

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

1073A

VOL. XI.

JANUARY, 1907.

No. 1.

THE OLD LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF FREE-WILL IN THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

(Concluded.)

To His Church the Holy One has given the *correct means of being constituted and made one*: "I have given them *Thy Word* and I pray for them, not only for them, but also for all who *by their Word* believe on me, that they may be one," John 17. Thus the Church is made, constituted, and forever kept together by the Word, not by a confession. This Church — and this only — can make a true confession of what constitutes her. That is the psychological order. We presume that Dr. Richard is able to give from memory a correct Lutheran definition of the Church, but not being of it he stumbles when he steps up to her from a different direction — here from the relation of Church and doctrine. We may mark his way of proving the prevalence of free-will by the confessions as unacknowledged rationalism. Let us hang it low, that he who runs may read. We quote Dr. Richard: "It is in part" — what are the remains? — "with the hope of making at least a small contribution to the inculcation of the principles stated above" (that Lutherans must be clocks never striking and ticking alike) "that we now advance to the discussion of the subject placed at the head of this article (The Old Lutheran Doctrine of Free-will), and we begin with the year 1530, for prior to that time there was no Lutheran Church, but only Lutherans, who were united in opposition to the teaching of the Roman Catholic

Church, rather than in a distinct program of their own. Indeed, prior to 1530 there was no general confession of faith among Lutherans, no single bond that held them together and constituted them a Church." We may be allowed to interject a few pricks in the form of questions into this corollary of historical assumptions. Where was, prior to 1530, the Church that Christ founded and of which He said the gates of hell should not prevail against her? Was it yet the Roman Church, and were its opposers the gates of hell let loose? Was Luther at Worms a traitor to the Church, or a confessor of the Church? Was he the founder of a new church, or was he at this time the whole Church? For all these questions, which arise out of above "historical" assertion, Romanists will have a ready answer, while Christians must bow their heads in shame! Another series of questions suggested by a reading of the above make a Lutheran despair, for instance: How could Lutherans recognize each other as being of the Church, when there was no Lutheran Church prior to 1530? How could Lutherans come together and act in unison at confessing their faith, if they had no single common bond? How could they know their faith, or the faith of the Church they were to confess? Was Melancthon the one who knew it, made it up for the princes by whom it was imposed on their subjects? These questions are easily disposed of when we know that the Word of God is the creator of the Church, the faith it has, the bond of all its believers, that constitutes them a Church — confession or no confession in writing. But they will empty the deepest well of psychology, recurring again and again, if the Confession assumes the prerogatives of the Word. The Confession, therefore, remains with a true Lutheran a document of faith to be explained in the sense of the Scripture, neither placed in lieu of it, nor placed on a par with private writings, nor explained according to them. The latter we would rather interpret, if possible, according to the sense of the Confession as long as their authors continue to affirm their adherence to it. We would extend such charity even to Dr. Richard, if his devia-

tions were not so glaringly and boastfully displayed. Only an unbeliever can maintain that the Church makes her faith by creeds, and it is a blasphemy of the Holy One and His Word that a Confession creates and constitutes His Church. It is a psychological impossibility to use the Augsburg Confession as documentary evidence for the maintenance of contrary teachings found in private writings.

After clearing up the right relation between the Augustana and the Church on the one hand, and the Augustana and the private writings of its confessors on the other, we now advance to what Dr. Richard regards as the strongest proof, that some free-will (remember: in spiritual things) was the old Lutheran doctrine, because it prevailed between 1530 and 1560, namely: It must be found in the 18th Article, because "it prevailed among the teachers who wrote the Augsburg Confession and continued to affirm it." We must remind him strongly that we have severed the Confession from the private writings of its author and other adherents. It never was Melancthon's book, as he was reminded by Luther, but the Church's book. It stands in a special category as the faith confessed by the Church. As we have shown on what authority it rests and what authority for us we may give it, we intend to examine it in the light of the Word of God and find out if its expression covers as much as was necessary, at that time, to confess. The point of controversy with us cannot be: "Is the doctrine of free-will *in rebus divinis* contained in the Augsburg Confession, because it prevailed among teachers who wrote it and continued to affirm it?" but: Does the Augsburg Confession either explicitly or impliedly contain, as part of the scriptural doctrine set forth in it, the doctrine of free-will *in rebus divinis*, or the ability of natural man to accomplish more or less of spiritual works? We subjoin the last clause, as we infer from Dr. Richard's utterances that he has no clear conception of free-will, and might understand us to say that man does not act *in any way*, neither resisting in his bound will, nor doing, when his will has come to life (faith and sanctification). We

