





THE SECOND

# General Conference of Lutherans

*In America*

HELD IN

*Philadelphia, April 1-3, 1902*

PROCEEDINGS, ESSAYS AND DEBATES.



NEWBERRY, S. C.  
LUTHERAN PUBLICATION BOARD,  
ELBERT H. AULL, Superintendent.  
1904.

THE LIBRARY OF  
THE MARY J. DREXEL HOME  
and  
PHILADELPHIA LUTHER HOUSE  
of  
DEACONESSES



## Preface.

---

The beginning of the Twentieth Century finds the General Synod, General Council and United Synod of the South engaged in an earnest effort to reach a common understanding, and to acknowledge the importance of each others' mission and work. In such effort, a most important agent has been the holding of public Conferences for the discussion of doctrinal and practical questions, that have brought together representatives of these once united, but now, for a generation, separated organizations of Lutherans. They were held first unofficially, through arrangements made by the late Rev. Dr. J. G. Morris of the General Synod, and the Rev. Dr. J. A. Seiss of the General Council, and have passed into history, as the Lutheran Diets of 1877 and 1878. After an interval of over twenty years, they were reintroduced by official provision made by these Bodies, and with the name of General Conference. Each of the organizations appointed a member of the Committee of Arrangements, and also a Finance Committee of laymen to secure funds needed to bring together representatives from a distance and provide for other expenses. In December, 1899, the first of these Conferences was held in Philadelphia. Its proceedings and essays were published in a volume, early in 1900. At their succeeding conventions, the three Bodies named resolved upon another Conference, and named the necessary committees.

Upon such authority, the Second General Conference was called at the same place for three days in the week succeeding Easter, 1902. The Committee of Arrangements being re-

responsible to the Bodies that appointed them, made all rules, decided all questions, appointed the secretaries, and presided at the sessions. The aim of this committee was to secure a fair presentation of the life and spirit, the doctrine and work in each of the Bodies. There was no effort either to seek for differences or to conceal them. The question of their ultimate removal was assumed to be outside of the sphere of the Conference.

Fully conscious of their limitations, the committee was content to proceed slowly, and feel the way as they advanced. Succeeding Conferences can doubtless make very material improvements. A still greater range of Lutheran Synods may hereafter participate. A smaller number of essayists may afford opportunity for ampler discussions. Or several sections might be held cotemporaneously, if the aim would be to increase representation. The suggestion has also been made that laymen be included on future programs. While these and other possibilities should be kept in mind, we are grateful that the Divine Hand has led us so successfully, through the difficulties that withstood us. The results gained are permanent and far-reaching.

For the Committee of Arrangements,

HENRY E JACOBS,

*Chairman.*

Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa., April 10th, 1902.

## Table of Contents.

---

Official Action and Preliminary Statement, . . . . .	1
Opening Service . . . . .	5
Sermon by the Rev. M. W. Hamma, D. D., . . . . .	5
Proceedings of the Conference. . . . .	17
Essays and Remarks, . . . . .	25
“Opening Address,” by the Rev. Prof. H. E. Jacobs, D. D., LL. D., . . . . .	25
“Justification by Faith,” by the Rev. L. G. M. Miller, D. D., . . . . .	32
“The Doctrine of Justification in its Relations,” by the Rev. Prof. J. W. Richard, D. D., . . . . .	42
Remarks by the Rev. J. A. Seiss, D. D., LL. D., L. H. D., . . . . .	77
Remarks by the Rev. Prof. G. F. Spieker, D. D., . . . . .	79
“The Relation of Young Peoples’ Societies to the Con- gregation,” by the Rev. C. Armand Miller, . . . . .	79
Remarks by the Rev. C. L. Fry, . . . . .	87
Remarks by the Rev. J. C. Kunzman, D. D., . . . . .	88
“The Place of the Holy Spirit in Lutheran Theology.” by the Rev. Prof. J. C. Moser, D. D., . . . . .	90
Remarks by the Rev. Prof. H. E. Jacobs, D. D. LL. D.	98

Remarks by the Rev. Prof. J. W. Richard, D. D. . . . .	99
• "The Lutheran Doctrine of the Sacraments," by the Rev. L. E. Busby, D. D., . . . . .	100
Remarks by the Rev. Prof. J. W. Richard, D. D., . . . . .	112
Remarks by the Rev. H. C. Holloway, D. D., . . . . .	114
Remarks by the Rev. E. F. Kever . . . . .	116
Remarks by the Rev. E. D. Weigle, D. D., . . . . .	116
• "Christian Liberty and its Limitations," by the Rev. S. A. Repass, D. D., . . . . .	121
Remarks by the Rev. Prof. J. Fry, D. D., . . . . .	130
Remarks by the Rev. S. A. Repass, D. D., . . . . .	130
• "The Historical Deaconess' Work and American Condi- Remarks by the Rev. D. L. Mackenzie . . . . .	117
Remarks by the Rev. Prof. H. E. Jacobs, D. D., LL. D., tions, by the Rev. G. C. Berkemeier, D. D., . . . . .	117 131
Remarks by the Rev. Prof. A. Spaeth, D. D., LL. D., . . .	141
Remarks by the Rev. F. P. Manhart, D. D., . . . . .	143
• "The Movement from Romanism to Lutheranism in Austria", by the Rev. C. Goedel, . . . . .	143
• "A Native Ministry for Congregations in Foreign Fields", by the Rev. J. H. Harpster, D. D., . . . . .	149
Remarks by the Rev. W. L. Seabrook, . . . . .	159
• "Women as Helpers in the Practical Work of the Church", by the Rev. J. P. Krechting, D. D., . . . . .	160
• "Our Home Mission Fields" "East" by the Rev. W. F. Bacher, . . . . .	168
"West" by the Rev. Prof. J. M. Ruthrauff D. D., . . . . .	176



"South" by the Rev. W. L. Seabrook, . . . . .	182
• "The Spiritual Priesthood of Believers," by the Rev. J. A. Hall, D. D., . . . . .	190
Remarks by the Rev. Prof. H. E. Jacobs, D. D., LL. D.,	201
Remarks by the Rev. Prof. D. H. Bauslin, D. D., . . . . .	201
• "Are Our Present Methods of Sunday School Work Adequate?" First Essay by the Rev. D. H. Geis- singer, D. D., . . . . .	202
Second Essay by the Rev. Prof. J. A. Sing- master, D. D., . . . . .	211
Remarks by the Rev. C. S. Albert, D. D., . . . . .	220
• "The attitude of the Lutheran Church to Current Dis- cussions Concerning the Holy Scripture," by the Rev. F. H. Knubel, . . . . .	222
Remarks by the Rev. T. E. Schmauk, D. D., . . . . .	230
" by the Rev. Prof. G. F. Spieker, D. D., . . . . .	231
" by the Rev. E. T. Horn, D. D., . . . . .	231
" by the Rev. C. S. Albert, D. D., . . . . .	232
" by the Rev. F. H. Knubel, . . . . .	233
• "Problems in Church Polity," by the Rev. Prof. J. Fry, D. D., . . . . .	234
Remarks by the Rev. Prof. J. M. Ruthrauff, D. D., . . . . .	245
" by the Rev. A. Aaron, . . . . .	246
" by the Rev. Prof. D. H. Bauslin, D. D., . . . . .	247
" by the Rev. J. C. Kunzman, D. D., . . . . .	248
" by the Rev. Prof. H. E. Jacobs, D. D., LL. D.	250
• "The Defamers of Luther" by the Rev. J. J. Young, D. D., . . . . .	252

Remarks by the Rev. Prof. A. Spaeth, D. D., LL. D.....	265
Remarks on the Conference and its Work. . . . .	269
"    by the Rev. L. E. Albert, D. D.....	269
"    by the Rev. H. C. Holloway, D. D.....	269
"    by the Rev. A. Aaron.....	270
"    by the Rev. Prof. D. H. Bauslin, D. D.....	271
"    by the Rev. J. H. Harpster, D. D.....	271
"    by the Rev. S. D. Daugherty.....	272
Register.....	274
Index.....	282

# The Second General Conference of Lutherans.

---

## OFFICIAL ACTION

AND

## PRELIMINARY STATEMENT.

---

The First General Conference of Lutherans held in Philadelphia, Pa., December 27-29, 1898, proved such a success that at the conclusion of the program there presented, the following action was taken:

"Resolved, That we, as a Convention, make known to the three General Bodies, by whose authority this Convention was called, the desirability of holding another Convention of a similar character in the future."

In response to this action the bodies interested appointed each a representative to make necessary arrangements for a Second Conference. Following is the official statement of the action of these representatives:

Washington, D. C., November 13, 1901.

The Joint Committee, having in charge the calling and arrangements of a Second General Conference of Lutherans, met November 13, 1901, in Washington, D. C.

There were present the Rev. Henry E. Jacobs, D. D., LL. D., of Philadelphia, Pa., on behalf of the General Council, the Rev. L. L. Smith of Strasburg, Va., the representative of the United Synod of the South, and the Rev. M. W. Hamma, D. D., the delegate of the General Synod, the full committee being present.

Dr. Jacobs was made president, and Dr. Hamma secretary of the committee. It was resolved to hold a General Conference, similar

to the one convened December 27-29, 1898, in Philadelphia, Pa., and subject in the main to the same rules, with the addition to Rule 2, inserted after "Conference," said committee shall make all rules.

The time selected was the week after Easter, 1902, beginning Tuesday, April 1st, at 10:30 a. m., and continuing three days.

Philadelphia, Pa., was again chosen as the most suitable place for the meeting; the sessions to be divided between two representative churches of the General Council and the Genral Synod, respectively.

The Rev. M. W. Hamma, D. D., was appointed to deliver the opening sermon, at 10:30 a. m., Tuesday, and the Rev. H. E. Jacobs, D. D., LL. D., the president of the committee, to open the business sessions with an address, Tuesday at 2 p. m.

The Secretary is to notify the essayists, and in case of declination, the representative of the body on the committee, to which the party declining belongs, shall fill the vacancy or vacancies.

The necessary funds to pay traveling expenses, and entertainment, if possible, of officers and persons on the programme, to be secured by the committees of laymen already appointed. Four hundred dollars are to be raised and are apportioned as follows:

General Council . . . . .	\$162.50
General Synod . . . . .	162.50
United Synod, South . . . . .	75.00

Tuesday evening, April 1, to be devoted to the subject of Sunday Schools, and Wednesday evening, April 2, to Home Missions.

Sessions will open and close as follows: 9 a. m.; 12m.; resume at 2 p. m., and adjourn at 5:30.

Reverends Wm. M. Baum, Jr., Andrew S. Fichthorn, and A. D. R. Hancher, were elected secretaries of the Conference.

Adjourned at call of president.

M. W. HAMMA, Sec. Com.

NOTE—The action of the committee, devoting Tuesday evening to the consideration of the subject of Sunday Schools was subsequently changed, a reception to the members of the Conference by the Lutheran Social Union of Philadelphia, at the New Century Drawing Room, Twelfth street below Chestnut, being substituted.

Following is the official program as it was carried out by the Conference.

#### PROGRAM.

Tuesday Morning, April 1, 1902, St. John's Church. 10:30, Divine service, with a sermon by M. W. Hamma, D. D., Washington, D. C., conducted by Rev. L. L. Smith, Strasburg, Va.

Tuesday Afternoon, St. John's Church. 2:00, Organization of

Conference: Secretaries, the Revs. Wm. M. Baum, Jr., Canajoharie, N. Y., Andrew S. Fichthorn, Norristown, Pa., and A. D. R. Hancher, Staunton, Va. Opening address by Chairman of Committee. Prof. Henry E. Jacobs, D. D., LL. D., Philadelphia Pa., presiding. 2:30, "Justification by Faith" L. G. M. Miller, D. D., Roanoke, Va. 3:00, "The Doctrine of Justification in its Relations," Prof. J. W. Richard, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa. 3:30. Discussion. 4:00, "The Relation of Young Peoples' Societies to the Congregation," Rev. C. Armand Miller, New York. 4:30, Discussion.

Tuesday Evening, 7:45, Reception to the members of the Conference by The Lutheran Social Union of Philadelphia, Pa., at the New Century Drawing Room, Twelfth Street below Chestnut.

Wednesday Morning, April 2, St. John's Church. 9:30, M. W. Hamma, D. D., presiding. Devotional Exercises. "The Place of the Holy Spirit in Lutheran Theology," Jason C. Moser, D. D., Hickory, N. C. 9:30, Discussion. 10:00, "The Lutheran Doctrine of the Sacraments," L. E. Busby, D. D., Salisbury, N. C. 10:30, Discussion. 11:00, "Christian Liberty and its Limitations," S. A. Reppass, D. D., Allentown, Pa. 11:30, Discussion.

Wednesday Afternoon, St. Matthew's Church, 2:00, M. W. Hamma, D. D., presiding. "The Historical Deaconess' Work and American Conditions," G. C. Berkemeier, D. D., Mt. Vernon, N. Y. 2:30. Discussion. 3:00, "The Movement from Romanism to Lutheranism in Austria," Rev. C. Goedel, Philadelphia, Pa. 3:30, Discussion. 3:50, "A Native Ministry for Congregations in Foreign Fields," J. H. Harpster, D. D., Guntur, India. 4:20, Discussion. 4:40, "Women as Helpers in the Practical Work of the Church," J. P. Krechting, D. D., New Germantown, N. J. 5:10, Discussion.

Wednesday Evening, St. Matthew's Church. M. W. Hamma, D. D., presiding. Opening services. 8:00, "Our Home Mission Fields: East, Rev. Wm. F. Bacher, Rondout, N. Y.; West, Prof. J. M. Ruthrauff, D. D., Springfield, Ohio; South, Rev. W. L. Seabrook, Newberry, S. C.

Thursday Morning, April 3, St. Matthew's Church. Rev. L. L. Smith, presiding. Devotional services. 9:00, "The Spiritual Priesthood of Believers," John A. Hall, D. D., Canton, Ohio. 9:30, Discussion. 9:45, "Are Our Present Methods of Sunday School Work Adequate?" David H. Geissinger, D. D., Pittsburg, Pa., J. A. Singmaster, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa. 10:25, Discussion. 10:55, "The Attitude of the Lutheran Church to Current Discussions Concerning the Holy Scripture," Rev. F. H. Knubel, New York. 11:25, Discussion.

Thursday Afternoon, St. Matthew's Church. Rev. L. L. Smith, presiding. 2:00, "Problems of Church Polity," Prof. Jacob Fry, D. D., Philadelphia, Pa., 2:30, Discussion. 3:00, "The Defamers of

Luther," J. J. Young, D. D., New York. 3:30. Discussion. 4:00. Open Hour.

The following rules were announced as governing the Conference:

1. All members of the three General Bodies that have authorized the calling of the Conference to have the privilege of participating in its proceedings.

2. The committee of arrangements, being responsible to the General Bodies that appointed them for the conduct of the Conference, said committee shall make all rules, will decide all questions that may arise, and will preside over the proceedings.

3. All essayists shall be limited to thirty minutes, and this rule shall be strictly enforced.

4. { No speech in the discussion shall exceed ten minutes; nor shall any speaker be recognized a second time in the discussion of any one topic while the privilege of the floor is claimed by others who have not spoken. The essayist shall, in all cases, have the privilege of closing the discussion on his own paper.

5. No vote to be taken on any of the topics under discussion, and all propositions and motions made in Conference shall be submitted to the committee, which, at its discretion, may refer them to the Conference for decision.

6. All papers read to be at the disposal of the committee for publication.

The Finance Committee, appointed by the bodies arranging for the Conference to secure the funds necessary to cover expenses are as follows:

**General Council:** Messrs. William Hengerer, Buffalo, N. Y., chairman; W. H. Stake, Philadelphia, Pa., treasurer; Oliver Williams, Catasaqua, Pa.; Charles Schimmelfeng, Warren, Pa.

**General Synod:** Messrs. C. F. Stifel, Allegheny, Pa.; J. G. C. Taddiken, New York, N. Y.; Isaac Harter, Canton, O.; J. L. Zimmerman, Springfield, O.; G. W. Deppen, Sunbury, Pa.

**United Synod of the South:** Revs. L. L. Smith, Strasburg, Va.; C. P. Boozer, Etheridge, S. C.; J. L. Deaton, Dallas, N. C.; C. B. Miller, China Grove, N. C.; M. J. Epting, Savannah, Ga.; F. M. Harr, Caney Branch, Tenn.

# The Opening Service.

---

The Second General Conference of Lutherans, representing the General Synod, the General Council and the United Synod of the South, was opened in St. John's Church, Race Street below Sixth Street, Philadelphia, Pa., Rev. E. E. Sibole, D. D., pastor, on Tuesday April 1, 1902, at 10:30 A. M., with divine service. The liturgical service was conducted by the Rev. L. L. Smith of Strasburg, Va. The sermon was preached by the Rev. M. W. Hamma, D. D., of Washington, D. C., from the text, Esther 4:14, "Who knoweth whether Thou art come to the Kingdom for such a time as this?"

Following is the sermon:

## THE MISSION OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH TO THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.

*The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all.*

*Fathers, Brethren and Friends*—In my endeavor to fulfill the duty assigned me for this hour, I present the following Scripture for our consideration:

Esther 4:14—"And who knoweth whether thou art come to the Kingdom for such a time as this?"

The text is related to one of the most striking and familiar events in Old Testament history. It recalls Babylon and the Captivity, the bitter sorrows of the exiled Israelites, the tragic conspiracies aimed at their destruction, the divine interposition to deliver them through the instrumentality of Esther; it reveals how the Almighty in his beneficent purposes takes up widely separated and often contradictory influences and makes them subservient to a common end, and how through long courses of Providence He prepares the agencies with which to

meet the crises that from time to time confront His cause, so that the help and the deliverance are at hand when the time, the day, the hour, the minute strikes—"Come to the Kingdom for such a time."

It is not my purpose to deal with the text in its historical relations, but rather to take it out of its ancient, oriental setting, and place it in the new environment of today, at the opening of the Twentieth Century and address it to the Lutheran Church of this country.

The divine writers, in order to express the absolute certainty of the truth of a statement sometimes put it into the form of a question.

Therefore, we may be allowed to read this passage as a positive declaration: "Thou art come to the Kingdom for such a time as this."

*The mission of the Lutheran Church to the Twentieth Century is the theme of this discourse and the engaging consideration of the hour.*

We are here in such a time as this providentially, to perform a special service in the Kingdom of God. The circumstances which gave birth to our church and the work to which she was originally called, peculiarly fit her to deal with the problems of the present day.

True, we are not again confronting the evils of the Dark Ages, as in the time of the Reformation, for the power of the old superstitions has been broken, intellectual and religious bondage have been largely abolished, knowledge has been spread abroad, the Gospel is free to every one, and the blessings of a Protestant civilization have advanced mankind in all its best interests to a marvelous extent. It is but just, however; to say that some of the difficulties confronting us today on religious lines are such as are incident to Protestantism itself.

As man's free moral agency necessarily carries with it the power to sin, so the beneficent principles of Protestantism, from the nature of the case, are susceptible of serious abuse. That glorious religious liberty, purchased by Luther and the Reformers, has suffered much of misinterpretation. In its name, the swollen conceit of self-opinions has opened its mouth and taught folly; intellectual pride has arrayed itself against re-



vealed truth; skepticism, heterodoxy, and many forms of unbelief have put forth their spurious teachings and claimed for them the liberality and the broadness of Protestantism. Through the great open door of private judgment, which Protestant teaching sets before all men, have also come a flood of heresies and infidelities, as well as the great ocean tide of evangelical truth.

While this new world stands as one of the most conspicuous examples of the beneficent results of Protestant religion, it is at the same time a most striking illustration of the evils that may come from the abuse of the same benign principles. It is in these latter manifestations that we find some serious perils to both Church and State.

The degeneration of the Church, as Luther found it, was the result of the dark ages preceding, while some religious perceptions of today come rather from the excessive light of Protestantism.

Men have gazed into the face of the sun defiantly and turned away smitten with blindness; they have stood wantonly in his light until brain reeled and fell from its throne. So have many in our land abused the exceeding light and liberty of Protestant Christianity, to their own hurt, and to the misleading and spiritual overthrow of many of their fellows.

So it comes to pass that there is need for much reforming in faith and life in this Protestant country. Now, it is not by a chance combination of circumstances that the Lutheran denomination has in late years made such rapid progress in America. There must be some special significance in the Providence that has raised her from a position of comparative obscurity to a leading place among the denominations of the United States in so brief a space of time. It must be noted also as a matter of no small moment, that with this extraordinary growth has come a constantly wider and deeper apprehension, among ministers and people alike, of the value of the doctrines and usages of Historic Lutheranism.

This has led to such a general reassertion of, and strong adhesion to, our confessional positions as to beget a spirit of love and loyalty to our own church scarcely known before. The significant Providence is that we are here today as one of the

THE LIBRARY OF  
THE MARY J. DREXEL HOME  
and  
PHILADELPHIA MOTHER HOUSE  
of  
DEACONESSES

controlling Christian powers of the Nation equipped with the same transforming divine forces that regenerated the Church of Christ in the Sixteenth Century and have changed the face of the world. What can all this mean, but that the call of God is upon us, and if we but heed, we may hear his voice ringing down to us in the living, thrilling present: "Thou art come to the Kingdom for such a time as this."

This general statement has but opened the door to our subject, and it remains now to designate and consider some specific features of our mission to the Twentieth Century.

It is to be noted that the *First element of the mission of the Lutheran Church to the time and country in which we live is the necessity to contend with renewed earnestness for the absolute supremacy of the sacred Scriptures.*

At the beginning of the Sixteenth Century, Ecclesiasticism held well nigh undisputed sway. The Bible had practically disappeared as the Divine authority. The first appeal of Luther was to the Word of God as over against hierarchical usurpation, and his insistence upon making the Scriptures again the only rule of faith and practice, brought on the crisis of Reformation. It was this distinct issue of the Divine authority against the human that rendered the one appealing monk mightier than all his hosts of foes, and won the battle and established the Protestant cause under the supremacy of the restored Word of God.

In this particular age, true, no special efforts have been made to deprive the people of the Bible itself, for that were impossible in view of the constantly enlarging facilities for its circulation, but a different method, however, is pursued, aiming at somewhat the same end. The sacred Book is put under such treatment, in many quarters, as in effect to destroy reverence for it as a fully inspired volume. Its various parts are subjected to unfair methods of criticism, in order to shake confidence in their Divine authenticity. It is more than hinted, that the old Book is out of date, and no longer fully adapted to man's needs, while not a few, who have neither the knowledge nor disposition to investigate for themselves, echo these statements, more than willing that faith in the only Revelation of God to

man may be destroyed, if for no other reason than to free themselves from its moral restraints. While these claims and declarations have been proven as unjustifiable, they nevertheless, have done no little harm to the cause of Religion.

It cannot be disguised that the Church herself, in many quarters, has more or less yielded to these influences. They have been called liberalizing tendencies in order to guise their real nature. Many are talking vaguely and doubtfully about the Bible, hardly daring to declare all they secretly mean, lest they openly reveal their disbelief of Divine inspiration. They are attempting to unduly exalt Science and Reason, scarcely hesitating to declare that the teaching of Scripture must agree with these in order to lay claim to Divine authority. Thus the influence of a certain style of religious instructors and writers in the church have strengthened the outside efforts made to discredit the Bible as the infallible standard of Truth.

It is small wonder therefore that the old orthodox beliefs and practices are being held with such increasing laxity by our American people, both inside and outside the church.

In these attempts at undoing the Bible, the Lutheran Church in this country has had no part nor lot, but has stood for its defense with at least something of the old time fortitude of Reformation days. Therefore, from the nature of the case, she stands in the front rank of the hosts of God, to lead once again in that great battle, now at hand, against those who would put aside, or replace the old Bible of Sinai and Calvary and Wartburg with something that is less in the amplitude of its Divine inspiration.

"Thou art come to the Kingdom for such a time as this."

*A second element in the mission of the Lutheran Church to the Twentieth Century is to teach with renewed insistence the Permanence and Realism of the Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity as re-established in the Lutheran Reformation.*

It is self-evident that in order to reliability the forms of Truth must be permanent.

Christian Doctrines that are subject to restatement at every change of worldly circumstances, lose the force of Divine authority. Such frequent alteration carries with it, not only the

possibility of the impairment, but the final elimination, of the supernatural element.

The modern spirit of Creed tinkering is born of a desire to change the doctrine quite as much as the form of statement. The clamor for a re-writing of the Confession generally has behind it the impelling motive of a belief already altered. Until men begin to quarrel with the substance of certain fundamentals the phraseology and mere verbal dress in which they are presented are no special offense. But inasmuch as the creeds are, in a large measure, but transcripts from the Bible, the re-writers find themselves up against the inspired records, Then comes the attempt to read other than the natural meaning into the text. Hypothetical interpretations are put upon positive declarations; plain historical narratives are changed into allegory; forced translations are made to turn the edge of unwelcome truths, and clear precepts are tunnelled through and honey-combed with doubtful disputations. These efforts have tended to loosen the bonds of faith, in definite, clear-cut doctrines along orthodox lines. Hence the befogged sentiment among many that "It matters little what we believe, so we live right."

This is but another method of discrediting fundamental truths by a pretended external righteousness, the insincerity and fallacy of which are well proven by the fact, that usually in these cases, the life is no better than the faith. It is little short of an axiom that to him to whom it matters little, what he believes, it will soon matter little, what he does.

The result of such teaching is to level all standards of orthodox faith down to a common plane of semi-religious insipidity, where all definite beliefs are decharacterized and bleached out to the same colorless condition and mean practically the same thing, because they mean nothing particular.

Such treatment of the standards of Christianity is at war with Revelation and subversive of the best purposes of Protestantism. The Reformation began in, and was established upon, certain definite and permanent statements of Truth, which in their substance are real and unchangeable.

In that universal demolition of the works of men which

took place at that time in order to find the eternal verities, only the realities of the Thorne could abide. Men's philosophies, traditions and assumptions vanished when the simple plain Word of God smote them with its light. So that when the church came out of the Reformation fires, all that remained on which to build the new world was the solitary, simple, unchangeable, omnipotent Scriptures of Divine Revelation. This and this alone was the residuum, the last analysis in the crucible of that fierce ordeal.

While the Lutheran Church does not pretend to possess a monopoly of Divine Truth, she may, however, justly claim to have restored to the people the simple Word of God, and to still hold it in its primitive, realistic and permanent forms as over against the looseness, vagueness and heterodoxy of the present day. And from her past unparalleled success in working needed reforms in religious conditions, she may, with no impropriety, act upon the conviction that her special mission to the Twentieth Century is to preach this same simple, realistic Gospel, as the only cure of the wrongness of faith and life so common among us.

With old time plainness, she must, with renewed emphasis, maintain that sin is still sin, that vicarious blood is still the only remedy, and that justification by faith is still the only salvation, and that the Word of God in its intense realism must be accepted to mean what it says, whether it speak of sin or savior or sacrament or salvation, or supreme authority of Divine Truth.

*An additional element in the mission of the Lutheran Church to "such a time as this" is to preach a religion of Education and Intelligence as over against the superficial, the emotional, and the sentimental.*

It is to be noted as one of the distinguishing characteristics of the Lutheran movement, that it was born of the most careful investigation of the spiritual condition of the church at that time. Intelligent and careful consideration marked every step of its origin and progress. It would have been of no avail to meet ignorance with ignorance, and superstition with dogmatism, and tradition with mere denial.

Knowledge, knowledge from a careful study of the Word of

God and Theology and History, was one of the potent influences that rendered the movement sound and normal at its birth and triumphant in its progress.

It was a moral and spiritual transformation wrought under God by the greatest campaign of Education ever undertaken. The means of instruction in some method or other went into every family. The Bible became the leading text book, Religion the theme of study, and schools sprang up on every hand, whose forms in some measure have become models for the educational work of many other lands.

As a result, the religious training of the young, their careful indoctrination in all that pertains to the Faith and Life of Christianity, as represented in the teachings of the Reformers, became the special feature in the upbuilding of the new religious life and church organization. But for this fundamental and instructive and constructive method of work, this cause would not have lived beyond the sensation of the offending monk's excommunication from his church. This educational process in religion, while one of the distinguishing characteristics of our church from the beginning, has nevertheless, always aimed at the very highest development of the spiritual element in the personal life of the Christian.

Rich in the subjective experiences of faith, she is unsurpassed in her wealth of Divine sentiment. It pulsates in her hymns, glows in her literature, and has written and sung her history into a sacred epic fit for the angels of God to chant.

On the line of experimental Religion, the Lutheran Church has no need to be taught of others, for she herself was the first teacher in bringing evangelical Christianity back to the world.

But much of the emotionalism and sentimentality which passes for general religiousness today, hardly rises to real seriousness, let alone substantiality. It concerns itself little either about form or doctrine and is content to say: "What we believe is not important, so that we have the right feeling." With these, personal discipleship is mainly the joyful play of pious emotions, a certain ecstasy of feeling, which sways the susceptibilities, and for the moment, makes life a dream, instead of a practical reality seized and possessed of stern duties to be done

day by day and a warfare to be waged to the end.

Much church going, attendance upon the multiplied meetings of many societies in the congregation are regarded as special marks of true discipleship.

For all this, we have no word of condemnation, if they stand fast-rooted in something better than themselves and are counted the fruit instead of religion itself.

Beyond question, this phase of Christianity has been so much overwrought and overvalued that religion by the method of instruction and indoctrination and the acquirement of an intelligent apprehension of its nature, has had a severe struggle to make way against the superficial, the emotional, the sentimental, the sensational—so common and so easy of propagation.

The failure of these modern methods is everywhere in evidence. Reaction against the superficial and sensational has set upon its way and will wax stronger and stronger as time goes on. The day is at hand when knowledge must play its part in personal religion as well as in all things else.

It is for such a time as this that the Lutheran Church has come to the Kingdom, to apply again her long-tried, ever-successful, educational, doctrinal faith and grace culture, as the best basis and preparation for a successful, useful and triumphant Christian life.

Now, it remains last and most important of all, to consider how, as a denomination, we shall adjust ourselves to the proper fulfillment of this mission. No call of Providence is automatic. It must be accepted and vitalized by responsive, active agency, that will carry it over into the Divine plan for its accomplishment.

To bring the Lutheran Church into the condition necessary to the execution of this great work, for which Providence seems to have fitted her, may be no easy task. It means the gathering up of all her forces into a oneness of supreme effort.

No fragment or section of the Denomination can stand apart and arrogate to itself alone the right to assume and accomplish this stupendous mission.

It was a Lutheran people, who, in a sufficiently large sense,

were united in believing the same things, and teaching the same things, and laboring for the same things, that, under God, wrought the miracle of Reformation at the first.

Nothing less than this will avail for the work that now confronts.

Hitherto one disabling fact has always stood against the realization of our great possibilities. With an unparalleled history, with a system of doctrines unequalled, with an endowment of spiritual resources unlimited in adaptability, yet by reason of our divisions, we have counted for less in the religious forces of this country than many of our inferiors. We have been compelled to meet every great opportunity with but a section of our forces, while the remainder were respectively, either indifferent, of critical attitude, or openly hostile. And thus, while we have wrought immense good in many directions, it has been in a disconnected manner rather than with the thoroughly organized, unified and concentrated resources of a denomination, endowed of God with immeasurable possibilities.

If united, no opportunity, though wide as the continent, wide as the hemisphere, wide as the world,—were too vast for us.

Now, I am not unmindful of the difficulties in the way of such unification of our church. Neither can I forget the hopeful fact that these difficulties have been greatly lessened in the last few years, as the holding of this Conference, among other things, may suggest.

A study of the doctrines and history of the Lutheran Church is encouraged and pursued as never before since the Sixteenth Century. This is fast dissipating the ignorance that fostered misjudgment between us. Fraternal intercourse is growing apace, and this is proving the death blow to that prejudice that bred distrust, and to that self-righteousness that could see no brother even in his own family, except as clothed in its own peculiar opinion. Thus the educational spirit has set us to talking over our differences, not with set jaw and a clenched fist in our pocket, but with "the law of kindness in our tongue," and the Christ-charity in our hearts.

And in such controversy, brotherly love gets the victory, and Heavenly Fellowship sets up its altar and begins to sing, "Blest be the tie that binds, our hearts in Christian love."



Considering the wonderful changes already wrought and the steps already taken, along the line of fraternal co-operation, it is not difficult to foresee what, in the divine logic of such a movement, must come, sooner or later, to the Lutherans of America.

If somewhat of a digression, it will be excused here to say, that the current efforts in some of our cities at "Church Federation" would be more hopeful of success, if the movement were not begun at the points of widest disagreement, viz.; between quite dissimilar denominations.

If, first of all, each church would confederate and unify the various branches of its own name and faith, between whom the difference is so slight and who stand already within a common bond of Denominationalism, the ultimate unity of Orthodox Christianity would not be impossible.

But this movement at Lutheran unity does not encounter the bridging of gulfs of differences, such as lie between distinct denominational bodies, does not necessarily carry with it any sacrifice of principle or truth in its achievement, as feared by some. The aim and method of procedure are thoroughly normal, and, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, will progress only as all the essentials of the Lutheran System can be preserved.

If this unity were sought to be rushed together tomorrow, some peril of unwholesome compromise might be encountered. But we wait on Him whose cause it is. He hastened not its beginning, and can wait the century through for its consummation. Certain it is, that in the fullness of its coming, it will be possessed and dominated of nothing less than the essential doctrines of Historic Lutheranism.

With three of the General Bodies already standing together, in at least a formal confederation, the practical unity of the General Lutheran Demonination has progressed quite into the domain of probability.

With a clear understanding, as already had, that this movement does not mean Organic Union, but Confederation of the several General Bodies, on the Historic Lutheran Basis, its furtherance may be consistently encouraged by all who are praying and laboring and hoping for the success of our beloved Church here and elsewhere.

If we can thus be aligned and unified in our efforts for the revival, promulgation and defense of Evangelical Christianity as reestablished by the Lutheran Reformers, the century before us, and the next, and the next, and still the next, will bring to our Church achievements, for the blessing of humanity and for the Kingdom of Christ, such as history has never recorded. But, if by reason of our divisions, we fail of our opportunity—"Then shall their enlargement and deliverance arise from another place."

And what this will mean to our church, only coming centuries of disappointment can reveal! If I may speak the Truth in unmistakable words, I dare say that the one duty that overlies all others, for us Lutherans, in this country and time, is to unify all our forces in order to measure up to our Providential Call. The supreme opportunity of this century waits before us, but will yield its fullness of Divine treasures to nothing less than a United Lutheran Church.

# Proceedings of The Conference.

---

## FIRST SESSION.

St. John's Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

Tuesday, April 1, 1902. 2 P. M.

The Rev. Prof. H. E. Jacobs, D. D., LL. D., of Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa., Chairman of the Joint Committee, appointed to arrange for the Second General Conference of Lutherans, called the Convention to order and presided during the first session. Prayer was offered by the Rev. Luther Kuhlman, D. D., of Frederick, Md. The appointment of the Joint Committee of the Rev. William M. Baum, Jr., of Canajoharie, N. Y., the Rev. Andrew S. Fichthorn, of Norristown, Pa., and the Rev. A. D. R. Hancher, of Staunton, Va., was announced, after which the rules to govern the Conference were read.

The Chairman of the Joint Committee, the Rev. Dr. Jacobs, then delivered the opening address.

The first subject considered was "Justification by Faith." The Rev. L. G. M. Miller, D. D., of Roanoke, Va., was the essayist.

The second paper was entitled, "The Doctrine of Justification in its Relations." It was presented by the Rev. Prof. J. W. Richard, D. D., of Gettysburg, Pa.

Remarks were made by the Rev. J. A. Seiss, D. D., LL. D., L. H. D., of Philadelphia, Pa.; the Rev. Prof. G. F. Spieker, D. D., of Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.; and the Rev. F. F. Schantz, D. D., of Myerstown, Pa.

The third paper presented the subject of, "The Relation of Young Peoples' Societies to the Congregation." It was read by the Rev. C. Armand Miller, of New York, N. Y.

Remarks were made by the Rev. C. L. Fry, of Philadelphia,

Pa.; the Rev. J. R. Groff, of Lykens, Pa.; the Rev. J. C. Kunzman, D. D., of Greensburg, Pa.; and the Rev. C. Armand Miller.

The session closed with prayer by the Rev. Prof. S. A. Ort, D. D., LL. D., of Springfield, Ohio.

---

### LUTHERAN SOCIAL UNION RECEPTION.

Tuesday, April 1, 1902, 7:45 P. M.

A reception was given to the members of the Conference by "The Lutheran Social Union of Philadelphia," at the New Century Drawing Room, Twelfth Street below Chestnut Street, at which more than two hundred members and guests were in attendance.

Mr. William J. Miller, president of the Union, occupied the chair and prayer was offered by the Rev. S. A. Repass, D. D., of Allentown, Pa.

The president of the union delivered the address of welcome. Addresses were also made by the Revs. W. L. Seabrook, of Newberry, S. C.; Prof. J. M. Ruthrauff, D. D., of Springfield, Ohio; Prof. J. A. Singmaster, D. D., of Gettysburg, Pa.; L. L. Smith, of Strasburg, Va.; C. Armand Miller, of New York, N. Y., and F. J. F. Schantz, D. D., of Myerstown, Pa.

Refreshments were then served and a delightful social hour was passed.

### SECOND SESSION.

St. John's Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

Wednesday, April, 2 1902, 9 A. M.

The Conference was called to order by the Rev. M. W. Hamma, D. D., who presided. The opening prayer was offered by the Rev. H. C. Holloway, D. D., of Bellefonte, Pa.

A paper on "The Place of the Holy Spirit in Lutheran Theology" was presented by the Rev. Prof. Jason C. Moser, D. D., of Hickory, N. C.

Remarks were made by the Rev. Prof. H. E. Jacobs, D. D., LL. D., of Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.; and the Rev. Prof. J. W. Richard, D. D., of Gettysburg, Pa.

The next subject considered was, "The Lutheran Doctrine of the Sacraments." The topic was presented in a paper by the Rev. L. E. Busby, D. D., of Salisbury, N. C.

Remarks were made by the Rev. J. R. Groff, of Lykens, Pa.; the Rev. H. C. Holloway, D. D., of Bellefonte, Pa.; the Rev. Prof. J. W. Richard, D. D., of Gettysburg, Pa.; the Rev. E. F. Keever, of Boston, Mass.; the Rev. E. D. Weigle, D. D., of Mechanicsburg, Pa.; the Rev. D. L. Mackenzie, of Lykens, Pa.; and the Rev. Prof. H. E. Jacobs, D. D., LL. D., of Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.

On motion of the Rev. Dr. Jacobs, the Rev. E. L. S. Tressel, of Baltimore, Md., a member of the Joint Synod of Ohio, was granted the courtesies of the Conference with the privilege of participating in the discussions.

The next subject presented was, "Christian Liberty and its Limitations." The essayist was the Rev. S. A. Repass, D. D., of Allentown, Pa.

Remarks were made by the Rev. L. G. M. Miller, D. D., of Ronoake, Va.; the Rev. Prof. J. Fry, D. D., of Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.; and the Rev. Dr. Repass.

The session was closed with prayer by the Rev. E. D. Weigle, D. D., of Mechanicsburg, Pa.

### THIRD SESSION.

St. Matthew's Church,

Wednesday, April 2, 1902, 2 P. M.

Beginning with the Third Session, the remaining meetings of the Conference were held in St. Matthew's Church, North West Corner of Broad and Mt. Vernon Streets, of which for twenty-eight years, the Rev. William M. Baum, D. D., lately deceased, was pastor.

The Rev. M. W. Hamma, D. D., of Washington, D. C., presided and called on the Rev. F. J. F. Schantz, D. D., of Myerstown, Pa, to open the session with prayer.

The first essay was entitled, "The Historical Deaconess' Work and American Conditions" and was presented by the Rev. G. C. Berkemeier, D. D., of Mt. Vernon, N. Y.

Remarks were made by the Rev. Prof. A. Spaeth, D. D., LL.

D., of Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, and by the Rev. F. P. Manhart, D. D., of Baltimore.

A paper on, "The Movement from Romanism to Lutheranism in Austria" was read by the Rev. Carl Goedel, of Philadelphia, Pa.

The next subject was, "A Native Ministry for Congregations in Foreign Fields," the essayist being the Rev. J. H. Harpster, D. D., of Guntur, India.

Remarks were made by the Rev. W. L. Seabrook, of Newberry, S. C.

The concluding paper of the session was entitled, "Women as Helpers in the Practical Work of the Church." It was presented by the Rev. J. P. Krechting, D. D., of New Germantown, N. J.

Remarks were made by the Rev. G. C. Berkemeier, D. D., of Mt. Vernon, N. Y.; and the Rev. Prof. A. Spaeth, D. D., LL. D., of Mt. Airy, Philadelphia.

The session was closed with prayer by the Rev. E. R. Cassaday, of Philadelphia, Pa.

#### FOURTH SESSION.

St. Matthew's Church,

Wednesday, April 2, 1902, 8 P. M.

The Fourth Session of the Conference was devoted to the consideration of the subject of Home Missions. The Rev. Dr. Hamma presided and the Rev. William M. Baum, Jr., conducted the liturgical service.

The first essay, "On Home Mission Fields: East," was by the Rev. William F. Bacher, of Rondout, N. Y.

The second essay, "Our Home Mission Fields: West," was by the Rev. Prof. J. M. Ruthrauff, D. D., of Springfield, Ohio.

The third essay, "Our Home Mission Fields: South," was by the Rev. W. L. Seabrook, of Newberry, S. C.

#### FIFTH SESSION.

St. Matthew's Church,

Thursday, April 3, 1902, 9 A. M.

The Rev. L. L. Smith, of Strasburg, Va., presided. The

Rev. L. G. M. Miller, D. D., of Roanoke, Va., opened the session with prayer.

The first paper, "The Spiritual Priesthood of Believers," was read by the Rev. John A. Hall, D. D., of Canton, Ohio.

Remarks were made by the Rev. Prof. H. E. Jacobs, D. D., LL. D., of Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, and the Rev. Prof. D. H. Bauslin, D. D., of Springfield, Ohio.

The next subject presented was, "Are Our Present Methods of Sunday School Work Adequate?" The essayists were the Rev. David H. Geissinger, D. D., of Pittsburg, Pa.; and the Rev. Prof. J. A. Singmaster, D. D., of Gettysburg, Pa.

Remarks were made by the Rev. Charles S. Albert, D. D., of Philadelphia, Pa.

A paper on "The Attitude of the Lutheran Church to Current Discussion concerning the Holy Scripture," was presented by the Rev. Frederick H. Knubel, of New York, N. Y.

Remarks were made by the Rev. T. E. Schmauk, D. D., of Lebanon, Pa.; the Rev. Prof. G. F. Spieker, D. D., of Mt. Airy, Philadelphia; the Rev. L. G. M. Miller, D. D., of Roanoke, Va.; the Rev. E. T. Horn, D. D., of Reading, Pa.; the Rev. Charles S. Albert, D. D., of Philadelphia, and Rev. F. H. Knubel.

The session was closed with prayer by the Rev. S. A. Repass, D. D., Allentown, Pa.

#### SIXTH SESSION.

St. Matthew's Church,

Thursday, April 3, 1902, 2 P. M.

The Rev. L. L. Smith, of Strasburg, Va., presided. The Rev. L. E. Albert, D. D., of Germantown, Philadelphia, offered prayer.

A paper on "Problems of Church Polity," was read by the Rev. Prof. J. Fry, D. D., of Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.

Remarks were made by the Rev. Prof. J. M. Ruthrauff, D. D., of Springfield, Ohio; the Rev. A. Aaron, of Passaic, N. J.; the Rev. Prof. D. H. Bauslin, D. D., of Springfield, Ohio; the Rev. J. C. Kunzman, D. D., of Greensburg, Pa.; and the Rev. Prof. H. E. Jacobs, D. D., LL. D., of Mt. Airy, Philadelphia.

On motion of the Rev. Dr. Bauslin, it was

*Resolved*, That the essays, the discussions and the proceedings of this Conference be published in book form.

On motion of the Rev. Dr. Jacobs, it was

*Resolved*, That the Secretaries of the Conference be intrusted with the work of editing and publishing the proceedings of the Conference.

On motion of the Rev. Dr. Bauslin, it was

*Resolved*, That the Secretaries of the Conference be directed to arrange for a canvass of the members of the Conference at the present session, for the purpose of securing advance subscriptions for the proposed volume.

As a result of the canvass eight-eight advance subscriptions were received.

The concluding paper of the Conference was then read. Its title was "The Defamers of Luther." It was presented by the Rev. J. J. Young, D. D., of New York, N. Y.

Remarks were made by the Rev. Prof. A. Spaeth, D. D., LL. D., of Mt. Airy, Philadelphia.

General remarks on the proceedings of the Conference were made by the Rev. L. E. Albert, D. D., of Germantown, Philadelphia; the Rev. H. C. Holloway, D. D., of Bellefonte, Pa.; the Rev. A. Aaron, of Passaic, N. J.; the Rev. Prof. D. H. Bauslin, D. D., of Springfield, Ohio; the Rev. John Weidley, of Pittsburg, Pa.; the Rev. J. H. Harpster, D. D., of Guntur, India; the Rev. S. D. Daugherty, of Philadelphia; and the Rev. G. W. Enders, D. D., of York, Pa.

On motion of the Rev. Dr. Manhart, it was

*Resolved*, That we, as a Convention, make known to the three General Bodies, by whose authority this Convention was called, the desirability of holding another Convention of a similar character in the future.

On motion of the Rev. Dr. Jacobs, it was

*Resolved*, That the thanks of this Conference be and hereby are tendered to St. John's pastor and congregation and to St. Matthew's congregation for the use of their churches during the Convention, to the Finance Committee appointed by the three General Bodies, and to those who have responded to the appeal for funds by which this meeting was rendered possible.

On motion of the Rev. Dr. Jacobs, it was

*Resolved*, That a suitable resolution, memorial of the late Rev. William Miller Baum, D. D., pastor of St. Matthew's Church, be prepared and entered in the proceedings of the Conference.

On motion of the Rev. Dr. L. E. Albert, it was



*Resolved*, That the Rev. Dr. Jacobs be appointed to prepare the resolution memorial of the Rev. Dr. Baum.

In accord with the above action the Rev. Dr. Jacobs presented the following minute:

*Resolved*, That this Conference places upon record its high regard for the memory of the Rev. William M. Baum, D. D., (born 1825; died 1902.) late pastor of St. Matthew's church, in which it is now assembled, and its grateful recognition of his courtesy and service in securing this place of meeting, and in most cordially communicating the action of St. Matthew's Board of Officers to the committee of arrangements. As Secretary of the Lutheran Diets of 1877 and 1878; as member of the Joint Committee of the three General Bodies, that proposed these Conferences; as an active participant in the First Conference of 1898, which also met in this church, and as President of the Lutheran Board of Publication, which joined in the publication of its proceedings, he was prominently identified with this movement for the bringing of the separated portions of the Lutheran Church in America to a better understanding. We recognize him as an honored and worthy representative of the Lutheran Church in this city; as a revered former President of the General Synod; as, for over a generation a most active and efficient member of the Boards of the institutions of the General Synod at Gettysburg; as a vigilant and devoted pastor; as a warm-hearted friend, and judicious counsellor, who, to the last days of his long life, shrank from no responsibility, which the call of the Church imposed upon him. While we regret his absence from these meetings, for which he planned, we rejoice in the assurance that, for all the faithful, there is entrance into a higher and holier assembly, where all divisions and discords of earth cease, and that unity in Christ, which is the object of these Conferences, will, at last, be completely attained.

The Rev. Dr. Repass spoke of the excellent program prepared by the Committee of Arrangements and in fitting terms expressed the thanks of the Conference to the members of the Committee for their efficient services.

The Conference then adjourned, the Rev. Dr. Seiss offering the closing prayer and pronouncing the benediction.

WILLIAM M. BAUM, Jr.,  
ANDREW S. FICHTHORN,  
A. D. R. HANCHER,

*Secretaries.*

# ESSAYS AND REMARKS.

---

Opening Address by the Rev. Prof. H. E. Jacobs, D. D., LL. D.

*Fathers and Brethren*:—A few words on the purpose, scope and character of this Convention.

We meet again in Philadelphia, in the extreme East, notwithstanding the fact that the center of our Lutheran population in the United States is west of Chicago. So often have the Conventions of both the General Synod and General Council been held in the Mississippi valley, that the impression is readily drawn that the center of their work and influences, coincides with the center of the country, or with that of the great body of Lutheran people in this land. This is an error. The west is full of Lutherans; but the General Synod and General Council combined form only a small percentage of these hosts. The word "General" is only the relic of an aspiration of both these bodies that has never been realized. The main strength of the General Council, exclusive of the influential Augustana Synod, is in Pennsylvania and New York; that of the General Synod in the same States and Maryland; that of the United Synod in a line along both sides of the Blue Ridge through Virginia and into the Carolinas.

The descendants of the Lutherans in America, during colonial days, are massed, therefore, with considerable compactness near the Atlantic coast. We represent the congregations and their colonies and immediate outgrowth, that were organized and brought together by Muhlenberg into the Mother Synod in 1748, and over which he exercised more or less supervision from Nova Scotia to Georgia. These congregations, now divided between three so-called General Bodies, together form the trunk of the tree, whose branches spread, far and wide, into every State of the Union. Here are the beginnings of the at-

tempt to frame for the future centuries of our Church the structure of a Church Constitution, and to develop Lutheranism as an Institution, in the organization of congregations and Synods and General Bodies, of Seminaries and Colleges, and of Missionary, Church Extension, Education, Publication and other beneficent agencies. Here the battles for the existence of distinctive Lutheranism in America, and for the perpetuation of Lutheranism through the language of this land, were first fought and their results remain.

Far, therefore, as we are from depreciating the West, with its hundreds of thousands of Lutherans, the call has not come to us to settle the questions concerning its future. East and West have each problems to solve separately, as well as those which concern them in common.

Separated as we have been by the dissensions of a generation ago, the three bodies that together stand for a history of over two centuries in America, have for years been more nearly approaching. We have a common service; we are preparing a common hymnal; our Deaconess' Boards are united in a common association; we are endeavoring to conduct our mission enterprises without friction or interference with each other; our pastors very largely refer to the same books as authorities; we include each other in all our enumeration of our strength in this country; we meet and co-operate in various social organizations, as that of the influential association whose guests we are to be tonight; and our general bodies have appointed committees to seek for still closer bonds of union.

Not only kinsmen according to the flesh, with family ties binding us together, many of us, while divided by these ecclesiastical lines are graduates of the same institutions, and pupils of the same professors. More than one representative of the General Synod, in this Conference, was born, baptised and confirmed in a congregation now of the General Council; and more than one representative of the General Council, here present, was born, baptised and confirmed in a congregation, now of the General Synod. The three essayists announced for this afternoon, representing each a different body, all come originally from congregations of the United Synod. The pastor of

the congregation of the General Council, in whose church we meet today, is a son of a congregation of the United Synod; while the late lamented pastor of the congregation of the General Synod, in whose church we will meet tomorrow, was a son of a congregation of the General Council. The representative of the General Council tomorrow was once the honored theological professor of our brethren in the South; their representative tomorrow night came to them from the General Synod.

All this shows that the divisions which have separated us are unnatural, and unless for the weightiest reasons, unjustifiable. Nothing is permanent unless it rests upon the firm basis of God's Word. Everything human shifts and changes. Personal animosities cannot be perpetuated for generations. Factional interests vanish in the face of more momentous issues. It is a fundamental Lutheran principle, that the true succession is not that of standing in the same external line of organization, but solely in that of faith and doctrine. Congregations, synods, general organizations, change; but beneath these changes the Word of God remains, and only by our relation to this standard, we rise or fall. It is no concern of ours, that perhaps a hundred years ago, some synod to which we belong was deficient in confessional earnestness. The question that presses itself upon us today is to see to it that we meet aright the responsibilities that God is now laying on our shoulders. We should not labor to be mechanically consistent with a past history, that we can neither explain, nor justify; but only to be faithful witnesses of Christ to our day and generation.

Nevertheless, however desirable that those who are so closely related should be more thoroughly united, our general bodies have not convened us to discuss any schemes of union. Should the time ever occur for such propositions to be feasible, the means employed would not be a Conference like this, but a representative commission of theologians and experienced men, both ministers and laymen, whose discussions would not be for the general public, as here, but would necessarily involve details of a more private and confidential character, until misunderstandings were removed. Our Lord does not prescribe as

the true method of settling differences between brethren, that they should each proclaim his neighbor's faults from the house-top, but he bids them to confer first in private, and to try alone, in God's presence, to reach an agreement. Public disputations, where parties previously alienated, have argued for victory, rarely convince either contestant of the untenableness of his position. At Leipsiz, Eck did not convert either Carlstadt or Luther; neither did Carlstadt or Luther convert Eck. Luther and Zwingli, both retired from Marburg, more firmly entrenched each in his position, than before the colloquy opened. Such discussions often drive opponents to extremes they would never have reached, if they had not been compelled to defend them.

And yet, this need not deter us from candidly seeking, in the spirit of Christian love towards one another, to have wrong impressions removed, that we believe others have entertained concerning us, or, in so doing, to even enter into the domain of matters that have been involved in controversy. I think that such course would not diminish the regard we have for each other, but, on the other hand, only increase it. We respect men who are as open as the day, and do not fear to express their full convictions. In ministers of Christ we expect nothing less than readiness, at all times, to declare all the counsel of God, and to give a reason for their faith to every one that asketh it. The statement has been widely made from divergent sources that at the Conference of 1899 there was a studious avoidance of all questions of differences. Such criticism is scarcely justifiable. Numerous differences appeared—and those, too, on most important questions. But what was remarkable, was, that such differences were not in accordance with our ecclesiastical divisions, but across them. On no subject discussed, was one ecclesiastical body pitted against the other; the differences manifested divided both bodies that were thought antagonistic. It would be a difficult matter to find representatives of either body with absolute unanimity antagonizing the representatives of the other body arrayed on the other side with similar consent.

We can scarcely run a line which will show with clearness

the exact contour of the ecclesiastical cleavage. Nor should we desire this. The lines of division at the former Conference demonstrated the fact that common influences are at work in all three bodies. You cannot raise the walls that separate us so high, or sink them so deep, as to exclude this community of interests.

