizing something which the orator holds out (as e. g. Duty, Virtue, or Happiness) as really being such, and so from taking it up into his own ideas. Secondly, the hearer, from a defective knowledge of existing relations, and of the present state of things, may be in doubt whether an idea, from which in other respects he does not dissent, is practicable. Lastly, the hearer may form a different opinion with respect to the actual reality of a matter to which the orator would apply one of the higher ideas, or to speak generally, may not be convinced of its real historical existence. Hence arises the necessity for the orator, first, to instruct the hearer in the true nature and quality of things; secondly, to make clear to him the practicability of the proposed undertaking; thirdly, to show him that the matter in question has been actually realized, or to convince him of its historical certainty. Hence arise for the theory of Eloquence, three subordinate Ideas, or Categories, as I would rather call them: Truth, Possibility, Actuality.”²

For the management of these, philosophic culture, and a great compass of solid knowledge are requisite—and the orator is morally bound to attain to such culture and knowledge, for the purpose of removing these obstacles in the mind of his hearer.

Now follows at some length an exhibition of the application of these categories, and of the influence of the author's principle in the division of the oration; showing that it should

¹ pp. 24–26.² p. 38.

govern in the outward form, as well as in the subject matter. We trust that our readers will judge for themselves of the value of these chapters. Meanwhile we cannot forbear offering the following extracts:

“While therefore, Duty commands the orator to strive after scientific culture, it also bids him to forget and sacrifice all the sensible, profound and excellent thought he may have upon a topic, if it is not indispensably necessary to the attainment of his End.”¹

Hence, if an orator in the expression of his ideas, seeks to please himself simply, and for this reason forgets his hearers: and the end which he has, or should have in view, I affirm that this is not only contrary to good sense, since he can never in this way attain his end, but it is also contrary to morality—it is reprehensible self-seeking.”²

“The distinctive agency of the orator consists in giving a powerful impulse and direction to the minds of others, and he is not equal to this, unless the goal to which he would direct them is plainly in his eye, and unless he earnestly desires to reach it himself. In a word, he must possess, so to speak, the faculty of Moral Ideas, and these belong to Character. The Imagination, it is true, generates those ideas from which the creations in the sphere of Art proceed; although even in the case of Art, as it seems to me, the products are always somewhat lacking in body and firmness unless they are set up by character. But inasmuch as the Will is the object which Eloquence seeks to influence, Eloquence must originate in the Will, in the moral state of the orator. Take the sacred orator for instance: where will he find matter for his discourses, if his own sanctification, if the moral and religious condition of men, does not lie near his heart—if he does not earnestly desire to improve human character? In him alone who is animated by these motives—who labors upon himself, and contemplates men around him with the design of elevating them to a higher degree of perfection—only in such an one will ideas, that may be referred and applied easily to the highest aim and end of the human will, be generated in their constant and abounding fulness; and such ideas are, beyond question, motive powers, moral and Christian, in their nature.”³

Then follows a brief dissertation on the distinction between Passion and Affection, and on the duty of the orator to speak with affection. From this we make the following beautiful extract:

¹ p. 41.

² p. 44.

³ pp. 71-72.

“Every one who has ever come before the people, filled with great ideas, has spoken with Affection ; but with the greatest affection by far, He who gave utterance to the greatest ideas ; namely, Christ. This Light of the World reveals eternal Truth with an abiding inspiration, which is at one time mild and gentle, at another with thunder and crash ; a great example for every sacred orator, and one that warrants him in dispensing with all, so called philosophical calmness, and obligates him to speak with similar affection.”¹

After speaking of the different kinds of affection he treats of the means of exciting affection. And here he finds three Laws—the Law of Adaptation, the Law of Constant progress, the Law of Vivacity. The Law of Adaptation requires the oration to be “so suited to the hearer’s power of comprehension as that it will neither strain it to over-exertion, nor leave it unemployed ;”² again, it requires “not only that the orator have reference to his whole individuality to his position, his relations, to the occurrences which enter deeply into, and determine his fortune and fate.”³ This knowledge of the hearer’s capacity and circumstances “should not be used to favor his errors and to flatter his passions” — this would be an immorality. But “the opposite fault, namely striking violently against existing and unalterable relations is likewise to be regarded as contrary to morality, and contrary to good sense.” “It also belongs to this adaptation in the oration, that the orator never rise into expressions, phrases, and images, that are above the language of cultivated society ; even before an auditory that would be able to follow a higher style of thought, and to understand more exquisite modes of speech.”⁴

“That which prevents the orator from entering into the conceptions of his hearers, speaking to them in their own language, and exciting affection by the adaptation of his discourse to their individuality, is in the last analysis of it, nothing but a moral defect. In the main, it is that self-complacent vanity, which only desires the pleasure of expressing itself aptly and agreeably, and which shrinks from the difficult, and oftentimes violent effort which is requisite in order to go out from self, and into another individuality. From this weakness arise, in sacred Eloquence, the loosely constructed, flowery orations, which, indeed, since they are adapted to excite the fancy of the hearer, often meet with enthusiastic applause (inasmuch as men generally, blinded by their own vanity, seldom set such an estimate upon the vanity of others, and chastise it, as it de-

¹ Page 86.² p. 108.³ p. 113.⁴ p. 121.

serves), yet whose idle play of thoughts and images can never produce a noble affection urging on to great resolves."¹

As in the moral life of man, and in all its individual developments, there must be a steady progress, a constant advancing towards the goal, so must it be in the oration. There must be "the easy connection and fusion of the parts of the process, so that each particular part, as it was occasioned and prepared for by what preceded, so in its turn serves as the occasion and preparation for what follows. If this essential requisite be wanting, and the movement of the discourse is only by leaps and impulses, individual brilliant fragments may, indeed, be the result, but no continuous ethical life."² This Law of progress admits of narration, but excludes description.³ It "determines the extent of the development of each individual thought that appears in the Rhetorical series."⁴ "To impart this constant flow to an oration is perhaps the most difficult among the many difficult things in Eloquence." "In the plan of the oration as it is first presented to the mind, the thoughts are never found already arranged in this constant progressive flow, but must be afterwards wrought into it. As they first present themselves they are hard, brittle, and separate particles; the mind must seize them, and by grinding them incessantly upon each other, crush them, until the friction kindles the mass, and runs like molten ore. The higher ideas, thrown as it were into this solution, take up the thoughts which belong to them, and which, now that they are fluid, obey the mystic power which attracts like to like, so that they form themselves into a firm chain." "That Demosthenean determination, that iron diligence, which is requisite in order to the formation of the rhetorical, constantly progressive train of thought, can spring only out of the effort to fill the minds of others with great ideas in which the orator has lost himself; the effort to satisfy his own conscience, and to employ only that which can rightfully contribute toward his success:— and what is such an effort, but the moral power of the character, in its finest development, and highest dignity?"⁵

Finally the orator must obey the Law of Vivacity — Moral Activity forbids the idea of isolation and rigidity. "It is itself a constant reception of outward influences, and an equally constant reaction upon them; and since all that is outward is never still, but fluctuates restlessly hither and thither, man when in action must change his position in respect to the outward every moment." "True virtue on the side of Law is

¹ pp. 123-124.² p. 135.³ p. 136.⁴ p. 139.⁵ pp. 143-145.

indeed unalterably the same, but on the side of Life is constantly changing and new. It would betray a want of elasticity in the character if one should continue the same way of action in entirely different circumstances. This change in the position and movements of the orator, peculiar to moral activity of all sorts, can be perceived in the case of the activity of the orator, only in the thoughts and the words, and in their constantly varying turns, since the orator makes use of thoughts and words only, in order to the realization of his Idea."¹

As the Law of Vivacity requires that each thought should appear with a peculiar turn and movement, so will it impart a peculiar form and structure to the period also in which the thought is presented.² It exerts its influence also on the position of the words,³ and it "requires a mingling of syllables in respect to their quantity, suited to the existing thought but going no further than to vary with each period, and never occupying the mind, at the expense of the thought."⁴

We have thus endeavored to present to our readers such a view of Theremin's work as will enable them to form some conception of its character, and induce them to become better acquainted with it. And while the copiousness of our quotations precludes the offering of some remarks of our own which we had intended, this will not be regretted, if it secure, as we trust it will, the attention of our readers to the work itself.—Enough, we think, has been here presented to show those who have not heretofore thoroughly regarded the subject, that there is a noble foundation for Rhetorical studies, and to wipe off the reproaches which have been unjustly heaped upon them. Rhetoric is rescued from the hands of the Sophist and the Empiric, and made to stand forth in its own moral dignity, at the same time the handmaid, and the champion of Truth. While, as we have before said, there are some minor points, in which we would express ourselves differently from the author, we cordially commend this work to the study of ministers of the Gospel, and candidates for the ministry.

The work of Prof. Day, "Elements of the Art of Rhetoric," which we have associated with this of Theremin, is well worthy of such companionship, and may justly be regarded as a valuable contribution to Rhetorical Studies, and highly honorable to our literature and country. It is the practical application of sound principles. It is an able, philosophical, systematic arrangement of the subject, covering the whole field, and bringing out distinctly its prominent points. We

¹ p. 147.² p. 158.³ p. 159.⁴ 160.

cannot now dwell upon it as we would. We have elsewhere¹ given an abstract of its course, and more fully expressed an opinion of it. As a text book — a book for instruction in the art of Rhetoric, we know of none in our language superior to it. We know of none which has so firmly seized upon the vital principles of the art, and so distinctly presented them to view. Rhetoric is clearly distinguished from other arts — its true province is pointed out. Some points—e. g. Invention—hitherto strangely overlooked, are brought clearly into notice, and fully treated — while Language is presented, as it should be, not as a thing to be regarded for itself alone, not as the mere jingle of pleasant sounds to delight the ear, nor simply as the dress, or even as the *vehicle* of thought—but as the embodiment of thought — “*the verbal body of thought,*” while an analysis of Style, new and striking, adds greatly to the completeness and value of the work. We trust that it will receive the regard which it so highly deserves, and that many to whom the study of Rhetoric is a dull and useless task, will receive from it new views, and be quickened to a living diligence.

We are glad to see such works. We are glad to see the noble art of Eloquence placed on a worthy basis. Man was made to *speak*. The preaching of the Gospel is God’s chosen means for saving men. It is a great thing to speak well: to speak as becomes an ambassador of God—to speak with *affection*—with affection for truth, for Christ, for dying men—like Him who spake as never man spake—so as to kindle affection for truth, for holiness, for God, in men. And we are glad to commend such works as those before us, because they seize upon this great principle, and go down into the heart, and demand that the orator’s soul be filled with great, moral truths, his heart in love with holiness, as well as his knowledge extended, his intellectual and physical faculties highly trained.

¹ Bib. Repos. Vol. VI. (1850) p. 566-570.

ARTICLE VII.

THE PROTESTANT PRINCIPLE IN ITS RELATIONS.

Translated by the Editor.

(Continued from p. 236.)

THE second series of controversies, which are settled in the definitions of the Concord Formula, originated in the movements of the Augsburg interim.