surely believe that spiritual man, created by the power of God through the Word, moves, acts, chooses, and does everything commanded by God, and this he does not by any other mind or will than by the same by which he, in his unconverted state, rejected God's proffered grace, in which state and activities it is sustained also solely by the power of God through the Word. If Dr. Richard has not known this fact of our teaching thus far, we are glad to inform him of this fact, and beg him to store it in his memory. We simply deny with the Confession that man *acts* in any way *together with* the Holy Spirit in the spiritual act of getting to life (conversion — faith) and *in the moving* to spiritual works. This, we assert and are going to prove, is contained in the Augsburg Confession, explained by the Holy Scripture, of whose doctrines it claims to be an exhibition. Dr. Richard says: The private writings explicitly and impliedly teach free-will, *i. e.*, man with his own powers cooperates somewhat and somehow toward his salvation; therefore the Augsburg Confession cannot but contain, explicitly and impliedly, the same doctrine, if read without interpolation. We beg to assure him that we are not going to read things into the Confession which are not in it. But must we not suspect him at the outset of interpolation when he is going to look at it through the private writings and their *supposed* teaching of free-will, the baselessness of which supposition we have no space to show?

Taking up the reasons of Dr. Richard we beg to acknowledge gladly that the teaching therein of un-free-will is not enforced by such strong language as Luther used in his private writings and as was afterward found necessary in the Form of Concord against such as intended to pervert the sense of the early Confession and which we must employ against Dr. Richard. We purposely are glad; for it favors beforehand in an inargumentative way our contention versus Dr. Richard that at this time there was *no one among* the confessors *disputing* (at least not openly) the teaching of un-free-will in the Church confessing. The contention of Dr. Richard that this strong language

was *purposefully* omitted, *because it did not prevail*, we assign, without hesitation, to the deepest limbo of psychological enigmas in Dr. Richard's historical research. We rather praise the confessors for being suave in manner though strong in the matter, as will appear further on. They had, by their manner of confessing, to make the most favorable impression on friends and foes alike, to stop the caviling of their formidable oppressors, win the favor of the undecided, and retain the trust of all for whom they were confessing—the Church. And they did it. Glorious spectacle this! They did it by their modesty and suavity. Every true confession of the Church has this halo of modesty and suavity about it, and we ask Dr. Richard to point out the want of it even in the Form of Concord.

How glad Luther felt about this grace of the Confession we gather from his comment, when it was sent to him for approval: "I have read Magister Philip's Apology, which pleases me well and find nothing to correct nor to change; would also be unfit; for I cannot step so graciously and softly. Christ, our Lord, may make it bring forth much and large fruit, for which we hope and pray. Amen." As Dr. Richard enlarges greatly on the fact, that the Confession does not contain any likening of man "to a stone, block, and statue," and on this ground takes it for granted that it *must contain* free-will in divine matters, and is afraid someone might read such likening into it, we disclaim any intention of this kind. We confess at once: These to him obnoxious words are not in it, though we entirely disagree with him as to the historical motive of such omission.

But for all that we are not going to let Dr. Richard squeeze the 18th Article of the Augsburg Confession until he gets, not the juice, but the wood-pulp. We quote it: "Of free-will it is taught that in some sense man has free-will outwardly to live honorably and to choose among things which reason comprehends; but without the grace, assistance, and operation of the Holy Spirit man is not able to become pleasing to God, to fear God heartily, or to believe in Him, or to cast the evil inborn

concupiscence out of his heart; but such things are effected through the Holy Spirit, who is given through the Word of God." We wish to state that we abide by these very words without omission, interpolations, or mental reading between its lines from anything outside.

