



*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WITHDRAWN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 THIRD.

1818—1820.

PREPARATION FOR THE MINISTRY—ENTRANCE INTO PRINCETON SEMINARY—HIS FATHER'S MOTIVES CRITICISED, CHARGES OF PIETISM AND PURITANISM BY R. W.,—WHO WERE THE PIETISTS?—THEIR CHARACTER AND DOCTRINES—OUR AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH FOUNDED BY THE PIETISTS—THE EARLY MINISTERS OF OUR CHURCH TRAINED BY THEM—WHO WERE THE PURITANS?—THEIR CALVINISM AND EXTREME VIEWS ON THE SABBATH NOT ADOPTED BY HIM—PERSECUTIONS AND BELIEF IN WITCHCRAFT COMMON AMONG ALL PEOPLE AT THAT TIME.

We have copied somewhat extended extracts from his diary, while he was a teacher in York Academy, in the first place to give the readers an insight into his state of mind during his early youth, and secondly to disprove the assertions of Dr. Morris, in his book "Fifty years in the Ministry," that he was "unsocial and ascetic" in his manners, that he was "unpopular," and that "nobody was intimate enough with him to regard him as a friend." It will be observed, that during a part of this time he seemed to have been under deep conviction of sin. He appears to have been tossed with doubts and fears, hopes and despondency, trying to convert himself by his own strength, until at last he gave himself entirely into the hands of God, who by his Holy Spirit wrought the gracious change, and gave him peace. The charge that he was unsociable and a recluse is sufficiently contradicted by his own account of conversa-

tions he had with different persons, whose society he enjoyed

Dr. Diehl's article in the *Quarterly Review* of January, 1874, contains a quotation from Dr. Morris' book, "Fifty Years in the Ministry," in which Dr. Schmucker's character is somewhat misrepresented, and to which Dr. Diehl appends some very appropriate criticisms :

"Dr. J. G. Morris, in reminiscences of Dr. Schmucker, published in the *Lutheran Observer*, gives a graphic account of him at the time of his teaching at York, the writer of the reminiscences being himself a pupil in the Academy at the time: 'He took temporary charge of the York Academy, and there it was that I received from him my final preparation for the Sophomore class at Princeton College. He was at that time a young man of twenty-one, of fair complexion, meagre visage, of vigorous health and of exceedingly staid deportment. Some people would have called his bearing dignified; but young as I was, I set it down as ascetic, unsocial and recluse. He was a laborious student, and had no intimate companions. He did not frequent the society of young ladies, nor indeed of any other class of people; and hence was not a popular young man. Everybody regarded him as a model of perfection, so far as purity of morals was concerned. But nobody was intimate enough with him to regard him as a friend. He was considerably ahead of most, if not all the young candidates for our ministry in theological and classical training.'

The qualification in the last remark was needless. Who of all the young candidates for the Lutheran ministry, in 1818—1820, was at all comparable in classic and theological training to Samuel S. Schmucker? He was immensely ahead of those who were licensed contemporaneously with him.

The extract from the reminiscences gives a mistaken

estimate of Mr. Schmucker's social disposition. He was not constitutionally unsocial or ascetic. He could not have been unpopular. Absenting himself from social enjoyments for the purpose of deep devotion to study and religious meditation would elevate him in the estimation of all right-thinking people. The young man who in the opinion of everybody was a model of perfection in moral purity; the young candidate for holy orders, who was conscientiously devoting every hour of his precious time to a preparation for his great lifework, having no leisure for ladies' society or social pleasures, would be considered a most exemplary candidate for the ministry. This very tribute of Dr. Morris implies a popularity far more desirable for a theological student, or a young licentiate, than any friendship he might have won by spending his evenings in society, or employing his rich intellectual stores in entertaining, hour by hour, half a dozen boon companions. The genial disposition of Dr. Schmucker in his later years, is sufficient evidence that constitutionally he was fitted, when all the glow of youth was upon him, for refined social enjoyments, had not a noble and all-absorbing work demanded his undivided time."