It does not enter into our plan to unfold these movements, which had respect to the Confession of the true doctrine, particularly the necessity and explicitness of it, although a new and correct presentation of them is required to counteract the misrepresentations of Planck. Just as little can we enter into particulars here in regard to the difference between the school of Luther and Melancthon which was connected with it; we can only glance at the Leipzig Interim and the Articles, which were assented to with the Catholic Bishops at Pegau.¹ In these articles the doctrine of the Church in regard to justification was not directly denied, but its distinctive character was so much disfigured, and the opposition in which it stood to the Romish view so softened, that it appeared very acceptable to those Catholic bishops. The Shibboleth of the Protestant Confession—the *sola fide*, was relinquished, and in the conception of justification, although it was regarded as the forgiveness of sin, the infused righteousness (*justitia infusa*) was placed. The theologians of Electoral Saxony had indeed appended the equivocal explanation: “*justitia infusa*”—*non tamen hoc sensu, quod persona propter haec remissionem peccatorum habeat, sed quod Deo haec imbecillis et inchoata conscientia propter Christum placeat*”; but when the Catholic bishop wished to know: *quod homo per Spiritum Sanctum renovatus hanc justitiam opere efficere possit*, then they agreed to unite both positions together, and thus arose the Formula: the virtue and good works in such reconciled persons are called righteousness, as was stated above in regard to the communicated righteousness, but not in the sense that the person acquires thereby forgiveness, or that he is in the judgment of God without sin, but renewed by the Holy Ghost, and can complete righteousness by works, and that God will ac-

¹ Twisten's lecture on M. Flacius Illyricus, with Rossel's additions is a valuable contribution to this. Berlin, 1844.

cept in believers for his Son's sake this weak incipient faith from a wretched shattered nature. Further, faith is reckoned amongst the Christian virtues, which is a return to the scholastic doctrine, yea the necessity of good works to salvation is openly asserted: "As this true knowledge of Christ must shine in us, so it is certainly true, that the virtues, faith, love, hope and others must be in us and are necessary to salvation"; were the Semi-pelagian theory of the relation of human freedom to the operations of divine grace is at least intimated: "God so draws man, that his will coöperates"; entirely statements in which the Catholic doctrine, notwithstanding the cautions, can without difficulty be found. In addition, that in this Interim the Episcopal jurisdiction is again restored, without any further condition than the general one, "the Episcopal office shall be conducted in accordance with the divine command," that the greater part of the discarded ceremonies was restored, Confirmation, Unction, Canonical hymns, lights, vessels, bells, indeed almost the entire ritual of the old mass, fasts, festivals, even the festival of Corpus Christi, &c.: thus may be comprehended the powerful excitement produced in the entire Lutheran church; it is obvious, that it was regarded as an unpardonable concession; it was looked upon, indeed, as a betrayal of the church,¹ particularly in reference to the four hundred ministers, who were, at that time, partly in prison and partly driven from their homes and wandering in Germany

¹ To this may be added what Flacius in his recital of the proceedings, &c. very properly remarks: The four comprehensive principles, which were formally propounded, in confirmation of the Leipzig documents, and brought into requisition, are not to be forgotten. First; when the Prince made known, that the Emperor insisted upon the adoption of the Interim by the Magistrates, they turned to the divines. The Emperor, said they, commands us through the Prince to adopt the Interim, what is your advice, teachers? Whereupon they gave no other reply, than this: We are concerned, that the utmost obedience may be paid to his Imperial Majesty, our most gracious Master, and such a course be pursued, that your Majesty and every man may see that peace and concord are our aim. This we sincerely recommend, and will contribute to it as much as possible. Is not by this the whole Interim recommended? In the second place, it was decided: All the customary usages of the other party, and of the old Church shall be observed by us, a determination, which the Hamburg clergy emphatically condemned. Third, at the close of the Leipzig Interim the divines declare themselves ready to search in the fathers, with their lords, the bishops concerning other things and articles, and to discuss their import in love. From this, at a late period, originated the Church-liturgy patched together in association with the Pope's bishops, read to the superintendents in the fall of 1549, and which contained the old chaos of papal worship. And now the last. When some of the princes, who had consented to the Interim, had given it to the bishops with the promise, to obey the imperial order, the bishops explained themselves in opposition, that they received what was handed them in the sense, that they would obey the Emperor and his interim, and whatever was defective in the

because they refused to adopt the Augsburg Interim ;¹ and it will be found not less natural, that a prejudice was excited, against those divines who sanctioned that agreement, in all those who remained faithful to the Confession, viz. : the refugees in Magdeburg and the northern German States—a prejudice against the University of Wittenberg and its head Melanchthon.² Whilst some, for instance the clergy of Hamburg, Brandenburg, Franconia, addressed themselves with their objections to Melanchthon, whose timid answer could not quiet them,³ others received the Interim (the Augsburg and Leipzig) at once ; from all quarters the severest censures came, particularly from those who fled to Magdeburg, Flacius, Nic. Gallus, Joh. Wigand and others ; and they had respect not merely to ceremonies and things indifferent (adiaphora,) but all the above concessions in doctrine were exposed and their incompatibility with the Confession shown ; the same points, which at a later period were subjects of special controversy, were here abridged and contested. This must all be remembered in order to understand the movement to which we are about to attend. For although the Interim was set aside by the political commotions of the year 1552, the mental excitement continued

writing, or obscure or equivocal, should be explained from the Emperor's book. No one on our side said ought against this explanation, but by silence consented. In these four specifications is the Interim adopted, and sanctioned anew from beginning to end. Whoever looks upon this as of little moment, I know not what he would consider of moment? In the good old time it was considered as the veriest treason against the cause of Christ, to scatter two grains of frankincense into the fire, and Paul looked upon it as a very serious matter, that Peter ate several times with the heathen. But he would not, on this account, for a moment yield to the opponents, that the true doctrine might be preserved to the Church.

¹ Compare Ranke German History V. 56—70. I cannot refrain from remembering the orthodoxy and firmness of the imprisoned Churfürst, and the splendid passage in Sleidan XX, 116. (ed. am Ende.)

² Ranke himself says loc. cit. 85. "And so it happened now, that whilst the protestant ecclesiastical dignitaries, in other parts, determined upon resistance, at all hazards, the birth-place of the protestant development, the mother University from which the advocates of the new issued, yea, the great teacher himself, the universally mentioned, who enjoyed the highest respect, did not indeed accept the imperial ordinance, but approximated more nearly than was thought possible. And then p. 446. "The Metropolis of the Evangelical doctrine, drawn into the bounds of the advancing efforts at restoration, permitted itself to concede what in the pressure of the moment might be excused, but could not be universally received. They must rather have become an abomination to those who resisted similar advances, preferred exile and banishment, and repelled those, who were not brought under the influence of the advancing victorious power. Melanchthon was placed by the influence of local politics in a one-sided position, in which he ceased to guide "the chariot of Israel."

³ The answer Corp. Ref. VII, 140.

and the anxiety in regard to purity of doctrine. The course of the divines of Electoral Saxony thus far was too well remembered, to allow the opponents of the Interim, some of whose leaders were now called to the University of Jena, to neglect the nourishment of this solicitude; and thus, through the chain of controversies now beginning, the opposition of these two Universities displays itself. The most important of these controversies are those in regard to good works, and the relation of human freedom to the influence of God's grace. Both pass through various stages, in a course similar in its antithesis, to those before mentioned. In this article, we direct our attention to the first.

The relation of good works to justifying faith, the Augustana and its Apology had explicitly stated, in Art. IV. 6. 20. It was the fundamental discriminating doctrine of the entire Confession, "that man is justified without works or merit," that works must be entirely excluded from the article on justification, whilst they would find their proper and necessary place in the article on the fruits of faith, or, as it was expressed, new obedience (*nova obedientia*); where it is, however, to be observed, that the expressions: faith justifies and it saves; it procures righteousness and eternal life; the *vita aeterna*, *salus aeterna* are synonymous. It arrested attention, when Melancthon, in lectures and works (1536), occasionally asserted: good works are in justification necessary (*in articulo justificationis causa sine qua non; bona opera necessaria, novam obedientiam necessariam esse ad vitam aeternam;*) but by his judicious explanations and recantations the rising storm was allayed; Melancthon abandoned those expressions, to which Luther had objected and confined himself to the Formula: *novam obedientiam (bona opera) esse necessariam,*¹ Mel. Loci 1535. (Particulars below). More serious appeared the same view in the Interim, where it came out as a concession to the opposite doctrine of the Papists, and where it had been properly controverted. (See above).

a) Much greater astonishment was created, when George Major, Professor in Wittenberg and for a time Superintendent of the Mansfield diocese in the year 1552, came forth with the assertion: "This I acknowledge that good works are necessary to salvation, I say openly with plain words, that none can be saved without good works, and more, that whosoever teaches otherwise, even though an angel from heaven, let him be ac-

¹ Comp. Walch Relig. Streit. innerh. der Luth. Kirche, I, 100, and particularly Galle Charakteristik Melancthons. (Halle, 1840.) p. 342.

• cursed.”¹ These assumptions, brought forward in a work against Amsdorf, and which were at once generally opposed,² he introduced into the pulpit and with the most bitter opposition to the Flacians; he further defended and exposed them in a sermon on the conversion of St. Paul, which, though in opposition to the urgent solicitations of the Mansfeld clergy, he published.³

In this he recants, or defines more accurately these propositions to the effect, that good works do not indeed merit justification, which is certainly obtained by faith alone,⁴ but as fruits of faith they are assuredly necessary to salvation, that is to retain it, (*ad retinendam salutem.*) “When you are, it is said here, justified by faith alone and have become a child and an heir of God, Christ now dwells in you by the Holy Ghost and by faith, then good works are of such great necessity not to obtain salvation, (which you have already by grace through faith), but to retain salvation and not to lose it again, that if you do not perform them, it is a sure sign, that your faith is dead and vain, deceptive and imaginary”; further in the same connection: “Our good works are not only necessary here but likewise before God in heaven, that we may receive for them the glorious reward of eternal life.” Instead of the expression good works, he uses in the same place: Renovation, new obedience, consisting in works, a new life, and says accordingly: “the new life, which consists in good works, is necessary to salvation.”⁵ But he so says it, that he not only continues to oppose the opposite doctrine with great heat, but at the same time makes forgiveness of sin and renovation as the two factors of salvation, or, to the extent of identity of justification and salvation, leaves them both unaccomplished in this life: “Sal-

¹ Amsdorf, Flacius, Nic. Gallus, wrote against them in the year 1552; the Lübeck divines and many others afterwards.

² S. Salig, 639. Schlüsselburg, VII, 30.

³ S. Schlüsselburg, 171, 297, Wigand's Report.

⁴ He had intimated this before in his reply to Amsdorf, for it is impossible that a man should have true faith, and not at the same time good works of every description.

⁵ Just the same in his confession in regard to the article on justification, Witt. 1558. A. 3. Therefore is pardon granted and righteousness imputed in the Gospel, without our merit and works, for Christ's sake, of grace through faith. But that we may not lose this great treasure, obtained in this way, and suffer shipwreck, it is necessary that we should persevere till the end of life, in faith, penitence, obedience to God, and performance of good works, A. 4. The same B. 2. Summa: that good works commanded by God, and new obedience are necessary to the salvation of believers, not to merit it (for this they have already of grace through faith), but as an effect of the true faith and the Holy Ghost, and the fruits of righteousness, and the new birth,

vation in this life is first forgiveness of sins, and second, commenced renewing of the image of God, likewise Righteousness, Holy Ghost and eternal life."¹

Justus Menius, Superintendent in Gotha, agreed essentially with these views, and appeared in 1554 as the defender of Major, and is regarded as belonging to the same school. He too maintained that good works are to be regarded not as justifying, but, as new obedience, the necessary effect of faith and connected with the retention of salvation, or as he expressed himself subsequently—*ad non amittendam salutem*.² How this was meant may be seen from the following assertion: "Through faith alone is man justified and saved before God. Why? Because through faith is received the forgiveness of sins and righteousness or obedience of Christ, in that he fulfilled the law for us; further, that the Holy Ghost is received, who requires the righteousness of the law, produces and completes it in us, in this life in part, in the life to come fully;" further: "It is certain, that new obedience towards God, and a new life in righteousness and holiness commenced in this life, accomplished in the life to come, is necessary, likewise, to salvation; and if any one, having been pardoned, sins against conscience, he loses his life and salvation."³ Major, at a later period, expressed himself just in this way. (See above).

which must follow faith, and without which they cannot and shall not be properly righteous and born again." In his last testament, 1570, he fully withdraws the expression, necessary to salvation, thereby abandoning the peculiarity of his earlier opinion; for this was its characteristic.

¹ Comp. The passage from his *Dispos. Epist. ad Rom.* (in *Schlüsselb.* p. 348): *Duplex salvificatio seu justificatio est: una in hac vita, altera in aeterna, quae in hac vita est salvificatio, constat primo remissione peccatorum et imputatione justitiae, secundo donatione et renovatione sp. sancti et spe vitae aeternae, gratis propter Christum donandae. Haec salvificatio et justificatio tantum est inchoata et imperfecta, quia in iis, qui fide justificati et salvati sunt, manet adhuc peccatum. — — Sic per fidem et sp. s. coepimus quidem justificari, sanctificari et salvari; reliquum igitur est, ut perfecte justi et salvi fiamus.*

² *Salig III*, 46, 53.

³ Reply of Justus Menius to M. Flacius Illyricus' virulent defamation, *Wittenb.* 1557. Fol. N. 4. Comp. the passages from his preparation for a happy death, 1556: The Holy Ghost commences in believers righteousness and life, which beginning is, in this life, very weak and imperfect, but nevertheless necessary to salvation, (in *Planck IV*, 516); particularly from the work: *Justi Menii Kurzer Bescheid, auf den Vortrab Flacii Illyricus.* *Wittenb.* 1557 f. B. 4: For Christ did not truly redeem us with his precious blood, that we should persevere in sins and lusts of every kind, but that we should depart from them by repentance, after having been redeemed and reconciled by Christ, and serve God in righteousness and holiness. And it is impossible, to have true faith and to live with God in grace and in the enjoyment of blessedness if there is no repentance and true conversion from sin and ungodliness.

