



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WITHDRAWN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 SEVENTEENTH.

SCHMUCKER'S RESIGNATION—HIS LETTER TO THE BOARD—
 NO CHANGE IN HIS DOCTRINAL VIEWS—REASONS FOR
 RESIGNATION—INCREASING AGE—DESIRE FOR LITERARY
 WORK—BROWN, HIS SUCCESSOR—SKETCH OF HIS LIFE—
 BROWN'S CHARGES—SCHMUCKER'S REPLY—NATURAL DE-
 PRAVITY—REGENERATION—JUSTIFICATION—SANCTIFICA-
 TION—B'S ARTICLE CONFUSED—OBJECTIONABLE SPIRIT—
 BROWN'S ATTACK ON SPRECHER—BROWN'S ELECTION—
 NOMINATED BY DR. BAUM—UNWRITTEN HISTORY—HAY
 AND KRAUTH.

DR. SCHMUCKER'S RESIGNATION.

Early in 1864, Dr. Schmucker announced his intention to resign his professorship in the Seminary. We give the following extracts from the minutes of the Board :

"*Meeting of Aug. 9th., 1864.*" Early in February, 1864, Rev. S. S. Schmucker, D. D., informed me (the President of the Board,) that he intended resigning the chair of Didactic Theology at the next meeting of the Board. The fact was made known to the directors and the church in general, by the following announcement, together with the letter of notification, in the *Lutheran and Missionary* and *Lutheran Observer*.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE INTENDED RESIGNATION OF DR. S.
S. SCHMUCKER.

It becomes the duty of the undersigned to announce to the members of the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, that the Rev. S. S. Schmucker, D. D., has formally notified him, that he purposes resigning the Professorship of Didactic Theology at their next meeting.

F. W. CONRAD,

President of the Board of Directors,
GETTYSBURG, *February*.

LETTER OF RESIGNATION.

GETTYSBURG, *February, 1864*.

REV. F. W. CONRAD,

President Board of Directors of Theol. Seminary.

DEAR BROTHER IN CHRIST.—After nearly forty-four years spent in the active duties of the ministerial office, thirty-eight of which were in connection with the Theological Seminary, I have resolved, after long and prayerful deliberation to resign my professorship at the next meeting of the Board in August. For this purpose I now give you the constitutional notice of six months in advance. Whilst I reserve to a future communication to the Board such remarks as I may feel desirous of making, I will state in general, that my chief reasons for this step, are the increasing infirmities of age, and a desire to devote the remaining years of my life more particularly to literary labors for the cause of God and of religion.

With sentiments of the warmest fraternal regard, I remain

Yours in Christ,

S. S. SCHMUCKER.

“During the second session of this meeting, Aug. 9th, 1864, Dr. Schmucker himself read the following paper :

“CHRISTIAN BRETHERN: Having six months ago forwarded to the President of your body, the constitutional notice of my intention to resign my office in this Institution, I hereby surrender into your hands this important trust, to take effect at the close of the present Seminary year, September 21st., 1864. Nearly forty years have elapsed, since I was elected by the General Synod in 1825, as first Professor of the Seminary, yet to be established. The greater part of the first year I spent, by request of the Board, in collecting funds for the endowment of the Institution, and on the fifth of September, 1825, the operation of the Seminary commenced. During all the intervening years, a kind Providence has preserved my health, so that with the exception of two or three cases, the instructions have never been interrupted more than a few days by sickness. During all this time also, my conscience bears me witness, that I have endeavored to discharge my duties with fidelity, to watch over the piety, improvement and general welfare of the students, and to promote the best interests of our beloved church.

“The Constitution of the Seminary, which was adopted at the commencement of the Institution, has continued to direct all its operations till this day. All its provisions have been carefully attended to. Its doctrinal tests have been statedly repeated before the Board by all the Professors, and I am happy here to record the declaration, that I approve of them all at present, as when I framed and first took them. The text book, viz., my Popular Theology, which grew out of my lectures on Dogmatics, during the first few years, has been retained till this day as the basis of my instructions, without the change of a single doctrine; and I record the additional declaration, that I this day cordially believe every doctrine taught in the entire volume. These facts I state in justice to the Institution

and myself, and in view of the future history of the Institution and the church.

“‘ In withdrawing from my official connection with the Seminary, as its Theological Professor, I feel constrained to give expression to my grateful recollection of the cordial and active co-operation of the Board throughout the history of the Institution in the various measures, which as Chairman of the Faculty, I from time to time proposed. Many of these dear brethren have entered the eternal world before me, and it cannot be very long before some of us will be called to join them.