We must also learn to discriminate between the testimony of the Church as a whole, or in its representative capacity, and that of individual members. It is unfair to judge an entire Church by a speaker or writer, here and there, to whose utterances such Church has given no official sanction. There is none of us who would not protest, if the attempt would be made to hold him responsible for every sentence written and every doctrine taught and every course advocated and every policy pursued by every pastor and editor and teacher in the particular Synod or General Body to which he belongs. You will not, therefore, deem us as partisan, when we commend that statement in the Principles of Church Polity of the General Council that prescribes that it is only "the official record" that "is to be accepted as evidence of the doctrinal position of each Synod, and of the principles, for which alone the other synods become responsible by connection with it." If it be urged that such official record is valueless, where flagrant departures from its prescriptions and even violent attacks upon its clear statements can be found, we certainly cannot be charged with indifference to the Confession to which we alike subscribe, when we ask: "In what Lutheran body is absolute conformity of all members with the official record enforced by disciplinary processes?" The Church on earth is only a hospital, filled with patients at various stages of convalescence. As in this world of sin, there is no human character, however pure, that is absolutely unassailable; so there is no church or church organization—whether it be a congregation, a synod, a general body, a church board, or a theological faculty, that is beyond criticism. But may the Lord help us to find our delight rather in tracing the progressive workings of divine grace triumphing over sin and error and prejudice; than in investigating diligently and attempting to measure with minutest accuracy and to proclaim with triumph

the amount of infirmity still remaining in a partially renewed nature. Were we consistent in such practice, no church, no congregation, no family, no friendship, could ever abide. Let us hear a confessional declaration on this subject. We quote from the Apology of the Augsburg Confession: "Just as in all families and in all States, concord should be nourished by mutual offices, and tranquility cannot be retained, unless men keep secret and forgive certain mistakes among themselves; so Paul commands that love exist, in order that it may in the church preserve concord, bear with the harsher manners of brethren, keep secret certain less serious mistakes, prevent the church from flying apart into various schisms and enmities and factious and heresies from arising from the schisms."

As in providing for this series of Conferences, the General Synod and the General Council have qualified their action with the statement that no change of the doctrinal basis of either body was intended, permit me to say that these two bases are not in my judgment exclusive of each other. It is a well known fact that the same hand that wrote the briefer doctrinal basis of the General Synod, wrote also the more extended and more explicit basis of the General Council. As one of the obstacles to our freest co-operation, the misconception ought to be removed that the General Council regards the acceptance of the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession, an insufficient test and guarantee to the Lutheran character of pastors and teachers. Wherever there is "the acceptance of the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession and the avowal of them without equivocation or mental reservation, there alone," says the official declaration of the General Council, "is the Church that alone is the Evangelical Lutheran Church." Even though the Augsburg Confession have never been read nor subscribed, if the faith that is held and taught be actually that of the Augsburg Confession, there is an end of all controversy. A truly Lutheran Church could be organized upon the basis of the small catechism alone, even without the Augsburg Confession. It is not subscription to the confession of faith, but it is the receiving, teaching and defending the faith of the confession, that determines our position. Our loyalty to the ampler confession (and as years advance



our admiration of these documents only increases) in no way interferes with our cordial recognition as Lutherans of all who hold unequivocally and simply to the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession, even though they be unwilling to prescribe any further ecclesiastical test. The church of Norway and of Denmark and of Iceland, if faithful to the Augsburg Confession, need not formally endorse any of the confessions that follow, in order to be acknowledged as in the unity of the faith.

But does not this Conference touch even deeper interests? Why should the uppermost thought in our deliberations be concerning the section of the church we represent? Why must the question of our relation to a particular church organization always be pushed into the foreground? Is not the progress of the Kingdom of God of more moment than that of even the most dearly cherished earthly institution? Is there not a medium between the selfish individualism that seeks to evade burdens by pleading its independence of synods, and that servility that has no appreciation of the fundamental principle of Protestantism, and that enunciated at Spire "in matters pertaining to God's honor and our soul's salvation, every one must stand and give an account of himself before God." Questions of ecclesiastical policy dwindle into insignificance when those concerning the needs and the responsibilities and the growth in the divine life of each individual soul assert themselves. The influence that is permanent in the history of Christianity is not that of the ecclesiastical politician or diplomat but that of him who, through agonizing inner struggles, comes forth to speak the word that a wounded conscience most needs, and ever turns away from the outward life to seek the sources of all true strength in communion with God. As Lutherans let us remember that the name we bear stands not so much for revered spiritual ancestors and historical continuity, for massive systems of doctrine and clear confessions of faith, for an elaborate liturgy, a rich hymnology, a soul-stirring music, thoroughly formulated schemes of church government, as for the simple, plain and direct application of the Gospel to the hearts of men. The real strength of Lutheranism lies not in the refined distinctions of scholasticism, or the learned opin-

ions of erudite scholars, or the labyrinth of prescriptions and decisions of ecclesiastical courts, that, in their proper place, are not to be over looked, but in its ability also, at the proper time and place, to be independent of all such supports. It is, for this reason, that Sixteenth Century Lutheranism has the advantage over that of the Seventeenth.

We were born and baptised, we were confirmed and ordained, we were redeemed and justified, not to be valiant advocates of particular church parties, but to be witnesses of Christ, and true shepards of souls; and if there be aught that is precious in the name of our Church, it is only as it stands for the very simplest and plainest and most easily understood form of the Gospel. This constitutes the charm of our catechism, and the rich hymnology of our Church, and, in our opinion, all of the confessions to which our fathers alike subscribed, when they convened in the old Ministerium more than a century ago.

Let us seek, first of all, to be faithful to our calling at the very center of our spiritual life. Then we may confidently expect that God will lead us to the right adjustment of all external relations.

If this Conference will further such an end, our meeting will not be in vain. May the Holy Spirit abide with us, and, according to our Lord's promise, lead us into all truth. Amen.

---

### JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

*By the Rev. L. G. M. Miller, D. D.*

Justification is that act of God, wherein He estimates and declares the guilty sinner to be sinless and holy, without spot before God, and the possessor of everlasting righteousness. In justification God adjudges the sinner to be in purity and holy obedience, that Christ is—even as Christ was adjudged to be, upon the cross, where "He made Him to be sin for us," what guilty man is. A justified sinner is a pardoned sinner, accounted clean and holy, at peace with God, a sinner not only not condemned by the broken law, but actually approved thereby, and for whom the law demands acceptance with God, as

having obeyed it in every particular, for "Christ is the end (or fulfillment) of the law, for righteousness, to every one that believeth." Justifying faith is compounded of conviction of the verity of God's promise, of pardon, through Christ, and personal reliance upon the same. He who is persuaded of the truth of God's offer of pardon through Christ, and who confidently relies upon that promise as applicable to, and effective upon himself, is by such conviction and reliance, and by that solely and alone, justified.

That no one could be justified by his own works, or character is evident. To be thus justified, one would need to be sinlessly holy in heart and conduct from his conception throughout—to be as holy as God is holy. He would need to have loved God with all the heart and soul and mind and strength, and his neighbor as himself, without one shadow of failure in any particular, or at any moment. This did the man, Christ Jesus, and nothing less than this could justify any man before God by his own works. In the nature of the case this is utterly impossible to the guilty sinner, "for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." Therefore, "it follows," by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight," for "the Scripture hath concluded all under sin."

Nor is the doctrine of justification by faith peculiar to the New Testament, for from the beginning of the world, no guilty sinner has ever been justified in any other way. In Eden God said to our first parents, "It (the woman's seed) shall bruise thy (the serpent's) head and thou shalt bruise his heel." Most wonderfully is Christ here designated, he only, of all the human race, is properly the seed of the woman. In this first promise is contained his incarnation, the absolute uniqueness of his birth, His atoning sufferings ("Shall bruise his heel"), and His victory. This wonderful promise Adam and Eve simply and heartily believed, and in and by this faith were justified. This was also true of the patriarchs, from Adam to Abraham. The same blessed promise was repeated and amplified to Abraham, and of him it is testified, "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness."

Nor were the Jews the less justified by faith, under the Mosaic dispensation. They could no more then have been justified by the works of the law, than now. During all that period, they were pardoned through the blood of the sacrifices continually offered, not through their fulfillment of the law. Their faith laid hold of the promised forgiveness through the sacrifices, and thus they were justified. As those sacrifices directly typified Christ, their faith in the blood of the offering was faith in the Blood of Christ. The Scripture says, "And the priest shall make an atonement for them, and it shall be forgiven them." They were forgiven then through faith in the blood of that atonement, or in other words, through Christ's blood and not through obedience to the law. On the great day of Atonement, when the High Priest alone went within the veil, to deal with God concerning the sins of the whole people, it was the blood sprinkled before and upon the mercy seat that secured pardon, that pardon being grasped and realized by faith alone. "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make atonement for the soul." Surely under the very dispensation of the law if anywhere, pardon of sin would have been sought and found by the law. But it was not so, indeed, could not have been so. There, as everywhere else, God's plan was justification by faith alone, in Christ's atoning sacrifice. But let us inquire more particularly what is that sole and special object upon which faith lays hold, in order to be justifying. Here there should be no obscurity, or even shadow of uncertainty.

Faith in God, as the Creator and Supreme Ruler of all, will by no means justify, though not a few seem to cherish that foolish notion. Nor will faith in God, as set forth in the Old Testament alone, the faith of the devout Jew today, justify. Nor will faith in Christ, as the most exalted of all creatures, the Supreme Teacher and Exemplar, justify. So the Arians or Unitarians regard Christ. But such faith is utterly futile and vain. Nay, it even makes Christ a liar and impostor, seeing He expressly claimed Godhead. Not even could we say that *the most special object* of justifying faith is the entire Christ, in His person and work, including His incarnation, and

His life and ministry, His example, and the whole body of His teachings. Not that Supreme faith in all these is not included in evangelical belief. Far be it from us to underrate, in the smallest degree, the necessity of faith in these, even as God's Word sets them forth. But now our inquiry is as to the particular object, apart from all else, the most immediate and special object upon which faith lays hold, in order to constitute it justifying or saving faith. Most strictly speaking it would be not clearly and entirely correct to say that faith in Christ justifies—even faith in the true and very God-man, Christ Jesus, the very Scriptural Christ—faith in His person and character, His example, His ministry, His miracles—faith in any or all of these combined, if it stop there, would never justify one single sinner. Had the eternal Son, one in essence, dignity and glory, with the Father, become incarnate, even as He did, had he lived and taught and wrought, just as he did, up to the very foot of the cross, and then, without the suffering of death, ascended to the Father, leaving behind the legacy of His life, teachings, miracles and example, not one solitary sinner could ever have been pardoned and saved. Even Christ, the true Christ, in all these glorious characters and activities, if we were to stop with these, is not the most immediate object of saving faith, which such faith relies on in order to be justified.

Be it forever remembered then, that not even faith in Christ justifies, if we would be unmistakably clear and explicit—but faith in Christ *crucified*, Christ *crucified*, alone. The most glorious Christ, even our own blessed Christ of Holy Scripture, *uncrucified*, could never save. It was not the *life* of Jesus that purchased redemption from sin, but his death, only, alone, and forever, *his death*. It is “the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.” Now Christ in the character of teacher, or miracle-worker, or exemplar, is not “the Lamb of God. On the cross alone, bleeding and dying under the load of our sins—there he is “the Lamb of God”, and in that character only “He taketh away the sin of the world.” “He tasted death for every man”, and it was only in His tasting death that we were delivered from death. Had he not been made “sin for us, who knew no sin”, we never could have been made “the right-

eousness of God in Him." But it was on the cross, on the cross alone, that he was effectually made sin for us. There, and only there, "the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquities of us all." It was "*on the tree*" that "He bore our sins in His own body," and had He not borne them for us, we would have had to bear them forever. It is "the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son", that "cleanseth us from all sin"—not His life, His ministry, His miracles, His example, but only and alone and forever His blood. Apart from His blood there could have been no pardon, no cleansing, no peace with God, no justification. "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission." "And you hath He quickened together with Him, having forgiven you all trespasses, blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross."

The power that quickened the dead Christ, in His grave, that power alone could quicken into everlasting life a sinner, dead in trespasses and sins. Such quickening power was only available to the sinner, and able to go into effect upon him, because it first quickened and went into effect upon a Christ crucified to death for our offences. No other hand than the hand nailed to the cross, not even Christ own hand otherwise, could have taken away that dread "handwriting that was against us, contrary to us"—to the cross alone could it have been nailed. Only His blood could effectually blot it out. Our blessed Lord said, with direct reference to His own death: "Verily, verily I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." Christ Himself is that corn of wheat. Had He not died, His mission to earth would have been utterly barren. He could have saved no sinners. He could have taken none with Him to glory. He would have abode alone. Only by virtue of His atoning death could He bring forth a blessed fruitage of ransomed souls. "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." But that is the indispensable condition. He must be "lifted up." Only a "lifted up" Christ can draw and save sinners. As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth

in Him, should not perish, but have eternal life." Notice well, it is not to one who simply believes in the Son of man, that eternal life is promised, but to the lifted up Son of man. Only as lifted up can He impart eternal life. It is with His stripes that we must be healed. "When thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin He shall see His seed, He shall prolong His days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand." Only as sin-offering could He beget his seed—only as such could His days be prolonged in the eternity of the blessedness of the redeemed, only as sin-offering had he power to make His Father's pleasure to prosper in the salvation of sinners.

If it be asked then, What is the most particular ground, the special object, the one sole thing upon which faith relies, in order to make it justifying? we reply: Faith, in order that it may justify or save, must rely, most specially and ultimately, upon the sacrificial, atoning, vicarious death of Christ—upon the blood of the cross—upon that alone and forever. Mark this well, for it is often denied and ridiculed, where it ought to be magnified and sounded abroad with trumpet tongue. It is just this that the sinner needs to know, if he knows nothing else, yes, and the saint as well. There must be no fog here. Here all must be plain and evident as the day and clear as the sunlight. *Here, here*, in the *cross of Christ* alone lies life and salvation. There let faith be firmly fixed upon that great transaction on the cross. Let it confide wholly in that as the full, free, and infinitely adequate satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. By that glorious death every possible claim of God's justice has been fully met and upon *that, that, that*, we are to rest assuredly for pardon and salvation. In that act of simple, personal confidence in the blood of the cross the sinner obtains freely, without work or merit, just as he is, forgiveness of sin and eternal life. "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this one is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins. And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." This then is what we mean by justification by faith—the complete pardon of the guilty sinner, his passage from death unto life, when he simply and nakedly trusts in

Christ's atoning sacrifice as offered for him himself and confidently considers himself forgiven and saved by virtue of Christ's death for him. And the more artlessly, unhesitatingly, and assuredly he confides in the sole merit of the precious blood, the better it is. When conscience accuses, and our sins terrify us, when the law thunders out its condemnation, and the heart begins to sink and fail, we cannot set over against these terrors our own deep repentance, our prayers and resolves, nor our virtues and charities, etc., and so obtain consolation. But over against such terrors, we are to set *the cross alone*. With the cross only can we hush the accusings of conscience, and the law's dreadful threatenings. Only behind the cross, in all this universe, the sinner can confidently say, "It is God that justifieth—who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." In the Pilgrim's Progress, Christian is represented with a burden on his back. There it immovably stuck, until he came to a place where he saw before him a cross. As he looked thereupon, his burden loosed of itself from off his shoulders, and fell from him, and rolled into an open sepulchre. So it is. No efforts of our own, however skilful and strenuous, can relieve us of our burden of sin. But when we turn to the cross, and there behold the Lamb of God, and rely upon the blood shed for us, there and then the burden disappears, swallowed up forever in the Savior's tomb. "Being justified by faith", in that wondrous propitiatory sacrifice, "we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Some emasculate the doctrine of the atonement, and annul the doctrine of justification, by claiming that the chief necessity and use of the atonement, was to exhibit the self-sacrificing love of God, and so to impress and move man's heart. But its primary design and efficacy is to Godward and not to manward. Its necessity grows out of the eternal nature of the Godhead. Its first great design was and is truly and really to satisfy God's justice—to render it possible for God to exercise His mercy upon sinful man, without compromising His character and word—"that He might be just, and the justifier of



him which believeth in Jesus." Notice well, we do not say to originate mercy in God's heart toward sinners, but only to make way for its exercise, consistent with the righteousness of God. When the high priest went within the veil, on the great day of atonement, to deal with God concerning the sins of the people, all the people were shut out. No human eye saw that awful interview. It was between the high priest (typifying Christ) and the Father alone. And yet, between these alone, before that sublime interview could take place, the blood must be sprinkled on and before the mercy-seat. Only on the basis of the blood could he intercede for their pardon. Otherwise than on the blood alone he dared not stand before God, to seek forgiveness for the sins of the people. The blood was indispensable there. But this transaction on the day of atonement was God's own appointed type of the ineffable counsellings between the Father and the Son, is the sublime secrecy of the God head. According to this God-given type then, even in the hidden counsels of the adorable Trinity, the Son could not approach the Father to secure the sinner's pardon, save only by and through the blood. Without the blood the Father had he pardoned man would have forfeited His Word, compromised His justice, and wrecked His character. The precious blood alone could open up the way for the downflow of His mercy upon sinful man, and enable Him to exercise the pardoning love of His holy heart upon him, whilst maintaining unsullied every glorious attribute of his nature.

If this be the true doctrine of the atonement, as it surely is, it inevitably follows that the atoner must be true and very God, as well as man. An angel, or a being even more exalted, yet not God, might have been an example, or given an exhibition of self-sacrificing love. But no being not of the same essence and nature as the Father, that is, no other than one of the co-equal persons of the adorable Trinity, could have satisfied the claims of the divine nature and character in the atoning act. No other would have been adequate to remove the hindrance to the exercise of the divine love and mercy upon sinful man. The integrity of the doctrine of justification, therefore, requires belief in the supreme Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ. So

it does also in the total depravity of sinful man, and the eternal consequences of sin unatoned.

Faith in Christ is not a mere barren conviction of the intellect, but a mighty, energetic and energizing principle. This it is, not because it has of itself any peculiar power, but solely because of the object which it embraces, that is, Christ Jesus. When it lays hold of Him, it necessarily lays hold of the almighty power and grace which He embodies, and that power at once effectuates the vivifying, cleansing and transforming of the sinner.

How wonderful then, in its amazing consequences, is the simple confidence of the heart in the atoning sacrifice of Christ our Lord! Many stumble at its very simplicity, and can scarcely believe that an exercise of mind and heart so plain, so direct, so unpretentious, so available to even a little child, could possibly entail such momentous results. Yet such is God's plan. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." "Thy faith hath saved thee." "Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth." "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."

Justification by faith alone is the very heart and soul of the Gospel. Yea, it is the Gospel—without it there would be no Gospel. Concerning it Luther on Galatians says: "Paul admonisheth as well teachers as hearers to take heed that they esteem not the doctrine of faith as a light matter, wherewith they may dally at their pleasure. It is a bright sunbeam, coming down from heaven, that enlighteneth, directeth, and guideth us. There can be nothing added to the doctrine of faith, or taken from it—for that is an utter defacing and overthrowing of the whole." In the Smalcald Articles it is said: "Of this article" (justification by faith alone) "nothing can be yielded or surrendered, even though heaven and earth, and all things should sink to ruin. And upon this article all things depend which we teach and practice. Therefore we must be sure concerning this doctrine, and not doubt, for otherwise all is lost and the pope and devil, and all things against us, gain the

victory and suit." If the pulpit has lost in power, it is because this heavenly doctrine is perverted and obscured in a thousand ways, as indeed it is. If the pulpit then would regain its hold upon the masses, this is not to be sought in all manner of humanitarian effort, and social reform, and ethical exposition, but in a firmer grasp upon, and more faithful presentation of, the great doctrine, the blessed Scripture fact, of free pardon through the blood of the crucified, apprehended by faith solely and alone. What the pulpit needs is the power of God, and only thus can that power be realized, "For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God." If we would have that power then, we must have that preaching. And for a right knowledge of this heavenly teaching, there are no uninspired documents on earth, we believe, of any time, or in any language, so clear and adequate as the Apology of Melancthon and Luther's Commentary on Galatians—as also, indeed, the rest of the Confessional writings. In this day of vain and shifting speculation upon things divine, of shallow and popular, of conceited and worldly-wise criticism of the Word of God, and its most fundamental teachings, all ministers and theological students, should constantly and faithfully exercise themselves in these writings. They are the very rock-bed, the marrow and fatness of the Gospel, and can never become antiquated or out of date, any more than can the Gospel itself, whose pure exponents and faithful witnesses they are. There is no mightier antidote against the incipient infidelity and apostacy, so evident everywhere, excepting the Holy Scriptures themselves, than are these writings, these clear and profound testimonies to the truth as it is in Jesus. And yet so simply and plainly are they stated, that our laity too could avail themselves of them, as well as our ministry, and this they should everywhere be encouraged to do.

## THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION IN ITS RELATIONS.\*

By Prof. J. W. Richard, D. D.

The knowledge of objects involves knowledge of their relations. We know objects in their relations to ourselves, to cause and effect, and to environment; and the better we know the relations of objects the better we know the objects. This principle is as true of thought-objects as it is of object-objects. Any of our psychical experiences are thought-objects when we hold them up before the mind, and contemplate them in their relations to ourselves, to their causes, to their effects, and to other thoughts. We may also concentrate our thoughts, and translate them into propositions, and may analyze them and combine them in concepts. In this way we systematize our thoughts and create science, whether it be the science of material objects, or the science of psychical experiences. And the more we generalize our concepts the more do we become convinced that there is a mysterious, but real nexus that links phenomenon to phenomenon, and finally connects phenomena with a common ground of existence, which we call a *fundamental principle*, and which comes to be conceived of not only as a *principium essendi*, but as an active agency that has more or less to do in determining the nature and significance of the phenomena.

Now among the phenomena of the human soul none is more real, none more potent than the Christian experience. It is known as a distinct fact in consciousness; it is known in relation to a remembered antithetical experience, in relation to its cause, and in relation to its effects. This Christian experience is the consciousness of enmity slain, of sin pardoned, of fellowship with God, of salvation. This Christian experience is expressed in the theological vocabulary by the word *Justification*, that is, *Justification* of the righteousness of faith accord-

---

\* About twelve pages of Dr. Richard's essay as here printed were not read before the Conference, the time allotted to each paper not permitting its presentation in its entirety. Even as it appears, it has been necessary to omit about twelve additional pages. The publishers regret that space will not permit the printing of the essay in its entirety.

ing to its subjective side, the personal certainty the Christian has that he stands in a new relation to God, and that he is renewed in his mind after the image of him that created him.

It was exactly in this way that *Justification* was at first known and contemplated by Luther. After a long and dreary night of doubt and spiritual agony, he threw himself by faith on the Lord Jesus Christ, and experienced peace and salvation; and at the same time he realized that he had become a new creature. Out of this, Luther's personal experience of salvation, the Lutheran Reformation of the sixteenth century was born; and it was only because Justification had in it this powerful element of personal experience, that it could become a genetic principle that imparted life to others and caused a religious movement the most far-reaching and beneficent of any in the history of Christianity.

But while on the one hand Luther contemplated Justification as the experience of salvation, he at the same time on the other hand contemplated it as an act of God, an *actus forensis* by which God declared him righteous, and brought him into fellowship with himself. This is the objective side of Justification.

Now it is, that is, when we put together the two sides, that we have Justification in its complete conception, as an act of divine grace by which man who was *injustus* is declared *justus* before God and is *justus*; though this conception did not come to Luther as a *doctrine*, in the sense of an article of faith, or as an ecclesiastical or theological *dogma* that must be believed. It was only when the period of reflection, of analysis and synthesis, came, that men began to contemplate Justification as an article of faith, as a doctrine or teaching of the divine word, and sought to discover its place and its relations; in other words, sought to know it scientifically.

Holding these fundamental principles in view we advance naturally to the discussion of *Justification in its Relations*. But before that can be done properly, it will be necessary to ascertain the place, that is, the significance, the content, and the extent of the theological conception, *Justification*. This can be done best by pursuing the inductive or historical method.

To Luther Justification was salvation. By the one declarative act of God, he knew himself to be in possession of all that the Gospel has to offer. He had the pardon of sin and adoption into the favor of God. More than this the Gospel does not offer for the present life. Hence he could say that Justification is the supreme article of faith, and the article of a standing or falling Church, meaning that it stands at the head of the Christian system, and that if it be kept in its proper place, the Church will prosper; but that if it be thrust from its central position the Church will fail. This conception of the article in its objective character at once gives it a normative and determinative place in the *ordo salutis*. This article as standing at the head, or center, as the eternal principle of Christianity, as in its practical application the end for which Christ came into the world, was used by Luther for judging the measure, proportions and validity of all other articles of the Christian faith. Even the Scriptures themselves were to be discriminated by this article; for a book of Scripture that does not teach faith in Christ is not to be esteemed so highly as one that does teach faith in him (Erl. Ed. 63 : 156-8.); for faith in Christ is everything.

Hence we hear Luther say in the preface to the *Commentary on Galatians*: "In my heart this article alone reigns, viz., the faith of Christ, from whom, through and to whom, my theological meditations flow and reflow continually." Again: "Wherefore it is very necessary that this doctrine be kept in continued practice and public exercise both of reading and hearing. And although it be never so well known, never so exactly learned, yet the devil, who continually rageth about seeking to devour us, is not dead. Likewise our flesh and old man are yet alive. Besides this all kinds of temptations vex and oppress us on every side; wherefore this doctrine can never be taught, urged and repeated enough. If this doctrine be lost, then is also the doctrine of truth, life and salvation lost and gone. If this doctrine flourish, then all good things flourish: Religion, the true service of God, the glory of God, the right knowledge of all things that are necessary for a Christian man to know." (Erl. Ed. I, 3, 4, 12.)

In 1530 he wrote to Brentz: "This gift of God, besides others, I particularly admire and venerate in you. In all your writings you faithfully and correctly urge the righteousness of faith. This article is the head and corner-stone. It alone begets, nourishes, edifies, defends the Church of God. Without this article the Church of God cannot subsist a single hour, as you know and perceive. No one can teach rightly in the Church nor successfully resist an opponent who does not hold this article, as Paul calls it this sound doctrine." (DeWett IV, 150.) In 1536 he wrote: "The article of Justification and it alone, makes true theologians. Therefore it is necessary in the Church, and it is to be often repeated." (Dissertationen, p. 39.) And in 1538: "Beyond all controversy the article of Justification is the head and sum of the Christian doctrine. When this is properly comprehended there is no danger either on the right hand, or on the left. For this it is that bruises the serpent's head, and overthrows whatever is opposed to Christ. Hence this article most of all is exposed to the bite of the serpent, and to every kind of attack, in order that it may be overthrown and perverted. Satan perceives that so long as this article remains intact, he labors in vain." (Dissertationen, p. 463.)

These quotations show that Luther attached supreme importance to the Article of Justification. He placed it at the very head of the Christian system, and practically identified it with the sum of Christianity. Equally evident is it that he regarded Justification as the *genetic* principle of the entire Christian doctrinal system. He says: "In this article David holds up to us the sum of the entire Christian doctrine, and the clear, beautiful sun that illumines the Christian congregation. If this article be grasped with sure and firm faith, and be maintained, then the others follow gradually after." Also: "Therefore the Article of Justification, as I have often said, must be diligently learned. For in this are embraced all the articles of our faith, and if this be kept intact, all the others are safe." (Com. on Galat. II, 23.)

Not less emphatic is Melancthon in assigning the first place to Justification: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are

heavy laden. When you have sinned you will not quiet your conscience by work; but alone by faith in Christ you will find peace, when you believe that he has borne your sins. This is that confession on which the Church is founded. Against this the gates of hell shall not prevail." (C. R. 21 : 55.) In his analysis of the epistle to the Romans he devotes thirteen short chapters to Justification, and only a few words to Predestination. In the *Loci* he declares: "This article contains the sum of the Gospel, for it shows the proper benefit of Christ, offers a sure consolation to pious souls, teaches what is the true worship of God, what is true prayer, and especially distinguishes the Church from the heathen, the Pelagians, that is from all who imagine that man is righteous by the law, or by discipline." (C. R. 21, 739.)

In his *Theological Propositions* Melancthon says: "The word faith signifies confidence in mercy, and rests on the Son of God, whom the Father hath appointed. This faith embraces all the articles of the Creed, and refers the others to these two: *Credo remissionem peccatorum, Credo vitam aeternam.*" (C. R. 12 : 406.) In his refutation of the Osiandrian error, he declares that the "contention cannot be regarded as a logomachy, but it is a controversy touching matters of great moment, viz., the proper honor and office of the Mediator, the true comfort of the pious, the difference of the divine persons, the difference between the law and the Gospel, and the meaning of the proposition: *Fide Justificamur.*" (C. R. 8 : 504.)

Quotations of identical import from these two fathers of the Lutheran Church might be multiplied almost indefinitely, but these will suffice to show that they gave Justification the place of highest rank in the *ordo salutis*, and in every formal and systematic statement of the Christian doctrine. They regarded it as Christianity itself (C. R. 21 : 39.), not in the sense that they dispensed with every other doctrine, but in the sense that they regarded it as embracing all other doctrines. It formed, as their works show, the central point around which all their theological thinking revolved. In their opposition to Pelagianism, and to the Semipelagianism of the Roman Catholic Church, which rejected the *sola fide*, they sometimes laid heavy



emphasis on the *Bondage of the Will*, and on Predestination as its correlate, but neither of these subjects received a hundredth part of the attention from Luther and Melanchthon that was bestowed by them on *Justification*. To this last they returned ever and again, as to the Alpha and Omega of human destiny. In the case of Luther, Predestination was regarded as the proper preparation for Justification (Loescher's Reformation Acta, I, 541); and in the case of Melanchthon it early came to be postponed to Justification in such a way that he declared that "those undoubtedly are elected, who by faith lay hold on mercy, and persevere in that confidence unto the end" (C. R. 21 : 332.)—thus laying the foundation for the *fide praevisa* that subsequently occupied so large a place in the Lutheran theology, and became a watchword against the *Praedestinatio absoluta* of the Reformed. Even in his so-called and much misunderstood Synergism, Melanchthon never taught that the human will begins the work of salvation, or contributes anything meritorious to Justification; and he was the first to note expressly that faith is the instrumental cause of Justification.

#### THE CONFESSIONS.

In the twentieth article of the Augustana it is said: "The doctrine of faith which is the chief article of the Christian Church." In Article IV, of the Apology, it is written: "Now, since this controversy concerns the principal article of the Christian doctrine, which, correctly understood, illumines and enlarges the honor of Christ, and brings the necessary and richest comfort to pious consciences, we beseech the Emperor to hear us clemently in regard to such important matters." In the Schmalkald Articles three classes of articles are named. Those about which there was no controversy, inasmuch as both parties confessed them; those with which the Lutheran Reformers were willing to treat with learned and sensible men; and what they call *Der Hauptartikel, Principalis Articulus*. Here it is said: "On this article depends everything that we teach and practice against the Pope, the Devil, and the whole world. Therefore in regard to this we must be entirely certain, and not doubt, otherwise all is lost, and the Pope and the Devil and

everything has the victory and the case against us." So important was the article in the estimation of its numerous signers, and so certain were they in regard to the Lutheran teaching thereon, that they would not suffer it to be brought under discussion. In the Form of Concord it is taught: "This article concerning Justification by faith is, as the Apology declares, the leading article of the whole Christian doctrine: without which a disturbed conscience can have no more consolation, or rightly conceive the riches of the grace of Christ, as Dr. Luther has written: 'If this single article remain pure, the whole Christian community will also remain pure and harmonious, and without any factions; but if it remain not pure, it is impossible to resist any error or fanatical spirit.' And with respect to this article in particular, Paul says: 'A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.' For that reason he enforces in this article, with much earnestness and zeal, the *particularæ exclusivæ*—namely, the words, 'without law,' 'without works,' 'by grace' (Rom. 3:28; 4:5; Eph. 2:8, 9) by which the works of man are excluded—for the purpose of showing how highly necessary it is in this article, not only to unfold the true doctrine, but also to set forth the contrary doctrines, that they may be discriminated, exposed and rejected."

From this quotation it is evident that the authors of the *Form of Concord*, who profess to adhere to the true and Christian sense of the Augsburg Confession, regarded the article of Justification not only as the chief article of the Christian faith, but as normative for the right apprehension of other doctrines, and as judicial for the detection and exclusion of the contrary doctrines.

#### THE DOGMATICIANS.

1. *Chemnitz*, the greatest of the Lutheran Dogmaticians, says: "This article pre-eminently distinguishes the Church from all other societies, and superstitions, as Augustine says: 'The Church distinguishes the just from the unjust, not by the law of works, but by the law of faith;' yea, this article is as it were the citadel, the chief bulwark of the entire Christian doctrine and Religion. If this be obscured, or corrupted, or subverted, it is impossible to retain purity of doctrine in the other articles.

But if this article be preserved, all idolatries and superstitions will perish of their own accord." (Loci, Pars. Sec. p. 216.)

2. *Gerhard*, distinguished alike for learning and piety, says: "The rank of this article, joined with its utility and necessity, is the highest. The pious and pure treatment of it ascribes the proper honor to Christ, brings a firm consolation to alarmed consciences, guards the distinction between law and gospel, incites the confidence of faith necessary in the true and profitable worship of God, and fires the minds of the pious to the serious performance of good works." (Loci, VII, p. 2.)

3. *Quenstedt*, known as the bookkeeper of the Wittenberg orthodox, calls Justification "*Divinissima doctrina*, the acropolis of the entire Christian religion, and the bond by which all the parts of the Christian doctrine are held together: and if this be broken, all the other articles are put out of joint and destroyed." He quotes *Meissner* as saying: "This article is, as it were, the *center of theology*, to which all things are directed in a straight line, the sacred ocean to which all things flow; the citadel of the faith which keeps all things safe and sound."

At the Council of Trent it was declared that all the errors of Luther arose from this one point.

And *Sarpi*, the historian of the Council of Trent, tells us that on the eighteenth of June, 1546, "it was proposed, that having, by divine inspiration, condemned the heresies concerning original sinne, the order of the things to bee handled did require, that the doctrine of the modernes, in the point of divine grace which is the medicine of sinne, should be examined; and that the rather it was fit to follow the order because it was observed by the *Augustane* Confession; all which the Councill meaneth to condemne. And the Fathers and Divines were intreated to have recourse by prayer unto the divine assistance, and to bee assiduous, and exact in their studies, because all the errors of *Martin* were resolved into that point. For having undertaken from the beginning to oppugne the Indulgences, he saw hee could not obtaine his purpose, except hee destroy the works of repentance, in defect whereof Indulgences doe succede. And justification by faith onely, a thing never heard of before, seemed to him a good means to effect this: from

whence hee hath collected not only that good workes are not necessary, but also that a dissolute libertie in observing the law of God, and of the Church, will serve the turne: hath denied efficiencie in the Sacraments, authoritie of Priests, Purgatorie, sacrifice of the Masse, and all other remedies for remission of sinnes. Therefore by a contrary way, hee that will establish the bodie of the Catholike doctrine, must overthrow this heresie of justice by faith only, and condemne the blasphemies of that enimie of good works." (Council of Trent(English Translation), p. 190.)

If now we inquire a little more analytically into the relation of the doctrine of Justification, as taught by Lutherans, to the article of the Trinity we find:

1. *That Justification, according to the Lutheran conception, has its prime source in God the Father, that is, in the love, mercy and grace of the Heavenly Father, for those three words lie at the root of the will to save.* It was the love of the Father that led him to have mercy on his children, and it was his mercy that led him to make gracious provision for their redemption in and through Christ. In holy Writ, which is to be our guide in this study, salvation is immediately connected with the love and grace of God, and these are connected with Christ. God so loved the world as to give his Son for its salvation, John 3: 16. By the grace of God Christ was to taste death for every man, Heb. 2: 9; the grace of God is given by Jesus Christ, 1 Cor. 1: 14; the gospel is called the gospel of the grace of God, Acts 20: 24. It is the grace of God that brings salvation, Tit. 2: 14. God hath called us according to his own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, 2 Tim. 1: 19. Election is by grace, Rom. 11: 5, and is in Christ, Eph. 1: 4. Hence grace may be defined as that truly paternal favor that led God to send his Son into the world to save sinful men; and we find that the Lutheran theology connects grace in causal relation directly with Justification. Luther says: "These two words, grace and peace, comprehend in themselves whatever belongs to Christianity. Grace releases from sin, and peace makes the conscience quiet." This is Justification according to its two sides. Again: "By

grace alone, all other means, either in heaven or in earth, set apart, we have remission of sins and peace with God" (Com. on Gal. Cap. 1, 3). He calls grace "the chief part of our Christian doctrine, namely, without works, purely by the grace of God given us in Christ, must we be saved. There is no other way nor method, nor work that can help us." "One has grace to be an apostle; another, a prophet; another, an evangelist, or an expounder of the Scriptures. But we all have the fullness of grace in our Lord God. So richly are the grace and mercy of God bestowed, that it is without measure, is eternal, belongs to all his in its height, depth and breadth. That is called grace. There are other gifts of various kinds for ruling the Church. These shall cease. But the grace and mercy of God are eternal, and our forgiveness of sin is not to last for one or two thousand years, but it is an eternal redemption, salvation, joy, life, forgiveness of sins, and has no limits. Such hath he bestowed upon us. Hence we have grace and the Holy Spirit without measure, not on account of our merit, but because we believe in him." (Erl. Ed., 47, pp. 172-3.)

Melancthon also connects Justification immediately with grace. He says: "Grace is the remission of sins, or mercy promised on account of Christ, or gratuitous acceptance, and is necessarily attended by the Holy Ghost." He identifies Christ with the throne of Grace. (C. R. 21 : 752-3.) In his *Loci* he discusses grace and Justification together, and represents Justification as depending directly and alone upon the mercy and grace of God on account of Christ. Indeed he knows of no justification except that which proceeds from the grace and mercy of God. In the Confessions it is said time and again that we are justified out of grace, freely, without works. The *particulæ exclusivæ* point to the grace of God. And everywhere in Lutheran theology the conception is that Justification has its original source in the grace of God, and that the grace of God is both manifested and magnified in sending Christ as Redeemer and Saviour.

2. *Justification, according to the Lutheran conception, brings the person and work of Christ into great prominence.* In Article IV of the Confession, Justification is declared to be

“out of grace for Christ’s sake”: *Um Christus willen, propter Christum*. This form of statement—“for Christ’s sake:” *propter Christum*—has great significance. It associates Christ *ex vi terminorum* in causal relation to Justification. It is used in the first and in every subsequent edition of Melancthon’s *Loci*, and times almost without number in the other writings of the great Preceptor, quite to the exclusion of every other form of statement by which the relation of Christ to Justification is presented. He never wearies of declaring that we are justified, receive the remission of sins, are reputed righteous, *on account of Christ*, on account of the Mediator the Son of God; that we have forgiveness of sins and acceptance before God on account of the obedience and intercession of Christ. “Beloved in the Beloved, that is, on account of the Beloved through whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins.” “Righteousness is reckoned to us on account of Christ through faith. If now righteousness is reckoned to us on account of Christ, it is alone the obedience of Christ by which we are acceptable to God, and not the gifts that follow. Daniel and David use the word *propter* in order to exclude our virtue and righteousness.” (C. R. VIII, 559.)

In Article XX of the Confession it is said: “On account of Christ we are received into grace.” “On account of Christ we have a gracious God!” And in Article XXVII it is said: “Righteousness cometh by faith to those that believe that they are received into favor by God for Christ’s sake.” In the Apology, Article IV: “The promise of remission of sins and of Justification on account of Christ who was given for us that he might make satisfaction for the sins of the world, and be presented as Mediator and Redeemer.” In the Form of Concord: “For the sake of the merit and perfect obedience, the bitter sufferings and death and the resurrection of Christ.” “For the sake of this perfect obedience which he rendered to his heavenly Father for us both in doing and in suffering, in his life and death, God forgives our sins, accounts us righteous and just, and saves us eternally.” And now that we may know who this Christ is, we turn to Article III of the Confession. Here we learn that he has “two natures, the divine

and the human, inseparably joined together in unity of person; one Christ, true God and true man; who was born of the Virgin Mary, truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, that he might reconcile the Father unto us, and might be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men." In the Apology it is said that Christ died to reconcile us to the Father. The reconciliation is twofold, but Christ the Godman is the reconciler. He is our peace, and hath made peace, and hath given us access to the Father. Eph. 2: 14-17.

If now we are asked at the bar of God whether we have loved God and have fulfilled the law, Christ steps in and says, "Yea, Father, I have done it that they might be reconciled, because they have believed on me, and are in me."

Now, it is exactly on this account that God can be just and the justifier of the believer. In so far as we believe in Christ, we are in Christ, and have put on Christ. The believer, therefore, is not looked upon as he is in himself, but as he is in Christ. God judges him as he sees him united with his Son Jesus Christ. Therefore the judgment is according to righteousness, and the righteousness bestowed is that of the Son of God, who, because he is the Son of God, has a righteousness that is sufficient to cover the transgressions of the whole world. Hence we can appreciate Luther's language when, treating of this "principal article of all Christian doctrine," he says: "Here you see how necessary a thing it is to believe and confess the article of the divinity of Christ, which when Arius denied he must needs also deny the article of our redemption. For to overcome the sin of the world, death, the curse and the wrath of God in himself, is not the work of any creature, but of the divine power. Therefore he who in himself should overcome these, must needs be truly and naturally God. For against this mighty power of sin, death, and the curse, which of itself reigneth throughout the world, and in the whole creature, it was necessary, to set a more high and mighty power. But besides the sovereign and divine power, no such power can be found. Wherefore, to abolish sin, to destroy death, to take away the curse in himself; and again, to give righteousness, to bring light, and to give the blessing, are the works of

the divine power only and alone. Now, because the Scripture doth attribute all these to Christ, therefore he in himself is life, righteousness, and blessing, which is, naturally and substantially, God. Therefore they that deny the divinity of Christ, do lose all Christianity, and become altogether Gentiles and Turks. We must learn therefore diligently the article of justification, as I often admonish you. For all other articles of our faith are comprehended in it; and if that remain sound then are all the rest sound. Wherefore, when we teach that men are justified by Christ, that Christ is the conqueror of sin and death, and the everlasting curse, we witness thereby that he is naturally and substantially God." (Com. on Gal., Chap. III: 13.)

We thus see the relation of Article IV of the Confession to Article III. The latter is not only the presupposition of the former, but the ground and reason for its existence in the Christian system. If there be no divine human Mediator, who by his almighty power, can overcome sin, death and hell, there can be no justification before God, for this justification cannot take place according to the divine nature alone, as Osiander taught, nor according to the human nature alone, as Stancar imagined. Faith looks upon the person of Christ, as the same was made under the law for us, bore our sins, and when proceeding to the Father, rendered entire and perfect obedience to his heavenly Father for us poor sinners, from his holy birth unto his death; and thereby covered all our disobedience, which inheres in our nature, in its thoughts, words, and deeds; so that it is no more imputed to us unto condemnation, but is pardoned and remitted through pure grace, for the sake of Christ alone." (Form of Concord, Art. III.)

3. *Justification, according to the Lutheran conception, also recognizes the presence and work of the Holy Ghost.*

Now it happens—just how it has so happened we do not know—that no Lutheran creed or confession contains an article *De Spiritu Sancto*. The Lutheran Church undoubtedly laid more stress on the person and work of Christ, that is, on the acquisition of redemption, than on the person and work of the Holy Ghost, that is, on the application of redemption. Never-



theless the Lutheran Confessions and Lutheran theology clearly and distinctly recognize the presence and the work of the Holy Ghost in justification by faith. His chief office is to work repentance and faith in those who hear the gospel. This he does by convicting the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment to come, John 16 : 8; by testifying of Christ, John 15 : 26; by taking the things of Christ and showing them unto men, John 16 : 14; by teaching all things, and by bringing unto men all things whatsoever Christ hath spoken, 1 Cor. 2 : 10. On the day of Pentecost the Holy Ghost came down from heaven in visible appearance. But now that the Church is established, "the Holy Ghost is sent by his word unto the hearts of believers, as is said: 'God sent the Spirit of his Son.' This sending is without any visible appearance; to wit, when by the hearing of the external word, we receive an inward fervency and light, whereby we are changed and become new creatures; whereby also we receive a new judgment, a new feeling, and a new moving. This change and this new judgment is not a work of reason, or the power of a man, but is the gift and operation of the Holy Ghost, which cometh with the word preached which purifieth our hearts by faith, and bringeth forth in us spiritual motions." (Com. on Gal. Chap. IV. 5, 6.) In Article V of the Confession it is said that God gives the Holy Ghost who works faith, where and when he will, in those who hear the Gospel. In the Catechism it is said: "I believe that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ my Lord, or come to him. But the Holy Ghost has called me through the Gospel, enlightened me by his gifts, sanctified and preserved me in the true faith." The Holy Ghost calls, illumines, converts, and, by working on the inner life of man, creates faith in the promised redemption. At the same time also he regenerates the believer, so that he is a new creature in Christ Jesus, and becomes a son of God. As Melancthon says: "When God pardons sins he at the same time gives the Holy Ghost, who begins new virtues, though the alarmed conscience first seeks the pardon of sins and reconciliation. It is anxious about this and in regard to this contends in true fear, and does not dispute about the new virtues that are

infused, though these follow reconciliation, yet it must not be supposed that our dignity or purity are causes of the pardon of sins." (C. R. 21 : 742.)

Hence nothing can be clearer than that the Lutheran faith recognizes the presence of the Holy Ghost as active in Justification. By the power of the truth he creates the faith that receives the heavenly gift of grace; and at the same time he works that experience of salvation, and that regeneration of the human spirit, that always attend the objective declaration of forgiveness, though no experience of salvation and no internal change of heart is the cause of the divine declaration of pardon. Hence looked at from the subjective side the Apology is perfectly correct when it says: "The sinner's justification means that he is changed into a pious being, and is born anew of the Holy Ghost." (Art. IV.)

## II.

### THE RELATION OF JUSTIFICATION TO ANTHROPOLOGY.

The moment we use the word Justification, the question arises, Justification from what? The answer given in the Lutheran system brings us face to face with the doctrine of sin, and the doctrine of sin leads to the inquiry for a state of sinlessness, or of *integrity*. Further back than this we cannot go in tracing man's ethical history.

#### 1. *The State of Integrity.*

When we hear of a condition of sin from which man is delivered by Justification, the question easily arises. Was man created in a condition of sin? To affirm that he was so created is at once to impeach the power and moral integrity of the Creator, and no speculation that has affirmed the creation of man in sin, has at any time been sanctioned by the Church. We are led then to inquire for the original condition of man, from which he departed by sin, from which sin he must be justified in order to enjoy fellowship with his Creator, who, because of the creational relation, must be also man's Lord and moral Governor.

The answer which Lutheranism gives to this inquiry must be in harmony with her central principle.

Now as Justification is a restoration to judicial righteousness, and thereby to a state of moral integrity, we must conclude that man's original condition was one of righteousness and integrity; that is, man, at the time of his creation, must have stood before his Creator free from guilt and free from moral imperfection. This would seem to be the legitimate conclusion from the facts involved in Justification.

With this conclusion corresponds the declaration of the Scripture that man was created in the image, after the likeness of God, and was "good," which predicates must be interpreted to mean at the very least, that he was adapted to serve the purpose had in view in his creation; and in that purpose must have been included the duty truly to fear, love and obey God. This conception of the *status integritatis* is expressed in the Apology as follows: "This the Holy Scriptures also testify when they say that man was created after God's own image and likeness. For what else is this, but that the divine wisdom and righteousness, which are of God, were formed in man through which we know God, through which the brightness of God was reflected in us; that is, that these gifts, namely, a true, clear knowledge of God, true fear of and confidence in him, etc., were given to man when he was first created." (Article II.)

What Justification proposes is, the restoration of man to a state of righteousness, or of right relation to God, in order that he may truly know, love and serve God. More than this it cannot do, for more than this is not possible in the ethico-religious sphere. Less than this it dare not attempt, for a perfectly holy God could not be satisfied with less. He could not admit into his presence a creature who was not righteous in his sight, and who had not been created after God in righteousness and in the holiness of truth. Eph. 4 : 24; Col. 3 : 14. Therefore Justification, or the righteousness of faith, must be a substitute for original righteousness, or for the state of integrity. Hence the doctrine of the *status integritatis* must be shaped so as to harmonize with the central principle of the system; which, as it embraces the whole sum of Christianity, must determine the view to be taken of man in his original condi-

tion, who now, because of sin, has become the subject of an objective Justification and of personal purification, that he may be restored to "righteousness and to the holiness of truth." Very properly, therefore, is it said that "original righteousness was the acceptableness of human nature before God, and in the very nature of men a light in the mind by which it was able firmly to assent to the Word of God, and a turning of the will to God, and obedience of heart in agreement with the decision of the law of God that is implicated in the mind." (C. R. 21 : 669.)

The person who is justified, who is united with Christ, who has put on the Lord Jesus Christ, who is renewed in the spirit of his mind, and is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him, and is so transformed by the renewing of the mind as to be able to prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God—all of which is involved essentially in the doctrine of Justification—that person is in a moral condition which differs in no essential respect from the *status integritatis*.

## 2. *The State of Corruption.*

None the less true is it that the doctrine of Justification enables us to establish a correct doctrine of sin—of sin, whether viewed as the loss of original righteousness, or as the corruption of man's ethical nature. If Justification be the restoration of original righteousness both in the judicial and in the ethical sense, then sin must be the loss of original righteousness both in the judicial and in the ethical sense, for God who justifies would not confer on man what he already possesses. Therefore original righteousness and original sin must be the ethico-religious antitheses of each other. The loss of the former brings on the latter. Hence it is perfectly correct to define original sin as the loss of original righteousness, and sin in general may be defined as the loss or destitution of the righteousness that ought to be; and from this it results that the more a man sins, the farther he gets away from the integrity of nature in which he was created. But inasmuch as the concreated righteousness is not an idle quality, but an inborn power to know, to love, and to serve God, so the loss of original right-

ousness is the loss of the power to know, to love, and to serve God. This doubtless is the very essence of sin, for this it is that causes man to miss the mark, and to come short of the end for which he was designed; or in other words, to defeat the final cause of his creation. Also as Justification involves regeneration and moral cleansing we are bound to conclude that sin brings, or is, a corruption and perversion of the moral power of the soul, so that the sinner exercises himself unto ungodliness and commits unlawful deeds. This quality of sin is expressed in Article II by the clauses: "Full of evil desires and propensities, and can have by nature no true fear of God, no true faith in God."

We may now give a classic definition of sin that will be in every respect in harmony with the doctrine of Justification by Faith: "Sin is a defect; inclination, or action, conflicting with the law of God, offensive to God, condemned by him, and causing those in whom it is found, unless forgiven, to become subjects of eternal wrath and punishment" (Melancthon).

### III.

#### THE RELATION OF JUSTIFICATION TO THE MEANS OF GRACE.

In Article V of the Confession it is said: "For obtaining this grace of God has instituted the office of preaching, and has given the Gospel and the sacraments, by which as by means, he gives the Holy Ghost, who works faith where and when he will, in those who hear the Gospel, which teaches that by the merit of Christ, not by our own merit, we have a gracious God, if we believe it." Or according to the Latin text: "That God not for the sake of our own merits, but for the sake of Christ justifies those who believe that for Christ's sake they are received into favor."

The clear implication, if not express declaration, is that in and of ourselves we do not have the faith that justifies. Such faith is wrought in us by the third person of the Trinity, but wrought through means that appeal to our rational and spiritual apprehension, viz., through the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments.

As these means are not identical in character, it is proper to consider each apart from the other.

1. *The Word of God as means for working faith.*

The Word of God has always been regarded by Lutherans as the primary, the chief, the absolutely indispensable means of grace. The Word is not only the source of our knowledge of God in Christ Jesus, and of the promises of salvation, and of the way of salvation; but it is the special instrument of the Holy Ghost for working contrition and faith. As divinely revealed truth in the form of *law*, it exposes and convicts of sin, creates a sense of responsibility, and acquaints us with the fact of our moral impotence. In this preliminary way the law can be regarded as a means of grace. But it cannot by itself work faith. It finally works wrath and drives men to despair.

But as divinely revealed truth in the form of *Gospel*, as the revelation of God's love, and as the promise of pardon, the Word of God is especially the primary, the chief, the absolutely indispensable means of grace (Rom. 10: 8); or it may be regarded as the chief instrument used by the Holy Ghost in leading men to appropriate the grace of God contained in the promises of the Gospel. As divinely revealed, and therefore authoritative truth, the Word is fitted to command the attention and respect of men. That it fails to do this in so many instances is not the fault of the Word itself. The reason must be sought in the darkened understanding and perverted moral sensibility.

As the Word of truth, this Word of God is taken by the Spirit of truth, who comprehends the deep things of God, and testifies to the spirit of man, as his instrument for illumining the mind of man, for working in the recesses of man's heart, and for guiding him in the way of all truth. And it is in the form of the preached Word reflected through sanctified personality, and witnessed to by the experience of salvation, that it exerts its greatest power. Hence it can and must be said that "The chief means of grace in the Church is the Word of preaching, which through its testimony in regard to sin (Law) and in regard to grace (Gospel) is fitted to work the penitent obedience of faith, and to serve the Holy Ghost, to that end in

proportion as it is a true expression of the salvation in Christ, that is, as it is scriptural." (Luthardt, Dogmatik, 10th ed., p. 341.) Christ himself was a preacher, and he commanded his apostles to go into all the world and preach the Gospel. On the day of Pentecost they founded the Church through preaching, and they regarded preaching as more important than baptizing (1 Cor. 1: 17). Preaching was also the chief instrumentality by which the Church was kept from utter stagnation and spiritual deadness in the Middle Ages, and it was the mighty force that promoted the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

Luther declared that "the Word is an almighty power, so powerful a thing it can do everything, achieve everything, bring Christ and the forgiveness of sins—we speak of the external Word preached orally by you and me." And it was especially this oral or preached Word, in distinction from the written Word, that Luther regarded as the Word of God. He says: "Faith comes out of preaching, and preaching from the Word of God." "God will give his Spirit to no one without the Word and the office of preaching, which he appointed solely to preach Christ." "Hence upon whom the office of preaching is bestowed, upon him is conferred the highest office in the Church. He may also baptize, administer the Lord's Supper, and discharge all pastoral duties, or if he do not thus wish he may abide in preaching alone, and leave to others baptism and other subordinate duties, as Christ did, and Paul, and all the apostles." He declared that "God has nothing to do with us, except through some means, and that is his Word." And from nothing did he pray more earnestly than to be delivered from dreams, visions, and angels. When he was attacked by the fanatics, who boasted of visions, dreams and revelations, and sought to instruct him, he replied: "I have not desired such revelations, and should they come before me, I would not believe them. I have earnestly prayed God to give me a true and clear knowledge of the Holy Scriptures. I have the Word. Therefore I know that I am in the right way, and that I cannot easily be deceived or fall into error." (Walch: 2: 1919.)