From this a correct judgment can be formed in regard to both men and their school. The position: good works are necessary to salvation was neither assumed by Major nor by Menius in the catholic sense. The first guarded himself sufficiently against this in his answer to Amsdorf, in explaining expressly, "that he spoke of good works only as the fruits of justifying faith, "which could as little be without faith as the sun is without brilliancy and light," and thus far, injustice was done him by his adversaries in accusing him of Papacy.¹ Just so Menius rejects decidedly this proposition in the territory of justification, but is not disposed to condemn it entirely in that of new obedience, although for his part, because it may be misunderstood, prefers withdrawing from it altogether, and instead of it using the expression new obedience.² The tendency of both is not to deny the sole justifying power of faith, but to enforce the necessity of renovation and good works following faith; they were concerned about the inward, inseparable union between faith and a new life—indeed in opposition to a neglect and disparagement of this side of the Christian order of salvation. For Major says at the close of the sermon on the conversion of Paul: "There are at this time many such seducers, who constantly cry: "faith alone justifies and good works have nothing to do with salvation;" and still more explicitly Menius: "there is a party amongst Protestants (Antinomians, &c.) who oppose the article on holiness, as the Papists and Anabaptists do the article on justification, as it is easy

For all, that are justified by grace through faith in Christ, and are reconciled and saved, must assuredly be converted, sanctified and renewed. For faith does not leave a man as it finds him, but receives truly the Holy Spirit who renews and sanctifies him, that he becomes a new and holy man, who obtains a new heart, perceptions, mind and an entirely new life and being. This, I say, must and does take place, in all, who have true faith, by which they are justified and saved; without this, there is certainly no true faith, neither Christ, the grace of God, salvation, nor happiness.

Therefore it is an open corruption and intolerable mutilation of the Gospel, when the article on Sanctification, taught therein in regard to renovation and new obedience, which the Holy Ghost produces, is taken away by that on justification, under the pretence that they conflict and are not both equally necessary to those who will be saved, who need not only to be justified, that is, to be freed from sin, and to be made righteous by forgiveness, and the imputation of Christ's righteousness, but must be renewed and sanctified in their whole nature by the Holy Ghost, that sin may be destroyed in the flesh, and swept away, and true righteousness be created in them by the Holy Ghost, commenced in this life, and finished in the life to come. In the same place: Renewal is necessary, that salvation obtained may not be lost.

¹ Comp. Major's Confession F. B. 2.

² Comp. the passages S. 148, 149, and Justus Menius' report of the bitter truth, 1558, F. O. 3.

to see how every one desires to be a believer and a Christian, and yet there are so few who permit the Holy Spirit to rule them." He reminds in this, in reference "to the groundless accusation of Osiander, as if ministers taught concerning the righteousness of faith so lazily and coldly, that the people could obtain grace, forgiveness of sin, and eternal life, although they remained unconverted and unreformed; therefore, Menius regarded it as his duty, to insist upon sanctification and renewing of the Holy Ghost or new obedience aside of the article on justification." And in opposition to this tendency both were decidedly right; it is an essential part of Evangelical truth that they and their school vindicate.¹

But on the other hand their numerous opponents were right, and amongst these may be enumerated not only Flacius, and they of Jena, but likewise most of the Ministerium of the Lutheran Church, principally in this that they rejected the proposition of Major, because it was the expression for the Catholic counter doctrine, the negation of the Protestant principle; it conveys the meaning, that works coöperate in justification and salvation; interpreted otherwise it loses its import. For it is a clear contradiction to say: first, that the faith which justifies must be followed by good works, and then: they are necessary to salvation, because the faith, which alone saves, must manifest itself by good works.² The proposition of Major, if any significance is to be attached to it, would come into contact with the article on justification and would affect its purity; "it is a sour vinegar, which would spoil the sweet honey taste of the Gospel." In this view it was properly rejected by all, but neither thus advocated by Major nor Menius, as we have seen. But even in that view to which they adhered, it was not free from objection. For it had not respect—so both correctly give the *Status Controversiæ*—to the manner in which the sinner is saved and what is necessary, but how the sinner who has been received into favor by faith on Christ and has been saved, should act, that he might re-

¹ They do their adversaries injustice and particularly Flacius, when they charge upon them the neglect of holiness and good works. What Menius says of Flacius is not true. He taught, that a sinner can be saved by faith without the renewing of the Holy Ghost, and remaining a sinner. This is one of the worst perversions which were then common on both sides. Schenkel should not have repeated it, who has treated this controversy very partially. The old warriors of the Church should not be reproached by those who imitate them. In this matter is Plänck, whose fairness is not always to be praised, more correct.

² Flacius, wider den Evangelisten des h. Chorrockts (1553) C. Hamburger das Bedenken bei Schlüsselb. VII. 564.

main safe and not again be rejected from the state of grace and salvation; and what is necessary to this.¹ In this view, the *sola fide* appears to be endangered. For according to this, although the establishment of justification does not, yet its continuance of the relation effected by it does depend upon faith and new obedience conjoined; the salvation of man has still two factors; the work of grace through Christ for us, and the work of the Spirit in us; trust in the one and obedience to the other. Faith does not in the progress of the Christian life entirely relinquish its principal significance to holiness, but divides with it, and is thereby lost. Against this conjunction an emphatic protest was raised at once. Necessary as new obedience doubtless was, the doctrine of a *necessitas ad Salutem* constantly led back to Romish errors, it reminded of the *fides formata* of the Scholastics, it contradicted the Scriptures, *quae et initium, et conservationem et finem salutis asserted for faith*; it abridged the certainty of the promise, *si enim fundamentum salutis aliqua ex parte, quantulacunque ea sit, in nostra opera recumbat, incerta erit promissio*; it diminished the glory of free grace and reacted injuriously upon the article on justification. The relation established by this remained the unchanged ground of the state of grace; and as soon as any one even in part rested salvation upon any thing of his own, he forsook Christ and fell from grace. Not only for the commencement, but likewise for the whole course of the Christian life the *nisi propter fidem* remained firm. Likewise the practical consequences were followed out: The doctrine would be an impediment to the comfort of tempted minds, troubled in consequence of sin; it took away from those who sought Christ in articulo mortis all consolation, and on the other strengthened confidence in our own acts; the opposition to Luther appeared exceedingly plain. Major was condemned for the confounding of justification and renovation, likewise for the dogma of a *justitia fidei inchoata*, which too nearly trenched upon the perfection of the righteousness of Christ, which is imputed to us as believers.²

The defects of this doctrine are exposed correctly in these criticisms. It appears that an aspect of Evangelical truth was supported partially and in a manner contradictory to the fundamental principle of Protestantism. This view received the sanction of the whole church; the doctrine of the necessity

¹ Major Bekenntniss B. 2. Menius, Bericht der bittern Wahrheit 1558. L. 3.

² Comp. the different controversial tracts in Schlüsslb. 163. ff. 182, 534. ff. 570—590, 301.

of good works and of new obedience to salvation was pronounced by the Wittenberg school itself suspicious and injurious. Melancthon, too, rejected it. Whilst the proposition is to be firmly maintained: *nova obedientia est necessaria*, we will not append the words *ad salutem*, because their addition will be explained as meritorious and the doctrines of grace will be obscured; for this remains true, that man is justified before God and made an heir of salvation by grace, for the sake of Christ.¹

b. We have thus far only presented the first Stadium of this controversy. In the second, which is directly connected with it, the other side of the opposition, the other extreme, comes into view. Although the opponents of Major in general decidedly recognized the necessity of new obedience and of good works as a fruit and display of faith, there were some who in part overlooked the connection between these and in part underrated them. This appears immediately in regard to the point which was condemned in the doctrine of Major and Menius, at the Synod of Eisenach (1556). For when to the correct proposition (the 4th): *Sola fides justificat et salvat*, in principio, medio et fine, it is added: "Although it is true, that grace and the gift by grace cannot be separated, but always co-exist, the gift of the Holy Spirit is not therefore apart or a concurring cause in justification, but is an appendage, a consequence and a result of grace"²: it is evident that in these last expressions an entirely objective view of the connection between justification and the gracious operations of the Holy Spirit, is at the foundation; a mere succession, which is not less erroneous than the former co-existence. We find other expressions in addition. Flacius says that God dwells only in those who are already justified; the indwelling of the Holy Ghost is the beginning of renovation: *quare instauratio aut renovatio est prorsus res separata a justificatione*;³ and more than this, Melancthon is said to have said to some one in perplexity: *Deus non curat opera*.

¹ Comp. Melancthon's Gutachten an den Senat zu Nordhausen Corp. Ref. VIII, 410; further: Artikel zu Worms gestellt 1557 loc. cit. IX, 403 und ebend. 474: but in this Confession is not added *ad salutem*, that the papistical view may not be taken from it. The Frankfort Abschied rejects it, Corp. Ref. IX, 498.

² The decrees of this Synod are found in Flacius' work, *de voce et re fidei*, (1563) p. 199; the history in Salig, III, 43.

³ Flacius loc. cit. *de justificatione*, 182 According to this it is intelligible how faith could be the work of the Holy Spirit, which Flacius nevertheless asserts 152, ff. This is however an isolated assertion; he in other places states the relation correctly.

Further they did not continue at this point. The Synod mentioned asserted, that the doctrine: that good works are necessary to salvation, in a legal view considered in the abstract or in the idea (*de idea*), was correct and therefore, (although liable to be misunderstood), might nevertheless be tolerated.¹ Against this Amsdorf, and with him, the Erfurt and Nordhausen divines started at once the most determined opposition: the law, considered in itself, has no relation to human salvation; contains no promise of eternal life;—not even when it is perfectly fulfilled. Its office is simply to expose sin, to reprove, to condemn; in addition it cannot be said that obedience to the law or good works could ever procure salvation.

The passage of Scripture, “do this and you shall live,” refers to the exterior life. They did not design by this to deny good works; they asserted them very explicitly, but in such a manner, that they reject most peremptorily every legal bearing. “Not because God in the law commanded them, but simply as fruits of faith, as unconstrained manifestations of love and gratitude for grace received, are they necessary, *ad testificandam remissionem debiti gratuitam*”²—and to distinguish this free relation they do not consider sufficiently appropriate the terms *necessitas* and *debitum*; they see in them a legal constraint. Many rejected them entirely on this account, indeed some went so far as to assert: “that faith may remain in connexion with wilful sin against the law.”³

This Antinomianism reached its acme in the famous proposition of the aged Amsdorf: that good works are injurious to salvation (1559); he means, indeed, only to say, that they are injurious, so far as they are considered meritorious, or so far as they are relied on. In no other sense was the law used by the Nordhausens; they were interested in distinguishing

¹ For the law, as it is in itself, not only requires such an obedience but promises life to them that have it.

² Thus Poach in his letter in *Schlüsselb.* IV, 344.

³ To what extreme these Antinomians proceeded, can be seen from Melancthon's views as presented to the Senate of Nordhausen, Jan. 13, 1555. *Corp. Ref.* VIII, 411: “Some will not bear this doctrine: good works are necessary; or thus: good works must be performed; they will not have these two words *necessitas* and *debitum*, and the court preacher (*Agricola*), understood *necessarium* and *debitum* for forced by fear, through reproof, and uttered pompous words, how good works might come without law. Another says: good works are more injurious than had to faith. Then came Dr. Jäkel and Naageorgius, who tore open the orifice still more, and understood the proposition *sola fide justificamur* thus: that faith and the Holy Ghost might be had, in connexion with wilful sin against the law of God; and they removed the difference between mortal sin, and evil desires in the Holy.

between faith and works, the fruits of faith and the works of the law, but the distinction resulted in an entire separation and in this to a depreciation of works.¹

We may then say in regard to this system: that it presented one phase of the Evangelical doctrine, but exhibited it so imperfectly, that it did not correspond to the other, and by this it came into contrast with the Church doctrine, which holds both in their proper relations—and this was its falsehood and its insufficiency.

