



*Yours in Christ,*  
*J. J. Schmucker.*

# LIFE AND TIMES

OF

## Rev. S. S. Schmucker, D. D.,

First Professor of Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary,  
at Gettysburg, Pa.

BY

### P. ANSTADT, D. D.,

Editor of Teachers' Journal, author of Communion Addresses, Luther's Smaller Catechism, Illustrated, Luther's Smaller Catechism, Pictorial Edition, Helps to Family Worship, Recognition of Friends in Heaven, Etc., Etc.

"I have lived, and am dying, in the faith of Jesus."

~~CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY~~

~~LIBRARY~~

~~SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS~~

YORK, PA.  
P. ANSTADT & SONS,  
1896.

WITHDRAWN

11434

13415

---

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1896, by  
P. ANSTADT & SONS,  
In the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

---

**DEDICATED**  
to the  
**Surviving Relatives, Friends**  
and  
**Students**  
of  
**Rev. S. S. Schmucker, D. D.,**  
by  
**The Author.**

## CHAPTER FOURTEENTH.

SCHMUCKER'S STUDIOUS HABITS—MORRIS' ACCOUNT—JACOBS' ACCOUNT—DIEHL'S ACCOUNT—SCHMUCKER AS A TEACHER—BRANCHES TAUGHT BY HIM—CHARACTER OF MINUTES PREPARED BY HIM—DICTATED HIS LECTURES—ORDER PRESERVED IN HIS CLASSES—STUDENTS' DEBATES—EXCITEMENT DURING ONE OF THESE DEBATES—HIS CRITICISMS ON ESSAYS, PRAYERS, SKELETONS AND SERMONS—TEXTS FOR FUNERAL SERMONS—ADMONITIONS TO LEAD CONSISTENT CHRISTIAN LIVES—HIS FACULTY OF QUIETING DISTURBANCES—MUHLENBERG'S AND SCHMUCKER'S PIETISM—SCHMUCKER'S PIETISM NO MISFORTUNE—THE CHURCH INDEBTED TO HIM—MUHLENBERG AND SCHMUCKER BOTH VIOLENTLY OPPOSED ON ACCOUNT OF THEIR PIETISM—THE HALLE PROFESSORS AND FOUNDERS OF THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH, PIETISTS—PERSECUTION OF MUHLENBERG BY BERKEMEIER AND KNOLL—ALBERT BENGEL A PIETIST—IS PIETISM RESPONSIBLE FOR RATIONALISM?—IS DEAD ORTHODOXY RESPONSIBLE?—TENDENCIES CHANGEABLE—SCHMUCKER AS A PREACHER—THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH—HAS THE SABBATH BEEN ABROGATED—SCHMUCKER'S TRACT—THE SABBATH INSTITUTED FOR ALL NATIONS—CHANGED TO THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK BY THE APOSTLES AND EARLY CHRISTIANS—HIS POSITION ON THE TEMPERANCE QUESTION—IN ADVANCE OF HIS CONTEMPORARIES—IN FAVOR OF LEGISLATIVE PROHIBITION—SAD EFFECTS AMONG THE MINISTRY—HIS POSITION ON THE SLAVERY QUESTION.

## SCHMUCKER'S STUDIOUS HABITS.

Of his studious habits Dr. Morris has the following to say, which is probably somewhat overdrawn :

"I never knew a man who needed and took less relaxation from severe mental toil than he. He never laid aside a subject he was working at because he had grown

weary of it. He seemed not to require that variety or change of subject that so many other head-workers find necessary to quicken their brain or give it a pause. It is true that in later life he sometimes went to 'the Springs,' but he took his work with him and labored as hard as ever. One of our divines told me that he once met Dr. Schmucker at Bedford. He was tinkering at the 'interminable' Liturgy or some other Synodical machine, and insisted upon my friend hearing it read and helping him to 'fix the thing up.' He would annoy him by questions and bother him with difficulties, all the while as calm as an August morning; upon which my friend lost his patience and curtly said, 'Dr. Schmucker, I have come here for relaxation. I want to lay aside all perplexing subjects, and I won't listen to you any longer.' Now this was a state of mind of which Dr. Schmucker had no conception, because he had no experience of it. With him it was work, work, all the time, without rest or cessation.

"I once crossed the Atlantic with him, and I can safely affirm that not a day passed on which the everlasting theme was not introduced. Even when he was suffering from sea-sickness, it seemed to be a relief to him to talk about General Synod, Liturgy, Constitution, Seminary and certain men. It was not only talk, for that might have been endured, but it was discussion, controversy, scrutiny, which required tension of thought to follow, and being at sea is not the place, nor time for prolonged and logical thinking. I used to get rid of what really was an annoyance by looking out of the cabin window, and exclaiming, 'Whale!' 'Whale!' and rush up on deck to find my whale was nothing but a dark wave or a floating mast of some wrecked vessel, but it answered my purpose for the time."

This is what Dr. Jacobs testifies: "He threw all the

energy of his life into the General Synod and the institutions at Gettysburg, withholding from them no amount of personal sacrifice or toil. Perfectly imperturbable, he moved forward toward the end in view, without regard to obstacles. Never have higher executive abilities been at the service of the church. . . . The effect of the later Pietism was, however, clearly discernable in the standard of theological education presented in his inaugural."\*

On the same subject Dr. Diehl writes as follows:

"Arduous as his labors had been at New Market, at Gettysburg he was called to bear a yet heavier burden of toil. At that day, at least two professors were deemed necessary in a Theological Seminary. The utmost labors of two men could not do more than teach three classes, in the studies laid down in the Seminary course. In our day, no Seminary is thought to be properly manned with less than three or four professors. Mr. Schmucker was required to do the work of at least two men in the way of instruction. Besides this, he had the labor of raising the requisite funds. He visited the cities to collect money. He traveled through the Church, preaching, and soliciting funds. His vacations were spent in this work. During the sessions, in addition to the instruction of the classes, he was employed in compiling the Hymn Book and other works.

