



*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WITHDRAWN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 SIXTEENTH.

SCHMUCKER AS A CONTROVERSIALIST—AVERSE TO PERSONAL COLLISION—DEBATED IN A KIND, CHRISTIAN SPIRIT—SHRANK FROM FIERCE PERSONAL CONFLICT—DIFFERED FROM DR. KURTZ—KURTZ AND THAD. STEVENS—OUR AIM IN CONTROVERSY—USE OF CONTROVERSY—DEFINITE PLATFORM—DR. SCHMUCKER ITS AUTHOR—ADOPTED BY THREE OR FOUR SYNODS—JACOBS' ERROR—DR. BAUGHER'S FIGURE—REASON ASSIGNED—ERRORS CLAIMED—EXCITING CONTROVERSY—CHANGES MADE BY DR. LOCHMAN—HOFFMAN—DR. MANN—CONTROVERSY IN A CHRISTIAN SPIRIT—CEREMONIES OF THE MASS—EXTENDED DISCUSSION—PRIVATE CONFESSION AND ABSOLUTION—MANNER IN WHICH THEY WERE PERFORMED—SCRIPTURE EXPLAINED—DIVINE OBLIGATION OF LORD'S DAY—VIEWS OF REFORMERS LAX—MISSOURIANS SAY SABBATH ABROGATED—THE SACRAMENTS—BAPTISMAL REGENERATION—PUSEYISM AND NEVINISM—EXORCISM—MANNER IN WHICH IT WAS PRACTICED—BY WHAT COUNTRIES ADOPTED—EVIDENCE OF PARDON—LORD'S SUPPER—MOSHEIM, SCHMUCKER, MORRIS, BAUGHER.

SCHMUCKER AS A CONTROVERSIALIST.

The Doctor sometimes spoke to his students in class on the subject of religious controversy. He did not object to controversy when properly conducted. "Our aim," he instructed us, "should not be victory over our opponents, but the truth." "Religious controversy," he said, "though it often degenerates from that calm and dignified character, which it should ever sustain as a mutual search after truth,

seems, sometimes, to be necessary and proper. Discussions on topics of practical utility are alike pleasing to God and beneficial to the church, if conducted in a Christian spirit, and the parties have truth, and not victory for their aim. Truth is the will of God, exhibited in the diversified creations of his hand, either physical, intellectual, or moral, and the revelation of his word, correctly apprehended by the human mind. Since truth therefore is of God, it need fear no investigation. The divinity that is in it will secure its ultimate triumph. Though it may for a season be obscured or crushed to earth by passion, prejudice, or irresponsible authority, it will sooner or later assert its rights, and secure the homage of all upright minds. No friend of truth should dread impartial investigation. If he has unconsciously imbibed erroneous opinions, he will thus be conducted to the truth; and if his views are correct, they will be confirmed by investigation. 'Eternal vigilance has been styled the price of civil liberty;' and to 'search the Scriptures daily,' to 'prove all things and hold fast to that which is good,' is the grand safeguard of religious truth and ecclesiastical purity. The life of the greatest moral hero of the sixteenth century,—Martin Luther,—to whom Christianity is so largely indebted, was almost entirely expended in controversial efforts; and even the mild and peace-loving Melancthon felt it his duty to devote much of his time, his learning, and his talents to the vindication of the truth against its enemies."

The most serious controversy in which Dr. Schmucker was engaged took place in 1856. It was in relation to the "Definite Platform," or "American Recension of the Augsburg Confession." This document was prepared by Drs. Schmucker, Kurtz and Sprecher, but Dr. Schmucker declared himself its author. It was drawn up at the request of about twenty Lutheran ministers in the East and in the

West, men "of the very first responsibility." We give an account of its inception and preparation in the Doctor's own words:

"The Definite Platform could never, *with truth*, be regarded as the work of a few individuals. Its inception was the result of a consultation of a large number of influential brethren, especially of the West, who had been convinced by the aggressions of surrounding symbolists, that a decided, but also a more *definite* stand on the ground of the General Synod, was necessary in self defence. It was prepared and published at their request, not as an official document, but as a draft of such a basis as they had agreed on. It was presented to them, and taken up for consideration by their several Synods; and the unanimity with which they adopted it is conclusive proof that it was prepared according to the stipulated principles."