We thus see how our central Principle fixes our attention

upon, and binds our thought to the Word of God as the instrument by which justifying faith is wrought in the heart, and as a means by which we are safeguarded against the vagaries and deceptions of men. He who would know the will of God in regard to his salvation must consult the Word of God; and he who would understand that word in its fullest import, and in its adaptation to his spiritual needs, must hear the voice and testimony of the believing ministry. It is to this end that God has instituted the office of public preaching and teaching in the Church; or as the *Form of Concord* states the matter: "For this reason God, through his infinite goodness and mercy, causes his divine and eternal law, and his marvelous counsel concerning our redemption, namely, the holy and saving Gospel concerning his eternal Son, our only Saviour and Redeemer, Jesus Christ, to be publicly preached. Through this preaching he gathers for himself an eternal Church from among the human race, and works in the hearts of men true repentance, the knowledge of sin, and genuine faith in Jesus Christ, the Son of God." Again: "Through this instrument, namely, preaching and the hearing of the Word, God works in us, softens our hearts, draws man, so that through the preaching of the law he perceives his sins, and the wrath of God, and feels true fear, contrition and sorrow of heart. And through preaching and meditation on the Holy Gospel which promises the most gracious remission of sins in Christ, a spark of faith is kindled in him, he accepts the forgiveness of sins for Christ's sake, and consoles himself with the promise of the Gospel; and thus the Holy Ghost, who works all these things, is sent forth into the heart." (New Market Translation, pp. 620-1). (Gal. 4 : 6).

It is thus true, as Thomasius says: "Justifying faith has its most immediate object in the Word of the Gospel, for it is especially faith in the promise of grace, in the testimony of God's grace in the preaching of Christ. But this object is likewise its *Principle*: for through it justifying faith arises in the heart. The Word has called and enlightened the justified person. On the one hand it awoke in him the knowledge of sin, and a sense of the need of salvation; and on



the other a longing for salvation and trust in the Saviour. If external events and circumstances have contributed to these ends, yet always was it the *Word* preached and heard that moved him to appropriate redemption." (The Luth. Confession in the Consequence of its Principle, p. 25.)

In corroboration of this explanation of the genesis of faith we appeal to the experience of the Christian who is distinctly conscious of the influence of the Word alone as the ruling factor in his conversion, according to Rom. 10 : 17: "Faith cometh of hearing, and hearing by the Word of Christ." This "Word of Christ" works on the deepest principles of life, the spiritual intuitions, as over against the natural (psychical) susceptibilities, which are of the earth, earthly. As Law, this divine Word works contrition, which according to the Lutheran teaching is, if not a part of faith, at least one of its necessary presuppositions. (Mueller's *Die Symb. Buecher*, Stuttgart, 1860, p. 615.) As Gospel, this divine Word works the *fides specialis*, by which each one believes that his own sins are pardoned for Christ's sake. Here now we have evangelical, that is, justifying faith, or justification by faith. This is our central Principle, but the principle of this Principle is the Word preached and read.

## 2. *The sacraments as means of grace.*

It is not in the words of our thesis (Art. V), neither is it taught anywhere in the Divine Word, that faith is wrought in its primary instance through a sacrament. It is not a doctrine of the Confessions, neither is it a teaching of the Scriptures, that infants receive faith through baptism, though "through baptism they are presented to God and become acceptable to Him." In the thirteenth article, which treats of the *use of the sacraments*, it is said that "the sacraments are signs and testimonies of the will of God towards us, instituted for the purpose of exciting and strengthening faith in those who use them." It is not said that they were instituted for the purpose of working faith in its primary instance. But it is said that the sacraments "require" faith and are properly used when they are received by faith, and strengthen faith. "In the case of adults it is the *continuation, increase and sealing* of faith that is

wrought through the sacraments, just as a person is said to acquire a thing when he daily obtains and acquires the continuation, special increase and sealing of that thing." (Carpzov, *Isagoge*, p. 249.)

That the Holy Ghost is imparted through the Christian sacraments, and that he operates graciously through the sacraments, results from the fact that a sacrament is a *visible word*, a picture that signifies the same thing that is preached by the Word. Luther called the sacraments *efficacia gratiae signa*, and symbols that awake faith, signs and promises of the forgiveness of sins. In the Apology, sacraments are described as "external signs, which God has enjoined, and with which are connected the promise of grace." But a sacrament is not a mere sign. It is a rite, a ceremony, that embodies a fact, and a principle, inasmuch as its constituting, informing power is the divine word. *Verbum accedit ad elementum, et fit sacramentum*. The word added, however, is not primarily, much less exclusively, the word of institution. Augustine's oft-quoted and much abused dictum is based on John 15 : 3; (Migne, *Patrologia*, XXXV, p. 1840.) and has reference to the Gospel in its broadest sense as the preaching of the Christian faith, which the receiver of the sacrament must believe. The great church Father does not in any sense speak here of the Lord's Supper, though doubtless the principle of the word added holds in regard to this sacrament as it does in regard to baptism. As a visible word, a sign, a seal, a symbolized truth, the sacrament is well fitted to work on the imagination of the intelligent receiver, and to enlist that powerful faculty in the interest of the gospel; and as by the very words of institution the truth is directed to the individual, the sacrament is specially adapted to impress the individual with the fact that the Lord comprehends him in the number of the elect ones; though it is by no means to be conceded that the Word preached is addressed only to all promiscuously, and to no one in particular. On the contrary, the Word directs its message also to each individual. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." "Whosoever will let him come."

Moreover, it is only through the Word read and spoken, that

the sacraments become intelligible, and can act as instruments for imparting the Holy Ghost. For until the Word, in the broad sense of the divine message of salvation, and of the revelation of grace on account of Jesus Christ, has been proclaimed and inculcated, and even spiritually apprehended, the sacraments remain dark enigmas. This is implied in the order of the Catechism: First the Law, then the Gospel, then the Christian Experience, and then the Sacraments—first the sacrament of initiation, and then the sacrament of confirmation. But “without the operation of the Word in creating faith, the relation in which baptism places a person remains purely an objective one, and the gift, which it puts into the heart, remains a treasure hid in a field. Without the appropriating personal faith, despite baptism and the Lord’s supper, there results no personal justification, and the sacramental mediation of grace is gradually withdrawn without being able to unfold its blessings, or it finally becomes a judgment upon the recipient. Hence the Word holds the chief place in the economy of salvation. If anyone be deprived of the sacrament not by his own fault, he can be in some way saved by grace through faith alone.” (Thomasius, *Person und Werk*, II, 358.)

The priority and superiority thus accorded to the Divine Word as means of grace, as compared with the sacraments, is fully justified by the Divine Word itself, which is represented not merely as a guide to salvation, but as a creative power of God for salvation to all who believe it (Rom. 1 : 16) as spirit and life (John 6 : 63), as an incorruptible seed, through which men are born again (Peter 1 : 23); as the bread by which man lives (Matt. 4 : 4); as the sword of the Spirit by which the world is to be overcome (Eph. 6 : 17; Heb. 4 : 12; Rev. 19 : 15). Behind this Word stands God himself, and through it he speaks to us, and treats with us. It must result therefore that wherever the Word of God is preached, it becomes a saviour from death unto death, or a saviour from life unto life (2 Cor. 2 : 4-16). It is the great deciding means of grace.

No such creating, life-giving, conquering power is ascribed to the sacraments. In the entire twenty-one epistles, which are intended to expound the Gospel to the churches or to individuals, scarcely a dozen references are made to baptism; and

Paul declares that Christ did not send him to baptize, but to preach the Gospel (1 Cor. 1 : 17) ; and in all these same epistles only a few verses of one are devoted to an exposition of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 10 : 16-18; 11 : 23-26). It is evident therefore that the Church has given a prominence to the sacraments as means of grace not warranted by the New Testament; and it is a demonstrated fact of history that this excess of prominence given to sacraments has wrought against "the eternal principle of Christianity." Too much and too often has the Church exalted the virtue and efficacy of sacraments at the expense of repentance and faith; nor is the Lutheran Church entirely free from this condemnation. Nevertheless, as instituted and ordered by the Lord, the sacraments dare not be overlooked, since they are the ordinary, but by no means the absolutely necessary, way to salvation; nor is grace necessarily bound objectively to the administration of the sacraments. *Crede et manducasti* is a commonplace in Lutheran teaching, and it was the distinct and unvarying teaching of the Lutheran Reformers, and it is likewise the teaching of the Lutheran Confessions, that sacraments are *subordinate* to the *Word*—to "the *Word of God preached and heard*," as Rohnert says; and the old Lutheran teaching laid heavy emphasis on repentance and faith. The Word works repentance and faith. The sacraments require repentance and faith as the conditions of their saving efficacy.

#### IV.

##### THE RELATION OF JUSTIFICATION TO THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.

1. It must never be forgotten that Justification has a subjective as well as an objective side. The believer is not only declared *justus*, but is *justus*, and is rightly called *holy*, not indeed because he is freed from all taint of sin, but because a life of holiness has been begun in him. He is generically a saint. He must be classed with those who have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb (Rev. 7 : 14). "As many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name, which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (John 1 : 12-13).

This divine birth is the inseparable attendant of Justification, which is not only the forgiveness of sins and adoption into sonship, but is a principiant forgiveness that acts on man's ethical nature, and makes him righteous, because it brings the renewing of the Holy Ghost and the living Christ into the heart. Hence the order of salvation is, *first*, Justification, and, *then*, Regeneration. In one place in the Apology Melancthon, seemingly at least, identifies the two. But the *Form of Concord* sets them in proper relation, and clearly distinguishes the one from the other. The reverse order could not be reconciled with the unquestioned Lutheran principle that we are justified by faith alone, without merits, works or righteousness of our own. The reverse order would also involve the absurdity that God regenerates a sinner before he justifies him, that is, while he is under condemnation. But it is involved in the whole Lutheran conception of Justification that God's work for man precedes God's work in man. God must pardon a man's sins, and give the assurance of his love, before the man can truly love God, and feel the new spiritual emotions of gratitude and love; for the former conditionates the latter, not only in the order of logical priority, but in the relation of cause and effect, just as thinking is prior to and the cause of thought. But as thought and thinking cannot be separated from each other in fact, so Regeneration and Justification cannot in fact be separated from each other. Where the one is, the objective fact, there the other is, the subjective experience. Where the pardon of sin is, the work of God for us, there Regeneration is, the work of God in us, the result inseparable from the cause, and a sure sign that faith is true and living. "All this takes place not in separate and successive moments of time, but *uno ictu temporis*. Faith and Justification are verily the cause and ground of love and sanctification, the latter the effect and result of the former, taking place not in chronological succession, but in a succession of reality. Were it otherwise, if love were subsequently added to faith, then faith would not in and of itself be the living power of love; but it would be first made alive through the superadded love, and we should be carried back again from the idea of the Protestant *fides viva*, and brought into the idea of the Catholic *fides formata*." (Philippi, Symbolik, p. 342.)

Again: "Faith justifies before God, in so far as the righteousness of Christ is imputed to it, which covers sin and takes away debt, not in so far as the righteousness of Christ is infused into the subject, and is stamped upon it as its own subjective holiness and righteousness. Faith justifies without asking whether sin has been rooted out of the heart and destroyed or not, but because it is covered, forgiven, not reckoned, not regarded from the side of God." (Phillippi, Symbolik, p. 338.)

This, beyond question, is the Lutheran position. In the passage already quoted from the *Loci* Melancthon declares: "When God pardons sins, he at the same time gives the Holy Ghost, who begins new virtues. \* \* \* The new virtues follow reconciliation." (C. R., 21:742) And in his celebrated letter to Brentz, in 1531, he writes: "You imagine that men are justified by faith, because by faith we receive the Holy Ghost, and afterwards are justified by the fulfilling of the law, which is effected by the Holy Ghost. This supposition places righteousness in our work, in our purity or perfection, albeit such perfection ought to follow faith. But turn your eyes wholly from renovation and the law to the promise and to Christ, and know that we are justified on account of Christ, that is, that we are accepted before God, and find peace of conscience not on account of that renovation. Such renovation is not sufficient. We are justified by faith alone, not because it is the root, as you write, but because it lays hold on Christ, on account of whom we are accepted." (C. R., 2 : 501.)

Again, in opposition to Osiander: "Our churches concede that we ought to be renewed, and that God is the cause of such renewal, and dwells in the saints. The indwelling is as follows: The Son gives the word of consolation. In this word is seen the will of the Father. At the same time he sends the Holy Ghost into hearts, who comforts the heart, and kindles love and devotion and all the virtues. But a person does not have reconciliation and remission on account of this renewing. But pardon and reconciliation, which are justification by faith for the sake of the Mediator. God and man, must be received first. When such faith beholds the Mediator we come to God and are justified, that is, accepted, not on account of our renew-

ing; but righteousness is imputed to us on account of the Mediator." (C. R., 8 : 195.)

Equally clear is Luther. In the *Preface to the Epistle to the Romans*, he says: "Faith is a divine work in us, which changes and regenerates us (John 1 : 13). It slays the old Adam, makes new creatures in heart, disposition and spiritual strength, and brings with it the Holy Ghost. Faith is a living, active, mighty thing. \* \* \* By faith the believer is waned from sin, and conceives an affection for the divine law; by this he gives God the glory, and renders due honor to his name." "Faith brings with it a host of splendid and glorious virtues, and is never alone. Hence the one is not to be confounded with the other; and what is of faith alone, is not to be assigned to virtues and works. Faith is like a mother from whom springs and is born this growth of splendid virtues. Hence where faith is not first, you will seek in vain for the virtues themselves." (Walch, 1 : 1430.) "These are the two parts of Justification. The first is the grace revealed through Christ, that through Christ we have a reconciled God, and that sin no more accuse us, but conscience by faith in the mercy of God is brought to quiet. The second is the gift of the Spirit with his gifts, who illumines against the filth of the spirit and flesh, that we may be defended from the machinations of the devil. (Op. Ex., 19 : 49. See p. 109.)

"The two parts must exist together in a Christian, and be urged in Christian teaching: First, *faith*, namely, that by the blood of Christ we are redeemed from sin and have forgiveness. Secondly, if we have this, *that we then are to become different persons and walk in a new life*. \* \* \* There are two things, the forgiveness of sins and the mortifying of the same, and both must be urged against those who confuse and pervert this order by false doctrine." (Erl. Ed., 8 : 264.)

The same relation is exhibited in the Apology: "Because faith brings the Holy Ghost and begets a new life in hearts, it must follow that it produces spiritual emotions in the heart. Therefore after that we have been justified and renewed we begin to fear God, to love, to thank and to obey God."

We must be in Christ and be clothed upon by his righteous-

ness before Christ can dwell in us and destroy the root of sin. Only in this way can Justification have its true significance and exert its power in Christian teaching and life.

Beginning with Calovius, the dogmaticians reversed this order, thrust Justification out of its central position, and postponed it to regeneration. A hard and dry orthodoxism now entered. Justification was looked upon rather as a doctrine to be believed, than as an experience of salvation to be enjoyed. In a word, Lutheranism had become very un-Lutheran: the active principle of its system had degenerated into a dogma. As a result Christian life declined, and the conscious fellowship with God in Christ was undervalued.

Luthardt has returned to the old order: Both in his *Dogmatik* and in his *Glaubensleher*, he discusses *Faith*, and *Justification* before he takes up *Regeneration*. Rohmert has the order: *Faith, Justification, Vocation, Illumination, Regeneration and Conversion*. In treating the *Ordo Salutis*, he says, exactly in accord with the oldest teachers, and with the Confessions: "As we have seen, Justification by faith forms the real central act of divine grace by which the sinner becomes a child of God, and receives personal participation in the redemptive work of Christ. With Justification there takes place at the same time a moral change of the person by the power of the Holy Ghost. This entrance into a state of grace, and the inner change of the justified connected therewith, take place according to a distinct order, called the order of salvation." That order places "Justification absolutely in the foreground, and postpones *vocare, convertere, regenerare et sanctificare*." (*Dogmatik d. Ev. Luth. Kirche*, pp 341-5.)

2. Since Justification gives fellowship with God and a new heart, two things must follow: (a) Where there is fellowship with God there must be peace of conscience and delight in the service of God. As the believer's righteousness is the righteousness of Christ, which is perfect, and which is in no sense the result of human merit, it follows that such righteousness must satisfy all sense of guilt, and every accusation of conscience. This result of Justification has been most beautifully presented by Melancthon in the Apology: "Faith alone paci-



fies the heart, which obtains rest and life when it freely and confidently relies on the promises of God for the sake of Christ. But our works can never pacify hearts; for we continually find that they are impure. Consequently it must follow, that through faith alone we become acceptable to God and are righteous when we are satisfied in our hearts that God will be merciful to us, not on account of our works and our fulfillment of the law, but by grace alone for Christ's sake." It is this confidence in the grace of God for the sake of Christ, or because of the obedience and righteousness of Christ, that gives the soul the sense of freedom from condemnation, and that quiets the conscience in the hour of temptation. Christ has so united himself with the believing soul in spiritual marriage, "that whatever Christ possesses, that the believing soul may take to itself, and boast of as its own, and whatever belongs to the soul that Christ claims as his." "For Christ is everlasting peace, consolation, righteousness, and life; and to these the terror of the law, heaviness of mind, sin, hell, and death, must needs give place. So Christ living and abiding in me, taketh away and swalloweth up all evils that vex and afflict me. This union or conjunction, then, is the cause that I am delivered from the terror of the law and sin, am separate from myself, and translated unto Christ and his kingdom, which is a kingdom of grace, righteousness, peace, joy, life, salvation and eternal glory." (Commentary on Galat., Chap. II, v. 20.)

(b) As faith regenerates the heart and gives the Holy Ghost, the justified person must do works acceptable to God. The new power of love and obedience, the new principle of life within the soul, will strive against sin, and will bring forth the fruits of faith. They will also prompt to the keeping of the law, and to the service of needy and suffering humanity. Luther's famous paradox: "A Christian man is the most free lord of all and subject to none; a Christian man is the most dutiful servant of all, and is subject to every one," expresses the true Christian life-ideal. Faith frees the Christian from the bondage of the law, and from rites and ceremonies instituted

by men; but it quickens the conscience, animates the sense of duty, and warms the heart with love to God and to man. As a living, acting, energizing principle reigning in the regenerate heart, it impels the Christian by an inner necessity of his new nature to do the will of God from the soul (Eph. 6 : 6). "O, what a living, busy, active, mighty thing is faith. Therefore it is impossible for it not to be constantly doing good. It does not inquire whether good works are to be done, but before the question is asked, it has done them, and is always doing them. The person who does not do good works is destitute of faith, gropes and looks about for faith and good works, and knows not what faith and good works are, though he prates a great deal about both." (Preface to Romans' Erl. Ed. 63 : 125.)

Christian good works consist in serving one's calling with faith in God, and with love to one's neighbor. Hence the Christian must stand in his place, wait on his calling, and do good to others as he has opportunity. "Faith is the actor, love is the act. Faith brings man to God, love brings him to man. By faith he becomes acceptable to God; by love he does good to men." Any work, therefore, that makes our fellowmen happier and better is a good work in the Christian sense, provided it proceed from faith.

But we must not carry this principle of faith so far as to maintain that the veracity, honesty, and beneficence of non-Christian people, "are only splendid vices." God is a Being of moral discernment, and must approve truth, virtue, and beneficence wherever found, though virtues and works can never make anyone righteous before God, or procure the pardon of sins. The judge is just, and he shall render unto every man according to his deeds (Matt. 16 : 27). We have only to maintain the twofold principle that no conformity to the letter of the law can make man righteous before God, and that out of faith will arise the keeping of the law according to its spirit. Hence Justification does not abrogate the law; it gives power to obey the law out of love. (See Erl. Ed. (Latin) 3 : 305.)

## V.

## THE RELATION OF JUSTIFICATION TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.

1. Faith unites us with Christ, and makes us members of his body, so that as believers we and Christ live one life. "For me to live is Christ" (Phil. 1 : 21). Faith also brings the Holy Ghost into our hearts, who sanctifies and cleanses us from sin. And as all believers are united to Christ, their common Head, and have the Holy Ghost, the Sanctifier of all, so they come to be united to each other, and to have a like generic holiness. Hence they constitute the company of believers, the *congregatio sanctorum*, the *societas fidei et Spiritus Sancti in cordibus*, who have "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all, and in all" (Eph. 4 : 5). This goodly company, thus united under the same headship, is the congregation of all believers scattered throughout the earth, whose essential quality is holiness. To this congregation belong only those who are first united to Christ and have the Holy Ghost dwelling in them. "Ye were washed, ye were sanctified ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God" (1 Cor. 6 : 11.) In other words, this congregation is a spiritual body. And as it is scattered throughout the earth, or exists wherever the Gospel is preached and the sacraments are administered, it is an object of faith: "I believe a holy Catholic Church." "And this Church alone is called in Scripture the Body of Christ; because Christ is its head, and sanctifies and strengthens it through his Spirit; as Paul says (Eph. 1 : 22-23): 'And gave him to be Head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.' Therefore, they in whom Christ effects nothing through his Spirit, are not members of Christ." (Apology, VII and VIII.) And yet this holy Catholic Church is not an impersonal institution, an idealistic conception. But it is composed of living persons to whom the attribute or predicate "holy" can be applied—a "living body," "living members," "a spiritual people," "the pillar of truth," "the household of God," "the bride of Christ," the people who "believe that they are received into grace and that their sins are pardoned for the

sake of Christ, who by his death makes satisfaction for our sins," whom God "accounts *justos et sanctos*." Primarily this holiness is the imputed righteousness of Christ, but it is also the personal sanctity of love to God and to fellow Christians: "Thus Paul enjoins love in the Church, which cultivates harmony and which, as there is need, bears the imperfections of brethren, and overlooks trifling errors, in order that the Church may not be divided into schisms, factions and heresies." (Apology, III.) In this Church is the "communion of saints." As all true believers have a common Heavenly Father, a common Lord, a common faith, so they all have *eo ipso* a common hope, a common joy, and a common right to the means of grace by which the Holy Ghost comforts hearts and sustains faith. Hence a seat in the Sanctuary and a seat at the Lord's Table should be open to everyone who professes "this faith," and has been baptized, for "through baptism we are first taken into the community of Christians." (Larger Catechism, IV, ad initium.) And as we can no more easily discern who has "faith and the Holy Ghost in the heart," than we can discern who is destitute of these internal qualities, except where the life is openly ungodly and impenitent, so is it the duty of "the congregation of all believers" to admit to her communion, and to "the feast of love," all who name the name of the Lord and depart from unrighteousness (2 Tim. 19). "For ye are all sons of God, through faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye all are one in Christ Jesus. And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise" (Gal. 3 : 26-29).

2. Our principle also requires us to affirm the unity of the Church. There are many churches in the sense of local organizations, or confraternities of believers, or aggregations of local organizations of believers into national or international groups of churches having different ceremonies and different views in regard to many doctrines; yet there is only one Church in the sense of "the body of Christ," and of "the pillar and ground of the truth."

To this "body" belong multitudes whose knowledge is limited and distorted; who build on the "pillar, wood, hay, stubble;" but they have a faith that as really appropriates Christ and brings the Holy Ghost, as does the faith of those who are the stewards of the mysteries of God; for the quality of faith is not determined by its magnitude. A weak, ignorant, and erring Christian "shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved; yet so as through fire" (1 Cor. 3 : 15). And "for the true unity of the Christian Church it is sufficient that the Gospel be preached therein according to its pure intent and meaning, and that the sacraments be administered in conformity with the Word of God" (Art. VII). But the Gospel is rightly preached where it is taught "that God, not on account of our merits, but on account of Christ, justifies those who believe that for Christ's sake they are received into grace" (Art. V); and the sacraments are rightly administered, when Baptism and the Lord's Supper are administered according to the institution of Christ.

These are the marks of the Christian community, and it must be conceded that only in rare instances have they been so darkened and perverted that they ceased entirely to be "instruments through which God moves hearts to believing." (Apology, VII and VIII.) But wherever there are believing hearts, there are members of Christ the Head, who stand "on the chief cornerstone; in whom each several building, fitly bound together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord" (Eph. 2 : 21). Hence, looked at from the standpoint of Justification by faith, it is evident that there can be but one holy Catholic Church. Since the Church in its essential characteristics is composed of those alone who are "holy," and since there is only one way by which men can become "holy," it must follow that there cannot be two or more churches, since the principle of classification is identical and invariable. From this it follows that the attribute of unity cannot "be predicted (1) of any particular Church, but of the *universal* Church, as no particular Church can claim that it is the one Church. It is one thing *to be the one Church*, and a different thing *to be of the one Church*. The whole Church is one. **Our Church is of the one.**

(2) Among the various causes of this unity and on account of which the Church is called one, is the *one true* formal cause, *namely, that aggregation by which many by agreement in faith according to the truth, and by harmony of will according to Christ, have a communion by means of which many members of the same body are one, because all connected with the head have and receive from the same head, the same life, the same feeling and affection; just as many children in the same family are one because by the bond of consanguinity and love they are united to their parents. The one formal ground of this unity is consent in regard to the teaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments.* (3) *Though this consent must be confined especially to the chief fundamental articles, since in secondary matters consent is not always required, especially if there be no negation and no heretical and positive dissent.*" (Carpzov, *Isagoge*, p. 303.)

But as this congregation of saints and true believers actualizes itself in "living members," in "a spiritual people," so it manifests itself openly in organizations, constitutions, assemblies, in the public preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments. The essential Church thus creates the empirical Church, which shows the attribute of visibility. Men can see the Church, can locate it, can say, *Here is the Church.* This is the Church broadly so-called, and embraces all those who profess faith in Christ, and by Baptism have united themselves to the body of which Christ is the head. The one distinguishing attribute, "holiness," is applied synecdochically to all who profess to have united themselves with the one only Source of "holiness." In this empirical Church there are, doubtless, many hypocrites and false Christians. Those have communion with the saints in the external relations and blessings of the Church. They are in the Church, though not of the Church; yet they must be included in the Church as it appears on earth, which "is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind" (Matt. 13 : 47).

"New although the wicked, and ungodly hypocrites, have fellowship with the true Church in external signs, in name and

office, yet when we would strictly define what the Church is, we must speak of the Church called the body of Christ, and having communion not only in external signs, but also holding faith and the gifts of the Holy Ghost." (Apology, VII and VIII.) Faith and the gifts of the Holy Ghost are Justification according to its two sides.

---

#### REMARKS.

The Rev. Dr. Seiss said:—

*Mr. President:* I wish to say, that I regard it a good fortune that the arrangements for this Conference provided for the consideration of the great and all-conditioning doctrine of Justification by Faith in Christ, which has resulted in the timely and able papers to which we have listened. We cannot too much emphasize this heart essence of the Gospel, so essential to true Christian life hope, especially in these days of popular drifting away from the vital elements of the only saving religion.

Both of these essays very well cover the fields of contemplation to which they are devoted. We need to have it clearly shown what Justification by faith means, and what are its relations to other parts of the Christian system. The very life of the Church, its teaching and preaching, and the eternal salvation of its individual members, are bound up in this doctrine. Redemption through Christ's blood, appropriated by an intelligent and living faith, is the only hope of sinful man. It is therefore to be commended that so much stress has been laid upon this doctrine by these papers, and that the first has so clearly emphasized Christ's sacrificial death as the meritorious ground-work of our forgiveness and justification. This is according to the Scriptures throughout, and our testimony on this point must never be the least abated. And yet, when we come to state the object on which justifying faith rests, it will not answer to limit our contemplations to the single fact of Christ's death, without embracing some other very vital things.

The sacrificial death of Christ, however central in the work of redemption, separately considered, does not take in all that

is involved in justifying faith. The affecting transactions of Good Friday need to take in the great fact noted by Christmas for their saving virtue and efficacy. We must have the Incarnation, in order to an availing propitiation. We must have a God-man on the cross, in order triumphantly to glory in it. Both the essays assume this, and also refer to it. But justifying faith must needs have regard to the Incarnation of the Son of God in order to see in His death an adequate satisfaction for our sins.

But even the Incarnate Son of God submitting to death to atone for human guilt, is still not all that saving faith needs for that hopeful confidence and assurance which the Gospel is meant to give. A dead Christ, although having met the whole penalty due to our sins, is not all that is required. With nothing but His death upon the cross to rest on, however meritorious that death, we are still left without the satisfying demonstration that it has been accepted, that the debt has been paid, and that He is able to save unto the uttermost. Good Friday must have an Easter to follow it, as well as a Christmas to precede it. We need a living Saviour, a Master of death, one whom the Law having slain as a substitute for sinners could not hold under its power, and hence the glorious Resurrection of Christ as well as His sacrificial death. Otherwise, how could we be sure that His sacrifice of His life in our stead really has availed for our justification and release?

Saving faith must accordingly take in the Saviour risen again from the dead, as well as His vicarious death. He was "delivered for our offences," but had to be "raised again for our justification;" for so the Word is, "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain: ye are yet in your sins."

I am well convinced that neither of these two essayists had the remotest idea of excluding from their views of justifying faith the necessary regard to the Deity, or the Resurrection of Christ. But it passed through my mind while listening to the first, that along with such an intense emphasizing of the death of Christ as the supreme thing embraced by saving faith, it might be well to note what rendered that death for our sins of such effective worth, and the demonstration of its acceptance furnished by our Saviour's resurrection, as likewise entering



very essentially into what faith embraces as the ground of our justification. Hence these remarks, not intended in any way to discredit the admirable papers which have just been read, but in the same line with them.

---

The Rev. Dr. Spieker said:—

The importance of this great material principle cannot be over estimated. The Lutheran Church is specially called to hear witness to the fundamental character of this principle both for her own sake and for the sake of others who do not realize how the life of the church depends upon it. So comprehensive is this principle that it includes the whole sacramental sphere, extending to the beginning of Christian life in the reception of grace by infants in Holy Baptism. It may be termed the heart of the Christian system, controlling every function the least as well as the greatest. Historically the Lutheran Church is the bearer of this standard, and is bound to preserve it in all its integrity.

---

#### RELATION OF YOUNG PEOPLES' SOCIETIES TO THE CONGREGATION.

*By the Rev. C. Armand Miller.*

The subject announced involves the radical questions connected with the discussion of the value of Young Peoples' Societies to the Church. It involves also a more far-reaching question, that of the place and right of organizations in general, in the Church. In the familiar phrase, there are three divinely ordained institutions, the Church, the Home and the State. This entirely unobjectionable statement, however, is sometimes interpreted to mean that nothing is authorized, or to be permitted without protest, which was not, in its present form, in one of these three original institutions, at the beginning. The objector to all sorts of organizations in the Church would hardly admit, nevertheless, that his dictum was to be applied to the State. The original divine institution of the State had nothing in it whatever, except, its divinely given authority, which is like what we recognize as the State to which we owe the duty inculcated in the fourth Commandment. The mode

of deriving, and of exercising that authority, is absolutely different. The original State had no federation of Commonwealths, no elective houses of legislation, no distribution of legislative, judicial and executive functions, no periodical outbursts of political frenzy connected with the expression of the will of the sovereign people. Are all these things to be absolutely rejected, as unauthorized, because not found in their present form in the first phase of the State's existence? Are there not also in the system of discipline, education, and even mutual bearing of the members of the Christian home of today, of the best type, many things which widely differ from the original institution of the home, and from its conditions in past centuries? Is all which was not characteristic, in every detail, of the home founded by Adam and Eve to be condemned as without divine warrant? And shall this same criticism which we are compelled to find untenable in reference to the other two original divine institutions, be held binding in its application to the Church? Here we can go farther than we have yet done, and claim that there is indication clearly given, of the right to adapt the organization of the Church to changing circumstances, in the very charter of the Church, the Book of the Acts. On the day of Pentecost, the Church received the very simple form of a body of believing witnesses, receiving others, who believed, into their fellowship by baptism. This continued until the demands of the needy who were cared for by the brotherly love of those more able to bestow gifts, became so exigent that to respond to them formed too great a part of the duties of the leaders of the Church. Then, by distinct, divine appointment, the deacons were set apart, to "serve tables" and to leave undisturbed, in their specific duty, those who were to give themselves to prayer and the Word. It might, of course, be possible to see in this appointment of the deacons only one specific act in the perfecting of a cast-iron organization of the Church; or it might be possible, and it would seem to some at least more consistent, to see in it a typical illustration and justification of the adaptation of the form and method of church organization to the changing needs of the time and place of the church's life. If the first alternative is taken, then the diaconate is the only organized activity in the Church which

has a right to live: if the second, then it stands as the type of the principle of assignment of specific work to special groups of men, within and as a part of the Church. The Church has unquestionably always taken the second view. Without specific divine command we find the organization, in New Testament times, of the female diaconate, and in later times of a host of subordinate workers, forming a definite organization within the Church, and known as lectors, singers, door-keepers, acolytes, exorcists, etc. Catechists, in our own Church, since the time of Bartholomew Ziegenbalg have had a recognized place and work, though there is no claim that they were definitely mentioned in the primeval divine institution of the Church. So, in reference to the banding together of workers for specific objects, in the Church, with its authority and under its control. As the work expands, and as the workers become numerous, there is to be found for every man his work. Some, for more than two hundred years, have found their work in the organization within the Church which we call the Sunday School. Others have grouped themselves into Missionary Societies. The Church Council, with its committees for detailed duties, the Synods with their officers and committees, and other perfectly familiar and unquestioned forms of Church organization are illustrations of the fact that the Church has never considered herself bound to the absolute limitation of her machinery to the pristine simplicity of the day when evangelizing was her whole task and the problems of training, of governing, of education, of the organized ministry of love, had not arisen.

The question, "What is the relation of the Young Peoples' Societies to the Congregation," seems to the writer, to be answered in what has gone before. That relation is precisely the same as the relation of every form of organization used and accepted in the Church, and not explicitly provided for in the congregation of Apostolic days. It is not a relation of alliance but of identity. The Church Council, for instance, or the Church Trustees, are the Church, at work in the persons of certain appointed individuals, for a certain defined end.

The Sunday School is the Church at work in the instruction of its youth. The Missionary Society is the Church, grouped for convenience and efficiency according to some principle of association, at work, for a particular field, or for a particular task in connection with the one fundamental activity of the Church, the extension of the kingdom of Christ. These, in the original unit of the Church, the congregation. So the Synod, or the Boards are the Church, not in all its individuals, but in certain specified ones, at work in directing or encouraging the whole Church in some locality or in some specific feature of its mission. In precisely the same way, but as limited to the Congregation, the Young Peoples' Society is the Church, in its youth, organized and guided for the accomplishment of certain necessary ends among themselves. This conception of the Young Peoples' Society demands a realization of the ideal in the characteristics of its form of organization. It must be, like the Sunday-School, and like every other organization of the congregation, under the direct control of that body, and since the congregation is represented officially by the pastor and church council, the constitution of the Young Peoples' Society must recognize the supreme authority in definite terms. If it is organized by the consent of the congregation, and in a way acceptable to it, the society has a right to be considered as prosecuting its work under the authority of the congregation, and is entitled to the definition already given. It is the congregation at work for and by its young people.

It would seem that many of the objections made to the work of the societies under discussion are based upon a mistaken view of the relation they are supposed to bear to the congregation. This mistake may apply in reference to what has been, so far, the subject of our consideration, the question of organic relation, the question of control and authority. Or again, it may be a mistake, possibly not without excuse, as to the object of the society. The theme assigned as the subject of this paper suggests a most important principle, viz: that the Young Peoples' Society is essentially a local, congregational agency, whose field is that of the congregation of which it is a part, and whose work is for and in that congregation. Just as much as any committee, properly appointed

and organized in the congregation is for the specific task assigned it by its creator, so is the Young Peoples' Society responsible to the congregation which is working through it, and is limited to the sphere and activity to which the congregation binds it. It does not exist chiefly, or at all, for the social fraternization of its members, or for any aim which finds its end in them, but for the furtherance of the work of the congregation with which it is connected as an integral part, to be useful in those directions and for those purposes which are entrusted to it. The motto of the Luther League, "Of the Church, by the Church, for the Church," is distinctly to be understood as meaning "of and by and for the congregation." Whether a Young Peoples' Society is to be formed in any particular congregation, therefore, is a question for the pastor and officers of that congregation to decide. What is to be the peculiar character and aim of any particular society is to be determined by the congregation within which it exists. The Young Peoples' Society, it cannot be too strongly emphasized, exists in order to be a strong, efficient factor in the congregational life. It is not to diffuse its activities and confuse its aims among a vague, wide realm of objects desirable in themselves, but not within its scope. It is to center every force it has upon the upbuilding of the congregation, to seek only those ends which the congregation seeks, and which the congregation assigns to it as suitable to its own activities.

Within this clearly marked sphere the Young Peoples' Society may be considered to have two main purposes. The first is to provide a field for the development of Christian service, its ideals, and the opportunity for their exercise. The recently confirmed member of the congregation discovers, as a rule, no work at hand within his reach, and no direction as to how to undertake the service of the Lord except in the routine of the ordinary Christian duties. He has been taught in the catechetical class the ideal of service, but if he is not given the practical opportunity to exemplify that ideal no long time will be required until he shall have fallen into a comfortable, easy-going way of living that will satisfy him, but profit no one. To find a duty for each individual, to set to each one his

task, will prove a difficult problem to the conscientious pastor, and will tax his judgment and invention almost beyond his powers. But with the aid of organization, with systematized effort, it can be done. This systematized effort is easily provided for in the Young Peoples' Society. Here in the subdivision of committees every one can be assigned to a fitting work. If a certain talent is clearly possessed the selection of the work for its possessor is easy, but if not, in the various duties of the visiting committee, the flower committee, the literary committee, the social committee, etc., a place can be found in which the occasion for development in lines of increasing and varied activity, is possible and probable. If you smile at the apparent triviality of the service suggested in the names of some of these committees you may not inappropriately be reminded that "a cup of cold water" given in the name of a disciple, will not go unrewarded, and further, that it is not so important, for the purpose in view, to have some great thing done, as to train our youth in the ideal that to lead a Christian life means to be doing something for Christ. The habit of Christian service is the habit which the Young Peoples' Society is intended and adapted to form. From this standpoint the Young Peoples' Society may be regarded as an instrumentality for the utilization of forces that would otherwise be liable to lie latent. As a matter of fact, the actual sum total of the activities of the Young Peoples' Societies is by no means to be slightly esteemed, and this also is to be taken into consideration in any estimate of the value of the relation of the Young Peoples' Societies to the congregation.

The second main purpose of these societies is to serve as a means of securing further study, clearer understanding of the faith of the congregation, and therefore the society provides a post-confirmation course of study in the doctrines, history, liturgy, missions, etc., of the Church. Under the direction of committees it sees to the acquirement of a library of selected books on these themes. It encourages and directs Bible study, and through devotional meetings and the preparation of papers on allotted themes actually accomplishes noteworthy

results in this direction. The amount of useful work that can be performed in this way is limited only by the earnestness and activity of the workers and the encouragement given by the pastor and the officers of the congregation. It is safe to say, however, that what has been achieved in the past is but a beginning, and that here is a means at hand for large usefulness in the solution of the problem which we all feel to be so pressing, of the further indoctrination of the young people, who are only too ready, without some such systematic plan and stimulus, to rest content with what they have learned in the catechetical class. In this phase of the work of the Young Peoples' Society in relation to the congregation, there is great potency, as yet largely undeveloped, to arouse the love and loyalty of our youth.

The theory of the relation of the Young Peoples' Society to the congregation which has been presented may seem to limit the work of each society too much. But this is only seeming. If the field is limited in its definition, it is not in its material. There is always enough to be done, in any congregation, to employ to the full the energy of every person who is willing to serve. There is always a large work of general benevolence and Christian love for which the congregation is responsible, outside of its actual membership. There are brethren of the same household of faith to be cared for in our hospitals, and almshouses, and even wandering ones, for whom we have a responsibility, in our penal institutions. Within and without the particular congregation's personnel, there is a sufficient space for the activity of the society.

If the Young Peoples' Society is the congregation at work for its youth, and that alone, the question may arise, what is the relation of the gatherings, or conventions of these societies, to the Church? Are not such gatherings inconsistent with the nature and purpose of the societies, if these have been correctly stated in this paper? At first sight, the question may seem to demand an affirmative answer, but a further examination seems to give different response. These conventions are simply conferences, neither claiming nor attempting to wield authority, in which those who are interested in the methods and activities that promise, and in experience

have been found, to give the best results in the work of our young people in the congregations, meet for the comparison of views, and for consultation and mutual encouragement and advice. While members of different Synods meet together thus, on terms of entire mutual confidence and recognition, as they do, for instance, in this Conference, they meet upon the well-understood basis of membership in the One Church whose faith is expressed in the Unaltered Augsburg Confession. They do not meet to discuss or settle questions of faith,—the relation of each society to a congregation which has accepted and confessed the faith has already obviated any necessity for that, but they meet to plan and stimulate greater activity, to seek to help each other to bring forth the fruits of faith in richer abundance. The results of their meetings, whatever of inspiration and of instruction may be gained, are to be devoted to the advantage of the local field of the individual society. The true conception of this relation shows the incorrectness of the contention that a doctrinal basis should be formally laid down in the constitution of the societies. They are not a confessing body. They are already in and a part of the Church which has confessed and does confess the pure faith.

To sum up, the relation of the Young Peoples' Society to the congregation may be considered from the standpoint of principle or of practice. From the former, it is to be regarded as not separate from the congregation, not allied with it, not even, in the strict sense a part of it, but much more, as the congregation itself, delegating certain specific features of its work for the young, to the young who are of its own membership. As standing in this relation, under the control, as the whole congregation of necessity is, of the pastor and Church Council, the Young Peoples' Society can be made just what the congregation will have it to be.

From the standpoint of practice, the Young Peoples' Society is the active instrumentality of the congregation to develop the love and loyalty of its young members, through the adaptation to each of a certain part of the work, and through the awakening of interest in further reading and study of devotional and churchly literature. To this may be added as an



incidental feature of the practical work of the society what, unfortunately is sometimes made to take up too large a space in the fore-ground, the cultivation of the actual sense of Christian fellowship through personal association. If such is the nerve of what is called the social work, this may become a very helpful and blessed feature of the Young Peoples' Society. If the effort is made to enter into competition with the concert-halls of the neighborhood, the so-called social work will suffer very disastrous defeat in every direction.

It is the conviction of the writer that the relation of the Young Peoples' Society to the congregation, rightly understood and applied, fully justifies the employment and encouragement of this organization in the work of the Church for her youth.

---

#### REMARKS.

The Rev. C. L. Fry said:—

It may surely be taken for granted, Mr. Chairman, that we are all agreed on the proposition, *if* a Young Peoples' Society be salutary at all, the more its effect is to build up its members in the doctrines, the history and the spirit of their own Church, the more valuable an agency it will become. There is just such a Young Peoples' League within our Lutheran Church in this country, organized for the specific purpose of deepening in the minds and hearts of its members a clear and strong apprehension of our distinctive faith and cultus. The Luther League has not been in existence long enough to warrant any reasonable expectation of its making a universal marked impress on the life of the Church as a whole, nor has its aim from the very beginning been anything but to do a quiet, unpretentious, educative work, whose influence shall gradually be felt, more and more, in the growing intelligence and efficiency of the laymen who go as delegates to our Synods, and the women who attend our Mission Conventions.

One thing, however, we dare assert, with no little satisfaction and confidence, on the floor of such a General Conference as this: the Luther League has at least made no monumental mistakes, and in so far has splendidly disappointed all

the suspicions which prophesied dire results from giving a measure of responsibility and power into the hands of our young people. We owe it to them to publicly say that these young people have given conspicuous and conclusive proof that they well deserve to be trusted. In the management of the affairs of the League they have shown themselves to be of a thoroughly conservative as well as wisely progressive spirit, and this augurs hopefully for the future.

The special importance which from the first has been attached to the weekly study of the Scriptural topics, and the use of the prescribed Reading Courses, is another good omen. These five instructive little volumes, which I here hold in my hand, are a sample of the Reading Courses. One of the books is doctrinal, the second history, the third devotional, the fourth missionary, and the fifth biography. There are four courses outlined thus far. A literature certificate, with corresponding seals, is issued on their completion. What a magnificent thing it would be, Mr. Chairman, if through the hosts of our young people we could *create a demand* for a distinctively American Lutheran Literature, precisely adapted to meet our unique and particular needs in this our own land! If our American Lutheran authors would be stimulated by knowing that the very best expositions of which they are capable will be welcomed with enthusiastic appreciation and wide diffusion, especially on the part of all the Leagues in the land!

Nor dare the social function be entirely omitted. How vastly much would it mean for the advancement of the work and the influence of our Church, if there were a personal acquaintance and mutual co-operation among the young people of our various congregations! And this can best be effected only through some such organization as the Luther League.

---

The Rev. Dr. Kunzman said:—

Societies are organizations. That our young people must be organized for work is self-evident. How they are to be organized is a question of expediency. The apostolate and the ministry were offices in the organized Christian Church for the ministry of the word, but the offices of deacon and deaconess were soon found necessary to take care of the work

of mercy in the growing Church. As trade expands, men are arranged in departments and become effective as specialists. So as the work of the Church increases, widens and diversifies no individual or set of individuals can become proficient in all its departments, and hence individuals and sets of individuals devote themselves and necessarily organize for these different works. If we examine the needs of our day, it will not be difficult to decide as to whether it be profitable and expedient to organize our young people into distinct societies and assign to them distinct work.

But I desire to call special attention, not to the how, but to the necessity of the organization of young people. You can never do anything with and through any number of persons without organization. As a Christian is a doer and not only a hearer of the word, and in the Church stands related to his fellow Christians, the Church needs to be organized for work. While justified by faith alone, the faith which justifies is never alone. We learn the truth of the Gospel by obedience to its precepts, by doing the will of God. We prove to the world the preciousness of the Gospel and its divinity by doing the works of Christ. The first table of the law brings us in relation to God and the second announces our duty to our fellowmen. And as in the Church we stand related to other Christians, we cannot in union with them discharge our duties except through organization. Christ came to minister.

We devote much thought, care and labor to the young in our Church. We demand that they be instructed in the home, the school and catechetical class and prepared for full communion. We confirm them by the hundreds. To this that they may bear fruit? What advantage is all this unless we organize them in this world of need to minister to their fellowmen? The Church which expects nothing receives nothing of its young people and the Church which would make them active must organize them.

## THE PLACE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN LUTHERAN THEOLOGY.

*By Rev. Prof. J. C. Moser, D. D.*

Nowhere else does the difference between Lutheran theology and all other theologies appear more manifest than in the place given to the Holy Spirit in these systems. Here the most marked distinctions occur. Here are some of the most important points of divergence that separate Lutheranism from all other teachings. It is a difference that appears not only in theoretical statement, but one that in practical matters and methods of work makes and marks our Lutheran Church separate, peculiar and apart from all others.

Lutheran theology is the doctrine of God and divine things that is in perfect accord with the Confessions of the Lutheran Church. Therefore in defining the place of the Holy Spirit in Lutheran theology we need have nothing to do with the vagaries of those professedly Lutheran teachers who have wandered from our Confession. Moreover, in the discussion of this subject we take theology not in the sense of a mere formal and technical statement of the truth of religion, but as that deep spiritual knowledge which makes wise unto salvation. This we believe to be true Lutheran theology. It is not mere theory, but is eminently practical, to be believed in the heart and preached from the pulpit.

In setting forth the doctrine of the divine Being and work, Lutheran theology treats of the love of God the Father, of the redemption effected by our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the grace of the Holy Spirit in the application of that redemption. Here already systems of theology begin to diverge in the placing of emphasis upon one of these rather than another. There is a theology that has its center in God the Father, in his will and sovereignty; there is a theology that finds its center in Christ and the cross; and there is a theology that revolves around the Holy Spirit and his work. Lutheran theology is Christo-centric. Christ and his work it emphasizes above all things. We would not thereby in the least ignore or dishonor the Father or the Spirit. We would simply put that first which God's Word puts first. In the New Testa-

ment benediction it is the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ that is put before every thing else; then the love of God the Father; and the last of all the communion of the Holy Spirit. With Paul Lutheran theology declares: "I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." By this he evidently means, not that it was his purpose to ignore all else, or to consider no other doctrines, but that he would view them all only in their relation to Christ and his cross.

Lutheran theology regards Christ and his mediatorial work the center and substance of divine revelation. The whole plan of salvation can be rightly understood and interpreted only when we begin with Christ, and view every teaching of the Scriptures in the light of his redemptive work. It has been this rule that has guided our church in developing and setting forth the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit was sent only to reveal and apply the things of Christ. "The Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." "When He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth; for He shall not speak of himself. He shall glorify me; for He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you."

The Holy Spirit has not come into the world to speak of himself, or to act for himself, or in any sense to do an independent work, but sent by the Father and Son upon the basis of what the Son had already done. He comes to take up and carry on the work of human salvation by applying to men the grace of the Son.

In a theology that is Christo-centric the Holy Spirit must occupy a place in proper relation to Christ and the atonement effected by him. There are those that so exalt the Spirit that they thereby neglect and obscure the work of Christ. They so magnify sanctification as to minimize justification. They would so direct attention to the Spirit, would so absorb mind and heart in the Spirit's work, as to turn men away from Christ, and thus defeat the very object and purpose of the Holy Spirit, who desires nothing so much as to direct us to Christ.

In Lutheran theology the Holy Spirit occupies no such place. In no way do we exalt the Holy Spirit and his work in us, so as to disparage or obscure Christ's work for us. While in rank and power the Spirit's work is co-ordinate with that of Christ, yet it bears the closest relationship to Christ and his work, and must not be separated therefrom. The Holy Spirit sent by Christ, bringing all the fulness of Christ's grace, comes in Christ's name, and bearing witness of Christ, He takes the things of Christ, and declares them unto men. In the forcible words of one of our own pastors, "The Spirit comes not to glorify himself, not to be first and chief, not himself to absorb all thought and attention, not to be the great and almost exclusive subject of our prayers and preachings, but rather to turn every eye and every heart to Christ."

This, then, is the place of the Holy Spirit in Lutheran theology in respect to his relation to Christ.

We teach, accordingly, that it is the peculiar province of the Holy Spirit in the work of human salvation to bring to men and apply the redemptive work of Christ, and thereby to produce faith, and through faith justification and all that accompanies and results therefrom, as the call, illumination, regeneration and conversion, mystical union, and renovation. But in accomplishing his work He confines his operations to the use of means, the means of God's own appointment.

And now taking another aspect of our subject, we may say that *the place of the Holy Spirit in Lutheran theology is that of perpetual and unbroken union with the divinely ordained means of grace, the word and sacraments.* Lutheran theology looks no-where else for the Holy Spirit in the accomplishment of his gracious work upon the hearts of men; and on the other hand it has the utmost confidence that the Spirit will always be found in living, active, efficacious connection with these means. "For by the Word and Sacraments, as by instruments, the Holy Spirit is given," declares the 5th Article of our Augsburg Confession. And the same article emphatically rejects the teaching of those "who imagine that the Holy Spirit is given to men without the outward word." The Holy Spirit in converting and saving men operates only by the word, is the position maintained by our theologians and by our Con-

fession. Says Luther in the Smalcald Articles: "We must firmly hold that God grants his spirit or grace to no one, except through or with the preceding outward word." "We must constantly maintain that God does not wish to deal with us otherwise than through the spoken Word and the sacraments, and that whatever without the Word and sacraments is extolled as spirit is the devil himself."

Lutheran theology teaches that the gospel always possesses divine power unto salvation, because it is always accompanied by the life-giving Spirit. The Holy Spirit is joined to the word indissolubly, and communicates thereto divine and saving power. The word that we preach is never a dead, empty, powerless word. It is the power of God unto salvation. It is the word of the Spirit. "The words that I have spoken unto you are Spirit, and are life." The word and the Spirit are so conjoined and united together that whatever the Spirit accomplishes for the salvation of men He accomplishes through the word, and whatever effects are produced by the word we know to be the work of the Spirit.

There are many who seem to regard any use of or reliance upon external means as not only unnecessary but in direct antagonism to the work of the Spirit. They appear to be persuaded that the farther they can get away from the means of grace, the more they will have of the Spirit. The idea of the spiritual must not, they think, be associated with any thing material. They therefore put in opposition things that belong together. It is as though one were to take the position that we are not nourished and kept alive by the bread we eat, by the water we drink, and by the air we breathe, but that our natural lives are sustained by the immediate power and goodness of God alone: that therefore the less we use and depend on these external means, bread, water, etc. the more life we will really have and enjoy directly from God. Absurd and foolish as this may seem, it is not more foolish than the position taken by the opponents of what they are pleased to call "sacramental religion." When they say that it is not by baptism that we are regenerated, but by the Holy Spirit, or by the grace of God, two things are put over

against each other that belong together and are in perfect harmony. There is no more opposition between the Holy Spirit and baptism as the causes of salvation, than there is between the Holy Spirit and grace. There is no more opposition between the Holy Spirit who regenerates the soul and baptism as the means through which He effects this gracious work, than there is between the power of God which sustains our natural life and the food through which He sustains it.

The place of the Holy Spirit in Lutheran theology, then, is something fixed and definite. He always accompanies and works efficaciously in and through the means of God's own appointment. Wherever these are, there is also the Spirit with His saving grace. In the theology of many the place of the Holy Spirit is a very indefinite and uncertain matter. There can be no assurance that any gracious work of the the Spirit will attend the means. He may accompany the word and sacraments with his grace and power, and He may not—most probably not.

As an illustration of the position of many, we quote a sentence or two from a sermon on the Holy Spirit recently preached by a prominent divine and teacher of theology of another faith. In speaking of the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration he says: "I am no sacramentarian. I do not believe in the changing efficacy of the sprinkled water or of the spoken formula; but I know of no reason in Scripture, or in experience, or in science why we may not believe that the gracious Spirit, in many cases, performs that mysterious work (regeneration) in the soul of the infant when the water of baptism is applied."

To Lutherans this is indeed a very strange and remarkable statement, not only unscriptural, but altogether inadequate and unsatisfactory. Yet much of the theology of our land and age can not get beyond this. It asserts very positively, "I do not believe in the saving efficacy of baptism," yet it ventures to say that the Holy Spirit may effect regeneration at the same time with the act of baptism; but baptism itself has nothing whatever to do with it, and can give no assurance that any gracious work of the Spirit accompanies it. This theology hazards the statement that there is no very strong reason in



Scripture, or in experience, or in science why we may not believe at least this much, that regeneration may occur co-incident with the application of the water in infant baptism, "in many cases." "In many cases," but not in all, "In many cases" the Holy Spirit happens to fulfill his promise; "in many cases" He is true to his word, incidentally, but in any particular case we can not be sure, and dare not venture on the word of promise connected with baptism. Certainty can come, says this theology, only through the inner experiences of heart and emotion. It looks to results only, to impressions and feelings, to indicate the presence and operation of the Holy Spirit.