“‘ The reasons which influenced me in tendering my resignation at this time, when there has been no serious change in my health, are first: The gradual and natural increase of the infirmities of age. I formerly thought no man ought to hold such a responsible and laborious post, as that assigned me, after he had passed the meridian vigour of life, say fifty, or at most sixty years of age, but should assume some easier post and there labor some years longer. But as I successively passed those periods, I was not conscious myself of any marked decline of vigor, and therefore have retained the post, which, I however now feel it a duty to resign to younger and more active hands, whilst I propose to labor for the kingdom of my God and Savior in various ways, especially by literary efforts.

“‘ With reference to this fact, I would request the Board to grant me the use of the Seminary Library, subject to the regulations thereof, as has been done to the college professors and our pastors in town. This design forms my second reason (2,) for resignation, a desire to have more time at command for the execution of some literary enterprises, which I hope may redound to the glory of God and the benefit of his church, third: I have also, after having looked at the state of the church for several years, thought

the present as favorable a time as would soon be offered, to elect a successor, who would carry on the work to which my life has been devoted, in the same liberal spirit, in which this Institution was founded, and has been thus far conducted; granting liberty of opinion in regard to those non-fundamental points on which the churches of the General Synod claim and exercise this right.

“Fourth: Finally, no one can be more sensible than I am, of the imperfection of my best meant services in behalf of the church, and of the beloved young men, numbering about four hundred, for whose education I have labored. I pray God, that he may continue to bless their labors for the advancement of the best interests of his church.

“With sincere regard for every member of this Board, and my best wishes for their welfare and that of my respective colleagues, I close this my final communication.

S. S. SCHMUCKER.

GETTYSBURG, *August 9th., 1864.*

“This important document was handed to a committee consisting of Drs. Lochman, Hay, and Rev. Baum, who subsequently reported the following, which was unanimously adopted:

“The undersigned appointed to draft a minute, expressing the views of the Board with reference to the resignation of Rev. Dr. Schmucker, respectfully present the following statement:

“This subject, introduced six months ago to the notice of the Board, and now formally pressed upon their attention, they recognize as one of extreme importance, in view of the fact that Dr. Schmucker has been so completely identified with the institution from its incipiency, and has to so great an extent been entrusted with the execution of its affairs. The sundering of relations of such long standing, and which involve to so great an extent

the welfare of our beloved church, is an act that should not be performed without solemn consideration and devout aspiration for the divine guidance.

“ Approaching the subject in this spirit, your committee has been led to the deliberate conclusion, that in view of the considerations adduced by Dr. Schmucker, in his communication to the Board, and of his unqualified declaration to the committee as to his settled purpose of withdrawing at this time, the Board have no alternative, but to accept of his resignation.

“ The committee further propose, that the request of Dr. Schmucker with reference to the use of the Seminary Library be cordially complied with, and the Board at the same time return to him their heartfelt thanks for his zeal and success, and for his untiring efforts in various ways to increase and improve the same.

“ Nor can your committee close this report without giving some expression of the universal sentiment of gratitude, which is felt to be due to one, who has devoted the labors of an ordinary life time to our beloved Institution, and who amid the increasing infirmities of age, still proposes to consecrate the remnant of an active and useful life, to the service of the church in a less conspicuous position. May the Lord our Saviour abundantly reward him for his years of patient toil, and grant him grace and strength, still further to co-operate with his brethren in the glorious work of extending the borders and promoting the efficiency of our beloved Zion.’

“ Adjourned with prayer by Dr. Hauer.

“ At a subsequent Session, it was

“ *Resolved*, that the name of the Rev. S. S. Schmucker, D. D., be retained on the Catalogue of this Institution during his lifetime, as ‘ Professor Emeritus.’

The Gettysburg *Star* of that date made the following editorial remark:

"If any man has ever earned a good claim to retire in his sixty-seventh year from wearisome and routine instruction, upon the honor and dignity of a Professor Emeritus, Dr. Schmucker had won that right, when he tendered his resignation to the Board of Directors, as the active incumbent of the chair of Dogmatic Theology in the Seminary of the General Synod."

"Called to preside over this Institution at its foundation, he was for some time its sole professor, and he may justly be called its father. He held this position until 1864, a period of nearly forty years, and during this time, by his ascendancy over the minds of his students, his numerous publications, his debates at synod, and his manifest devotion to every cause of public interest, he was beyond question the most conspicuous and influential man in the Lutheran Church in America, and the best known to the Christian community outside of it."—*Wolf*.

"For eight years more he resided in Gettysburg, leading a life of comparative leisure, and yet never idle. A certain number of hours every day were spent in his study, in general reading, and arranging some literary scheme, which, however, was never consummated."—*Diehl*.