"And yet, the young men that left the Seminary and applied for license at the Synods, seemed to be well qualified for the gospel ministry. Calls came to them from vacant churches. In their pulpit and pastoral work they were successful. Within a few years the graduates of the Seminary were in demand. Everywhere they were received with favor. They were soon found occupying important pulpits. The first who left Prof. Schmucker's lecture room,

---

\* Jacobs' History, page 366

at Gettysburg, was called to the first English Lutheran Church, of one of our eastern cities."

"The best standard of a man's workmanship is the character and quality of the products of his labor. Judged by this rule, the Gettysburg Professor must have been a skillful teacher. He trained men well for the sacred work. The Church soon endorsed his efficiency, by sending pressing calls to his pupils.

"When one man was required to teach Greek and Hebrew Philology, Sacred Geography, Sacred Chronology, Biblical and Profane History, Biblical Antiquities, Mental Philosophy, Natural Theology, Evidences of Christianity, Biblical Criticism, Exegetical and Biblical Theology, Systematic Divinity, Ecclesiastical History, Pastoral and Polemic Theology, Church Government, the Composition and Delivery of Sermons, the instruction may not have been as thorough in any one branch as that afforded by the theological chairs of our best schools at this day. Under such circumstances, a man must be judged by the general results and character of his work. Did he send forth good preachers and pastors? Did he inspire them with the right spirit? Did he give them back to the church, intelligent, godly, self-denying, laborious young ministers? Were they adapted to the wants of the Lutheran Church?

"In all these particulars, the results of the theological training, at Gettysburg, when Mr. Schmucker was the only teacher in the Seminary were highly satisfactory. The best, the most active and the most intelligent ministers expressed themselves highly pleased with the qualifications displayed by the young men, who were trained by him. The students themselves, had an exalted opinion of his abilities, his attainments, and his fidelity."—*Diehl*.

#### SCHMUCKER AS A TEACHER.

Professor Schmucker was one of the best teachers and disciplinarians, at whose feet it was ever my privilege to sit.

He dictated his lectures, and usually gave us sufficient time to commit them to paper. At the beginning of the course, he also gave us a plain and simple system of shorthand and abbreviations to facilitate rapidity in taking down the lectures. His enunciation was slow and clear, so that not a word or a syllable was lost or misunderstood.

I do not remember of any kind of levity having ever been indulged in by any of the students in his class, much less by himself, although a good natured smile at a ludicrous mistake of a fellow student, a striking illustration, or pleasant anecdote told by himself, was not unusual.

He insisted on close attention, perfect order, faithful study of the lessons, and close observance of the rules of the institution.

On certain occasions the students had debates on some theological subjects, assigned by the Professor; the debaters were appointed on opposite sides of the question in dispute. The Doctor himself presided and at the end of the debate he would compliment or criticise the respective speakers, and then give his own opinion or decision. During one of these debates we had considerable excitement inside and outside of the class room. The subject was that abstruse question, which I learn has since been debated by the students in the Seminary; namely, whether the soul is imparted immediately by God, or inherited from the parents. The respective intellectual combatants had studied hard and made ample research and preparations to get down to the bottom of this deep question. The rule in these debates was, that no manuscript should be read, the object being to train the students in extemporaneous speaking. The sainted W. H. H. however, came in with a long, elaborate essay, which he wished to read in support of his side of the question, and plead that the rule might be suspended in this important case. But the Doctor was in-

exorable, the rule was not set aside and poor H. had to stumble through his argument the best way he could. At the end of the debate, the Professor gave his decision which was in opposition to Brother H. This increased the excitement and the disappointment of the good brother; he assembled a number of the students outside of study hours, read his essay to us, boasted that he had totally demolished the Doctor's argument, and offered to meet him in public debate before all the students and the faculty. But with all his bluster, I believe the students all agreed with the Doctor, except perhaps the sainted Brother C.

His criticism of our essays, abstracts, and sermons were generally faithful and correct, in pointing out errors in the logic, rhetoric, scriptural proof-texts, historical dates or facts.

I remember also that he criticised the expressions of some of us in our prayers. For example, expressions like these were sometimes used by students in the class-room:

"Forgive us of our sins."

"Grant to give us."

The too frequent and inappropriate, or irreverent repetition of the name of the Deity.

Tautology and redundancy of expression, etc., etc.

These, and other inaccuracies in grammar, he taught us to avoid in our prayers. How far his instructions were heeded by all of his students I am not prepared to say, but I have heard the above and similar faulty language from pulpits of different denominations very frequently since.

We were also required at stated times to read essays on given subjects, and write sermons and skeletons on selected texts. These were read in the presence of the class, the Professor presiding. The students would first be asked to express their criticism, and then the Professor would commend, correct, or censure, according to his

views. An incident in these exercises I still remember very well. It was made my duty to write and read an essay on *African Slavery* in the South. Remember this was long before the war, while slavery was yet in full force in the Southern States. I gave expression to some very strong anti-slavery sentiments, and a Southern Brother took offense. But the Doctor sustained me in my position.

The most searching criticisms were made by the Doctor on our sermons and skeletons. It is true, he would commend everything in them that he thought commendable, but we could seldom present a skeleton in which he did not find a flaw in the introduction, divisions, or application. Especially in funeral sermons were we cautioned to be careful in the selection of the texts, and the treatment of the subject in relation to the dead. He also pointed out texts which were not appropriate, one of which I will relate from memory, an anecdote told in class. At the funeral of a notably wicked man, who had opposed the church, and had caused the minister much trouble, the preacher took this text, "Bind him hand and foot, and cast him into outer darkness, where shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

The relatives, of course, were very angry, and consulted a lawyer, with a view of prosecuting the preacher. They were told, however, that if the preacher had taken his text out of the Bible, they could do nothing by law against him. This was given as certainly one of the most objectionable kind of funeral texts.