It was printed in pamphlet form and sent to the district synods in connection with the General Synod for discussion and adoption, if thought proper. It was adopted by three synods in the West, within a few weeks after its publication. So far as we know, it was not adopted by any of the Eastern synods, except perhaps the Melancthon, which had temporarily separated from the Maryland Synod, but after a few years re-united with it.*

I distinctly remember the discussion when it was brought up in the West Pennsylvania Synod. It was bitterly opposed by Dr. Baugher, Sr., and some others. Referring to the omissions in the Confession, he made use

* The following Synods in the West adopted the Definite Platform: The Synod of Ohio, the Olive Branch Synod, of Ohio, and the Wittenberg Synod, of Ohio. Morris' Fifty Years in the Ministry, page 538.

Dr. Jacobs, in his History, says, "It was indorsed by one of the smallest synods of Ohio," which is doubtless an unintentional error by the learned historian. See his History, p. 426.

of the following striking figure of speech, "Here is a beautiful tree standing in front of a man's house, and some one comes along and cuts off some of its branches." To which it was replied, "When a tree has stood over three hundred years, it will naturally need some little trimming."

One reason assigned for the necessity of the American Recension was the fact, that the Western General Synod churches were intermingled with the German churches of the Missouri and Old Ohio Synods, which insist upon the adoption of the whole mass of the Symbolical Books. It is stated, also, that "not a single sentence has been added to the Augsburg Confession, whilst those several aspects of doctrine only were omitted which have long since been regarded by the great mass of our churches as unscriptural and as remnants of Romish error."

The only errors claimed to be contained in the Augsburg Confession (and which are omitted in the Recension) are :

1. The Approval of the Ceremonies of the Mass ;
2. Private Confession and Absolution ;
3. Denial of the Divine Obligation of the Christian Sabbath ;
4. Baptismal Regeneration ;
5. The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of the Savior in the Eucharist.

"With these few exceptions we retain the entire Augsburg Confession with all the great doctrines of the Reformation."

A most exciting controversy followed in the church papers, particularly the *Lutheran Observer*, and afterwards in pamphlets and books. Dr. Morris in his *Fifty Years in the Ministry* has copied the gist of what was published against the Definite Platform, and Drs. Kurtz and Schmucker wrote in its defense in the *Observer*. Some one

said, Dr. Schmucker made the greatest mistake of his life in preparing this document, and his son, Dr. B. M. Schmucker, says, "The Definite Platform was his most unsuccessful publication." Yet, "No one questioned the sincerity of his conviction, or the completeness of his consecration to Christ and his church." *

It must certainly be admitted, that the publication of this document was unsuccessful, in so far as it failed to be adopted by any considerable number of synods, and its authors also made a mistake by underestimating the strength of the confessional sentiment which had been infused into the church by the influence of the German Lutherans in this country. Had the Definite Platform been presented at the time of the organization of the General Synod, or even twenty-five or thirty years later, it would undoubtedly have been adopted, without opposition. In confirmation of this opinion Dr. Schmucker makes the following statement in his book, *American Lutheranism Vindicated*, pp. 39-41: "Dr. George Lochman, D. D., (father of Dr. A. H. Lochman, of York, one of the founders of the General Synod), one of the most active, pious, and respected divines of our church, in his Catechism, published in 1822, states it as one of '*the leading principles*' of our church, 'that the Holy Scriptures and *not human authority*, are the only source whence we are to draw our religious sentiments, whether they relate to faith or practice.' 'That christians are accountable to God alone for their religious principles.'

"He also published an edition of the Augsburg Confession, in his work, entitled *Doctrine and Discipline of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, in which *he made more omissions than are found in the American Recension*; and yet no

* Wolf's Lutherans in America, p. 346.

one found fault with him for doing so. That the reader may judge of the extent of these omissions, we specify them: In

Art. I. he omitted the definition of *person*, in the Trinity.

Art. II. omits the condemnatory clause.

Art. III. omits the epithet *pure*, in reference to the Virgin Mary, and the reference to the so-called 'Apostles' Creed.'