DR. S. S. SCHMUCKER'S SUCCESSOR.

Rev. James Allen Brown became Dr. Schmucker's successor. It will be interesting to the readers to learn under what circumstances he was elected to that prominent position, and what were the causes that brought about this result. Rev. Brown came into prominence in the church by his opposition to Dr. Schmucker. He was a colleague with Rev. J N. Hoffman in Reading, and near about the same time that Hoffman published his "Broken Platform," Brown introduced some strong worded resolutions in the Synod of East Pennsylvania, against the "Definite Platform." Afterwards he charged Dr. Schmucker with

fundamental errors on the doctrines of Regeneration, Natural Depravity and Sanctification. By this means he got himself into prominence and the way of promotion. Had he attacked any other man in the church it would not have aroused much attention, nor have had any influence in promoting him to higher stations. But the opponents of Dr. Schmucker urged him on; the attention of the church was directed to him; he was called to a professorship of Theology and ancient languages in Newberry College, South Carolina, and finally elected Professor of Didactic Theology and chairman of the faculty in the Seminary at Gettysburg.

As this is a very important event in Dr. Schmucker's life, and Rev. Brown's charges affected him more painfully than any other occurrence in his life, we will give a brief extract from his biographical sketch in Jenson's American Lutheran Biographies, and then copy a part of Dr. Schmucker's reply to Rev. Brown's charges against his orthodoxy :

REV. JAMES ALLEN BROWN, D. D.,

" Was born in Lancaster County, Pa., February 19th., 1821. Both of his parents were Quakers. His early years were passed on the farm, but as he evinced an unusual desire for study, he derived every possible advantage from the public schools, and a few books which he found in his father's library. Then he taught school and pursued his studies privately at Mt. Joy, and Emmaus Institute, Middletown, Pa., of which his uncle was at that time President. He also was a Quaker, but as the charter of that institution required that all its officers, directors and teachers must be Lutherans, he joined the Lutheran Church.

" In 1841 Mr. Brown entered the senior class in Pennsylvania College at Gettysburg, and graduated in the class of 1842. During his year at college he connected himself

with the Presbyterian Church at Gettysburg, being baptized, February 19th., 1841. From October 22nd., 1842, to April 6th., 1843, he had charge of a select school at Leitersburg, Md. In the spring of 1844 he was elected principal of the academy at Darlington, Md., which office he held until the 12th of September, 1845. In the meantime he had also been studying theology with Rev. Mr. Carter, a Presbyterian Minister, at New Windsor, Md.

“ On the 18th of October, 1845, Mr. Brown was licensed by the Maryland Synod of the Lutheran Church, and received a call to what was then called Luther Chapel, now the Third Lutheran Church on Monument Street, Baltimore. He served this congregation till February 4th., 1848, when he accepted a call from Zion Lutheran Church at York, Pa. This church he served something over a year, when he received a call to St. Matthew's Lutheran Church in Reading, Pa. His ministry in Reading continued nearly ten years. In February, 1859, he accepted a professorship of theology and ancient languages in Newberry College, South Carolina. But the civil war breaking out, he had to flee for safety to the North, where he accepted a chaplaincy in the Union Army. After a period of fifteen months he resigned and accepted a chaplaincy of the United States Army hospital at York, Pa.

“ After two years of faithful service in this capacity, he was, in August, 1864, elected Professor of Didactic Theology and Chairman of the Faculty in the Theological Seminary of the General Synod at Gettysburg, as the successor of Dr. Schmucker.

“ On December 9th., 1879, he was suddenly stricken with paralysis, which deprived him of the power of speech and the use of his right arm. His resignation was tendered in June, 1880, but was not accepted by the Board of Directors until the summer of 1881.

"In the month of September, 1881, he removed with his family to Lancaster, Pa., and in the spring of 1883, after one or two slight relapses, he passed away, on the morning of the 19th of June, surrounded by his entire family."

DR. SCHMUCKER'S REPLY TO REV. BROWN'S CHARGES.

In justice to Dr. Schmucker, we copy the greater part of his reply to Rev. Brown's charges. The importance of the subject is a sufficient apology for the length of the quotation. It will also be interesting and instructive to students of theology and ministers of the gospel to read Dr. Schmucker's views on the subjects of Natural Depravity, Regeneration and Sanctification :