The Doctor frequently admonished us to be always consistent, as christian young men, in our deportment, not only in our intercourse with each other in the Seminary, but also before other professing christians and before the world.

He had also a peculiar faculty of quieting any disturbance or dissatisfaction among the students. A notable

instance occurred during my student years. At that time we boarded in common in the basement of the Seminary. The steward supplied the boarding at a very moderate rate; and all the students were seated at meals around a large table. On one occasion there was a general complaint as to the quality of the boarding. It consisted very frequently of what was called "Pot-pie." Passavant called it "Death in the Pot." A general rebellion was inaugurated. A statement of our grievances was written out, and sent to the faculty with an appeal for better fare. In answer to our humble petition the Doctor called a meeting of the students in the chapel. There he very solemnly admonished us to the exercise of christian patience, moderation and forbearance. He reminded us, that the steward could not afford to give us many luxuries for the low price we paid him, but that he would speak with the steward, and admonish him to give us wholesome food, which he hoped would be conducive to our bodily health and vigor of our mental faculties. This was good advice, and satisfactory; the quality and variety of our diet was also visibly improved, and we considered the strike a success.

#### MUHLENBERG'S AND SCHMUCKER'S PIETISM.

In a previous part of this book (page 47) we quoted an extract from an article of R. W., (Reuben Weiser,) declaring that his father, Dr. J. G. Schmucker, was a "Pietist of the Spenerian school;" and adding, this was, perhaps a misfortune for one who was to have the training of not less than five hundred ministers in his hands."

We certainly do not regard Schmucker's Pietism as a misfortune, but on the contrary as a gracious superintending providence. There were some other learned and good men living at that time, but we can think of no one among them, who was in every respect so well qualified for this

work, and so intensely and unselfishly devoted to it during half a century as Dr. Schmucker. We are not alone in this opinion of his usefulness and devotion to the church. Dr. Morris gives the following testimony :

“ It cannot be doubted that to Dr. Schmucker the church is much indebted for the respectable position it assumed and the progress it made during the early part of his career. He had a noble ambition to elevate its character by the development of its resources, and he succeeded. He was indefatigable in his labors to promote what he considered to be its best interests. I never knew a man more wholly given up to the prosecution of his plans. He read none of the popular books on science or literature, which most cultivated clergymen indulge in for recreation from more severe studies, and to keep abreast of the progress of mind ; but his entire time, day and night, at home and elsewhere, was devoted to his favorite pursuits of writing, planning, begging and talking for the church.”

Dr. Schmucker was violently opposed by certain ultra confessionalists, who accused him of heterodoxy and disloyalty to the Lutheran Church, for whose welfare he had labored and sacrificed his time and money. But Dr. Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, the patriarch of the American Lutheran Church, passed through precisely the same experience. Dr. Wolf in his “ Lutherans in America,” (pages 252 3,) writes thus of Muhlenberg :

“ They assailed him with poisoned shafts of calumny and malice to counteract his usefulness and prevent the progress of Christ's Kingdom. . . . Berkemeier and Knoll entertained strong prejudice against Muhlenberg's Pietism, and persistently sought to undermine his influence by impugning his orthodoxy and his loyalty to the Lutheran Church. Berkemeier claimed for himself and the men from Hamburg a more positive Lutheran orthodoxy,

than he conceded to Hartwig and Muhlenberg and others trained in Halle. He earnestly warned the congregations against them."

Nothing could more accurately describe the treatment which Dr. Schmucker received from his opponents. The same violent persecution was also carried on against Spener, the father of Pietism, as also against those godly men, Francke, the founder of the great orphan house at Halle, and Arndt, the author of the "True Christianity." Prayer meetings were introduced by Spener, and became the salt of the earth, even to the present day. Albert Bengel, the learned Lutheran Commentator, was especially the hand of the Lord by which this salt was cast abroad. On one occasion he expressed himself as follows: "I do not understand why there should be opposition to prayer-meetings. Why should each one be pious and remain by himself? It is just as if people were going on a journey, and I should advise them, 'Don't go together in company, but let each remain about a gunshot behind the other.'"

The accusation is often made, that Pietism was the forerunner of Rationalism, and consequently led to and is responsible for Rationalism. But this is a false assumption, as Dr. Sprecher has shown in his learned book, the "Groundwork." Auberlen put the matter correctly, when he said, that "there was a two-fold opposition, side by side, to the dead orthodoxy of the seventeenth century, one intellectual, the other spiritual, or in other words, the one rationalistic, the other pietistic." Auberlen even says, "Humanism was older than the Reformation, and Rationalism was older than Pietism."

The question might be asked, How did Rationalism get into the other universities of Germany, where the so-called "dead orthodoxy" prevailed? Is the orthodoxy, that once prevailed in those schools, responsible for the

Rationalism that has succeeded and abounded in them for, lo, these many years?

From all accounts Rationalism predominates at the present time, not only in Halle, but also in all the other German universities.\*

As the "dead orthodoxy" was also the forerunner in these institutions, we might with equal propriety hold it responsible for the Rationalism now taught in their halls.

