

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XIII.

OCTOBER, 1909.

No. 4.

THE MURDEROUS POPE.

Lord, keep us in Thy Word and work;
Restrain the murderous Pope and Turk!
Luther.

Christ bids preach the Gospel; He does not bid us force the Gospel on any. He argued and showed from the Scripture that He was the Savior, *e. g.*, on the way to Emmaus. When the Samaritans would not receive Christ, James and John asked, "Lord, wilt Thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them?" But the Savior rebuked them, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them," Luke 9, 52—56. Christ said to Peter, "Put up thy sword!" Christ assured Pontius Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world."

The Apostle says: "Not that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy," 2 Cor. 1, 24; 1 Pet. 5, 8. "We persuade men," 2 Cor. 5, 11—20; 1 Cor. 9, 19—22; Eph. 3, 14—19. "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good," 1 Thess. 5, 21. "I speak unto wise men; judge ye what I say," 1 Cor. 10, 15; Acts 17, 11. 12. "We do not war after the flesh; for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal," 2 Cor. 10, 4.

Athanasius pronounced it a mark of the true religion that it forced no one and declared persecution an invention and a mark of Satan. Chrysostom said that to kill heretics was to

BOOK REVIEW.

DOGMATIK von A. Hoenecke. 3. Lieferung. 1909. Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wis. Pages 161—240. Price, 40 cts.

(See pages 125—128, 188—190 of the current volume of THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.) The present number completes the thesis on the Holy Trinity, reproduced in our last issue, and adds Thesis II: The Church describes the mystery of the Trinity in accordance with the Holy Scriptures. She does not become involved in a contradiction, when, in doing so, she offers a description in terms that are not found in Scripture, but are not foreign to Scripture, as regards their form. Thesis III: The theology of the Church, while employing such terms, foreign to Scripture, in describing the Trinity, testifies expressly that such philosophical terms as "essence," "person," which she employs in this connection, are not employed in their ordinary, but in a special meaning. Thesis IV: The theology of the Church comprehends the statement of the Holy Scriptures, viz., that in God there is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in the following dog-

matic formulæ: Una divina essentia in tribus personis subsistit, or: Unus est Deus essentia, sed idem essentia Deus unus, trinus est personis. Chap. V. The Doctrine of the Works of God. § 22. Creation. Thesis I: The Holy Scriptures assure us that God is, in a perfect sense of the term, the Creator of the world. Thesis II: Genesis narrates the history of the creation in such a manner that we cannot but view the same as a temporal act. Thesis III: Inasmuch as God is a perfectly free agent in the creation of the world, it must be conceded that God might have refused to create the world, or that He might have created the world in a different manner than He did; on the other hand, it is certain that the world, as created, is perfect. Thesis IV: The ultimate end of the creation is the glory of God. § 23. On Divine Providence. Thesis I: The providence of God, in the strict sense, is that provident care, resting on the love of God, as also on His foreknowledge and purpose, by which all created things are preserved, permeated, and ordered, in accordance with their final purpose, which is the glory of God and the welfare of mankind.

AUXILIARIUM. Predigtentwuerfe aus der fuenfzigjaehrigen Amtszeit des seligen Pastors C. Gross sen. Dargeboten von seinen Soehnen C. und E. M. Gross. Zweites Heft. St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing House Print. 1909. Price, 50 cts.

(See p. 123 of the current volume of THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.) The present number contains 47 outlines on Epistle and Gospel pericopes from Septuagesima Sunday to Second Easter Day inclusive. The outlines for Good Friday in this collection are exceptionally rich in content. In a Second Part are added 50 outlines for sermons preached on a variety of occasions, such as arise in the life of a congregation, also a few sermons on free texts.—The *Auxiliarium* promises to become a little *thesaurus homileticus*.

FIFTH READER. *Standard American Series*. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 1909. Price, 50 cts.

We anticipate that the above announcement will draw a sigh of relief from our schoolteachers' hearts, for this closing volume of our series of "Readers" had been expected for some time. The contents are such as to insure the realization of every just expectation. It is a live and lively Reader, well adapted to rounding the instruction in

English which a pupil ought to receive in a Twentieth Century Lutheran Parish School.—The book has two parts, containing, respectively, 46 and 45 selections, followed by a list of proper nouns and a Vocabulary at the end of the book, marked for spelling exercises. Each lesson is prefaced by a list of defined words.

PORTRAITS OF JESUS. By *William Dallmann*. American Lutheran Publication Board, Pittsburg, Pa. 1909. 227 pages.

The present volume, well printed and tastefully bound in purple and gold, which comes to us from the esteemed author's pen, is a fruit of his ministrations at the sanctuary. Tracing the sketch which the Master has left us of Himself, the author has reverently drawn likenesses of our Lord and God, which enlighten, stir, cheer, and comfort the reader as they must have stirred the congregation which listened to them. There are twenty-four characterizations of Jesus in this book, suggested by the names and titles in which the Lord chose to exhibit His exalted dignity and His blessed mission to men. The arrangement of matter in each "portrait" can be seen — to quote at random — from the twelfth, "Jesus the Good Shepherd." It is shown that Jesus is what He claims to be, because He 1. saves, 2. feeds, 3. protects, 4. enlarges His flock. We heartily commend this book.

SOCIALISM. A Review of Modern Economic Movements, with Especial Reference to Socialism and Its Antagonism to Christianity. A Conference Paper by *Rev. C. C. Morhart* of Cleveland, O. Printed by request of Lake Erie Conference. American Lutheran Publication Board, Pittsburg, Pa. 30 pages. Price, 10 cts.