"The article in the last number of the Review, charged us with grave doctrinal errors, and we confess, its character and design excited alike our surprise and regret. After examining it, however, the title, '*New Theology*. By Rev. J. A. Brown,' appeared to admit of a meaning more appropriate than we had at first supposed ; for the theology discussed, though attributed to us, is really, in the main, the aggregate of Rev. B's. misapprehensions, and may *properly* be termed *his* theology. From the beginning, we doubted the propriety of a formal reply to this anomalous production. Had the writer fairly interpreted our views on the topics concerned, as they have for a quarter of a century been understood from our Popular Theology (which he repeatedly quotes) and other works, by the divines and intelligent laity of our church, and as they have been apprehended by able reviewers, and by distinguished theologians of other churches ; we would with pleasure have entered on the inquiry with him, whether they accord with the 'Word of God, our only infallible rule, and the fundamentals of that Word, as substantially set forth in the Augsburg Confession,' which is the doctrinal test of the General Synod. But his charge of fundamental heresy,

when, in the same book, we reiterate and avow the entire articles of the Augsburg Confession on the disputed doctrines, savors too much of contracted bigotry, to require a serious refutation. The points left undetermined by the Augsburg Confession are, at least among American Lutherans, regarded as free subjects of private opinion. And the more we examined the article of Rev. B., the more we were inclined to accord with the judgement of our friends generally, both far and near, who dissuaded us from a reply.

“Therefore, without any unfriendly feelings towards Rev. B., we decline the formal discussion of his article, for the following reasons :

“I. Because his article *is not a review of the sentiments of our book, but of his own glaring misapprehensions and consequent misrepresentations of them.* Either from want of ability or disposition, he has misapprehended the fair, legitimate import of our *Popular Theology*, and of our *Vindication of American Lutheranism*, on each of the subjects which he discusses !

I. “Thus, in our definition of *natural depravity*, as a hereditary ‘disorder of our *bodily and mental* constitution’ (a mode of definition adopted even by the Form of Concord), he makes ‘mental’ signify only a *part* of the mind, and, in truth, makes it exclude the most important part of it, namely, the *moral or active* powers; and then, on the ground of his own erroneous apprehension or definition of the term, positively charges us with denying that the moral powers are affected by natural depravity! We would ask, are the will and affections no part of the mind? Does *mental* philosophy denote the science which discusses a *part* of our mental faculties, and omits the will and affections? For the same reason, the phrase “*mental* constitution,” necessarily signifies the constitution of the *mind*, and not of a part of it. Glaring as this misapprehension is, it is

rendered the more inexcusable by the fact, that in the same chapter of the Popular Theology, which furnishes the Rev. B. with our definition of natural depravity (on p. 144), we read the following words: 'That it (the natural depravity) is total, that is, extends to all our powers, is certain.' Such glaring misapprehension of plain English, in a self-constituted critic, bears its own refutation on the face of it.

2. "He misapprehends our definition of regeneration. We say regeneration in the Scriptures, designates the whole change (by which the sinner becomes a new creature in Christ Jesus), therefore including illumination, conviction, and penitence, as well as the change occurring in the mind in the moment of transition from a state of condemnation to that of justification; but he strangely supposes us also to include *sanctification* in this definition of its Scriptural meaning. We however generally employ the word in the other, or theological sense there defined, as signifying the change occurring in the particular moment of transition from the state of condemnation to that of justification; but he, in defiance of the context, represents us as using it in the former sense, and then charges on us the inconsistencies which flow from his own mistake! We represent regeneration as a '*radical and entire change,*' in opposition to a superficial and partial one, and as including '*a new heart;*' he charges us with representing it as partial and superficial, and as leaving the heart unchanged!! In the passage which immediately precedes the one objected to by our reviewer, we find a definition of regeneration, which certainly covers the whole ground: "*Regeneration, in the proper sense of the term, consists in a RADICAL change in our religious views of the divine character, law, &c; a change in religious feelings, and in our religious purposes and habits of action.*" Here the change is described (a) as *radical*, not superficial, not a mere outward change of moral character

or conduct ; but a '*radical*' one, a change which, as the etymology of the word implies, affects the root or source of human thought and action. (b) It is such a *radical* change, not only of some one department of the human mind, or of human thought and action ; but such radical change of the *entire* mind, of *all the powers* of the human soul ; for they are usually reduced to three departments, designated by some metaphysicians as views (cognitions), feelings and actions, or, by others, referring to the faculties, as intellect, sensibilities and will. Now this makes regeneration include a change,

a) " In our *religious views* , i. e. views of the character of God, his relation to us, and ours to him ; of his law, as to its spirituality, extent and comprehensiveness ; of our character as related to that law, as sinners, and in short, in our views of any and every subject that has any *religious* bearing at all. As this change is a radical one, it affects these views even in the root or fountains, or powers of mind whence they spring.

b) " Regeneration includes a change in our *religious feelings*, from indifference to religion, to an acute sensibility on the subject ; from selfishness to a feeling of universal benevolence ; from antipathy to religion, to a sympathy with every thing holy and good.

c) " Regeneration, according to the definition, includes a change in our *religious purposes*, viz., from *purposes* of self-indulgence, and of a life of sin, to purposes of reformation and sincere, entire obedience to God ; and from actual *habits* of sin, to those of holiness, from the service of the world to the service of God.