The truth is, there can be no perfect security, that a theological seminary shall for all time maintain the doctrinal position of its founders, either in Germany or in America. The Seminary at Gettysburg was founded by Dr. S. S. Schmucker, Wittenberg College and Seminary were founded by Drs. Ezra Keller and Samuel Sprecher, and the Missionary Institute at Selin's Grove was founded by Dr. Benjamin Kurtz; but what assurance have we, that the doctrinal status and religious tendency of their founders shall remain unchanged for all time to come? In Germany, where the church and her institutions are under the control of the state, where the professors are not obligated to teach according to the Augsburg Confession, the change from Orthodoxy to Heterodoxy is made very easy.†

---

\* I see statements in the German papers that it is urgently proposed to found a new University from which Rationalism shall be excluded, only orthodox professors be appointed, and the pure Scriptural doctrines only shall be taught.

† This reminds of a striking analogy in nature. When the winter is past, and the spring time has come, the voice of the Cuckoo is heard in the land. This singular bird builds no nest of its own, but lays its eggs in the nests of some other birds, that they may hatch them along with their own, and feed the young both alike. But the young Cuckoos are larger than the other birdies, and have bigger mouths; so they get most of the food, starve out the original heirs, and at last crowd them out of the nest altogether.

## DR. SCHMUCKER AS A PREACHER.

"About seventy-five years ago Drs. Schmucker and Kurtz were regarded as the two ablest English Lutheran preachers in America. They differed very widely, however, in their style of oratory. When Schmucker entered the ministry, Kurtz was already attracting notice as a rising young man in the church.

"Though Mr. S. delivered his sermons without manuscript, he was not an extemporaneous preacher. He made full preparation, writing his sermons with great care. Such, however, was his facility in memorizing his own compositions, that three readings would often be sufficient to transfer an entire sermon from the manuscript to his memory. His sermons were framed after the models of the best authorities of that time. Going to the root of his subject, analyzing it carefully, arranging his matter systematically, clothing his thoughts in a clear, Addisonian style, instructive and practical at the same time, an occasional flower of rhetoric, appeals to the conscience, as well as to reason, touching at times the fountain of emotions, always solemn in aspect and dignified in manner, distinct in his enunciation, clear in voice and loud enough to be easily heard by all, he was such a preacher in 1822, as all classes delighted to hear."

The foregoing eulogy is given by Dr. Diehl; my own estimate corresponds with it entirely. Having often heard him preach, his sermons made a deep impression on my mind, and many important truths have been indelibly fixed in my memory. He did not use many illustrations; if he had, it would have made his sermons more popular; but when he did use one, it was always striking and appropriate.

I select the following as a sample from his sermon, preached in Middletown, Md., before the Synod of Mary-

land in the year 1824. It is said, that this sermon produced the final determination in the minds of the members of this Synod to establish a theological seminary :

“An American Indian gave the following advice to a Moravian missionary, by one of whom he was led to Christ and converted :

“‘Brethren,’ said he, ‘I have grown old among the heathen ; therefore I know how the heathen think. Once a preacher came and began to explain to us that there is a God. We answered, ‘Dost thou think us so ignorant as not to know that? Go back to the place whence thou camest.’

“‘Then again another preacher came and began to teach us, and to say, ‘You must not steal, nor lie, nor get drunk.’ We answered, ‘Thou fool! dost thou think we don’t know that? Learn first thyself, and then teach the people to whom thou belongest, to leave off these things ; for who steals, or lies, or is more drunken than thine own people?’ And thus we dismissed him.

“‘After some time Brother Christian Henry Rauch came into my hut and sat down by me. He spoke to me nearly as follows: ‘I come to you in the name of the God of heaven and earth. He wants to let you know that he will make you happy, and deliver you from the misery in which you lie at present. To this end he became a man, gave his life a ransom for man, and shed his blood for him on the cross!’ When he had finished his discourse, he lay down upon a board, fatigued by the journey, and fell into a sound sleep. I then thought: ‘See how he lies and sleeps! I might kill him and throw him out into the woods, and who would regard it? But this gives him no concern.’

“‘However, I could not forget his words. They constantly recurred to my mind. Even when I was asleep,

I dreamed of the blood of Christ shed for us. I found this to be different from what I had ever heard, and I interpreted Christian Henry's words to the other Indians. Thus, through the grace of God, an awakening took place among us.'

"I say, therefore, brethren, preach Christ, our Savior, and his sufferings and death, if you would have your words gain entrance among the heathen."

#### SCHMUCKER'S VIEWS ON REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

Dr. Schmucker advocated genuine revivals of religion. He was in favor of protracted efforts for the conversion of sinners and the edification of believers. He was not, however, in favor of unnecessary noise and confusion; he wanted the meetings to be conducted decently and in order. I never knew a man who was more orderly in all his conduct, walk and conversation.

His views may be gathered from his account of the evangelistic labors of Muhlenberg and his co-laborers and successors in the early history of the American Lutheran Church. In his discourse entitled, "Retrospect of Lutheranism," he gives the following account of the work of Muhlenberg and his fellow-laborers in promoting genuine revivals of religion:

"Muhlenberg and his early fellow-laborers had been trained by the Spirit of God as worthy disciples of the Frankean School. The period of their education was the age of revivals in Germany, and succeeded the era of pietistic controversies, which grew out of them, and enlisted on the one side or the other, the entire theological intellect of the country. Their own views were decidedly orthodox and evangelical, and they were careful to require evidences of genuine piety from applicants for the ministerial office. Among the questions they were required to answer were

the following: How do you know that Christ was not only a teacher, but also that he has made atonement for the sins of men? What is meant by the influence and blessings of the Holy Spirit? What are the evidences of conversion?

"Their preaching was most evangelical and edifying, and their journals show that they earnestly looked for the divine blessing. Muhlenberg states that he sometimes, after a sermon, added a brief paraphrase or exhortation on the closing hymn, and described the case of a young man who attributed his conversion to this practice. All that they have written and all that is on record of their sermons prove that they were anxious mainly for the glory of their Savior and the salvation of souls committed to their care. It was in this spirit that they plainly assailed the prevailing views of the land, and often incurred the displeasure of the vicious.