Unhappily we cannot say the same of Dr. Richard. He has extracted the following sense out of it: "First. It *vindicates* the *essential* freedom of the human will, in that it declares that man, that is, the natural man, has the power of choice. . . . It is the power by which he determines to hear and to meditate on the Word of God, which is the *conditio sine qua non* of his becoming a Christian." The part left out is filled up by a psychological disquisition.

We are not concerned in it, much as Dr. Richard wants us to be. The quoted words are to be the sense of the first clause of the 18th Article. That they *must* be in, because of their prevalence at the time, is fortified by a quotation from Melancthon's *De Anima* (C. R. 3, 153) where Melancthon gives a *general definition* of the will, from whence Dr. Richard argues *the possession of free-will in divine things, because Melancthon applies not the stock, stone, and statue likening to the natural man*, but ascribes *velle ac nolle* to man and states his ability to regulate his external actions in regard to what *seems* good or evil, Melancthon thereby clearly indicating that the whole disquisition does not pertain to the question in hand. "It is therefore Lutheran to affirm that the human will possesses the inherent power of choice made known to the understanding (reason)." We believe this latter announcement partly to be true, that is, in regard to natural things and actions, but not to the extent Dr. Richard wants, as the Confession limits this inherent power to "*power in some sense,*" namely, to lead an outwardly honorable life and to choose in things which reason comprehends, explaining what those things are by a quotation from Augustine: "He may will or choose or not will or choose to labor in the field, eat and drink, dress so or so, marry, raise cattle, and numerous other things that

are good for this life, and he may will to do evil things: to worship an idol, to murder, and so on."

Now as to the first part of what he styles "the explicit statement of the Confession," viz.: "It vindicates the essential freedom of the human will, in that it declares that man, that is, natural man, has the power of choice." The Confession, to a plain reader, says just the reverse. To him it appears that it is not the object of the Confession to "vindicate" the essential freedom of the human will, but that statement is the incidental reflection back of a much greater and weightier matter *allowing some freedom* for the human will, the power of which in spiritual things is to be altogether denied. No mention is made of any "essential" freedom, but it is limited by the Confession to freedom "in some sense," not even extending it to all matters of this life. But of the second part of Dr. Richard's "explicit statement of the Confession," that the human will is "the power by which he determines to hear and to meditate on the Word of God," *not one word* is found in the Confession. It is silent as the grave. It is altogether a fabrication of Dr. Richard, which he has interpolated, "read into the Confession." From the Word of God, by which we are bound to get the sense of the Confession, it appears that hearing and meditating on the Word of God is a spiritual activity (Luke 11, 28; John 6, 45; 8, 37, etc.), which is excluded from the human will in its natural state by the second clause of the 18th Article, enforced anon of this spiritual work in the German text of the Confession by the passage 2 Cor. 2, 14: "The natural man perceiveth" (= heareth, meditateth, understandeth) "not the things of the Spirit of God" (*i. e.*, the Gospel). Dr. Richard's argument for the prevalence of his old Lutheran doctrine that man has free-will in spiritual things, falls flat, in so far as his "explicit statement" of the same in the first confession is missing.

We now proceed to his second so-called "implied statement of the Confession" of his doctrine of free-will, which he finds in the second clause of the 18th Article, interpreted, of