Here again our Lutheran theology takes issue. While we would by no means limit the grace and power of the Spirit, we can be sure of his presence and work only in the use of the word and sacraments. "Only then can we consider an effect as certainly produced by the Holy Spirit, when it is brought to pass through these external means," is the position of Lutheran theology on this point. "For," says our Confession, "we should not and can not always judge, from our feelings, of the presence, operations, and gifts of the Holy Spirit; but inas much as these are often cloaked in much infirmity, we should be convinced, from the promise, that the word of God preached and heard is assuredly the ministry and instrument of the Spirit, by which He truly and efficaciously operates in our hearts."

Lutherans have no confidence in the flesh, or in any experience of mere feeling or emotion. We look with suspicion upon the genuineness of that Christianity which says, "I have experienced certain feelings! therefore the work of the Spirit has been effected in my heart. I have been born again, and am a child of God." The true Lutheran says, "I have been baptized. Through baptism God's grace and Spirit have come to me; for baptism is "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." God has thereby signified his acceptance of me, a poor sinner, and has received me into his love and favor. Therefore I am a child of God."

Even among those who belong to the school of subjectiveism there has been of late years, a decided reaction against mere emotionalism in religion. From a prominent preacher and

teacher of this class I quote a few sentences that serve to show this, and at the same time corroborate the position of our church.

"We are just a little suspicious of that Christian who carries his most sacred spiritual experiences on his coat-sleeve, and who is always ready to testify, not from the Word of God, but from his own experience. 'The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple.' If you could tell me with vivid and microscopic detail all about your own regeneration, I should really begin to doubt whether you had ever been regenerated." "We should be careful to give experience its proper place and to fix upon it its true valuation. We are somewhat in danger in these times of selling out to mere experience. A single ounce of God's Word is worth more than a hundred-weight of man's experience." To all this we Lutherans say amen with emphasis.

There is yet another feature of our subject that perhaps merits consideration. Has the doctrine of the Holy Spirit received altogether adequate treatment in Lutheran theology? Has there not been a grave omission, in no place has been given to the consideration of the work of the Holy Spirit in empowering and equipping men for service in the church? This is a question that should receive attention, especially in our age, which has been called the age of the Spirit. Whatever we may think of the importance of this matter, the theology of our church has given it no consideration.

Luther indeed speaks of a special blessing which accompanies the exercise of the office of preaching by men properly called to it: but he ascribes this special blessing to the possession and certainty of their divine calling, which is assured to them through the outward call and through the confirmation of that call in ordination. It is true also that our theologians speak of the grace of ordination, and say that the gifts of the Holy Ghost, necessary for the discharge of the duties of the ministry, are conferred and increased therein through the prayers of the Church; yet it is clear that they do not regard this as occurring by means of some special baptism of the Spirit. Lutheran theology has no place for a second blessing

or Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit since the days of the apostles, either to bring men into a state of sinless perfection, or to bestow some distinct and special endowment for the work of the church. Nowhere in our theology is found the notion that there is one gift of the Holy Spirit that effects regeneration and another and distinct gift that confers power for service. Nowhere is found the vain dream that by some special act of preparation or consecration on our part we fit ourselves to receive this Pentecostal blessing, the baptism and infilling of the Holy Ghost. Very distinctly and emphatically does our Confession reject the erroneous teaching of those "who imagine that the Holy Spirit is given to men . . . through their own preparations and works."

The theologians of our church evidently regard the special gift of the Holy Spirit in the apostolic days as providing for a special need of that time. The New Testament was then unwritten. It was necessary, therefore, that every teacher have the gift of inspiration, and that the possession of this gift be confirmed by signs and miracles.

In the judgment of our teachers no further divine power is promised in the Bible, or is necessary for the work of the church than that which every Christian may have through faith in the word; and moreover that every believer possesses this power precisely in proportion to the strength of his faith and his knowledge of the truth, without any special outpouring or infilling of the Spirit. The expression, "filled with the Spirit," is not descriptive of some extraordinary power or enrichment, but is the prerogative alike of all believers. In the words of a great preacher of another faith: "This state of 'being filled with the Holy Ghost' is not regarded by the writer of the Acts of the Apostles as necessarily carrying with it the power of working miracles, or any other supernatural endowment, nor is it confined to the aristocracy of the Church, but it belongs to all." "Filled with the Spirit." There is but one way to be filled, and that is to be filled with the word of the Spirit. We receive the Spirit through the hearing of faith; we minister the Spirit through the hearing of faith.

What we need, then, to make us efficient workers in Christ's service is God's Word and absolute, unwavering faith in that word. Having these, we have all the spiritual endowment promised; we have all the divine equipment we need; we have all the power of the Spirit that God bestows upon his ministering servants, making our ministry "mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds."

This, then in brief, is the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Lutheran theology—a doctrine full of divine assurance and comfort to the Christian heart. It is a doctrine, too, that should give confidence and encouragement to every faithful Christian teacher. The gospel we preach is not an empty vessel or a dead letter. We can be sure the ministry of the word is the ministry of the Spirit. "For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance." Lutheran preachers proclaim their message with all confidence, firmly believing that the Holy Spirit, according to the divine promise, will surely accompany his word, and work through it effectually to the conversion of sinners and the edification of believers.

---

#### REMARKS.

The Rev. Dr. Jacobs commended the paper for its thorough presentation of the subject. The passage Dr. Moser cited from a Reformed clergyman came ultimately from Calvin himself. In his "Institutes," (Book IV : XVII 39.) he severely arraigns those who deny the possibility of Baptismal Regeneration. Although he cannot conceive how regeneration occurs through Baptism, he maintains that it may occur at Baptism. The entire tendency of the Reformed Church is to deny the activity of the Holy Spirit in and through means. The Spirit is regarded as working cotemporaneously with their use, and alongside of, but not through them. In his *Ratio Fidei*, sent to Augsburg, Zwingli explicitly declares that the Holy Spirit employs no means for his operations. The Spirit brings means, but no means bring or carry the Spirit. According to the Calvinistic and Zwinglian conception. Means of Grace are instrumentalities by which man applies himself

to grace; while according to the Lutheran conception, they are the divinely ordained institutions through which God communicates himself to man. According to the Reformed, they are from man Godward; according to Lutheran doctrine they are from God manward.

The Reformed have charged the Lutheran Church with indifference to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Prof. Smeaton of the Free Church of Scotland, in a very scholarly monograph on the work of the Holy Spirit, maintains that it was entirely neglected in Lutheran Theology until the Pietistic controversy gave occasion for its more ample treatment; and that, owing to this neglect, Lutheranism lapsed into Formalism, Dead Orthodoxy, etc. Unfortunately for his theory, the Golden Age of Lutheranism in Germany was long before the period which he claims for the introduction of this doctrine. So Dr. Kuyper, the present prime minister of Holland, in his lately published monograph claims that Calvin was the discoverer of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit! We need only refer to the outline of the entire subject in Luther's explanation of the Third Article of the creed, with which all here are familiar.

---

The Dr. Richard said in substance:—

The person and work of the Holy Spirit is by no means ignored in the Lutheran system. Luther's *Commentary on Galatians* is filled with the spirit of the spirit. Every Lutheran confession recognizes the spirit's activity in connection with the means of grace. Yet it is true—and it is to be lamented because it is true—that no Lutheran confession contains an article *De Spiritu sancto*. Lutherans have given more attention to the acquisition of redemption—to the person and work of Christ—than they have to the application of redemption—the doctrine of the person and work of the Holy Spirit. The Lutheran dogmaticians have treated the doctrine of the Spirit too abstractly. They have not sufficiently magnified his practical relations to the Church and to the individual. One great need of the Lutheran Church today is a thorough work on the Holy Spirit. Such a work should be both doctrinal and practical. If this Conference should be the cause or occasion

of the production of the desiderated work, its holding will prove a great benefit to the Church.

---

## THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS.

*By the Rev. L. E. Busby, D. D.*

The importance of this subject is distinctly marked by its position on the program—between the discussion of “The Place of the Holy Spirit in Lutheran Theology” and “Christian Liberty and its Limitations”—the former as bearing on the right intention of the Sacraments on the *divine* side; the latter, the result, internal and external, of such use, on the *human* side.

The means and method of Redemption on the one hand, and of Sanctification on the other, must point to the all-important Doctrine of the Sacraments. Hence the essential need of right teaching and views on the subject of this paper.

For the sake of brevity and accuracy we shall do little more than compile and set in order the teachings of our profound thinkers as the most satisfactory presentation of the subject.

By *Doctrine* we are to understand the principles and divinely revealed truths given by God through His Word, and which form the *basis* of Christian teaching. Dr. Weidner defines doctrine to be “a truth of *faith*, derived from the revealed Word, and taught as a positive truth on the authority of that Word.” When such truth of faith stands as the exponent of the Church we speak of Church Doctrine. *Dogma* and *Doctrine* are not synonymous; the former *embracing*, as Dr. Jacobs states, “a *definition* of the latter.” Dogma is so often used in an unfavorable sense as not to be used in this discussion—of our teachings.

By “The Lutheran Doctrine of the Sacraments” we mean the revealed truths of God’s Word in regard to Baptism and the Lord’s Supper—the only sacraments strictly marked in Holy Scripture—and those truths as set forth in our confessions.

By the term “Sacrament” we mean “a holy rite or act instituted of God, consisting of an earthly or external element or

sign, and of a heavenly element; by which rite or act God not only seals the promise of grace, viz: the forgiveness of sins, but also through the elements truly imparts to every one, who partakes of the sacraments, heavenly possessions, according to the divine Word and promise." (Hutter, p. 164.)

#### I. BAPTISM.

The Lutheran Doctrine of Baptism is stated in Augsburg Confession, Art. IX.; Apology, Art. IX.; Large and Small Catechisms Part IV.; Smalcald Articles, Part III., Art. V.; Formula of Concord, Ep. Chap. XII., etc.

Article IX. of the Augsburg Confession says:

"Of Baptism they teach, that it is necessary to salvation, and that by Baptism the grace of God is offered, and that children are to be baptized, who by Baptism, being offered to God are received into God's favor.

"They condemn the Anabaptists who allow not the Baptism of children, and affirm that children are saved without Baptism."

The Scripture basis of this teaching is found in Matt. 28: 19, 20; Mark 16:16.

We define Christian Baptism to be "that sacrament or rite, instituted by Christ, through which those who do not resist the grace of the Holy Spirit, are born again into a new life." (John 3:5. Col. 2: 12, 13; Tit. 3:5); brought into fellowship with Christ (Rom. 6:3-5; Gal. 3:27); and His church (I. Cor. 12:13); and made partakers of eternal life, (Tit. 3:5; I. Pet. 3:21).

The *earthly element* in Baptism is "not mere water, but that water which is comprehended in God's command, and connected with God's Word"—(Small Cat.)

The *heavenly element* "object is the *Holy Trinity*; and the *benefits* of Baptism are: "it causes the forgiveness of sin, delivers from death and the devil, and gives everlasting salvation to all who believe it as the words and promise of God declare;" or as Augsburg Confession, (Art. V., 2.) says. Baptism is a direct *instrument of grace*, "for through the Word and Sacraments, the Holy Spirit is given, who worketh faith, where and when it pleaseth God," i. e. in those who do not re-

ject the grace of the Spirit which is offered in Baptism.

The Lutheran Church, therefore, rejects (1) the view that Baptism is not necessary because the Holy Spirit is given *immediately* and *directly*, without the external Word and Sacraments, (2) the view that Baptism is simply an initiation-ceremony into external church membership; (3) the view that Baptism is primarily the act of the convert, who thus makes a profession of regeneration which has already taken place in him, and therefore there is a rejection of Infant Baptism, and an admission to Baptism of those only who give evidence of being really regenerated; (4) the view that Baptism is only a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, but not a direct instrument of grace. (Luth. Cyc. Baptism.)

We attach great significance to Baptism because of what God's Word declares and commands.

The Apostolic teaching in regard to its significance is clearly set forth by Dr. Weidner in Lutheran Cyclopedia, page 39.

The initiative method and plan of induction into God's Kingdom is, therefore, Baptism, and to this the church is bound by the positive command of Christ. (Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:16).

We, however, make a distinction between "*necessary to Salvation*" and "*essential to salvation.*" "We hold that this *necessity*, though absolute as regards the work of the Spirit, is, as regards the outward part of Baptism (i. e. the use of water), *ordinary*, not absolute, or without exception; that the *contempt*, not the *want*, of the sacrament condemns; and that, though God binds us to His means, He does not bind His own mercy by them. (Krauth, C. R., p. 129; Gerhard IX, 282; Hollazius, 1098, etc.)

Upon this consensus of belief the Lutheran Church maintains the salvability of infants dying unbaptized.

We reject that unscriptural teaching that unbaptized infants are saved on the ground of *personal innocence*; but "that, as corrupt by nature, that nature must be changed by the Holy Spirit through the application of Christ's redemptory work, of which Baptism is the ordinary channel" (A. C. Arts, IX and II; Krauth, C. R. p. 129.)

The infant, as well as the adult, is a proper subject of Bap-



tism, as seen by comparing John 3:5 and Mark 10:14. Hence we teach: "It is very certain, that the promise of salvation pertains also to little children, for the divine promises of grace and of the Holy Spirit belong not alone to the old, but also to children . . . . Because salvation is offered to all, to men, women, children, and infants," (Apol. IX., 52), and "children and infants ought to be baptized, for they belong to the promised redemption made through Christ, and the Church should administer it to them." (Smal. Art., III.; V., 4).

Some of the reasons for Infant Baptism were as follows:

1. Christ commanded "*all nations*" to be baptized, and therefore infants, (Matt 28:19).
2. The Kingdom of Christ is found only where the Word and Sacraments are found, (John 3:5).
3. The promise of salvation belongs to children, (Matt. 19:14; Mark 10:14; Matt. 18:10, 14).
4. God has for all the centuries gathered congregations through whom He extends and perpetuates the faith.
5. The analogy between circumcision and baptism, (Col. 2:12; cf. Apol. Art. IV., and Large Catechism).
6. Whole families in the primitive church were baptized, therefore, presumably children, (Acts 16:15, 33; 18:8; 1 Cor. 1:16).
7. The whole church is to be cleansed by baptism, (Eph. 5:26); therefore, infants who are unclean by nature, are to be cleansed in the Scripturally-appointed way.

Other convincing reasons might be given:

Opponents of Infant Baptism object on the ground that "the Sacrament of Baptism is no advantage *without faith*; and as infants have no faith, the sacrament should, therefore, not be administered to them."

In answer to such objection the Augsburg Confession Article V., 2, says: "Through the Word and Sacraments the Holy Ghost is given, Who worketh faith where and when it pleaseth God." We, therefore, have no right to limit the power and operations of the Holy Spirit by our limited conception of that power. Faith as a divinely-wrought condition of the soul may *exist*, though there may be no *outward response* or *expression* of it.

We believe, therefore, "that the Holy Ghost, with His gifts, is brought through Baptism to the individual; and that, as faith is the gift of God, (Eph. 2:28), and is offered and sealed to the unresisting heart through the appointed means, therefore that gift is *actually conferred*, and there is wrought a receptivity of grace, or *receptive faith*. "Such an *interwrought condition* in the infant," says Dr. Weidner, "is not an acting on its part but an *internal, real, and effective* uniting with Christ, by which the Holy Spirit makes it a partaker of Christ by means of His Word and Sacrament." Dr. Krauth, (C. R. p. 580) says: "This divinely wrought condition we call *receptive faith*, and though its phenomena are suspended, it is really faith, and as really involves what is essential to justification as does the faith of the adult. There is no justifying merit in faith as an *act*, nor is there any in the acts it originates."

Quenstedt (IV., 153) notes the distinction between "the *primary and immediate act* or operation of justifying faith, and the *secondary and mediate operation*" defining the former as that "by which it reposes in Christ the mediator, and apprehends His benefits by the operation of the Holy Spirit;" and this he calls, the *internal and formal* faith which he attributes to children. The latter is "that by which faith is drawn out externally, etc, which we deny in infants."

Chemnitz (Loc. c. th. III., 160) says: "We by no means grant that infants who are baptized are either *without* faith or are baptized *on the faith of others* . . . For Baptism is the laver of regeneration and the renewal of the Holy Spirit who is poured out upon those baptized, that, being justified, they may become heirs of eternal life, Tit. 3:5; Matt. 10:15; and this is called *the faith of infants*."

Krauth (C. R. 578, 579) says: "When we say that infants *believe* or *have faith*, it is not meant that they understand, or have consciousness of faith; but the error is rejected that baptized infants are pleasing to God, and are saved, *without any action of the Holy Spirit* in them . . . The Holy Spirit operates in them in His own way, which it is not in our power to explain. That operation of the Spirit in infants we call *faith* and we affirm that they *believe*. . . Faith as an *act*,

like sin as an act, presupposes a *condition* of mind, which condition is the essential thing in both cases, to which the act is merely phenomenal."

We might also quote many others. In adult Baptism a conscious and cordial assent of the will is essential to the salutary effect of this sacrament. Hence, Christ says—speaking of adults—"He that *believeth*, and is baptized, shall be saved," Mark 16: 16.

We reject the Romish dogma "*opus operatum*," i. e. that saving grace is conferred "by virtue of the mere sacramental action, so that personal faith is excluded by the efficiency of sacramental grace." Although Baptism when properly performed, and as arranged on the *divine* side, is in itself a perfect and complete vehicle of saving grace, yet the offered grace cannot become effective and beneficial in the case of adults without the personal faith of the applicant. We, therefore, discriminate between the *substance* and the *fruits* of faith. (See small Cat. Schmid, p. 550.)

The Holy Spirit through the Word must bring repentance and faith to the adult who has actually transgressed God's law, and the Spirit must make these real and effective before he can be engrafted into Christ, have fellowship with Him, and receive the seal and assurance of forgiveness. Baptism, as we learn from Rom. 6: 3, 4, is the appointed means of saving union with Christ, and such union is formed, provided the human will, capable of resisting the Divine will, is brought into a humble submission to the Holy Spirit so as not to reject a hearty acceptance of the offered grace.

"Adults may, by actual impenitence, hypocrisy, and obstinacy, deprive themselves of the salutary effect of Baptism." (Gerhard IX., 170).

As to the *mode* or *manner* of applying Baptism the Lutheran Church maintains that water is the prescribed earthly element, in the name of the Holy Trinity; but that *validity* of the Sacrament depends neither upon the *quantity of water* nor upon the *external mode* of its application.

The undue prominence given to *mode* in our day did not obtain in the days of the Reformation. Consequently, we have

no formulated article on *mode* in Baptism. Luther and our Confessors do not regard *immersion* as a necessary mode. The Large Catechism expressly recognizes *pouring* as a preferable mode, because clearly taught in God's Word, established and blessed by long usage, and as fully comporting with the command "let all things be done decently and in order" (1 Cor., 14:40).

From every fair exegesis of Scripture passages on the subject of Baptism, the etymological study and usage of the Greek word translated "Baptize," the practice of the Church for all these Christian ages, and the writings of theologians, we are forced to conclude that the claim that immersion is the only Scripture mode is unwarranted.

---

## II. THE LORD'S SUPPER.

In Baptism the spiritual life is begun; in the Lord's Supper that life is *sustained* and *developed*. Hence the need of the constant use of the Supper by the individual.

The Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper is found in the Augsburg Confession, Articles X., XXII., XXIV.; Apology, same Articles; Formula of Concord, Chap. VII; and in the two Catechisms, Part V.

Article X of the Confession reads:

Of the Supper of the Lord they teach that the true body and blood of Christ are truly present (under the form of bread and wine), and are (there) communicated to those that eat in the Lord's Supper (and received).

And they disapprove of those that teach otherwise, (wherefore also the opposite doctrine is rejected.)

The Formula of Concord, Epitome and Solid Declaration, Part II., Chaps. VII and VIII., affirm:

"With the consecrated or blessed bread and wine the communicants receive the Lord's body and blood. It is that body which is given for you."

The Catechisms, Part V., says:

"It (the Sacrament of the Altar) is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, in and under the bread and wine

which we Christians are commanded by the Word of Christ to eat and to drink."

The Scripture basis for this teaching is found in Matt. 26: 26-28; Mark 14:22-24; Luke 22:19, 20; 1 Cor. 10:16; 11: 23-25.

The question at issue when the Confession was formulated was as to the *kind of interpretation* that should be applied to the words of institution. Two methods were used, to wit: The *Literal* and the *Figurative*.

The Lutheran Church has always maintained that the words should be understood in a *real* and *literal* sense. Form of Concord, Epit., Art. VII., says:

"We believe, teach, and confess, that the words of the Testament of Christ are not otherwise to be understood than in a *literal* sense, so that the bread does not signify the absent body of Christ, nor the wine the absent blood, but that it is truly, because of the sacramental union, the body and blood of Christ." Hence, "not the elements *alone*, but the elements sacramentally with the heavenly matter, and essentially present, compose the sacrament of the Lord's Supper on earth." We believe when Christ used the words, "Take eat, this is my body; take, drink, this is my blood," He used words that most clearly, literally, and emphatically conveyed His very meaning. The spiritualizing process of the Sacramentarians of Luther's day made it necessary safely to guard this literal teaching of Christ. The necessity is no less great in this day.

St. Paul (1 Cor. 10:16) asks: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the *communion of the blood* of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the *communion of the body* of Christ?"—in which language there is clearly indicated both the *earthly* and *heavenly* elements of the Supper. In 1 Cor. 11: 29 the apostle gives this warning: "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, *not discerning the Lord's body*:" and this was the concluding declaration that followed verse 27, in which he says: "Whosoever shall eat of this bread, and drink of this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the *body and blood of the Lord*."

The Lord's Supper is, therefore, not a mere sign or emblem, but that through which Christ is really and truly imparted to the communicant.

As in Baptism, so in the Lord's Supper, the integrity of the Sacrament is not marred or vitiated by the spiritual condition of the administrator or the applicant; yet, in order that the Supper may be of real benefit to the communicant he must receive it in *faith*. Otherwise he will not "discern the Lord's body," and the sacrament will be a condemnation.

Schmid (558) says: "When we speak, however, of the bread and wine, we understand real and true bread and wine, as we also by the body and blood of Christ mean the *real* and *true body* and the *real* and *true blood* of Jesus Christ, as He possesses both *since His glorification*. And as the bread and wine, so also this body and this blood of Christ are really and truly present." As we really and truly partake of the bread and wine, so we really and truly partake of the body and blood of Christ; so that, in both cases, the participation is not metaphorical, but *literal*.

The Lutheran doctrine is known as the doctrine of the *Real Presence*, carefully discriminating between the presence of the spiritual, glorified body of Christ and the spiritual presence of the body of Christ.

Theologians have drawn out the important distinction between *oral manducation* and *spiritual manducation*. The former because it occurs only in the Lord's Supper, is called *Sacramental*.

It is true that, because of a lack of faith, the communicant may partake *orally* of the body and blood of Christ *without spiritual benefit*; while in *spiritual manducation* there is a hearty appropriation of Christ and a reception of the benefits of the mercy and grace of God, the forgiveness of sins, righteousness, and eternal life. The chief thing in the Sacrament, as the catechism declares, "is the forgiveness of sins."

The term "Sacramental eating" as held by the Lutheran Church is quite different from that held by the Calvinists. Gerhard (X., 303) says: "The Calvinists define *Sacramental eating* thus: that we receive by the mouth the bread, which

is the sacrament, i. e., only the *sign* of the *absent* body of Christ."

"We (Lutherans) describe the *Sacramental eating* thus: that we receive with the mouth the bread which is the *communion* of the truly *present* body of Christ."

"The Calvinists define *Spiritual manducation* thus: that the soul elevates itself and its organ, viz., *faith*, to heaven, and there enjoys the body and blood of Christ, with its benefits."

We (Lutherans) by no means deny the application of the benefits of Christ by faith, i. e., the Spiritual eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ, as spoken of in John 6: 53-56, but we have reference to the *fruits* and *design* of the Holy Supper, and therefore distinguish from that the *sacramental manducation* belonging to the *form* of the Eucharist. But when the sacramental eating is called *spiritual*, this is meant to counteract all *carnal* and *earthly* ideas which human reason can conceive, with regard to this celestial mystery."

Therefore, the gross, physical, Capernaite mode of eating understood by the Jews in John 6 is rejected.

The Romish dogma of *Tran-substantiation* which was foisted upon the Church, and advocated for hundreds of years, was denounced by Luther as destructive of the true meaning of the Sacrament, i. e., a *communion*. The Romish idea destroys the earthly element of bread and wine at the time of the sacramental act of consecration, and vitiates the distribution by withholding the cup from the laity.

Luther and his co-reformers restored the true doctrine of the *Real Presence* as taught in the Scriptures, and advocated by the Church Fathers; and insisted that the Lord's Supper should be administered in both kinds. (Augs. Conf. Art. XXII.)

It is important to note the historical fact that, as Coppersmier declares ("Means of Grace," p. 120), "the Christian Church for more than 1500 years had, as a body, retained and confessed the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Sacrament." Great errors, it is true, had crept in and obscured at times this doctrine, but the doctrine itself remained."

Krauth, (C. R. p. 635-738) gives us a brilliant array of historical proofs of the above assertion.

The Lutheran Church rejects the symbolic idea of the sacrament as announced by Zwingli; i. e., that the earthly elements are mere *symbols or signs* of the heavenly elements, and that the design and blessing of the sacrament are only such as would serve as a *remembrance* of Christ's sacrifice for sin.

We reject also the dogma of Consubstantiation. It is lamentable what ignorance prevails among scholars and others outside of the Lutheran Church in charging us with teaching Consubstantiation. A few years ago a prominent editor of a religious magazine openly made the charge against us, and even persisted in it after being corrected.

We reject also *Subpanation*, *Impanation*, and in fact every rationalistic idea that denies the Real Presence as we teach it in our confessions.

With Luther, we can say: "Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the Sacramentarians; nor standeth in the way of the Zwinglians; nor sitteth in the seat of the Zurichers."

As to *Form*, we teach that the body and blood of Christ, *in with*, and *under* the bread and wine, are communicated to us *only* when the *mode prescribed by our Saviour is perfectly observed*. Schmid (p. 559) says as to that mode:

"There must be: (a) The consecration of the elements. (b) The distribution of the elements. (c) The partaking of the elements."

On this point the Form of Concord, (Sol. Dec. VII., 83) is very specific.

It follows, then, that the Romish dogma of a *permanent* change in the elements apart from and after the sacramental act, so as to connect some *magical efficacy* with the Lord's Supper as a propitiatory sacrifice, must be unscriptural, and therefore dangerous.

---

In this rapid, surface-view of the subject assigned the writer, important matter has been necessarily omitted, and for that reason this paper appears fragmentary. We have sought only to give the more salient thoughts on the various points involved.

One all-important question confronts us as a Church in this dawn of the 20th century, to wit: What emphasis shall we give to the doctrine of the sacraments?



*Outside* of the Lutheran Church, among the denominations, and among rationalistic teachers, there are grossly wrong teachings that must be corrected. Light must be planted in the midst of this darkness. This task lies at the door of the Lutheran Church today, as it did in the 16th century. If it be true that:

“He is the free-man whom the *Truth* makes free  
And all are slaves besides,”

and that Truth is:

“That golden key,

That opes the palace of eternity,”—

then we owe it to God and to man to proclaim the truth, for men are to “know the truth, and the truth shall set them free.”

Doctrinal preaching has largely lost favor in our day, the more so, perhaps, because of its infrequency in the pulpit. Dr. Mann used deplorably to say, “This is not a Sacramental age.” The lax and ultra-confessional dogmas of the denominations around us make the conservative doctrines of our Church the target of their attack; nevertheless those doctrines are truly the fortress. Scriptural and impregnable, of our defence and progress. *Truth, consecration, organization*—these are the guarantee of victory.

Truth we already have; consecration and organization must not be lacking. To encourage us to the performance of our duty, we may note the fact as recently mentioned by Dr. Blanchard, of Wheaton College, in regard to the status of the Lutheran Church in relation to the “higher criticism” and the anti-Biblical controversies of the day, that “out of nearly two millions of Lutheran communicants in the United States, with twenty-four Theological Seminaries,” and we may add, its splendid array of scholarship, “there is not a higher critic among them;” nor, indeed, is there a need of one. While the denominations around us are shifting their doctrinal position and readjusting their creeds, the great Evangelical Lutheran Church needs no readjustment, no new confession. In the whole panoply of God she stands as she has always stood, the champion of the Faith.

*Within* the Church there is substantial agreement in regard to the meaning and efficacy of the sacraments. There may

be diverging tendencies in regard to special points—divergencies that can in no better way be weighed and harmonized than in a fraternal, Spirit-controlled Conference of this character. To the consummation of this end may the Spirit of God lead us! In a fraternal cooperation of heart and hand what mighty strides the Lutheran Church would make in this grand country of ours!

Today the little band of loyal Lutherans of the Southland through a humble member of the "old mother Synod," extends the fraternal hand to the great Lutheran hosts of the North, East, and West, and with glad heart exclaims, "We are brethren fighting under a common banner, and champions of a common cause!"

---

#### REMARKS.

The Rev Dr. Richard said in substance:—

There are two points in the essay just read to which we wish to advert.

1. It is true that Lutherans of former days very generally, perhaps universally, repudiated the term *Consubstantiation* when applied to their doctrine of the Lord's Supper. This they had a right to do if they conceived that the term was used to convey the idea that in the Lord's Supper there is an amalgamation of the substance of the bread and of the substance of the body, whereby a new substance is formed—which no Lutheran probably ever taught. But in recent times eminent Lutheran theologians have used the term in describing the Lutheran doctrine. At this moment we recall the names of Rohnert in his *Means of Grace*, Phillippi in his *Dogmatik*, the Mensel *Handle-rikon*, Steitz and Hauck in the *Real-encyclopadie?* (Art. Transubstantiation), Kaweran in the *Moeller Church History*. These theologians, whose learning and Lutheran soundness it would not become us to impeach, use the word in the sense of *res in re*; or, that the two objects of the Supper bread and body, are brought together in one and the same act of taking and eating; or in the sense that the two unchanged

substances coexist in their integrity in the same place—which the Lutheran theology certainly does teach: “The two substances, the natural bread, and the true natural body of Christ, are together present here on earth in the instituted administration of this sacrament.” It may be not wise therefore for us to reject the word altogether, and to affirm unqualifiedly that Lutherans have taught *Consubstantiation*, and that the word entirely misrepresents the Lutheran doctrine.

2. The second point to which we wish to advert is that of *Infant Faith*. We are positively of the opinion that *infant faith is psychologically impossible*. “Faith cometh of hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ.” New-born infants cannot hear the word of Christ in the sense manifestly intended by the apostle. The argument based on the *passivity* of the new-born child not only involves a *begging of the question*, but it contradicts first principles. Evangelical, saving faith, in its first instance, is an *act*, an act of the understanding and of the ethico-religious will. A new-born child cannot feel a moral obligation. We dare not assume that baptism works magically or *opere operato* in the latent religious susceptibility of the new-born child. In view of the utter silence of the New Testament on the subject of infant baptism, we are not warranted in assuming more than that baptism places the child in the covenant of grace, and secures it access to the preaching and teaching of the divine word, since we baptize children with reference primarily to their living, and not primarily with reference to the possibility of their dying in infancy.

It should also be observed that those persons who advance a theory of infant faith, are forced to define or to describe infant faith very differently from what they define or describe that saving faith which they ascribe to believing adults. Recall the definition or description of infant faith taken by the essayist from Chemnitz, through Dr. Krauth. It must also be observed that no person is to be *de Lutheranized* because he does not believe and teach infant faith, since *infant faith is not confessional*. *Der Kinder Glaube ist Keine symbolische Lehre*, says Dr. Plitt in his *Grandriss der Symbolik*, Infant faith is

not affirmed in any confession of any church. Luther does indeed say (in the Large Catechism) we bring the child to baptism with the intention and hope that it *may believe*, not because it does believe. The act looks to the future, to the time when the child comes to hear and to apprehend the word of Christ. Luther's language is really the language of doubt, and not that of an affirming assured faith, for he at length turns the whole question of infant faith over to the doctors, that is, to the philosophers. And when in another place he tries to prove the possibility of faith in infants, by reference to the fact that a believing adult does not lose his faith while sleeping, we reply by saying, neither did he get his faith in the primary instance, while sleeping. The illustration of comparison, is utterly *non apropos*. Faith in its primary instance is an energetic act of the conscious spirit. We baptize children with the intention and hope that they may believe, and because we believe that by baptism children are placed in the covenant of God. This is a great grace. But it is not the teaching of any Lutheran Confession that the unbaptized child will be lost. Rather is it the implied teaching of the Lutheran Confessions, based as they are on the doctrine of God's fatherly love, and His will to save all men, that all children dying before they have consciously sinned, will be saved. The harsh teaching of the entire Wittenburg Theological Faculty in 1545, and of some Lutherans since, denying salvation to the unbaptized children of Jews and heathen, has not been approved by the Lutheran Church as a whole; and it is not probable that a Lutheran can be found any where in the world today, who would affirm that unbaptized infants dying in infancy are lost.

---

The Rev. Dr. H. C. Holloway said:—

I am pleased as well as profited by the excellent paper of Dr. Busby. It is refreshing to have so clearly and forcibly stated the distinctive doctrines of our Church. We have been, and still are, too frequently misunderstood in this regard. I belong to a ministerial association in my town, where five out of eight ministers understood that the Lutheran Church taught the Romish doctrine of Consubstantiation in the Lord's Sup-

per. They do not believe it now, but it required a good deal of earnest and persistent effort upon my part to correct this misapprehension. It is not the Church's fault but may be traceable to our modesty that this old error still lingers and it laid at the door of our Church.

One of the number of ministers of the association referred to, is a Scotchman, who paraded authors, distinguished for their learning, such as Dr. Shedd's "History of Christian Doctrine," by which it was hoped to fasten this Romish error on our Church. But this effort was successfully met and refuted by an array of Lutheran divines, as well as the Augsburg Confession itself, and Luther, who firmly and persistently repudiated this error. Notably also the learned and sainted Dr. Charles P. Krauth; was quoted, who said: "We beg him," Dr. Shedd, "therefore, as he desires to do, as he would be done by, not to think that our Lutheran Church, historically the mother of pure Churches, in some sense even of his own Church among them, has ever believed in the doctrine of Consubstantiation."

We hold that the only fair and proper way to know what a Church's doctrines are on any subject, is to go to its original sources—its confession. A church cannot be held responsible for what this and the other man may teach or write, but what says the Confession of that Church? He who finds the doctrine of Consubstantiation, or any other Romish error, taught in the Augsburg Confession, or any of the Lutheran symbols, surely has read them to no profit. Never, according to the teachings of our Confession can that monstrous doctrine of Consubstantiation be attributed to our Church. From first to last, the Lutheran Church has neglected the very name of Consubstantiation and everything which that name properly implies.

And, on the other hand, no Church has so ably, persistently, as well as successfully controverted this, and all popish errors, as the Lutheran Church. It seems to me we should preach more frequently on these great fundamental doctrines, and emphasize them; for I am very sure that whenever the distinctive teachings of our great and pure Church are clearly and distinctly set forth, they commend themselves to all intelligent, thinking people.

The Rev. Edwin F. Keever said:—

There seems to be considerable complaint about the way in which other churches misunderstand our Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, some charging us with believing Consubstantiation, and others that we even hold Transubstantiation. But this is to be expected; since both these terms have always been variable. Even after the Council of the Lateran in 1215 had determined the dogma of Transubstantiation, many of the Schoolmen did not think that that doctrine required an absolute change of the bread-substance and a separation of substance from accidents, but might be more reasonably and Scripturally understood in the mode which Luther afterwards adopted.

As to Consubstantiation it has always been a variable term. Its application to the Lord's Supper, as far as I have been able to discover, has never been exactly defined. The modern understanding of the word is also indefinite, and in some cases might be applied properly to the Lutheran doctrine. In this discussion it would seem that the speakers who repudiate Consubstantiation ought first to state their conception of it, so that we may all be in the clear.

---

The Rev. Dr. Weigle said:—

Appreciating the learning and ability of our theological professors to make clear distinctions by carefully defining what the teaching of our Church is touching the sacraments, I wish to say a word from the stand-point of a pastor. My experience and observation as a pastor teaches me that the people are not in danger of seeing too much in the sacraments. I would not teach that the divine life always has its beginning in Baptism, but that it is not sealed to us until we have been baptized. Our Christianity is an open letter so long as we are not baptized. With respect to the Lord's Supper, I would teach that the bread remaining bread, and the wine remaining wine, with these elements of bread and wine, as channels, as vehicles, we receive the glorified Christ, it is for us pastors to teach and preach faithfully the doctrines of our Church. Our teaching wins

favor wherever lovingly and loyally maintained, because it is in harmony with God's Word.

---

The Rev. D. L. Mackenzie lamented the difficulty of some of the speakers in accepting the Lutheran doctrine of the sacraments, and particularly that of Luther's Catechisms, "When the Word is preached, it not only enters my ear, but also the Holy Ghost, through that word, enables me to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. So, when the Lord's Supper is administered, not only do the consecrated bread and wine enter my mouth but also, through the ear, the Word of God, and Christ, in the word, enter and meet the elements, at the portal of the body, enabling me to receive the communion of the body and blood of Christ."

---

The Rev. Dr. Jacobs said:—

That it was to be regretted that ample time could not be given to this discussion. We have reached a point where we can candidly express and treat of our differences with dispassionateness and respect for one another; and we would linger here for hours, if we could. He was glad that Dr. Richard had spoken frankly. There was much with which he agreed. We must deal with the antagonists of our Lutheran faith discriminatingly, and concede that there is often a basis for what we, nevertheless, justly condemn as misrepresentations. Dr. Richard was correct in stating that there were Lutheran theologians as late as 1559 who had no hope of the salvation of unbaptized children born without the Church. This opinion was supported by prominent names of a considerably later period. Their proof-text was: "What have I to do, to judge them that are without?" But the error of our critics is that they make the Church chargeable with the opinions of individual theologians. Our Confessions nowhere make such statement. Nevertheless I can apologize for a theologian, not of our Church, who reads such statements of some of our theologians, and interprets the "necessary" of Art. II. of the Augsburg Confession accordingly.

As to the term "consubstantiation," he could readily under-

stand the seeming justice of its application. Lutherans believe the substantial presence of the body of Christ, and the substantial presence of the bread contemporaneously and conjointly in the Lord's Supper. Etymologically, the term would seem justifiable. But the term has a history. That history can be fully appreciated only through scholarly investigation into the Mediaeval writers, such as the brother who has just spoken (Rev. E. F. Keever) has been making. The term became technical theology already in the formularies of the early Church that confessed that Christ is "consubstantial with the Father" according to His divinity, and "consubstantial with us," according to His humanity. It was the Latin of the Greek word "homoousios," the battle-cry of Nicene orthodoxy. It meant "of the same nature." This is what we deny of the Body of Christ in the Lord's Supper. It has not become one nature with the Bread. That there may have been theologians, who have thought that the term might be accepted and defended by Lutherans is not remarkable. There is no position so absurd and untenable as not to claim the admiration and enlist the championship of eccentric scholars. It is rejected by the overwhelming testimony of those who teach the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper as inadequate, confusing, misleading, and an offensive nick-name for a holy mystery.

He could not share the high regard for the opinions of living German theologians that had been expressed. It was not exactly a matter of indifference if the statement were correct that appeal to the words of institution in the evangelists was so universally abandoned by conservative German scholars. But it would be only a matter of regret that they had departed from the sole standard, and would not affect our faith in the least. What are all the faculties in Germany combined? Why must we be always referred to Germany, as though we had not the Word of God in our own hands, and must find only there the oracles that could interpret it? Is not this a violation of the formal principle of Protestantism? What, too, is the result? How long do the faculties of Germany abide by one position? Is not everything there, uncertain, vacillating, shifting? As my revered and now departed senior colleague, Dr.



Mann, once told a body of American scholars, in my presence: "The German scholars all run in one direction, one year; and in the next, turn around, and run with equal zeal, the opposite way." We have the standard according to which to judge them; and let us have independence enough to use it without looking across the ocean for our opinions.

He was not ready to admit Dr. Richard's statement that there was nothing in the Lutheran Confessions concerning *Kinder-Glaube*. There occurred to him the passage in the Large Catechism, where Luther says: "We bring children to baptism, not because they believe, but in order that they may believe." Perhaps the difference between us on this subject, is not as great as may at first appear. No one maintains that infants have conscious faith, or that this faith puts forth acts. The difference may lie in our definition of faith. Faith, we hold, is not only, nay more, not chiefly an act. Back of the act is a state, a relation, an attitude, a *habitus* as the old teachers called it. This question was discussed at Wittenberg in 1536, in that famous conference between Luther and his colleagues, on the one hand, and Bucer and his friends, on the other, which resulted in the Wittenberg Concord. We have a full report of that discussion from Bucer himself, (*Scripta Anglica*, p. 656.) in which he says that he urged the passage, "Faith cometh by hearing," and that Luther answered that just as we do not affirm that believers lose faith when they go to sleep, and receive it anew when they awaken, so the conscious exercise of faith is not essential to its presence. This so far satisfied Bucer that he united with Luther in the statement: "It is manifest that through Baptism there come to infants the forgiveness of original sin and the gift of the Holy Ghost who is efficacious in them according to their measure. Although we do not understand of what nature that action of God in them is, nevertheless it is certain that in them new and holy movements are wrought. For although we must not imagine that infants understand, nevertheless these movements and inclinations to believe Christ and love God, are in a measure like the movements of faith and love. This is what we say, when we say that infants have faith. For we speak thus, that

it may be understood that infants cannot become holy and be saved without a divine action in them." (Wittenberg Concord, "of Baptism.")

This in no way conflicts with the words: "Faith cometh by hearing." In the missionary chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, St. Paul is presenting the great argument for sending the Gospel to the heathen. It is not by baptism, but by the preaching of the word, that heathen are converted to Christianity. This argument for missionary effort no more affirms that hearing is the only instrument by which faith comes than the history of a saved soul in Rom. 8: 30, proves that none are called but they who have been predestinated, or that all who are called are justified and glorified. Just as the Apostle in the latter passage makes no attempt to give an exhaustive presentation of the doctrine of predestination, so in the former there is no exhaustive treatment of the doctrine of the Means of Grace. Otherwise, why not deny also that the reading of the word confers faith, since the Apostle speaks only of hearing. And yet even to the baptized child, faith must come by hearing, as the Christian Life is a progress from faith to faith, and the faith once given in the feeblest degree in Baptism must grow through faith given by hearing, or it perishes like a grain of wheat cast into the sands of the desert.

The speaker had intended to refer also to the objection to the term "oral" as descriptive of the reception of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Supper, but, in his very limited time, overlooked it while speaking. He would have said that the Formula of Concord carefully guards the term from gross conceptions, as the essayist has shown, and means by its use, only to emphasize the objective presence, as distinguished from all theories of a subjective presence. Do the presence and reception depend upon the word and institution of Christ, or upon the faith of the communicant? If the reception be only by faith and not also by the mouth, can unbelievers eat and drink to their condemnation? So the Augsburg Confession says that the body and blood of Christ are distributed "to those eating" in the Holy Supper. It is simply this doctrine of Art. X of the

Augustana, and the later Confession designates by the term "oral manducation."

---

## CHRISTIAN LIBERTY AND ITS LIMITATIONS.

*By the Rev. S. A. Repass, D. D.*

It is well in writing on any subject to secure a clear understanding of the meaning of terms; otherwise clear conclusions cannot be reached. Nor is it less important to have well in mind the presuppositions upon which our reasoning rests; otherwise we may run into confusion and vague generalities. Comprehensively viewed our thinking is at best partial and fragmentary, embracing no more than small sections of the great whole of any subject on which it may be exercised. We do not know all about anything, and can scarcely aim at more than to focus our thoughts upon what lies more directly about us. And yet it is not wise nor safe to take too much for granted. The subject of this paper is well guarded and defined. It is not *liberty* of which we are expected to write, a word with which all sorts of men have sought to conjure. It is *Christian Liberty*, that which the Christian man has and in which he lives and rejoices. The Christian man, we repeat. And he is one who is no longer in the state of nature, or bound by the sinful limitations of the natural man. There is no condition more real, and no fact more certainly established, than that our subjection by nature to a state of sin. We are under its dominion and no endeavor or struggle of our own can give or bring release. We are born in it, live it, and die in it, unless delivered by our Lord Jesus Christ. This condition is no less one of condemnation, one upon which rests the righteous wrath of the all-holy God. Holy Scripture sets forth no truth more constantly and clearly than this, that we are by nature the children of wrath. Here it is less a fact that we are willingly subject to this tyranny, and as unwilling to break with it as we are in our own strength unable. We love the servitude which above all others renders us most miserable. Indeed, nothing is quite so difficult as to gain our consent to be delivered. This is at once the deepest mystery of sin and guilt; and it is this that drew the pity and

love of God to our state of helpless misery.

The Christian man is one who has accepted the deliverance brought to us in the Gospel. The whole plan of redemption centers on its practical side in the salvation of the individual; so that I may in truth say, "the Son of God was born, lived, died, rose again for me; and on the throne of His grace rules as my gracious Lord and King. He has broken the power of sin, delivered wholly from its condemnation, and me set at liberty; and He who was sometime the willing slave of Satan has through grace become a free man, yet the willing servant of Jesus Christ. To such an one "there is no condemnation." He lives and walks at liberty. No state possible or conceivable is so high or blessed as this; and none is so real. Compared to it, that of which the natural man loves to boast is no more than the shadow of an unreality.

We need to hold strictly to the presentation just made. The Christian man is not man in a state of nature under the bondage of sin and its condemnation. In other words, he is a new creature, and created in Jesus Christ after His own image. Of such an one, it is said, and is true, "old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." While there has been no destruction of the nature of the man there has been a renewal, a real and truly new energy implanted, involving a change of his relation to God, and making him who was before a child of wrath, a child of God. This is something more, and, indeed, something other, than a mere awakening of the conscience, giving to him clearer moral perceptions; and something other than the quickening of certain forces before latent, bring these out into the light of consciousness, and imparting to the man earnestness of purpose, and even a better and higher aim in life. We say, and with emphasis, the Christian is something more and other than this. To reach the thought of the New Testament in what it declares concerning him who is born of God there must be included something wholly new, something in no sense belonging to the man in his natural state. This is that given in Regeneration, a birth in its nature, its origin, and its author, from above. In this view of it Regeneration is akin to the Incarnation. To the one, the in-

dividual, a new nature is given, this being the condition of a renewed personality; in the other, the person of the Son of God assumes humanity. In both the union is equally real. It is this that makes, and indeed, *is* the Christian man. Education can never evolve it, no matter how complete this may be. Nor can any measure of civilization, however broad and refined, bring man or humanity to this new stage, as truly new to the individual as the Incarnation was a new thing to the race. The Christian man is born from above, is truly a new creature, and possessing a new consciousness, may we not say, a new personality?

This is the presupposition involved in our subject, "Christian Liberty." And it is a fundamental one, distinguishing as well the nature of this liberty as its source and its sphere. No one is absolutely free, i. e., wholly independent of any authority beyond himself. This can be predicated only of God. To claim it for the creature is a contradiction in the terms employed, as in the very conception itself. We were created dependent beings, and having a moral nature formed in the image of God or bound by the law both of God and of our own nature to live under obedience. The planets are not more certainly appointed to their orbits than we to conform our lives to the law of our being, which is that of obedience to God. Not only were we created for this as the supreme aim of life, making it indeed the very sphere in which our lives should move: but as originally created our nature was perfectly conformed to the divine will. The law of God concerning us, and the law of our own being, and as well the actual movements of the entire inner and outer life, run in complete accord, with nothing of antagonism existing to impair the harmony. Certainly here were present all the conditions necessary to liberty of conduct and life. It was not liberty to act without regard to the will of another, which would have been as well a violation of the very laws of their own being as of the law of God. It was the free action of creatures whose delight was in the law of the Lord, and all of whose desires were towards Him. There was no constraint either from within or from without impelling to an unwilling obedience, or forcing to a certain line of conduct.

There was unity of the moral creature and the Creator, bringing in the largest measure of happiness. This was the condition in which our first parents were created and lived. They were at liberty.

With the temptation came disobedience and sin; and with sin guilt and condemnation, and bondage. We are not here concerned with the mystery of the introduction of evil into our world. It is enough to hold by this statement, that yielding to the temptation our first parents fell away from their condition of purity and became guilty. That act of disobedience

“Brought death into our world, and all its woe.”

corrupting the nature of man as certainly as transgressed the corrupting the nature of man as certainly as it transgressed the of freedom or liberty, i. e., the loss of both the power and desire to obey God. It is more, we repeat, than the mere violation of the law of the Sovereign, or than an act of rebellion against His authority. It was as well an act of violence done to the entire nature of the moral creature, destroying the harmony of his living, separating him from God, his true life and joy, and precipitating him into a state of bondage, which is itself a state of sin and guilt. The fall is no myth, the Garden of Eden no park of wild animals, and the temptation no mere dramatic representation of man's birth into a condition of self-conscious freedom. It was truly a fall. A fall from liberty in union with God into a state of slavery. Verily, the more complete our obedience to God, the more complete our liberty.

The Lord Christ came to bring men deliverance from this guilty misery. The Law intervened to give the knowledge of sin, and the consciousness of the need of divine help. It could do no more than this, and when this was effected its end was accomplished. It was indeed a long and severe discipline and education, and to which both Jews and Gentiles were subjected. The nations and races of men were worn out in the process, and became more and more sunken in sin and a state of hopelessness. Apart from those in whom preparatory grace had wrought its good work, there was increasing despair and increasing bondage. Neither by wisdom, nor by power, nor by art could redemption be secured. True liberty was gone, since

"all had sinned and come short of the glory of God."

From this condition, we repeat, the Lord Jesus Christ came to bring deliverance. In our nature and for God's eternal Son lived and died, in order that through Him we might have salvation, even forgiveness of sin and eternal life. What he did for us toward God was in order that we might be saved and sanctified through Him, and serve Him in righteousness and holiness in our life. Those who believe are delivered from the condemnation of sin, and truly and really restored to His favor. Without any work or merit of their own, and without any obedience as a condition, except as faith itself is obedience, they are fully accepted as children and adopted as sons of God. And in that relation they yield a free and ready obedience, finding their delight in doing His good pleasure. Their service is a service of freedom, rendered without constraint; and as they have, to use Luther's fine phrase, "a heart of the Law," they delight in obeying Him who gave it. The ground or necessity of compulsion is removed, all fear is clean gone, and reconciled in Christ in the spirit of children they render ready and willing service. While they are diligent in obedience, and fear to offend against God, this is in neither case the ground of their hope of acceptance. That is the complete righteousness of Jesus Christ, theirs by faith, and theirs henceforth and forever. This is Christian Liberty, the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free. They who stand in it serve in liberty, and walk at liberty. All things are theirs, and they are lords over all. The law cannot bind the conscience of such, since they are free from its constraints; and whatever service it requires or demands they render freely. They refuse to go under any yoke of bondage, no matter by whom or what this may be imposed. Having taken refuge in Christ they stand in a large and secure place, rejoicing in the victory he has gained for them. In bondage to no one, and to nothing, they walk on high places assured of their liberty and confident in their possession. From the law, from Church ceremonies, from holy days and Sabbath days, and from all compulsory human enactments, they are free, free in the liberty of Christ.

These statements scarcely require qualification before those

We are truly instructed in our Lutheran faith. Christian liberty is not license, nor indeed anything like it. From all forms of Antinomianism it is totally removed. Justification by faith no more conflicts with the duty of doing good to others than does this liberty conflict with the service of love to our neighbor, with the obligation, indeed, strongly binding on the Christian, to lay down his life for the brethren, and to be the servant of all men in love. Commenting on 1 Cor. 9:19: "Though I be free from all men yet have I made myself servant unto all." Luther lays down the principle points: First, that by faith the Christian is a free man over all things and subject to none: Second, that by love he is servant to all things and subject to every one, the former looking chiefly to man's relation to God, in a state of grace and justification, as a man, regenerate, and spiritual man; the latter to his being still in the world, and under the duties which his calling and condition of life impose upon him. By faith the Christian is united to Christ, and whatever belongs to Christ belongs to the Christian. Christ's life, righteousness, and salvation have freed us from sin, death, and hell, and from the law. But as Christ took upon Himself the form of a servant to minister unto us, thus the Christian, being himself free from all works by faith, resigns his own liberty in order to do to his neighbor as Christ has done to him. For the Christian does not live in himself, but in Christ and in the brethren; in Christ by faith, and in his fellowmen by love. By faith he soars upward to God; by love he stoops to his fellowmen. And this is the true Christian Liberty, not a liberty from works, but from those false presumptuous opinions concerning works, which seek justification through works. Lord over all, yet servant to all—this is at the same time the prerogative and the duty of the Christian man. His Christian Liberty is a most real and blessed gift, and constrained by the love of Christ he is most true to himself when he serves others in love. How could he better show himself a Christian than in thus imitating Christ.

In principle what is written shows the limitations of Christian Liberty. There will scarcely be the transgression of "the perfect law of liberty" when "the faith that worketh by love"



is present and rules the heart and life. When this is wanting, liberty may become license. On the one hand, if faith be mere opinion and theory, in other words, if it be not evangelical, it cannot bear that distinctive fruit—Christian love. On the other hand, if love be other than that born of the faith that saves it is liable to run into all manner of extravagance, and manifest itself in unfaithfulness to Christ and His holy truth. Faith puts, and faith keeps the heart, the man indeed, right before God; while love, which is the product of faith, puts and holds the man in right Christian relations towards Christian men. Christian Liberty has its limitations, but as this liberty is born of the Gospel it is safe-guarded by Christian love.

The Christian man is a freeman; and in the highest and best sense he only can justify his claim to that distinction. Set free from the dominion of sin and wrath, and in and with Christ made lord over all things, he truly walks in a large place, and having "a heart of the law," renders obedience in love, and without constraint from without or from within. In so far as he stands and walks in the liberty wherewith 'Christ has made him free' he has and cherishes the consciousness of the entire security of his position. In so far as he depart from this he becomes again "entangled with the yoke of bondage," and will be led into, either despair, or into the hopeless endeavor to work out his own righteousness. In Christ there is offered a deliverance at once complete and final. Apart from Him there may be hard labor and conflict, but no true hope of release. A caged bird may beat its prison never so eagerly to escape its confinement, but with no other result than bleeding and broken wings. The Lord Christ gives release, and leads to liberty.