This paper has, in reality, two parts: one is historical, and traces the genesis of the leading manifestations of the socialistic *Zeitgeist*; the other is elenchic, and exhibits the antichristian character of Socialism. The presentation of matter is in very compact form, and the progression of thought quite rapid. Standard authorities have been quoted in their most significant utterances. Very much valuable information on a live question of the hour has been crowded into comparatively little space. We fully share the author's conviction: "The survey of economic history leads to three conclusions: first, that Socialists, *e. g.*, Karl Marx in the Socialist Mani-

festos of 1848, distorts the facts of economic history to support Socialistic theories; second, that Socialism itself is a problematical solution of social problems; and finally, that there is no simple, easily applied formula which will cure social evils. A review of the Socialist publications leads to the conclusion that Christians should not be members of a party that does not confine itself to party affairs, but deliberately antagonizes the Christian religion." The author uses Bebel's declaration on the subject of religion made at the Social Democratic Congress of 1907, with telling effect, to show "that every Social Democrat, or Socialist, may think and believe what he pleases, but he may confess his faith only as long as he is an atheist. With Socialists religion is a private affair, but infidelity is a party affair. A man may be a Christian and as such accept economic Socialism as a principle of social action, but it is hard to see how a regular Socialist can be a Christian and at the same time be a member of a practical Socialist party that is anti-Christian." Among the bibliography at the end we could wish to have seen included Ely's "Socialism. An Examination of its Nature, Strength, and Weakness, with Suggestions for Social Reforms." The references at the end of this book to Socialistic literature are exceptionally exhaustive and critically arranged.

THE CHICAGO SYNOD AND ITS ANTECEDENTS. By *Martin L. Wagner*. Wartburg Publishing House Press, Waverly, Iowa. 271 pages, and 46 pages of plates.

The Chicago Synod is a Lutheran church body, young in name but hoary in its antecedents. It received its present name at a convention held at the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Holy Trinity in Chicago, Ill., on September 24, 1896. The Chicago Synod is the lawful heir and successor to "The Indiana Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church," founded in Zion's Evangelical Lutheran Church, East Germantown, Ind., October 23, 1871. This synod, again, took the place of "The Union Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church," which was organized at Newton Church, Boone County, Ind., November 5, 1859. (Since 1863 the term "Evangelic" in the name of the synod was displaced by "Evangelical.") The "Union Synod," in turn, supplanted "The Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Indiana," which constituted itself as a distinct church body at a called meeting in St. John's Church, Johnson County, Ind., August 15, 1835. This date marks the beginning of the synodical history of the society under review in this book. But the society boasts a pre-synodical

history that is brimful of interest to the patient searcher for the beginnings of Lutheranism in our country. Its headwaters lie south and east of the Ohio River and the Alleghenies, and following this little synodical river up-stream, we are carried back into the closing decades of the eighteenth century. "It may very properly be said that the Synod of Indiana had its genesis in the settlement of Lutherans in North Carolina." (p. 108.) Names like Adolf Nuessmann, Gottfried Arndt, Gottlieb Storch, Paul Henkel, Robert Miller, Gottlieb Schober, David Henkel, John Morkert (the author always writes Markert), Christian Moretz, Philip Henkel, occur again and again in the account of the causes which led up to the organization of the first Indiana Synod. The earnest struggle which engaged the American Lutheran Church in the early part of the nineteenth century, the struggle between "General Synodism" and "Henkelism," must be taken into consideration, if one would understand the early character and the later development of the Chicago Synod. The ancestors of the Chicago Synod were ranged on the side of the Henkels and the Tennessee Synod. Some of their ablest men had come to them from that quarter, and Henkel and Tennessee influence was dominant among them for many years. The author has traced this influence and passed a fair judgment on its strength and its weaknesses. He has words of cordial approval, yea, of admiration, for the staunch confessionalism of the old leaders of the Tennessee Synod; and he offers just censure on the lack of educational facilities provided by this synod, and the rather loose connection of its pastors with their congregations. The struggle of the Tennessee Synod with the General Synod is a memorable one. We do not know whether the author has had access to the records still existing of that struggle. The classical work of Dr. Graebner he seems not to know. But there are records which exhibit well the line of argument of the Tennesseans against the General Synod, that deserve to be preserved somewhere. We herewith offer some of them from our collection of Lutherana, not charging the author with an omission, but simply to illustrate the character of theological warfare a century ago.

THE OBJECTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION OF THE GENERAL SYNOD.

We, the committee, consisting of Adam Miller, David Henkel, Conrad Keicher, Ambrose Henkel, Daniel Lutz, John Smith, and Peter C. Boger, being appointed by the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Tennessee for the purpose of compiling the objections against the constitution of the General Synod, intend to proceed conscientiously, according to the best of our knowledge. We shall translate and review the principal and most important articles and sections of the constitution of the General Synod.— That which is printed with the smaller type, are the articles and sections of said constitution; but that with the larger, our objections against it.

CONSTITUTION OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN GENERAL SYNOD IN THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

"Whereas Jesus Christ, the great head of His church, hath not given her any particular prescriptions how church government should be regulated, she therefore enjoys the privilege in all her departments to make such regulations as appear best, agreeable to situation and circumstances. In confidence therefore to God our Father, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, by the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the divine Word—for the exercise of brotherly love, for the furtherance of Christian harmony, for the preservation of the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace—we, the deputies of the German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Pennsylvania and adjacent states, the German and English Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North Carolina and adjacent states, the Evangelical Lutheran Ministry of New York and adjacent states and territories, and the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Maryland, Virginia, etc., have for ourselves and our successors in their place adopted the following constitution:"

Objections.