" This, it will be admitted, is the natural import of the above definition ; and we may well ask every impartial reader, what passage of Scripture, descriptive of regeneration, will not be comprehended in one or other of the above features of this change ?

3. "Again, we affirm, that in the sense of the word regeneration, in which it signifies a radical change in our religious views of the divine character, law, &c., of our religious feelings, and of our religious purposes of action, *infants* (not children of some age, but *infants*) are incapable of it: because they neither have, nor can have, any religious views or feelings or actions at all; and if they are naturally incapable of the mental exercises of which regeneration consists, they cannot be the subjects of regeneration in *that sense* of the term; and what sensible man will deny this? We do affirm some influences of the Spirit on infants, (for example, the same which attend the baptism of adult believers, as far as they are capable of them) the nature of which is mysterious; we do distinctly imply that they are capable of regeneration or spiritual change, in *some* sense, but not in that applicable to adults; but he makes us deny all gracious influence on them!! He first appears to be horrified at our leaving infants without the hope of heaven, and then admits that we maintain their salvation for Christ's sake!! It should, moreover be remembered, that the change of infants is merely incidentally mentioned in a few sentences, and the *negative* side presented, the positive not being required by the subject under discussion. We have stated what change does not take place in infants, the nature of that which does, we have not defined, and no one has authority to speak for us.

4. "Finally, in regard to justification, we say in the Popular Theology, 'justification is that judicial act of God, by which a believing sinner, in consideration of the *merits of Christ*, is released from the penalty of the law, and is declared to be entitled to heaven.' 'This justification takes place *at the moment*, when the sinner *first attains* a living faith in the Redeemer.' And in the Vindication of American Lutheranism, we teach, 'Whenever the return-

ing sinner exercises the FIRST ACT of *living faith*, he is justified ; that is, then God performs that judicial or forensic act, by which a believing sinner, in consideration of *the merits of Christ*, is released from the penalty of the divine law, and is declared to be entitled to heaven.' But notwithstanding these, and other most explicit declarations, that we are justified for Christ's sake, and not for our works, and that this justification takes place at the moment of the *very first* act of living faith in the Redeemer, will it be believed that our cloudy reviewer insists on it, that we teach justification in part by works, and that mainly on the ground of his own erroneous supposition, that we use the word regeneration as including sanctification !! Other examples of our reviewer's obtuseness could be added, but certainly these will abundantly suffice to show, that he has mistaken his calling when he assumes to act the theological reviewer !

II. " Another reason for our declining to enter into a formal refutation of Rev. B's. article, *is his manifest want of acquaintance with Lutheran Theology*. Were not the subject too grave a one, it would be purely amusing to behold a man step forward as volunteer champion of orthodoxy in the Lutheran church, adducing as authority to sustain his positions, *not Lutheran*, but Calvinistic divines ; to find him cite, not the illustrious Lutheran Theologians of the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth or nineteenth century ; but the hightoned Calvinist, Edwards, the Congregationalist, Dwight, and Dick and Chalmers, and even the erratic opium-eater, Coleridge ! And it would be a useless consumption of time, formally to refute the unfounded assertions, which he would not have made, if better informed on the subject.

" I. Thus, in our definition of innate depravity, as 'a *disorder* of our mental and bodily constitution,' &c., he

seizes on the word 'disorder,' which literally implies an abnormal or a confused state, gives it one of its possible meanings, to which we do not object, namely, that of *disease*; and then makes himself merry, by affirming this view of natural depravity to be exemplified in the case of 'a dyspeptic,' or of 'an insane person,' &c.; evidently unacquainted with the fact, that the representation of natural depravity under the figure of a disease, is authorized by the best Lutheran authorities, and is also often met with among writers of other denominations, such as Drs. Hopkins, Dick, &c. We would refer our reviewer for better information, among others, to *Dr. Reinhard's Dogmatik*, who terms it 'moralische Krankheit,' moral disease; and *Dr. Baumgarten's Glaubenslehre*, 'Krankheit,' disease: and *Dr. Julius Mueller*, ueber die Suende, 'Krankheit,' disease. The form of Concord terms it 'lepra quadam spirituali,' 'mit einem geistlichen Aussatz,' spiritual leprosy; and also 'morbus,' 'Krankheit,' sickness. The Augsburg Confession itself represents natural depravity as a disease, in Article II., 'morbus,' 'Seuche.' Yea, even the good word of God seems to have given rise to this view, 'The whole head is *sick*, the whole heart is faint,' &c.—Is. 1: 5, 6. 'Is there no balm in Gilead,' &c.—Jeremiah 8: 22.