course, through private writings thus: "That by such grace, assistance, and operation he (natural man) *can do* these things that are required of him in his relation to God. The *underlying* idea is that grace imparts strength and power to the will, and this it does by illumining the understanding and by impact as of personality upon personality." (Of this last we have no cognizance. We only know that the Holy Ghost operated upon us by the Word. If Dr. Richard's personality has been worked upon by "impact of the Holy Spirit's personality" we will not dispute it at present as out of our way. But perhaps this Zwinglian leaven causes his befuddling in the matter at issue.) This "implied statement" he has also fortified by a quotation from *De Anima* (C. R. 13, 162; we cannot verify it, but assume it to be correctly given), in which Melancthon affirms that the Holy Spirit does not create a new faculty of will, but operates upon the same faculty which man has in natural matters under the bondage of Satan, renewing it for use in spiritual things. We have no quarrel with Melancthon on this point, but we add that such renewing operation is called in Scripture a creation (Ps. 51, 11: "Create in me a clean heart") and the renewed heart a *new heart* (Jer.) a new man, a new creature.

According to Dr. Richard, this means "that the human will is *stimulated* and *energized* by the Holy Spirit and *made competent* for action" and considers it "the *plain* and common-sense meaning of the Confession" though it is only "the implied statement" as he had said a few lines ahead. As an authority he affirms: "As such it must be regarded." And yet, certain he is only "that the absolute passivity of the will is neither expressed nor implied in the 18th Article." Under these circumstances we may join issue with his authority.

Now a plain reader, who is not well versed in reading between the lines nor has the spectacles of private writings on hand, will get the following sense out of the words of the 18th Article: Man has *some*—not all—free-will to conduct his outward life according to what he understands by his reason; but (an opposing and excluding conjunction in all kinds of

grammar) he is *not able* (opposed by "but" to free-will in matters of reason, it can but mean: has no free will or ability) to become pleasing, fearing, and believing God heartily, or to cast out of his heart (the special seat of the evil will: Matt. 15, 9) the inborn evil concupiscence (the will to do evil), save by the grace, assistance, and operation of the Holy Spirit, who works through the Word (not through any "impact of personality upon personality"). If this sense is not founded on the words of the Confession, we have no means to know what words say. Worldly men, like Talleyrand, may use words to conceal their thoughts, but we do not expect it from confessors of Christian Truth. We run on this horn of the dilemma proposed by Dr. Richard without a shiver. The composers of the Confession may be, for what we do not know, the worst knaves and rogues, but here they were the greatest saints: confessors of God's Truth. (Cf. for a scriptural example Peter, Matt. 16, 16—23.) All of Dr. Richard's erudition *cannot change the words* and to the *words* of the Confession we cling, even to those which have, with him, such a Pickwickian meaning. We ask Dr. Richard: Do we find the words: Man "*can do* these things" in the Augsburg Confession? Do the words: The will is "stimulated," "energized," "made competent for action," occur in the 18th Article, or are they synonyms for any words used therein? As a reasonable man he will answer: No, they are "the underlying idea."

Now we hold that there are, for some truths expressed, underlying ideas, *i. e.*, other truths. They lie at the bottom of the superstructure. They are the causes, or reasons, including the smaller truth, but never opposed to the expression of the same. The 18th Article expresses with so many words the truth: Man is not able to do spiritual works. Can this be grounded on Dr. Richard's "underlying idea": Man *can do* these spiritual works? Not by any means. The cause cannot be the opposite of the effect, as Dr. Richard's underlying idea is to the 18th Article. It is extracted from the antonyms of the expressions of the truth and put beside the truth nullify-

ing it. We will give the underlying idea of the words of the Confession in the last clause of the 18th Article, the same of which Dr. Richard has given them. The Holy Spirit through the Word "*is given*" (concipitur = received), because natural man has Him not nor His Word and activities, "assists," because man is unable to do what he ought, and "operates on man's will," because it is bound, yea, dead in trespasses and sins, without power to operate. The underlying idea of the truth expressed by the 18th Article, that man is not able to do spiritual works is given by the 2d Article of the Confession: "Of Original Sin: Further they teach that after the fall of Adam all men naturally born are conceived and born in sin, that is, that they all from their mother's womb are *full* of concupiscence and evil propensities and have not by nature true fear of God nor true faith in God." The 18th Article cannot but confess the truth arising out of this general truth in regard to the will of man in conversion. Standing on the bed-rock of the Scriptural truth confessed in the 2d Article, it gives a clear note: Because man's will is unable, the Holy Spirit does all. It gives no explanation, because Scripture supplies none.