"Thus for his faithfulness toward Sabbath-breakers in Philadelphia, Dr. Kunze, in 1784, was attacked in the newspapers of the day. Soon after his settlement in New York, Dr. Kunze remarks: 'Several individuals have come to me, and with tears besought me to teach them what they must do to be saved.' The reports which they stately sent to Halle abounded in individual narratives of conversions, and demonstrate that they watched for souls as those that must give account.

"They encouraged prayer-meetings among their church-members, and often conducted them themselves. Nor did they deem it necessary to forbid these meetings, although formalists within the church opposed them, and the ungodly world without sometimes disturbed the meetings, as was the case at Lancaster in 1773, in the pastoral charge of Dr. Helmuth. Speaking of a revival of religion then in progress, he says:

“Twice or thrice a week meetings were held in the evening at different places by the subjects of this work of grace, and the time spent in singing, praying and reading a chapter in the Word of God, or in Arndt's True Christianity, and if no prayer-meeting was held in church on Sabbath evening, the substance of the morning sermon was discussed. In some houses the number was rather large, there being sometimes as many as forty persons assembled at one place. The children of the world several times attempted to disturb their worship by standing at the windows listening, and by throwing stones against the doors. But by grace they were enabled to bear it without any resistance, and even when on their way home they were assailed on the streets with various nicknames, and stigmatized as hypocrites, pietists, etc., yet they answered not a word. Some of these persecutors also, when they heard these men sing and pray with fervor and sincerity, not only ceased their opposition, but induced others to do the same.’

“The labors of the greater number of these men were extensively blessed. Speaking of a visit to Tulpehocken, Father Muhlenberg says that he found many souls who professed the Rev. Mr. M. Kurtz to be their spiritual father; and his own labors were crowned with very extensive success. In 1782 there was also a season of revival of great interest in the church in Philadelphia. ‘Particularly among the young,’ says Dr. Kunze, “there has been a fire kindled, which continued to burn, to our great joy, about a year.’”

#### SCHMUCKER'S VIEW OF THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

Dr. Schmucker taught the divine obligation to keep the Christian Sabbath or Lord's Day, as a day of sacred rest. He regarded it as a Christian's bounden duty to abstain from all unnecessary secular labor on the first

day in every week, and devote that day to religious duties in the family or the public worship of God.

On this subject he wrote a tract which was published in English by the American Tract Society, and was also translated into the German language. In this tract he very clearly shows, that in the beginning the Sabbath was instituted for the whole human race, and not for the Jews alone; that in the Christian dispensation it was changed from the seventh to the first day of the week, which day has continued to be observed from the earliest time of the christian church to the present day; that it is also regarded necessary by the secular governments; that the Sabbath is one of the safeguards against crime; that it is necessary for our physical, intellectual, moral and spiritual welfare; that the French infidels committed a fatal error, when they undertook to make the tenth instead of the seventh a day of rest. He laments the fact that so many people in this favored land desecrate the Christian Sabbath, and our railroads, canals and many public works disregard their obligation to keep the Lord's Day holy.

There are now some theologians who maintain, that the Sabbath was only a ceremonial regulation for the Jews, and was abrogated after the advent of Christ, so that we are under no moral obligation to keep it holy, and that it has not been changed from the seventh to the first day of the week, but that we keep this day merely as a human regulation for convenience sake, in order that we may have an appointed time for public worship. We copy the following selection from Schmucker's tract, in which he proves, that the Sabbath was instituted for the whole human race, proves that it was properly changed by the early Christian Church from the seventh to the first day of the week :

“The word of God, we believe, inculcates the divine obligation to consecrate one day in seven to rest from

secular toil, and to exercises of religious devotion. This was enacted at the end of the creative week, for reasons equally applicable to all nations and all generations: 'Because in six days the Lord created the heavens and the earth, and rested on the seventh from all the works which he had made.' And as he created the heavens and the earth, not for the Jews only, but for all nations, so the example of his resting and sanctifying the seventh day, must also have been designed for all. Here we find the original and formal institution of the Sabbath. In Exod. xx. 8-11, it is evidently spoken of as already existing and known. The language, '*Remember* the Sabbath day,' etc., implies a previous acquaintance with it. The same is true of Exod. xvi. Moreover, the declaration of the Savior, that the Sabbath was made for *man*, forbids the idea of its restriction to the Israelites alone, and implies that it was intended for all mankind, and therefore appropriately instituted at that early day. That the Sabbath was appointed at the time just stated, is moreover sustained by the fact, that the division of time into weeks was found among the most ancient nations, as far back as history and tradition extend. It was found among the Egyptians, Assyrians, Phœnicians, Ancient Chinese, Indians, Arabians, and others. No other rational account of the general prevalence of the hebdomadal division of time in the earliest ages of antiquity can be given, than that it was spread by tradition from the family of Noah, who had derived it from our first parents.

"We claim not that the identical hours must be observed over the whole earth; for, unless the night were employed, this would be physically impossible. Had the popular theory of antiquity proved true, that the earth is an extended plain, the same twelve hours might have been observed for the active duties of the Sabbath by all men. But how can the inhabitants of a revolving sphere, illumi-