"2. He objects to our statement, that regeneration *does not destroy*, but merely restrains the natural depravity of the christian; although we elsewhere described regeneration as 'a radical,' and not superficial, as an 'entire,' and not partial change, and as including 'a new heart,' thus showing that the restraint imposed on natural depravity by regeneration, is an extensive and decided one. But he goes further, and says: 'We boldly affirm that regeneration has to do, and that chiefly, with natural depravity—and that *its very object is ITS REMOVAL.*' Thus, he seems not to

know, that *he is himself unsound, and in conflict with our best authorities*, and we may add, with the *word of God itself*. Thus *Luther* says: 'Baptism removes the guilt of natural depravity, but *not the material or substance of it*;' 'The Holy Ghost, which is given by baptism, *begins* (incipit) to mortify the sinful desires, and creates new impulses or inclinations (motus) in that individual.' (Mueler Symb. p. 83). *Quenstedt* thus expresses himself: 'The guilt (of natural depravity) is removed in regeneration and justification; the dominion of it, gradually in renovation (sanctification); but *the root* (of this depravity) *is not removed, until the separation of the soul from the body*.' *Dr. Baumgarten* says: 'We deny that natural depravity can be entirely eradicated by the use of the means of grace' in this life. 'The fountain and root of natural depravity continues in the regenerate;' 'It continually seeks to obtain the control (of them).' 'The entire removal and eradication of natural depravity does not take place till after the death of the believer.' *Dr. Knapp* thus expresses himself: 'The root and germ of natural depravity will remain, and cease only with death.' And, *finally*, the Symbolical books, in numerous passages, teach that the deliverance from the influence of natural depravity through the Holy Spirit, in regeneration and renovation, '*is only begun in this life, and will not be perfect until the life to come*,' '*welches doch in diesem Leben nur angefangen, aber allererst in jenem Leben, vollkommen seyn wird*.'

" 3. On the glaring mistake of Rev. B., in representing our statement, that the corruptible and mortal *nature* of children is changed at death, as a quotation from 1 Cor. 15; whereas the apostle is there speaking of the *body alone*, and our sentence is neither marked as a quotation, nor intended as one, and his then charging our sentence as being a novel explanation of that text, we will not dwell. But he

maintains that infants, and by inference probably (as he states nothing to the contrary) adults also, must be *wholly sanctified in this life*; since, he affirms, that death can effect no change in them, and the body will not be changed until the resurrection; evidently not acquainted with the fact that the prevailing opinion of Lutheran, and also of other divines, is that which we maintain, and he so positively and dogmatically condemns, that not 'by' death, but at the moment of the separation of soul and body, the depraved nature of believing adults, as well as of infants, that is, all that remains living and conscious of them, their soul, is wholly delivered from every taint of sin by the Holy Spirit of God. Thus is the law in his members, which warred against the law of his mind as long as he lived, eradicated from the believer, as is also from infants, that native depravity with which they were born. For the better information of our reviewer, we would refer him to the following, amongst a multitude of Lutheran authors, who all agree with us, in what is also the doctrine of the Symbolical books, that *at death*, the remaining depravity of our corrupt nature is eradicated; that is, the souls of those who are admitted to heaven, are perfectly liberated from all remaining depravity, whilst their bodies return to the dust and are destitute of consciousness and moral character until the resurrection. Thus, *Quenstedt* fixes the time for the final eradication of natural depravity, 'ipsa animæ a corpore solutione,' at the time of the *release of the soul from the body*. *Dr. Baumgarten*, 'in and after death,' 'in und nach dem Tode:' *Dr. Reinhard* 'in death,' 'im Tode,' and the learned and pious *Dr. Knapp*, gives the following testimony in perfect unison with the view maintained in our *Vindication*, &c.: 'This corruption can never be entirely eradicated, even by the most sincere endeavors of the pious; although through divine assistance, an end may be put

to the dominion of sin, and its outbreakings be prevented; yet, the root and germ of evil will remain, and cease only *with death*, or the laying aside of the body.' Finally, the *Form of Concord*, the most minute of the ancient Lutheran symbols, also agrees with us: 'This work of the Holy Spirit (the deliverance from natural depravity) is merely commenced in us in this life, and will be accomplished and completed *only in the other world*,' 'in altera tantum vita absolvetur et perficietur.'