Art. IV. omits the closing sentence, that God will regard this faith as righteousness.

Art. V. omits the condemnatory clause, and part of another sentence.

Art. VI. omits the word '*true*,' in reference to the unity of the church.

Art. VIII. omits the condemnatory clause concerning the *Donatists*.

Art. IX. omits the name *Anabaptists*.

Art. X. omits the condemnatory clause.

Art. XII. omits '*absolution*' and part of the condemnatory clause.

Art. XVII. omits the condemnatory clause.

Art. XVIII. omits the name of Augustine's work, *Hypognosticon*, and about *ten lines at the close*.

Art. XIX. omits the *last sentence*.

Art. XX. omits different portions of this long article, amounting to one-half of the whole.

Art. XXI. omits all that is said on war, and the Turks, etc., and the entire concluding paragraph, amounting to half a page 12mo.

"Yet this work (of Dr. Lochman) was circulated throughout the church, and we never heard a single word of objection, although the notes appended to it are far from being symbolic."

Among the first to take up the pen against the Definite Platform was Rev. John N. Hoffman, then pastor of Trinity Lutheran Church in Reading, Pa. He came out in a printed pamphlet, entitled "The Broken Platform." This does not appear to have been a learned effort.

I find it criticised in Dr. Fry's "History of Trinity Luth. Church," and in Dr. Morris' "Fifty years in the ministry." The former says apologetically, that "he suffered from bodily weakness," and the latter says, "The book was crudely put together, hastily prepared, and carelessly composed. It was not equal to the acknowledged talents of the author. He was a man of mental vigor, but of imperfect education, and most billious temperament." Dr. Schmucker did not deem it worth while to take any notice, publicly, so far as I have seen, of Hoffman's "broken platform."

An abler and more moderate attack on the Definite Platform appeared in a book written by W. J. Mann, Pastor of a German Lutheran church in Philadelphia and Professor of Theology in Mount Airy Seminary. Dr. Schmucker replied in a book of nearly 200 pages under the title, "*American Lutheranism Vindicated.*"

The discussion between these two reverend gentlemen may be set down as a model of Christian controversy. Dr. Schmucker opens the discussion as follows:

"Within the last few months, a discussion on creeds has occupied the religious papers of our church in this country, the specific subjects of which were the merits of the '*Definite Synodical Platform,*' recently adopted by several of our Western Synods, and the import and scriptural truth of some portions of that venerable document, the *Augsburg Confession*. In these discussions we took part, in a series of articles over the initials of our name, in the Lutheran Observer, in vindication of the Definite Platform, which we

hold to be a faithful and definite exhibition of the import of the *generic* doctrinal pledge of the General Synod. That pledge includes, in connection with absolute assent to the Word of God, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, the belief 'that the fundamental doctrines of Scripture are taught in a manner substantially correct in the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession;' and the Platform is an unaltered copy of these articles of that confession, only omitting those parts, which we know by long acquaintance with American Lutherans, to be generally regarded by them not only as nonfundamental, but *erroneous*. The Definite Platform, therefore retains *even more* of the Augsburg Confession than the General Synod's pledge requires; for it contains some specifications of the Augsburg Confession, which though true, are not fundamental. The Platform is, therefore, more symbolic than the General Synod's doctrinal basis, though the contrary opinion has repeatedly been expressed, by those who have not carefully examined. Had both parties in this discussion exhibited more christian comity, and abstained from personalities, levelling their logical artillery against opinions instead of the persons entertaining them, the effect upon the church would, we think, have been favorable, and unity of sentiment might have been promoted. That a different impression has been made on many minds is, doubtless, owing to the human infirmity and passion that mingled in the contest. Which party exhibited the largest amount of this weakness, we will not undertake to decide, although we doubt not, that here as in most other cases, the judgement of the Leyden cobbler would be found correct, who was in the habit of attending the public Latin disputations of the university, and when asked whether he understood Latin, replied, 'No, but I know who is wrong in the argument, by seeing *who gets angry first*.' Nevertheless, christian truth

has often been defended in a very unchristian way, and doubtless more depends on the natural temper and the manners of the disputants, as well as the extent to which divine grace enables them to subdue their passions. The disposition occasionally evinced, to frown down discussion by invective and denunciation, is not only illogical, as it proves neither the affirmative nor negative of the disputed question; but in this free country, where we acknowledge no popes, and in the judgment of free Americans, who think for themselves, it must always reflect unfavorably on its authors.