Immediately from every quarter, there arose a powerful opposition. The Wittenberg school entered upon the controversy in great earnest, and to Melancthon is due the praise of having contributed much to the overthrow of the system. He directed attention to the opposition of the Scriptures, and the danger to morals, the libertinism which it involved; *est igitur barbarica impietas fingere, non esse necessariam hanc obedientiam, sed esse concessam licentiam omittendi eam*; he calls this a clear falsehood, an open blasphemy.² On the other hand he renders most decidedly emphatic the necessity of the new obedience and good works: "Therefore this proposition must be supported, he exclaims, it is and will continue an eternal truth, and can be destroyed by no devil."³ This necessity he defines more accurately, partly as an internal, founded on the nature of justifying faith, partly as a *necessitas ordinis*, as a *debitum*. In the first respect he holds up, denying that external consequence, that justification cannot occur without conversion, which is itself an effect of the Holy Spirit, and therefore *eo ipso* embraces the commencement of renovation, that faith, according to its nature, enkindles a new light and life in the heart, therefore never without inward fruits, which must be followed by outward; "the two statements, *sola fide justificamur* and *fides non est sola* are both correct and to be equally asserted." In the other respect he says: "good works or new obedience is necessary on account of the divine order, because the rational creation is obligated to obey God, was created for this and is now regenerated, that it may be like him, as the Apostle writes: *debitores sumus*;" and guards this *debitum* against the Antinomian explanation: *insulsitatis est, fingere, haec vocabula necessitatem et debitum significare, terrore extortum, sed ordinem divinum et immotum in Deo significat*; it does not at all depend upon the pleasure of the believer,

¹ They say this themselves in a letter to the Eisenach Synod: "We separate the doctrine of faith and works as widely as heaven and earth." Salig III, 57.

² C. Ref. IX, 370-474.

³ Loc. Cit. 777.

whether he will render such obedience, or not, it is his sacred duty; but he exercises it not from constraint, but impelled by love. With this Melanchthon is entirely satisfied, "that with this should not be united *ad salutem*, which is liable to misapprehension and easily leads to the idea of a merit in works.¹ For this explanation is to be avoided: good works deserve salvation, and faith and consolation must abide firmly in Christ alone, that we certainly by him alone, *propter eum et per eum*, have forgiveness of sins and the imputation of righteousness, the Holy Ghost and the right of inheritance to eternal life. This foundation is sure.²

Thus did Melanchthon, and in the same manner, yea, nearly with the same words, his school afterwards, unfold these relations and proclaim them in published works.³ The correctness of the position cannot be doubted, and in addition, in

¹ Loc. Cit. comp. IX, 396. 406. 412. 497. ff. 618.

² Loc. Cit. comp. VIII, 412.

³ Part. in the: *Endlicher Bericht und Erklärung der Theologen beider Universitäten Leipzig und Wittenberg, 1571. N. 2 ff.* As we, however, teach, that the blessings of Christ are received through faith, so we must likewise ever and ever teach this, that the reception of God's grace and the merits of Christ by faith, occurs in no other way than in true conversion to God and sincere acknowledgement of sin. For although conversion to God is one thing, and the reception of grace and reconciliation with God, or the imputation of the righteousness and obedience of Christ is another, it is nevertheless undeniable, that in all, who are justified before God, conversion must take place at the same time; for God has embraced both in his oath, that conversion is necessary, and that there must be faith in forgiveness. As [live, (he says), I desire not the death of the sinner, but that he be converted, and live.

Further we teach, that this is God's unchanging truth, that in the heart, which receives forgiveness of sins by faith, the Holy Ghost produces abiding comfort and life, and brings into action every virtue, increase of faith, confidence and hope, enkindles love, impels to proper worship, and to good works, and that it is entirely impossible, that faith can be in a heart, that continues in sins against conscience, and has not a good determination to obey God, and to live according to his will. And as the doctrine of good works belongs here, and cannot be omitted, we teach, that it is necessary, that there should be new obedience and a good conscience, as is expressly taught in the writings of the apostles. For this is God's eternal, unchangeable will, that all his rational creatures shall be obedient to him. And for this purpose he sent his Son Jesus Christ, that he might bring us back to this obedience. As some object to the language "obedience is obligatory and necessary," and say, it is legal, which they regard as constraint and terror, as if a person was deterred from stealing, because he feared the gallows, this conception is foreign and improper; for necessary and obligatory are the divine, eternal, unchangeable Wisdom of God, righteousness and order called—that the rational creation should obey God, as it was created for this. And Christ and Paul use the word obligated. Luke 17: We have done, what is our duty to do. Rom. 8: We are debtors not to live after the flesh.

Therefore, every one, who has been in the grace of God, and acts against his conscience, grieves the Holy Spirit, loses grace and righteousness, makes shipwreck of his faith, and again becomes liable to God's wrath and eternal punishment, where no conversion follows.

maintaining that good works embrace not only the outward but the entire internal life of faith.

It is not to be overlooked, that the more rigid Lutheran party, or as it is usually called, the Flacian, controverted these errors and were indeed foremost in it.¹ For already in the year 1556, Flacius, Gallus, and particularly Mörlin, later Chemnitz and many others appeared against the Erfurthers, and displayed in their objections the Ethical and dogmatical results to which this doctrine led,² in such a way, as not to overlook the truth contained in it: *Prostromo etiam dicendum est de illa propositione: bona opera esse perniciosá ad salutem. Quando enim nude et truncatim ita ponitur, sicut simpliciter non est falsa, sed secundum quid, ita simpliciter non est vera, sed secundum aliquid. Non est autem in ecclesia ludendum hujusmodi ambiguis paradoxis, quae longa circuitione, operosa et sollicita interpretatione vix possunt ita declarari, ut aures pie non offendatur.* The necessity of new obedience, as the fruit of faith, they no less than the Wittenbergers acknowledged, and deduced it from the nature of faith;³ only they lay greater stress on this necessity not being external, but the internal, free constraint of the heart born again by faith, and deny more strongly than they all, concurrence of works in justification.

This was the state of things about the year 1570.⁴ It is evident, that notwithstanding the differences which remained, there was agreement in the main matter. There was agreement in the fundamental principle, the extremes on both sides were relinquished; on the one hand the necessity of good works was admitted, on the other the *necessitas ad salutem* was not retained.

What was done by the Formula of Concord? It brought together that which was common, and rejected then the position of Major in regard to the necessity of good works to salvation, as well as that of Amsdorf in regard to their deleteriousness, the first, because so far as it was drawn into the article on justification, destroyed the fundamental doctrine *de sola fide justificante*, the other, because considered in itself it is false and offensive, and is injurious to submission and integrity;

¹ It is therefore entirely a mistake, to represent this as a controversy between the school of Melancthon and that of Flacius. Much more both contended against the same errors in different ways. And in the Formula of Concord the rights of both are asserted, (see below).

² The substance of their argument may be found in the *sententia Wigandi et Illyrici de scripto Synodi Isenacensis. 1556.*

³ *Comp. in Schlüsselb. loc. cit. 552 ff. 603, 615, 617, ff.*

⁴ We do not examine the Altenburg Convention as it accomplished nothing.

It rejects then, proceeding further, the opinion that faith and justification could exist with wilful sins, or could not be lost by wicked works (the Antinomians), as likewise the opinion that faith alone at the beginning received righteousness and salvation, afterwards its office went over to works, and that they afterwards must support faith, and then righteousness and salvation received (Menius) — and in opposition lays down the two positive positions: 1) that faith is the only proper means whereby righteousness and salvation are not only obtained, but likewise sustained by God (*fides initium, medium et finis salutis*); 2) that good works necessarily follow faith and justification; likewise (item) that good works are necessary fruits of faith, which, without them, would be a dead faith, or mere fancy (reference to Luther's introduction to the Epistle to the Romans). In explaining this more minutely, it was attempted to unite both points, *necessitas* and *libertas* — and this was the point on which, at last, the controversy turned. The necessity of good works, it asserts, rests directly upon the eternal will of God, (*ordo divinus, mandatum div.*), which requires all men, especially believers, to walk in good works, and so far it does not depend upon the will of the renewed, in *hominis renati arbitrio*, whether he will act well or ill (*bene aut male, quando ipsi visum voluerit*); on the other hand this necessity is no legal constraint, this obedience not compulsory, for such external works God does not ask, but they must be performed by them, whom Christ has freed, willingly, *libero Spiritu*.

The opposition of force and freedom is not applicable to this relation, but it refers to a necessity which is at the same time freedom; and it is this which the Gospel secures. Epit. IV. Sol. Declar. IV. de bonis operibus. (Comp. the Art. on Antinomianism.)

Thus did the Formula of Concord strike the proper mean between these two extremes. But did these explanations correspond to the fundamental principle of the church, did they agree with the contents of the older Confessions? Are they really nothing more than the simple application, as they profess, to these controverted points of Articles IV. VI. XX. of the Augsburg Confession, and of the 3d section of the Apology. The new is only two fold, to wit: the more thorough exposition of the necessity of good works, in accordance with God's plan, and this is founded in the *propter voluntatem Dei* of the Art. XX, in the *sunt facienda opera propter mandatum Dei* of the Apology (p. 95), then the union of both points, necessity and liberty — and this is the necessary consequence of the above cited points to the others: *fide corda renovantur et in-*

duunt novos motus, fides regenerat nos at adfert Spiritum S., impossibile est dilectionem divellere a fide; for both positions are only not contradictory, if the necessity is, at the same time, freedom. If this determination transcends the older Confessions, it is merely an advance and certainly consistent and true.

Thus it appears that in the Article on good works the Formula Concordiæ cannot be censured.

ARTICLE VIII.

GUERICKE'S MANUAL OF CHRISTIAN ARCHÆOLOGY.

Lehrbuch der christlich-kirchlichen Archæologie, von H. E. F. GUERICKE, Dr. der Theol. u. Phil., Prof. der Theologie zu Halle. [Manual of Christian and Ecclesiastical Archæology, by H. E. F. Guericke, D. D., etc.] Leipzig, 1847.

HAVING already incidentally referred to this work, and the name and merits of its distinguished author being, in various ways, sufficiently familiar to the readers of the *Ev. Review*, we should not at this time have bestowed any special notice upon it, were not this forced upon us by the violent and, we must say, most ungenerous assault of the Editor of the "*Kirchenfreund*" upon the literary reputation of Dr. Guericke. It has seldom been our lot to notice an attempt to break down a writer's reputation at once so studied, so industriously circulated, and so inexcusable as that which we find in the "*Kirchenfreund*" for January 1851, which is also translated (with variations), and transferred to the "*Mercersburg Review*" for the same month. Beyond what charity required, we have hitherto taken no notice of either of these periodicals, nor shall we do so now, although rather challenged to it by their direct allusion to this periodical, which they profess to wish so well, whilst they compassionate its "*well meaning ignorance.*" We cannot, however, avoid suggesting to these our worthy cotemporaries, that they would materially promote the objects, which we have no doubt they have most deeply at heart, by interfering less frequently with the proceedings of those who do not feel that they need their advice, and somewhat abating that dogmatic tone which conveys to the uninitiated generally the idea, that those who use it are under the strange hallucination,

that "*wisdom will die with them.*" But our present business is with the statements and criticism of the Editor of the "*Kirchenfreund*," contained in his "*Reminiscences of Neander*," p. 26, which (not having the Mercersburg Review at hand) we translate as follows :

"It is well known, that he [Neander] upon all occasions, in conversations, expressed his decided antipathy towards two important phenomena of the present time, on the one hand, namely, towards *the philosophy of Hegel and its theology*, and this towards its right, Göschel, Dörner and Martensen, as well as towards Baur and Strauss on its negative left, and on the other side, towards *church-orthodoxy*, whether standing in the service of the [Prussian] union, as in the case of Hengstenberg's *Kirchenzeitung*, or exclusively Lutheran, as in the writings of Rudelbach and Guericke."

And in a note is added :

"Of the latter, I heard him speak very seldom, and then quite cursorily and contemptuously as of an ungrateful copyist, who abused the hard labors of others for the promotion of his ultra Lutheran dogmatism and fanaticism. The unworthy dependence of Guericke's "*Church History*" upon the works of Neander, Hase and others, of his "*Symbolik*" upon the private lectures of Ullmann, (which, as Ullmann himself told me, he copied almost word for word, by pages and by chapters, in the general part, without the slightest reference to his source), of his "*Introduction*" upon various correspondent works not cited, among others *von Gerlach's N. T.*, etc., is well known and would not be referred to here, had not an English Quarterly of this country, which in other respects we however from our heart wish the best success, in well meaning ignorance repeatedly praised this Guericke, as one of the greatest, if not the greatest among the litterati of Germany, and as a genuine and model theologian especially deserving of study."