III. "Because the entire article of Rev. B. is confused and unsystematic, showing that he has studied *Belles Lettres* more successfully than Logic or Hermeneutics. Thus, he has but two captions in his article, 'regeneration' and 'justification;' but, in reality, he discusses three topics, regeneration, natural depravity and justification. But instead of considering them in the order of nature and system, in which one would illustrate the other, he discusses regeneration before natural depravity! His article, moreover, exhibits no discrimination between the facts of a doctrine, and different philosophical explanations of it; no clear perception of the difference between its fundamental features, fixed in our doctrinal basis, and its collateral aspects, which are free to diversity. And as to the mode of interpretation, by wresting passages from the context, and considering them apart from other portions of the work, by which their import would be limited and determined; it does violence to the fundamental laws of language, and is sustained by no authority. By it, it were easy to convict the inspired servant of God, Moses, of *pelagianism*, when he seems to teach the ability of man to turn to God without the aid of divine grace, in the words, 'I have placed life and death before you, *choose* life.'—Deut. 30: 19. Or Paul of teaching *Antinomianism*, when he tells the Romans, 'Therefore, we conclude, that a man is justi-

fied by faith, without the deeds of the law.'—Rom. 3: 28. Or James, of teaching *Justification by works*, when he says. 'Ye see then that by works a man is justified, and not by faith.'—2: 24. Paul could also be convicted of *Universalism* from 1 Tim. 2: 4. 'Who (God) will *have all men to be saved* and come to a knowledge of the truth:' and even the blessed Savior himself could be convicted of more than one heresy from the Sermon on the Mount!

IV. "Finally, because the spirit of the Rev. B's. article is generally thought not to be such as became him, under the circumstances of the case. Instead of exhibiting some solicitude to ascertain the real sentiments of the volume he undertook to criticise, and an honorable caution, not unnecessarily either to injure the usefulness, or wound the feelings of its author, he manifests an unamiable recklessness and dogmatism. For, he himself admits, 'that other portions of the volume might be adduced, to show that *views contrary to those* (which he ascribes to us) *are also inculcated;*' or rather to show that he had misapprehended our sentiments, and attributed to us doctrines, which other passages prove we do not hold. But he was not willing to take the trouble rightly to understand us. If he found difficulty in apprehending the import of our works; this fact, together with the circumstance, that others generally have not thought them obscure, should have convinced him that to review them was not his vocation. Whether his confusion arose from obscurity in our representations of truth, or want of system in his own mind, the readers of this article are more competent impartially to judge, than our reviewer himself. It is with sincere regret that we have found ourselves called on to make these exposures. We will admit, that for his want of acquaintance with Lutheran theology, some apology may be found in the training of Rev. B. in

another denomination, and perhaps in the scanty leisure allowed by his pastoral duties, for general theological study; but ought not the same facts to have taught him, what his numerous misapprehensions have demonstrated to others, that he is not the most proper individual to defend our Zion against real or imaginary foes.

*Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis
Tempus eget.—*

“When God called Luther to assail the errors of Popery, the world beheld the wisdom of the choice in his special qualifications, exhibited in the progress of the work, in his just interpretations of his opponents’ views, and his intelligent discrimination between truth and error. But certainly we look in vain for such qualifications in the review of Rev. B.; whilst it abounds in melancholy evidence of a mind which, if upright, as we trust, is the unconscious victim of delusive prejudice and self-confidence. Let him rather leave to older and better qualified men, the charge of impugning the orthodoxy of those who were preaching the Gospel before he was born, and have devoted their entire life to the best interests of our beloved Zion. There is no want of such men in our church. In their hands, her interests are secure; and when the emergency calls for them, they will doubtless be found at their post; whilst our reviewer may be a faithful preacher of the Gospel of Christ, and a successful and peaceful co-worker with those whom he has unaccountably, and without provocation, attempted to denounce.

S. S. SCHMUCKER.”

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Gettysburg, Aug. 1. 1857. }

We have not learned, that Rev. Brown made any rejoinder to the above reply of Dr. Schmucker; but it is

certain, that the Seminary Board did not entertain the charges, nor were they sustained by any one of the district synods connected with the General Synod. Dr. B. Kurtz is reported to have made a powerful and scathing denunciation of the charges before the Synod of East Pennsylvania at its session in Hughesville, Pa. Says Dr. Jacobs in his History, page 427, "Dr. Krauth, Jr., arrested these proceedings, who did not deem his former instructor's course such as to warrant action."