nated from one fixed point, all have their Sabbath *day*, or any other *day*, at the same time? We need scarcely remind any of you, that if colonies had simultaneously emigrated from Eden, and proceeded half round the globe, they would have been involved in midnight, whilst the meridian sun illumined their starting point: and if they continued their progress till they completed the circuit, each having faithfully kept the seventh day as Sabbath, they would find themselves observing different days. But though the simultaneousness of sabbatic observance will be conceded as unnecessary, it is evident, that whilst these divergent colonies might both regularly observe the seventh day, counting from the time they started, yet when they met, as they would be observing different days, they must either have two conflicting Sabbaths, or one of them must change its day and adopt that of the other. Since the Creator has made it physically impossible to observe the same hours, or even, in some cases, the same day; does he not thus evidently teach us, that it was not unalterably the *seventh* day of the week, but the religious observance of the *seventh portion* of time which essentially constitutes his Sabbath? while, in the Old Testament dispensation, the seventh day was confessedly appointed. During the Mosaic dispensation, the same proportion of time was reiterated, with various ceremonial injunctions, and the Sabbath, like the rainbow of old, employed as a type or sign to the Israelites, without altering its primitive relation to other nations. This ceremonial character and its appendages, which were peculiar to the Mosaic economy, and 'were shadows of things to come, of which Christ is the body,' Paul tells the Colossians (ii. 16) were abolished in the New testament, with the other types and shadows of the old; but the primitive design and obligation remained to sanctify the seventh portion of time. The inspired apostles, doubtless

for wise reasons, selected the day of our Lord's resurrection, the first day of the week, for their stated seventh-day religious services, perhaps to connect the Savior's triumph over death and the powers of hell, with the perpetual public devotions of Christians, and possibly to prevent the ceremonial aspects of the Jewish Sabbath from becoming connected with that of Christians, to which there would have been a constant tendency, if the same day had been retained.

“That the inspired apostles, and primitive Christians under their guidance, selected the first day for their regular weekly public exercises, we think, needs no labored argument. Luke the evangelist, not only tells us, that the disciples came together on the first day to break bread, that is, to celebrate the communion, but he says, on the first day of the week, *when* they came together for this purpose, Paul preached to them; implying that it was their custom so to convene. Paul also directs the Christians of Corinth and Galatia to hold their charitable collections on the first, or, as St. John calls it, ‘The Lord's Day,’ for the obvious reason, that then they were assembled. 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. Indeed, the resurrection of Christ was so decidedly the culminating and crowning scene in the work of redemption, it was so obviously the day of triumph for Christ, for Christianity, and for Christians, that the disciples from the beginning very naturally regarded it as the day most closely connected with their religion and worship, and observed it as such. And the divine Savior himself seems to have evinced his approbation of the practice. We have no account of his having met with them after his resurrection on the Jewish Sabbath; but every instance of his appearance to them was on the first day of the week, on the Lord's Day. It was on this day that he favored their assembly with his presence, and pronounced his benediction, ‘Peace

be with you.' It was on this day that he poured out his Spirit upon them, and bestowed the gift of tongues; and it was on this day, also, that he revealed himself and the prophetic history of his church to St. John at Patmos. Luke xxiv. 36. Levit. xxiii. 15, 16. Acts ii. 1.

"That this day was religiously observed by Christians, in regular succession during the first three centuries, is evident from the testimony of Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Cyprian. Eusebius, of the fourth century, tells us that Christians were so well known by the fact of their observing the Lord's day, that the heathen, when wishing to know whether any person was a disciple of Christ, decided by his answer to the inquiry, *Dost thou observe the Lord's day?* In the fourth century, Constantine, the first Christian emperor, enacted civil laws, requiring abstinence from secular labor on the Lord's day; and from that time to the present, similar prohibitions, more or less stringent, are embodied in the code of every Christian nation."

On the question of the divine obligation of the Lord's Day, Dr. Schmucker stood squarely on the basis of the General Synod. This will appear evident from its action at York in May 1864. A number of preambles and a resolution, read and moved by Dr. Passavant, were adopted. We copy the resolution which reads as follows:

"*Resolved*, That while this Synod, resting on the word of God as the sole authority in matters of faith on its infallible warrant, rejects the Romish doctrine of the real presence or Transubstantiation, and with it the doctrine of Consubstantiation; rejects the Romish mass, and all the ceremonies distinctive of the mass; denies any power in the sacraments, as an *opus operatum*, or that the blessings of Baptism and the Lord's Supper can be received without faith; rejects auricular confession and priestly absolution; holds that there is no priesthood on earth, but that of all

believers, and that God only can forgive sins; and *maintains the Divine obligation of the Sabbath.*" \*

Dr. C. P. Krauth, Sr., his colleague in the Seminary, published a treatise on the Sabbath, in which he maintained the Divine obligation of the Lord's Day. 1856, page 53.

\* The divine appointment of the Lord's Day is also taught in the Provisional Catechism adopted by the General Synod. Under question 58, "Why do we now keep the first day of the week, or Sunday?" the fourth reason assigned is, "Because the apostles kept this day for religious worship and being inspired, they must have known their Lord's will."

Under question sixty, "What is meant by keeping the Sabbath holy?" the answer is, "We keep the Sabbath holy, when we give the day to the word and worship of God, and Christian service of our fellow men, resting from worldly labor."

In Luther's Larger Catechism also we find these words: "Since then so much depends upon God's Word, that without it no Sabbath can be kept holy, we ought to know, that God will insist upon a strict observance of the commandment, and will punish all who despise his Word, and are not willing to hear and learn it, especially at the times appointed for the purpose."

Dr. Conrad's Catechism teaches as follows on the Sabbath question:

"62 When was the Sabbath instituted? Immediately after the work of creation was finished.

"66 How do we remember the Sabbath day? By observing it for rest and worship.

"67 What is meant by God's hallowing the Sabbath? The setting apart of the seventh day from common to sacred purposes.

"68 How is the Sabbath kept holy? By abstaining from all worldly pursuits, and regulating our thoughts, words and actions according to its sacred character.

"70 How may its spiritual blessings be secured? By prayer and meditation at home, by worshiping in the house of God, and by doing good.

"71 How is the Sabbath profaned? By spending it in secular pursuits, by visiting and travel, by recreation and pleasure, as if it were an ordinary, and not a holy day.