Can it possibly be true that Christ has given His Church no particular prescriptions how church-government should be regulated? Has He left it to a majority of votes to do as they please in this respect? We readily admit: the Church enjoys the privilege to introduce some innocent customs, such as holy-days, days of humiliation and prayer, and such like things, which may edify, provided always that such be not imposed upon any person contrary to his will or conscience, and that such be not ordered contrary to the doctrines and regulations of Christ and His apostles. But such local and temporary regulations do by no means comprise the whole government of the Church in all her departments: they comprise only the least and most insignificant part thereof. What is to be understood by the departments of the Church? The departments of the Church must be the several stations in the Church, such as the ministry, church-council, the congregation, etc., the same as the members compose one body, 1 Cor. 12, 12—31. Temporary and local regulations, which Christ did not prescribe, can be none of the departments or branches of the Church, because the Church consists of all believers and saints in the world, and the several stations they fill are her departments. If the constitution had said that Christ had given no prescriptions for the establishment of a general synod, nor particular ones for the regulation of some things not essential to the Church, we should not allege any objections. But instead of this, it saith: Christ has not given any particular prescriptions how church-government should be regulated; that the Church therefore enjoys the liberty in all her departments to make such regulations as appear best, according to situation and circumstances. Agreeable to this statement, there is nothing to govern the General Synod but their own majority; they acknowledge no other criterion of church-government. Christ, agreeable to this, would be excluded from the government of His Church; if He has left no particular prescriptions how she should be regulated, He must have devolved this important measure on the majority of votes! But, blessed be God: our blessed Savior has not left His Church in this destitute manner. Some necessary rules He has prescribed Himself, and others by His apostles, when, after His luminous ascension to His Father, He anointed them with extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost; hence whatsoever they have written is the same as His own declarations. Christ is real God as well as man; He must therefore be an omniscient King, enthroned at His Father's right hand; in a single moment all things are present to His view; all possible circumstances with which His Church is encompassed, in every age and clime to eternity, He foresees; His infinite wisdom prescribed everything necessary to govern and comfort His people. He is not like the kings of this world who stand in need of a multitude of counselors to secure their safety. The following passages are the prescriptions of Christ and His apostles how to regulate the Church in all

her departments: Christ saith Matt. 18, 15: "Moreover, if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." Christ, in this passage, in a particular manner prescribes a rule how to treat an offending brother. In this case the Church has not the liberty to act according to her pleasure, agreeable to situation and circumstances: as, for instance, a wealthy and popular brother, being guilty of trespasses, would be screened, in order to avoid his displeasure and the loss of his ample stipends, whereas the poor one would be rebuked. — This would be acting agreeable to circumstances, but not according to the rule of Christ. Matt. 6 He prescribes a rule how His Church shall be governed, in giving of alms, in fasting and praying. 1 Cor, 11, 4—15, St. Paul prescribes sufficient rules with respect to public worship. 1 Tim. 3, 1—13, he describes the grades of ministers: Bishops and Deacons, with their requisite qualifications. 1 Tim. 5, 19, he gives instructions how to receive an accusation against an elder. V. 20, he commands to rebuke those openly who sin. And v. 22, that hands should not suddenly be laid on any man. 2 Tim. 2, 3—6, he shows that ministers should not be entangled with the things of this world. 1 Cor. 5, 1—13, he directs the Church how to treat fornicators, covetous, extortioners, etc. Gal. 6, how to treat a brother that is overtaken in a fault. 2 Thess. 3, 6; Tit. 1, 5—8; Acts 20, 28; 1 Tim. 3, 2—6; Tit. 1, 9; 1 Pet. 5, 2, 3, the duty of teachers may be seen. — See 1 Cor. 9, 14; Gal. 6, 6, 7; 1 Tim. 5, 17, 18; 1 Thess. 5, 12, 13; Hebr. 13, 17, how hearers should treat their teachers is prescribed. — The duties of husbands, wives, parents, children, masters, and servants are all defined, 1 Pet. 3, 7; Col. 3, 19; Eph. 5, 22, and chap. 6. From these and many more passages, that might be quoted, it is evident that Christ and His inspired apostles have given the Church sufficient prescriptions of her government in all her various branches. They are general rules, and yet applicable in every particular case that may occur, so that they are also particular prescriptions. But that the constitution of the General Synod saith that Christ has not left such particular prescriptions appears a strange, unwarranted, and arbitrary assertion. Is it possible that any person can imagine that a majority of votes in our days can prescribe better rules and regulations than those prescribed by Christ and His apostles?

This constitution further saith: "By the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the divine Word." How is it possible that they can consistently say that the Holy Spirit, in the *divine Word*, hath taught or guided them to establish a General Synod, when at the same time they declare that Christ has *not* given any particular prescriptions how church-government should be regulated? Has He given no particular prescriptions in this respect, then, surely, He has nowhere in His Word commanded or sanctioned this constitution of the General Synod. — How, then, could they have been guided by the Holy Spirit in the divine Word to form it, provided the divine Word, as they affirm, is silent with respect to such things? Can it be supposed that the Holy Spirit, in a miraculous manner, taught them, without the Word? Doth the Holy Spirit, now, teach any person without the Word? If this were the case, there would be no need for the Word, because every one might be taught by the Spirit without it.

It further saith: "For the exercise of brotherly love, for the furtherance of Christian harmony, for the preservation of the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace." — We sincerely wish it might be considered that

the attempt of the establishment of this General Synod has not produced any brotherly love, nor harmony, nor peace, but, on the contrary, divisions, contentions, and confusion.) This establishment is nothing but self-invented rules and traditions of men—and such as love Christian liberty cannot suffer themselves to be brought into bondage; hence the confusion. O ye watchmen of Zion, pity and spare the flock!

ARTICLE I.

“The body founded on this constitution is denominated: *The Evangelical Lutheran General Synod of the United States of America.*”

This body, indeed, may call itself Evangelical Lutheran, yet not be such. The constitution does nowhere say that the Augsburg Confession