Let us look into this delineation of Schmucker's character a little closer. Morris says:

"Dr. Schmucker was the severest moralist I ever knew, and carried his principles, I think, to an extreme length. (?) He objected to some amusements which a wiser age now sanctions, and opposed some recreations which the church now approves. He did not know one card from another. I do not suppose he ever had a dice-box in his hand, even for amusement. He knew nothing of checkers, or back-gammon or chess. He never was in a theatre or circus, never heard an opera. He even doubted the propriety of Christians going to hear famous vocalists in a

concert hall, especially if they had appeared on the operatic stage. He never used tobacco in any form. He never drank a drop of strong liquor as a beverage. He never conformed to any modern fashion in dress for fashion's sake, however neat and appropriate it might be."

This is certainly very high praise and the highest compliment that could have been paid to a Christian gentleman and Theological Professor. Dr. Morris may not have so intended it, but rather as a reflection on his sound judgment in objecting to some amusements which a "wiser age now sanctions and the church now approves." Pray what are those amusements, which this "wiser age" sanctions and the church approves?

Is it dancing? I have heard of some church members in this wiser (?) age who go to balls and send their children to dancing schools, perhaps at the same time that they attend the catechetical instruction of their pastor. Dr. Schmucker certainly and *wisely* did not approve of this kind of amusement.

Is it card playing? I have heard it said that there are some fashionable church members, who indulge in card playing in their parlors, and perhaps also in their club-rooms. But Dr. Schmucker, to his praise be it said, was opposed to all sorts of gambling. "He did not know one card from another." We confess ourselves equally ignorant of the gambler's art, and we hope most, if not all, of our ministerial brethren can also say this of themselves.

"He never was in a theatre or circus." This is certainly to his credit. A Christian, who has consecrated his life to the service and glory of God, should be ashamed to be seen in such places.

"He never used tobacco in any form." Would that all of his students had followed his example in this respect! Perhaps a future, even "wiser" age than this, will see the



evils of the use of tobacco and all narcotics in every form.

"He never drank a drop of strong liquor as a beverage." On the temperance question Dr. Schmucker was far in advance of the time in which he lived. He had seen the sad effects of intoxicants in some of his ministerial brethren of that day, and we commend his example to all Christian people in this "wiser age."

"He never conformed to any modern fashion in dress for fashion's sake." No, he never indulged in or approved of some of the follies of modern fashions in dress. But in his unaffected piety, in the genuine politeness of his deportment, and in the neatness and propriety of his dress, he may be designated as, in the highest sense of the term, a Christian gentleman.

We do not think Dr. Schmucker "carried his principles of morality to an extreme length," especially for a man occupying his position. What would probably have been the character of the five hundred men whom he trained for the ministry, if he had encouraged them in card-playing and theatre-going, and if he had not warned them by his example and precept against the use of tobacco and strong drink?

We thank God that he called into his service a man of such exemplary piety and unimpeachable moral character to be the instructor and guide of the rising ministry in our General Synod; to write the constitutions of our general and district synods; to prepare the text-books for our early theological students; to compile the hymn-book for our churches, and translate Luther's Catechism into English for our people.

Dr. Schmucker was not a recluse, averse to all social enjoyment and friendly intercourse; nor did he regard *all* games and plays as sinful, especially when they afforded needed exercise and were conducive to health. But he

maintained that, as Christian ministers, we should deny ourselves even of some innocent recreations, if there was danger of giving offense to weaker brethren, just as Paul declared that he would eat no meat, if it would cause his weak brother to stumble. We remember how on one occasion the theological students were playing a game of ball in the rear of the Seminary building, and became very noisy. The Doctor admonished them, either to give up ball playing near the Seminary, or be less boisterous; for people going along the road and hearing the noise might think the theological students were indulging in an unbecoming carousal.

So also in regard to dress. He did not teach us to dress in a manner that might be called unfashionable, or unbecoming to a Christian gentleman; but he advised us never to attract attention by any singularity in our apparel, but rather to dress very much like the people among whom we lived, as Christ and his apostles doubtless also dressed like the people of their time and country.