“The same topic, so closely connected with the prosperity of our beloved church, is to engage our attention on the present occasion, in reply to an interesting, christian, and gentlemanly pamphlet, from the pen of the *Rev. Mr. Mann*, of Philadelphia, who controverts some of the positions of the Definite Synodical Platform. It shall be my earnest effort to write in the same christian manner, and my prayer is that the Spirit of our Divine Master may direct my pen, that it may record.

‘No line, which dying, I could wish to blot.’

The reply of his antagonist is worthy of the “Mann.” It reads as follows: “We shall endeavor to maintain in this controversy a dignified and christian spirit, as becomes this holy subject, and though differing in some points, know one Master and one service. People on earth will always differ in their opinions. The truth will gain by giving free scope to investigation, and by the illustrations of the different sides of the same question.” On this Dr. Schmucker remarks, “This position is true, and creditable alike to the head and the heart of the author.”

We have not the space to give the arguments on both sides of this interesting discussion, and will therefore con-

tent ourselves by rendering a mere outline. We give the topics in the order in which they are enumerated.

I. *The approval of the ceremonies of the mass.* The words, in Art. xxiv. read as follows: "It is unjustly charged against our churches, that they have abolished the mass. For it is notorious, that the mass is celebrated among us with greater devotion and seriousness, than by our opponents, (the Papists) . . . In the public ceremonies of the mass, also, no other perceptible change has been made, than that in several places German hymns are sung along with the Latin."

The discussion on the mass extends over thirty-three pages of the "American Lutherism Vindicated." The whole point of dispute is on the question, whether the mass and the Lord's Supper mean the same thing. Dr. Mann affirms, that "the word mass was at the time when the Confession was written, (1530) *in general use for the Eucharist*; and that in later years the term mass, in this sense, was entirely given up." Dr. Schmucker on the other hand maintains, that the mass and the Lord's Supper, have entirely distinct meanings; first, because there are *two different articles in the Confession; the one with mass (Messe) for its caption, and the other headed: OF THE HOLY SUPPER.* Now, if mass here signified Holy Supper, the probability is, that one or the other term would have been used in both places; Secondly, that Luther and the other reformers designated them as different things. We give only two citations from Luther: 'Above all other abominations, the *mass*, that has hitherto been regarded as a *sacrifice* or *good work*, by which one designed to procure grace for the other, is to be rejected,' *

"Let this much suffice to be said of the *Mass*, and

* Luther's Works Vol. XX. p. 3.

service of the minister; we will now proceed to treat of the manner in which the holy *sacrament* shall be administered to the people, for whose benefit especially the Supper of our Lord was instituted."*

The remainder of the other thirty-three pages of the Vindication are filled up with citations from other Lutheran authors, which the readers can consult, if they have the desire to do so.

II. *Of Private Confession and Absolution.* Three kinds of confession and absolution are referred to in the discussion between Drs. Schmucker and Mann; 1. Auricular confession and absolution as practiced in the Romish Church, 2. Private Confession and Absolution, as taught in the Augsburg Confession, and 3. Public or General Confession and Absolution as practiced in the American Lutheran churches. The main difference between the Romish Auricular Confession, and private or individual Confession, consists in this, that the former requires all sins to be confessed to the priest, and that there can be no absolution for sins not thus confessed, and the latter does not require a detailed enumeration of all sins committed, but only of the most important ones (*nur die Groebsten*).

The following is the manner in which Private Confession and Absolution was practiced: "Absolution was received *privately* by each one *individually*, kneeling before the *confessional*, the confessor *imposing his hands* at the time. Private confession was given only *in the church*, in which the confessional was so located *near the pulpit*, that *no other person could be near, or hear what was said* by the penitent."† The following directory for Absolution will convey to the reader a correct idea of its form :

* Luther's letter to Nicolas Hausman in 1523.

† See Koecher p. 515.