1) That this institution of General Synods promotes unity in spirit is contrary to constant experience. The Presbyterians, Methodists, and other churches are governed by General Synods: and have many human rules and regulations; but yet, from time to time, many disputes and factions have arisen among them, so that they are split into many sects and parties. The Lutheran church never heretofore was governed by a General Synod; yet, she never was divided until this novel system was introduced. She produced many able, learned, and pious ministers. When sometimes a few immoral ministers imposed themselves on the congregations, they were abhorred by the pious, and the people getting sufficiently acquainted with their fruits, had reason enough to abandon them, without the interposition of a General Synod.—The first Lutheran ministers emigrated from Germany and Sweden, where they also were ordained. Some settled in Pennsylvania, and others in the Southern states. Being few in number, no particular synods were formed for many years: yet they were united. The Augsburg Confession of faith, containing the principal doctrines of the Holy Scriptures, was their standard of union. It was unalterable: they had no novel system, produced by a majority of votes, to expect. Congregations being vacant, and candidates ready for holy orders, to supply the vacancies, one or more neighboring ministers were requested to examine and ordain them. But when, at length, the congregations increased in number, and their needs grew more pressing, the few ministers in Pennsylvania, with their congregations, mutually agreed to assemble once in a year: not to prescribe human laws and self-invented traditions to the church, but to examine and ordain ministers, and to reprove the immoral and such as had departed from sound doctrines, and to devise means to promulgate the Gospel. Such a meeting is called a Synod. Sometime, near the year 1790, another one was formed in New York—in 1803, one in the state of North Carolina—in 1818, one in the state of Ohio—in 1820, one in Tennessee—in this same year, some of the ministers, who had belonged to that of Pennsylvania, formed one for the states of Maryland, Virginia, etc. Each of these Synods, before the General Constitution was formed, were independent, and not amenable to any superior tribunal, except that of Christ. Differences in local and temporary regulations, the formation of new synods, etc., were not considered as divisions of the church; their standard of unity was far more noble and exalted: the pure scriptural doctrines of the Augsburg Confession of faith were their meridian sun they viewed with united eyes; and anything less, such as local and temporary regulations, never influenced their minds, even to think of divisions. The church proceeded peaceably, until the unhappy and fatal period of 1819 arrived, when a meeting was called in Baltimore, consisting of some of the Synod of Pennsylvania, and an individual from North Carolina, for the purpose of devising a plan for the establishment of the General Synod. Said plan was printed and circulated. But the Revs. Leist, Steck, Scheld, Kuemmerer, and Andrew Henkel, ministers of the state of Ohio, published eight objections against it—these, together with the objections of some others, were printed in the German language. In addition, a publication was issued in the English language, on the same subject, entitled, “*Carolina Herald of Liberty.*” In the year 1820, another meeting was held in Hagerstown, when and where the constitution was formed against which the present objections are made. From what I can learn, the Synod of Pennsylvania, a part of North Carolina and Maryland compose the General Synod; and all ministers connected with either of those synods are under the jurisdiction of the General Synod, and partakers of the same cause. I am not able to ascertain with certainty whether the Synod of New York have adopted this constitution; it is certain some of their members were present when it was formed—but I am credibly informed by a friend who was present at their last meeting, in last October, that no deputies appeared from New York, nor that they transmitted any excuse for not appearing. The Synods of Ohio, Tennessee, and a part of North Carolina reject the constitution of the General Synod. There are also individual ministers in Virginia and Kentucky who had belonged to the Synod of Pennsylvania, that are opposed to the General Synod.—The German-Reformed church, who heretofore were governed without a General Synod, have also lately adopted the government of a General Synod.—*Clerk of the Committee.*

of faith, or Luther's Catechism, or the Bible shall be the foundation of doctrine and discipline of the General Synod. It is well known that they always have been the standard of the Lutheran Church. Why does the constitution not once name them? It is truly said by some that every person knows this, without any further mention, that they have always been the standard of the Church. True indeed! But who assures us that they are to be the standard of this General Synod? There is not a single clause to bind the General Synod to act in conformity to them. The General Synod has unlimited power by this constitution to promote any doctrine, to establish any new creed, or institute any discipline they please; for there is no Augsburg Confession of faith, no Luther's Catechism, nor Bible to restrict them. If they see cause, they may establish the principles of deism, or any other that may seem most lucrative and popular. No doubt many are ready to say: Surely, so many pious and learned men would not aim at such horrid things, even if there is no provision made in the constitution. But it is not reasonable that the Christian Church should repose her confidence in man, or to make flesh her refuge. If we are to trust to the piety, learning, and good motives of men, we need no constitution at all, we may adopt the principles of monarchical despotism, and be ruled without a law, agreeable to the pleasure of tyrants. Had the framers of this constitution been zealous advocates for the Lutheran doctrine, they would have been careful to insert a clause to compel the General Synod always to act according to our standard books. It is an easy thing to prove that some of the founders of this General Synod have openly denied some of the important doctrines of the Augsburg Confession of faith and Luther's Catechism.

ARTICLE II.

"This body consists of deputies from the different Evangelical Synodical and Ministerial Connections in the United States, who connect themselves therewith, and who have been properly recognized as members, according to the following relation:

"A connection which counts six ministers, sends one deputy; that of fourteen, sends two; twenty-five, three; forty, four; sixty, five; and that which counts eighty-six, or more, sends six deputies from the order of ordained ministers; and likewise as many lay deputies.

"All deputies agreeable to this relation, appearing in the General Synod, have equal rights and votes as members of the body, except in that case which shall afterwards herein be reserved. It is left to the option of every synodical and ministerial connection how to appoint their deputies.—Every connection defrays the traveling expenses of its deputies, until the General Synod shall have an own treasury, out of which they may be defrayed."

This body may consist of deputies from the *different* evangelical connections. It is not said of the *several Evangelical* LUTHERAN connections. If this body may consist of the different connections, then it is evident that it may be composed of *all* denominations, such as Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, etc. These all denominate themselves Evangelical, and are even recognized as such by some who call themselves Lutherans. Thus it is manifest that all denominations who call themselves Evangelical may have seats and votes in this body, forasmuch as there is nothing to prohibit them from it. These taken together, are many times more numerous than the Lutherans; hence they could easily destroy the Lutheran Church under her own name, inasmuch as they are generally opposed to Luther's doctrines. What is the benefit of Luther's name when his doctrines are extirpated? Does the General Synod intend to extirpate the Lutheran doctrine in allowing deputies from other connections to have votes? Or do they intend to entice other denominations to take part with them, and then proselyte them to their own side?

ARTICLE III.

"The transactions of the General Synod are as follows, *viz.*: SECT. I. They examine the minutes of the different particular Synods and Ministries, in order to acquaint themselves with the situation of the church. Each particular Synod

shall therefore communicate as many copies of the minutes of their transactions to the General Synod as there are members constituting the same.