Dr. Morris gives a similar characteristic of the elder Dr. Baugher, father of the present H. L. Baugher, D. D. He writes:

“Dr. Baugher was a severe and exemplary moralist. He never sanctioned among clergymen and Christian people, what many regard as innocent amusements, such as chess or checkers, and I doubt whether he would now sanction *Croquet*, which has since become a popular clerical amusement.”

“He was a puritanic observer of what he called the Sabbath, and severely temperate in all things.”

“His Presbyterian training influenced the character of his theology, although he was in no proper sense a Calvinist.”—*Fifty years in the Ministry, pages 192, 193.*

On August 5th, Mr. Schmucker took charge of the Clas-

sical department of the York Academy. He had during the first session seventeen boys under his instruction, but in the following sessions the number increased to twenty-eight.

He remained in charge of the Academy until November, 1817, when he resigned his position and accompanied his brother George on a tour westward along the Juniata River, over the Allegheny Mountains to Pittsburg, and down the Ohio River as far as Louisville, Ky. His diary at this time shows much mental conflict about his plans for the future, but the result was, that he finally decided to devote himself to the work of the gospel ministry. He began his direct preparation under the supervision of his father, with such diligence, that when he decided to go to Princeton, and enter the Theological Seminary, he was able to stand a very satisfactory examination in all the studies of the first year, and to enter the class at the opening of the second year of their course of study. He arrived at Princeton, August 17, 1818, was matriculated August 22, and remained there until March 30, 1820. Among his fellow students were Bishops McIlvain and Johns, and Dr. Robert Baird was his room mate. The great lights of Princeton Seminary and of the Presbyterian Church at that time were Drs. Alexander and Miller. Under these distinguished professors he received as finished a theological education, as could be gained in any institution then existing in this country.

The fact of his having gone to Princeton to complete his course of theological studies has been much deplored by some writers in the Lutheran Church. Dr. J. G. Morris publishes an article in his "Fifty Years in the Ministry," from the pen of R. W., (Reuben Weiser,) one paragraph of which we will transcribe and append for the perusal of our readers:

"He was a man of most exemplary piety and sincerity.

His views on theology were clear and scriptural, and although he was devotedly attached to the Lutheran Church, it was doubted by many of his warmest friends, after 1845, whether he was true to the confessional standpoint of historical Lutheranism."

"His father, Dr. J. G. Schmucker, was a Pietistic Lutheran of the Spenerian school, and hence sent him to study theology at a Puritanical Seminary; this was, perhaps, a misfortune for one who was to have the training of not less than five hundred ministers in his hands."

"He had his enemies in the Lutheran Church all along, and leading men in the Pennsylvania Synod, and in the New York Ministerium, and in Ohio, and North Carolina opposed his Puritanism, but he bravely maintained his position till about 1846. About that time his Lutheran orthodoxy began to be suspected by some of his own students, and especially those who had charge of Pennsylvania College."

In reply to these utterances we remark :

1. Dr. Schmucker never concealed his theological views. He declared them openly in his oral teachings, and in his writings. And further, there was no material change in his theological views, from the time he subscribed his inaugural oath, until his resignation, a period of about forty years, as he himself declares in his letter of resignation to the Board. The following declaration was written by his own hand at the time of his resignation, and read before the Board of Directors :

"I record the declaration, that I this day cordially believe every doctrine taught in the entire volume (Popular Theology). These facts I state in justice to the institution and myself, and in view of the future history of the institution and the church."

Hence there could be no *doubt* or *suspicion*, after the

year 1845, by "his warmest friends," of his confessional standpoint; both his friends and enemies knew his standpoint very well. Some leading men in the Tennessee Synod, and in the Pennsylvania Synod, and in the Ohio Synod, and in the Missouri Synod knew the doctrinal standpoint of Dr. Schmucker and the General Synod, long before the year 1846. The German Professor, Dr. Schaeffer, and some of the German students under his training, opposed (not suspected) his confessional standpoint; but some of the professors in Pennsylvania College opposed him on other grounds. Their confessional standpoint did not differ very much from his at that time, as will be shown in a subsequent part of this Biography.