"78 By whom was the change from the seventh to the first day of the week made? By the apostles, with the approbation of Jesus Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath."

The following by Dr. C. P. Krauth, Jr., late Professor of Theology in Mt. Airy Seminary, and author of the "Conservative Reformation," is taken from his treatise on the Augsburg Confession, 1868, pages 81-83. It is very positive on the Divine obligation of the Lord's Day, and sustains Dr. Schmucker's position very decidedly :

"The Confessors maintained that the *Jewish Sabbath* is abrogated, but that so far as its ends and obligations

---

Dr. Morris teaches in his Catechism as follows:

"7 On what day do Christians keep the Sabbath? On the first day of the week, because on that day the Savior rose from the dead.

"8 Who first changed the day? The holy apostles who knew the Lord's will, and were directed by the Holy Ghost. They set apart the first day in thankful remembrance of Christ's resurrection, for the out-pouring of the Holy Spirit, and for the time of public worship among Christians."

Dr. Ziegler in his Catechetics teaches as follows: "94 Why do we now keep the first day of the week, or Sunday? Because his disciples kept it by frequently meeting on it for religious worship; and being inspired, they must have known the Lord's will."

He also recommends his students to read "the Sabbath Manual" by Edwards, published by the American Tract Society, Nos. 1-4.

The fathers of the American Luth. Church inculcated the strict observance of the Lord's Day, as may be seen from the following extract from the Halle Annals: "So faithfully did Dr. Kunze direct the artillery of the pulpit against the vice of Sabbath breaking, then as now prevalent among European Germans, that they became greatly excited, and published some abusive articles against him in the English newspapers; the German editor wisely declined to insert such articles."

Dr. Mann, member of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, in his "Plea for the Augsburg Confession," writes as follows: "Luther and Melancthon had received from the older church, the doctrine and practice of the Christian Sabbath, as a holy day, as a divine institution and obligation, and they had not a word to say against this view of the Sabbath. But they had a great deal to say against the abuses, by which the bishops made the Sabbath a day of sin and dishonor to God and his church, instead of making it a day devoted to his glory."

- Page 28.

were original and generic they are unchangeable, and that to meet these ends and obligations the Christian Church, through the Apostles, had appointed the first day of the week, or Lord's Day. In what they here say they mean to confute two Romish errors. The first was that of the "*observation*" of days, that is, of *such* a keeping as was Judaizing in its spirit, and opposed to the grace of the Gospel, such as St. Paul expressly condemned when he says: '*Ye observe* days. . . . I am afraid lest I have bestowed labor upon you in vain.' Galat. iv. 10. Secondly, the idea that such outward observation was in itself meritoriously *necessary* to salvation. This the Confession denied, and shows that there is a necessity for the Lord's Day, but not of the kind Romanism had invented.

"A systematic statement of the predominant doctrine of the Sabbath *involved* in the views of the greatest writers of our Church, may be presented in the following propositions :

"1. The law that one day in seven shall be set apart for the service of God, has existed by Divine command, from the foundation of the world, and its obligation is a part of the original law of nature.

"2. The command was repeated in the Decalogue and in the Mosaic law, with specific ceremonial characteristics adapting it to the Jewish nation.

"3. The law itself, generically considered, is of perpetual and universal obligation; its specific ceremonial characteristics pertain only to the Jews.

"4. The law itself has never been abrogated; the specific ceremonial characteristics have been.

"5. To keep one day in seven holy to God, to abstain from all that may conflict with its sanctification, is generic, not specific; moral, not ceremonial.

" 6. The obligation to keep holy the seventh day, or Saturday, is ceremonial, and not binding on Christians.

" 7. The resurrection of Christ, his successive appearances, the Pentecostal effusion of his Spirit, on the first day of the week, together with the example of the Apostles, and of the Apostolic Church, have shown to the Church what day in the seven may, under the New Dispensation, most fitly be kept holy, and have led to the substitution of the first day of the week for the seventh, as the Christian Sabbath.

" 8. To keep holy the first day of the week, to consecrate it to God, and to this end to abstain upon it from all works except those of necessity, mercy, and the service of God, *is obligatory on all men.*

" No Church can show a purer record than the Lutheran Church, on this very question of sound doctrine in regard to the moral and Divine obligation to consecrate one day in every seven to God, and to repose from toil. The greatest leaders of theology in our church, considered a denial of the Divine obligation to keep one day in seven as *Socinian*. The Sabbatarians, harmonizing with the Jews, considered even the determinative part of the fourth command as perpetual, and contended that Saturday should be kept. Our fathers rejected this error. The Anabaptists and Socinians contended that no part of the fourth command is of Divine obligation—that all is ceremonial. Our fathers rejected this error, and rested on this point as in others, on the truth removed from each extreme—that the generic Sabbath is primitive and has never been abrogated—that only what is ceremonial in the Jewish Sabbath is abrogated—that the Christian Sabbath is a glorious bond of the sovereignty of God in the law, and of the freedom of the church under the gospel; *Divine in its generic origin and obligation, and apostolic in its specific determination.*"

## DR. SCHMUCKER'S POSITION ON THE TEMPERANCE QUESTION.

On the subject of Temperance, Dr. Schmucker was half a century in advance of his contemporaries. He was a tee-total abstainer from intoxicants as a beverage, while the temperance people advocated moderate drinking; he advocated legislation to prevent the sale of alcoholic liquors, while others pleaded only for moral suasion; he was a Prohibitionist, long before Local Option was thought of, or the Prohibition Party had an existence. I shall never forget a speech which I heard him make while I was a student in Pennsylvania College (1841-44). A public meeting was called to assemble in the old Gettysburg court house, which stood in the centre of the square. The meeting was addressed by Dr. Schmucker. He then and there contended that temperance could never become prevalent in this country by means of moral suasion, but that the whole liquor traffic should be suppressed by law. "For," said the Doctor, "so long as liquor is publicly sold in taverns, (there were then no lager beer saloons) there will always be boys and men unprincipled enough to drink it." This declaration has been literally verified, as the experience of half a century has now clearly demonstrated.