Surely, it need not be said that this liberty gives no license to sin; since we all know this well. "For how can we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?" The fruits of saving faith are fruits of righteousness and peace. While the Christian man is not without sin, his whole life indeed being a struggle against the sin within and without, yet living in sin is not less violence against the law of his renewed life than against God Himself. Liberty to sin, or violate any of the divine laws,

is, to say the least, monstrously absurd, and an utter inversion of every conception of the Christian life. That any bearing the name of Christ have maintained and practiced such a theory is one of the strangest contradictions presenting itself to the student of church history. The Christian life is not one contrary to law; nor one alone obedience to law; nor one in any sense antagonistic to law. It stands and moves, having its beginning and completion, in Him who was Himself the most perfect personal embodiment of the law. We are justified by faith in Him who is "the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Verily, Christian liberty contains and confers no warrant for wrong-doing. Much rather is it this: the inherited privilege and ability to conform the life in Jesus Christ to the law governing the new creature. On this side Christian liberty has its limitations in righteousness and truth.

As towards men it has and finds its limitations in the law of Christian love. It dare not sacrifice truth in order to please those who may reject it, nor make any compromise of what it sacredly holds to be truth. Born of the truth the truly Christian man loves it; how then can he cast reproach upon its master who loves him? And yet, he holds the truth in love even toward those who err in departing from it: while, without hypocrisy or partiality, he bears testimony against the error. The truth of God's Word is a thing so sacred and vital that the maintenance of it abundantly justifies the religious controversies of the past and present; while the rancor and littleness of spirit often characterizing these is a clear violation of the law of Christian love. To disown truth for the sake of peace, as in the interest of Christian union, is treason to God and truth, and introduces evils a hundred fold more damaging to the cause of true religion than all the gains it hopes to secure. Such a course is not an abuse of Christian Liberty. It is something quite different; a license that merits only reprobation.

There are not a few questions, *adiaphora* in their nature, which might receive consideration under the subject of this paper. It is not difficult for the Christian man to determine his attitude

towards those who are brethren, under conditions of this character. The principle, and indeed the rule of conduct, is clearly laid down by the apostle. We may not always insist on our rights, or on the exercise of our liberty in Christ, regardless of the opinions and convictions of others. Here the law of Christian love clearly indicates our course of action, requiring that we resign our liberty for the sake of those who are weak in the faith. Now the strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not insist on pleasing themselves. He who claims to have been led, and who indeed has been led, into the liberty of the Gospel, may regard with true Christian pity those who are still in bondage to the old letter, and who have not been wholly delivered from the "law of ordinances;" and without surrendering his own freedom may well stoop to his brother in weakness. "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient: all things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of any." In what is vital I must and can yield nothing, holding the truth in love, but still holding it against all contradictions, and even persecution. In what is indifferent I may resign my liberty, and be "all things to all men." This is after the example of our Lord and His apostles. Christian Liberty has its limitations; but in matters *adiaphora* it is bounded by the large sphere of Christian love.

Redeemed without money or price of our own, and yet redeemed at an infinite cost, we are called to the service of our Lord. This service is perfect freedom, yet it no less demands the undivided affection and energy of our redeemed nature. To weary of it, or to give it in any other than a spirit of ready and entire willingness, indicates that we have not risen to a just estimate of our vocation and privilege. Ours is an estate of liberty. We are to live in and breathe it as the condition of our Christian life. It is the portion only of those who are the children of God by faith in His well beloved Son. All others are in bondage, however loudly they may boast of liberty, for

"He is free whom the truth makes free,  
And all are slaves besides."

## REMARKS.

The Rev. Dr. Fry said:—

The paper read did not touch upon a point of serious importance which he would like discussed,—viz. May the limitations of our liberty ever become a law? For example, because Paul says, "if meat make by brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world stands," it has been affirmed a Christian has no *right* to use his liberty in any way or thing at which any other person may take offence. Thus the liberty we gain under the Gospel is prohibited by the force of a law, whenever its exercise is displeasing to another. Doubtless there are limitations to Christian liberty, but there ought to be boundary lines to these limitations. He asked the essayist if he had given this point any consideration?

---

The Rev. Dr. Repass said:—

Answering the question of Dr. Fry.—While a brother might seek to make an unreasonable use of the doctrine of Christian liberty as defined, imposing most unwarranted restraints upon others, the position taken in the paper was clearly Scriptural, and the principle sufficiently comprehensive to include the whole practical Christian life. In things, or matters, indifferent, Christians may well yield their liberty even to those who are unreasonable in maintaining what they claim to be their conscientious conditions. It is always our right and duty to seek to instruct a weak brother, and to lead him into clearer light. When this is done in a spirit of love, rather than of dictation and proud superiority, the truth can scarcely fail to lead the brother into a clearer vision of that liberty "wherewith Christ hath made us free." Nothing is so expansive and all-conquering as the truth here and maintained in the love of Christ.

## THE HISTORICAL DEACONESS WORK AND AMERICAN CONDITIONS.

*By Rev. G. C. Berkmeier, D. D., Director of the Wartburg Orphans' Farm School, Mt. Vernon, N. Y.*

Woman in her proper place is always a benediction, out of place she is a curse. Woman is equally out of place, when she usurps the prerogatives of man, as when she—by a false ascetic principle—separates from man, ceases to be his earthly helpmeet, confining herself within the high walls of nunnery, declaring in violation of God's first ordinance, that, after all, it is good for man to be alone.

Christianity has given woman her proper place, bestowed on her the most exalted honors and vested her with unprecedented rights. Nothing proves this more significantly than the office of the female diaconate in the primitive Church. The scope of this office was to afford a full development to female energies for social and religious purposes; to associate women, as far as possible in rank and practice with men, while preserving to each sex its distinct sphere of activity—to the one the supremacy of the head, to the other that of the heart; to the one power, to the other influence; to the one the office of public preaching, exhortation and relief, to the other that of private exhortation, consolation and helpfulness, yet each acting under the influence of that Holy Spirit, who was invoked alike over the head of the deacon and deaconess at their ordination. True in this was the Church to the laws of man's being, as displayed progressively throughout Holy Scripture, from Genesis to Revelations. By a preordained and eternal marriage man and woman must be one in order to fulfill the great destinies of humanity. Genesis shows us how it is not good for man to be alone, how woman is made a helpmeet for him. The New Testament discovers to us the deep spiritual ground of this relation, by showing us Christ as the Holy Bridegroom of his hallowed Bride—the Church. History confirms the lesson from age to age, from country to country, by showing how, if on the one hand you ignore sex and put woman on the same footing with man, woman becomes a monster,—whilst if you deprive either sex of its free action, of its free influence over

each other, the result is national sterility, the man a savage, the woman a fool. Restore eastern women their scriptural rights and infuse them with the Christian spirit, and the whole eastern world will rise up new-born.

These are very broad and general statements,—and yet they are fundamental, and dare not be lost sight of in the proper discussion of our particular subject, “The Historical Deaconess Work.” I did not choose this subject. It was assigned to me. At first I was at loss how to treat it without first examining exegetically and dogmatically the scriptural office of the female diaconate;—yet that has been done, been done so often and so thoroughly by others, that at the best I could only repeat what you have all heard before. It is well, however, always to examine our settled axioms in the light of history, thereby not only proving our example, but also entering into a deeper understanding of the same. History is the one unerring corrective for the subtle and often very limited reasonings of man and “the Owls of Minerva sing in the evening-time.”

In considering the Female Diaconate there is surely a lesson for us in its history. If we rehearse this history as briefly as possible, we will have to note the following facts.

1. The early apostolic Church set the seal upon the ministering functions of women by the appointment of a Female Diaconate, strictly excluded from the priestly functions of public teaching and worship, (cult), but nearly coequal with the male diaconate as respects the exercise of active charity and to which in the records of the second Century we find women solemnly ordained.

2. The Deaconess of the primitive Church is an individual deaconess and, like the deacon, attached to the service of a particular congregation. The deacon and deaconess work together, although on separate lines, still with one object in view—the amelioration of the world by the selfdenying service of love. Through their effectual services the Church became the divine organization for taking care of men. The “widows” were not to be “neglected in the daily ministrations.” Every man is cared for “according as he has need.” The poor, the destitute are, at the very beginning,

embraced in this systematic Charity of the Church. There had been nothing like this before. It was a revelation to the heathen world. The Church proclaimed through such service of love the brotherhood and equality of men. She declared the awful value of the meanest beggar. She knew no earthly names, no national distinctions, no social differences in her work of mercy. As her Lord had died for all, so she was come to care for all. In the third Century we find into how large a system the first spontaneous Charity had developed itself. Never has the world seen more heroic deeds of self-sacrificing love than those of Christian women, the deaconesses of the Church, in those memorable days. They nursed the sick, they visited the prison-houses, they followed the martyrs to the stake and stood with them on the bloody sand of the amphitheatre. They carried their lives in their hands, willing at all times to be offered up in their service.

3. In the course of time the typical individual Deaconess of the primitive Church entirely disappears. Why? Evidently through the growth in the Church of false ascetic principles and in particular of the practice of religious celibacy. In exact proportion as we find the female diaconate languish and gradually disappear, we see the rise and growth of monachism. The deaconess was placed under the pernicious vow of celibacy and became a nun, the nuns live together in close monastic communion. By and by monachism resists supreme, monachism with its perpetual vows, and galling observances and doctrines, which are but the tradition of men. Shut in by the high walls of the cloister, separated from the wicked outer world by a grated iron door, these caged saints consider themselves a little holy inner world, and now follows a great year-long, life-long, age-long struggle of the loving female heart to be as useful and as saintly as it can without endangering her awful vows and trembling beneath the Damoclean sword of tremendous penalties. It was all a mistake, a sad, dark pernicious mistake—the mistake of religious celibacy and underlying this, a doctrine only second in unscriptural falsehood to Mariolatry itself—that of the marriage of the individual soul with Christ.

4. Thus perished the institution of the female diaconate. The beautiful river, whose living waters were destined to refresh and gladden the barren desert of human woe and suffering was itself lost in the desert sand of monachism—was lost but not gone, had disappeared for a time to emerge once more in new glory and continue triumphantly on its beneficent course.

Already in the eleventh to the thirteenth century a period opens, in which women strive for a larger sphere of activity in the field of charity and to set themselves free from the shackles of monachism. At this time we find in Germany and Belgium as early as the tenth century the flourishing *Beguine Sisterhoods*, founded on the principle of fellowship, and consisting of widows and unmarried girls who, without separating themselves wholly from their kind or vowing poverty, perpetual chastity or absolute obedience, yet led, either at their own homes or in common dwellings, a life of prayer, meditation and charitable ministrations. These sisters cared for orphans, and the aged, went out to nurse the sick, to attend deathbeds,—in short there is perhaps none of the natural diaconical functions of women which they did not perform. They wore their own peculiar uniform. This Beguine movement, really offers the first complete realization of the idea of a *collective female diaconate*, in the shape of free sisterhoods of women, and it is very significant that these institutions arose and took root precisely in those great cities of Northern Europe, the original mission of its freedom, trade and industry, spreading over the low countries, North Germany, Flemish and German France, Switzerland—almost the whole range of those populations over which Protestantism spread itself two or three centuries later. They were thoroughly evangelical in spirit and we can say forerunners of the coming reformation.

5. There would now remain to be considered what efforts have been made by Protestantism to reproduce the typical institution of the early Church towards the consecration of female zeal and usefulness to the service of the Church only a few hints will have to suffice. After the restoration of the Bible and scriptural doctrine and the abolition of celibacy, or



in other words, after the unmonasticising of the church, the need of the Female Diaconate soon manifests itself. Those who are familiar with the 16th century are aware, by how much the spirit had preceded the practice of religious reforms; how, when all the principles had been already proclaimed which lapped at its base the old Romish world, the fabric of that old world remained still standing and the evangelical doctrine was received by and preached in many a convent, without seemingly a suspicion that it was soon to be deemed incompatible with their existence. In 1521 when the controversy as to celibacy was already beginning, we find Luther thus writing to Melanchthon in a letter exhibiting the struggle going on in his own mind: "If with a free and evangelical mind thou takest vows and of thy free will makest thyself a slave, it is just that thou do keep thy vows." Of the Beguines it is related that they embraced almost everywhere the doctrines of the Reformation. Monastic foundations, however, strange to say, subsisted to a much later period in connection with Lutheranism. At the same time we notice the ever growing attempt to revive the type of the early deaconess, which finally led to the great and glorious work of Fliedner in Kaiserwerth and Loehe in Neuendettelsau. It may be interesting in this connection to note that our Pilgrim Fathers had for a period at least, their ordained deaconesses, for we find in one of the memorials of the Pilgrim Fathers a description of one of the congregations wherein we are told that there were 300 communicants, two pastors, and teachers, four ruling elders, three able and Godly men for deacons, one ancient widow for a deaconess, who did the service for many years, though she was 60 years of age when she was chosen. "She honored her place and was an ornament to the congregation; she usually sat in a convenient place in the congregation with a little birchen rod in her hand and kept little children in great awe from disturbing the congregation; she did frequently visit the sick and weak, especially women, and, as there was need, called out maids and old women to watch and do them other help as their necessities did require; and if they were poor, she would gather relief for them or acquaint the deacons and she was obeyed as a

mother in Israel and an officer of Christ. (Young's Chronicles of Pilgrim Fathers). With the exception of the "little birchen rod" and the "great awe of little children," puritan attributes, of which we find no trace among the records of early deaconesses—it must be admitted that we find here a most faithful reproduction of most of the functions of the original office.

- o. Comparing the primitive institution of the early Church with the most recent developments of the present day, we are almost unable to find any resemblance between the two. They seem to be two entirely different things. The female diaconate of the early Church was essentially individual, whilst that of the present day is collective; the diaconate of the early Church had its pivot and fitting place in the constitution of the congregation, whilst that of the present day has to seek its standing ground in the principle of fellowship,—hence the mother-house and the sisterhood. These motherhouses, apart from being the common home of all the individual members of the community, are at the same time also the school for the *training of women* for the various works of charity. Is this not something entirely new? Not a *restoration* of the early female diaconate, but a *substitution* of something entirely different from it? And in addition to this, must we not ask, how far is the establishment of such an *ecclesiola in ecclesia*, of such a distinct community of sisters a lawful one? Has not Christ told us, "Ye are all brethren" how then can any number of men or women say among themselves, "*We* are brothers,—*We* are sisters?" Is that not unscriptural, false and wrong? It certainly would be, if the aim of the community would be to *make* a sisterhood and not to manifest one. If those who thus call themselves sisters do so in no spirit of exclusion towards the others, but simply to show the many the reality of that large family of which they are called to be members and to glorify and better the name of that elder brother, who hath sealed the covenant of adoption with His blood—then they are not objectionable, but rather help to strengthen and develop the universal brotherhood of the Church and to afford a beautiful witness for its truth. But, let us add: they will bear that witness just in proportion as they do not seek their

perfection in themselves, but out of themselves; as, instead of raising walls of adamant between the sisterhood on the one hand and the great world without on the other, they on contrary devote the whole strength of their united efforts continually towards promoting the regeneration of the outer world through all works of self-sacrifice and love.

And as regards the other criticism that the female diaconate in its present development is something new and entirely different from the typical individual deaconess of the early Church, we freely admit that the present *form* is new, but maintain that the office is essentially the same—our present parish deaconess being almost identical with the one of the early Church. The present system of a sisterhood with a motherhouse as centre and nursery is—it seems to us—a necessary and happy adaptation to the needs and circumstances of the present day. Such adaptation we find in all the various departments of our present Church life and its working agencies—neither our Bible Societies, nor our Missionary Societies, nor our Ladies Societies can trace their pedigree to the Apostles nor yet to the early Reformers.

But before concluding I dare not forget that my subject is, “The Historic Deaconess Work and *American Conditions*.” This brings us from the past to the present, from foreign lands to our own country, and the matter before us at once ceases to be an academical discussion, it comes home to our immediate personal interest—as a subject of vital and practical importance. The evangelical deaconess has come over to invade and conquer the new world. Hers is a peaceful conquest and no breach of the Monroe doctrine is involved. We hail her advent and wish her God-speed. We need her to supplement our forces.

The Church of God has several offices, several classes of duties. She has the *prophetic* office. She is sent to preach the word, to teach the truth, to illuminate and guide mankind. But this is but one of her offices. Together with the prophetic she has also the *diaconical* office, quite as important and absolutely necessary in our day. I can't help but feel that this other office has been to some extent ignored by our Church in

our time and country. The prophetic office has been magnified to the dwarfing of the other. The duty of preaching the word has been dwelt upon to the extent almost of forgetting other practical duties, which in all the world's history were never before so urgent. This has given our Lutheran Church an appearance of one-sidedness. She appears as the great champion of orthodoxy, maintaining the faith once delivered unto the saints. Heroic work has been done in this respect. The clash of sharp weapons has been heard and is still heard in the vigorous theological and dogmatical discussions. These exploits have been necessary. They are one of the blessed legacies of our great Reformer, who has given to the word the best things any man can give—ideas—thoughts of truth and righteousness. These truths are of the most awful import. But is the Church of God to deal with them alone? Are they not awfully important for the very reason, that they are to be translated into *acts*? Was not our own Luther preeminently a man of action, who solidified his thoughts into deeds and his faith into works? and if we look to the apostolic age, we find, it is true, the church in the amplest exercise of her prophetic office. She magnified that office. She made it of first importance. She proclaimed God's truths with all her might. But she did more than this. She was not only an organization for the preaching of the Gospel, but likewise was a charitable organization for carrying out into visible result the principles she proclaimed and the law of love she preached. She addressed men's eyes as well as their ears. She proclaimed a concrete, embodied truth. She herself was a divine epistle, a holy evangel "known and read of all men." We know, she preached and taught, but the preaching, which had the great effect, which so rapidly overcame heathenism, which won her triumph from fire and rack and block, was the visible preaching of her charity, her divine love and pity toward mankind. So she stood amid the vileness of heathenism—teaching and preaching? Aye, but doing also, proclaiming the Gospel as an embodied, living truth, visibly, with both her hands;—both offices being beautifully and harmoniously united; the *prophetic* as well as the *diaconical*.

Oh would that these two offices could once more be united as the two great working agencies of our Church in the new world. We live in a practical age. The American people are a practical people. There is a way to preach Christ in this land that must prove effective. It is idle to sneer at humanitarianism, or to dwell on purity of doctrine, as if that were all. The church that visits the sick, comforts the sorrowing, cares for the widows and fatherless and preaches the Gospel to the poor, is the Church which the American people will confess to be the real Bride of Christ. We cannot wonder at its judgment. It has no better rule than the Lords: "Ye shall know them by their fruits." The world has become almost deaf to words. But if not ears, it has eyes. It can see a visible Gospel—and one of the most beautiful representations of visible Christianity is the evangelical Deaconess in her quiet and self-sacrificing work of Christian benevolence. *The theological seminaries and the motherhouses of Deaconesses should be looked upon as the two great nurseries of our Church, the training schools of our principal workers, the one pursuing the prophetic the other the diaconical office.*

We are considering our *American* conditions. American soil is a peculiar soil. The greatest danger threatening the development of the Female Diaconate in this country would be the utterly false notion as though a deaconess could be or should be a female evangelist, an engine of religious propaganda instead of confining herself to the one cardinal office, that of practically setting forth that faith which is "shewn by works," which "worketh by love." Let her convert by example, that is enough. A Christian deaconess should be obedient, should be humble, should be a servant. We must expect that this conception will be largely criticized as "un-American." That matters not, as long as it is scriptural. We must send out deaconesses, who will make their environment more nearly what it should be, not such, who will yield to and are moulded by the environment in which they find themselves.

It cannot be denied, that the female diaconate in its present form is an importation from the Fatherland. It is in our opinion of utmost importance, that our few sisters here in the

world should entertain the most intimate relations with the tens of thousand on the other side of the great ocean, learning by their experience, asking for their advice, and being encouraged by their example. Such a relation will prove most salutary, will protect from many foolish experiments and ensure a steady, healthy growth.

On the other hand we are satisfied that whilst remaining essentially the same with those of the Fatherland, our sisterhoods will, in the course of time, develop their own *peculiar American traits*, their own individuality. We do not want an exact reproduction of that which is European, but rather a healthy, spontaneous evolution. As the honey of Madeira has the taste of violets and that of Rome of Roses and as the wines of different climes have all the peculiar aroma of the land on which they grew—so also is the kingdom of God. Let us sow our seed in faith and let God give a body as it shall please Him, and to every seed its own body. We are confronted on this side of the Atlantic not only with theories, but with conditions, with American conditions, and to take these into account and *adapt* ourselves to our surroundings, as far as it is possible, without sacrificing principle,—this in our opinion only proves good, sanctified American common sense. In this respect we can learn great lessons from the Roman Catholic Church, which studies carefully American life and conditions and then suits herself to such conditions with an adaptability, which is simply amazing, knowing of course that in this country she has no adventitious aids to rely upon, that here her institutions stand exposed to the fiercest glare of public scrutiny and must rely solely on their practical worth.

Speaking of American conditions, I dare not neglect to speak one word regarding that one great difficulty that confronts us in all working agencies of our Lutheran Church here in the new world, and that is the *language question*. It is related that a high priest in India made this remark: "Of two things I am certain, and the third is yet doubtful. I am certain that I shall be no Christian. I am likewise certain, that my grandchild will be a Christian—doubtful alone is what my son will do." You understand, what I mean to say. There is

no doubt, that our grand-children at least will speak English, perhaps only English, and as enthusiastically as I champion the German, still I must confess that in building up the great deaconess-work of our Church in this country, due attention should be paid to the requirements of the future. To the English I would say: Do not destroy the German, there is a blessing in it—a great conservative force, a living link between the glorious past and the promising future and go where you please, you will find that at the present time the most and the best deaconesses are German. To the *German* brethren I would say: Do not fear the English—if they are only English Lutheran then they cannot help to be at heart good Germans!

The female diaconate as represented by Kaiserswerth Neuen-dettelsau and recently also in its first beginnings in this our country and in this city is exactly the thing which our Lutheran Church *must* have to cope with the difficult work of the present day. We can no longer rest satisfied with the dry schemes of ladies societies and committees, with the casual labors of women otherwise engaged, bestowing on the church the mere crumbs of their leisure, taking up the work and putting it down again in a haphazard way—sometimes as a means of introducing themselves into a particular society. Give us, oh, good Lord, give us a female diaconate devoted freely and wholly to this most important work; a female diaconate, prepared and educated for the work and solemnly consecrated to it by the invoking of the Holy Spirit. It has already been a blessing to us and needs but a franker and more general recognition and a more enthusiastic support at the hands of loyal Lutherans, to bear yet more abundant fruit!

---

#### REMARKS.

The Rev. Dr. Spaeth said:—

What are, in particular, the American conditions under which we have to take up and to carry on the deaconess work in this country?

In the first place, we have here the system of the *Free Church*, in distinction from the State Church system in Ger-

many and Skandinavia. The Church in America, as organized in her Synods and General Bodies covers every field of associated Christian activity, particularly those important fields of Foreign and Inner Missions, which, in Europe are left to voluntary associations of individuals. While in Europe the formal and proper connection between the Deaconess cause and the official representatives and authorities of the Church has thus far been a problem which is still waiting for its satisfactory solution, our Deaconess institutions in America, from the very outset, have been seeking proper recognition and formal connection with the ecclesiastical bodies. This is the case even in those institutions which are originally private undertakings of individuals or associations. The General Synod has, thus far, been most consistent in establishing its whole Deaconess work in full official connection with the organized church, by the appointment of a Deaconess Board to whom the management of the whole work is committed.

A second point to be considered under "American Conditions" is the character of *woman in America*. Her peculiar gifts of aggressiveness and adaptability seem to me most promising for the establishment and expansion of the Deaconess work on this continent, provided that they are properly balanced and disciplined by the strict, systematic, almost military training such as the Motherhouse affords.

Again, the peculiar "American conditions" under which we are undertaking the Deaconess work in this country, suggest the possibility, even probability, that hospital nursing will not be the most important and prominent feature of our Deaconess work of the future. The "Trained Nurse" who is so much in evidence in our American hospitals, and for whose systematic education so much is being done may sooner or later crowd the deaconess out of hospital work, at least in such institutions as are not directly under the control of the Church. But we need not be alarmed at this prospect. It would naturally have the happy result of confining the deaconess to her proper sphere, the ministry of mercy in the Church itself, parish work, the caring for the little ones, the orphans, the poor, teaching the young, etc.



The Rev. Dr. Manhart said:—

The position of the Deaconess connected with the Motherhouse of the General Synod has been clearly defined. Hers is an office of helpful service in the Church. Her office is as definitely established at that of the minister of the Word. She is "set apart" or "consecrated" to her office by men representing the Church. This service is to her the equivalent of ordination to the minister. Her work and position are for her as important, and demand as great fidelity, as the office of the Christian ministry for the man.

Her duties and her relations are by no means identical with those of the minister of the Word and sacraments. They are womanly duties and relations while they are also churchly. The deaconess is a Church official. As such she pledges conformity to the Church's doctrinal basis and its principles. The Motherhouse corresponds in large measure to the theological seminary, so that in addition to being a home of probationers and deaconesses, and a centre from which laborers are sent to out stations, it must also be a training school in biblical and churchly learning, in true piety, and in practical ability in the varied duties of active service they are to render in the Church. Christ Himself is the model of all true diaconate service. In the Church the female diaconate is an office and ministry of kindly, helpful and merciful ministry in the name and spirit of Christ. Its complete establishment among us will be a vast addition to the Church's working power.

---

## THE MOVEMENT FROM ROMANISM TO LUTHERANISM IN AUSTRIA.

*By the Rev. Carl Goodel.*

Our God is a God that hideth Himself. We find the proof of this in His manner of dealing with men and with His Kingdom. Often it is His good pleasure to let His faithful ones cast the net for months and years without success,—to plow and sow and yet reap nothing. At such times His servants bow in humble and patient submission, and await the coming of His grace. But there are also times when He mercifully puts forth His mighty hand, and performs visible wonders where man had

done and planned nothing, and even failed in many things. Into such a marvelously ripe field I ask the brethren to follow me for a little while.

Our path leads to Austria,—into a land where once the majority of the inhabitants adhered to the Gospel and to the doctrines of Luther, and where, in the single city of Prague thirty-five Lutheran pastors were stationed as late as the beginning of the seventeenth century. Then came the Jesuits and won the entire country for Rome, exterminated Protestantism by the aid of the civil authorities, inflicted horrible cruelties on men and women, on the aged and on children, and killed, tortured and exiled the flower of the country. The light of the Gospel seemed to be entirely extinguished, evangelical services were no longer permitted, houses were ransacked for Bibles, catechisms and Lutheran hymn-books; and owners of such were severely punished. The Church of the Gospel was dead, but not the potencies of the Gospel. In the homes of peasants and burghers, these quietly brought forth fragrant blossoms, and kept many a faithful man, many a believing woman true to the faith of the fathers. By these the pure doctrine was silently perpetuated through many generations. After 1781, in which year the edict of toleration was issued by Joseph II, evangelical worship could again be held under certain restrictions. Thus, in a small way, an evangelical church was revived, and in the larger towns congregations of the Augsburg and the Helvetic Confessions were formed, to which the present emperor has granted substantial rights and privileges. Nevertheless with the Roman Catholic Confession, and papal, Episcopal and priestly influences everywhere dominant, the Church of the pure Word and Sacraments was merely tolerated, and remained a feeble and oppressed body. Exclusive of Hungary, there are in Austria 450,000 Protestants, 300,000 of whom adhere to the Augsburg Confession, and are therefore our brethren in the faith. Less than two per cent. of the total population is therefore Protestant. While the large land-holders all belong to the Catholic nobility, and the immense estates and wealth of the monasteries are the possession of the Roman Catholic Church, our Church on the contrary, is poor. This

poverty makes itself felt very especially as regards the support of the pastors and schools. Along-side of the public schools, which of course are Romish, the Protestants are permitted to have their own schools. These, however, must be maintained at private expense: and as a result the number of such schools has steadily declined.

Such were the conditions existing in the needy, vanishing, small Evangelical Church when, in the year 1898, in a gathering of students, the cry was raised "Away from Rome," and a movement which had already been quietly fermenting, was inaugurated, that, over against the Slavo-Roman sympathies of the domineering clergy, set in motion national aspirations, which found a hearty response, especially among the more cultured classes of Bohemia and Steiermark. On the ground that the Roman Catholic Church is the greatest enemy of true culture, politico-national agitators urged separation from it with considerable success. But this politico-national movement away from Rome and the Romish Church was only the impulse to a far more powerful movement fanned into life by God. The majority of those who left the Church still carried with them so much of the religious spirit of their ancestors, that they did not wish to remain without a Church connection: and, in accordance with their German-national sympathies, they chose the most German man that ever lived, Dr. Martin Luther. He became their hero, and next to that of Bismark, no name was so frequently mentioned as that of our Reformer. But his translation of the Bible, his writings and especially his Catechism also found their way into the country, to deliver from error and bring to a knowledge of the truth those, who in their search after God, had never found real satisfaction in the Church of Rome, and who, as persons of culture, and as is also usual in South America, Spain, Italy, France and Belgium, had turned away entirely from the Church and hence also from God and His Son Jesus Christ. I had read of men, and in my visit to Bohemia met with such, who for years had not gone to church, because disgusted with the Roman Catholic cultus and priesthood, but who now, since they have found

the Gospel as set forth by Luther and our Church, never miss a service, stand in the front rank of Rome's antagonists and of those most active in the building of the True Zion, give large sums of money for the support of the Church of the Augsburg Confession, and devote all their spare time to the work of church councils and the propagation of the Gospel. Merchants, lawyers and railroad officials carry New Testaments and tracts with them. That everywhere they may spread the Gospel and may also bring peace to their brethren by convincing them from the Scriptures.

The most prominent layman in the movement is the attorney, Dr. Anton Eisenkolb in Karbitz, a man who loves his native land with all his heart, a very poor Catholic, but a good patriot. He was one of the first of those who for national reasons forsook the Roman Catholic Church. He became acquainted with pastors and laymen in Germany, read the Bible and Luther's writings, and turned with an undivided heart from a life without God and a Saviour to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Before a meeting of five thousand people, assembled to protest against clericalism, I myself heard him give such sterling testimony for Christ, the only begotten Son of God, as I have rarely heard from the lips of a layman. And one of his political friends, who has not yet embraced the Gospel, said to me: "Dr. Eisenkolb cannot speak three sentences in public without making mention of 'His Lord Jesus Christ' or the Gospel." This man, after his acceptance of the Evangelical faith, and after he had made many stirring addresses in all parts of the country against the power and cunning of Rome, was elected to the Austrian Parliament by a vote of 80,000, in a Roman Catholic district that contains at most not over 2,000 Protestant men. This proves to what an extent the Roman Catholic Church has suffered the loss of confidence in Bohemia, where it ruled the people with an iron hand, and yet since the days of Huss and the Bohemian brethren failed to convince them of the truth of its teachings.

The following quotation from an address which Dr. Eisenkolb made in the Austrian Parliament, in February, 1901, will serve to show the character of the man: "We accepted the new confession as a matter of inner conviction; and, in order

that we might make no mistake, we studied Luther's Catechism, we again learned to pray, our hearts again opened to Christian truth, and they belong to Jesus, the Saviour. We allow no one, not even a minister, to stand between us and our God and Saviour. We take pleasure in the conflict for true Christianity, for the Gospel, because with our whole heart we are devoted to our Saviour." In view of such a testimony what must be thought of the oft-repeated Romish falsehood that the movement away from Rome has nothing at all to do with religion—a statement that was at first also believed among us? How can the lie uttered by priests and bishops, that separation from Rome means separation from Christ and God, continue to deceive, in the face of such a testimony from a man who has hundreds of like mind behind him?

By personal observation I have become convinced that in Bohemia, where the movement is strongest, the Roman Catholic Church has completely lost its power, and that the masses are only awaiting their opportunity to forsake it and to strike out for themselves. The more than 20,000, that in constantly growing numbers have in the last few years come over to the Protestant Church, are only the beginning of a multitude ten-fold larger, who, in all parts of the Austrian Empire, are almost ready to make the change, if only they can be given the guarantee that they will again be provided with a church building, a cemetery, and a school. Any one, who, like these Austrians, has for a long time been under Rome's rule, is at least churchly, even if not religious in our sense, and is therefore not so ready to give up the venerable and beautiful usages to which he was accustomed. I often read and have often heard it said: "As soon as the Evangelicals move from a hall to a church edifice, I will not wait long to connect myself with the Lutheran Church."

But where our God builds Zion with such wonderful speed, His colaborers have many and important duties laid upon them. So rapid was the increase which He gave the several congregations and the entire Austrian church, that there were neither pastors, churches, nor chapels at hand to care for those who came. They, therefore, turned to their brethren in the faith,

first of all to those in Germany. And there, love did much for them. Thus, e. g. the Evangelical Union ("Evang. Bund") pays the salary of forty-six newly-appointed vicars; the Gustav Adolf Society rendered financial assistance in the building of more than fifty churches, chapels and school houses; and a single resolution of the "Bund" directed that \$40,000 be paid to congregations in Austria. An intense desire to help the brethren in the dispersion has taken possession of the theological youth of Germany; and many a noble brother is already in the field, laboring with self-denying zeal, and constantly exposed to the danger of being exiled by the civil authorities which are altogether under Romish influence, or else running the risk of physical violence to himself and his flock, such as one of the friends I made in Bohemia experienced last fall. And yet this very person assured me that it was his greatest joy to bring God's Word and Sacrament to souls that were so earnest in their search, and so ready to make sacrifices with him. Where there is such love and such honest zeal the need for personal helpers will no doubt be relieved; but financial aid will be required in increasing measure for many years to come.

Three years ago our newly-won brethren already appealed to our Church in America. Their cry for help found a response in the German Philadelphia Conference of the Pennsylvania Synod. Upon presentation of the cause in Church papers and before a number of congregations \$400 was placed at my disposal. On my visit to Germany last summer, I went to Bohemia, and there learned to know a number of new congregations by personal observation, for the purpose of distributing among them, by direction of our Synod, the sum of \$330. It was not my wish to pay this sum into one of the large relief funds, but rather to establish personal relations with the brethren. And in this I was entirely successful. I expected much, but found a great deal more; namely, wide awake, intelligent, self-possessed and positive leaders of the movement, pastors and church officers burning with love to their Lord and their brethren, and hundreds of men and women who in the fervency of their love, in the steadfastness of their faith, in willingness to

sacrifice, in devotion to God's Word, in zeal for God's house, and in their efforts to win others into the Lord's vineyard, reminded one of Apostolic days. In the congregation at Klostergrab, where, in the year 1617, under the lead of a bishop, the Lutheran church was stormed and burned by a mob of Romanists, I saw, almost finished, the neat little church in which upwards of 200 men and women, residing in a place that only three years ago was entirely Catholic, will gather to thank God for the grace vouchsafed in a pure Gospel. I there attended a meeting of several hundred people, the majority of whom still belong to the Catholic church, who listened most eagerly and without a sign of weariness, from 8.30 p. m. to midnight to what was told them of the excellence of the Lutheran faith. Among them was a miner of seventy-three years, who connected with the Lutheran church two years ago, and who is by his pastor called the Hans Sachs of his congregation, because he writes hymns in a popular vein which celebrate the mighty acts of God in these days. At the close of the meeting he rose and asked me to carry greetings to the brethren in America. "Pray for us, and think of us," he said, "as we pray for you." This greeting, I today also bring to this assembly of Lutherans, with the request not to forget the needs of our new fellow-believers. I will gratefully receive small and large contributions. Let me also urge upon the pastors to interest themselves in this matter, and to make it known to their congregations.

May the Lord strengthen, preserve and increase the Lutheran Church in Austria!

---

#### A NATIVE MINISTRY FOR CONGREGATIONS IN FOREIGN FIELDS.

*By the Rev. J. H. Harpster, D. D.*

The need of a native ministry for congregations in the foreign field needs no discussion. It is self-evident. Any one can see that a native ministry is just as important to the growth and development of the church in the foreign as in the home field. For the sake of distinction, we speak of it as the "foreign field" here; it is the home field there.

Still, granted a native ministry, there is considerable difference of opinion among equally capable and experienced missionaries in regard to such points, say, as the conditions which should govern the placing of a native ministry over congregations, the amount of liberty and independent action which should be given to it, to what extent it should be kept under the control of the foreign missionary, and other matters of like character connected with the subject. No doubt there is enough difference of opinion on these points to furnish matter for a paper.

In estimating the development and strength of a mission, nothing is of more importance than a knowledge of the native agency which it has created and which engages in its work. Missions develop in complexity of organization as they increase in size. At its beginning, a mission is necessarily a very simple affair. It consists merely of one or more missionaries surrounded by a handful of Christians, and assisted by a very few natives in the preaching of the Gospel message to the heathen masses. As the work grows, the native agency grows, or ought to grow; and the one grows, and can grow, only as the other does—no faster, no slower. That is the law. The mission which fails in developing a truly converted, devoted native ministry, fails as a mission.

There is, therefore, no subject relating to mission economics more important than the raising up of a well-equipped spiritually, morally, intellectually, indigenous ministry. For, essential as foreign missionaries are to begin missions, and for a time at least to direct them, a native ministry by its gifts, its numbers, vernacular speech, knowledge of native character, ability to live and labor in their own country at comparatively small expense, has great advantages over the foreign missionary. The intelligent, philosophic view of missions, therefore, is that which is ever looking forward to the time, and making preparation for it, when the foreign workers will decrease and their place be occupied by an efficient native force.

In pursuing this line of mission policy, we are clearly following that of the early church. We cannot, therefore, be in



error in adopting it. The history of the early church shows that it was the custom of the Apostles to select from among their converts approved men, to lay hands on them and ordain them to the work of the ministry. We read that they "ordained them elders in every church." Paul writes to his young disciple, Titus, that the object he had in view in leaving him in Crete was that he "should set in order the things that were wanting, and ordain elders in every city as he had appointed him." Many other passages could be cited to the same effect. Evidently, to their way of thinking, it did not require a quarter of a century to get a man from their converts fit for the ministry! In that early church every congregation, apparently, had its native pastor, and in some cases, as at Ephesus, evidently three or four, or more. They saw, we may be sure, what we should see, that the only way to conserve mission work and to extend it, was by the ordination and establishment of a native ministry.

This, I say, was the method of the Apostles, the method of the men who had learned their work in the school and at the feet of Christ.

I anticipate the objection that Paul and Peter had a higher type of men to select a native ministry from than the missionary in India, say, has today. I doubt it. I doubt whether there is a mission in India today, with an organization twenty or twenty-five years old, that has not a number of catechists quite as learned and quite as devoted as the average run of men whom Paul and Peter and Timothy and Titus hesitated not to set apart for the work of the ministry by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. At all events the burden of proof rests with the man who says that the average Hindu catechist of Guntur and Narasaravupet and Rajahmundry is not as learned and not as devoted as the average Gentile catechist of Lys-tra and Iconium and Antioch, and whom these great missionary leaders prayed over, ordained, commended to the grace of God, and left, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to do the best he could.

I think I am not an extremist. To insist that there ought to be the same proportion of foreign missionaries to the number

of people in the foreign as in the home field is to label oneself a missionary crank, and properly so. In order to maintain the same proportion, the General Synod would need to send to the Guntur field one hundred and twenty missionaries; and if it counts adherents, two hundred and forty; whilst to maintain the same proportion to the people in the districts in which the General Synod and General Council are located, it would require that each of these branches of our church should keep no less than six thousand foreign missionaries constantly in the field. It needs only to make a statement like this to show how unreasonable and utterly impracticable it is. It goes without saying that if the conversion of the heathen world depended upon a herculean effort like this on the part of the church in Christian lands the outlook would be hopeless indeed.

But, in the economy of God's grace, the conversion of heathen peoples has never required an impossible effort like that on the part of a foreign church. It is impracticable and impossible. No nation, nor any considerable part of it, was ever converted to Christianity, or any other religion, by foreign missionaries. Take it in India. It has been said and is, without any manner of doubt, true, that ninety per cent of the converts to Christianity are made by other Hindu converts. It is a humiliating and a painful thing, as one must sometimes do, to sit and listen to a missionary describing to an interested audience his work, his success, the number of people that have been brought into the church, the wonderful doors that have been opened and entered, but never so much as mentioning his native fellow workers and their share in it all. All yet in India, at all events, it is almost always the native catechist who has discovered the convert, has wrenched him away from his old belief, instructed him in the principles of Christ and presented him to the missionary for baptism. About all that the missionary did was to baptize him—after proper care and inquiry, of course—and then take to himself any credit belonging to the transaction.

I do not mean to reflect upon the energy or devotion of the missionary. I do not blame him for not doing more than he can do; I do blame him for taking credit that does not belong to him. But the fact is that so far as the direct, individual,

hand-to-hand grapple with heathenism is concerned, the native brother, as a rule, is the better worker. And this is only what should be expected. When all is said and done, the missionary is a foreigner and remains a foreigner. He is all too often a bird of passage, and this of necessity. How frequently does it occur that a missionary is sent out, and great hopes of his usefulness are entertained by the Church and the Board, but before he gets the barest working knowledge of the vernacular, his wife gets sick, or his children fall ill, or his own health breaks down, and he leaves the country and the foreign field knows him no more forever. The native worker lives and dies in his own country. The missionary is a foreigner; the language is strange and uncouth to him; the modes of thought, the manners and customs of the people are as different from those he has been accustomed to as those of another world might be. If he is an American he comes to these utterly strange people primed to the full with American ideas and Yankee notions, and he finds it the most difficult thing of his life to adapt himself to the order of things into which he finds himself introduced in musty old Hindustan. He finds that much of the cargo he has brought from America is practically useless, and the best thing to be done with it is to pitch it overboard. If he is a sensible man he will do it; but it is the simple and sorrowful fact that more than one missionary comes to India who is not a sensible man, and who blights his missionary career by insisting on carrying out his foreign ideas regardless of the peculiarities and prejudices of the people he has come to help and save.

Now, in all these respects the native has an immense advantage over the foreign worker. When he stands up in the village street he speaks his mother tongue; he is at home in the country; he knows the people he is talking to, and can drive home his argument by illustrations drawn from the common experience of the audience before him as not one foreign missionary in a score can do.

It has been well said that "the foreign missionary brings certain qualifications to the work which the native worker does not possess. He has back of him a thousand years of a

Christian history. He has definite and skilled knowledge of Christian doctrine and thought. Brought up from childhood among Christians and Christian influences he ought to possess a high degree of spirituality, and, as a rule, does. And he has powers of organization and authority which belong peculiarly to the Western and are rarely found in Eastern character. For the present and for some time to come, the foreign missionary, for the most part, must initiate and guide and control." All that is true; but the direct impact upon heathenism, I say, must be made by the sons and daughters of the soil. That has always been the history of successful mission achievement. Augustin and a few dozen monks with him, constituted, as far as we know, the entire foreign missionary force that inaugurated the mission that converted England. St. Patrick seems to have been the single, solitary foreign missionary to Ireland; and Boniface and a few with him, to Germany. But wherever the few missionaries went they at once established monasteries and institutions for the training of an indigenous ministry who should carry on the propaganda under the foreign missionary's guidance and control.

With every year of advancing thought and missionary experience I am coming to see more and more clearly that the need of foreign missions is not large numbers of foreign missionaries. Provided they be well equipped, and have the stuff in them to make leaders, comparatively few foreign missionaries are all that is needed. But what is needed is a large, a thoroughly trained and devoted native ministry.

The Rev. J. Cooling, one of the oldest, and confessedly, one of the wisest missionaries in India, in a paper recently read before the Madras Missionary Conference upon this subject says: "The Church of England in Tinnevely and Tanjore is leaving its mission more and more to the care of the native pastors. The relation of the European missionary to the native church is largely advisory. This system has worked well, and in my judgment indicates the wisest line of policy. Do not withdraw the European missionary from the field, but let him gradually hand over all direct control of the native churches to the Indian pastorates. No missionary, as a rule,

should do what an Indian pastor or catechist can do equally well."

I have said that no nation was ever converted to Christianity by foreign missionaries. He who says so has not read history aright. No church in any land was ever established upon a foundation that endured that was not established by men of the soil. Every attempt of foreigners, as far as I know, failed. That brilliant "missionary meteor," Francis Xavier, came to India and baptized the Hindus not only by the thousands, but by tens and hundreds of thousands. For ten years, so say the chronicles, his baptisms averaged 70,000 per year. In Travencore 10,000 entered in one month by the "gate" which he opened so wide. He baptized, so the record states, until his hands dropped and his voice became inaudible. And, perhaps, not one trace of his work remains; nor did, perhaps, fifty years after his death. So far as permanent results are concerned all his work was little more than the plowing of water. The sides closed in and left no trace. Why? Because he organized no indigenous ministry. He tried to do all the work himself, like some missionaries are trying to do in India today, and when he passed away his work passed with him. So it has always been, and so it always will be where the foreign missionary arrogates to himself all responsibility, and fails to raise up a self-reliant native ministry.

This brings me to another point in connection with this subject. And that is, the attitude of the foreign missionary to the native ministry.

It is a common saying among older missionaries that in the first period the young missionary regards all native Christians as faultless angels. In the next period the idol is shattered, and the native Christian is regarded as wholly and entirely bad, with hardly one redeeming virtue. As time passes, if he is a sensible man, he comes to estimate native Christians at what they are. In the second period, however, which sometimes lasts too long, the native worker is never trusted, always suspected, even despised.

This second period in the case of too many missionaries seems to last during their entire missionary career. It is most

unfortunate. And in this way: No honest man works willingly with, or under a man, who distrusts him and refuses to intrust him with responsibility because of suspicion. This jealousy of the native worker is most injurious to missions. As might have been foreseen, it is keeping many of the best educated Indian Christians from entering mission work. In the mission with which I am directly connected, during the last two years two young men who had been in our mission school for, perhaps ten years, upon whom we had, I think, spent more money than upon any two young men in the mission, who were among our brightest students, when the time came to enter the service of the mission, deliberately entered secular employment. And it was not so much to be wondered at. When an intelligent Indian Christian young man revolves the question of a life calling, and surveys the outlook, what does he see? He sees larger and larger openings for secular employment, in which he has a fair chance of rising to a commanding position. Or he sees, on the one hand, that the Government of India, without any special expression of good-will, is, more and more, making simple fitness for a place the only test of its acquisition. He sees that highly responsible positions are accorded to men of tried worth, and that he has a fair likelihood of attaining to one of the highest positions within the reach of his powers.

When on the other hand, he turns to observe the attitude taken by the missionaries towards those who enter mission service, what does he find? He finds, to be sure, the utmost expression of good-will, and he knows that it is perfectly sincere. But he notices that, with the best of intentions, there is a fixed policy of conservatism, and hardly any sign of a disposition to accord positions of trust and responsibility to even the tried servants of the missions; much less to create opportunities which I, for one, would be ashamed to acknowledge does not exist among our native mission workers as much as among government employees.

Take a concrete case. Here are two young men attending the same school—some mission school, say. They are of equal ability; they pass the same examinations, and determine as to their life calling. The one elects to enter government employ-

ment; the other the service of the mission. Ten years pass. The government employee, under an impartial system of preferment, has gradually risen to a place among the foremost in his department of service. The mission worker after ten, twenty, thirty years of faithful service still finds himself the repressed subordinate of the white missionary, often ruled with iron hand, and with no prospect of ever being anything else than a subordinate. The result is, inevitably is, that many educated Christians stand aloof from entering mission work; and the further result is that the mission which pursues that policy of distrust of the native worker is more or less filled with poor, incompetent men who are willing to work for a few rupees a month, and who have no influence whatever except with the lowest grade of Hindu society.

I say, more or less filled; for there are men of good intellectual training among the workers in all our missions; and the wonder to me is that, in view of the persistent refusal to admit them to the ordained ministry, or to trust them with responsibility and independence of action, there are.

There is no doubt about it that the Christian church of India is too much dominated by foreign influence. The controlling and intimidating authority of the foreign missionary restrains the freedom and damps the energy of the Indian worker. And the Home Boards always side with the missionaries. The time has come to change this condition of things. Properly qualified natives of character and ability must be raised to the office of the ordained ministry; and they, with the entire body of catechists, must be given more of the freedom of action which is given to their white associate to develop their work along the lines which commend themselves to their judgment. It is certain there are missionaries and mission Boards who do not understand the change that has taken place in the thought and opinion of the Indian church in the last few years. This change has been brought about by Christianity itself. However immature and inconsiderate these opinions may often be, aspirations, ideas of freedom and independence have sprung up. And this, I say, is the natural result of the teachings of Christianity itself. It is certain, also, that the halo which used

to surround the white missionary has been largely dissipated. The native mission worker whose father and grandfather, perhaps, were Christians, and who feels himself capable of filling the higher places in the Christian ministry, and who certainly is, sees no reason, in the Gospel or out of it, why the foreigner should arrogate to himself all the high places and he be rigidly excluded. I say the time has come to recognize the change that has taken place in the ideas and expectations of the educated classes generally, and of the Christian community as naturally affected by the change, and to change our mission policy. The time has come to gradually, but of fixed and determined policy, to raise the status of our native fellow workers of tried worth and ability.

And this is true particularly of two missions represented here. I feel it should be one of the functions of this paper to call attention to the fact that, whilst in the Protestant missions of South India generally there is one native ordained pastor to every 853 members of the native church, in Rajahmundry there is only one to every 2,000 of a membership; and in Guntur, with a baptized membership of certainly over 25,000, there is not one single ordained native pastor! It is this condition of things in these two missions that led that prominent missionary, the Rev. Mr. Cooling, to say in the paper already referred to, "The two most remarkable cases"—that is, of failure to ordain a native ministry—"are the two American Lutheran Missions at Rajahmundry and Guntur." The most remarkable of all is the Guntur mission; for the Rajahmundry mission has now three ordained native pastors, but the Guntur mission, with four times as many baptized Christians, not one. Mr. Cooling adds in his paper, "The Guntur, or General Synod mission, has 159 catechists, and as we may infer, many of these men are men of intellect and spiritual gifts, equal to such as in a neighboring mission are ordained." Without any manner of doubt they are.

I say, therefore, that the time has come in these two missions to take into counsel our native brethren far more than we have yet done, and to educate them up to a higher standard of self-reliance, and this, as I understand it, can only be done



by giving them spheres of greater responsibility and independence. The Boards at home must be brought to see the necessity of more frequently raising Indian Christian workers to posts now occupied by their foreign missionaries wherever men of approved competence are available. Dr. Wilson of Bombay, that splendid missionary and educator, openly declared that he aimed at preparing his Christian students to take the place of the foreign missionaries, and that he expected them to do the work of missionaries to their countrymen *better than foreigners*, including himself and his colleagues, giants though they were in intellect and spiritual power. Missionaries who will not trust their native brethren must receive official direction from their Boards to trust them. The testimony of those missions who have done most in the way of raising up a native ministry—notably the German Lutheran mission in India—is that the men thus raised up can be fully trusted with the responsibility and authority given the foreign missionary. They also bear testimony that they have found that the men who have thus been trusted have grown and developed far more than other men, their equals in education and ability, who have been kept down because of an unwillingness to trust them. But a few weeks ago, an Indian bishop of the Church of England being asked whether the time had not come when a native Indian bishop ought to be claimed from Christian missions, replied: “Ah, I think the time has come, and I think that we ought to risk a good deal to reach that consummation.” No doubt we must allow for imperfection. We are not perfect ourselves. If we raise these men they may at first, now and then, abuse their authority; but give it to them and the exercise will create the cure and remedy for such abuses in a thousand ways.

---

#### REMARKS.

The Rev. W. L. Seabrook said:

As a member of the Executive Committee of the Board of Missions of the United Synod in the South, I feel that I should say to the Conference that the foreign work of the United Synod is being prosecuted along the lines suggested

by Dr. Harpster. We have in Japan three American missionaries with their wives. Two of these are located in Saga, and the third in Kumamoto. A fourth, not employed by the United Synod, but supported by the Danish Church, working, however, in line with our representatives to build up one Lutheran Church in Japan, is located at Kurume. Two native Japanese have been given thorough theological training and have been regularly ordained, one as pastor of the church in Saga, the other as missionary pastor at Kumamoto. Three evangelists are receiving careful instruction in theology, while aiding in the work. One of these is a physician, who gave up a good practice to become a worker in our mission. From the large cities our missionaries, native pastors and evangelists cover towns and villages intermediate, preaching and teaching. It is our ultimate hope to build up a native Japanese Lutheran Church.

---

#### "WOMEN AS WORKERS IN THE PRACTICAL WORK OF THE CHURCH."

*By the Rev. J. P. Krcchting, D. D.*

"The woman's cause is man's, they rise or sink  
Together, dwarfed or godlike, bond or free."

The statement of the question implies, that there is *practical* work to be done in the church; that men are the natural leaders in this work; and that *women* are to be "*helpers*." Whether all men want them to be *helpers* or not the fact remains, they *will help*; and have already accomplished much: and their work will grow a hundredfold, when all men once awake from their Rip Van Winklian sleep, to the glory and possibility of the hour; and realize how much more and better work can be done, by a combination of two forces the strong and the gentle, the robust and refined, the head and the heart; the first representing man, the last woman.

Woman's development through former ages may have been slow, it nevertheless has been sure; and in these latter days, it has been marvellously rapid.

The great things of which they have always been capable.

when but half a chance has been given them is proved by many shining examples.

Since the time of the Renaissance, such shining lights have greatly multiplied among all nations, and notwithstanding an illogical and unreasoning prejudice, on the part of some of the "lords of creation," woman has not left herself without witness, in all countries, in every department of learning and human activity.

In these modern days her development and accomplishments are fairly dazzling. She is "turning the world upside down, and is come hither also!" exclaim my countrymen, in surprise and feigned alarm.

Yes, old, staid, conservative Germany is rubbing the sleep and prejudice of centuries out of her eyes, and pretends to be overwhelmed with astonishment, that "Three Degrees of Honor" should be awarded to women, two of them Americans, at the University of Berlin.

One, Carolina T. Stewart, of Texas, whose graduating thesis on German philosophy, it is said, was the most learned and comprehensive essay on that subject ever read by the instructors in German literature.

This year, we are informed by the Saturday Review of the New York Times, "The honors at the Berlin University have been carried off by a delicate looking Yankee girl, with bright blue eyes and rosy cheeks, who looks so frail and tiny as if a strong gust of wind might pick her up and carry her away." Miss Mary W. Montgomery, of New Haven, is the daughter of a congregational minister a former missionary. She took her degree last summer for Oriental languages. Just think, this young lady who has Sanskrit, Hebrew, Turkish, Arabic, Greek, and Egyptian at her finger's end is thought to be the most accomplished woman in the world in these branches. America, I am glad to know, is to have the benefit of her wonderful talents.