2. The sneer at Pietism comes with a bad grace from an American Lutheran minister, especially one belonging to the General Synod. Who were the Pietists? and what were the teachings and practices on which their Pietism was based? They were such men as Spener, Francke, Arndt, Knapp, Storr, Flatt, Freylinghausen, holy, active, pious Lutheran Christians, who showed their faith by their works. As to their teachings and practices we will let the Lutheran historian, Dr. Mosheim, whose authority and orthodoxy none will dispute, give the reply. He says, "Pietism owed its origin to the pious and learned Spener, who formed private devotional societies at Frankfort, in order to cultivate vital and practical religion; and published a book, entitled, 'Pious Desires,' which greatly promoted this object. His followers laid it down as an essential maxim, that none should be admitted into the ministry, but those, who not only had received a proper education, but were also distinguished by their wisdom and sanctity of manners, and had hearts filled with divine love. Hence, they proposed an alteration in the schools of divinity, in Germany, which embraced the following points:

*a.* "That the scholastic theology, which reigned in the academies, and was composed of intricate and disputable doctrines, and obscure and unusual forms of expression, should be totally abolished."

*b.* "That polemical divinity, which comprehended the controversies subsisting between Christians of different communions, should be less eagerly studied, and less frequently treated, though not entirely neglected."

*c.* "That all mixture of philosophy and human science with divine wisdom, was to be most carefully avoided, i. e., that pagan philosophy and classical learning should be kept distinct from, and by no means supercede Biblical Theology." But

*d.* "That, on the contrary, all those students who were designed for the ministry, should be accustomed from their early youth to the perusal and study of the Holy Scriptures, and be taught a plain system of theology, drawn from these unerring sources of truth."

*e.* "That the whole course of their education was to be so directed as to render them useful in life, by the practical power of their doctrine, and the commanding influence of their example."

"This work began about 1670. In 1691 Spener removed from Dresden to Berlin, where he propagated the same principles, which widely spread, and were well supported in many parts of Germany by the excellent professors, Francke and others. This raised much controversy, in which the Pietists were charged with many errors. Of these the chief was, that "divine influence is necessary to the right understanding of the Scriptures." They taught, that without such help, no man can enter into the spirit of them; no man can relish or enjoy those parts which relate to the divine life, and the experience of the Christian; for so saith St. Paul: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the

Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

"Another thing which gave great offence was, that they renounced the vain amusements of the world. Thus, dancing, pantomimes, public sports, theatrical diversions, the reading of humorous and comical books, with several other kinds of pleasure and entertainments, were prohibited by the Pietists as unlawful and unseemly; and therefore, by no means of an indifferent nature."

"But the most offensive of all their errors, real or supposed, was, that 'No person who was not himself a model of piety, and divine love, was qualified to be a public teacher of piety, or a guide to others in the way of salvation.' This was so offensive to the carnal clergy of Germany, who, it seems, at that time were not a few, that they raised the cry of heresy, and charged them (strange as it may seem) with making void the efficacy of the divine word!"\*

This is exactly the position and practice of our General Synod to-day; we foster prayermeetings among our people, and we make it a rule that our ministers shall not only be educated men, but they shall also lead consistent Christian lives, and have their hearts filled with divine love.

It will be seen by every one who studied theology under Dr. S. S. Schmucker, that those are substantially the same principles and practices which were inculcated and insisted on by him in the Seminary at Gettysburg; and these are the doctrines and practices that prevail in our General Synod to-day, and were held and practiced by the fathers of our American Lutheran Church. Yes, Prof. Schmucker was a Pietist, and his father was a Pietist, and the founders of our General Synod, yea, the fathers of our American Lutheran Church, who came from Pietistic Halle,

---

\* Mosheim's History, Vol. V., 312-324.

the Muhlenbergs, Kunzes, Helmuths, Schmidts, Schaeffers, and the ministers trained by them, Schmucker Senior, the Lochmans, Kurtzes, Schaeffers, were all Pietists of the Spenerian school. They are our spiritual fathers. Would to God, that all their sons had inherited more of their Pietism! Was it really "a misfortune," that the man who under God had the training of the first five hundred men in our General Synod, was "a Pietist of the Spenerian school?" Would it have been less a misfortune if he had been trained in the dead scholastic orthodoxy and the formalism which prevailed in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, the champions of which persecuted the Pietists? Or would it have been less a misfortune, if he had been trained in the rationalistic schools that predominated at the close of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries? No, we thank God, that he was a Pietist of the Spenerian school.