We beg *Dr. Guericke's* pardon for the part which we take in the dissemination of these, we will not say slanders, but certainly ill-natured, uncharitable and unjustifiable misrepresentations, and this retailing, of private gossip, before the American public. But we hope he will, ere long, become too well known even on this side of the Atlantic, to render it possible for these things to do him any harm. Were we not so well acquainted with Prof. Schaff's character and position, we should be at a great loss how to account for such a demonstration, and although he himself had been conscious of the best of motives for making such an attack, he should have considered, that his own ambition to flourish as a church historian, and his antagonistic position, both in philosophy and theology, to the uncompromising school of Rudelbach and Guericke would excite in many minds the suspicion, that he was any thing but disinterested and impartial in the testimony, which he here bears against a fellow-laborer in the same field. Moreover, his own experience of the ease with which such charges are made, and the difficulty which there is in disproving them, should have made him very slow in taking up an evil report against an author. We have no doubt that there are hundreds

who recollect the insinuations of the Princeton Repertory in reference to a work of his own, where there is a score that remembers or does full justice to his explanation and denial.

But supposing that every charge here made by Prof. Schaff were perfectly true, as he, of course, believes it is, we utterly deny the propriety of his retailing in this form and giving such publicity to private conversations of this nature. It is unjust to all the parties concerned. Neander and Ullmann are here both presented in a most unamiable light, much more so, undoubtedly, than they deserve; for as they did not think proper to *publish* such charges they are by no means as culpable as he who, without any solicitation on their part, volunteers to do it for them. The jealousies and quarrels of authors are notorious, and he does but little service to literature, least of all to theology, who provokes and gives publicity to these things. After all the parties to such things have passed from the stage of action, it may not do much harm to gather such things as proofs of the infirmity of human nature, or as additional illustrations of the "*Miseries of Authors*;" but to publish them during the lifetime of any whose feelings may thus be injured is, in our humble judgment, utterly inexcusable.

But we shall now proceed to show how utterly groundless some of these charges are, whether made by Dr. Neander or by Prof. Schaff, and as these are the only tangible ones, we think we might take the frivolity of the others for granted, though upon them too we may have something to say. First, then, *Neander* is represented as charging *Guericke* with being "*an ungrateful copyist.*" His "*Church History*" is, of course, the work here in question. Turning to the Preface to the *first edition* of that work, p. 5, we find the following passage: "The intelligent reader will here perceive the disciple, but not, I trust, a servile one of DR. NEANDER, whom I most profoundly respect; a teacher to whom this whole work is greatly indebted, both for its form and for its contents; from whom, however, I have learned this especially, namely, to be no man's slave, but ever to grow up towards Christ, the only master, who must increase whilst all human teachers decrease." Not content with this certainly not *ungrateful* or grudging acknowledgment of his obligations to his former teacher, he pays him the following generous tribute in his Introduction (p. 24, 6th ed.): "Appropriating to himself all the spoils of the past, *Neander* has found the art of giving new life to the dead, a genuine teacher of church-history for all time, not for learners merely, but for teachers likewise, *only not yet for the church.*" Nor is *Guericke* content with this general acknowl-

edgment. At the head of nearly every chapter and in his notes, again and again he refers to the corresponding parts of Neander's history, and to his various works that bear upon the subject. What more any one could have asked, what more ample acknowledgment Guericke could have made, we are at a loss to imagine. We have no doubt, however, that there was one thing that Neander missed, and which was the occasion of all the bitterness in which Prof. Schaff represents him as indulging — Guericke did not belong to his school in theology, would not acknowledge him as his master, in other words, *would not become his copyist*. His offence, therefore, was exactly the reverse of that with which Neander through Prof. S. charges him. But this is an offence that German Professors, who are accustomed to see a whole generation of students moulded by their instructions and adopting their system, can with difficulty forgive.

With reference to the value and character of Guericke's Church History, there is, however, one witness whose impartiality, when he gives a favorable opinion, will be readily admitted, and whom it, therefore, gives us great pleasure to quote. *Prof. Schaff* himself, in his "*Introduction to Church History*," (see his "*Kirchenfreund*" for Sept. 1849, p. 331-2) says: "Of smaller works *Guericke* and *Hase* are most worthy of commendation as manuals. *Guericke's* book is just about the right compass for students who are commencing, and condenses the most important matter and the results of the investigations of others, especially of Neander, in a sound church spirit, and in a nervous and brief review; but from the period of the Reformation it loses the character of an impartial and objective historical work, and becomes an honorable, to be sure, but yet an unjust and passionate polemical work, directed against the Reformed church, and a violent invective against modern infidelity," &c. Coming from such a source this must be regarded as high praise. Prof. S. did not then, it seems, regard Guericke as a "*mere copyist*," but as a vigorous epitomizer at least of the results of preceding investigations down to that time. Nor does he say a word against him as an honorable man, although he was at that time undoubtedly in possession of all the information which he now brings forward for the purpose of discrediting him. We think the inference inevitable, that he did not then attach much importance to the complaints of Dr. Neander, and that he had not yet thought of his indebtedness to Hase.

And it is much to be regretted that he did not persevere in the same dispassionate frame of mind. It would certainly

have saved him from the strange mistake he has made in representing *Guericke*, whose book was published a year before *Hase's*, as his copyist! The work of the former first made its appearance in 1833, that of the latter in 1834, as we learn from the dates appended to the Prefaces to the first edition of each respectively. If, then, there is any striking coincidence between the two works and the one is indebted to the other, it is easy to determine where the obligation rests. But although not familiar with *Hase's* work, which we have only examined since our attention was thus directed to it, we readily acquit him of every thing like plagiarism. We are too well acquainted with him as a writer, to believe that he would condescend to any thing of the kind. And for the same reason precisely, and with even less hesitation, are we assured, that *Guericke* is equally incapable of any thing like literary piracy. He is a man of too much originality, of too much independence of mind, to be able to do any thing of the kind even if he were so disposed. His style is notoriously his own — we cannot but wish that it were less so, and the very attacks made upon him as “a bigotted Lutheran” are proof of his originality and independence.

But as Prof. Schaff has arraigned him so sternly as a bitter partizan, who does nothing like justice to those from whom he differs, we shall let him here say a few words in his own defence, which may also give our readers some idea of his work itself:

“In so far as the exhibition of the history of the Christian church is connected with Christian faith and knowledge—and this connection is most intimate — I have everywhere in this work, (continually intent upon uniting real objectivity with a living subjectivity), spoken in accordance with my well-established convictions and recognized truth; and I have done this in some instances, perhaps, where the fear of man might have influenced me to act differently. But the divine mercy has so directed my way through life, that I dare not and cannot do otherwise! It is true, that in this way I have in the fullness of my love taken sides for the Christian church in general, and in particular for that which has ever been the purest of Christian churches. Had I done otherwise, I could have had no rightful claim at all to the name either of a Christian, of an Evangelical, or of an Evangelical Lutheran Christian. Only then could I have done otherwise, had belief and unbelief, truth and error, life and death affected my heart alike, or had I imagined, that it was somehow no partizanship at once and ever to agree with *that party* which protests against every

party, or no ruling and animating influence to begin by sweeping away indifferently all existing historical interests." "If the historian is not a living mirror of history, history is but a corpse; but if he is such a living mirror, how can the holiest element of his own soul fail to make its appearance, every where, in the history of the holy!" — "*Partial*, however, I shall nowhere be." pp. 5 and 6.

But the character of Guericke's Church History may now be considered as fairly established. Not only has it gone through *seven* editions, in spite of the strong ground which it so confessedly takes against the prevalent tendencies of German theology, but, even according to prof. Schaff's own showing, no work of equal merit has been produced for the last eighteen years. It is not, therefore, surprising that a translation of this work has been called for in Great Britain, which will, undoubtedly, be reprinted, as soon as it makes its appearance, in this country. But we have already dwelt too long upon this point of Prof. Schaff's indictment.

The next point which we are called to notice in this attack upon Dr. Guericke, is *Dr. Ullmann's* reported assertion, that his "*Symbolik*" is a wholesale plagiarism from his (U's.) private University Lectures! This is so incredible, that we must insist upon hearing both sides before we admit it as an established fact. We have here nothing but Dr. U's. naked assertion, and this may have no better foundation than Dr. Neander's complaint, the futility of which, we think, we have abundantly shown. But we shall patiently wait until we get more light upon this subject, not at all uneasy as to the result in which we have not the slightest personal interest, having no other acquaintance with Dr. G. than through his writings, the value of which will not be in the slightest degree affected by the source from which they are drawn. In fact, admitting all Dr. Schaff's allegations, it must be acknowledged that Dr. Guericke is not only a most bold and reckless plagiarist, but moreover one of astonishing taste and skill. According to this, he not only marks as his prey such men as *Neander*, *Ullmann*, *Hase* and *von Gerlach*, who are among the leading authors of the age, but he at the same time uses the materials, which he derives from them, with so great skill as to teach a system diametrically opposite to theirs, and entirely subversive of it, (except in the case of *von Gerlach*)! We must also observe, that if his statements are correct, Prof. Schaff is certainly most unreasonable in ridiculing us for regarding Dr. Guericke as one of the most distinguished theologians of the day. According to his own showing he is not only this, but embodies in his

works the quintessence of the labors of half a dozen of the leading minds of Germany! But, perhaps, he thinks us inexcusable for not being aware of the facts which he now asserts so positively? Here we must confess our obtuseness. We have read some of Neander's works with considerable attention, but, really, it never struck us, and does not now strike us, that Guericke follows him any closer in his History than Prof. S. does in that part of his with which he has favored us in his *Kirchenfreund* for 1849, and which we read with a great deal of pleasure. Not even Prof. S's criticism of Guericke's work which we there find, and to which we have referred above, suggested to us the idea that there was any thing amiss in the use which Guericke makes of Neander. Making all due allowances for his position and prejudices, Prof. S. himself confirmed us in our admiration of Dr. Guericke as an author. Nor did we find him and ourselves singular in our high estimate of him. In fact, if our readers will refer to what this Review has said of him, (Vol. I. pp. 305-6) they will find that we have taken as our authority and employed chiefly the language of *Dr. Rudelbach*, whose acquaintance both with Guericke and with the literature and theology of Germany is certainly, to say the least, quite equal to that of the Editor of the "*Kirchenfreund*." We beg leave to refer our readers to that part of the Review just quoted (p. 306) for a characterization of Guericke's Church History and Symbolik quite as acute, we venture to say, and not less partial, we opine, than that which we have quoted above from the "*Kirchenfreund*." In short, we rather think it argues that Guericke is an extraordinary man, when he thus excites the jealousy of so many of his distinguished cotemporaries. But if he has used their labors without giving them due credit, of which we so far have no evidence, we shall be the last to apologise for him.

In reference to the charge, that Guericke in his "*Introduction to the critical study of the N. T.*" has failed to give the proper credit to von Gerlach and other important writers, we would only observe, in passing, that if this is the fact, we have no doubt that it was entirely accidental, for which the number of works that he does quote may serve as a sufficient excuse.

Finally, in this defence, we shall say a few words in reference to the "intolerant and bigoted Lutheranism," with which Prof. Schaff and some others charge Guericke. That he is, in all he writes, a Lutheran of the most decided character admits of no doubt. Of this he makes no mystery. In the Preface to the second edition of his "*Symbolik*" (p. xi.), he tells us: "As regards any stand-point (Princip), it is confess-

edly — and who dare or would be willing *at the present time* to hold back any of the deep convictions of his heart?—that of the Lutheran church. Of this I am not ashamed.” But that he is either fanatical or intolerant we do not hesitate to deny. Let his own words here speak for him. “I likewise joyfully acknowledge,” says he in the Preface just quoted, (pp. xiii–xvi) “the intimate relations of my Confession of faith with that of others, especially those [the Reformed] with whom the Union has brought us into closer proximity. Joyfully do I offer the hand of universal Protestant brotherhood to all who maintain a christian position by standing firmly and honestly upon the so-called fundamental Protestant principle of Scriptural authority and of justification by faith, however susceptible of various explanations, and however variously explained these fundamental principles are, and however little adapted they therefore are, in a time so illusory as ours to form the basis of a firm church edifice, and however unnatural and unedifying, especially at such a time as this, may be a free theological communion resting *upon this alone*, and this not as a means of transition, but as an abiding statute with manifest aversion to a firm and clear Confession of faith. Joyfully, too, do I concede, especially in such a time as ours, together with the necessary church objectivity, the decided right of scientific investigation, and of individual subjectivity if only this is in some way *generically* related to the confession of the church. Joyfully, in fine, do I, on the other side, ever firmly maintain (that I may not stultify the church-history of the 17th and 18th centuries) the possibility, yea the necessity of development, of living, organic development (Fortbildung) of the genuine faith of the church — for this faith is to stand in and for our times not as something worn out and dead, but as renewed in youth and vigorous with life.” We have not room to quote nor time to translate what he then adds in reference to the folly of attempting to explain away and liberalize away all confessional differences, but we commend it to those so eager in that work. We think that we have quoted enough to exhibit Guericke as anything but an illiberal and narrow-minded sectarian. — One other fact, however, we must here notice: *it is not true, as has been so often charged, that Guericke belongs to the extreme Lutheran party.* On the contrary, he is even now bitterly denounced by some of the organs of that party in Prussia, as may be seen by a reference to the last No. (IV, pp. 766–771) of the “*Zeitschrift für Luth. Kirche u. Theol.*” Against the extravagances and ultrasisms of that party, especially its hierarchial tendencies, he protests in the plainest and strongest

language. For this he has been threatened with something like excommunication! The article to which we refer concludes with the following rather severe, though well-merited rebuke of this presumptuous intolerance: "The Lutheran church is greater than a priestly conventicle of Lutheran novices; greater and wider spread than the Prussian horizon even. A Lutheran faction (*ecclesiola*) that hedges itself in so narrowly, and is so fundamentally narrow-minded, as not to have room, full room, for the theological teachings and services of one who with an overflowing heart acknowledges himself a child of this great mother church, and is unequivocally known as such to the whole world, such a body—we are bold enough in our folly to say it—has passed sentence upon itself before the present and to all future time."