We have to say a few words on how Dr. Richard gets at his "underlying idea," that the human will cooperates in spiritual works. He sublimates it by a mysterious psychology from the words "assists" and "assistance (Hilfe = auxilium)." According to Dr. Richard (*Luth. Quarterly*, Jan., 1904) we have not advanced to this newly invented psychology. Therefore we want to look at it closely and set it down for our inspection. "The activity of the will under such divine operation is clearly implied, otherwise there would be no meaning in the word 'assistance,' and conversion would be *per modum coercionis* (compulsory). . . . The will must decide. . . . Otherwise, conversion is left without ethical content, and the abiding in sin is without responsibility. . . . Its own conduct (Verhalten) now determines its destiny." Let us see: If the Doctor "assists" some wayfaring Willy by an alms, the beggar has acted, assisted, or helped the Doctor, because the beggar *decided*

to take or lay hold on (*concupitur*) the bounty. The Doctor's "assistance" could be no alone activity of his and absolute passivity of the tramp, but implied the activity of the tramp, otherwise there would be no meaning in the word "assistance," and the reception of the gift would be compulsory. Therefore the tramp "assisted" in the assistance. They "assisted" each other. It was the Doctor-ward and tramp-ward side of the Doctor's "assistance," according to a later dictum of Dr. Richard. Thus we have set the psychology of assistance before our mind. But as the worst tramp would decline such psychological honors, our will declines such honor from Dr. Richard in conversion. We need a conversion by the Holy Spirit in His way of assistance, which we show in the following manner: If I assist a man found lying on the road with a broken leg and bring him to a surgeon, *I* do the assisting alone. It is my activity. If he says: "I will assist you by *deciding to allow* you to help me," I will call him impudent or consider him mad from pain, yet try to help him, but *let him alone if he resists*. My underlying idea (and I should insist that it be his also) is, when I help or assist him, *that he cannot help himself*. In my act of assisting he can do nothing. He may have all his will, but it is unavailing, powerless. My assistance is my "alone activity" and his assistance "absolute passivity." *My* good will only comes into consideration, his will not in the least. According to Dr. Richard's logic his will is of the highest importance in my saving him. His salvation would be without ethical content. But we must insist that the ethical content lies wholly on my side, and he gets the benefit. This is all he needs, and it would be no compulsion either. Wholly aside from my assistance it is when the fallen and helpless man rejects my proffered aid. In *his rejection* his will enters even to preventing my assistance, and he must bear all responsibility. The consequences rest on him alone. By applying this to the conversion of man, it will be seen that alone activity and absolute passivity is "the underlying idea" of the word "assist," used in the 18th Article of the Confession enforced in front by the grace and in the rear by

the operation of the Holy Spirit both in the acts of conversion (getting faith) and sanctification. This doctrine is in the Augsburg Confession, therefore the old Lutheran doctrine. If Dr. Richard cannot see it, we must beg him to revise his psychological conception and to rely on the words instead of hunting for some cabalistic meaning in accordance with private writings. Until then we call his "ethical content" of conversion "the pride of mortal, that rushes in where angels fear to tread."

We must as yet look into the historical facts for the maintenance of Dr. Richard's contention that free-will *in rebus divinis* is in the Augsburg Confession and therefore the old Lutheran doctrine, though we confess only to a smattering of historical knowledge and have no means of verifying our data. This argument is based on the same psychology noted above. It is to be "in," because it prevailed; and because some very different bedfellows held it, therefore it prevailed. We condense it: The Romanists found no fault with the 18th Article, and the Protestant confessors did not object to their doing so, therefore the Protestants understood it in the sense of the Romanists. It must thus contain free-will in spiritual matters, because Romanists cling strenuously to it. Dr. Richard has proved all, immensely more than he needs to do. Aristotle was childish when he ruled: "Probatur magis, probatur nihil."