We are the children of the Pietists; they are our spiritual fathers. Most of those in the General Synod who now sneer at Pietism, are themselves Pietists. They know not what they do. Father, forgive them!

Rev. W. H. Dunbar, D. D., gave expression to the truth here presented, in an article in the *Lutheran Observer*, and copied with approval in other church papers, in the following extract:

"And this is and has been from the first the historic position of the General Synod. It was the Lutheranism, rescued from the dead confessionalism, restored in the original spirit of its founder through the influences of Arndt, Spener, Francke and others, that was transplanted to this country. Thus restored, a reaction took place, and in the early part of this century in this country it seemed almost to lose its distinctive identity as a Lutheran Church. Even the great confession was ignored in its church life. It remained for



the General Synod to restore the Confession to its proper place.\* Nobly did her founders and their successors accomplish this work. Loyal to the Confession, insisting on sound doctrine, her genuine Lutheranism could not be questioned. The matter of externals, liturgies, etc., has not been ignored."

3. "His father sent him to a Puritanical Seminary," says the writer in the "Fifty Years in the Ministry." To what other seminary could he have sent him, but the Presbyterian Seminary at Princeton, if he was to have a thorough theological training? There was, indeed, no Lutheran Theological Seminary in this country, until Dr. Schmucker himself founded the one at Gettysburg.† There were other Lutheran ministers who also studied theology at Princeton; for example, Drs. J. G. Morris, and Henry L. Baugher, Sr., and we never heard that they suffered any misfortune from studying in that "Puritanical Seminary."

4. And who were the Puritans of America? Let Mosheim, the great Lutheran historian, furnish the reply. It is given in Herzog's Encyclopedia, a German work of high standing: "A part of the congregation of John Robinson led the way of the Pilgrim Fathers. With fasting and prayer they prepared themselves for the journey to the distant land. After a heart-affecting farewell and Psalm singing, they boarded the two small ships, that were to bring them to New England. In September, 1620, they departed from England forever, and became the pioneers for their persecuted Puritan brethren, 20,000 of whom followed them in the next fifteen years, regardless of the dan-

---

\* It was mainly through Dr. Schmucker's instrumentality that the Augsburg Confession was "restored to its proper place" after the organization of the General Synod. ED.

† Hartwick Seminary was chartered in 1816, but had not, I think, risen to the dignity of a Theological Seminary until a number of years later.

gers and privations, which befell the first colony of New England; as there alone it was possible for them to escape the oppression of the Hierarchy, and to found a church according to the principles of the Apostolic Church . . . To the earnest determination, the invincible courage, and the unalterable will of these Pilgrim Fathers, the New England Colony is indebted for its prosperity, and the present North American states for their greatness."

Milton, the renowned author of "Paradise Lost," speaks of them as "Faithful and freeborn Englishmen, and good Christians, constrained to forsake their dearest home, their friends and kindred, whom nothing but the wide ocean and the savage deserts could hide and shelter from the fury of the bishops." Among them was "John Elliott, famous as the apostle to the Indians, and the first Protestant missionary to the heathen."

PURITANISM:—"It has been a common term of reproach, applied to the friends of pure religion and undefiled."

"The persecutions carried on against the Puritans during the reign of Elizabeth and the Stuarts, served to lay the foundation of a new empire, and eventually a vast republic in the western world. Hither, as into a wilderness, they fled from the face of their persecutors; and being protected in the free exercise of their religion, continued to increase, until at length they became an independent nation."\*

Now, if the above eulogies are deserved, and who doubts it? then the Puritans, who landed on Plymouth Rock, merit the respect and admiration of the whole Christian world.