We have room for but a few words more upon the work of which the title heads this article. It is, as it professes to be, a *manual* for the subject of which it treats, presenting the results of existing investigations on the clearest and most comprehensive manner. Its reference to the original sources are sufficiently copious, perhaps even more so than is necessary, the principal passages being generally quoted at length. We know of no corresponding work in English, *Bingham's "Antiquities"* being rather a collection of materials than a systematic work. In German, Augusti, Rheinwald and Böhmer have all labored successfully in this field and made most valuable additions to it. To all of these Guericke freely acknowledges his obligations, and modestly observes, that this work of his 'may bear the same relation to a more comprehensive one, *that his church history does to the works of Neander and Gieseler.*' To the student of theology the subjects here discussed are of the highest importance. After a highly interesting and valuable Introduction, the work is divided into two parts. I. Archaeology of the social relations of the church, and II. The Archaeology of church worship. Under the former are discussed, 1) Church-members; 2) Congregations and constitution of the church; 3) Church officers; 4) Church communion as manifested externally. Under the second division: 1) Of sacred places; 2) of church festivals; 3) of churchly acts (worship in a more restricted sense); under which is embraced public worship in general, singing, reading of the Scriptures, preaching, baptism, the Lord's Supper, marriage and burial. — One of the most interesting and valuable sections is that upon the "*Development of the episcopal office.*" The position which he here takes may be understood from the introductory paragraphs, which are as follows:

“An essential change of the original constitution of the church in its collective capacity was produced by the development of the episcopate, properly so called, and the establishment of the superiority of the bishops over the presbyters.

In the Apostolic age there had, undoubtedly, been presbyters or bishops; but during the lifetime of the Apostles these were not bishops in the later meaning of the term, but bishops . . . e. presbyters. What in later times devolved upon the bishops was, in the time of the Apostles, performed by the Apostles and those to whom they delegated their power. Among the Apostles also, perhaps James alone occupied at Jerusalem a position which, taking into consideration the peculiar circumstances of the church at Jerusalem, can be considered as fully parallel with that of the bishops, properly so called, in later times. Consequently, the peculiarity of the episcopacy, that is, the superiority of the bishops to the presbyters, as an institution of the church in general, undoubtedly first made its appearance subsequently to the Apostolic age properly so called. The question is, how this was brought about.” pp. 35, 36.

This question he proceeds to answer, in opposition to *Rothe* and high churchmen generally, in a manner which, however clear and simple, will be satisfactory to neither extreme in the controversy upon church government which has now so long agitated the church. But we have no doubt that a translation of this, as well as of the work generally, would be highly acceptable to a large class of theological students.

ARTICLE IX.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.—GERMANY.

Dr. Fr. Zanke commenced on the 1st of October last, a new weekly paper at Leipzig, under the title of “*Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland.*” Its object, as we learn from the first No. with which the politeness of Mr. R. Garrigue has supplied us, is “to furnish a full and speedy review of all departments of German literature. To effect this, every book that appears in Germany, as well as German works published abroad but incorporated in our book-trade, will be noticed bibliographically with all possible accuracy, and their price stated; of all the more important scientific publications a condensed statement of contents will be given, and explanatory notices and brief information will be furnished of all more important works, the contents and object of which are not sufficiently clear from their title.” We are favorably impressed by this No., although it necessarily has, as the Editor

confesses, much of the imperfection that may be expected to adhere to a paper so recently started. It is in quarto form of eight pages, and contains notices of nearly seventy different works arranged under the appropriate headings. The Editor's condensed statement of the design and contents, and mode in which subjects are treated, is very clear and satisfactory. Such a work as this, in connection with Rudelbach and Guericke's bibliographical notices will keep the theologian, at least, pretty well informed of what is transpiring in the literary world.—We learn from this, that Prof. H. Ewald has just published his views of the Gospels under the title: *Die drei ersten Evangelien übersetzt und erklärt.* (Göttingen. Dietrich. 1850. XIX, 368 pp. 8vo. 1 Thlr. 22½ sgr.) It is, of course, deeply rationalistic, his object being to separate what he calls the primitive gospels (*Urevangelien*), from supposed additions of a later date! Ewald is a great philologist, but a much better politician than he is a theologian, which must be the only excuse that can be offered for his introducing into this work “sharp criticisms on the politics of the day and of Prussia especially!” — The following show the tendency of existing religious movements: “*Entwurf einer Verfassungs-Urkunde für die evangelisch Lutherische Kirche des Herzogthums Braunschweig. Nebst Anlagen.*” (Braunschweig, 1850. X, 125 pp. 9 sgr.)—“*Die Symbolische Grundlage der evangelischen Kirchenlehre, oder die ein- und zwanzig Lehrartikel der Augsburgerischen Confession. Deutsch und Lateinisch. 2te durch einen Anhang vermehrte Ausg.* (Berlin, 1850. 32 pp. 8vo. 4 sgr.) This edition of the A. C. is superintended by Dr. Twesten. M. A. Stern is said to have made a valuable contribution to the decyphering of the cuneiform inscriptions in his work entitled: “*Die dritte Gattung der aehämischen Keilinschriften erklärt, von M. A. Stern. Mit einer Stein-druck Tafel.*” (XII, 236 pp. gr. 8vo. 1 Thlr. 10 sgr.) Prof. Nägelbach is bringing out a second edition of his observations upon Homer's *Iliad*, (“*Anmerkungen zur Ilias,*” Buch I, II, 1—483. III.) 1 Thlr. 15 sgr. G. Parthey publishes a new edition of Plutarch's *Isis and Osiris* (Plutarch übersetzt Isis u. Osiris nach neuvergnlichen Handschriften, mit Uebersetzung und Erläuterungen.) XX, 308 pp. gr. 8vo. 2 Thlr.

The ninth volume of Dr. Ritter's *History of Philosophy*, (*Geschichte der Philosophie*), being the commencement of his history of modern philosophy, has made its appearance. It embraces the 15th, 16th and part of the 17th century, including the revival of learning, and the elements of that wonderful mental commotion, out of which modern Philosophy has grown. This part of Ritter's great work is also printed separately under the title, “*Geschichte der neueren Philosophie, 1ster Band.* Preis 3 Thlr. 10 sgr.”

Studien u. Kritiken. The fourth No. of this review for 1850 contains the following articles: I. **ESSAYS:** 1) *Sach* über die Behandlung der Lehre von der göttlichen Dreieinigkeit in der Predigt; 2) *Grimm*, Die Echtheit der Briefe an die Thessalonicher. II. **THOUGHTS AND OBSERVATIONS:** 1) *Hauff*, über einige Stellen von Ps. 119, Ps. 62, 3 u. Ies. 64, 8. 2) *Böhmer*, Das Fusswaschen Christi, nach seiner sacramentlichen Würde dargestellt. III. **REVIEWS:** 1) *Göbel*, Geschichte des christlichen Lebens in der

rheinisch-westphälischen Kirche, rec. von *Wächter*. 2) *Schmidt*, histoire et doctrine de la secte des Cathares ou Albigen. *Monastier*, histoire etc. *Herzog*, de origine etc. rec. von *Hahn*. IV. ECCLESIASTICAL: Gutachten der theol. Facultät der Universität Heidelberg über den der evangelischen Kirche der Rheinpfalz vorgelegten Verfassungs-Entwurf. Mit einem Vorwort von *D. C. Ullmann*. This last article, from the pen of Ullmann, throws great light upon the present state of religious affairs in Germany.

Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche.—Viertes Quartalheft, 1850. The contents promise more than usual interest, and are as follows: 1) *Delitzsch*, über die beiden Geschlechts-Register Jesu Christi, zunächst das bei Matt. 2) *L. Könnemann*, Die Versuchungsgeschichte des Herrn, Matt. 4, 1—11. 3) *J. C. Rodatz*, zur endlichen Verständigung über die Einsetzungsworte des heiligen Abendmahls. 4) *K. Ströbel*, Aphoristische Bemerkungen zu der vorsteh. Abh. v. Rodatz. 5) Bibliographie der neuesten theol. Litteratur. 6) Dringliche Frage an die Kirche dieser Zeit von G. [uericke?] 7) *Guericke*, Abgenöthigter Widerruf oder Wiederruf. We regret to learn from this last article that Guericke's earnest warnings against the hierarchical and Romanizing tendencies of the so called old Lutherans of Prussia, instead of leading them to retrace their steps where they have departed from the true principles of the church, have only excited their anger and led them to denounce him in the bitterest terms. We are also sorry to learn that the non-appearance of the continuation of Rudelbach's masterly articles on "State Christianity and religious freedom" is owing to the illness of the author, whom we heartily wish a speedy recovery and long-continued strength to serve the church. Rudelbach's efforts in favor of religious freedom and the separation of the church from the bondage of the State, cannot but have a most salutary influence, and will add the gratitude of all liberal-minded men to that praise which his labors in her behalf have already given him in the church. In the Bibliographical department *Ströbel* gives a very cutting notice of *R. Stier's* last work ("Die Weisheit Solomons in Hiskias-tagen"), and exposes the weak points in D'Aubigne's "Reform and Lutheranism."—*Guericke* praises without stint the second edition of *Tischendorf's* Greek New Testament, gives a warm recommendation of *Delitzsch's* "Zum Hause Gottes oder der Kirche. Katechismus in drei Hauptstücken, and rather a favorable notice of *Holzhausen's* "Protestantismus nach seiner geschichtlichen Entstehung, Begründung u. Fortbildung, Bd. I—II.—*Rudelbach* notices at considerable length a work of *Ign. Beidtel*, Prof. of Eccles. Jurisprudence at Ollmütz, entitled "Untersuchungen über die kirchlichen Zustände in den Kais. Oesterreichischen Staaten" u. s. f. (Wien 1849), which seems to be an omen of a better state of things among Romish theologians, so far as religious freedom is concerned. Not only does B. assert the independence of the church of the state, but he likewise advocates the rights of the laity in the government of the church. "The clergy," says he, "is not entitled to decide all things by itself, where the people are concerned. The people, professing to be Catholics, have a right to desire that an ecclesiastical system should be recognized in the State correspondent to

that of the Catholic church."—R. also devotes considerable space to a notice of *Rennecke's* work "Über die principielle Begründung der Lehren von der Sünde, von der Person Christi, von der Erlösung und Rechtfertigung," acknowledging the great ability displayed in it, but pointing out the unsoundness of many of its positions.

ARTICLE X.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

History and Geography of the Middle Ages. For Colleges and Schools. (Chiefly from the French). By George Washington Greene, Author of "Life of General Greene," "Historical Studies," &c.—Part I. History. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chestnut St., 1851.

THE Preface of this work opens with the following sentence: "The following pages, as the title indicates, are chiefly taken from a popular French work, which has passed rapidly through several editions, and received the sanction of the University. It will be found to contain a clear and satisfactory exposition of the revolutions of the Middle Ages, with such general views of literature, society and manners, as are required to explain the passage from ancient to modern history." The approbation of the University of Paris, bestowed upon a work of this kind, is, in itself, a sufficient recommendation. From our hasty inspection of its contents, we judge that it is written with a just appreciation of the importance of the subject, with a command of abundant materials, with sound discrimination, well-considered method, and decided ability for condensed historic narrative. We have often lamented the extent to which the study of history is neglected in schools and colleges, and we therefore gratefully welcome the appearance of text-books like the present, as auguries of a better state of things. The want of necessary helps can, at all events, be no longer plead in excuse of ignorance and neglect.