She will doubtless become a useful *helper* in the *practical work of the Church*.

There are women, who, while they have more heart and are

stronger in their affections than men, are at the same, by no means weaker in culture, and in the grasp of their mental vigor and intellectual poise. In all the activities of life, women prove themselves the equal of men. They have as successfully ruled great empires; have even led large armies to splendid victory. As writers of books, they have attained highest rank among distinguished authors, of poetry and prose. In science, medicine, philophosy and law, they have accomplished wonders.

In *politics* even woman is by no means a novice. If not publicly conspicuous she is a silent mighty factor—"a power behind the throne." Napoleon is quoted as having said to Madam De Stael, "What have women to do with politics?" She replied, "Women have to do with politics, when politics bring their heads in danger." Through all the silent centuries, woman's influence has been the resistless magnet drawing together the interests of nations, and illuminating the pages of human history.

And here, and there, through the marching years, stars of the first magnitude, have arisen, who by the splendor of their matchless achievements have glorified the darkness of a hard and prosy age. In the earliest dawn, in the primal sweetness and freshness of paradisaal verdure and bloom, before any shadow of sin had cast its blight upon the fresh young world. God saw, what a lonely helpless creature man would be without the gentle sympathy, the helpful, quick guiding and refining influence, the genial comradeship of woman. Divine compassion felt that it was not good for man to be *alone*; and with the unfolded map of the future history of the *home, society* and the *Church*, before Him, declared, "*I will make him an helpmeet for him.*" And ever since, no home, no society, no church-organization has been complete, where *woman*, man's suitable *helper*, has been lacking.

Every added year, as the human race grows broader, deeper and fuller in the measure of its ordained intellectual vigor and largeness, it will approach to a more evenly adjusted social balance, where the two sexes working together in union, divinely blessed, offer the most wholesome variety, yet a perfect unity—a God ordained "*mutuality.*" Step by step and year by year, the gentler sex is advancing to the goal of her fullest devel-

opment, and high destiny, as man's *fellow-worker*; not only in the sacrament of family and social economy, but as the true rights of the two sexes are settled, there will be no hindrance or obstacle in the way of her unfolding the peculiar character of her personal faculties, intellectual, moral and spiritual, as an independent power, in the practical work of the church. And that independent power will not create division, or difference of plans or interests; but inconceivably greater will be the gain for the kingdom of righteousness, as the result of the balance and harmony of "masculinity and femininity," each developing that which is highest and best in each other."

Woman's quicker insight into things, and her warmer affections, will act as a mighty spur and inspiration on the slower, perhaps stronger, intellect of man. The weaker will conceive and foresee, the stronger execute, and accomplish. Womanly impulse and manly concentration, will walk side by side, mutually helping to solve all the practical problems of humanity; and pushing the *practical work* of the church to its destined splendor and high goal, by the inspiration of a union, sanctified by God, and smiled upon by holy Angels. They will help each other most, when in closest intimacy, they yet remain most different and distinct; she constantly growing more *womanly*, he constantly growing more *manly*.

It aims, purpose and affection *one*, in sweet affinity blending together; each growing stronger, in him, or herself divinely *apart*, but one supplementing the other. Another, perhaps, makes my meaning plainer. He says, "Woman is all *heart* . . . . Man is all *head*. Man when he is truly manly, carries his strength in his head, woman, when she is truly *womanly*, carries her special strength in her heart. . . . Neither monopolizes the special department; but by *eminence*, he is reason, she is love. Woman, however powerfully she may think, and in some instances she will think more powerfully than man, is the representative of affection. Man, however ardently and constantly he may love—and in some instances he will love more ardently and more constantly than woman—is the representative of thought. If any of us think this discrimination

gives any advantage to man, it is only because we are not yet Christian enough to acknowledge that the spirit is grander than the intellect, holiness wiser than logic, the human heart deeper and nobler than the head." (Dr. Huntington).

Wonderfully this truth of Scripture is being verified in the history of the church of Christ, that "*There are diversities of gifts, but one spirit.*" And in "*the practical work of the church,*" where woman has already proved herself such a forceful, and successful "*helper,*" let all scepticism in the divine dictum, "*What God hath joined together let no man put asunder,*" immediately disappear.

When we consider, the blessed, mighty work already accomplished by these *helpers*, at home and abroad; the missions and missionaries they are sustaining, the money they are raising for the work of the Lord, the souls they are turning from the power of evil, toward the light, by their gentle ministries and Godgiven tact, we can only wonder, that the least remains of doubt should still exist in the mind of any enlightened Christian man, that in public and in private, "*Women are the legitimate helpers in the practical work of the Church!*" Angels are surprised, that the leaven of this inspiring Gospel, of woman's practical cooperation with man, in the blessed work of winning a fallen world for Christ, has not yet leavened the whole lump of humanity.

It is strange, with the splendid results of the beneficent work before them, that every church in the land has not yet an earnest, active woman's missionary society. If the fault could be traced, would we not find that in most cases this lack was due to the fact of an unphilosophical and unreasonable prejudice of the pastors of these churches and the husbands of some women, who, while they are intelligent and up to date in other matters, find it hard to recover from the defective training of heathen ancestors, who regarded woman as an inferior animal, whose sphere of activity should be relegated to the kitchen, mostly, doubtless thinking it well for her to remember that the more direct route to a man's heart is by the way of the stomach, entirely forgetting that the record of the allwise creative act is, "so God created man in his own image, in the

image of God created he him, male and female created he them." "So then they are no more twain, but one flesh." That established their correlation and equality, pretty clearly; and the question of sex-barriers and boundary lines should be forever set aside in the practical work of the church.

Capacity, talent and fitness should alone decide a man's or woman's place for work in the Master's wide-extended fields. There is no doubt that the best work can be done by a union of the sexes; "The thinking head" if you please, and "the loving heart." For wisely it has been hinted, "it is by the law of social diversity, reciprocity and balance that the greatest results are worked out," the greatest good is accomplished. And nowhere is this so true as in the practical work of the church.

Here, noble, loving, consecrated woman finds her most congenial and useful field for the exercise of her consecrated gifts. Oh, how wisely and usefully she has employed them during the last quarter of a century! With man, she has entered the wildest and most savage lands; faced deathly climates, all manner of unimagined horrors and perils by land and sea. Hardships and dangers have not dampened her zeal and devotion in the pathway of duty. Love to Christ and love to man, having become the master passion of her redeemed heart, she has laid every gift and talent at the Saviour's feet, to go wherever he leads: "to do whatever He wants her to do." Thousands of heathen homes through her instrumentality have already become houses of prayer. Many a dark, ignorant mind has become luminous with the glory of God and the light of truth.

As deaconesses and nurses what cheer and comfort they have brought to unnumbered homes as they prayed:

"Not might to rule, but strength I ask,  
To minister to want and pain;  
To follow where thy chastening hand  
Doth conquer loss and makes it gain."

"Give me the love that gives itself,  
Nor recompense nor honor asks;  
That sees Thee in the least of Thine,  
And serves Thee in the humblest task."

As physicians and Zenanna workers, women have gained access into homes, walled, with stronger walls than those of China, by the custom of centuries. Into all these homes they have taken the name of Jesus as a messenger of light to the poor benighted heart; and the beauty of the Christ life has flashed from their faces into the dark lives of their heathen sisters with resistless power, and awakened new thoughts and sometimes inspiration and longing after the purer and the holier religion of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The most inspiring scene at the Ecumenical Conference of 1900, at Carnegie Hall, which as a thrilling memory will remain in the minds of all who were present, was the welcome extended to more than four hundred women missionaries, of which another says, "It came after the formal addresses were over and was a sight long to be remembered in the history of missions. White haired women, the greater part of whose lives, in many cases had been spent in the mission fields were marshalled on the platform in groups by Mrs. A. J. Gordon, of Boston, amid clapping of thousands of hands, the waving of thousands of handkerchiefs, and the smiles and tears of a host of women, worked up to the highest pitch of enthusiasm. Mrs. Gordon would not let the missionaries go till she had told some touching or heroic tale of their personal sacrifice, or of the success, which had crowned their years of toil and teaching."

The same heroism and spirit of self-sacrifice distinguish many of the lives of our women—home missionaries—wives of clergymen who serve the master at starvation salaries. How many of them plan and toil to keep the wolf from the door—to nourish the children, and to keep the domini looking respectable! Why the long-continued hardships and sacrifices they endure, shame the swift death of the martyrs who died at the stake.

In the slums of the city on plain and prairie, in city and country churches, as teachers and workers in the Sunday School and prayer meeting, in the C. E. Societies, in leagues, and temperance organizations, in our choirs, and missionary societies, every where, the women are efficient helpers in the practical work of the church.



This is no longer a question, or experiment, but a most cheering and glorious fact. These women helpers are the joy and inspiration of many a pastor's heart. The church would not endure, without them, and the practical help which they render. Did you ever think of this, that even God, I say it reverently, could not redeem the world without the aid of woman's instrumentality? God was born of a woman, to save the world. Who therefore would set a limit to her sanctified activity? And how the Lord has blessed their efforts, and glorified their work, since the sainted Mrs. Doremus of New York city was inspired to start the first missionary society forty years ago! Fifty-two Women's Boards are reported today, and their united gifts in one year amounted to \$2,600,000. "*What hath God wrought?*" by women as helpers in the practical work of the church! Another says that \$30,000,000 was paid into the societies since their organization "by systematically collecting the small sums of two cents a week." "We have taken a third of a century to prove that woman understands the systematic giving of titles."

More than facts or figures are the broadened lives, the heroic hearts, the unselfish hands that through this work have been developed.

"If I could show you the girls, glorious girls from Wellesley, and Vassar and Smith; from high schools, and normal schools; working girls, from printing office and factory, from kitchen and sewing room, all united in one great girl's club, our missionary garden of roses, you would feel as I feel as I work among their sweetness and freshness." "There is the little child, Christ's own object lesson, learning as soon as it can reach out its dimpled hands to give to the dear Saviour, and even the babies, as soon as they can boast of a name, must have it inscribed on the 'cradle roll.' And we have only just begun." (Mrs. N. M. Waterbury, Sec. W. B. For. M. S., Boston, Mass.)

God bless the mothers and sisters, the trainers of youth, the "*helpers in the practical work of the church!*" And let him be ashamed who does not bid them God-speed in the work, upon which God has set His seal.

"Oh woman! whose form and whose soul  
Are the spells and the light of each path we pursue,  
Whether sunn'd in the tropics or chill'd at the pole,  
If woman be there, there is happiness too."

---

### OUR HOME MISSION FIELD—EAST.

*By the Rev. William F. Bacher.*

The Church of our Lord Jesus Christ, in order to be true to that command of her great Head which lies at the foundation of all her activities, is and ever must be a missionary organization. At first thought one might suppose that the great commission had to do solely with what we call foreign missions; but as our Lord sends forth His servants not only to carry the light of the Word into those places that hitherto have remained in darkness but also to feed His lambs and to build up and continue the work of the church, we have both the exalted privilege and the solemn duty of engaging in that particular form of Christian activity covered by the term Home Missions.

The Lutheran Church in America ought to be particularly interested in this Home Mission work. From the earliest years of her history in this land she has been essentially a missionary Church. Even if the term missions be narrowly construed to refer only to such parishes as have been organized as a result of the efforts of one sent from without it would be safe to say that a very large number of the eleven thousand organized churches in America today were at first mission churches. It will be equally within the bounds of reason to predict that a considerable percentage of the Church's future growth in numbers, wealth, and influence will depend largely upon the energy and zeal with which she carries on her missionary operations. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that in a gathering like this, called to discuss questions and consider interests vitally connected with the future welfare of our beloved Church, the Home Mission work should not be neglected.

Coming now to the particular phase of the subject immediately before us, let me note briefly some limitations that present themselves.

We speak now of Home Missions. But if we strive to point

out and emphasize the importance of energetic missionary operations at home, let it not for a moment be supposed that we have lost sight of the equally pressing need of large and faithful endeavor in the foreign field. As we have already hinted, there is no essential difference between these two branches of evangelical work. Both grow out of the same commission. Neither of them dare be fostered at the expense of the other. The diligent cultivation of the one field will inevitably help the other. If we pay proper attention to the conversion of the heathen in foreign parts it will serve to remind us of our duty to the so-called heathen at home. If we diligently cultivate and build up the interests of the church at home it will be the means of supplying additional power for the foreign work.

Our topic also limits us to the East. This, however, is a somewhat indefinite term. Some have the New England states only in mind when they speak of the East, though such people often employ a qualifying phrase and say "way down East." Others again—and among them, it is to be feared, are many Lutherans—limit the term "East" to the narrow strip of territory East of the Allegheny mountains. Geographically our topic would include all the states up to and including Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri, for the western boundary of the states is very nearly the dividing line between East and West. It will serve our purpose, however, to defer somewhat to popular usage and include only the territory east of Chicago and north of the Ohio and Potomac rivers.

What, then, has been done to cultivate this Eastern field and what are its possibilities, requirements, and probable future development?

First, let it be observed that the Lutheran Church has not neglected the Eastern field. It is sometimes asserted that our Church has suffered great losses in this older portion of the land, partly through a failure properly to handle the language question and partly through a failure to realize her mission and make full use of her opportunities. There is no doubt much truth in this complaint but there are some facts in this connection that must not be forgotten.

One such fact is that the period of great growth did not be-

gin until after the Civil War. Although the history of our Church in America goes back to a point nearly 150 years prior to the Declaration of Independence, the grand total of communicant members at the beginning of the Civil War, 41 years ago, was only 232,780, less than one seventh of the vast host that is now put to our credit by the statistician. It seems almost incredible that within the life-time of many now present who still call themselves young our membership has increased from 232,000 to over 1,700,000. This means not only that the past forty years have constituted the period of the Church's greatest growth, but also the period of the greatest increase of material, and that the slow growth of the preceding 200 years was due quite as much to lack of material as to anything else.

Another fact to be remembered is that notwithstanding the peculiar difficulties we have had to meet in the past we have succeeded in reaching out and possessing the land in a surprising manner. These difficulties have been and they still are formidable. *We have* suffered from lack of organization. Our form of church polity is not the best to promote aggressive, systematic mission work. *We have* suffered from the weaknesses of infancy. Although old in years our Church has remained young in numbers. The great size of the present has been reached so recently and so rapidly that we are like a good-natured young giant who has not the remotest idea of his real strength. *We have* suffered also from the fact that the Lutheran population gathered at any one point has often been of a very cosmopolitan nature, speaking different tongues, accustomed to different methods, and manifesting different national traits and temperament. Even where all speak the same language it is often difficult to amalgamate the different elements. Yet in spite of these various adverse conditions the growth of the Church even in the East has been remarkable. We have not lived up to the full measure of our opportunities but we certainly have succeeded in occupying a very large portion of our territory.

Still another fact is that with the increase of internal strength, with the vast increase of material and consequent opportunity and need, and with that wider outlook and more sys-

tematic endeavor that might be expected to result from increasing knowledge of real power as well as from larger experience, the Church has come to a period of great awakening. That would be an interesting volume that would relate the history of the mission work of the Church in the East during the past forty years—that would show with what patience and persistence, in spite of every obstacle, our various Synods and general bodies have been reaching out and occupying field after field until now we are fairly well represented in almost every portion of this district. According to a recent statement in the Lutheran the General Council is to be credited with 267 missions at present under its care in the East and the general Synod with 98, a total of 365. New points are constantly being taken up. Surely we have not entirely neglected our opportunities. We have not done all that ought to have been done, nor yet all that might have been done; but the results thus far attained, the work now being carried on, the ideas and plans now being developed, and the growing interest manifested on all sides inspire the confident hope that we are at the beginning of an era of far better things.

Really the Home Mission work of the Church is only now opening up, even here in the East. And it is a vast work. Our statisticians usually tell us that there are 8,000,000 baptized Lutherans in the United States and Canada. This estimate is probably based on the statistics of immigration from Lutheran countries. Now there are about 1,700,000 confirmed members actually connected with existing churches. The ratio of confirmed to baptized membership is about ten to seventeen. Applying this ratio to the reported confirmed membership we find that our baptized membership is about 2,890,000 or at most not over 3,000,000. Where are the remaining 5,000,000? Many of them undoubtedly have become so thoroughly identified with other denominations or with the world as no longer to deserve to be called or counted as Lutherans. Yet a great many, if statistics are at all reliable, while not exactly yearning for the coming of the missionary, furnish him with an abundance of good material. These people must be cared for and we above all others need to take up this important work.

We must remember, too, that we owe a duty to the un-

churched masses of the land, whatever their ecclesiastical origin. We have this class in the East. They are to be found in great numbers in every center of population. We profess to believe and preach the pure Gospel, that very Gospel that is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth, Jew or Gentile. We also have the command to go into the highways and hedges and compel them to come in. If our confessions and our methods cannot stand the test of an earnest endeavor to gather in those who are not entirely beyond the reach of all truth and all legitimate effort, we had better call a halt and face the question of revisions. To put ourselves in a position to meet this problem of the unchurched multitudes of the land is an important part of our Home Mission work.

In order, however, to be in a position to do our work we must see to it among other things that our field be well occupied. If we would properly cultivate our field considered in its general aspect, we must pay due regard to the geographical situation. Thus regarded our mission work must be, first of all, city mission work.

Everyone knows the process of concentration of population in the cities that is going on in our land. This process is especially marked in the Eastern section. Here we have a population of over thirty-two million, about 42 per cent of the whole. In the United States there are 135 cities having a population above 30,000 and of these 135 cities, 83 with a total population of nearly thirteen million are to be found in the East. These 83 cities contain nearly 40 per cent of the entire population. In the State of New York 61 per cent of the population is to be found in the twelve cities having a population of 30,000 or more. These cities are the great centers of the commercial, manufacturing, and financial interests of the country. They rule the land. In a large measure this is true of the moral and spiritual interests of our people. The demoralizing influence of the godlessness and wickedness and general worldliness of the city extends over a large section of the territory of which it is the center. If we would save the country we must first save these great centers of influence. It is not merely a question of being able to find more people to the square mile, nor

of finding perhaps a larger percentage of the unchurched in the city than in the country, but rather a question of the ultimate spiritual welfare of the whole land.

Even if we limit ourselves to the narrower sphere of caring only for the Lutherans who are drawn into this current of concentration with others and who are to be found in great numbers in the cities, we shall find plenty to do. Every country pastor knows of this steady movement toward the city. He may not always be able or willing to follow up those who remove to the city. Some of them may be confirmed nomads, always moving. Others may also belong to that class which constitutes the frayed edge to be found on the border of every congregational fabric. But many of them represent the best element among our vigorous and ambitious youth, for the city knows the value of fresh young country blood. They do not go in flocks and herd together in the same streets and wards. Because of these things it is a difficult task to gather them, but they must be gathered. As we fulfill our duty toward this class new city congregations are called into being, existing ones are strengthened, and the forces are increased that make for the moral and spiritual uplifting of the city.

It is true that our Church is on the ground. Outside of New England there are very few of these 83 cities that have no Lutheran parish. Nevertheless a great field presents itself to us in these places. Although much has been done and much energy is now being expended the territory is far from being adequately covered. The larger cities present a complex and difficult problem. The older sections vacated by the churches because of the changing character of the population dare not be vacated by the Church. There is great need of true missionary work in the crowded tenement districts and in the so-called slums. There is also the ever-widening circle of suburban districts on the borders of the great cities that must not be overlooked. The number of residence centers adjacent to the cities is ever increasing and their population growing. Verily they who are responsible for the spread of the Gospel in our cities have a great task on their hands.

Next after the larger cities we need to consider the smaller

places. According to the census of 1900 there are in the United States 703 cities ranging in population from 5,000 to 30,000. Of these 379 are to be found in the East. According to the Church Almanac 147 of the 379 cities are without a resident Lutheran pastor and presumably without a Lutheran church of any kind. The mere fact of the existence of a city in any locality does not necessarily indicate the presence of many Lutherans or the pressing need of a Lutheran church. But the presumption is that some Lutherans are to be found in almost every one of these 147 cities. There is just as much reason for caring for a few Lutherans as there is for looking after the spiritual interests of the more numerous colonies. Our first duty is to those larger communities where for various reasons the need is more pressing. But after the work in these larger centers has been put upon a good foundation we ought to occupy the smaller places one after another until every one of them has a Lutheran church. To do this will not only provide for our brethren in the faith in such places, but will also strengthen the church in the larger cities nearby. This effect is well illustrated by the remark of an Episcopal rector in one of our growing cities to the effect that his flourishing parish could hardly have had an existence, had it not been for the many missions maintained by his church in the smaller surrounding towns.

Looking at our field from a geographical point of view there is still another feature to be noted, viz., the fact that one of the most populous sections of the East, hitherto affording but little attraction to the hosts of Lutheran immigrants, but now gradually showing an increasing Lutheran population both in rural and in manufacturing districts, begins to loom up as one of the most important mission fields in the land. The New England states, the section of which we now speak, contain a considerable number of the cities already referred to as having no Lutheran church, together with an increasing number of places where German or Scandinavian churches have been organized, considering the character and extent of the population, the increasing Lutheran immigration, the number of growing and prosperous cities as well as the general eccles-



istical situation in a region where the Unitarianism that has long held sway must sooner or later reach the end of its influence and standing, the New England states certainly present to us a most inviting and important field.

Such, in brief, is our field in the East, a field that would seem at first sight to be pretty well occupied, but which, nevertheless offers abundant opportunity for further expansion. We have here a great opportunity if certain conditions can be met our church will be able to give a good account of herself in the future even as she has in the past.

One condition is that we reach a right solution of the language question. It is perfectly natural to cling to the mother tongue and to be filled with a desire to train up the children in the old language as well as in the old faith. But the faith is surely of vastly greater importance than the language, and the confessions must ever be above the externals of national or provincial usage that happen to accompany them. In this land, therefore, where the language is overwhelmingly English, the policy that would look well to the future must not only look with friendly eye on all rightly directed English mission work, but treasonable as it may sound to some—ought also to remove every obstacle that may hinder the anglicization of the foreign-speaking church and its constituency and to foster, though not force, with careful hand a process that must take place sooner or later in spite of every obstacle. This is particularly true in this older section of the East where the language question is perhaps more acute than elsewhere.

Other conditions to be observed in the East are such as are connected with our whole mission field. The compact concerning the establishment of new missions in fields already well occupied and served by others ought to be observed with great care and all surplus energy expended on destitute fields. We need an abundant supply of men for the work, men having both the necessary talents and the right missionary spirit. Our pastors, especially in the East where distances are not so great, need to keep a watchful eye on nearby places with a view to their occupancy at the earliest possible moment. Much can be done, and for that matter much is being done without waiting for a missionary to be sent from afar. Our boards, mission

authorities, and individual pastors ought to redouble their efforts to arouse in our people such a spirit of praying and working as will be commensurate with the work to be done.

Let us look toward the future with courage and hope. Let us take up our great work in that spirit of optimism that will come of true faith and a determination to arise and manfully strive to do the Lord's work. Let us make the best possible use of our opportunities and the future will see our church in this land abundantly fulfilling her great mission.

---

### OUR HOME MISSION FIELDS—WEST.

*By the Rev. Prof. J. M. Ruthrauff, D. D.*

Perhaps no more appropriate text could be found for the subject assigned me, than the words of our Saviour as recorded in the 4th chapter and 35th verse in the Gospel by John: "Lift up your eyes and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest."

It is a good thing to make an occasional survey of the work the Lord has given us to do, that we may if possible, measure its character and magnitude more accurately, devise wiser methods, and enter upon it with a more becoming zeal. I wish therefore to make a somewhat brief, but comprehensive survey of our "Western Home Mission Field."

In this field I include all the territory west of Indiana, and north of Arkansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Arizona; but including California and Alaska. This territory contains 2,103,364 square miles; or nearly three-fourths of the entire territory of the United States. This would make more than forty-seven states as large as the State of Pennsylvania; or more than 252 states as large as Massachusetts.

This territory constitutes a vast empire, unsurpassed, yea unequalled, in climate, scenery, location, and in natural resources, in this country, if in the world. While in climate it embraces, the perpetual spring and flowers of Southern California, and the perpetual snows of northern Alaska, the great body of this field lies in the temperate zone, the most genial and hospitable to man.

As to scenery, perhaps nothing in the world can surpass, for variety, vastness, and sublimity, that of the Yosemite valley, and the Rocky Mountain range. In farm products, it is among the richest in the world, containing most of the great wheat, corn, and stock raising states of the Union. It is the garden spot of the country. It could furnish bread and meat, and clothing for a population many times as large as the entire population of the United States.

In timber, coal, iron, stone, nickle, tin, copper, silver and gold, it is unsurpassed: containing nearly all the richest silver, gold and tin mines in the country, perhaps the richest in the world. This territory produced, during 1899, about \$69,000,000 of gold, and the same of silver, or about \$138,000,000 of both.

It has about 3,000 miles of sea-coast, and a number of excellent harbors. It is easily accessible, from the East, by railway, by the lakes on the north, and by the Mississippi, Missouri, and other rivers through the Gulf of Mexico; and when the Panama canal is completed by ocean vessels to all European countries. Besides our new possessions in the Pacific Ocean, and our new markets in the Philippine Islands, and in China, point out for this country a magnificent future. In this territory there is now a population of 22,304,806 souls; more than one-fourth of the entire population of our country. If settled as densely as Pennsylvania, it would have a population of over 296,000,000; and if as densely as Massachusetts it would have a population of over 700,000,000. Or if we omit Alaska it would still support over 400,000,000.

In settling and developing this section our Lutheran people have played no small part; and are destined to act a still more conspicuous part. While an effort was made to populate this section, by emigration from other races, a Providential hand directed the strong, sturdy, industrious and conservative Lutheran stock from Germany, Norway, Sweden, and other lands to this country in such large numbers, for more than a generation before the Civil War, that they have held the balance of power in the great Northwest, and wielded it with no un-

certain hand, in all the great crises through which our country has passed during the past fifty years.

When these people came to this new world, it is true they brought with them their language and many of the customs of their Fatherland; this was right and proper, nor did they forget their native land in a fortnight. This could not be expected. He who could so easily forget the mother who gave him birth, and who did not at times experience an intense longing for the former associations, and even a preference for some things he had left behind, would not be loyal to his new home, and could not be depended upon in time of trial.

Only he who has a true appreciation of the natural ties of home and native land, can truly estimate, and fulfill the new obligations of his adopted home.

When our people came to this new country, they identified themselves at once with all the best interests of the country! They bought farms, built homes, schools, churches, colleges, asylums, paid taxes, accepted office, and served in our armies. They became Americans in the true and best meaning of the term, most of the characteristics they brought with them from the old country, such as industry, economy, intelligence and religion were gratefully needed in the new country, and added strength to our civilization. True they were often misunderstood and wronged, but they were conscious of their rights and strength; and the day of their vindication is near at hand, when the divine meaning of this mighty movement will be truly estimated and appreciated.

Of the 22,304,806 of a population now in this western territory, over one-fourth are Lutherans. A recent letter from Rev. J. N. Lenker says that there are fully 6,000,000 Lutherans including children in this western field. On this territory we have 3739 Lutheran ministers. I have been unable to secure a reliable estimate of the organized congregations, and the adult membership of our church in this territory; but can give the number of Lutheran ministers in some of the larger cities, in which we lead all other denominations. Chicago has 121, Milwaukee 55, Minneapolis 58, St. Louis 42, St. Paul 32.

On this field we publish 73 Lutheran periodicals, nearly one-half of the Lutheran publications of this country. We have

30 academies, over one-half of the Lutheran academies in the land. We have 25 colleges with 238 instructors and 4350 students; 1049 of whom are in college classes. There are 16 Theological Seminaries with 57 teachers and 829 students. There are 13 Lutheran hospitals; 5 Lutheran Homes for the Aged, 5 Deaconess Homes, and 28 Orphan Homes. This is no mean showing. It is doubtful if any other people have ever emigrated to a new country, and enjoyed such a magnificent development in educational, moral, religious, and material forces, as have our Lutheran stock in the great Northwest. But notwithstanding this splendid showing, and proud as we may justly be of our Lutheran heritage in this field, it has never been truer than now, that, "The fields are white already to harvest." There are still many communities where German and Scandinavian churches are needed and will be for many years to come. But the field is peculiarly ripe for the organization of English churches. Much of this vast population is in the second and third generation. Millions of these people speak the English language as well, or better, than their mother tongue; while many speak only the English language. And unless English Lutheran churches can be organized within easy reach of these people many of them will drift into the churches of other denominations, or into the world and be lost. Many of the German and Scandinavian pastors preach English part of the time. This is a wise provision, and in many places is productive of great good. But this is not always possible, or entirely satisfactory. First because there are very few men who can preach acceptably in more than one language; secondly because the parents and pastors who naturally prefer to worship in their native language, and who naturally desire to have their children do so as long as possible, fail to appreciate the needs of their children, or to make proper provision for them. It is the same difficulty with which our church has had to contend in this country from the beginning, and which has cost us the loss of millions of our own children. Our fathers had a magnificent opportunity in the Atlantic States; but they failed to see it, or to improve it. They failed to provide English services for their children, or to found schools and colleges early enough, and of sufficient strength, to meet the demands

of their own descendants. As a result our church is either weak, or extinct where it was once strong; and where it is now fairly strong it should be much stronger. A still greater opportunity confronts us today, especially in this western field. Shall we like our fathers, fail to see the day of our opportunity? or, having profited by their experience, shall we prove ourselves equal to the demand upon us? and worthy of so great a heritage? It is more than an opportunity that confronts us. It is a tremendous responsibility. By both a natural and scriptural law, we are under obligations to provide for our own. These millions are our own in blood, in history, in baptism, in doctrines, and in usages. Hence we cannot escape the Divine obligation to assist them in securing an adequate ministry, and especially in the English language, in which their descendants are destined to live and worship. Besides the significance of our large numbers in this field, at this time must not be overlooked. God certainly means something by it. In this time of rationalistic tendencies, and intense materialistic development, that beget indifference to religious duties, and threaten to rob the scriptures of their rightful authority, and paralyze the preaching of so many pulpits, it is cause for profound gratitude that our millions of Lutheran people in this land are substantially a unit in their doctrinal belief; and that they are more and more shaping their worship and life in harmony with our best historic development, through which God has wrought so much for the nations of the earth in the past, and promises so much for the future, especially in our own land. I trust I will not be thought boastful or vain, when I say that I believe most profoundly that we "have come to this country for just such a time as this." But in order that we may meet the demand upon us, in some reasonable measure, certain things are necessary.

1. We must have a more adequate Lutheran ministry. Whatever may be said about having too many ministers in other denominations, it is not true in the Lutheran church. I believe I am not wrong when I say that nearly all the graduates from our Seminaries are called to serve congregations already organized, before the Seminary year has properly clos-

ed. This leaves the great home mission field largely unprovided for. Indeed the demand for true well equipped men has never been greater; men of real ability, and who are willing to take ample time to secure proper training, men who have a true Lutheran consciousness; men who know the history, doctrines, usages, works and opportunities of their church; men who are not merely looking for a place, but who are ready to enter any promising field and make a place; men who are willing to thank God that they are counted worthy to serve, even in the most difficult fields.

2. We should be wise and judicious in founding and developing our churches. Churches should not be founded where not needed. Parents and children, pastors, and synods, should endeavor to divest themselves as much as possible of purely selfish interests, and work together for the largest possible good. While it is natural for us to love our own language best, to desire our children to remain with us as long as possible, and to see our own Synod dominant in a given community, yet since we are becoming so thoroughly a unit in doctrine and usage, mere questions of personal taste, or language, or of synodical connection, should give way where necessary to the greater end of securing the best development, of the greatest number of our people and thereby advance the cause of Christ more rapidly.

3. In order to train an adequate Lutheran ministry, and an adequate leadership in all other lines of life, with true appreciation of our church and her needs, we must have stronger colleges. We cannot expect such a ministry or such a leadership to come from purely secular schools, or even from the schools of other denominations. The tree will produce fruit only of its own kind; so only those who have been trained in Lutheran schools, will be properly fitted to render the most valuable service, in our ministry or in other departments of our great work. "Only the fittest will survive" in educational lines as in all others. And while sentiment may control for a time, our young people will not long be contented to study in inferior schools; and unless we make our colleges on this territory what they should be, we will drive our children in the

purely secular schools of the state; and make a greater mistake than our fathers did in the East, where their children were obliged to go to the colleges of other denominations. We must not, we dare not enact such a blunder with our eyes open! Of course to train an adequate ministry; to found and develop home mission churches, as rapidly as the ripening field demands; and to equip our schools and colleges as they should be, will demand large giving. But we have the strength; if we will only use it. But before our people will act properly and feel proper interest in this direction they must be properly instructed. For interest springs from knowledge. Hence in the last analysis, we are brought back to the preacher. Let our people be properly instructed from the pulpit; through our church literature, and in all our schools and seminaries, and the work in all our fields of activity will prosper. It is not a question of resources, but of properly commanding and using wisely what we have. We must not wait for others to do our work for us. The responsibility rests upon us all, and when the offerings of the many, of small means, are linked with the offerings of those who are more favored among us, the demands of the hour will be easily met. "The fields are, (indeed) white already to harvest; but the laborers are few," and the means are inadequate. "Let us pray the Lord of the harvest, that He will send forth laborers into his vineyard," and that the people may bring their tithes more faithfully to the work of the Lord.

---

### OUR HOME MISSION FIELD—SOUTH.

*By the Rev. W. L. Seabrook.*

If it shall be possible for me to present the facts so that you shall see them from the view point of one who loves the Southland you will not regard as extreme the assertion that no more important topic is before this conference for consideration than this: "Our Mission Field South."

A bulletin issued a few weeks ago by the Census Bureau shows that for the first time in our country's history the south is growing faster than the north: that for the decade ending



with 1900 the increase in population was for the west 31.9 per cent; for the south 22.4 per cent, and for the north 19 per cent. Under this classification the north and south are the regions on their respective sides of the Potomac and Ohio and the southern boundaries of Missouri and Kansas, while the west is the stretch of country extending from the eastern lines of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado and New Mexico to the Pacific. As compared with the rate of growth between 1880 and 1890, there was a proportionate decrease from 1890 to 1900 in the west and the north; and a proportionate increase in the south.

An editorial paragraph in the *Lutheran* of January 23, 1902, gives the following comparative statistics: The percentage of increase from 1860 to 1880 was 186.6 per cent for the west; 61.9 per cent for the north; 48.4 per cent for the south. From 1880 to 1890 it was respectively 71.3; 24.8; and 20.1. During the following decade (1890-1900) the percentage is 31 west, 19 north and 22.4 south. The *Lutheran* further says: "With the great industrial expansion in the south has come a wave of emigration from the north and in the future this is destined to increase;" and then asks, "Is the church in the north taking this new movement into account? The General Council has its eyes at present largely on the west, where its most fruitful field lies; but will the United Synod in the South be able to cover this vast territory unaided?" I am here tonight to ask this further question, should the United Synod in the South be expected to cover this vast territory unaided?

Before giving what I conceive to be the only answer to this questioning, I desire to point out the fact that in the above classification of territory by the Census Bureau as west, north and south, many states are included in the north, that we commonly count as belonging to the west—Kansas, Nebraska, the Dakotas, Minnesota and Wisconsin, Iowa, Michigan and Missouri.

If comparison were made of the growth of that territory which we commonly call the south—that great country lying east of the Mississippi and south of the Potomac and Ohio rivers—and that territory commonly known as the north, leaving out the above named states included by the Census Bu-

reau, while accurate statistics are not yet at hand, I am confident that such a comparison would show that the percentage of increase in the south has been at least twice as great as in the north.

A few of the causes of this accelerated rate of growth in the south may be named as the discovery of her valuable mineral deposits and the enormous increase in all manufacturing industries; and the favorable climate of the south, making it possible for employees to live more cheaply and more comfortably than in the north. Her inexhaustible mineral deposits and her fertile soil existed before 1861, but the presence of slavery repelled immigration and capital, and naturally constrained southern political leaders to use their influence to keep capital and labor out. Senator Hammond of South Carolina lamented in 1856 that to his own knowledge floating capital was leaving Charleston at the rate of \$500,000 a year and going outside of South Carolina for investment, and that this exodus had been under way for many years. But during the past decade all this is changed. Capital is not going out of the state, but coming in. Neither capital nor labor is repelled, but invited. *For all honorable men, who can contribute to the advancement of the great New South, whether by brain, brawn or capital, a generous, whole-souled, hospitable people have only the word of welcome.* That these facts are becoming known and are bearing their fruit is evidenced by this, that the capital invested in manufactures in South Carolina alone in the ten years ending 1900 increased 130 per cent, the manufacturing establishments grew 57 per cent, and there was an expansion of 73 per cent in the wages paid their workers. Practically the same thing can be said of all the south. No such proportionate gain has been made in the north. Fifteen years ago the raw product of the cotton field in the south was all shipped to the north to be woven into cloth. Today hundreds of cotton mills in the south represent the investment of millions of dollars and the employment of thousands of men, women and children, and the number is constantly increasing.

By way of illustration, permit me to cite the city of my residence and pastorate, Newberry, South Carolina, increasing in

population in the decade about 60 per cent; the building of a cotton mill having an actual capital stock of \$350,000, employing 700 hands, another mill now in process of erection, with an actual capital of \$500,000, which will employ about 750 hands and add not less than 1,500 to the city's population within twelve months; the possibility of the erection of a third mill within a few years, and the confident estimate on the part of conservative men that the population of the city will increase 50 per cent within the next decade.

The value of the south's mineral products, iron, coal, oil, phosphates and other things which was in 1880 \$21,000,000, had risen to \$171,000,000 in 1900, an increase more than eight-fold in twenty years. The growth of mineral production in the north was small compared with this marvelous expansion. A closer search for these and other sorts of minerals promises to make the south's growth in this field still more rapid in the decade which will end in 1910.

One illustration will be sufficient: The great Flat Top coal fields of Virginia and West Virginia. From the Rev. W. H. Greever, who was for years our faithful and successful missionary on this territory, I have learned that it begins properly with Bluefield on the east and ends with Welch on the west; though the lumber and coal business is continually growing westward until it has practically opened up the vast country extending to the Ohio. Welch is only about thirty miles west of Bluefield. In that limited territory alone there is now a population of from 75,000 to 100,000, where a few years ago there was only a small number of scattered, ignorant mountaineers. As an illustration of the wonderful development of this section let me say that lands which could have been bought not long ago for a few cents an acre recently changed hands, in part only, at a consideration of the enormous sum of thirty-nine million dollars. The growth in value of property and in population in this, perhaps the greatest soft coal field in the world, experts tell us has just begun.

The agricultural development of the south has not kept pace with its growth in mining and manufacturing, but the people of the north and west are learning that in the south the soil,

which can be tilled from January to November, is as fertile as the most productive garden spots of north or west; that it can be cultivated with less labor than is required in the north and with greater certainty of results than in the west; that farming lands can be purchased more cheaply than in the north, by reason of the fact that few southern men have learned to cultivate their lands as do the northern farmers, and many small holders have sought employment in the factories, leaving their farms to be tilled by negroes. These conditions have already attracted thousands of families, and as the great Southern Railway company and other trunk lines, growing more rapidly than in any other section, reach out their gigantic arms making every point accessible, and bringing these facts to the knowledge of home-seekers, they will settle there in increasing numbers.

All this territory, with its wonderful development, is "Our Home Mission Field South." Of its vast extent some adequate idea may be given by comparison. The area of Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, North Carolina and Virginia is greater than that of New England, the Middle States, Maryland, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Michigan.

In the Southern States just named the whole field, as promising as any to our church, the work of the Lutheran Church is being done by the United Synod in the South alone, with the exception of here and there an isolated representative of the Missouri Synod or of the Joint Ohio Synod.

You ask, "Is the United Synod caring for the Lutherans of this great Southland?" I answer you frankly that in common with the whole Church, of every name, on every field, in view of the great opportunity, in view of the need, in view of her obligation, in view of our Lord's command—of her it cannot be said that "She hath done what she could." But I do say, honestly and conscientiously, that, considering her numerical strength and financial ability, there is no branch of the church of Jesus Christ, of Lutheran or other name, that is doing more to meet its obligation than are some of the district synods of the United Synod.

There are in the United Synod eight district synods. Dur-

ing the biennium closing in the autumn of 1901, one of these synods contributed to the work of Home Missions 18 1-2 cents per capita; another 19 3-5 cents; another 20 cents; another which has within its bounds 33 pastorates, 11 of which are missions, contributed 50 cents per capita. The total communicant membership of the United Synod is less than 40,000; many of her churches are missions; several of the synods are almost entirely missionary territory; she has no men of great wealth and very few who in the north would be counted even moderately rich men; yet she is making a heroic effort to care for her own people and provide for those of her faith coming from the north and west. By her constant aid the church at Richmond, Va., has become self-supporting. Within the decade she planted the church in Norfolk, Va., bringing it within the past year almost to a condition of self-support. Less than four years ago she sent her missionary to Newport News, Va., and expects the same result there in a few years. Faithful men have sought to care for our Lutheran interests at Asheville, N. C., Atlanta, Ga., and other cities, and if they could have had adequate and proper support must have succeeded as fully as those at former places named.

A recent canvass of the city of Burnswick, Ga., found many Lutherans. The South Carolina Synod now has in the field as its traveling missionary Rev. S. T. Hallman, D. D., who has found in such cities as Greenwood and Spartanburg many Lutherans longing for the church of their fathers. To him appeals come from Saluda, Florence and other important cities, begging for speedy organization of congregations. To the Board of Missions of the United Synod comes the most earnest plea for help from the great state of Mississippi, where a few earnest pastors, with little help, supporting themselves by manual labor, care for congregations far apart, numbering together 700 communicant members, with many calls to organize congregations at other points in the state.

In view of these few instances, selected from many, of what she has done and is doing, the answer to our questions is very plain. The United Synod in the South is seeking to do her best to care for the Lutheran interests within her bounds. If

she has reached or approached the limit of her ability it is equally clear that alone she cannot hope to meet the rapidly growing need. Should she be expected to do so alone? The answer is not mine, but is forced upon us by the facts.

Whence comes this increased population? It is certain that they are not southern born. Take, by way of illustration, the city of Newport News, Va. In 1890 its population was not more than 2,500; today it is not less than 25,000. Here the United Synod has not only placed a missionary, whom it is now supporting, but has provided for our Lutheran congregation a church home. For whom was this done? At the outset for Lutherans from the north and west as well as from the south—who compose perhaps 50 per cent of the new congregation. Practically the same thing may be said of Norfolk, Va., of Asheville, N. C., of Atlanta, Ga., and of almost every mission point in the south. In some sections almost the entire new population is not native born, and in some sections is almost entirely Lutheran, as in the recently established colonies of Scandinavians on the James river in Virginia, and of hundreds of Finns brought into South Carolina by the Atlantic Coast Lumber company, who are said to be but the forerunners of thousands to follow.

As further illustrative of the same facts, permit me to quote from a letter relative to the Flat Top Coal field territory of Virginia: "There are loyal Lutherans scattered throughout the territory anxious to co-operate with missionaries of their own church in efforts to reach the great population. What is the Lutheran Church doing for the salvation of this needy people? Two men are at work with but scant support! Scarcely enough to keep in touch with the scattered members of our own church now in the field! Comparatively nothing for the thousands not in any church! And nothing for the increase of population which is already pouring into the territory. Absolutely and literally nothing for the great field of several hundred miles to the west of this one. The nearest neighbor to our Lutheran pastor at Graham, Va., on the west, is, perhaps, Rev. Geo. H. Schnur at Chillicothe, Ohio. And this too is border territory, though it is in the bounds of the United Synod and should be left there. An opportunity for co-operation!"

Yes, an opportunity for co-operation—timely, practical, necessary! Co-operation in the spirit of Christian brotherhood, Christian confidence like that evidenced by the General Council in its appeal to the General Synod for its help in its India field, and by the General Synod in its response to that appeal by the assignment of Dr. Harpster to his new post of service for our one Lutheran Faith!

I speak to you tonight not as the representative of the United Synod in the South, but as a Lutheran. I speak to you not of the United Synod Mission field, but of "*Our Mission Field South*," and the facts already cited show that as of no other section of our land this is the true designation. It is "Our Mission Field" and "*our*" means not alone United Synod, but as well General Council and General Synod. I am not here to appeal for help. The facts are the appeal. Through them the voices of your own people speak to you, brethren of the General Synod, brethren of the General Council. Forth from you they have come, are coming to us. We will do what we can to care for them, but we say to you frankly that we cannot do it alone.

How can you care for your own who come to us? By sending your own missionaries, and establishing here and there isolated missions, far from your district synods and ministeriums? No, for many reasons this would be impracticable. How can you care for them? I believe that there is but one way, and that way through practical co-operation with us. We are the United Synod of the South—united not alone in the sense that ours is a union of district synods in the southern states, but united in this that we are a united Lutheran Church. We have come as pastors, as people, some from the General Council, some from the General Synod, some are to the "manner born." Some of us received our theological training at the Chicago Seminary, some at Gettysburg, some at Mt. Airy, some at Roanoke, some at Newberry, and some at Hickory. But we are united—united in our common faith; united in our love to our Church; united in loyalty to her pure doctrines.

The facts appeal for your co-operation in our united work. The method of that co-operation you must determine when your general bodies meet in deliberative assembly. Northern

capital, aiding in the development of the New South in material things, has received its reward in annually increasing dividends. Here is the example which should be followed by the nothern church, and richest spiritual returns will be her reward.

---

### THE SPIRITUAL PRIESTHOOD OF BELIEVERS.

*By the Rev. John A. Hall, D. D.*

The normal relation between God and His people and of His people to Him is that of fellowship. And since God is Father and redeemed men are His children, the ideal of this fellowship is that of the family. In the scriptures this relation is sometimes set forth under the analogue of a city, sometimes under that of a spiritual kingdom, sometimes under that of a shepherd and his flock. But the idea that underlies is that of a spiritual society, in which all are equals, because all sustain the same relation to God. The prayer of Christ in which the divine purpose finds its expression is, "That they all may be one in us."

To the realization of such a society in time, every agency and every institution in the history of Israel was made to contribute. The fact that out of that soil the New Testament Church was logically developed, the fact that its roots are to be traced to Israel's history and institutions, is sufficient proof that such was the divine purpose in the establishment of both.

And this was also the purpose of the wilderness training, the creation of a spiritual society, a society in which the mutual fellowship of God with His people and of His people with each other, was to furnish the creative and sustaining power.

Now in the establishment of such a society two things in the history of the Hebrews were made to contribute. First, the giving of the Ten Commandments with their proem. With a people constitutionally religious as were the Hebrews, it was impossible that the environment of Egypt should be without its effect. It may be true that the religion of Egypt was monotheistic; if it was, it was so only to the initiated. To the majority and more especially to those whose temperament and training were alien to the temperament and training of the Egyptian, that old religion was pre-eminently polytheistic. In-



deed everything was calculated to impress upon the mind its polytheistic character. The highways, the places of public assembly, the tombs were covered with the symbols of her manifold deities, and presiding over their worship, mediating between the worshiper and the deity, there stood a priesthood, the like of which for assumed sacredness and conceded power, the world has never seen. It was out of this environment that Israel entered the school of the wilderness.

The first lesson that accordingly needed to be learned was the one that concerned itself with the being and nature of God. It was set forth in what is known as the proem to the ten words, "I am Jehovah, the God who delivered thee out of Egypt and the house of bondage, thou shalt have no other gods before Me." In the name, Jehovah, that God here gives Himself, Israel in the very beginning was taught the vital distinctions, that in His very nature, separated Him from the gods of Egypt. He was the One having life in Himself, the uncreated, and by whom all things were made that are made. The name itself was an education.

But aside from what the name taught as to the being and nature of God, the proem also announced that His purpose in delivering them out of Egypt, and out of the House of Bondage was, that He might make out of them a people for Himself, a people that might find in Him a God, and in finding in Him a God also find in each other brethren. For a God who is spiritual, a God whose mighty acts are declared as being wrought for all, is already the Creator of a spiritual society of which He is the center, and of which all that are drawn to Him are members.

But while the idea of a spiritual society was already contained in the introduction of the ten words, to its actual forming, something more was necessary. Among the forces looking to that end the establishment of the priesthood was, without doubt, the most prominent factor. For seventeen centuries it held its place in Jewish history and when it passed away, it was that it might give place to that for which it has been the preparation—the universal priesthood of believers.

Now to the attainment of this end the Old Testament priesthood contributed by the emphasis that it placed on two things.

On the one hand it taught the nature of the relations that in such a spiritual community, must in the nature of the case, exist between God and His people. On the other it revealed the necessity of a perfect mediator and high priest, through whom these relations might be inaugurated and kept alive.

It is of significance that, as an order, if such it may be called, the priesthood had no existence until the people were familiarized with it in Egypt. But even as an order, it was unlike any similar institution of Christian times, in that it was representative. It derived its rights from the people. Even the Hebrew term, by which the order was designated (*Cohen*) had, as its primary meaning one who stands for another, or who mediates for another. Accordingly the clan or tribe to which the name applied was consecrated to its specific work by the nation itself. Not by the hands of Moses, or of Aaron, but by the hands of the whole assembly of the children of Israel were the Levites set apart and then presented by Aaron as an offering of the children of Israel. The words of the institution are these: "And thou shalt bring the Levites before the Lord and the children of Israel shall put their hands upon the Levites, and Aaron shall offer the Levites before the Lord for an offering of Israel that they may execute the service of the Lord." Thus in its very conception, the office of the priesthood was representative and delegated. In his official capacity, the priest stood for the whole people and through him the people were conceived as acting.

Now this was a truth of the greatest importance. It perpetually emphasized the fact that God was not to be thought of as a respecter of persons. If kept constantly in the foreground, the truth that the true, the ideal priesthood, was, in its very nature, universal, and that while for a time its functions might be confined to the house of Levi, still its essential rights belonged to the people, that without the people there could be no priesthood for the reason that it was the people that made the institution.

But what was true of the priesthood was also true of the High Priest in Whom everything belonging to the priesthood gathered itself and reached its culmination. He, too, repre-

sented the whole people. All Israel was conceived as being in him. The prerogative held by him belonged to the whole of them, but was transferred to him because it was impossible that all Israelites, should, at all times, keep themselves holy as became a high priest of Jehovah.

Thus was the priesthood of the Old Testament representative. It possessed no rights, no prerogatives, that were not delegated. It existed for the people. It was their sins for which he made atonement. It was their offering of blood unto which God had respect, and it was with them that he communed.

But while the priesthood was thus designed to articulate the relations that God sustained to all His people, it also bore witness to the conditions that controlled and limited that relationship. It was true that God was no respecter of persons. It was true that all who trusted in Him were members of His family. But it was also true that He was the Holy One of Israel—the Being, Who, on account of His greatness was the condescending God and Who, on account of His holiness, required holiness as the condition of fellowship. This was the truth that constantly found its expression in the ministrations of the priesthood. In the worship of the Holy One the people were required to stand at an awful distance. Nor were the priests themselves, even when consecrated, permitted to traverse all the courts of the tabernacle. One individual alone could pass the veil into the presence chamber of God, and he only in such manner as was calculated to impress his soul with the intense sanctity of the place—The place made holy because the dwelling-place of the Holy One of Israel. And thus while the priesthood stood as a perpetual reminder that God desired, yea, sought fellowship with His people, it was no less a reminder of His infinite Holiness—a Holiness that was not rudely to be approached and that demanded holiness as the indispensable requirement and condition of such fellowship.

And so it came that on its doctrinal side the Levitical priesthood stood for two things. It taught, that as to His nature, God was social, that He was no respecter of persons. But it

also taught that as a condition of that fellowship into which He desired to enter with all, holiness was indispensable. Both of these truths needed to be explicated, for both were vital to the being of that spiritual family—the universal priesthood to which the Levitical looked. The disposition of God to fellowship with all needed to be known, but the condition of such fellowship was just as important, for without likeness in character there can be no true fellowship.

But the office of the priesthood was also prophetic, in that it emphasized the need of a perfect high priest. Out of its own weakness and imperfections it spoke of the need of a perfect priest and a perfect offering, and so made known what, on his priestly side, the Messiah was both to be and to do.

And here it ought to be said that a comparison of the prophetic office with that of the priestly to the disparagement of the latter is entirely unwarranted. Both were necessary, each was the complement of the other. In speech it was given to the prophet to instruct the people and to herald the Messiah; to the priest it was given also to teach, and in dramatic act foretell His coming. Every official act whether of preparation or of ministry, particularly in the ritual of the high priest pointed to Calvary and its sacrifice with a distinctness to which the words of the prophet scarcely approached. More especially was this the case in the part that the high priest took in the service of the great day of atonement. He alone entered the sanctuary, he alone conducted the ministry of the awful place. So too, in what he was and in what he offered there was a reminder of the need both of a perfect mediator and a perfect offering. For in what he was, even the high priest was imperfect. Taken from among men he was indeed the possessor of a nature identical with those for whom he stood, but with the imperfection that he shared also the guilt of the people.

What was needed was something more than a likeness in nature; it was exemption from the guilt of his brethren at the moment that he was one with them in nature. And that requirement no priest, taken from among men, could possibly possess. It was this imperfection that stamped the Old Testa-

ment priesthood as transitory, that classed it among the institutions that in the divine purpose were to pass away, and that made it even in the times of its highest attainment, a priesthood that was to be absolutely perfect.

And so too, it was with the offering. It also was imperfect, and, in the nature of the case, could not be acceptable to God. It could not be that the Holy One, the Jehovah, should be pleased with the sacrifice of bulls and of goats. Spiritual in His nature, but one sacrifice could be wholly acceptable—even that of infinite love.

Such in brief, was the Old Testament priesthood, and such were its sacrifices. Shadows, prophecies of better things to come, but not the substance. For more than seventeen centuries they were both the preparation for and the herald of better things. Yet as an institution the priesthood taught as well as any institution could teach, the great truths that needed to be made known. It spoke of the nature of God, of His desire for fellowship with all men, yet emphasized the condition on which alone fellowship with a Holy Being could be had. It spoke as plainly as any institution could speak of the infinite need of a perfect priest, one united in nature with his brethren, yet free from the sinfulness of those brethren. It spoke as profoundly as any institution could, of the imperfection of the sacrifice; its utter insignificance as an atonement for man's deep transgression, or as a solvent for his sins. And this was all it could do. Weak, inefficient, temporal, national, the herald of a perfect priest and a perfect sacrifice, as an institution it passed away.