At the same time it affords us great satisfaction to record, that the German immigrants who came from the Fatherland for conscience sake and founded the Lutheran church

---

\* Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.

in Pennsylvania and in Georgia, will not suffer in comparison with the Puritans. Their history presents a most beautiful example of patient endurance and untiring zeal in the service of God. Their indefatigable self denial, industry, their earnest and faithful life, illustrating the doctrines of the church which they loved and for whose advancement they were toiling, made a deep impression on their contemporaries, and secured the confidence and sympathy of all with whom they were brought in contact.

Let us inquire, in how far the life and character of Dr. Schmucker was influenced by the Puritanism in the Princeton Seminary, and in how far this was "a misfortune to the General Synod"?

1. The Puritans were a devotedly pious and intensely conscientious people. The same may be said of Dr. Schmucker. But he did not imbibe his piety from the Puritans, he imbibed it in the Lutheran Church and in the "Spenerian school," under the guidance of his "Pietistic father," and his Pietistic teachers, Helmuth and Schmidt. The Holy Ghost had wrought that great work of grace in his heart long before he studied Theology at Princeton.

2. The Puritans were Calvinists in doctrine. But Dr. Schmucker never endorsed their Calvinism. Every one of his students must know that he opposed the Calvinistic doctrines of unconditional Predestination and Reprobation; he did this frequently in his lectures to the students, as well as in his writings. Hence, the General Synod suffered no "misfortune" as regards the Calvinism of the Puritans.

3. The Puritans were intensely opposed to the Episcopal hierarchy of the church of England, with its pretension to Apostolical Succession, and its imposing liturgical service. Dr. Schmucker did not share their intense aversion to the English hierarchy, but he also denied their claim to Apostolical Succession, their denial of our ministerial ordi-

nation, and their assumption of being the only true church on earth. Most of his students must remember something of his lectures on this subject. Among the books he recommended was Mason on Episcopacy, which exposes the absurdity of the Apostolical Succession. About the time the writer studied in the seminary, there was a heated controversy carried on between the Episcopalians and the Presbyterians. One of the phrases, on which the changes were rung at that time, ran in this way: "A country without a king, and a church without a bishop." It must be confessed that Dr. Schmucker sided with the Puritans on this question. But this did the General Synod no injury. We Lutherans don't differ much from the Puritans in our views on the church of England's claim to Apostolical Succession.

4. The Puritans were very rigorous in the observance of the Sabbath. Indeed, most people now think they carried their views and practices to an unwarranted extreme. They seemed to regard it as obligatory on Christians to observe the ceremonial regulations of the Mosaic law, almost with the same minuteness as the Pharisees did in the time of the Savior. But Dr. Schmucker never entertained or taught such extreme views as are attributed to the Puritans on the observance of the Sabbath. Yet he did believe and teach the divine obligation of the observation of the Christian Sabbath, as can be seen in his "Appeal on behalf of the Christian Sabbath," published by the American Tract Society.

It is true, that the ultra confessional Lutherans, such as the Missourians, deny the divine obligation to observe the Christian Sabbath, but we of the General Synod do maintain this divine obligation, and thus endorse his views on this point. Verily, we have suffered no "misfortune" from Puritanism on the Sabbath question. Would to God, there were more Puritanism infused into the minds of our

church members in these times of Sabbath desecration, and the efforts of the enemies of the Church to introduce the continental Sunday into this country, and indeed, to abrogate all Sunday laws from our statute books.

5. The Puritans are frequently held up to scorn and ridicule by certain writers, as believing in witchcraft and the burning of witches. Notably has this been done in a lecture delivered in different places by a Lutheran minister on "Plymouth Rock and other Rocks." I do not think these views of the early Puritans on witchcraft were taught in the Princeton Seminary; certainly not carried into practice, and it is still more certain that Dr. Schmucker did not teach or approve them; and hence the church suffered no "misfortune" on this subject from his studying theology in a Puritan Seminary. But it should also be remembered, that at the time the Puritans landed on Plymouth Rock the belief in witchcraft and the burning of suspected witches was general in the whole Christian Church on earth. While the Puritans were burning witches in New England, the Englishmen in Great Britain and the Germans in Germany were doing the same thing. Even our own great Luther had not outgrown this absurd superstition. Listen to the following from Luther's Table Talk: August 25, 1538, the conversation fell upon witches, who spoil milk, eggs, and butter in farm yards. Dr. Luther said: "I should have no compassion on these witches; I would burn all of them . . . Does not witchcraft merit death, which is a revolt of the creature against the Creator, a denial to God of the authority it accords to the demon."