Notes on the Parables of our Lord. By Richard Chevenix Trench, M. A., Professor of Divinity, King's College, London; Author of "Notes on the Miracles of our Lord," &c. &c. Second American from the last English Edition. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chestnut St. 1850.

WE noticed very fully, in a former number, the work by the same author, "on the Miracles of our Lord," and we are prepared to speak of this in the same strain of commendation as of the other. We decidedly reckon the theological works of Trench among the best that issue from the English press.

In the present, as in the former volume, we have an introductory essay : that in the vol. before us is divided into four chapters : I., On the Definition of a Parable : II., On Teaching by Parables : III., On the Interpretation of Parables : IV., On other Parables besides those in the Scriptures. The parables considered are thirty in number, so that several that are usually accounted parables, are omitted. This work, like the other, not only affords ample evidence of the author's extensive and solid scholarship, of his intimacy with German theological literature, and with patristic lore, but exhibits very satisfactory results of independent thought, of careful and sound reflection.— Though intended for theologians and students of theology, the writings of Trench have a deep interest, and a fund of valuable information for the general reader. Truly evangelical in their character, they successfully combat the absurd notions of rationalists and errorists, while they fully and skilfully exhibit, strikingly elucidate, clearly explain, fairly expound, and earnestly enforce the truth of Scripture. We recommend those two works to all, but especially to theological students.

Lives of Eminent Literary and Scientific Men of America. By James Wynne, D. D. New York : D. Appleton & Company, No. 200 Broadway. 1850.

THIS is an instructive and interesting volume of more than 350 pp., containing brief memoirs of Benjamin Franklin, Rev. Jonathan Edwards, Robert Fulton, Chief Justice Marshall, Dr. Rittenhouse, and Eli Whitney. It appears to be the author's design, rather to exhibit the intellectual development, to portray the literary character, to define the position and describe the influence and achievements, in the world of literature, or science, or both, of the distinguished individuals whose names have just been given, than to present their biographies in full and minute detail : yet even of this there is quite sufficient to impart a lively interest to the several sketches. The subjects are well selected, and the narratives are drawn up in a fair, business-like style, with sound discrimination and correct taste. The volume will be very acceptable to those who have not the means of obtaining, or the time for reading, more extended biographies.

We wonder that, in a book so neatly got up, and so handsomely printed, such typographical errors should occur, as the following ; p. 30 : "Franklin sat up his married establishment on a very economical scale" :—p. 42., "servicable,"—p. 101., "Mr. Todd, who he met at Lord" &c., and others of a similar character, all which should be carefully looked after in a second edition.

The Gospel its own Advocate. By George Griffin, L. L. D. N. York, D. Appleton & Company, 200 Broadway. Philadelphia : Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chestnut St. 1850.

WE would not venture to say that this book brings forward any thing absolutely new ; but it certainly presents, in a somewhat novel and most effective form, the internal evidences of Christianity. The work is the production of an eminent jurist of the city of New York : a sober-minded, thoughtful man, already well-stricken in years, but still in full possession and command of his

vigorous intellect. To the undertaking to place in clear, strong and striking light, the internal evidences of our holy religion, the author brings, with extensive and accurate learning, all the acute sagacity, the searching shrewdness, the cautious discrimination of the practised lawyer, deeply skilled in estimating and sifting evidence, and in bringing all that can be honestly elicited, to bear fairly, candidly and judiciously, upon the case in hand. In the third chapter, the author assails and effectually confutes, "the primary objection of skeptical philosophy against the Gospel's claim to inspiration," viz: "That God has never condescended to make a preternatural revelation of himself to the children of men." The work is written in a terse style, with much skill in condensation, with great power of argument, and a good deal of originality of thought, and will do good service to young theologians: and, proceeding from a distinguished lawyer of decided Christian character, and known to be a profound as well as elegant scholar, it is well fitted, and not unlikely, to influence for good that class of accomplished rationalistic skeptics, which is, in this country as well as elsewhere, growing daily more numerous.

The Prelude; or, Growth of a Poet's Mind. An autobiographical Poem. By William Wordsworth. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 164 Chestnut St. 1850.

WE have not had time to do more than take a hasty glance at the pages of this beautiful volume; but, to the admirers of William Wordsworth's poetry—and their number is steadily increasing—it is not necessary that we should recommend it. He undertakes here "to record, in verse, the origin and progress of his own powers, as far as he was acquainted with them." Beginning with childhood, and conducting the reader through the scenes and pursuits of college-life with its books and its vacations, of foreign travel and a residence in London, the poem exhibits a mass of psychological phenomena and intellectual experiences and educational processes, which, interesting in themselves to serious and reflecting minds, derive an additional interest from the poetic conceptions, the graphic descriptions and spirited delineations, the masculine tone of thought and feeling, and the easy-flowing versification of the distinguished author. The paper and letter-press are beautiful, as is usually the case with the Messrs. Appleton.

The Method of the Divine Government, Physical and Moral. By Rev. James M' Cosh. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 285, Broadway. 1851.

HERE is an octavo volume of more than 500 pp., on a subject upon which not a few may incline to suppose that nothing new can be advanced. Nothing, however, could be better calculated to dispel every such prejudice, than an attentive perusal of the work before us. The author's name is, as yet, new in the world of letters, this being his first published production; but this first effort has at once placed him in the foremost rank of the writers of the age. The work discusses the greatest questions that can agitate the human soul, and employ the human mind. We deem its appearance so im-

portant, that, if we had room, we would gladly bestow a long article upon its thorough reviewal; as it is, we can only state the leading heads, under which the various aspects of the great theme are ventilated. The whole is divided into four books, as follows: *Book First.* General View of the Divine Government as fitted to throw light on the character of God. *Chap. I.* Introduction. *Ch. II.* General Aspect of the Divine Government. Phenomena presented by the Providence of God, and the Conscience of Man, though generally overlooked. *Chap. III.* The actual World, and the view which it gives of its Governor. *Book Second.* Particular Inquiry into the Method of the Divine Government in the physical World. *Chapt. I.* General Laws. *Chapt. II.* The Providence of God. *Chapt. III.* Relation of the Providence of God to the character of Man. *Book Third.* Particular Inquiry into the Principles of the human Mind through which God governs Mankind. *Chapt. I.* Man's original and indestructible moral nature. *Chapt. II.* Actual Moral State of man. *Chapt. III.* Other governing principles of the human mind. *Book Fourth.* Results.—The Reconciliation of God and Man. *Chapt. I.* Nature and Revealed Religion.—The Character of God. *Chapt. II.* Restoration of Man.—In a great number of sections under these general divisions, the most momentous questions, the most interesting and fruitful topics, are investigated and discussed in elaborate detail, with extraordinary ability, and with admirable clearness, A sound philosophy pervades the entire volume; not the pert and flippant philosophy of modern self-sufficient speculators, but the sober, profound and searching philosophy of the serious thinker, whose mind is guided, and whose soul is thoroughly pervaded, by the glorious truths of God's own Revelation; and although we have not read the entire volume, we venture to say that the results at which the author arrives under every division of his treatise will be entirely satisfactory to evangelical christians of every name. In the VIth Section under the Chapter on "The Providence of God," we have an instructive and exceedingly delightful treatise on the "Method of answering prayer, and furthering spiritual ends." Grave and in some respects abstruse as the subjects here treated are, the treatise is by no means dry, forbidding in its method, or repulsive in its style. It is written with most fruitfully practical reference to man's greatest concerns and duties, in a very attractive style, and it abounds in delightfully apt and felicitous illustrations. We are free to acknowledge, that we have never read a book in which such grave discussions, such elaborate and profound reasonings, are conducted in a manner and style so deeply interesting, nay, so positively fascinating. — It examines with great acuteness and skill sundry erroneous and mischievous philosophical opinions and theories, develops and discusses general principles with great sagacity and fidelity, and draws its deductions with extreme caution and candor, and in all its reasonings is characterized by a spirit thoroughly and highly devout. The work has already attracted much attention, and won warm commendation, in Europe, and we trust that it will find an extensive circulation in this country, not only among theologians, but also among general readers. We are glad to learn that the American publishers are rapidly progressing with a second edition.

Christ's Second Coming : Will it be Pre-Millennial? By the Rev. David Brown, A. M., St. James' Free Church, Glasgow. New York : Robert Carter & Brothers. 285 Broadway. 1851.

THE great question discussed in this volume is now again extensively, and in some quarters deeply, agitating the mind of christendom. The notion that the Savior will, for a thousand years, reign in visible presence on earth, before the whole number of the saved is complete, is again urged with great earnestness and zeal, by many good men, and by some who are not, we apprehend, governed by the best motives. In England the estimable Bickersteth is prominent among the advocates of this view, which we regard as irreconcilable with Scripture, and as involving a variety of absurdities. But as the defenders of this theory are numerous, and many of them highly respectable, the appearance of the admirable work named above has afforded us great satisfaction. It presents a complete and connected view of what the Scriptures say concerning Christ's Second Advent, and thus, by words of highest authority, accompanied by just criticism and sound exposition, it sets the subject itself in its true and proper light; it exposes and discusses, in a spirit of great kindness and candor, in a gentle and respectful tone, the errors into which premillennialists have fallen, and completely confutes them; it detects, with much acuteness, the disadvantages under which they labor, and the contradictions in which they are entangled, and shows, by these processes, that their position is utterly untenable: it exhibits in full, and ventilates in extenso, the doctrines of the Bible, which clearly concur in demonstrating that, when Christ cometh the second time, in glory, it will be when the present economy shall cease, and hence, for the final winding up of this world's affairs. The work bears unmistakable evidences of extensive learning, of great ability, of a close and critical study of God's word, and it is written with all that sobriety and earnestness which become the subject, and with that generous urbanity of manner towards opponents, which we expect from the christian controvertist. The book is calculated to effect great good, and we hope, it will be extensively read.

The Principles of Geology explained, and viewed in their Relations to Natural and Revealed Religion. By Rev. David King, LL. D. Glasgow. With Notes and an Appendix, by John Scouler, M. D. F. L. S. Prof. of Nat. History to the Royal Society, Dublin. New York, Robert Carter & Brothers. 286 Broadway. 1851.

WE have very attentively read this volume, and the perusal has afforded us the highest gratification. Designed for general readers, and more especially for young people, it is entirely popular in its character and

style; more so, decidedly, than the more elaborate and very excellent work of Dr. John Pye Smith. It presents a succinct view of the principles of modern geology, sufficiently complete for the purpose more immediately in hand, which is, to exhibit the religious tendency of geology. The relations of the science to Natural and Revealed Religion are set forth and discussed with great candor and ability; its decided tendency, not only to uphold and invigorate the principles of what is termed natural religion, but to confirm and establish the impregnable veracity of the Scriptures, is made clearly and triumphantly manifest; and "the Development-Theory," that sorry bantling of the author of the "Vestiges of Creation," of Wislicenius and other deluded theorists, is most thoroughly and irretrievably demolished. The work is characterized throughout by clear intelligence, sound argument, fervent piety, and a sincere desire to instruct and benefit both young and old: it is an admirable book, and no well educated family should be without it.

A Copious and Critical Latin-English Lexicon, founded on the larger Latin-German Lexicon of Dr. William Freund: with Additions and Corrections from the Lexicons of Gesner, Facciolati, Scheller, Georges, etc. By E. A. Andrews, LL. D. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1851.

LEVERETT'S was the first Latin-English Lexicon which, to any satisfactory degree, provided for the wants of students who aimed at a thorough acquaintance with the noble language of the ancient mistress of the world. It is a modified translation of Scheller's Latin-German Lexicon, which was, for a long time, *the* Lexicon of the Schools. But from the progress of philological criticism in Germany, Greek and Latin Lexicography has gained new vantage ground, and derived invaluable improvements; and in that land of profound scholars, Passow and Freund, the former in Greek, the latter in Latin, have produced works which have superseded those of their predecessors. The enterprising publishers named above, have already brought out an improved edition of Liddell and Scott's translation of Passow's Greek Lexicon, and we have now before us their most recent publication of this kind, the entire title of which is placed at the head of this notice. The work is substantially a translation of Dr. Freund's large Lexicon, differing from the original chiefly in the condensation of examples given from classical authors, and "by the insertion of such words as had been accidentally omitted, together with many proper names of persons and places found in the best authors, and numerous translations of difficult phrases occurring in the course of the work." The attentive student will find these additions more numerous than might be expected; and even yet there is room for many more corrections and additions. To

those who are acquainted with the state of classical learning in Germany, any recommendation from us of the work before us will be quite unnecessary. Dr. Freund's Lexicon is well known to be the greatest work of the kind ever published, in various respects, in its compass, in its thoroughly philosophical method and arrangement, especially in the genetic or historical development of words, vastly in advance of all that preceded it. And as the present publication gives us the substance of this great work, with not a few important additions, omitting from the examples cited those clauses only which have no necessary connexion with the special purpose for which they are quoted, we have given it the highest praise that can be bestowed. The American editor has long enjoyed a distinguished reputation for classical learning, and the work of translation has been done by men in whose scholarship we have the utmost confidence.—Paper and typography are beautiful, and by the peculiar type in which the words to be defined are severally printed, the eye of the student is greatly aided, and the labor of research diminished. The work cannot fail to take the place of all others in our academies and colleges, and will be a welcome acquisition to the riper scholar.