But while the institution passed away, it passed that it might give place to a higher and a better—even that for which it stood, and that gave to it its significance and meaning. So far as the institution was temporal, imperfect, national, it crumbled. So far as it was universal and spiritual, it survived. But even on this side it was enlarged, spiritualized, perfected. For there was that in the priesthood that could not pass away, and this was the truths that gave it meaning. It is still as true as it was then, that God is Holy, the unapproachable, save through mediation. It is still true, that He demands holiness as the indispensable condition of fellowship. It is still true that man

needs a high priest to mediate between him and God and the need of such a perfect priest is still as it was then, the testimony of every earnest soul.

But it is because of what Christ is, because of His supreme perfection, because of His oneness with God and His oneness with man, because that in Him every believer is, and He in every believer, that His priesthood supplanted and destroyed that of which it was the archetype. In a word, because of the transcendent perfection of His nature as priest, and the supreme merit of His blood an atonement there can be no other after Him. In the perfection of His priesthood every other priesthood is made void; yea, the veriest blasphemy.

Let us now look at that priesthood, which, in universal history, took the place of that in Jewish. We have seen that the idea of the universal priesthood of God's believing people was never lost sight of or obscured. All along it was the people unto whom God had respect; it was the people who even through the high priest, were conceived as ministering before God. And that idea is fundamental. The normal right of every child of God is, that of being his own priest. And this right no institution, no class of men may usurp. In God's family there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond or free, priest or laity, holy or unholy. A universal fatherhood means a universal brotherhood, equality of rights, of privileges, and above all, of access and of fellowship with the Father. With that idea history began. In the patriarchal age each man was his own priest. Not until the children of Israel left Egypt and were placed under that peculiar polity which, by the hand of Moses, was set up among them, do we hear of any individual or class of individuals holding the office of the priesthood as a distinct or exclusive privilege. And as inspired history began so it ended. It left man face to face with God, no mediator save Christ. It made of redeemed humanity a brotherhood of priests. That such was the divine purpose is proven in the fact that such was the end attained. No where in the New Testament is there the faintest trace of a special class. All are one in Christ Jesus. All belong, through faith, to the spiritual community, are members of one family, claiming the

same parentage, heirs of the same promises, living under the same laws, following the same customs, observing the same worship, believing in the same Christ. But how came this to be? I answer, that it came as a necessary result of the perfect Priesthood of Christ. It came because of what Christ was in Himself; because of His perfect sacrifice; because of the relation, which on account of His unique person, He sustains to the race and through faith is made to sustain to the individual believer. See how this comes. First Christ was the perfect High Priest. The weakness of the Levitical priesthood as of every priesthood taken from among men, was twofold. On its mediatorial side it was inefficient through the sinfulness of the priest. Sharing the sinfulness of his brethren even the high priest required to be cleansed by rites and offerings in order that he might mediate between a Holy God and his fellowmen. Even he needed the mediation of one standing between him and God.

And then too, on its representative side it was weak in that it was individual and narrow. No single human being truly can sympathize with every other, or be touched with a feeling for another's infirmities. That this may be, there is needed one in whose soul every other soul is represented, one whose nature touches that of every man's in its innermost fiber. And such a high priest is Christ. On account of His unique person, He is at once the Perfect Mediator and High Priest of His people. While partaker of flesh and blood like His brethren, yet being the Holy One of God, He needed no offering or ablutions to consecrate Him to the office of Priesthood. In the constitution of His person He has everything that can be desired to render Him the proper head and high priest of His people. In Him the arrangement for the reconciling of heaven and earth and re-establishing the lost intercourse between man and his creator, is absolutely perfect. On the one side as the beloved Son of God, He has, at all times, free access to the presence of the Father and in whatever He asks must also have power as a prince to prevail. On the other, as the representative of His people, as one in nature with them, they can, at all times, make known with confidence to Him the sins and sorrows of their condition, recognizing that what is His, is also theirs. can rise

with filial boldness to realize their near relationship to God and their full participation in the favor and blessing of heaven.

But just because He is the Perfect Priest, He is also the end of the priestly order. Because of what He is, there can be no other. And then too, he was the Perfect Sacrifice. At best the sacrifices of the Old Testament were representative. They could, in the nature of the case, be no more. The thing offered could not be the offerer. And yet it was this that was needed to the offering of a perfect sacrifice. But in Christ there is no distinction between the sacrifice and the offering. The one great offering through which He finished transgressions, made an end of sin, and brought in the everlasting righteousness, was at once furnished by Himself and offered by Himself. He gave Himself to death as thus laden with their guilt, an offering of a sweet smelling savor to God, and rose again for their justification as one fully able of himself to prove and to do everything that was necessary to close up the breach which sin had made between man and God. But as after the perfect priest, there can be no other, so after the perfect sacrifice, there can be no other that is meritorious. His blood, His sacrifice, His righteousness so precluded every other as that the thought of any other as being acceptable to the taking away of sin, is, in itself, sinful. I do not mean by that, that the sacrifice of a broken spirit and a contrite heart, on account of the sacrifice made by Christ, is unacceptable. I do not mean that good works, because of the perfect sacrifice of Christ, are made evil or repugnant to God. This is the meaning; that even these, are in the truest and the best sense, His, for it is His spirit that worketh in us; it is His sacrifice alone, whether wrought in His own person and life, or in us by His spirit, that is acceptable to God, for He and the believer are one.

First and last His priesthood is the only acceptable priesthood, His sacrifice the only sacrifice that can atone for sin.

But the uniqueness of Christ's person, by virtue of which He becomes the Perfect Priest and the Perfect Sacrifice, also enlarges the priesthood that is established through and in Him. Because of the transcendent nature of His person, the priesthood as an order of necessity passes away, and by the same



necessity becomes universal. For who is this perfect priest? Who is this one who has entered into the heavenly sanctuary, bearing His blood as an atonement? It is He who called himself the Son of Man. It is He, who, in styling Himself, the Son of Man, sets Himself forth as the embodiment of human nature in its archetypal form. It is the One in Whom the believer lives, in Whom the life of the believer is lost—had with him in God. It is the universal man; the One so completely the embodiment of humanity as that His righteousness as well as His sufferings are made the righteousness and suffering of the believing soul. So intimately united with the race by the mystery of His incarnation as that in the words of Luther He can say, "I am that sinner." That is, "His guilt and punishment belong to me;" and that the believer can say by faith, "I am Christ," that is, "His death and His righteousness belong to me." It is by virtue of the vital relation that He sustains to the believer, and the believer to Him, that He was indeed "made sin for us, who knew no sin, that He was indeed wounded for our transgressions, that the chastisement of our peace was upon Him and by His stripes we are healed."

Let us own that we are here in the presence of a mystery. The union of the divine and the human accomplished in the incarnation on account of which the believer is made one with Christ is confessedly not for the understanding to fathom. It is sufficient for our faith to know that the scriptures in which it is asserted, are numerous, varied and explicit. The sixth chapter of John, the farewell address of Christ, the intercessory prayer are full of it. We are one with Christ, even as He is One with the Father, as the branch is one with the vine, as the wife is one with the husband, as the members are one with the body. And this union is not only legal, but vital. He dwells in us and we in Him, even our bodies as well as our souls, are united by faith with Christ. And here it should not be forgotten that this vital union of Christ with the believer, and of the believer with Christ, on account of which the believer is made a priest, is the logical outcome of a true understanding of the incarnation. I own that it has nothing to do with this discussion, but at this time and in this place I will be pardoned for saying, that the distinctive view of the incar-

nation that holds within it the key of the problem of the relation of God and man and in which that problem is summarized, has been the contribution of the Lutheran Church to constructive theology. The men who have most nearly solved the problem of that relation, and the profound meaning of the sacrament that grows out of it, have been men of the land, and the children of Luther. The theologians of other lands and churches that have today attempted, through the incarnation, to vivify theology and relate it to modern knowledge, are only paying an unconscious tribute to the faith and the insight of the reformer and his sons. I do not mean that to them it was given as a new or special revelation, for it was not. It was rather the insight that they had into the cardinal truth of justifying faith, that enabled them to see the relation of that truth to the incarnation, and that of the incarnation to it. Every great truth is luminous. From every such truth perceived, there radiates a light in the brightness of which some other truth is the better understood. It was so with the truth of justifying faith in Christ. For the question that it was sure to suggest was this, "how comes it that faith justifies?" Faith in itself has and can have no merit. And the answer was, faith justifies through the union that it effects between the believer and Christ.

But that unity not only justifies; it also makes out of every believer a priest of God. On account of the living unity into which faith brings us with Christ, His sacrifice not only becomes that of the believers, but in Him the believer is made a high priest. United to Him we partake in every gift and distinction which belongs to Christ, we are made priests of His spiritual house, chosen in Christ, we are in Him constituted a royal priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices. To interpose any others as priests between the believer and Christ, is to traverse the order of God and subvert the arrangements of His house. It is to shut anew the way into the holiest which Christ has laid fully open; it is to disparage the Christ in Whose life we live, and in Whose righteousness we are accepted.

## REMARKS.

The Rev. Dr. Jacobs spoke appreciatingly of the carefully prepared and eloquent paper of Dr. Hall. The main point to be kept in view he thought was that under the New Testament, there are but two priesthoods, one that of Jesus Christ our Great High Priest, who has offered once for all the only propitiatory sacrifice on the altar of the cross, and the other that of every believing man and woman and child, without distinction of order, made spiritual priests to offer the eucharistic sacrifices of prayer, praise and thanksgiving. The ministry of the word and sacraments has nothing to do with the priesthood; ministers of the Gospel are in no sense priests. The ministry is an office not an order, least of all a self-perpetuating order. The ministry is simply the executive of the congregation for the discharge of duties God has committed to the Church, i. e., to each and every congregation, "where two or three are gathered together in Christ's name." No duties of the spiritual priesthood are transferable to the ministry. The public preaching of the Word and administration of sacraments belong not to the priesthood as such, but to the assembly of spiritual priests collectively, i. e., the church or congregation. Reference was made to Luther's classical work, "The Freedom of a Christian" of 1520, and to Spener's important, but brief treatment of "The Spiritual Priesthood" in seventy questions and answers, with an allusion to a one-sided development of the subject that had characterized the Pietistic revolt against the other extreme.

---

The Rev. Dr. Bauslin said:—

The Reformation of the sixteenth century brought to the front three fundamental but neglected principles of Christianity. The first of these was what has been rightly denominated the material principle of the Reformation, viz., Justification by Faith. The second was the formal principle of the Reformation, viz., the supremacy of the Holy Scriptures as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. A third principle re-affirmed by that great and vitalizing movement we might call the social principle or the priesthood of all believers, the re-

assertion of the direct access of men to God without any sort of mediation.

All these principles are fundamental in the Lutheran apprehension of the gospel and the organization of the church. There are no indications of any sort of abandonment or minimizing even of these principles among us. Their prominence among us and the fidelity with which these principles have always been asserted by Lutherans, make any so-called "High Church" tendencies among us impossible. That term is a misnomer among us. So long as Lutheranism cherishes and holds fast to these principles, which have been prominent in its entire history, any tendency to Romanism among us is about as probable as that the chairman of this Conference will be made a Cardinal or that the Pope will come to America next summer to participate in a Methodist camp-meeting.

---

#### ARE OUR PRESENT METHODS OF SUNDAY SCHOOL WORK ADEQUATE?

*By the Rev. D. H. Geissinger, D. D.*

I understand "Methods" to include everything pertaining to the Sunday School, organization, administration, apparatus, lesson systems, teaching principles and practice, sessions, services and everything else that belongs to or that enters into the operation of the specific work carried on in this department of the activity of the Church.

"Adequate" I take to mean, fully sufficient to secure the desired object, or at least sufficient to secure such object to a reasonable and fairly satisfactory extent.

This definition of the term "Adequate" makes it necessary at the very beginning of the study of our subject to ask, What is the object of the Sunday School? What is the primary and chief purpose which the Sunday School is intended to subserve?

It seems strange to ask such a question. It would be superfluous, if not really out of order to ask such a question in an assembly of intelligent Lutherans, if it were not for the fact that there are abroad in the world very divergent conceptions of the nature and purpose of the Sunday School from those

which we hold. Because of these divergent views it is necessary in a public conference and discussion to define clearly our Lutheran position on the Sunday School question. This will help us to see eye to eye as Lutherans, and it will fortify us against the subtle encroachments of unsound principles and theories, and help to save our people from the baleful consequences of erroneous and demoralizing practices.

The very fact that most of the histories of the Sunday School trace its origin to Robert Raikes betrays an entire misconception of what we understand this institution to be, and to be for. Raikes' school had no direct connection with the Church. It was an effort on the part of a benevolent man to take ragged, noisy, uncared-for urchins off the street on the Lord's day. It was a Sunday School only because it was held on Sunday. Its primary object was to keep the children indoors, to instruct them in the simple rudiments of knowledge and in the catechism, and to improve their morals.

Now according to our idea of the Sunday School, as to its essential character, principles and purposes, we must trace it to the Garden of Eden. The first thing God did after the creation of man was to instruct him. So about the very first thing in the order of human history is a Sunday School session. That was a small school. The conditions seem to have been entirely favorable. The methods must have been perfect. And yet, from our human point of view, they were not adequate.

As we understand it, the Sunday School is simply the organized, teaching activity of the Church. Sunday School is not an adequate designation. Bible School or Church School would be better. From the very beginning the children have constituted a large part of the Church. The feeding of the lambs has been always an important duty of the Church.

Provision has always been made for the discharge of this duty in the arrangements and in connection with the ordinances of the Church.

And this matter has been more or less faithfully attended to during the entire history of the Church. There have been, indeed, times when neither the children nor the adults have received much spiritual instruction, and yet there never was a

time when some instruction was not given, in some form, to some part of the Church.

The apostolic commission co-ordinates the teaching with the preaching function of the Church. Preaching, baptizing, teaching are the means, involving the divinely ordained methods for the discipling of the nations.

The idea underlying our word "Disciple" contains the true conception of the Sunday School. A disciple is literally a learning youth; one who attends upon a teacher, or follows a teacher in order that he may learn, one, be he adult or child, who learns in the spirit of childhood.

So, over against those who claim that the Sunday School is apart from the Church, that it is merely a human institution, that it is of modern origin and growth; we claim that the Sunday School, rightly understood, is a part of the Church; that the Sunday School is the Church engaged in a certain necessary line of her divinely appointed activity; that as to its essential nature and function the origin and authority of the Sunday School are the same as the origin and authority of the Church; that the Sunday School is, therefore, as old as the Church, and even antedates the organization of the Church with her full equipment of sacramental and sermonic ordinances.

And so it must be a fact, and as a matter of history it is a fact, that the Church of the Conservative Reformation, whenever and wherever she has been true to herself, that is, loyal to her own doctrinal principles, and consistent with these principles in her practice, has emphasized the importance and necessity of thorough spiritual and doctrinal instruction for all, and especially for the young.

In this view the primary object of the Sunday School is clear. It is, first, to teach those who have been baptized, those who have been planted into Christ and incorporated with the Church which is the Body of Christ, "all things whatsoever He has commanded," and, secondly, as a missionary instrumentality, to reach the unbaptized with the Word, and bring them, if possible, into the Church, and train them especially in the knowledge which is eternal life.

With this conception of the Sunday School and its purpose clearly before us let us get back to the question that is our subject, namely, "Are Our Present Methods of Sunday School Work Adequate?"

That is, are these methods adequate for the feeding of the lambs and the sheep of the Good Shepherd's fold; adequate to their healthful nourishment; adequate to their growth in grace and in the knowledge of the truths of salvation; adequate to their rooting and grounding in the "One Faith;" adequate to their spiritual upbuilding so that they may become temples for the indwelling of the Holy Trinity and living stones in the walls of the new Jerusalem?

And are these present methods adequate for the effectual reaching of those who have not been sealed in holy Baptism, those who are carelessly and perilously straying in the wilderness? That is, adequate to find such and effectually lead them, or at least many of them into the Good Shepherd's fold of life?

Now in the short time I have been able to give to a careful study of this question I have reached the paradoxical conclusion that our present Sunday School methods are adequate, and they are not adequate. They are adequate in some respects and inadequate in others.

They are adequate in some places and cases and inadequate in others.

Take, for example, our Sunday School apparatus. This includes everything that is provided for the purpose of imparting instruction.

There has undoubtedly been great enlargement, development and improvement in this teaching apparatus. Compared with what we have now, it was, even a generation ago, exceedingly meagre. Not in substance, of course, but in form. A generation ago we had the Bible, with very limited helps in the way of available commentaries, and explanations; a few simple question books, and the catechism in some of our congregations. But now we have a really confusing wealth of all sorts of helps for the study and understanding of the Word of God, and Christian doctrine. Commentaries, dictionaries, classified subjects, illustrations, side-lights historical, side-

lights scientific, side-lights archaeological, side-lights sociological, head-lights omniological, maps, diagrams, picture schemes and charts, so that where for a long time there was too little there now seems to be serious danger of getting too much. The pedagogical Sunday School apparatus in the Christian world today, would fill a large museum, and it would be a variegated and wonderfully surprising collection.

After a number of years of earnest and faithful effort on the part of individual pastors and others to provide lesson books and lesson leaves for our Sunday Schools, about half a dozen years ago the General Council took vigorous and systematic hold of this particular work. Fortunately at that juncture of the history of our Sunday School work the Lord raised up for us a Moses, who, by natural endowments and thorough training was peculiarly qualified to lead us, it not out of a veritable Egyptain bondage yet certainly out of a somewhat barren and inhospitable wilderness, into a well ordered, beautifully arranged, fruitful, milk-and-honey-flowing Canaan.

We have not succeeded, as yet, in getting all the tribes settled in their appointed borders, but we are working shoulder to shoulder in that direction, and there is ever-increasing encouragement that this great objective point will ultimately be reached.

As a result of this movement we have not what seems to us to be a very excellent graded system of text books, which, of course, carries with it the grading of our schools, and the adoption of a method based upon correct pedagogical principles, and corresponding to the most approved educational methods in use in secular schools.

Our graded series of text books is not yet complete. A few of the higher grade books have not yet been issued, and only a few of the others have appeared in revised and improved editions. But when this series is completed, which will be within a comparatively short time, it will be ample and more than ample for all the purposes of proper Sunday School work.

The principle of this scheme is adaptation to the age and capacity of the pupil. Starting with the simplest elementary scriptural facts, given in the form of stories and talks and



with such illustrations as appeal particularly to childhood, the course advances by easy gradations to the profoundest doctrines of our religion. The aim has been to keep as closely as possible to the gradual unfolding of Revelation itself. Every department of Biblical knowledge receives due attention, and is brought into its logically indicated place in the curriculum. This gives a unity to the system, and a comprehensive, progressive character that supplies everything that is needful for a very thorough Biblical and doctrinal education.

The general plan has been adopted, and as a plan we do not see how it can be greatly improved upon. It will require time and painstaking labor to work it out to a satisfactory degree of symmetry, and to make its several parts all that it is possible to make them in themselves. The ultimate intention is to have this entire course in convenient and substantially bound books. These books to be put into the hands of teachers and scholars, to be kept and owned by them, to be studied at home, to be preserved for reference and use throughout life.

In consideration of the excellence of this system of text books, and of the abundant material which it renders available to every school that adopts and uses it, I am prepared to say, that in this respect our General Council Sunday School methods are adequate. He would be an exacting and a carping critic who would presume to say that it does not provide in rich abundance "milk for the babes, and strong meat for them that are of full age."

The present methods of Sunday School organization among us so far as I have observed, do not seem to be adequate. Many of our schools are not under the immediate supervision of the church authorities as such. They are carried on practically as an entirely separate organization. There is little attempt at proper grading and classification. There is rarely any provision for examinations and systematic promotions. We are not in favor of very much organization for the Sunday School. Almost better have too little than too much. I am not, as yet favorable to a separate constitution for the Sunday School. But some rules and regulations ought to be provided. These should be simple and have direct reference to the ad-

ministration of the school, to its order of services, and to its methods of teaching.

I think such provisions and principles as would have a proper place in a formal constitution, would better be incorporated in the constitution of the congregation.

It is in the matter of teachers that I think the greatest weakness in our present Sunday School methods will be found. Not that I have anything but the highest admiration, and the most sincere praise for all who are engaged in the work of teaching in our Sunday Schools.

And we have many excellent and very successful teachers. But in the nature of the situation as our schools are arranged, needing so large a number of teachers, it is simply impossible to procure enough who are in every way qualified for this difficult and responsible position. I have had experience with many teachers, and with many types of teachers, and I have found a few in every school I have been connected with whom I would have no hesitation in saying were fully adequate to the work required of them. But some of the best people I have known, so far as spirituality and earnest piety were concerned, have been failures or nearly failures as teachers.

There are comparatively few persons, even among those who have ample endowments of education and natural ability, who are "apt to teach."

It requires peculiar personal qualities and abilities to be a real efficient teacher. Even our pastors are not all of them by any means thoroughly adequate catechists. And we are not all equally successful in gathering and holding Bible classes.

I am not prepared to say how this deficiency is to be remedied. But we ought to look seriously to this point. A partial solution of the problem may be found in schools for teachers, and in arranging our schools so that there will be fewer classes.

The number and the length of our Sunday School sessions are, as I look at the matter, obviously and decidedly inadequate.

I regard it as simply impossible to do thoroughly effective teaching in, say a maximum of one hour a week. In many of

our schools there is only a half or three quarters of an hour devoted to actual teaching. And I have been in schools where they gave half an hour to the teaching of the lesson and some of the teachers would be through in half that time, and have fifteen good minutes left for the interchange of pleasantries and conversation on current events.

Our present methods for the careful study of the lesson may not be inadequate in themselves, but they fail to connect with the scholar to any great extent. I charge this partly to the long tolerance of the miserable makeshift of weekly and monthly lesson leaves. The original lesson leaf, it was supposed by some, would remedy this very evil or mitigate it, but as a matter of fact it aggravated it. I know of nothing that will help to remove this deplorable inadequacy so long as parents do not see to it that their children study their Sunday School lessons as carefully and faithfully as they study the day school work.

Our methods of discipline in the Sunday School are inadequate. Not that it is expected or that it would be desirable to have anything like the enforced and often rigid discipline of the public schools.

But there certainly should be a discipline of love, of tact, of tenderness that would constrain reverence, good order and respectful attention. I would recommend the stopping of all other work and drilling on this line for half the time of the school, if necessary. Disorder, irreverence, inattention are exceedingly demoralizing. I cannot see how good seed can be properly planted under such conditions.

So while we have the subjects and the teaching material in adequate abundance, yet I think we must all acknowledge that "Our Present Methods" or the personalities that have the handling of them are often very inadequate.

But notwithstanding all the inadequateness and discouraging features of our Sunday School work, it is a fact that this work is in many cases encouragingly adequate. We simply cannot begin to estimate the mighty and extensive power for good which the Sunday Schools of our country are exercising at this moment. In millions of young hearts and lives they are

planting the seed of eternal life. The husbandry may often be rude and unskilful and unsatisfactory, but the divine character of the seed it sows makes it adequate to the salvation of those who receive it and keep it.

No matter how the Word of God goes out, how bunglingly it is deposited, it does not return void when there is an honest heart to apprehend it. And on the other hand, if there be **not** an honest heart for its appropriation, the methods of angels and the matchless skill of the Master Himself would be inadequate. Spiritual edification is not a matter of mere tuition, though its forms and its material should be absolutely perfect. If it were, God could and doubtless would provide a faculty of arch-angels for the salutary education of every soul on earth. There is something more, something deeper than mere tuition, something that points to the profound fact that the getting of the knowledge of spiritual truths and realities is by a process of life rather than by a process of the intellect. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness!" "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven," said the Master to Peter, when Peter's soul had grasped the greatest fundamental truth of our holy religion.

And yet men cannot believe in the full sense of the word without knowing, and they cannot know without a preacher or a teacher. Therefore it will always be incumbent upon us to furnish the best tuition, best in substance and form, that we can possibly devise.

There is plenty of room for improvement. It seems to me that we must look toward and work for a change of our present methods that will afford more time for teaching, more time for contact and intercourse between instructor and pupil. This I think will have to be done, even if we have to give up some of the time that is now set apart for preaching. I am inclined to believe that we are now in or we are rapidly coming into an age and a condition when we shall need more teaching than preaching, and when more of our preaching should virtually take the form of teaching.

Not in every place as yet, perhaps, but in many places I am persuaded that it would be a gain to give Sunday morning to

a full service of worship and preaching, and Sunday afternoon and evening to the Sunday School work. Wednesday could be profitably used in the same way, and wherever possible Saturday afternoon classes should be arranged. If the State could be prevailed upon to give the children to the respective churches to which they belong one half a day in each week I believe it would result in immense benefit to the churches, and it would help mightily and increasingly in saving the nation from the demoralizing and destructive influences of the subtle rationalism and infidelity which more than anything else menace the stability and the glory of our civil institutions.

---

## ARE OUR PRESENT METHODS OF SUNDAY SCHOOL WORK ADEQUATE?

*By the Rev. Prof. J. A. Singmaster, D. D.*

Our topic, if we have interpreted it rightly, includes the whole problem of the Sunday School. An institution of such vast importance will ever awaken interest and discussion. Nevertheless, we may assume that, after an existence of over a century in its modern form, a good many things concerning the Sunday School are fairly well settled.

### I. PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS.

Before considering what we regard the fundamental needs of the Sunday School, we shall make several preliminary observations concerning matters upon which there is or ought to be agreement among thoughtful Sunday School workers.

1. We may take it for granted that the right of the Sunday School to exist can no longer be challenged. It has come to stay. No church can live and grow without it. Nor would we change the name Sunday School to Bible School or Lord's Day School. The name is simple and easily understood. The only good reason for a change may come when its sessions are no long exclusively held on Sundays.

2. The relation of the Sunday school to the Church has become clearly understood. It is not the children's Church, nor the private property of the superintendent, nor a substitute for the Church, nor co-ordinate with the Church. The Sun-

day School is simply a department of the Church through which it performs its function as a teacher especially of children. The object of the Sunday School is primarily religious instruction, imparted with a view to building up a noble character.

3. We may further assume that right ideas prevail or at least are gaining ground in regard to singing in the Sunday School as a part of divine worship. The demand is growing for hymns of a truly poetical character, throbbing with exalted sentiment, grace, and life, adapted to the years of the singers. Music is desired that is melodious, tender, and joyful.

4. It is also being recognized that the Library ought by no means to be limited to so-called religious books, many of which are veritable trash, but that it may profitably include any good standard works, which, for instance, a minister would permit his children to read.

5. Concerning certain adjuncts of the Sunday School pertaining to its comfort there is abundant evidence that there is a just demand for better accommodations. The cellar and the garret no longer satisfy the awakened sense of need. We fear however that some modern Sunday School architecture has failed to secure the primary requisites of air, light, seeing and hearing.

In all these points there is no doubt abundant room for development, but we are persuaded that, in general, right principles prevail, and that these will in due time produce their legitimate fruit.

6. In regard to the subject-matter of teaching there is now about universal agreement that it must be biblical, including the Bible itself, and such expositions as are offered through question books, the catechism, biblical histories, and the like. The spelling-book is no longer in favor. The prevalent usage in all Sunday Schools gives a large place to selected lessons from the Bible. Whether these selections are to be along the line of the pericopes of the church year, or in accordance with the so-called International Lessons is a question under debate. After an experience of a good many years, our preference is still for the latter when modified so as to recognize

the principal church festivals. Much may be said on either side, and this may be said of both, that a faithful use of them will bring fine results.

7. It is conceded pretty generally also that the lessons ought to be graded according to the capacity of the scholars. There is danger, however, of carrying the matter of grading too far in the present day Sunday School, with its comparatively inefficient teaching force. The too great multiplication of booklets and pamphlets in the attempt to provide graded lessons involves both expense and confusion. We believe, however, that there should be permanent text-books, particularly for the lower grades. There should be a simple question-book, covering the main facts of the Bible, more especially its history and biography. There must be also a Bible History setting forth in easy language the characters, institutions and events of both Testaments. As I endeavor to recall the helps in my own religious education it seems to me that the old "Question Book," and "Percept upon Percept" (a Bible history) did more for me than all the oral instruction of my childhood. The permanent text book idea is founded upon the nature of the child mind. The truth taught receives the *form* of association with the book and its pictures, while its *substance* appeals to the imagination and impresses itself upon the memory. Nothing can be more important than to lodge the facts of the Bible in the mind of the child.

## II. FUNDAMENTAL NEEDS.

The foregoing remarks may be considered as preparatory to a statement of the most fundamental and crying needs of the Sunday School. The first need is a fuller understanding of the mission of the Sunday School, and the second is that of better teachers.

1. *The Mission of the Sunday School.* The deeper meaning of the Sunday School and its management have received rather superficial attention from the students of church problems. The literature on the subject is scant. Public and private libraries are almost barren of it. Ecclesiastical assemblies, such as Synods, Ecumenical Conferences and Alliances rarely hear addresses on the fundamental ideas of the Sunday School.

Even the theological seminaries do not give the matter much attention. The Sunday School receives its dignity and importance from the fact that it is a link in the training of the child, that it furnishes a part of its education. Public education has become secularized. It does only a part of the work. Religious training is excluded. Protestantism and Democracy have made its continuance impossible in view of the freedom of worship, and the separation of Church and State.

The parochial or Church school has become practically an impossibility among us. The hope of its restoration, among Protestants at least, is vain. We must therefore, make the most of our opportunities for imparting religious instruction in the home, the Sunday School, the catechetical class, and the regular services of the Church.

The Sunday School, therefore, must supplement the day-school in endeavoring to impart that which the State fails to give. Where the child has the advantage of truly Christian home-life the Sunday School measurably atones for the want of religious training in the day-school. But when the child comes from a home destitute of intelligence and piety, the responsibility of the Sunday School is proportionately increased, and its inadequacy often revealed. The fate of the latter child is largely influenced by the character of the Sunday School. As to the children whose parents do not send them to Sunday School at all, we can only say here that that is a missionary problem.

The Sunday School then assumes the position of a teacher of religious truth. In order to fulfill this holy office "it must be made fully conscious of the principles on which its work rests and of the methods best suited to the attainment of its ends." It is a *school*, and as such must recognize and apply the principles of teaching just as the successful day-school does. The truths of the Bible must be apprehended by the same faculties which grasp the truths of physical science.

2. *The Sunday School Teacher.* It is impossible to conduct a school without teachers and equally so to have a good school without good teachers. Competent teachers, who give their best thought to the Sunday School will solve every



vexed question in child training in the school. They alone will agitate the just demands of the school and finally secure them.

As a matter of fact much teaching in the Sunday School is no teaching at all, judged by results. Keep your ears open as you slowly walk through the aisles of a Sunday School room, or ask your children about the lesson after school, and you will discover that the score of yesterday's game, the latest fashion, or perchance some scandal has been more discussed than the lesson. Or, you may learn that the teacher is far behind his scholars in knowledge, and that his teaching consists of weary platitudes, story telling, or preaching.

On the other hand justice demands the acknowledgment that there are many noble and faithful teachers, who have to some extent acquired the art of teaching while practicing it, who have natural fitness for the work, who love Christ and his little ones and who do the best they can, and thus merit our gratitude and win the Master's approbation.

But is it easy to teach? Is it just to expect that *anyone* who has the right spirit can teach? Is it any more reasonable to hope that a man can teach without special endowment and training than that he can preach without them? We are brought to the conclusion, therefore, that the Sunday School will fail of its mission without adequately trained teachers. To secure these ought to be the first concern.

In order to secure efficient teachers it must be seen to that the pastor be a Sunday School man. He should consider the Sunday School a part of his field. He ought to be profoundly interested in it. He ought to know all about it. He is the pastor of the Sunday School. There he comes into touch with the best part of his congregation. He neglects it at his peril. He cultivates it to his profit. Did those pastors, who are not gifted in the work of the pulpit, and who hold their places by a slender tenure but realize that through the Sunday School they can make themselves loved and useful, yea, indispensable to a congregation, they would cultivate this field more than they are doing. Though I gave much attention to the Sunday School during the twenty-five years of my pastoral life, were I to return to it I would spend my very best efforts upon it.

It is a confession of great weakness, if not of failure, for a minister to say that he is not at home in the Sunday School. It is even worse when the teachers feel that his presence is a damper, and that his suggestions are impracticable. It is scarcely a question whether such a man, in spite of some pulpit ability, is fit to be a pastor at all. How can the flock thrive under a shepherd who does not know how to take care of lambs? He may seem to get along in a well established congregation, but will inevitably fail in a weak or a new enterprise.

The pastor must be a teacher. I do not say that he must have a class in the Sunday School. He need not necessarily be superintendent. But he must know how to teach, and how to superintend. He must be an expert, and overseer. He must be to the Sunday School what the general manager is to a great industrial establishment, a man who looks on, who sees and hears in a moment when anything goes wrong, and knows the remedy, and how to apply it. The pastor must have a high ideal of a school, and a practical turn so as to realize it as far as possible out of the material at hand

We will never solve the Sunday School problem until we have the kind of a pastor described. But you say, he does not exist. Then I answer, we must make him. To begin, he will have to start in the primary department of the Sunday School as a child, and come up through all the grades and most of the offices, teaching and administrative. All this is possible with the average candidate for the ministry during the 20 or 25 years of his life before he becomes a pastor.

During the years of his preparation, in the academy, college and seminary, he should keep in intimate touch with the School, as scholar, teacher, or officer. If he neglect this, he will discover to his sorrow that he has lost the habit of attendance, and the liking, as well as the skill for that kind of service.

Beyond this, there ought to be a place in the seminary curriculum for the fuller study of the great questions involved in the Sunday School. As a matter of fact, I fear, that these receive but scant attention either from a low conception of their

merit in themselves, or in comparison with other branches. But what subject in the department of practical theology can be of greater moment than that which has to do with the children of the Church? It seems to us, that we have not thoroughly adjusted ourselves to the conditions prevailing in our country, and that we are still too much bound by the traditions of old times and old countries.

But I would go back a little further and deeper than the study of the Sunday School as an institution in my search for a full solution of the Sunday School problem. I believe that it will be found in pedagogy, the science that treats of the principles and the art of teaching. The pastor is preeminently a teacher, and a teacher of teachers, a molder of public sentiment, a trainer of children. Anomalous as it may seem, the majority of men now in the ministry have never made a serious study of pedagogics, I will venture the statement that in few of their libraries will you find a single volume on child-training. It is true that there is some preparation for teaching in the study of mental philosophy, in the observation of the methods of other teachers and in their personal experience. But these do not make up for the loss of direct, positive study of the subject.

The intrinsic importance of pedagogics is recognized in all our State Normal Schools which make the study obligatory upon all candidates for graduation, and give them the opportunity of practice in their model schools. No doubt many of these students fail to get the best out of this study on account of their immature years, lack of culture and superficial work, but they are better qualified for their profession by even this imperfect study than they otherwise could be.

"The Sunday School," says Dr. Butler, of Columbia University, "must, first of all understand fully the organization, aims, and methods of the public schools; for it is their ally. \* \* \* It must study the facts of child-life and development, and it must base its methods upon the actual needs and capacities of childhood. It must organize its work economically and scientifically and it must demand of its teachers special and continuous preparation for their work."

Our many-sided Luther has this to say in his *Table Talk* on the importance to the clergy of a knowledge of teaching: "I would have no one chosen for a preacher who has not previously been a school teacher. But at the present time our young men want to become preachers at once, and to avoid the labor of school-keeping. When one has taught about ten years, then he can give it up with a good conscience."

It is surely a great undertaking for a young man to assume the management of a congregation with its Sunday School without any theoretical or practical knowledge of teaching. We believe that the seminary ought to fit him for this work as far as it can by a more thorough training in the principles of teaching. This it seems to us might properly come under the department of catechetics. If it be said in reply that pedagogy does not properly belong to the seminary course I would answer that it is just as germane to it as homiletics, which treats particularly of preaching.

The pastor being a thorough Sunday School man, one great step is taken toward good teaching. Does he find that there are already a number of competent teachers connected with the school, his task of forming an excellent corps will be easier. But he will have to set in motion certain processes which will continue to produce good teachers.

Starting with the teachers at work in the school, everything possible should be done to improve them. Those who are really capable will be glad for opportunities for acquiring new ideas, while many of the incapable ones will drop out of the ranks together with the positively indifferent. At all events new teachers are in constant demand. The ultimate success of the Sunday School depends largely upon their selection and training.

It is a mistake to call for volunteers from the pulpit. It generally ends in chagrin, either because the call is unheeded or heeded by unsuitable persons. A good Sunday School teacher must be hand-picked like apples that are to keep. There may be some adults at hand who will make tolerable teachers, who perhaps in other places or other years were trained for the work. But the chief reliance must be the young people of the

congregation. They will most naturally come from the Bible and Catechism classes.

Having secured by personal solicitation a number of persons of intelligence and of the proper spirit a Normal Class should be formed to which all the teachers should be invited. This class should meet at any convenient time, preferably during the week, for the study of the methods of teaching, and for the systematic study of the Bible. The pastor himself or the best teacher obtainable should have charge of this class. It need not be confined to the members of one congregation. Several churches could unite with profit, especially where churches of the same denomination are contiguous.

The candidates for teaching who are members of the Normal Class should be formed into a regular Bible class in the Sunday School, and taught by the best of teachers in order that the prospective teachers may have not only the best possible instruction in the matter but also in the manner of teaching. This class will ordinarily study the lesson one Sunday in advance of the regular course in order that when any of its members are needed as substitute teachers they will have studied the lesson.

The regular staff of teachers will need a weekly teacher's meeting for the study of the lesson and for consultation. It is doubtful whether any school can attain any high degree of efficiency without a weekly teacher's meeting.

This plan of preparing teachers is not new, but it is not generally followed, however simple. It starts with a pastor who is a thorough Sunday School man. It contemplates the careful selection of candidates. It demands a Normal Class, a Bible class and a teachers' meeting. This entirely practicable plan may involve labor and self-denial, and does not commend itself to those who play at keeping Sunday School, but under the blessing of God it will equip the school with excellent teachers.

But even more than this should be aimed at. It is the solemn duty of the Church to supply its schools with the best teachers whom love and money can secure. It ought not to be satisfied with home-made teachers. It ought to demand of its many academies, girls' schools, colleges and theological seminaries courses of study that will fit the laity for church work, especial-

ly as teachers in the Sunday School. Perhaps we would be justified in setting up one more school and call it a Teachers' Seminary. Competent teachers ought to be paid. The teachers of the Infant Department and of the main Bible Classes ought to be persons of such ability and training as to command a salary in every well-to-do congregation. Surely they deserve it as much as the sexton, the organist, the soloist or the pastor. Would it not be a good thing, if we can not have the parochial school, to have at least the teacher to help the pastor in this momentous matter of teaching the children? If he could combine teacher and musician it would be all the better and his maintenance would be easier. With such a helper, the pastor could make Sunday School teachers that would be a credit to the church.

I might add also that to accomplish its mission the Sunday School must give more time to its work. It must adjust its meeting place with a view to keeping the children more than an hour on a Sunday. Perhaps a Saturday session ought to be arranged in which teaching rather than devotional exercises shall take up about all the time.

With a larger conception of the nature of the Sunday School and a fuller realization of the vast responsibility involved in the training of the young will come better teachers, better teaching, better rooms and better results.

---

#### REMARKS.

The Rev. Dr. Charles S. Albert said:—

There are two theories of Sunday School work: one lays stress on information rather than on inspiration; the other lays stress on inspiration rather than on information. By inspiration, we mean that presentation of the scripture which will impress the mind and heart of the scholar with divine truth, whereby they shall be brought to the saving knowledge of Christ Jesus, and be built up in faith. It does not mean that inspiration must dispense with information, for the Bible is the source of inspiring truth and its contents must be known in order to bring this truth to heart. But it does mean that the Bible is

not to become a text book (like the text books of the secular schools) where information concerning Bible facts, history and geography and personages is made the most important result, and the Bible is treated as literature rather than in its peculiar and unique feature as a means of grace. In all our plans, therefore, for a graded system, we hold that emphasis must be laid on inspiration rather than on information.

It may be said that the International System has been an outgrowth. It has not been a theory which first has to be studied to be put into practice but something which has grown up and gained strength, which is, because it has been found to answer the wants of the people and of the Sunday Schools. It has been evolved, and, therefore, with all its weaknesses has elements of strength which cannot be overlooked. It is a response to what Bible students, up to this time, have found to be the best in this stage of Bible study. Whatever changes may be made in the future must be made from what has been already gained, and slowly, if the best results are to be obtained.

Two other features are too often neglected in considering schemes of Sunday School study. The lack of suitable teachers, the other the lack of time to be devoted to such study. The time given, the whole year, to Bible study in the Sunday Schools, if every Sunday is utilized, is but 26 hours, or but little over a day. Join this to the fact that many teachers are slenderly equipped for their office, it will be seen that it becomes necessary, in presenting schemes of study, to take these two factors into account, and adopt such a plan as shall obtain the best results with these conditions. Our plans, therefore, dare not be, under present circumstances, too elaborate. They must be simple and easy to handle. With it all, it must not be forgotten that the voluntary system of teaching has been productive of immense good even if there has been a weakness in imperfect Bible knowledge. The Christian workers have been developed in our Sunday Schools to the up-building of their own character. There has been the personal contact between soul and soul which, in many cases, is far more efficient to start a young child in the way of truth than cold

information from the teacher's lips, whose heart is not interested in the child.

Any one of the pastors here, that would give testimony as to the work of the Sunday School in preparing the scholars for the church, could tell of the mighty influence exerted upon them, an influence which perpetuates itself in after years; could bring example after example of the lasting work upon the soul and character done by very ordinary teachers who were filled with the love of Christ and sought to bring others to that which they themselves had obtained.

---

### THE ATTITUDE OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH TO CURRENT DISCUSSIONS CONCERNING THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.

*By the Rev. F. H. Knubel.*

It is somewhat difficult to determine just what the current discussions concerning the Holy Scripture are. They resemble the warfare in a Philippine or South African insurrection; one never knows at what old point they will break out afresh nor with what strength. The enemy appears to be routed or reconciled, but suddenly reappears, under a new leader perhaps and sometimes wearing the Khaki uniform of a friend. However, though it is difficult to determine them and though our thoughts shall finally lead us to see the constant attitude of the Lutheran Church to Scriptural discussions, independent of their current form, it is well that we in the first place mention in a summary and general way what the present discussions are.

Chief among them is doubtless the large and involved question concerning the entire Old Testament history and religion, which, while its extreme negative positions have been abandoned has won to a greater or less adherence at least the entire European scholarship. As is well known, it proceeds upon the basis of a searching literary and historical investigation; it calls in question many supposedly orthodox claims as to authorship; it asserts itself as having undeniably established certain documents or classes of documents, which lie behind many



of the Old Testament books and which as the sources of those books were amalgamated or chemically combined by earnest editors or redactors of later days until the present form was reached; it thus discovers certain historical and religious parties contending throughout the history of Israel: it redates the entire literature; finally it presents a picture of Old Testament religious history (varying with different critics as to details, but in main outline holding much agreement), which it claims to be true to fact, inasmuch as it accords with the idea of development inherent both in human affairs and also in Divine creation and revelation. It need not be mentioned perhaps that many of the less radical scholars partaking of these views sincerely claim and defend for themselves more or less orthodox opinions concerning revelation and inspiration, and show also that they are asserting no dishonesty on the part of the Old Testament editors and redactors. This is the principal current discussion concerning the Holy Scripture. However, present New Testament discussions, or rather the present form thereof, are more closely allied to these Old Testament methods than is generally supposed. For, while they concern the old Synoptic, Johannean, and Early Apostolic problems, there has developed the selfsame literary and historic search for antecedent and component documents, like questions as to authorship and editing, and above all the same principle of historic development. So far has this gone in special instances as to assert extreme views of the "Kenosis" and to represent Jesus as largely possessed of the conceptions of His time and place; then, further, to look upon the early Church in its growing thought as attributing to Jesus what had not actually been in His words, and deducing purposes of His mission (His life and death) not justified by Him.

Thus it is believed there has been given a brief, though just statement of the most important current discussions concerning the Holy Scripture. It is true that matters like inspiration and the cessation of direct revelation with our present canon receive some constant attention, but our time will not permit their discussion.

What now is the attitude of the Lutheran Church thereto?

What our attitude ought to be, because of our symbolic statements and because of our knowledge of Truth,—that shall be our final question and by that we shall test the attitude we find actually to exist among Lutherans. And when we ask now first what the existing attitude is, we are at once confronted by the seeming impossibility of a statment thereof, because of the wideness of our Church; because of the fact that the Church does not consist merely of the specialists and ministers, but includes the laity; because of unions as in Prussia; because individual's statements are not necessarily the mind of the Church. However, with the single exception of "Missouri" Lutherans here and abroad, holding with their usual uniqueness to the old verbal inspiration theory, it is probably true that our Church's attitude to these discussions may be designated in the following threefold manner.

1. Bold assumption. Many individuals in Germany and some in this country and elsewhere call attention to Luther's apparently free handling of the Scriptural books and writers; they likewise emphasize and glory in our seeming symbolic freedom from doctrinal bonds as to inspiration, etc. They therefore boldly assume that our Church has a large measure of liberty, if need be, to adopt results of modern discussion.

2. Ignorance. It may seem harsh to assert it, yet particularly in America and reaching even to the most studious circles, ignorance is on the whole manifest—manifest in nothing so much as in rash denunciation.

3. Calm security; a calmness, which is the more marevllous when compared with the dismay evident in other Christian circles; a security, which is unmoved by the strongest evidences of widespread acceptance of these modern ideas.

Now, finally, let us test each of the three, searching whether they be proper attitudes for the Lutheran Church, ascertaining in how far they rest upon our real life and knowledge and position as a Church. It is hoped that thereby we shall in the end realize our true position towards not merely current, but all discussions of the Holy Scripture; that we shall gain a clearer view of our position concerning inspiration; that we shall conceive afresh the far reaching possibilities of our prin-

ciples; that we shall gain new stimulus in our Church consciousness, and once more thank Him who guided our fathers and us.

1. Bold assumption. It is largely a piece of assumption to assert that we have no doctrine of inspiration. It is likewise a misunderstanding of Luther's broad conceptions to seek in him and in his statement concerning Scripture the justification for modern extravagances. The truth in both claims will appear later. For the present we call attention merely to our Formal Principle, and would also refer to an article by Prof. Nosgen in the "Lutheran Quarterly" of April, 1896. The article is on "The Teaching of the Lutheran Symbols concerning the Holy Scripture," and it brings forth a sometimes startling array of evidence, revealing confessional acknowledgment on our part to far more than is usually supposed. Without the time to quote therefrom and independent thereof, this much is easily evident to any Lutheran as for and against those who assume our complete freedom: The modern discussions concerning the Holy Scripture, while they claim to proceed upon a purely objective literary and historical course, are very clearly controlled by a subjective theory and philosophical conception. It is evolution and the evolutionary philosophy swaying both the Old and the New Testament ideas, and seeking to force history and religion into agreement. There is beauty and truth in the idea of development; there is development in the Scripture; but a rearrangement of Scripture upon the subjective idea of the critics as to what the development ought to be is not permissible; nor will Lutheran ideas of the Word allow that what *was* development in *objective* revelation *from* God should be presented as though it were a *subjective* development in the knowledge *of* God on the part of Israel and the individuals of the Scripture—yet such is much of the modern presentation. Lutheranism has wide room for the idea of development in the Holy Scripture, and indeed has paved the way for it; she has room to admit all that a purely objective study upon a literary and historical basis shall gain; but she cannot brook that which interferes with the objectivity of God's revelation or that which merely a philosophical theory demands.

2. Ignorance. In some way the indifference which lies behind the prevailing ignorance of American Lutherans upon these matters ought to be stirred. It has been suggested from other quarters that there rests upon us a large responsibility in this particular. Our country is being flooded with many a book and pamphlet from negative critical sources, which is often a diluted and sometimes almost a plagiarized reproduction of radical German thought. Standing as we do in closest touch, with these German centres of theological ferment, knowing and possessing the spirit of the German, realizing how much of a more positive nature the Fatherland has worked out, and conscious that the day is at hand when from that perpetual forerunner in Scriptural truth there will come the strong defence against overwrought conceptions and the positive gain from current discussions—in view of all this our obligation to American Christianity sets the brand of culpability upon our ignorance. And, furthermore, we are by our indifference losing much of the strong Scriptural truth which these modern struggles have already gained—truth which works out into the most practical form. The results of Biblical Theology, the impressive development of divine revelation, the stronger lights upon the life and mission of Jesus, the uncovered facts of Apostolic history—all these have already prepared for the Christian new understanding and new delight in his Bible, new joy in the communion with his Saviour, his God.

3. Finally, that attitude of calm security on the part of the Lutheran Church, so impressive in the midst of the fearing ones, so characteristic of our spirit—Is it a false security, or does it rest upon some deep foundations in the principles which mark us for a separate existence as a body of Christians? We are assured that it is the latter, and it is to this point that we would give largest attention, expecting to manifest our determining position upon Scriptural questions and upon the development thereof for the future. We have a double consideration.

(a). By two great principles do we find ourselves determined in all matters of truth and life, the material principle concerning justification by faith alone in Christ and the formal principle concerning the sole normative authority of

the Holy Scripture for doctrine and practice. It is however an acknowledged and oft mentioned fact that by Lutherans the material principle receives the precedence and greater emphasis, while the entire Reformed theologies emphasize as supreme the formal principle; to them the normative authority of the Holy Scripture is the prime matter. It is therefore no cause for wonder to behold them so thoroughly alarmed by the inroads of modern critical discussion; they regard their citadel as endangered. For us as Lutherans there lies behind the formal principle of the Scripture the material principle of justification or to state the heart thereof, of Christ. Behind the Scriptures, which are for us the Word of God, we are ever contemplating Christ, who is the Personal Word of God; behind the written Word we have the Living Word. The Holy Scripture throughout is merely the recorded Christ, a statement which many of His own words justify. It is by this true and important regard for the relative positions of the material and formal principles that Lutherans feel so calm a security amid all discussions of the Scripture. In the sturdy assurance of our faith in the personal Christ we gain abiding confidence in that by which He has been mediated to us, or better in which He came to us.

In this connection also comes a further suggestion to the Lutheran. All the mystery of the divine and human in the written Word has its full parallel in the Personal Word, Jesus Christ. For centuries the Christian Church has struggled with the glorious mystery of His personality, and not without distinct advance. We recognize a positive gain in Luther's statements of the "*communicatio idiomatum*," and many are seeing a further advance in the modern discussions of the "*kenosis*." May we not safely predict that all progress in the Christological investigation will finally effect and alone make possible true gain in the doctrines concerning the Scripture; must not this be the result? No, can we not almost see that Protestantism and especially Lutheranism having in the 16th century reclaimed the written Word for Christianity, has been going through the same struggle therewith that the early Christian centuries had as to Christ, the Personal Word. In those centuries there was first the contest which established

the divinity of Jesus Christ, and then that which established His humanity. So also the first Protestant centuries fought for the supreme divinity of the written word; then, when that idea was carried to an extreme, there arose and still wages the battle for the establishment of the humanity thereof and their proper mingling. May we not hope that a coming Luther will proclaim the "*Communicatio idiomatum*" in the written word, and beyond that some coming Thomasius write of the "*kenosis*" therein?

Herein lies some indication of Lutheranism's attitude toward Scriptural discussion, and outlook concerning inspiration and other doctrines of the Scripture. It arises from our view of the material principle as supreme over the formal principle, our view of the Personal Word behind the written Word.

(b). We proceed to the second consideration which is the cause of the calm security manifested by the Lutheran Church in the face of current discussions.

The formal principle is usually stated by us in common terms with all Protestantism, we would not wish to seem heretical, yet we believe that this is a grave mistake, and that our true position demands that we mark a vital difference on our part even in this formal principle. Let it be remembered that the statement of the two principles material and formal, is a matter of no later date than the century just passed and that we are therefore not inseparably wedded to their terminology. Yet it is not the terminology we would dispute, but the common, narrow conception of the formal principle in agreement with the views of other Protestantism. There are perhaps no greater defamers of Luther and original Lutheranism than the modern schools of Ritschl and Harnack with their claims that they are his genuine disciples, the true exponents of real Protestantism; yet they are right in claiming that we Lutherans of the modern day have much more to learn from Luther, and have not profited sufficiently by all that has been offered in early Lutheranism's rich finds.

Here is our point. For Lutherans the Holy Scripture or the Word of God is above all thing the Means of Grace; to other Protestantism it is in itself not so at all—but merely a normative authority. They regard the Holy Spirit as the creator

thereof, but practically represent Him as having left it then as a finished task; to us He is not only the creator, but the forever immanent preserver thereof. They picture that fusion of inspiration by which in the spirit's fire there came forth at last the durable steel which breaks the rocks; we see the word constantly not only as a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces, but also *forever* as a living fire according to the well known text. They speak of the "Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture" and truly designate their view in its hardness thus; we see it better as a living, productive seed. Concisely we mean that *Lutherans should properly never even think of the Holy Scripture apart from the Spirit of God, who is forever and to our knowledge only active therein and thereby.* It is for this reason that we believe the cold conception of the formal principle current among other Protestants is impossible for us and that, though we may use the terminology of the principle, we should never do so without the consciousness of the living heart of the Holy Scripture. We probably do not realize as yet how large an influence this truth concerning the Scripture has upon our entire doctrinal position; how emphatically it marks us off from both Roman Catholicism with its view of the Spirit in the organized Church and from other Protestants with their indefinite views of the Spirit; how telling its demands are in our practical Church life. We certainly do not seem at least to be emphasizing it sufficiently. For our present discussion however we call attention to it as being the second great factor in our idea of the Scripture, the second great cause of our calm security, the second great hope of the future development. Lutherans in the midst of all discussions concerning the Holy Scripture know of this inner witness of the Spirit working forever, even upon the heart and mind of the negative critic, correcting, preserving, conquering.

Thus we have made a twofold presentation of the cause of our calm security, and have aimed to reveal its justification. We are ever seeing the living, Personal Word behind the written Word, and also we are ever seeing the written Word itself as a living Word because of the indwelling spirit. There comes thereby also a union of the twofold consideration. The spirit

who by His indwelling renders the written Word a living Word is the spirit of Christ, the spirit who testifies of Christ alone, and therefore the Personal Word behind the written Word is Himself the living power in the written Word.

We hasten to a close. A consideration of what has been presented will give a different light upon Luther's treatment of Scripture books and authors. It will also reveal to us that the seeming absence of a statement upon inspiration in our symbols was not caused, as is generally stated, by the absence of occasion for such statement; it is rather because we have in these fundamental Lutheran positions the foundations for a true and sure statement thereof. I will suggest also that in the end we shall probably come back to a right appreciation of Luther's method of estimating Scripture and portions of Scripture—"je nachdem die Schriften Christum treiben."