"SECT. II. With respect to all proposed manuscripts and books for the public use in churches, the General Synod shall act as a joint committee of the particular Synods and Ministries, in the following manner:

"1. They examine all the manuscripts and books, proposed by the particular Synods or Ministries, for the use of the church, such as catechisms, liturgies, compilation of hymns, or confession of faith, and impart their well-considered advice and admonition. No Synod nor Ministry in connection with this General Synod shall therefore not publish any new book of the aforesaid description for public use without having first handed a complete copy thereof to the General Synod, and have received their sentiments, or admonitions, or advice."

Here no individual Synod can neither publish nor introduce books for public use of churches without previously receiving the advice and admonition of the General Synod. Such books, as compilation of hymns and liturgies, mostly contain the forms and ceremonies of public worship. Now if no person shall enjoy the liberty to introduce such books without previously getting the advice of the General Synod, then the power is already arrogated that no ceremonies shall be used in the church without their advice and consent. The 7th article of our church saith: "It is not necessary for the true unity of the Church that uniform ceremonies as established by men should be observed." Why shall individual societies be robbed of the liberty to introduce such books as suit them best, when our confession of faith grants every person liberty in this case? Why are measures taken to rob people of their Christian liberty? The plea that is urged is, that every person has liberty to write books: he shall only ask the General Synod for advice before he publishes them. Why shall any person ask for advice, if he still has the liberty to comply with such advice or to reject it? It must be a natural consequence that such advice must be obeyed, otherwise advising would be a useless thing. Shall no person introduce books of the aforesaid description without having first received the advice of the General Synod, then there is already compulsion in this case; for men are compelled to ask advice, and obey it, if advising shall answer any purpose. Every minister might with equal propriety be bound not to preach a sermon without first presenting a copy thereof to the General Synod, and receive their well-considered advice and admonition; for any man that would publish a book with erroneous doctrines would also preach such. A man who preaches erroneous doctrines may be censured and suspended for heresy; if he publishes such in books, the Church has the same authority to censure him, so that there is no need to compel men to ask for advice before they publish them.

One thing more is here to be considered. It is said: "The General Synod shall examine all the manuscripts and books for the public use of churches, such as catechisms, hymns, liturgies, or confession of faith." An opportunity is here given to introduce a new confession of faith. This appears a conclusive proof that the General Synod do not intend to be governed by the Augsburg Confession of faith, nor vindicate the Lutheran doctrines contained therein; for if they did, they would not by this clause have given liberty to form other confessions of faith. Perhaps this may be one of the reasons why they have nowhere promised in the constitution that Luther's Catechism, the Augsburg Confession of faith, nor the Bible should be the guide of their body. They wish to have power to form a new confession, perhaps more popular, and suited to the new-fangled opinions of this present age of infidelity. Were not the men, such as Luther, Melancthon, etc., who formed the Augsburg Confession of faith as a testimony against popery and other heresies, godly and enlightened men, and whose instrumentality we owe our light of the Gospel? Will any of the votaries of the General Synod presume to say that this confession is erroneous, heretical, and wicked? Can they form

a better one? If they answer in the affirmative, they are no Lutherans, as they call themselves. If they answer in the negative, why, then, have they not positively specified in the constitution that such should remain the standard of the Church? Why have they given an opportunity to introduce a new confession? It is known that all Lutheran ministers when they are ordained are solemnly pledged as by an oath to maintain the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession of faith. But when there is an opportunity given to propose and introduce other confessions, perhaps the very reverse: what shall become of all the oaths made at the time of ordination?

"2. If the General Synod deem it expedient, they may propose to the particular Synods and Ministries new books, as aforesaid, for general or particular public use. Every proposal of the kind the particular Synods and Ministries shall also observe; and in case any of them should not approve of such proposal, it is hoped the reasons will be sent to the next General Synod, that they may be inserted in the minutes of the General Synod."

Indeed, privilege is granted to the particular Synods, in case they should not approve of the proposals for introducing books, to send their objections to the next General Synod. But nevertheless, there is no promise made that such reasons or objections should be received or adopted; they shall only be inserted in the minutes of the General Synod. What purpose can this answer? Is it to expose such Synods to public ridicule, when nothing more is promised than barely to insert their reasons or objections in the general minutes?

"3. To no General Synod can the power be given, everywhere to prescribe uniform ceremonies, to introduce alterations, in things respecting faith, or in things which respect the manner of publishing the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and foundation of our faith, which might oppress the conscience of the brethren in Christ."

No power needs or can be given to this General Synod to prescribe uniform ceremonies — they have already grasped it, when they suffer no book for public worship which contains ceremonies to be introduced without their advice and approbation!!

Alteration in things of faith may not be made; yet they may be omitted, without a breach of this clause. To alter a thing, and to omit a thing, is not the same.

"SECT. III. If for the future, 25 ministers living in one circuit, of whom at least fifteen must be ordained, apply to the General Synod for permission to form a particular Ministry for themselves, and in case the Synod or Ministry to which they before belonged, allege no well-grounded reasons against the attempt, after being formally notified, then the General Synod shall have authority to grant the application. And if in a whole state no particular Synod or Ministry is existing, and if six ordained ministers live in it and make application, then the General Synod shall grant the establishment of such a new Synod or Ministry in the state. But until the grant or permission of the General Synod, in such cases, is formally imparted, no deputies from a newly established synodical body shall enjoy a seat or vote in the General Synod."

In this section provision is made that more Synods may be formed of those already existing. The Synod of Pennsylvania being the most numerous, no doubt will know how to form themselves into more synods, in order to get more votes in the General Synod, that they may sway their regal scepter over every other Synod!