The Island World of the Pacific: Being the personal Narrative and Results of Travel through the Sandwich or Hawaiian Islands, and other Parts of Polynesia. By Rev. Henry F. Cheever, Author of "The Whale and his Captors." With Engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1851.

WE have read this volume with deep interest. It is by no means designed merely to supply ordinary readers with entertaining narrative, although of this there is no lack: it aims to exhibit briefly, and as far as known, the past history of the Sandwich Islands: to depict their condition at the time when Christianity visited them, and to place before us the results effected through its introduction among their inhabitants, who had, through their previous intercourse with men called civilized, been degraded and demoralized to a deep far beneath even their wretched state during the prevalence of heathenism. The author is not without apprehension that the consequence of the frightful extent to which licentiousness formerly prevailed, and still measurably obtains, in these islands, will yet be the extinction of the aboriginal race. To the Christian reader the history of the Sandwich Islands is both sad and precious:—sad in its evidences of human depravity—precious in its testimony to the saving and sanctifying power of the Gospel; and to Christians, this book, written in a most earnest and Christian spirit, will be most welcome. We hope the book may have a wide circulation and do much good.

Lives of the Queens of Scotland and English Princesses connected with the regal Succession of Great Britain. By Agnes Strickland, Author of the "Lives of the Queens of England." Vol. I. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. No. 82 Cliff St. 1851.

IN the "Lives of the Queens of England," the author has already given evidence of indomitable industry, of patient and extensive research, and of decided ability to make good use of her ample materials. Her lives are written with minute detail of facts and circumstances, with great historical accuracy, with ample citations from noted authorities, and in an easy, pleasing style. Memoirs like these, apart from their general historic interest, are adapted to teach and enforce various grave and important lessons; and to those who rel-

ish minute historic narrative, and desire acquaintance with the checkered career of the great and noble of this earth, long since gone to their account. Miss Strickland's Volumes cannot but afford exceedingly interesting, instructive and profitable reading.

The Bards of the Bible. By George Gilfillan. New York: Harper and Brothers, 82 Cliff St. 1851.

WE know of no writer more capable than Gilfillan of entering into the spirit of the subject treated in this volume, and of discussing it in a form at once instructive and attractive. The keen insight to trace and unfold the characteristics and peculiar excellencies of distinguished authors, which he has displayed in his literary portraiture, connected as it is with great vivacity of fancy, and deep fervor of feeling, eminently fits him for a just appreciation, and a lively, impressive exhibition, of the character and beauties of the poetic element, so largely diffused through the Sacred Volume. His liveliness and ardor are here awed into reverent sobriety, and chastened and subdued into humble and devout seriousness of tone, without detriment to his wonted vigor of thought, his splendid diction, and his copious affluence of illustration. After discussing the classifications of Hebrew Poetry given by Herder, Lowth, and Ewald, he propounds a division of his own, under the two general heads of Song, and Poetic Statement: and to us his arrangement, with its subdivisions, is more satisfactory than the multiplied refinements of Bishops Lowth and Jebb. The work displays a profound appreciation, and an ardent admiration of the beauties of Scripture Poetry, and breathes, throughout, an earnest spirit, and genuine devotional feeling; and to those who reverence and love the Sacred Volume, it will be a welcome guide to the perception and due estimation of its marvellous excellencies, when considered merely from a literary point of view, while, at the same time, it will afford them solid instruction, and true edification.

A New Classical Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, Mythology, and Geography, partly based upon the Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology. By Wm. Smith, L. L. D. Editor of the *Dictionaries of Greek and Roman Antiquities, and of the Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology.* Revised, with numerous corrections and additions, by Charles Anthon, L. L. D. Professor of the Greek and Latin Languages in Columbia College. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1851.

OF the unspeakable importance and value of a work like this, to the student of the Greek and Latin Classics, there cannot be a doubt, and of the excellence of the volume here offered to the public, the names on the title-page are an ample guarantee. Dr. Anthon's classical scholarship, as accurate and profound as it is extensive, enjoys a world-wide celebrity; and we regard the fact that any work in this department of literature is edited by him, as prima facie evidence of its preëminent claims to general acceptance. The corrections, improvements, and additions, with which he has enriched the original English work, will be found both numerous and important. He says in his Preface: "It" (the present work) "is not designed to, and, in the Editor's opinion, will not supersede his own 'Classical Dictionary' published in 1841, since the articles are purposely brief, and results only are stated, without the fulness of detail, which is desirable to the more advanced scholar and the educated man of leisure; but it is intended for the use of those, whose means will not allow a more expensive, or their scanty time the use of a more copious work." To such the present will be a most welcome publication, and they will find this American edition far superior to the English work upon which it is based.

Foreign Reminiscences, By Henry Richard Lord Holland. Edited by his Son. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. No. 82 Cliff St. 1851.

THIS is a very spicy volume on the politics of Continental Europe, from the pen of a British nobleman, long conversant with the political world, and on terms of intimacy with many persons of highest rank, and with distinguished statesmen and revolutionary leaders of Europe. Its importance to general history is not, perhaps, very great; but, proceeding from one who was much and long behind the curtain which conceals from the public eye the private affairs of courts, diplomatists, parties and demagogues, it abounds in piquant anecdotes, supplies a good deal of information too minute and personal for the pages of the general historian, and constitutes altogether a most interesting *mélange*. There is a good deal about Prince Talleyrand, of whose treacherous designs towards Napoleon some glaring instances are given, while his general honesty is asserted in self-contradictory terms. To Napoleon himself, of whom Lord Holland was a warm admirer, falls the lion's share of the "Reminiscences, which, as respects some of the other personages introduced, savor rather strongly of the "chronique scandaleuse." Some of the statements made are of very questionable authority, those, especially, which affect the private character of Marie Antoinette. The book is by no means calculated to elevate our estimate of European sovereigns, courtiers and public functionaries, among whom Napoleon's greatness looms up in colossal proportions. Considering the character and opportunities of the writer of these reminiscences, they possess no small degree of value and interest.

The History of the United States of America, from the Adoption of the Federal Constitution, to the end of the Sixteenth Congress. By Richard Hildreth. In Three Volumes. Vol. I.—Administration of Washington. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff St. 1851.

THIS work forms the appropriate sequel to the three vols. from the same pen which have preceded it, on the Colonial and revolutionary History of the U. States. Through his three first volumes, Mr. Hildreth has established his reputation as a judicious and impartial historian. To American citizens a work of such ample detail on the history of this great republic must be one of unbounded interest. Written in a perspicuous and manly, but not often glowing, style, and free equally from offensive partisanship and from a feeble want of political character and decision, consistent with itself throughout, and studiously just to all, it engages at once our interest and wins our confidence. The protracted and exciting debates on the slavery question which agitated Congress and the country in 1790, are (like those on many other subjects) very fully reported, and have a peculiar interest in connexion with the stormy proceedings which have recently shaken our political edifice, and are by no means yet exhibiting their final phase. The work should be found on the shelves of every reading American, who reveres the memory of the great founders of our republic, and delights to trace her progress in her career, thus far, under the blessing of Providence, so prosperous and brilliant.

Heaven; or, an Earnest and Scriptural Inquiry into the Abode of the Sainted Dead, by the Rev. H. Harbaugh, Pastor of the First German Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa. Second Edition, revised and improved.

“Selig sind Die das Heimweh haben, denn sie sollen nach Haus kommen.”—STILLING.

A BOOK whose subject is deeply interesting to the Christian, written *con amore* and representing the various phases of opinion which have, from age to age, prevailed on its subject. On most points, we should agree with the author, but not on all. His illustrations are sometimes quite pleasing, his citations happy, and the practical effect of his performance must be good, to those who are in a position to be interested in discussions, carried on as these are.

INDEX TO VOL. II.

- ~~~~~
- Abbott's Illustrated Hist. 146, 445
 Andrews' Translat'n of Freund's Lat. Lex. 593
 Antiquity & the Church-Fathers 302
 Arnold's Greek Book 450
 Atonement of Christ 301
 Beattie's Thos. Campbell 443
 Bible, Silent influence of the 353
 Brook's Ovid 382
 Brown's Christ's Second Coming 592
 Carlyle's Latter day pamphlets 142
 Chalmer's Memoirs 448
 Christian education, 382
 Church Development 151
 Church-feeling 390
 Church Question 58
 Confessional, History of the 144
 Conquest of Canada 142
 Cheever's Island World of the Pacific 594
 Dark Scenes of History 141
 Dyer's Life of Calvin 143
 Ecclesiastical Standards 512
 Eccle. Year and Church festivals 16
 Eichelberger, Rev. L. Art. by 94
 Evangelist, Work of an 84
 Family worship 148
 Faith, Illustrations of 140
 Formula Concord 409
 Foster, John 150
 Fowler's English Grammar 441
 Gilfillan's Bards of the Bible 595
 Gentiles into the Church, Admission of the 371
 Geology, Princip. of explained 592
 German Reader. 449
 Greene's History and Geography of the Middle Ages 588
 Green, Dr. Ashbel 147
 Greenwald, Rev. E. Art. by 84
 Griffin—the Gospel its own Advocate 589
 Guericke's Manual of Ch. Arch. 576
 Harbaugh's Heaven 596
 Harper's Magazine 147
 Hebrews, Delitzsch on the 184
 Hildreth's History of the U. S. 596
 Historical Reminiscences 265
 Hoffman, Rev. J. N. 402, 465
 Holland's Reminiscences 595
 Howitt's Year-Book 447
 Human Race, Unity of the 451
 Humboldt's Cosmos 142
 Hunt's Autobiography 445
 Hymn, from the German 135
 Intelligence, Literary and Theol. 296
 Jacobs, Prof. M. Art. by 184, 451
 Johnson, Life of Dr. 444
 Johnson's Cicero 449
 King's Principles of Geology 592
 Krauth, Dr. C. P. Art. by 1, 215, 561
 Krauth, Rev. C. P. Art. by 78, 287
 Lintner, Dr. G. A. Art. by 512
 Literary Intelligence—Foreign 585
 Loomis' Astronomy 441
 Lutheran Church in the U. S. 1
 Lutheran Church, Vocation of the 489
 McClintock's Greek Book 446
 McCosh's Divine Government 590
 Mental and Moral Culture 94
 Mills, Dr. H. 135
 Moore's Castriot 449
 Moore on Health 448
 Morris, Dr. J. G. Art. by 284
 Mühlenberg's Voyage 113
 Norwegian Church 422
 Paul Gerhard 282
 Pennsylvania College 539
 Pillars of Hercules 145
 Protestant Principle 215
 Republic, past, present, and future 145
 Rhetorical Studies 546
 Robinson's Greek Lexicon 447
 Sabbath Schools, Claims of 148
 Sadtler, Rev. B. 409
 Schaeffer, Dr. C. F. Art. by 36, 301
 Schaeffer, Rev. C. W. Art. by 371
 Schmidt, Dr. H. I. Art. by 16, 320
 Schmucker, Dr. S. S. Art. by 151, 489
 Schmucker, Rev. B. M. Art. by 422, 523
 Sears' Life of Luther 435
 Seiss, Rev. J. A. Art. by 58
 Smith, Prof. J. F. Art. by 353, 547
 Smith's Classical Dictionary 595
 Smith's Classical Series 595
 Southey's Life 147
 Spring's Mercy Seat 150
 Stier's Hebrews 139

- Stier's Poems 140
Strickland's Lives of Scottish Queens
and English Princesses 594
Symbolic Theology 36
Symbols 442
Tefft's Shoulder-knot 443
Thanksgiving Sermon 149
Torgau Articles 78
Transfiguration 237
Trench on the Parables 588
Unity of the Human Race 451
Vocation of the Lutheran Church 489
Wordsworth Prelude 590
Wynne's Lives of Em. Lit. and Sci.
men 529