"It is well known that *private* confession was rejected in the Lutheran Church in Denmark and Sweden in the beginning, as well as by different portions of Germany at an early day, and a public or general confession adopted in its stead. In Luther's Short Directory for Confession, &c., we have his formula for *private* or individual absolution, which will convey to the reader a more correct idea of its form: After the directions for confession of sins; the

Confessor says: '*God be merciful to thee and strengthen thy faith. Amen.*'

'*Dost thou believe that my remission of thy sins is God's remission?*'

Answer of the penitent: '*Yes, dear sir, I do.*'

Then the confessor says: '*According to thy faith, so be it unto thee. And I, by command of our Lord Jesus Christ, forgive thee thy sins, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen. Depart in peace.*'"

The discussion of this subject covers 9 printed pages. We give a brief outline.

Mann. "Private confession may be useful as a means of bringing the members of the church into personal interview with the pastor."

Schmucker. "The advantage of such interviews we freely admit; but they can be, and are secured in our churches without this rite; and as it is confessedly destitute of Scripture authority, we have no right to invent a *new ordinance* in Christ's church for any purpose."

M. "The impression might be made by the Platform, that the Lutheran doctrine has some affinity to the Romish doctrine of Auricular Confession."

S. "But the Platform expressly states the rejection of *Auricular* Confession by the Reformers and their retention of what they called *Private* Confession in its stead."

M. "The power of the Keys' authorizes a minister to pronounce absolution of sins, Matt. xviii. 18. 'Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven.'"

S. "But the previous context, 'Tell it to the *church*' etc., clearly shows, that it refers to church discipline, and signifies, 'Whatever acts of discipline ye enact in regard to such an individual, I will ratify in heaven.' But this has no bearing on private confession and private absolution.

"The other passage from John xx. 23. 'Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained,' was uttered on a different occasion, after the Savior's resurrection; and either refers to a miraculous power bestowed on the apostles, to discern the condition of the heart, and to announce pardon to those whom they knew to be truly penitent and believing; or to confer on the ministry, in all ages, the power to announce *in general*, the condition on which God will pardon sinners. But it contains no authority to uninspired ministers to apply these promises to individuals, the condition of whose hearts they cannot know, as is done in private absolution." Dr. Schmucker makes the following additional statements:

"In Art. XXVI. of the Augsburg Confession, being Topic V. of the Abuses Corrected, the Confession says: 'Confession is *not commanded in Scripture*, but has been instituted *by the church*.' Even the inspired apostles never in a single instance, either undertook to forgive sins themselves, or to announce the pardon of sin to any *individual personally*. It is therefore a solemn thing for ministers, unguided by inspiration, to assume greater power.

"The Scriptures throughout present *God*, and the *Lamb of God*, as the only beings that can 'forgive' and 'take away' sin. Ex. xxiv. 6, 7. 'The Lord passed by before him and proclaimed, 'The Lord God, merciful—*forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin*.'"

"The very fact, that sin is committed essentially *against* God, in violation of *His* law, implies that no other being, not even an angel or archangel, much less a man (who is himself a sinner—ED.) can forgive it. 'Against thee, thee only, have I sinned,' said the Psalmist, 'and done this evil in thy sight.'

"The Lutheran Church in Sweden and Denmark *have always rejected Private Confession and Absolution in practice.* And the entire church in Germany and the United States, which now use *public* confession, have also discontinued it. With the exception, perhaps, of the Missouri Synod and its allies in Germany, we are not aware that Private Confession and Absolution are practiced by any Lutheran churches in the world."

III. *Denial of the Divine Institution and Obligation of the Christian Sabbath.* The discussion on this topic covers fourteen pages in the Vindication. Art. XXVIII. of the Augsburg Confession contains the teachings which are objected to. We quote the following: "Those who suppose that the ordinance concerning Sunday instead of Sabbath is enacted as necessary, are greatly mistaken." "It was necessary to appoint a certain day, in order that the people might know when they should assemble; the Christian Church has appointed Sunday (the Lord's Day) for this purpose; and to this change she was the more inclined and willing, that the people might have an example of Christian *liberty*, and might know that *the observance of neither Sabbath, nor any other day is necessary.*"

"The consciences of men must not be oppressed by representing these things as *necessary to salvation*, or *teaching that they are guilty of sin, if they break these regulations without offense to others*; for no one affirms that a woman commits sin who goes out with her head uncovered, without giving offense to the people. SUCH ALSO IS THE ORDI-

NANCE CONCERNING SUNDAY, Easter, Whit Sunday and similar festivals and customs."