Further, if no Synod shall be considered lawful, so that their deputies cannot enjoy seats and votes in the General Synod, unless such be established by the formal grant and permission of the General Synod, then, surely, there is no Synod in America lawful, nor ought any according to this enjoy seats and votes in the General Synod. The Synods who now compose the General Synod, and arrogate to themselves the power of giving formal grants and permissions to form Synods, them-

selves had no formal grants from a General Synod to become Synods. How were they formed? By formal permission from a General Synod? No. A General Synod never heretofore governed the Lutheran Church in America. From Europe they could not get such, because the Church there did not derive her existence from a General Synod. Luther was excommunicated by the Church of Rome—yet as an individual he performed ordinations; from him and a few of his associates the Church, under the auspices of heaven, derived her existence. The ordinations of most ministers in Pennsylvania and the Carolinas were derived from individuals, and they formed themselves into Synods by mutual consent. Now those very men who have no formal permission for the bodies they compose arrogate to themselves authority of giving formal grants and prohibiting ministers from forming Synods without petitioning them for liberty! Let them first get formal permissions from a superior power to become Synods: then it is time enough for them to assume this dictatorial power, which power they do not now possess legally! This pretended power at present is nothing but an arbitrary usurpation. They cannot get this authority legally, from no Protestant community; for none of them derived their existence from the majority who called themselves the universal Church. This is a prerogative for which the pope and the Romish Church contend.

SECT. IV. — In this section the constitution points out how uniformity in the grades of the ministry is to be preserved. This not being very interesting, nothing more needs to be said on this head.

“SECT. V. The General Synod shall not be viewed as a peculiar tribunal of appeals; yet in the following cases they may interfere:

“1. They may, when complaints with respect to doctrine and church-discipline are tabled by whole Synods, or congregations, or individual ministers, impart their sentiments or advice. Nevertheless, the General Synod shall take good care not to burden the consciences of ministers with human traditions, and not to afflict any person with respect to difference in opinion.”

The General Synod shall not burden the consciences of ministers with human traditions: yet at the same time the very institution of the General Synod is nothing but human laws and traditions, nowhere commanded by Christ nor His apostles. That this is so the framers of this constitution in the introduction thereof themselves affirm. They say: “Christ has given His Church no particular prescriptions how church-government shall be regulated.” Has He not given any prescriptions in this case, then, surely, He has not commanded the establishment of such a General Synod; hence it can be nothing but human tradition. In the name of common sense, how can this be consistent? “The General Synod shall take great care not to burden the consciences of ministers with human laws or traditions,” when at the same time, agreeable to their own concessions, the very establishment of this General Synod is nothing but human laws and traditions!!²⁾ How vehemently our Savior up-

2) The unity of the Lutheran church doth not consist in any external forms or ceremonies, or government established by men. It is independent of any general head except Christ. The seventh article of the Augsburg Confession of faith points out the true nature of her unity. It saith: “For it is sufficient for the true unity of the Christian Church that the preaching be pure, according to the true understanding of the Gospel, and the sacraments administered according to divine Scripture; and it is not necessary for the true unity of the Christian Church that the same ceremonies, as established by men should be observed; as St. Paul saith, 1st Eph. 4: ‘One body, one spirit, as ye all are called to the same hope of your calling; one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism.’” One of the reasons why the Reformers inserted this article into their confession was no doubt to rebut the cavils of the papists. The doctrine of the papists in this respect is: that the Christian Church must have a general external union, obey one visible head, which is the pope and his cardinals, and a separation from them is a criminal schism. Their church being over all the world, governed by the same visible head, generally uniform in ceremonies and other external regulations, and

braided the Pharisees for their human laws and traditions they imposed upon the common people. By means of human laws and traditions popery was established.—Why are preparations made now again to introduce that horrid beast? How careful individual Synods should be not to impose human traditions upon the Church; but remember that they do not assemble for the purpose of making laws for the Church, but only to devise means to execute those already made by Christ.

Further, it is said: "that no person shall be afflicted with respect to difference in opinion." What an opportunity is here given to introduce all manner of false doctrines! If no person is to be afflicted in respect to difference in opinion, then no person can be excommunicated

always able to punish many whom she views as heretics, she therefore having such an ascendancy over her members, denominates herself the only true Catholic Church in the world. The papists further argue that the Protestant Church cannot be the true Church of Christ, because they are divided in forms, in ceremonies, separated into many independent bodies, and accountable to no general external tribunal—so that they cannot punish heretics with any degree of power, and as the Church is but one body united in every member, the Protestant cannot be the Church. But this article of our confession sufficiently answers this plea of the papists. It is the same as if it had said: the Church of Christ is but one united body, consisting of innumerable members; but what unites them? All believers believe in one invisible Lord, by whom they are governed, for He is their King: they are anointed by the same Holy Ghost, for He is their Comforter and Guide. This is an invisible, god-like union, not discerned by the carnal eye, nor doth it imitate the unity of the kingdoms of this world: Christ is its polar star, the Bible its charter, ministers who proclaim sweet words of peace, its heralds, Baptism and the Lord's Supper its seal, bond, token, and security. This union is independent of all human ceremonies, traditions, general synods, or anything of the kind, and has existed ever since the promulgation of the Gospel, in all realms and climes. It was a stumbling-block to the Jews, because they could not even make the law of Moses subservient thereunto, much less their self-invented traditions. A union which consists of human laws, ceremonies, and discipline may be termed a political union—a union peculiar to civil government of this world. Now, even were it the case that all who call themselves Christians would be united in this manner, it would by no means prove their spiritual unity: for many may conform to one external rule, and yet be divided in heart, for they are not all Israelites that are of Israel.—It is evident, because the General Synod is but the invention of men, that they make much more necessary to Christian unity than the pure preaching of the Gospel and the proper administration of the sacraments commanded by Christ. Thus, this establishment of the General Synod must be contrary to the Seventh Article of our confession of faith. True Christianity is thereby blended with human laws and policy—the true lineaments of popery. The following passages prove it to be a criminal conduct in Christians to submit to legal bondage, or to be subject to the rudiments of this world: Col. 2. 16. 17: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of Sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." V. 20—22: "Wherefore, if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances, (touch not, taste not, handle not; which are all to perish with the using,) after the commandments and doctrines of men." If no man is to judge Christians in respect to meat and drink or of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days—who, then, has a right to judge them in respect of forming books for the public use in churches, or in respect of meeting as a synod, without a formal permission, or in respect of performing ordinations? The General Synod have arrogated this right of judging and oppressing Christians in these respects! These are prerogatives they claim, contrary to the doctrines of the apostle. If Christians, who are dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, are not to be subject to ordinances, nor to the doctrines and commandments of men, how can the General Synod reasonably expect for Christians to be subject to their human ordinance: their constitution—and how to the scepter of their majority? St. Paul exhorts Titus, chap. 1, 14: "Not give heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men that turn from the truth." What is the whole system of the General Synod, but the commandments of men? Christ rebukes the Pharisees for their doctrines and commandments of men, and saith: "Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up. Let them alone: they be blind leaders of the blind," Matt. 15, 13, 14. Is the General Synod a plant which has been planted by the heavenly Father? No. It was planted by a majority of votes. Can it reasonably be required of Christians to foster a plant which God did not plant? It is too lamentable a fact that among the most of denominations human laws, discipline, and ceremonies are made the rallying point of unity!—*Clerk of the Committee.*