Some years after Dr. Brown had become Professor of Theology at Gettysburg, he made another attack on the orthodoxy of the next most prominent man in the General Synod, which was equally unavailing. This was against Prof. Dr. Samuel Sprecher of Springfield, Ohio, brother-in-law of Dr. Schmucker. He had written a book entitled "Ground Work of Lutheran Theology." Dr. Brown impugned the orthodoxy of this book. The matter was brought for decision before the General Synod at its session in Baltimore. An earnest discussion ensued. Dr. Brown brought in a large number of books, from which he undertook to sustain his charges by reading extracts. But Dr. Sprecher did not need to read extracts from books; he could repeat his authorities from memory, and he was overwhelmingly sustained by the General Synod. Dr. Brown attempted to open the discussion again at the next meeting of the General Synod, at Carthage, Ills., but the Synod declined to reconsider the subject. Dr. Brown then began to write a book to sustain his charges against the "Ground Work." He devoted a great deal of time and labor upon this work; his health became enfeebled; he went to Bedford Springs to recuperate; but he took his manuscript with him; consequently his health was not visibly improved; but on his return he continued to study and work on his efforts to demolish the "Ground Work,"

and in the midst of these labors he was stricken with paralysis, which so sadly ended his literary and professional career.

THE ELECTION OF DR. J. A. BROWN.

There were several candidates proposed as the successors of Dr. Schmucker. Dr. W. M. Baum, who was a member of the Board at that time, has kindly sent us the following statement :

“When the Board of Directors of the Seminary addressed itself to the duty of electing a successor to Dr. Schmucker, the following names were suggested : Dr. J. A. Brown, Dr. C. A. Hay, and Dr. C. F. Schaeffer. I am not positive with reference to the nomination of Dr. C. P. Krauth, Jr.

“When I nominated Dr. Brown, it was with the statement, that in my judgment he was well qualified for the position, by reason of his natural abilities, scholarship, fidelity to the doctrinal attitude of the General Synod. Divergent tendencies and affiliations, similar to those of the present day, existed in the church, and were reflected in the minds of the Board of Directors.

“Dr. Brown was chosen by a good majority, and so far as external manifestations appeared, was cordially accepted by all. He was frank, fearless and decided, and commanded the respect and confidence, even of those who were not in sympathy with his views.” The eminent qualifications here ascribed to Dr. Brown will readily be admitted by all ; his “affiliations,” and some of the “divergent tendencies” were doubtless the potent factors that procured his election. Dr. Baum does not seem to have been aware, or has forgotten the fact, that there was a strong desire in one part of the church, that Dr. C. P. Krauth, Jr., should fill that vacated chair. I give the following state-

ment as a fragment of the unwritten history of the Seminary, which I have never seen in print, but have received from the lips of men who professed to be acquainted with the facts: "An agreement had been entered into between Drs. Hay and Krauth, Jr., and their friends, to use their influence to have the former become the successor of Prof. C. P. Krauth, Sr., and the latter to become the successor of Prof. S. S. Schmucker." The first part of this programme was literally carried out; Dr. Charles Hay, became the successor of Prof. Krauth, Sr., but Dr. C. P. Krauth, Jr., did not become the successor of Prof. S. S. Schmucker.

This unwritten history is corroborated by Dr. Jacobs. I quote here verbatim from his *History of the Lutheran Church in the United States*, page 462: "One name, viz., that of Charles Porterfield Krauth, was upon many lips, as that of the most thoroughly trained Lutheran Theologian in America, and there was a general desire that he should be placed as the exponent of the theology of the Lutheran confessions. His exhaustive articles in the *Lutheran and Missionary* of which he was editor in chief, 1861-67, ranked with the most scholarly defenses of the faith of the Augsburg Confession, which had ever been made. If the chair at Gettysburg, vacated by the resignation of Dr. S. S. Schmucker, had been filled by his election, the Ministerium (of Pennsylvania) would in all probability have felt that his presence was a guarantee, that the future ministers would be furnished with the necessary defenses against all radical tendencies. When the election resulted differently it was no antipathy to the professor elect, who had done good service in the battle against the 'Definite Platform,' that turned the sentiment of a large portion of those, who had hitherto been averse to another seminary."

This is certainly very high praise bestowed upon Dr. Charles Porterfield Krauth, but some might dispute the

claim, that his "exhaustive articles ranked with the most scholarly defenses of the Augsburg Confession, that *had ever been made.*" There was also a most palpable "antipathy" between Krauth and Brown, as can be seen by the very bitter controversy that was waged between the two men in the Reviews and separate pamphlets.

What would have been the effect on the church, if Krauth had been elected instead of Brown, God only knows. Dr. C. P. Krauth a short time before had been the most ardent friend and able defender of the General Synod and her institutions, and the presumption is, that if he had been elected successor to Dr. Schmucker, the General Council would not have been organized, and Mt. Airy Seminary would not have been established. Here the proverb was verified, "Man proposes, but God disposes."