The Doctor took occasion frequently to speak on the subject to the students in the class room, exhorting them to total abstinence from intoxicating liquors as a beverage, and to advocate temperance principles from the pulpit. Morris says of him; "He never drank a glass of strong liquor as a beverage in his life." The drinking of wine and whiskey was customary and even fashionable in the early period of his ministry, among ministers as well as laymen. There was, it is said, in those days a stillhouse on almost every farm in York County. The farmers would distill their grain into whiskey, which they would send by wagon to Baltimore, being far less bulky and weighty in that

shape than corn or rye. It was a great grief to him to see some of his own ministerial brethren fall victims to the vice of intemperance. Even some of the ministers who participated in the organization of the General Synod, and the establishment of the Seminary became inebriates. He told us in class to what peculiar temptations the ministers of that day were exposed. It was at that time regarded as a duty required by hospitality to set out a bottle to every visitor as soon as he entered the house. When a minister paid a pastoral visit in one of the families of his congregation the inevitable bottle of wine or whiskey was set before him. It was regarded as a slight if he declined to drink. But by the time a minister had made half a dozen or more pastoral visits and drank more or less at every house, he would hardly get home a sober man. Now, if this course was continued for any length of time, a taste for ardent spirits would be formed, which he could no longer resist, and he would become a confirmed drunkard, disgrace his calling and would have to retire from the ministry or be deposed from his office.

#### HIS POSITION ON SLAVERY.

Dr. Schmucker was an avowed enemy of the slavery system. He made no secret of his views, but expressed them in public and in private. Also in his lectures in the seminary he frequently expressed his aversion to the Negro slavery as it existed in the Southern States, and not unfrequently to the ill-suppressed opposition of students from the South.

The following statements from his youngest son, Samuel D. Schmucker, Esq., will give some insight into the Doctor's relation to slavery and his views upon the system:

"We had two old Negro servants in my early life, who had been slaves in my mother's family, and were manumit-

ted, but I am not familiar with the details of their history. They were freed before I was born. I know that after these servants became superannuated, they were supported by father, as long as they lived. A modest legacy, left by my maternal grandmother for that purpose, assisted, in part, I believe, to support them.

"Your reference to the manumitted Negro servants reminds me of the circumstance, that in my early life run-away slaves would occasionally come to our house. Father would allow any such to sleep in his barn by day, and I am sure, assisted them, at least to the extent of supplying them with food. After the decision of the Dred Scott case, I once asked him, what he would do, if a fugitive slave were to approach him personally for aid? He replied, that he would never assist in returning a fellow being into bondage, and would succor any such that were in distress, and that if he was prosecuted for it, he would admit the fact, and pay the penalty for which the law might make him liable.

"He always favored the gradual abolition of slavery, and insisted, that it should be accomplished by law, even if the slave holder had such a standing before the law, as to entitle him to compensation for the manumitted slave at the public expense."

The following is contributed by Dr. Diehl on this subject in the *Quarterly Review*:

"At the Synod of Maryland and Virginia, 1824, he pleaded earnestly the cause of African Colonization. Born in Maryland, and settled as pastor for five years in Virginia, he was familiar with slavery in all its phases and relations. He understood the condition and moral character of the colored population in the slave states. When colonization failed to accomplish what its early advocates had ardently hoped, and emancipation societies were organized, Dr

Schmucker gave the subject much attention. He adopted moderate abolition sentiments. These sentiments he did not conceal, but stated them frankly in his lecture room to the students. In his *Popular Theology*, 1834, he gave his views to the public advocating still African Colonization as the means of evangelizing Africa, and giving freedom to a small number, but urging gradual emancipation as the only remedy to our great political evil. As his *Theology* was extensively circulated in the Southern States, and many of his pupils were scattered all over the South, his sentiments were known. Hence, when the war broke out, and the southern people were intensely embittered against all emancipationists, he was the object of no small amount of bitter feeling. And when Lee's army invaded Maryland on their way to Pennsylvania, 1863, they declared their purpose to arrest Dr. Schmucker. A week before the battle of Gettysburg, he received a communication from a Lutheran minister in Maryland, making known to him their avowed purpose to arrest him, and advising him, by all means, to leave Gettysburg, should the confederates move in that direction. When they took possession of Seminary Hill, they occupied his house for three days, July, 1, 2, 3. His house was pierced by thirteen cannon balls. His fine library was shamefully abused, and some of his furniture plundered.

“ Having noticed the poverty and wretchedness of the free colored population of Pennsylvania, and attributing their sad condition, largely, to their exclusion from mechanical and other lucrative employments, he went to Harrisburg, 1842, and laid before the Legislature of the State, a petition for the passage of a law for the melioration of the colored people. He drew up a bill, which provided that colored girls over 13 and boys over 14 years, should all be registered by the assessors, and if idle, or neglected by their

parents, should be brought before Justices of the peace, and by them bound, while minors, to respectable white people, to be brought up to trades or other industrial pursuits. This bill was moved by a member and passed the first and second reading. But before the final reading and vote, some of the demagogues determined to defeat it, by stigmatizing it as an abolition measure. They gained their point. But the following year, Dr. Schmucker introduced the same bill through a member. It was received with general favor. But then a quarrel sprang up about the State election. So violent was the commotion that the military were called out. In the turmoil the bill was lost sight of. Had the salutary law passed, no doubt the colored people of Pennsylvania would have been in a better moral and physical condition, than they were at the breaking out of the war."