The Augsburg Confession distinctly teaches,

1. "That the Jewish Sabbath was entirely abolished;
2. "That no particular day was divinely appointed in its stead;
3. "That those who suppose the ordinance concerning Sunday instead of Sabbath is enacted as necessary, 'are greatly mistaken;'
4. "But that as it was necessary to appoint a certain day for the convocation of the people, 'the Christian Church (not the apostles,) appointed Sunday.'"

Dr. Mann in his "Plea for the Augsburg Confession," affirms that the Confession does not object to the divine institution and obligation of the Lord's Day, but to the corruptions which the Romish Church had connected with it, and especially the idea that the observance of the Lord's Day was a meritorious work, and would secure our justification before God.

On page 28 of his Plea he writes, "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." So also Dr. Krauth, Jr., who is regarded as very high authority by many, affirms that the Confession teaches the divine obligation of the Lord's Day. So also the General Synod at York declared its belief in the divine obligation of the Lord's Day. Indeed, our English American Lutheran churches all, so far as we know, believe in the divine institution of the Christian Sabbath or Lord's Day. Yet at the time of the Reformation the views and practice of all the churches were very lax on this subject, and those who now profess to understand the Confession better than we do,

declare, that it teaches, the Sabbath was instituted for the Jews only, and is not obligatory on the Gentiles, but was abrogated at the advent of Christ. In corroboration of this, Dr. Schmucker quotes from some of the most distinguished German theologians, such as Drs. Ruecker, Hengstenberg, and Walter. We give herewith the quotation from Prof. Walter :

“ We cannot agree with him (the author, whom he is reviewing) in the views he expresses concerning the Sabbath. He asserts that the Sabbath or Christian Sunday *is a divine institution*, and that this is the doctrine of the Lutheran Symbols; That the Lutheran Church differs from the Calvinistic only in the mode of observing the Sabbath, the former advocating an evangelical, the latter, a legal method. *The contrary of this is clearly evident from Article XXVIII of the Augsburg Confession*, and it would be *almost incomprehensible how the author could fail to perceive this*, were it not for his manifest desire to make the sanctification of the Sabbath as binding a duty as any other precept in the decalogue, and his apprehension that this could not be accomplished in any other way, than by maintaining the divine appointment of the Sunday.”

“The Augsburg Confession treats the Sabbath as a mere Jewish institution, and supposes it to be totally revoked, whilst the propriety of our retaining the Lord's Day or Christian Sabbath as a day of religious worship, is supposed to rest only on the agreement of the churches for the convenience of general convocation.”

To this may be added the action of the Missouri Synod during the World's Fair in Chicago. The Protestant churches sent petitions to Congress, very numerous signed, asking that the gates of the fair grounds should be closed on Sunday. The Missourians declared in their theological monthly, “ *Lehre und Wehre*,” that if the gates

were to be closed on Sunday to give the employees rest, it was all right ; but if it was for Scriptural reasons, it was wrong ; and they would not sign the petitions. If we mistake not, the Roman Catholics also declined to sign the petitions.

IV, V. *The Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.* We will present a few extracts from the discussion on these ordinances :

Mann : "The Lutheran doctrine maintains that the Sacraments have an *intrinsic* value ; but the Definite Platform seems to regard them as mere *signs*, which may have a tendency to *promote piety*."

Schmucker : "We not only admit, but strenuously affirm, that the Sacraments have an important, *intrinsic* influence. The Platform thus describes it, 'Baptism in adults is a means of making a profession of previous faith, or of being received into the visible church, as well as a *pledge* and *condition* of obtaining *those blessings purchased by Christ*, and offered to all who repent, believe in him, and profess his name by Baptism.'"

Mann : "The Primitive Church regarded the Sacraments as *mysteries*."