"Luther discoursed at length concerning witchcraft. He said, that his mother had had to undergo infinite annoyance from one of her neighbors, who was a witch . . . This witch could throw a charm upon children, which made them cry themselves to death. A pastor having

punished her for some knavery, she cast a spell upon him, by means of some earth upon which he had walked, and which she bewitched. The poor man hereupon fell sick of a malady, which no remedy could remove, and shortly after died." \* More of the same sort might be quoted, but this we have transcribed, to show the absurdity of charging the Puritans alone with the horrible superstitions and practices of which our own forefathers were equally guilty.

6. Finally the Puritans are frequently charged with intolerance, notably because Roger Williams was driven out from the Colony, on account of his religious principles.† We certainly can not commend them for their religious intolerance, and least of all can Dr. Schmucker be charged with Puritanism as one who favored religious intolerance. On the contrary he has been frequently charged with being too liberal towards Christians of other denominations. His views are best learned from his writings on the subject of Christian Union and the part he took in the formation of the Evangelical Alliance.

Surely our General Synod has suffered nothing in this respect from his studying theology at a Puritanical Seminary.

The fact, however, should not be forgotten, or overlooked, by those who so frequently denounce the Puritans

---

\* See *Luther's Table Talk*, published by the Lutheran Board of Publication. Philadelphia, 1868, pages 312, 313.

† Roger Williams was a Puritan, and a fugitive from English persecution; but his wrongs had not clouded his accurate understanding. He had revolved the nature of intolerance, and arrived at the great principle which is its sole effectual remedy; namely "The civil magistrate should restrain crime, but never control opinion; should punish guilt, but never violate the freedom of the soul."—*Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*,

on account of their intolerance, that in those times persecution for conscience sake was not confined to the New England Puritans, the Church of England, or the Roman Catholic Church. It is a singular, yea, a sad fact, that those who had themselves been persecuted and driven from their homes, in turn also persecuted those who did not coincide with them in their doctrinal views, or mode of worship. The truth is, Christians of all denominations in those times had not yet learned to see the necessity of the separation of church and state, and therefore they regarded dissent from the doctrines and usages of the church, as a crime against the government, and the persecution was exercised by the civil power, against non-conformists. Even so wise and good a man as our own great Luther had not yet grasped the precious Protestant principle of religious toleration or freedom of conscience, at the time he composed his Small Catechism. In the Preface of that admirable little book he writes, after giving directions how to teach the Catechism :

“But if any refuse to receive your instructions, tell them plainly that they deny Christ and are not Christians ; such persons shall not be admitted to the Lord’s Table, nor present a child for Baptism, nor enjoy any of our Christian privileges, but are to be sent back to the pope and his agents, and, indeed, to Satan himself. Their parents and employers should, besides, refuse to furnish them with food and drink, and notify them that the government was disposed to banish from the country all persons of such a rude and intractable character.”

We copy this from the General Council’s edition of Luther’s Small Catechism, Published by the Lutheran Bookstore, Philadelphia, in the year 1874.

The same paragraph is also published in Loehle’s edition of Luther’s Catechism, translated by Rev. Edward T.

Horn, D. D., for the use of the General Synod South. It must be a matter of surprise that such teachings should be put into the hands of our children and youth at the close of the nineteenth century, and in this land of civil and religious liberty.

If any one of our readers wishes to inform himself in regard to persecutions in Germany for conscience sake, he will find abundant information in Hagenbach's History of Protestantism during the sixteenth century; for instance, in the martyrdom of Chancellor Crell.