Now for the single historical facts of Dr. Richard. "In both cases (in the two confutations of the Augsburg Confession, the first and that of August 3) they (the Roman confutators) state how they understand the article *De Libero Arbitrio*, that is, essentially as Melancthon had explained in his private writings of 1527—'30." But if they say so, he has failed to quote their correct sayings. He cites from the first Confutation only the words: "Sana et catholica est haec assertio principuum," and he adds: "and warn against the determinism expressed in Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio* and the first edition of Melancthon's *Loci*. Have they really had in mind only the editio prima? We would like Dr. Richard to be explicit, if they did so. But the confutators do say nothing "that they

understood the article as Melancthon had explained free-will." We at least are thoroughly at sea as to that from their quoted words. Much less than that, the confutators of August 3d express: "Quae confessio acceptatur et approbatur." Thus the giant's assertion sweeps far wider than his cited quotation. It is for the *largest* part unproved. If the component integral part of the whole is unproved, the whole is unproved. But what *seems* to be proved, according to the giant's quotation, is, that if we must accept the confutators as sincere and understanding what they say, the 18th Article of the Confession is thoroughly Roman, that is: "that the moral nature of man through the Fall is *somewhat weakened*, yet man has as yet the freedom of will for choice between good and evil. He has strength to withstand evil concupiscence, to do the good, and to cooperate to his conversion." (Rohnert's Dogmatik, p. 218.) If this is true, Luther might have spared his trouble at reforming the Church, and the confessors the trouble to confess.

Now comes the witness of the confessors to such interpretation. The Lutheran parties of the Committee of Reconciliation (two princes, two jurists, three theologians) "reported: In the 16th, 17th, 18th, and 19th articles there is no difference." Melancthon "made no mention of the 18th Article of the Confession in the first draft of the Apology." "Moreover, the Confession (Art. 21) *boasts*"—we find no boasting in it—"that there is nothing in it (the Confession, not the 18th Article) which is discrepant with the Scriptures, or with the Catholic Church, or with the Roman Church, in so far as is known from writers." This Dr. Richard, like a true sophist, applies only to the 18th Article, while the Confession applies it to its whole contents. If it makes the 18th Article to be understood in the Roman sense, then the whole Confession is to be understood in the Roman sense, *quod absurdum est*. This is truly sweeping. Dr. Richard again has proved it all. We all, including Dr. Richard, are Roman papists, 1) in regard to the 16th, 17th, 18th, and 19th articles; 2) in regard to the whole Augsburg Confession. Dr. Richard will have to resort and

subscribe to the Form of Concord if he wants to remain a Protestant.

But we have compassion for him and will help him to remain a Protestant and Lutheran by simply clinging to the Augsburg Confession. For the first we give him a *correct view of the whole Confession*, including Article 18, by translating from the German text the "boast" of the Church for her Confession in the 2d Article: "For inasmuch the same (Confession) be clearly founded on Holy Scripture and, furthermore, is not discrepant nor contrary to the Catholic Christian, yea, even the Roman Church, as can be learned from the writings of the Fathers, we hold that our opponents cannot be dissenting from us in the articles shown above." We think that the Latin text, which Dr. Richard has translated, does not teach anything else. From the history of the Augsburg Confession we remember that the princes at the Diet (June 25, 1530) said of the Latin copy that it "was put together in haste and bad to read," when Emperor Charles V insisted on its reading. We further remember that the confessors had to put in "differences" according to the imperial convocation of the Diet at Augsburg. Therefore the contention of the confessors cited above means that *they were* the true Catholic Church, and their opponents, where they disagreed, not in accord with the Church. They were true confessors who were neither "insincere," did not "equivocate," did not "hide their convictions," did not "mutilate and obscure their faith," but "did heroically witness and faithfully defend it, as far as this argument is concerned." On that horn of the proposed dilemma we stake ourselves.