Schmucker : "But Mr. Mann presents no evidence of this fact from God's word, or the *apostolic* church ; and the church of subsequent ages is no conclusive doctrinal authority for us Protestants."

M. "God is able to accomplish by the Holy Baptism, performed in the mysterious name of the ever adored Trinity, a work of regeneration in the heart of the little child. The expression used in the Augsburg Confession, Article II., is 'Regenerated by Baptism and the Holy Ghost.' (John iii. 5.) This doctrine, however, is not to be understood, as if the new creation was fully completed by new generation. It is complete, so far as a *live seed* is com-

plete in itself. This does by no means exclude subsequent development brought about by favorable internal and external influence. And Christ, the God-man, is able to make us poor creatures *partakers of his celestial nature* (2 Pet. i. 4,) in the most solemn rite of his church, (the Eucharist) which is therefore communion between Christ and man in the fullest manner possible on earth."

S. "Here the respected author, (Dr. Mann,) by adopting the theory that a living seed is implanted by Baptism (whether into the soul or body he does not specify,) and then that the Godman, Christ Jesus, makes these baptized individuals *partakers of his Celestial Nature by the sacramental supper*, seems to favor something like the theory of concorporation, or a physical union between Christ and the believer, which is known in *various* places as Puseyism in England, and Nevinism in the German Reformed Church in this country, and which has spread a withering influence over the interests of practical piety wherever embraced. Yet we would by no means affirm that Rev. Mr. Mann has embraced all the cardinal features of this system." *

* For the information of such of our readers as prefer a skeleton of the Puseyite system of the sacraments, rather than wade through volumes of Semi-romish discussion, we annex its features:—

I. That man is "made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven," in and by holy Baptism.

II. That man "made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven," in and by holy Baptism, is renewed from time to time in holy Communion.

III. That a "death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness" is given to every adult, and every infant, in and by the outward visible sign or form in Baptism, "water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

IV. That the gift may be received; in the case of adults, worthily or unworthily, but that it is always received.

V. That the body and blood of Christ are given to every one who receives the Sacramental Bread and Wine.

VI. That the gift may be received worthily or unworthily, but that it is always received.

There is no mistaking the meaning of this. It is clear and explicit; but wherein it differs from Romanism it would be difficult to tell.—*American Lutheranism Viudicated* b 124.

The Definite Platform rejects also the rite of Exorcism, which was practiced in connection with Baptism, and is prescribed in the Book of Concord. We give the following extract from the Directory for Baptism: "The minister shall say, 'Come out, thou unclean spirit, and give place to the Holy Ghost.' Then he shall make the sign of the cross on forehead and breast, and say, 'Receive the sign of the holy cross, both on forehead and breast.' After a short prayer he continues, 'I adjure thee, thou unclean spirit, in the name of the Father, † and the Son, † and the Holy Ghost, † that thou come out and depart from this the servant of Jesus Christ. Amen.'" *

This rite is now regarded as a remnant of Romish superstition. It was translated from the Latin into the German language and incorporated into the Symbolical Books. "It presupposes, that the child before Baptism is possessed by an evil spirit, and that this rite or formula has a magic influence over the kingdom of evil spirits." †

According to Siegel and others, Exorcism was received and practiced in Sweden, the entire kingdom of Wurtemberg, Hanover, Saxony, etc. But we have no knowledge of a single English Lutheran congregation in America, that has received and practiced Exorcism.

Therefore as regards,

1. The approval of the ceremonies of the mass,
2. Private confession and absolution;
3. Denial of the Divine Obligation of the Christian Sabbath or Lord's Day;
4. Baptismal Regeneration and Exorcism, there seems to be a glaring inconsistency in making profession of and subscribing to doctrines which we do not believe and rites which we do not practice.

* Book of Concord, Wegandt und Grieben, Berlin 1862, page 305.
 † Baumgarten, History of Christian Doctrines. Vol. ii. page 322.

The following extract from "American Lutheranism Vindicated" will be interesting and edifying to our readers:

"The evidence of this pardon or justification, to the believer himself, is within his own heart:—

(a) It is that peace of God, or sense of pardoned sin, wrought in the soul by the Holy Spirit. 'Being justified by faith, we have *peace with God*, through our Lord Jesus Christ.' Rom. v. 1.