for propagating any false or wicked doctrine. One might deny the holy Trinity, and encourage any system of infidelity, and yet, agreeable to this constitution, no one could be rebuked nor suspended. One might plead this article in defense and say the General Synod have no right to oppress me for my different opinion!

"2. If parties are divided with respect to doctrines and church-discipline and in a brotherly manner refer the case, wherein the division originated, to the General Synod, then they shall minutely examine the case, and agreeable to their knowledge of right, of equity, of brotherly love and truth declare their sentiments."

"3. If differences between Synods and Synods are referred, then at the decision the votes shall be taken according to Synods: but the Synods referring have no votes."

In the beginning of this section it is said that the General Synod is not to be viewed as a tribunal of appeals; yet in these clauses appeals are received and finally decided! What an inconsistency!

"SECT. VI. The General Synod may devise plans, for general institutions, for seminaries of learning and missionaries, and likewise institutions for the support of ministers' widows and orphans and poor ministers, and by the help of God to promote the accomplishment thereof."

"SECT. VII. The General Synod may also for the purpose of executing their designs create an own treasury."

We cannot conceive the propriety of paying missionaries out of a general fund. How many pious ministers heretofore have preached the Gospel in remote parts without such a provision. Men who are commissioned by Christ to preach the Gospel, "take no thought, saying, What shall we eat, or what shall we drink, or wherewithal shall we be clothed?" Matt. 6, 31—34. Their daily employment is to teach and admonish the people — for their support they depend on the faithful promise of our Lord who said: "All these things shall be added unto you." Men who are sent of God shall profit the people: the Lord therefore, who feeds the winged songsters, though they toil not, and arrays the lilies of the field, stirreth up the hearts of the people, and fills them with gratitude, so that they freely honor Him with their substance in supporting His ministers: thus the promise of Christ shall evermore be verified. But hirelings and wolves do not believe this promise. They are either entangled with some temporal employment to secure their support, or else must know what they are to have from a general fund before they go forth to labor in the Lord's vineyard. When men know what they shall get from a general fund before they preach, they have no need to exercise faith in the promise of Christ, for their trust is in the general fund! The country is already filled with such hired circuit-riders, whose trust for a support is not in the promise of our Lord, because they first bargain with their superiors, or general synods, what they are to have per month or year from the general fund. Was the mission of the primitive apostles conducted in this manner? Had Christ established a general treasury out of which He had hired His apostles by the month or year? No. Is it not degrading for Christians to depart so far from the paths of Christ and His apostles? Is it not enough that we have His promise? Genuine ministers have no need of a general fund to support them; their mission is profitable to the people, whose hearts being moved by the Lord, will support their teachers — but such men who are not called of God do not profit the people; they therefore do not expect to be supported by the promise of Christ — hence they must look to the general treasury. What is better calculated to induce hirelings to enter into holy orders than their sure wages by a general fund?

Why are ministers' widows and orphans, and poor ministers only, to be supported by a general fund, and not also other poor members of

the church? Are the families of ministers a nobler race than other people, so that extraordinary provisions must be made for them in preference to others? Would it not be better if every congregation had a fund of its own to support their needy at home? Each congregation are best acquainted with their own poor, and know who deserves help. Is it necessary that the congregations should send their money several hundred miles from home into the general fund, and that the poor should receive it from thence?—Pious ministers accustom their families to honest labor, so that they may know how to support themselves when they need it. Who supports the people's widows and orphans? It is too lamentable a fact that too many ministers do not accustom their children to labor, but indulge them in their pride, vanity, indolence, and in the imitation of rich, proud, and pompous people of the world. Behold! how many ministers with their wives in our time, surpassing humility—how grand their attire—how lofty their appearance—how great their association with the wealthy of this world—with what contempt do they view the poor—how numerous their waiters—and how little do they expose themselves to preach the Gospel unto the poor! There is no similarity between them and Christ whose ministers they affect to be—for He was poor; He appeared lowly and in the form of a servant. Such vain, arrogant, and indolent families truly cannot support themselves in such style after their fathers' decease; a general treasury indeed might be considered necessary to support such in their vanity. The farmers and mechanics may labor hard to procure money to fill this treasury: of which, though, their widows and orphans in their straits could expect no assistance. Have we any nobility in America whom the people must bear upon their hands? What a constant tax is hereby imposed upon the congregations! How frequently the ministers or church-council must admonish the people to cast their mites into the general fund, lest it should be exhausted. There would be no end to begging and expostulating with the people for money. Howbeit, it is said that no person is compelled to contribute towards the general fund. We grant it, in one sense, but not in another—for such as did not freely contribute would be viewed with a contemptible eye, and frequently reproved as avaricious, hardened wretches, so that at last they would find themselves obliged to contribute.

Such widows and orphans who by some misfortune are rendered unable to support themselves generally find benefactors in addition to those means civil government hath already provided.