As regards the 18th Article, for which the Committee reported agreement, because the Romanists did not object, Melancthon *made* mention of it as soon as the Apology was to go into publicity, while it was unnecessary at the time when it was to be delivered to the Emperor. Should the confessors anger the Emperor yet more by objecting to him what his confutators had pleased to find correct? But Melancthon stated

the difference completely to his co-confessors, when publishing the Apology, because Emperor Charles had refused it.

We translate a few sentences from the Apology to show how Melanchthon and the Church understood their confession and pointed out the differences. "Our opponents accept the 18th Article of free-will, though they quote a few sentences from Scripture which do (in the opinion of the opponents) not agree with it. They also make a great clamor (noise) thereof, that free-will should not be exalted as Pelagians do, and should not take therefrom too much with the Manicheans. That they may well say! For what difference is there between the Pelagians and our opponents, if they both teach that men can love God, keep the commandments *quoad substantiam actuum* (in so far as the substance of the acts is concerned), that is, do good works without the Holy Spirit by means of their natural reason to merit the grace of God? What numerous errors follow from this Pelagian teaching which they so strongly drive and preach in their schools! . . . We ALSO say that man's will has *some freedom*. For in things which may be comprehended by reason (*quas ratio per se comprehendit*) we have a free-will. There is in us, *in small measure*, a power of choice to lead outwardly an honorable life, to speak of God, to show outward worship or holy manners, to obey the government and parents, not to steal and murder. . . . This the Holy Scripture calls the *righteousnes of the Law or of the flesh* . . . though the inherited evil concupiscence is so powerful that men follow the same oftener than their reason. And the devil, who according to Paul works powerfully in the godless, provokes and entices the poor, weak nature to all sins. . . . But such hearts as are without the Holy Spirit are without fear of God, faith, and trust, believe not that God forgives sins and hears prayers. Therefore they are godless. . . . But *free-will and reason are powerless* (unable) to have true faith," etc.

We shield "Melanchthon's memory from falsehood, treason, and hypocrisy" by showing that he knew the difference between his co-confessors and the confutators, and confessed it

when he had to do it. Melancthon also distinctly states of the 9th and 10th articles, *without pointing out the difference* between the Roman and the Protestant interpretation, that the confutators did not object to them, and the 9th Article is mentioned by the confutators themselves as correct. Did he and his co-confessors for that reason endorse the Roman doctrines of the *opus operatum*, transubstantiation, etc.? We will remind Dr. Richard only of the York and Canton resolution of the General Synod of which he has been a stout defender (as far as we know).

Now in regard to the "Lutheran seven" members of the Committee of Reconciliation, August 18, 1530. Did "they equivocate, hide their convictions, mutilate and obscure their faith"? We say they *did* faithfully witness and heroically defend their faith, not only when they subscribed the Confession, but also when their opponents were in ascendancy. They defended it in Committee from Scripture, Church (even Roman) authorities, etc., so strongly, that the Romanists had to *let it pass*, because they could bring no true reason against it, for which the Apology is witness, declaring that they had made a great noise against it. They had to let it, like some other articles, pass and report agreement, and the confessors, we hold, were *not obliged to oppose them in that*. They were *glad to have carried that point*, which the Roman church most strongly defends, in which she has her being. Is this not a by far nobler vindication of their sincerity, conviction, and faithfulness than Dr. Richard's, that they interpreted it and wanted it interpreted by their opponents in the Roman sense by *not injecting* the "lapis — truncus — mere passive — subjectum patiens — subjectum convertendum theory of free-will," which was wholly unnecessary? On account of the lying Romanist endorsement the Augsburg Confession need *not* contain free-will.

Thus we have unbuttoned the historical argument, and we may take our dear Augsburg Confession and recommend it to all followers of the Lord as a sacred inheritance and faithful witness for the truth of God that *man has no free-will in divine*

matters and for spiritual works without having received the Holy Spirit through the Word. But when men like Dr. Richard put it on as a subterfuge for saying that yet something of it is left, *we must be permitted to use much stronger language:* "Longe fuge: fenum habet in cornu!"

Carroll, Nebr.

FR. SCHWARZ.