(b) '*The love of God shed abroad in our hearts* by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.'

(c) It is the testimony of 'the Spirit bearing witness with our spirits that we are children of God.' 'He that believeth hath the witness in himself.'

(d) It is the *fruit of the Spirit*, exhibited in the believer's life, 'which is love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance.'

(e) It is 'being led by the Spirit of God,' for then, says the apostle, they are the sons of God.

"All these evidences presuppose or involve that great change of heart and life, termed by the Savior new birth, by which the sinner becomes morally qualified for that pardon, purchased by the blood of Christ, and appropriated to the believer by his faith. But no outward rites *necessarily* imply such moral preparation, and hence they could not be the conditions of justification, according to the analogy of God's Word. *

"Hence the sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, are not the *immediate* conditions or means of pardon or justification; *but they are means of grace, like the Word of God and seals of grace to all worthy recipients.* They have an *intrinsic efficacy* by virtue of the truths symbolically represented by them, and an *additional specific efficacy* in virtue of their peculiar nature, in connexion with the influence of the Holy Spirit, to awaken, convert and sanctify the soul."

The remainder of the discussion on the Definite Platform is taken up with a controversy on the presence of the real body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, which perhaps would not interest or edify our readers very much, and we will therefore conclude this chapter by a quotation from his edition of Luther's Smaller Catechism as a brief statement of his view on the Savior's presence in the Lord's Supper :

"The Lutheran church," says the celebrated Dr. Mosheim, "does not believe in impanation, nor in subpanation, nor in consubstantiation ; nor in a physical or material presence of the body and blood of the Savior." *Elementa Theol. Dog. in loc.*

"The Lutheran church maintains that the Savior fulfills his promise and is actually present, especially present, at the Holy Supper, in a manner incomprehensible to us, and not defined in Scripture. And why should it be thought impossible, that he, who fills immensity with his presence should be there, where his disciples meet to celebrate his dying love."

Here is an extract from Dr. J. G. Morris' edition of Luther's Smaller Catechism :

"What the nature of this presence is, we know not. The thing itself we know ; but the mode of its truth is a mystery which we cannot comprehend. We deny that Christ is present and received in a physical or material manner. But should any one ask, How is he present ? Our answer is, We know not. We commonly call his presence in this holy ordinance, a 'sacramental presence.' This might seem to be an attempt to define the mode of his presence ; but by this word we mean nothing more than that we are ignorant of the mode.—They therefore err who say that we believe in *impanation*, or that Christ is *in* the bread and wine. Nor are those correct who charge us with believing *subpanation*, that is, that Christ is *under* the form of bread

and wine. And equally groundless is the charge of *consubstantiation*, or the belief that the body and blood of Christ are changed into one substance with the bread and wine."—*Dr. Mosheim*.

The Rev. Henry Baugher, D. D., President of Penn'a College and father of Prof. H. L. Baugher, Jr., D. D., in 1840 prepared an excellent report on the *Doctrines and Usages* of the Synod of Maryland, of which he was an honored and influential member. It will be seen from the following extract, that he held substantially the same views on Regeneration, Sacraments and the Symbolical Books, as those set forth by Dr. Schmucker in his defense of the Definite Platform :

"ON REGENERATION.—We believe that the Scriptures teach that regeneration is the act of God, the Holy Ghost, by which, through the truth, the sinner is persuaded to abandon his sins and submit to God, on the terms made known in the gospel. This change, we are taught, is radical, and is essential to present peace and eternal happiness. Consequently, it is possible, and is the privilege of the regenerated person to know and rejoice in the change produced in him.

"OF THE SACRAMENTS.—We believe that 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*,' but only through the faith of the believer. Neither do the scriptures warrant the belief, that Christ is present in the Lord's Supper in any other than a spiritual manner.

"OF THE SYMBOLICAL BOOKS.—Luther's Larger and Smaller Catechisms, the Formula Concordiæ, Augsburg Confession, Apology, and Smalkald Articles are called in Germany the Symbolical Books of the church. We regard them as good and useful exhibitions of truth, but do not receive them as binding on the conscience, except so far as they agree with the word of God."