SECT. VIII. — This section shows how the General Synod shall endeavor to heal divisions, and to observe the opinions which are growing common, in order to promote a general union and harmony. — All that we can understand from this is a desire to *unite with all denominations.*

Conclusion.

We conclude, hoping that the friends of the General Synod will not view us as enemies, because we freely spend our opinion with respect to their designs. We would freely join in with them if we could do it with a good conscience. Such a general connection of all ministers would certainly exalt the clerical state, in a temporal view, to a high degree above the people. Greater burdens might then be imposed upon them; and such of us as are ministers might thereby live more comfortable. Our widows and orphans, might live with much ease, and our missionary services whilst we are alive would be amply remunerated. Being connected in this view, we could make the people more dependent, for when the clergy unanimously agree in any matter, if ever so oppressive, the people must either yield obedience or else be deprived of the sacred means. It would, moreover, render us more popular, because the General Synod system;

as it borders upon temporal grandeur, finds many patrons who are wealthy, and it is much easier to swim with than against the current. But this does not appear justifiable in our view. The Church of Christ in its very beginning did not appear grand and powerful, nor had she any temporal wealth or authority. Her apostles were poor fishermen, supported by no general fund; and even her great Head, Jesus Christ, was poorer than the birds and foxes, and was satisfied with the meanest fare, whilst He went about doing all the good He could. Neither Christ nor His apostles exercised any temporal authority over the people, nor did they compel them to obey human laws and traditions. Wherever a connection is found extremely numerous, wealthy, grand, and exercising great authority like unto a civil government, we may conclude it is not the Church of Jesus. The scribes and Pharisees were of this description; hence the kingdom of Christ could not thrive among them.

We do not expect, finally, to prevent the establishment of this General Synod by publishing our objections, because we believe, agreeable to the divine predictions, that the great falling away is approaching, so that Antichrist will set himself into the temple of God, 2 Thess. 2. We also believe that the establishment of General Synods is preparing the way for him. Antichrist will not, nor cannot get into power without a general union, which is not effected by a divine harmony of godly doctrines, but by common temporal interests, and the power of a majority. Notwithstanding, we consider it our duty to make the people attentive to those things, and to instruct such as are not willfully blind. But should we be deceived in our opinion, and clearly be convinced of it, we shall not be ashamed to recant.

In vain people dream of the millennium, before crosses and tribulations shall have visited the Christian world by the rage of Antichrist. His kingdom is reared under a good garb; if this were not the case, no person would be deceived. Men who are notoriously immoral and vicious cannot deceive, but they only who appear like innocent lambs.

May God preserve all His people against every temptation, for Jesus' sake! Amen.

This document is appended to the "Report of the Transactions of the Second Evangelical Lutheran Conference: held in Zion's Church, Sullivan County, Tennessee, the 22d of October, 1821." A year and eight months later there was held in Harrison's Church, Nelson County, Ky., "a session, composed of Evangelical Lutheran Ministers and Lay-members." At this meeting Rev. Zink from Washington County, Ind., Rev. Morkert from Winchester, O., and delegates from Jefferson, Washington and Floyd Counties, Ind., attended. We have, in this gathering, probably the germ of the later Synod of Indiana. Paul and David Henkel had been deputed by the Tennessee Synod "to hold this session in Kentucky," but only the latter was able to attend and was made secretary. To the brief report which he published he appended the following note:

TO THE READER.

It is to be observed that one of the minister's belonging to the General Synod, a very strong advocate for the same, was also present at the above session. He endeavored to make us believe that the constitution of the General Synod is not in all points to be understood as it reads,

but that it would be necessary that the framers thereof should be present in order to explain its meaning. Thus this great votary gave us clearly to understand that the constitution of the General Synod is very defective, full of ambiguous terms and duplicity; otherwise there would be no need to call upon the framers thereof to tell us what it meant. A constitution abounding with ambiguous terms which requires the skill of lawyers to explain, is justly rejected by Christians who walk honestly and in Christian simplicity. A thing that requires such skill to explain can have no tendency to create a good understanding.—*The Secretary.*

The connection with the Tennessee Synod later became loosened; that Synod was itself showing signs of decay; and its daughter in Indiana was disgraced by the heresy of two of her leading members, and the additional ambition and tyranny of one of them, and was well-nigh destroyed. Alliances with other synods were sought, *e. g.*, the Joint Synod of Ohio in the days of Prof. Worley; but the Indiana Synod, chiefly through the untiring work of Rev. J. L. Stirewalt, was ultimately steered into the General Council, where it is at present.

The author's account bears the stamp of sincerity. Whether the incoming of Missouri into the state of Indiana and the decisive words spoken by her theologians on such points as "Church and Ministry," "Rights and authority of a Christian congregation," "the character of the call to the ministry," etc., reacted on the Synod of Indiana, which at that time was no longer a German body, we would not decide at present. The Minutes of the 42d Ev. Lutheran Synod and Ministerium of North Carolina, convened in St. Paul's Church, Catawba Co., N. C., May 5, 1848, noted at its third session, at Newton, N. C., in the report of its corresponding secretary, the following interesting item:

11. *The German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri.*—This is a new synod: it met for the first time in Chicago, Illinois, in May last. It is composed of 25 ministers, dispersed through six different States. The officers are—Rev. C. F. W. Walther, President; Dr. Sihler, Vice-President; Rev. Husmann, Secretary; and Rev. Barthel, Treasurer. These German brethren have not become fully Americanized yet, but it is to be hoped that they will accomplish good for the Church in the wilderness of the West.

The hope here expressed has, we trust, in a measure, been realized, although the volume before us gives hardly any evidence of it.

The Chicago Synod numbers at present 37 pastors, 59 congregations, 6573 communicants.

THE REVEREND KARL G. SCHLERF of Chicago, Ill., has called our attention to the fact that his congregation has been overlooked in the table on page 183 and in the account on the preceding pages in our last issue. It belongs in Group A and column 1.