---

#### REMARKS.

The Rev. Dr. Schmauk said:—

The paper just presented is one of the ablest of its kind and length ever given to the Church on this subject. Yet the Lutheran Church today, however strong her natural attitude of security may be, cannot afford to assume it with regard to present issues. For the Biblical criticism of the day, both without and within the Church, does not confine itself to an examination of the formal principle of the Reformation by dissecting ancient Scriptural records; but it grounds itself in the material principle of organic development by natural evolution. It is not chiefly the formal, but fundamentally the material principle that is at stake in current critical discussions. A criticism that eliminates the supernatural in the Old Testament, cannot leave untouched the incarnation, the atonement, the supernatural operation of the means of grace and the miracles of redemption in the New Testament. The ultimate issue of current critical discussions leads directly to the question, Shall justification by faith stand? The man who puts his finger on the Old Testament records to divide them on internal grounds of probability is also the man who reaches



his hand back to Jehovah Himself and develops Him as an exalted human conception from the original Baal who was the god of the primitive depths in the Semites' worship of nature.

---

The Rev. Dr. Spieker said:—

Such papers as this are calculated to promote the unification of the different parts of the Lutheran Church in this country. The remarkable unity of our Church in America over against the assaults of negative criticism of the Word of God are a cause for gratitude and rejoicing. As a Church we have been enabled to realize that our strength lies in the proclamation of the truth of revelation, which we accept as the highest and best science, and the only really effectual antidote against the poison of error, with which the atmosphere of the day is charged. This, we believe, is the true ark of our safety. In the kingdom of God, liberty and victory are always on the side of the truth. But safety never implies a false security, as is evident from the fact that our Church has furnished a number of positive contributions to the literature of the controversy. Our students, at least in our seminary at Mt. Airy, are not ignorant of Satan's devices as to the negative criticism and its prime object, and our laity, as a body, have with the teachers of the Church, had grace and common sense given them, to estimate negation at its proper value.

---

The Rev. Dr. Horn said:—

The paper of Mr. Knubel is an admirable contribution on an important subject. It is a mistake to say that our Church feels secure. The newspapers spread among our people the latest extravagances of criticism. Many of our young men are educated in institutions beyond the influence of our Church. And not a few of our ministers are a good deal disturbed. The study of Biblical Introduction is of prime importance at the present time. It has been said that the public prints do not make much account of our Church. We do not deserve consideration unless we are fit to lead and able to answer the questions of the age. Moreover we are bound by the very principles of our belief to inquire into the foundations of the faith.

No dogmaticians, no resolutions of Synods, no decisions of ancient councils can settle once and forever what books are God's Word. We must always be asking where God's Word is, and how we know it to be God's Word and must always be able to justify our answer to others.

---

The Rev. Dr. C. S. Albert said:—

The subject before us is one of the most important today. The higher criticism is far more prevalent than many of us care to conceive. As yet our own Lutheran Church has been but slightly affected, but that we will escape contagion is not to be hoped for. Therefore, papers like that just heard are most valuable for they point out how we may meet this danger that is threatening the very existence of our faith. I know it is claimed by these critics that they are thoroughly loyal to the truth as it is in Jesus, yet they are attacking the historicity of the scriptures which are essential to the maintenance of our faith. A faith which has no historical basis, that is dependent upon feeling or emotion alone, will not abide the time of doubt and trial. We are so constituted that inward evidence must continually be supplemented by outward evidence. The outward evidence is not sufficient without inward testimony, neither is the inward testimony able to stand without the outward evidence.

Take for instance, the attacks now being made on Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as real historical characters. They are represented to us as tribal names. They never existed. There is gathered under the name of Abraham, for instance, the events which were characteristic of the tribe. Ingenious writers, who indeed had a high moral purpose presented human experiences which they attach to these tribal names. They added stories, with great moral truths embodied in them, but often with no foundation in reality. But carry this out by reference to the New Testament. Paul declares that Abraham was an illustration of a righteousness which comes by faith. He certainly believed him to have been a real personage, with great faith toward God, but if he were not a real personage, what becomes of the illustration which Paul has made basal, and what of the doc-

trine of righteousness by faith and what of the inspiration of Paul and his knowledge of the scriptures? Attack the historicity of Abraham, and you have attacked the argument of Paul, and more than his argument, his inspiration by the Holy Spirit. But go deeper than this. Our Lord Jesus says: "Abraham saw my day and was glad." He certainly refers to Abraham as a person that lived. He is not the name of a tribe to him. The doctrine of His self-emptying is used by these critics in order to avert the conflict between Him as the Son of God with knowledge of all things, and this woeful ignorance of plain fact. And will that doctrine suffice under circumstances? Not at all. The actual deduction to be made is that if the historicity of Abraham is a myth, then Jesus Christ was human. If His knowledge is imperfect, we have no divine knowledge and what is worse no divine Lord and Saviour.

Whilst we cannot escape criticism of the Bible which has its legitimate task, we must be prepared to meet the unjust deductions of destructive criticism and present those true deductions which shall preserve to us the Bible as the infallible guide to God's truth and revelation.

---

The Rev. Knubel said:—

The purpose of the paper presented has not been to lull us as Lutherans into apathy, as a full consideration thereof will reveal. It is true that the largest consideration was given to that attitude of calm security, and its genuine, deep cause revealed. This was because that attitude is the most prevalent one actually existing and also because it is the fundamental attitude our Church must and may assume; it rests upon our deepest principles. However, under the second heading attention was called to our responsibility and a severe word of blame applied to all ignorance and mere indifference; our genuine security fits us the more to struggle with these questions.

## PROBLEMS OF CHURCH POLITY.

*By the Rev. Prof. J. Fry, D. D.*

Church Polity signifies the principles and rules by which the church is governed and its affairs administered.

Its derivation from *politics*, or *politicia*, shows its primary meaning to be the relation a man sustains to the city of which he is an inhabitant. In ecclesiastical usage, however, it includes the entire system of church government. It has the same root and is nearly synonymous with the word policy; the difference being that church polity refers to a fixed form of government, while church policy relates to ways and means which are temporary and liable to change from time to time as may seem most expedient. A church therefore does not adopt any form of policy, but some fixed form of polity is necessary. This polity may differ in different countries and in different periods of history, but there must always be a polity which is recognized as the proper form of government in maintaining its principles, governing its pastors and congregations, and carrying on its work.

The purpose of the polity of the church is three-fold; its preservation, purification and perpetuation. Self-preservation is the first purpose of all government; and the first problem of church polity is how best to secure, defend and protect the faith, cultus and life of the church against all error, unbelief, or deeds of violence. Equally important is it to maintain the purity of the church, by preventing improper persons becoming its teachers, ministers or members; and by exercising its discipline on those within its fold who err from the faith, fall from grace, or bring shame on its name. The third purpose is the perpetuation of the church, i. e., its constant growth and progress in fulfilment of its commission to go unto all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. As an institution established of God for the salvation of men it needs a certain polity, as well as a wise policy, in the management of its complex machinery whereby it moves forward and does its work in conquering the world for Christ.

It is not the province of this paper to enter on an account

of the various forms of government which have been adopted and tried in the history of the Christian Church. The Lutheran Church from the beginning laid all stress on faith and doctrine, and place forms of government among those things which should be left to the liberty of the church. She remembered the words of St. Paul that while there was one Lord, there were differences of administrations and diversities of operations. In her history and development she has recognized and adopted episcopal, synodical and congregational forms of government, as times and circumstances made best. Wherever the bishops accepted the pure gospel as confessed at Augsburg, the episcopal form of polity was retained,—and where they rejected it our churches rejected them, and exercised their inherent authority to provide for a ministry and the administration of their congregations in accordance with their faith. And thus it came to pass each country accepting the Lutheran doctrine had its own polity and method of church government. And so, when these countries contributed to the population of the new world on this side of the Atlantic all these varieties of government were represented here. For some years they kept in touch with, if not under control of, the church authorities of the lands from which they came, until the time arrived for them to adopt a polity of their own, adapted to their situation and needs and to the republican form of civil government which they found established here.

As our church has never adopted any particular form of government as Lutheran, church polity will always remain one of her open questions, about which men may differ without prejudice to their orthodoxy or church loyalty. This fact however, that our church polity is an open question, makes it a troublesome question. It is constantly rising up and demanding changes, which demands cannot be answered or settled by an appeal to our recognized standards or confessions of faith. Our subject therefore is wisely worded "*Problems of Church polity.*" Problems they are, and problems they will remain.

There are two of these problems, the consideration of which must suffice in the limited time at our disposal; is any essential change in our church polity in this country practicable,—and if not, in what way can our polity be improved? But be-

fore proceeding to their consideration, some statement concerning our present polity is important.

#### I. OUR PRESENT POLITY.

The principle which underlies our church polity is that the power of the church lies in its congregations, which in their normal state consist of Christian believers, having regular pastors over them, and is exercised by all the members thereof, and not by any distinct order or class. As each person, when uniting with a congregation, yields the exercise of his power to the will of the majority, so these congregations, uniting together into bodies called synods, transfer many of their powers to these larger bodies for the sake of good order, mutual protection, and co-operation in the general work of the church. In so doing, these congregations do not lose their individuality, but simply delegate certain powers to the synod of which they form a part. Our polity is not the division of the greater body into those which are less, but of uniting the lesser into something which is larger. We do not divide Synods into Conferences, and Conferences into congregations,—but unite congregations into Synods, and Synods into general bodies. The power exercised by the church does not descend from the Synod to the congregations, but ascends from the congregations to the synod for united and more efficient action. Our polity therefore is primarily congregational, but in active operation is largely synodical.

The adoption of this polity by our church in this country, was accidental rather than the result of deliberate consideration and choice. Had the Swedes, who came in 1637, settled in New Amsterdam (now New York) instead of on the banks of the Delaware, and given their form of government to congregations of the Lutheran faith in that centre of influence, it is possible the form of episcopacy known in Sweden would have prevailed among the Lutheran churches of America. Indeed such plan was proposed by the Rev. Wilhelm Christoph Berkenmyer, who, while pastor of the Dutch Lutheran congregation in New York, wrote to the Swedish pastors on the Delaware proposing that all Lutheran congregations in this coun-

try, whether Dutch, German or Swedish, be placed under the care of the king of Sweden.

It so happened however that the first Lutherans who gave start to our church polity on these Western shores came from the Netherlands, and brought with them the church constitutions and form of government to which they had been accustomed in that country, and the imprint of which is yet found in the constitutions and customs of many of our congregations. Even some of the pioneer pastors from Germany, like Berkenmyer himself, came appointed and empowered by the consistory of Amsterdam. Muhlenberg also came under its influence during his temporary residence in New York as pastor of the Dutch Lutheran congregation, and the Synod of Amsterdam certainly had strong influence in shaping our American church polity.

While the first influence which shaped our church polity was therefore accidental rather than designed or selected, the further development of that polity was interrupted by the overwhelming numbers of Lutherans coming from Germany, who soon outnumbered the Dutch and Swedish Lutherans combined. Although these German Lutheran emigrants had a common faith and language, they had no uniform polity or plan of government. In all Germany there was no recognized central authority to give them rules and regulations, or to decide questions of polity. The manifold divisions of the fatherland furnished manifold customs and ideas which could not be combined into any system acceptable to all. Accustomed as they had been to have the State decide and regulate all such questions, they were neither competent nor ready to decide on any permanent form of church government. The one centre in Germany which had most to do in regulating the affairs of Lutheran congregations in this country was Halle, and yet the fathers at Halle were men engaged and interested in the preparation and sending out of missionaries to preach the Gospel and administer the Sacraments, rather than to establish a particular form of government by which the congregations organized should be controlled. It is true that Muhlenberg and his associates were called to "establish good order" in the congregations as well as to preach and teach the people, but they

came with no prearranged plan or form of polity for the unification and government of the churches they would find or plant here. And when the day came for them to draw up constitutions for these congregations, they were influenced as much by the Lutheran churches in London and Amsterdam, as by those in Halle or any part of Germany. There was as much of Providence as of accident in this, for it left our fathers free to adopt such polity as was best adapted to the new order of things which they found here, where for the first time Lutheran congregations were to be established in a country in which Church and State were absolutely separate. They were wise men, and when questions of church polity arose for decision, they were decided according to the needs, situation and condition of the congregations they were serving here, rather than by the conditions and regulations of those from which they had come.

As we have already stated, no forms of polity was ever adopted by vote in any ecclesiastical convention of our early churches in this country. It was a gradual development, starting with certain features of the Lutheran church in the Netherlands and shaping itself from out the various and often divergent features of church government in all the lands of Europe which contributed to the Lutheran population of this country. It has grown with the growth of our church. The Ministerium of Pennsylvania and adjacent States, the Mother Synod, was a very different ecclesiastical body in its purposes and powers at first, from what it is today. There is no inconsistency in this fact, for while Lutheran doctrine is fixed Lutheran polity is flexible. There is a parallel between our church polity and the national polity under which we live. Both began as experiments which have had a historical development. As that which at first was colonial has become federal in the nation, so that church polity which at first was largely congregational has become more and more synodical. We are not afraid of this, albeit we need to watch lest history repeats itself in the tendency to imperialism,—the setting up of a monarchy in the nation and a hierarchy in the church.

The fact that our polity is still largely congregational and



that our Synods are considered only advisory bodies, has been regarded by many as the weak feature of our church in this country. The many losses and disasters our church has suffered in the past, and the many unsatisfactory conditions we find today are attributed to our polity, and the saying is often heard that while we are the strongest in doctrine we are the weakest in government of any part of the Christian church. Without admitting or denying the correctness of this saying, it starts the question—why not change our polity and adopt a stronger form of government? This brings us to the consideration of the two problems in church polity, already stated.

## II. PROBLEMS IN OUR CHURCH POLITY.

*Problem 1. Is any essential change in our present polity practicable?* We use the word *practicable*, rather than the word *desirable*, because, much as certain changes may be desirable, their discussion is useless if they are not practicable.

The one change most generally mentioned and most favorably esteemed by its advocates, is a change to the episcopal system: the introduction of the office of bishops similar to those in the Lutheran church in Scandinavian countries. It is not intended thereby to establish a new order of men in the church, but only an office of special dignity, permanence and authority. The advocates of this system believe the establishment of this office among us in which authority and power is lodged in certain persons who shall see that the affairs of the church are properly administered and its rules and laws enforced, would speedily relieve, and often remove, many ills under which our body ecclesiastic is suffering. They point to churches under the episcopal system which are prosperous, powerful and influential, as the result of that polity. They also refer to the fact that the office of bishop has been retained in our churches in Northern Europe from the beginning, and the adoption of the same polity by our church in this country would violate no Lutheran principle or usage. The recent visit of Bishop Von Scheele of Sweden to this country, and the very favorable impression produced wherever he appeared, has revived the question,—“why cannot we have Lutheran bishops in America as well as in Sweden?” There is no small number of men

and women who seem convinced we would gain greatly in public esteem and recognition, as well as in church order and discipline, if men of equal dignity and fitness were made bishops of our church in this country, and our church polity were changed accordingly.

The problem has its attractions and there are arguments in its favor,—but its successful establishment in our church in the United States would require radical changes in the constitution of our congregations to which the members would never submit, and therefore we affirm the problem is impracticable.

If bishops are to be simply ornamental figure-heads, to add dignity and impressiveness to ecclesiastical ceremonies at church conventions, consecrations, ordinations, etc., or on social occasions, it might not be difficult to establish the office, but it would not help our church polity. If rather the office is desirable in order that our government may be strengthened, and our ecclesiastical affairs be better administered than these bishops must have authority and power to enforce rules, regulations and resolutions, and in some way impose penalties for their violation or neglect. Without power, the office is simply ornamental; and the power needed cannot be conferred by resolutions or amendments to synodical constitutions. The power possessed by bishops in Sweden, or by superintendents in Germany, comes from the connection of Church and State in those countries. They are officers of the State as well as of the Church, and the power of the State is at their command. It is not the Church polity but the State power that makes their administration strong and efficient.

It is true there are Churches under Episcopal government in this country, in which the power of Bishops is strong without aid from the civil authority. The Roman Catholic, Protestant Episcopal, and Methodist Episcopal Churches are examples of this; and we must look for sources of power for their bishops, outside of any connection between Church and State—and we find three other such sources. The first may be called the power of property. The Roman Catholic Bishops have almost unlimited power over their congregations from the fact that the title to the properties occupied by these congregations is vested in the Bishop and is under his control. He holds the

power of the keys in a very literal sense and when necessary can order the church doors to be locked until his regulations and requirements are obeyed. If our congregations could be induced to convey the title to their church properties to a bishop, he would have all authority and power over them that could be desired—but this is impracticable.

Another source of episcopal power is the power of pastoral appointment, as seen in the polity of the Methodist Episcopal Church. If our pastors can be persuaded to relinquish all right to accept calls they may receive, and our people to relinquish all right to elect and call their own pastors, and both submit to the decision of a bishop, so that all pastoral relations shall be a matter of episcopal appointment, then also would they put in his hands a power which few would dare to despise. But this is utterly impracticable. Revolutions do not go backward; and neither our people nor pastors would give place by subjection to such polity, no, not for an hour.

The third source of political power lies in the doctrine concerning the ministry. If our people can be induced to believe that bishops are a higher order of ministers, and that they are clothed with divine authority in exercising their office as rulers in the church, and that they alone have power to admit persons into the church by confirmation, or into the ministry by ordination—as is taught and believed in the Protestant Episcopal church, then the office is invested with an authority which can make itself felt. This also is impracticable, because our church could not adopt any such theory without contradicting its creed and revolutionizing its history.

But if it were practicable, and a change to the episcopal system could be made, it is very questionable whether our polity would be improved and a stronger church government be secured. In those branches of the Protestant church in which the office of bishop is retained, it is very evident the authority of these bishops is chiefly strong in congregations which are feeble and need aid from diocesan funds, but often lightly esteemed by those which are influential and rich. Wealthy congregations select their own pastors and instruct the

bishop whom he shall appoint—and in various ways demonstrate the fact that in this country the will of the people, when strong enough to be expressed, is the supreme power in Church as well as in State.

Where the Church has no connection with nor dependence on the State, the influence of those occupying official positions is largely personal. The man makes the office, rather than the office makes the man. We have had Presidents of Synods who were more truly bishops without the title, than others who bore it. If by his learning, wisdom, and personal influence he is the right man for the place, his authority will be respected and recognized—but if he be the wrong man and unqualified for the post—the office or title can give him little power. On this account we believe the establishment of bishops among us would be inexpedient, even if it were not impracticable. As bishops are chosen for life, unless deposed for false doctrine or inconsistent conduct, an incompetent man becomes a burden and a hindrance from which the church can get no relief until he dies. Where executive officers are chosen for limited terms, as is now the case with our synodical presidents, there is but little difficulty in getting rid of incompetent or unworthy persons.

In this connection we call attention to the remarkable fact that any movement or sentiment to change our church polity into the episcopal system has never emanated from our churches in this country which are of Scandinavian origin. Many of their leaders were educated and brought up under that system of church government in their native land, and certainly would have introduced it into their synods if any advantage would have been thereby gained. Their leaders were not long in discerning that the polity of the church as it is in Sweden and Norway, was not the polity best adapted to the establishment and growth of their churches in a land where they were entirely separate from any support by the State, and they wisely decided and have adhered to that polity which prevails in the Lutheran Churches of this country.

There is wisdom in having Church polity correspond with the form of government of the country in which the church is

located. An episcopal form of government may be adapted to Churches in a monarchy,—but a more popular form is better in a republic. No form of government is of divine order, but is of human devising and therefore imperfect. And the greater our liberty certainly the greater is the danger of its abuse. Our republican form of national government is not without its weaknesses,—but who proposes to remedy these by changing our government into a monarchy? So the remedy for any weakness in our church polity is not in a radical change of that polity,—but in doing what we can to strengthen and improve it.

This brings us to *Problem 2. How may our present polity be improved?*

Admitting that our synodical-congregational polity has its weaknesses and defects, we believe they are not so much the fault of the system as results arising from neglect and conditions which may be removed or remedied.

Because our polity is congregational, *i. e.*, the power to decide questions lies in the congregations, does not mean our polity is the same as independency. Our Church has never held nor taught that congregations are independent of each other, but that those holding the same faith constitute one body in Christ and are members one of another. The affiliation and confederation of congregations into synodical bodies has always been our polity. What we need is to strengthen this synodical or confederation feature. Not that congregational rights are to be reduced, but synodical authority and power should be maintained. The parallel with our national government illustrates this. The sovereignty of the States is fully recognized, but the federal power has been more and more asserted. The power lies in the States, but is exercised largely through their representatives in the national government. So we recognize the sovereignty of congregations,—but it is in the union and combination of the sovereignties into ecclesiastical bodies that their powers are best exercised. No sovereignty is thereby destroyed or transferred, but many are combined and concentrated, for in union there is strength. Our polity is all right, and one of which we need not be ashamed.

ed. It has its root in the polity of the primitive church, and is the best adapted to our situation in this country. Under it we have grown and prospered until we stand third in membership among the Protestant Churches in the United States.

There are two ways in which our polity may be strengthened. The first is by educating our people concerning our needs as a church, and the active interest and co-operation in the general work of the church, which our church polity demands of all our congregations.

As a rule our congregations are loyal and not rebellious to synodical authority. They understand that Synods are not hierarchical but representative bodies, in which every parish has its voice and vote,—and when properly and intelligently informed concerning synodical resolutions and requirements, they realize an obligation to co-operate in their fulfilment. The proof that better education in church matters would remedy many of our ills is seen in the fact that those congregations which are best informed are the most ready to co-operate in synodical work. This educational work must be performed largely by the pastors in their preaching, teaching and conversation, and the wider distribution and circulation of church literature in the congregations. And any assistance they may need can be given by the officers of the Synod and Conferences, or by special committees appointed for the visitation of the churches, equally as well, and often better than by the rare visits of a bishop to each congregation.

The second way in which our polity can be strengthened, is by making it respected. No few problems in church polity would be solved if it was an established practice for Synod to call pastors to account for acts of disobedience or neglect. Synods are not advisory bodies to pastors who belong to them. Our Church has never had any such polity. Every pastor signs the constitution and rules of the Synod, and is amenable to it. He is under legal as well as religious obligations to comply with its resolutions and plans. The failure of Synods to bring delinquent members to account, brings the Synod itself into contempt, and has made our church polity so often a broken reed.

The problem how our church polity may be improved finds its best solution therefore in the two words, education and discipline; education of our people so that they may thoroughly understand and become interested in the work of the Church,—and the exercise of proper discipline upon pastors who are unfaithful or disobedient. Pastors must get rid of the impression that Synods are only advisory bodies to them, and that our church polity provides that nothing can be enforced. Much of our polity has been weak either because it has been misunderstood, or its power unemployed. What we need is not revolution,—but appreciation and employment of what we already possess.

But this remedy will require time. In ecclesiastical matters, things which are weak cannot become strong in a day. Educational work is necessarily slow, and we must be patient in looking for results. But we must not lose faith in the process nor in its sufficiency, nor lose time in beginning the process. The best government is that which is educational. It seeks not only the compliance but the consent of the governed. It aims to produce in the people "a willing mind." It is the government of the Church, not under the hierarchy of the Old Testament, but under the liberty of the New. It is the polity of the Church's manhood, "till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

---

#### REMARKS.

The Rev. Dr. Ruthrauff said:—

Whether we call the presiding officers in our synods Bishops or Presidents, is of little importance, yet we have some weak points in our Church polity which we should endeavor to overcome. We need better supervision over our district Synods, many difficulties might be avoided, or settled, many weak churches saved, and many new points occupied, by better supervision. We are losing constantly for the want of such supervision, many methods have been tried to overcome this weakness, but none of them wholly satisfactory.

Synodical missionaries have been tried but this has not been wholly satisfactory; for the reason that the best men will not accept the position under present conditions and depend on the uncertain support usually offered for such services. Besides they do not command the authority that the president of Synod does. Then the churches are reluctant to have them come to their field because they feel unwilling to make extra contributions for his support.

Pastors are too busy to make efficient presidents of our synods, and the work is often neglected, most of our synods change presidents every year or two, and no man becomes fully qualified for his work until he must lay it down and a new and untried man is placed in office. If we required our presidents to resign their pastoral work, the most capable men would not accept the position made under present conditions. The term of office is too short and the support of the position too uncertain. I believe these difficulties could be largely overcome if the Synod would endow the president's office, and own a suitable parsonage; and then make the position permanent, like that of the pastorate; or at least extend the time of service to three or five years; and then subject to re-election. This would enable the Synod to secure the services of the very best men. They would be independent so far as support is concerned. Their entire time and strength could be concentrated upon the work. When congregations become vacant, the president could supply them occasionally, administer the communion, and advise them, without being open to the charge, that he was seeking a place for himself, for he would have no temptation to do so. He would have time to look up new mission points, organize congregations, and serve them until suitable pastors could be secured. When weak churches become vacant, or have difficulties, he would not only feel an obligation to assist them, but he would have the time to do it, and do it well without neglecting other work. I would like to see the plan tested in some of our Synods.

---

The Rev. A. Aaron said:—

Our conservative church covers a large territory taking a



broad standpoint among different nations, languages and political forms. Variety of official appellation, whether bishop, superintendent or president never confuses us. Dr. Fry's able paper spoke of the visit by a Swedish bishop. His mission and so general a reception by us here manifested the tender relation and unity of our Church. We regard the apostolical succession, the advantages of a properly qualified man at the head, and the last courteous bishop's visit, but the Augustana Synod is not ready for a bishop, nor should a district synod precede the general body. It is however noteworthy that our first bishop-visit was Swedish. The first Lutheran pastor in America was a Swede, Swedish was the first congregation. A Swede officiated at the first Lutheran ordination, and we meet today on the historical ground near the sacred walls built by the old Lutherans of the North. I regret the small representation from the Augustana Synod at this convention, which may be corrected later on when we meet farther west.

We do not deny the weakness in our Church polity and the universal lack of mission zeal. Our strength lies in the pure doctrine, perfect to salvation. Let us emphasize both and we shall see an awakening spirit of preserving what we already have and also obedience to the home and foreign mission cause.

---

The Rev. Dr. Bauslin said:—

One point in the admirable presentation of this subject by Dr. Fry, it seems to us, which can stand the emphasis of a re-assertion is what he has said regarding the ordinary function of a Synod for such as have voluntarily entered into its fellowship. A Synod is made up of congregations, ministers and the properly selected lay representatives of congregations united together and working together under a common constitution, for such as have thus voluntarily entered into an ecclesiastical alliance, it seems to us that the conclusions reach by the There is no police or other external restraint in the matter and for such as have thus voluntarily entered into an ecclesiastical alliance, it seems to us that the conclusions reached by the Synod thus constituted ought in all good conscience, to be accepted.

We must also express our gratification at Dr. Fry's position on the subject of the episcopate, holding fast to their views of the universal priesthood and the non-sacerdotal character of the Ministry. Lutherans are very suspicious of anything that might even be remotely construed as looking toward anything like orders in its ministry.

---

The Rev. Dr. Kunzman said:—

This question lies in the realm of the adiophora. Church government, whether it be Episcopal, Presbyterian or Congregational or any modification of these, has in and of itself no moral attribute. We may organize according to either form, and yet not forfeit the good will of our Heavenly Father.

The question is one of expediency. Organizations are effective, or non-effective, strong or weak, adequate or inadequate as they are adapted or not adapted to accomplish the work which God has assigned to His Church. Men may pervert an organization, but the evil lies in the men and not in the organization. And as all organizations are managed by men, they are all equally in danger from this source.

Not the form but the principles of the government determine and give to it a moral character. Principle is the determining factor, the soul of things. The priesthood of believers or the hierarchy of the clergy, democracy or aristocracy may have the same form but not the same nature of government. The principle of the one is opposed to the principle of the other, and whilst we always have to deal and reckon with the human element, a Lutheran organization cannot properly become oppressive, no matter what its form. Even Melancthon in his subscription to the Smalcald Article declared that rightly wielded they would acknowledge the authority of the pope as of human and not divine, right.

We must distinguish between the divine and human elements in the Church. The Word and Sacraments are the gift of God. They are divine and hence unchangeable. Government, etc., are the human element to carry the heavenly treasure to the children of men. These need not and cannot be everywhere alike, but must be taken out of and adapted to the neces-

sities of every age. The demands of the work determine the form and extent of the organization.

When the ministerium of Pennsylvania was organized the Lutheran membership of America was small. Its jurisdiction was to extend to the Lutherans in Pennsylvania and adjacent states. Synod after Synod was formed and only in 1821 was there an attempt made to unite all the Lutherans in America in one organization. Little stress had been laid on organization and little attention was paid to it, and the work was carried on as it is even to this day by detached and antagonistic organizations. This entails much loss. We are the most united and the most divided Church in America. Had the organization been extended or the work enlarged, and, whilst not neglecting sound doctrine, had the work of missions been uppermost, at least a *modus vivendi* would have been found among and with all our bodies.

Organizations must extend and enlarge as the work enlarges. The size and extent of the work determines the size and extent of the organization. If our work be confined to a certain county and State, and we have no mission beyond their borders, then a county or State organization is sufficient. But if our work extends from the Atlantic to the Pacific and is to reach the nation, the organization must have as its field the nation and must be national. If our people are found scattered in every State and Territory, we cannot do justice to them unless our organization extends and operates where they are found. A large work demands a comparatively large organization. If we are bound together into a general body, discussion of Church doctrine and polity do not exhaust the round of our duties, and unless we are organized for work, the work of ministration, we do not fulfill our mission as an organization. Organization is both centralization and distribution, and a distribution of the work not according to whim and caprice but according to a thought-out and determined plan.

Had our Lutheran Church been as strong on its human as on its divine side, no one can doubt but that it would be stronger both in Europe and America. We pride ourselves, and rightly, in the possession of the pure and unadulterated

word and sacraments. These are the means of grace, the treasures of heaven for the salvation of a perishing world. But we must never forget that God has committed these treasures to our Church, not that we may wrap them in a napkin and lay them away, but that we may bear them to the lost. We can not bear them without organization. We cannot bear successfully without an effective and exclusive organization. Let the Church feel its national duty and it will have a national organization. Luther stood for truth and individual liberty. Loyola stood for error and organization. As a soldier he had learned the value and power of organization. The Church historian Kurtz tells us that nine tenths of the German people stood ready and had embraced the principles of the Reformation. It was there that Loyola organized the Jesuits and thousands were enslaved whom Luther had freed. God works through means. Had our Church met the Jesuits at every point, had we been organized and carried the torch of truth as aggressively as they scattered error, who could have been doubtful as to the issue. Yes, God works through earthly instrumentalities, and organization is one of them, and where the earthen vessels do not bear the heavenly treasures, the saving word never comes. Again we say that we have been weak on the human side and it is high time that we repair our weakness.

---

The Rev. Dr. Jacobs spoke with reference to two points that had been advanced in the discussion, viz., the importance of centralization of Church power, and the criticism of Lutheran Church polity. As he is unable to recall his exact statements, he offers the following more matured prepared summary:

Let us proceed slowly in advocating centralization. The organizations of the Pennsylvania Railroad, which has been extolled as a model for the organization of our Church in America, belongs to an entirely different sphere. It is a secular organization for secular ends, using solely secular means and machinery, determined by secular motives and having as its sole end purely material returns. The sphere of the Church is that of the kingdom of God. Its charter has been issued by

Him who said: "My kingdom is not of this world." Wherever it has to assume an organized form, its external means are only the Word and the Sacraments. Far more potent than the force of a complicated and central organization is that of the Holy Spirit living and active, breathing and burning wherever the word is brought to men's hearts. Let us remember that we confess: "I believe in the Holy Ghost." The strength of the Church, therefore, is not in centralization, but in decentralization. Its aim is not to make men feel that each has his exact place in some vast earthly machine which is to do his work for him, but to awaken and develop the sense of individual responsibility. The power of the Holy Spirit is to be brought through the truth to the hearts of individuals. Our various Church enterprises should gain support not by the appliances of ecclesiastical legislation, and the preaching of submission to centralized authority, but by enlisting the sympathy of the people. The tendency of even the best guarded schemes of centralization is to limit the number of those brought into closest contact with the details of the work, and who feel the burden of its responsibilities. There is a place where the rule holds: *Divide et impera*.

We have heard so often the complaint that while the Lutheran Church has the very purest doctrine, it has the most miserable Church polity, that we must apologize for some feeling in meeting this charge. As we all know, Lutheranism stands for no particular form of Church organization, and as soon as it attempts to depart from this principle, it ceases to be Lutheranism. Our unity and our strength lie solely in our Confessions. This gives Lutheranism a flexibility and plasticity and power of adjustment with respect to external relations that would otherwise be impossible. Church constitutions belong to the category of the "human traditions, rites and ceremonies," that Article VII of the Augsburg Confession declares need not "be everywhere alike." While, therefore, with all our hearts we favor all schemes for harmonious co-operation, and do not deny that what are known as "business methods" should be resorted to in the administration of the various institutions and benevolent agencies of the Church, nevertheless in all such

arrangements let us remember that the principle of Christian Liberty must be maintained, and that Church authority be not invoked for what our Confessions declare is entirely outside of its scope.

The most compact church organization, consistent with the principles laid down in the Augsburg Confession, presupposes a certain amount of homogeneity of the people united. There must be a firm historical basis and several generations of common work under similar relations by the majority of its constituents, in order that it may be effected. The wider the scheme of Church organization, the greater the amount of liberty that must be left within the various circles of its constituents with respect to the details of their own work. The strength of organization must often be sacrificed in its efforts at comprehensiveness. The Lutheran Church can never be organized after the model of the communions that lay all the stress on organization, the Roman Catholic, the Presbyterian, the Protestant Episcopal, the Methodist, etc.

---

### THE DEFAMERS OF LUTHER.

*By the Rev. J. J. Young, D. D.*

Among earth's great men few have received such attention, from both friend and foe, as Martin Luther. That there should be great diversity in the description of such a character is evident. We cannot, for instance, expect the devout Roman Catholic to look upon him and his labors in the same light as the devout Greek Catholic, or the devout Protestant. Whilst all are Christians the relation they sustain to the great Reformer must nevertheless affect their views concerning him. There must also be some allowance made for the age in which the Reformer lived. It is evident that the sweet spirit of Him, who greeted his betrayer as, "Friend," had not yet permeated His followers as today. More stress was then laid upon the law of retaliation than on the Gospel of love. To knock out an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth was also more in harmony with the old Adam, than to love an enemy or pray for a persecutor.

There seems to have been a general belief in those days that every thing was lawful in an ecclesiastical as well as in a national warfare. Party bias was then almost universally accepted as a guaranty for truth. The time has, however, come when the followers of Him, who is the truth, should seek, set forth and defend the truth regardless of results.

The subject assigned us implies that Luther has been defamed. Since there are various ways in which this can be done, and since our limited time compels us to confine ourselves to one line of treatment, we will, therefore, consider some allegations relating to his translation of the Bible and his death.

#### LUTHER'S TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE

May be considered as his life work; the means through which he brought about the great Reformation. It is doubtless on this account that his opponents have endeavored to destroy its influence and power. They have declared his translation a corrupt book and branded him as a corrupter of the Bible. In doing so they at the same time, assailed the very foundation of Protestantism. If this allegation be true then our infallible rule of faith and practice is gone; our doctrines are based upon a corrupt book, and Luther is undeserving of our confidence. This is a most serious matter demanding the most careful investigation.

Anderdon, in his book, "Luther," written to counteract the influence of the 400th anniversary of Luther's birth in England, says, (p. 51.): "Perhaps there is hardly an error more widely spread, or one more groundless, than that Protestantism (not stooping to define the shadowy term) is built on the Bible." By this the writer doubtless means that Protestantism, whatever that may be or mean, is founded not on the Sacred Scriptures, but on a corrupt translation of the same. Again, the same writer says (p. 55 and 56): "But is he (Luther) infallible in deciding that St. James' Epistle, and the Apocalypse with other books are not Scripture?" Again (p. 56): "We have seen how Luther took away from the Word of God. Let us now see how he added to it." The writer does not state what is implied in the other books. He may here refer to

the Antilegomena, to which the Epistle of James and Apocalypse belong, or to the Apocrypha of the O. F., or to both.

As far as the Apocrypha of the O. F. is concerned every thorough student of the Bible knows, or ought to know, that Luther is neither the first, nor the only student of the Sacred Scriptures, who denied their canonicity. These books, belonging to the septuagint and not to the Hebrew canon, did not receive the same recognition, nor have the same authority as the books composing the Hebrew canon. That these books of obscure origin received a decided opposition by those who thoroughly investigated the Hebrew canon, is evident. Among these investigators we find even Jerome, whose piety, honesty and scholarship no one doubts. It is true, however, that whilst Jerome rejected the Apocrypha Augustine received the same. Augustine doubtless did so because he considered the Septuagint, in which those books were found, as inspired which Jerome did not (*City of God*, B. XVIII, C. 43). Yet, in spite of Augustine's great influence, we find throughout the Middle ages biblical scholars maintaining Jerome's position. As far as the Church of Rome is concerned the question whether these books were to be placed on equal footing with the Hebrew canon, was not finally settled till the IV session of the Council of Trent, (April 8, 1546—June 17, 1556). Since Luther died before that final settlement took place how can he be accused of taking them from the Bible? Luther considered the Apocrypha as good and useful to read. Hence he translated and published the same in his German Bible. He also referred to them in his sermons, based sermons on texts taken from them, and treated them as they had been by god-fearing and scholarly men before his time.

As far as St. James' Epistle and the Apocalypse are concerned a diligent study of the Fathers will show that they belonged to the books known as Antilegomena. The New Testament books known by that name were the Second Epistle of Peter, the Epistles of James, Jude, Second and Third of John, Hebrews and the Apocalypse. They were called Antilegomena, or disputed books, to distinguish them from the Homologoumena, or universally acknowledged books of the New Testa-



ment. A careful study of the church history of Eusebius will give the necessary information upon this subject. Though the ancient controversy gradually subsided and the Antilegomena were put on par with the Homologoumena, it was nevertheless revived again about the time of the Reformation; especially by Erasmus and Cardinal Cajetan. Luther did, however, not exclude these books from the New Testament canon. As far as the Epistle of James is concerned, he considered it as inferior to the Gospel of John, Paul's Epistles to the Romans, Galatians, Ephesians and the First Epistle of Peter. Compared with these it was eine rechte stroherne Epistel. In his introduction to the Epistle of James and Jude he even praises the Epistle of James though it had been rejected by the ancients. He says:—"Diese Epistel St. Jakobi, obwohl, sie von den Alten verworfen ist, lobe ich, und halte sie doch fuer gut." (Luth. S. Schrif. V. XIV, p. 91, St. Louis Ed.) Hence Luther did not reject the Antilegomena.

As far as the allegation of adding to the word of God is concerned, Anderdon cites on p. 56 the following instances quoted from Rohrbacher: "As to adding to the Bible in his translation, here is a noted example. St. Paul says, in his Epistle to the Romans, C. III., v 28: 'We account a man to be justified by faith without the works of the law.' Luther makes him say: 'We account a man to be justified by faith *only*, without the works of the law;' adding the word *only*, which is found neither in the Greek nor the Latin." In regard to this addition of the word "only," Luther does not stand alone among the translators of the sacred Scriptures, who have realized that the context completely justifies the same. We are told that the translators of the Geneva Italian Bible of 1476, and of the Nuernberg German Bible of 1483, have put it in also. (Lutheran Com. on Rom. p. 75). Why should it be more criminal for Luther to put in the word "only" than for the translators who preceded him? If Luther be guilty of "arrogance and blasphemy for putting into that verse the word "only" then must the Geneva and Nuernberg translators be guilty too; but if they be not guilty of "arrogance and blasphemy," neither can he, no matter whether his name be Luther or not.

Luther is further accused of rejecting the solemnly authorized Vulgate and of following a misinterpreted Hebrew and a corrected Greek Text. Anderdon says, (p. 52,) "The testimony of a careful writer is as follows: It was at this same time that he put forth a translation of the Bible, in which, without resting on the Vulgate, which had been accepted and solemnly authorized by the church, he sometimes follows a misinterpreted Hebrew, sometimes a corrupt Greek, omitting or adding, as might prejudice or promote his doctrines, especially in the New Testament." This is according to Anderdon's understanding, "the testimony of a careful writer," and this careful writer accuses Luther of rejecting the Vulgate, which he says "had been accepted and solemnly authorized by the church" at the time Luther began his translation of the Bible. Since the Vulgate was not accepted and solemnly authorized by the Church of Rome till the IV Sess. of the Council of Trent, which was after Luther's death, the testimony of this careful writer is absolutely false.

In order to save this careful writer and himself from the just condemnation for quoting and describing him as a "careful" writer, Anderdon puts in the following footnote: "It would be more accurate to say, approved by the universal use of the West. The first formal decree in favor of the Vulgate was promulgated by the Sacred Council of Trent, eleven years after Luther's translation was finished." Since Anderdon seems to have known better why does he in his text quote such testimony, and then describe the man as "a careful writer." This looks suspicious, to say the least. Luther's translation was completed in 1534, the Vulgate was accepted and solemnly authorized at the IV Sess. of the Council of Trent, which session lasted from April 8, 1546—June 17, 1556. The accepted and solemnly authorized Vulgate had to be prepared, however, after it had been accepted and authorized. Hence it did not appear, according to Real Ency. fuer Prot. Thoel, Vol. 8, p. 456, till 1590. According to the Standard Dictionary "the Edition of Pope Clement VIII, of 1592-93 is the source of the modern Douay version, and the accepted standard of the Roman Catholic church." Since the solemnly authorized Vulgate did not ap-

pear till over fifty years after the publication of Luther's translation, and over forty years after his death, how can Luther be accused of rejecting the "accepted and solemnly authorized Vulgate?" or how can the "accepted and solemnly authorized Vulgate" be represented as approved by the universal use of the West, when it took over forty years after it had been authorized to prepare it?

But this "careful writer makes another statement, which dare not be overlooked, since his first contains such a remarkable revelation. In this he charges Luther with following "sometimes a misinterpreted Hebrew," and "sometimes a corrected Greek," omitting and adding at pleasure. Is this really so? Allow me here to introduce a man by the name of Wedewer, belonging to the same household of faith as Anderdon and his "careful writer," and at the time he wrote engaged in the same work in Germany in which Anderdon was in England, when he wrote his "Luther," Wedewer, in order to show why Luther's translation of the Bible, which had been so highly praised during the Luther celebration in Germany, was such an excellent and perfect translation, accuses Luther of having used an old Catholic translation to such an extent that his work was really no translation, but only a revision of a former translation. He says:—"Luther hat die alte Katolische Uebersetzung Stark benutzt resp. im Neuen Testament wesentlich beibehalten und nur revidirt ungeschurt den Katolischen Deutschen Text und benutzte ihn tuechtig Wort zu sagen. (Wedewer, Johannes Dietenberger, Freiburg, 1888, S. 174f) See Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift Vol. I., p. 136.

It is really amazing how careful some of these writers belonging to Luther's opponents are; how they contradict each other and how they are quoted by their own men without the least doubt that their statements may after all be groundless, resting upon nothing but sand instead of the supposed rock.

Since Luther's opponents use such questionable tactics to-day, what must have been their tactics during the Reformation? Is it any wonder that at times he would rain upon them the most heavy blows, and then again poke all sorts of fun at

them? None, whatever, they have no one to blame but themselves. In their effort to upset his life work, to remove the foundation of Protestantism, they have carried on a warfare, not only to their discredit as Christian scholars, but also to the injury of the cause of truth and to the advancement of the kingdom of Christ. Luther is, however, not the only translator, who has been called by his fellow Christians a corrupter of the Bible. Jerome was treated about the same way because he endeavored to give to the Church a copy of the sacred Scriptures based upon the original. In his apology he replies to his calumniators in the following words: "Innocence would be dead long ago if wickedness were always allied to power, and calumny could prevail in all that it seeks to accomplish." (The Nicene and Post N. Fath. vol. III p. 515). Though he was called by persons, who doubtless considered themselves scholars and true followers of Christ, a *falsarius*, *sacrilegus* and *corruptor sanctarum scripturarum*, and was accused of translating from a bad Hebrew manuscript, yet in course of time this uncalled for and false censure not only passed away, but he was even considered to have been guided by the Holy Spirit, and to have been preserved from error. (See Real Ency. Vol. 8 p. 447) As in the political world the rebel and outlaw of today may become the patriot and lawgiver of tomorrow, thus in the religious the heretic and corrupter of the sacred Scriptures of one age of the Church may become the saint and divinely inspired translator of another. We must now turn however to

#### LUTHER'S DEATH AND BURIAL.

The strange rumors circulated immediately after Luther's death were in perfect harmony with the superstition of the age and the expectation of his enemies. A paper setting forth his fearful removal was circulated in Rome a year before he died. Hence it would have been altogether out of harmony with said paper, and entirely unnatural, if such rumors had not been spread after his actual departure. According to a letter of Jonas, March 9, 1546, (Kolde, Luther's Selbstmord, p. 20) his enemies circulated a rumor that, as Luther's remains were being conveyed from Eisleben to Wittenberg, they arrived on

their way at Halle with the empty casket. Of course every body was allowed to conjecture how the body might have disappeared. Paul Majunke, in his "Luther's Lebendsande," p. 15, gives his readers another account of the wonderful funeral procession from Eisleben to Wittenberg. This account is not only striking and picturesque, but may also be designated as a savory description. According to this report a numberless flock of ravens, croaking in a most terrifying manner, accompanied the procession. In order to make the presence of these ravens sure we have found two accounts for their appearance. According to one account they were not really ravens, but evil spirits, the former occupants of Luther's body, who were now, at the command of their chief, accompanying the remains to their final resting place. (Kolde. L. S. p. 32). According to another account these black ravens were drawn there by the stench that proceeded from the casket. (Majunke L. L. p. 14). This stench is reported to have been so offensive that the Professors and Doctors of Wittenberg University were unable to carry the casket from the city gate to the castle church. And this pestiferous stench, says Majunke, proceeded from the remains, "trotzdem sie sich in einem metallenen Sarge befand und eisige Kaelte herschte." (Majunke L. L. p. 14.) Even the metallic casket and the bitter cold could not prevent the same. Hence it must have been miraculous. Of course we are not told how Luther's remains missing already at Halle, re-entered the casket; how they were finally brought into the castle church; how the vast crowds were enabled to attend the funeral services; how the city and surrounding country were miraculously delivered from an intensely malignant epidemic, which the pestiferous stench would naturally produce. All this is passed over in silence.

The stupid absurdity and profaneness of these stories illustrate the monstrous superstition of that age. Even Majunke, who has been spreading them again in order to counteract the Luther celebration in Germany, confesses in one place that he has little faith in the same. His words are as follows:

"Es ist mir wirklich gleichgiltig, ob vor Luther's Leiche hundert oder tausend Trompeter oder Reiter Hergegangen

sind und auch die Geschichte von den Raben und von dem Gestank lege ich Keinen sonderlichen Werth. Und hierin begegne ich wieder Bozcius und Bellarmin welche beide ganz nebenbei einmal diese Umstaend erwaechnen, das hauppgewicht aber auf das Sterben Luther legen." (Majunke, L. L. p. 41.) Since he himself has little faith in these stories and places his principal stress upon Luther's death, it is difficult to understand why he should dig up and place before the public of this enlightened age such disgusting, profane, absurd, superstitious and selfcontradictory stories. It almost looks as if he aims "to catch the unwary," defame Luther, slander Protestantism in general and the Lutheran Church in particular. He who publicly confesses to have little faith in the evil rumors he circulates not only robs them of credence, but also impugns his own motives.

Let us, however, proceed to Luther's death. Since Majunke places so much stress upon it, it will be necessary to investigate the account of the same carefully in order to find out whether it is founded upon the solid or shifting sand. Why does Majunke join Bozcius and Bellarmine in placing so much stress upon Luther's death? A careful study shows that there was then a general belief that a heresiarch must die a fearful horrible and ignominious death. Anderdon says, (Luther p. 123): "The chair of Peter is like the Ark of the Covenant; no Uzzah ever touched it irreverently, and remained unscathed." This seems to have been the general belief in those days, and is doubtless held by many today. He, who firmly holds to this belief, must therefore necessarily show that Luther died such a death. Anderdon, though firmly believing that no one will go unscathed that irreverently touches the chair of Peter, appears to have little faith in the belief as above stated. Hence, after giving a highly colored description of Luther's last evening, closes by saying: "A few hours later Luther was a corpse (Anderdon, Luther, p. 31). Majunke, however, seems to be a firm believer in this questionable and fallacious doctrine.

We call this doctrine questionable and fallacious not because we wish to assert thereby that there may be no heresiarchs, and

that they may not thus die, but because our judgment concerning the character of our fellow-worshippers of God and their death may at times be very erroneous. Who for instance, is a heresiarch? Is every one that dies a fearful, horrible and ignominious death such an one? May not a person be in the eyes of one a heretic, apostate and a blasphemer, and in the eyes of another a faithful servant of the Lord, a child of the living God and an heir of heaven? The Jews, for instance, who in their own eyes were pious and godfearing men and considered their mode of worshipping the God of their fathers as alone true, looked upon Paul in the same light as Luther has been looked upon by his opponents. In their religious zeal they considered him unfit to live. He was persecuted by them from the time of his conversion at Damascus, till he was put to death by the hand of the executioner at Rome; and after his death defamers were not wanting. Were they right in their judgment? Many of the names ascribed to Luther by his opponents you will find in the Gospels ascribed unto our Saviour. Christ was called a glutton and winebibber, described as in league with Beelzebub and having a devil, as a perverter of the nation and a malefactor, as a blasphemer and one that ought to die, and that by men who stood high in the Church. Even the successor of the divinely appointed head of the Mosaic economy and the members of the highest ecclesiastical tribunal of that economy, condemned him to death as a blasphemer, caused him to die that fearful, horrible and ignominious death upon the cross. Having done all this they tried to cover their error and crime by means of a clumsy story. Was Christ, because He was condemned by the successor of the divinely appointed head of the Mosaic economy and the highest ecclesiastical tribunal of the same and because He died a fearful, horrible and ignominious death, a heresiarch? Were those who condemned Him infallible in their judgment? Anderdon doubtless saw the difficulty, hence he avoided it; Majunke, however, holds on to the monstrous doctrine that places Christ among the heresiarchs, and declares the successor of the divinely appointed head of the Mosaic economy and the highest ecclesiastical tribunal of the same, as infallible in its judgment. Hence, he and all who

hold this view are compelled to show in some way or other that Luther died a fearful, horrible and ignominious death.

Luther's opponents, as we have seen, knew more about his remains than about his death. In spite of the authentic accounts of Luther's edifying, peaceful and blessed death by about sixteen trustworthy persons, who were eye witnesses and whose names are given (See Kold L. S. p. 11 and 13), his opponents nevertheless surmised that he died a most horrible death, a death corresponding to that of Judas Iscariot. Such surmisings were in perfect harmony with their view about Luther and even necessitated by the belief just referred to. In this doubtful condition they seemed to have remained till 1592, or 46 years. It was during that memorable year that a key was found to unlock the supposed mystery in perfect harmony with the superstition and belief of the age, and also to the complete satisfaction of his opponents. It appears that whilst this scholarly Bozius wrote his remarkable chapter on the end of all heresiarchs for his well known work, *De Signis Ecclesiae*, a servant of Luther, who after his Master's death had returned to the Roman Catholic Church, and whose name is unfortunately not given, revealed how the servants found Luther, Feb. 18, 1546, "*Juxta lectum suum pensilem et misere strangulatum*," but were immediately put under oath not to reveal the same. (Majunke L. L. p. 27 and 28). The long looked for revelation came at last just in the very nick of time, and was doubtless gratefully received by the historian. How could Bozius have completed the important chapter, which he was at this very time writing, without being able to depict Luther's dreadful, horrible and ignominious death? The dreadful deaths of such heresiarchs as Oecolampadius, Carlsstadt, Bucer and Calvin, were all known to the writer, but if Luther's had not been made known unto him just at that time, his arch of heresiarchs could not have been completed for want of the keystone, the prime heretic Luther.

According to Majunke's account it is somewhat doubtful whether Bozius obtained this important information from Luther's former servant personally or through some other parties. He says: "Dieser Diener befand



sich noch im jugendlichen Alter als sein Her starb. Nach dem Tode desselben Kehrte er in die Katholische Kirche zurueck und trat hierauf entweder in Persoenlicher Beziehung zu Bozius (oder Bozis) oder zu dessen Frembe Kreis, gerade als der selbe sein Beruehmtes, von Theologen das folgenden Jahrhunderts haufig citirtes Werk. *De Signis Ecclesiae* (Rom und: Koeln 1592 und 1593) schrieb." (L. L., p. 25.) Since Bozius may have based his account of Luther's death upon second hand evidence, it, therefore, depends somewhat upon the character and intelligence of these friends and since we have sufficient and satisfactory assurance that his informants, whose names are not given, were persons of credible character and intelligence, we have no sufficient and satisfactory assurance that their statements are true.

Let us now turn to the servant himself. According to Majunke, (L. L. p. 25) he was quite young when his master died, had been a Lutheran and returned to the Catholic Church after his Master's death. This is all that we know about him. It is a great pity that his name was not given, since the honor, which really seems to belong to Luther's servant is, according to the *Duesburger Volkszeitung* (Kolde, L. S., p. 33) claimed by a servant of the Count of Mansfield, who declares to have been sent by his master to Luther's room in order to find out why he slept so long; and that he was the first to find Luther as above mentioned. Of course it is somewhat difficult to decide at this late day, to whom the great honor really belongs, since there may have been others as justly entitled to it as these two anonymous servants.

Without being partial of either of them, we would nevertheless ask: why did Bozius withhold the name of the man who rendered him such important and valuable service just in the very nick of time? He surely did not wish to rob the man of the honor due him after he had enabled him to complete his famous chapter on the end of all heresiarchs? Was the servant not man enough to stand by his statement after he had made it? would his name have greatly depreciated the value of the same? would the mentioning of his name have exposed him to any danger? or was it an invention? To say the least, the

withholding of his name looks suspicious. It looks as if it had been intentionally withheld. Whilst Luther's friends have furnished about sixteen names of persons present at his death his opponents have not furnished a single one. Their entire account is based upon the statement of an anonymous person. But this anonymity suggests a question in perfect harmony with a fair and just inquiry after the truth, namely: What is the legal value of a statement made by an anonymous person about 46 years after the supposed event has taken place?

According to the sacred Scriptures Bozius and all who have followed him have established nothing. In turning to the Bible we find there a clear and definite law to secure a person against injury to life, property of character, through inadequate or false attestation. Even if the evidence of the anonymous servant were true, it would be insufficient to establish that of which Luther is accused. The testimony produced is not only somewhat doubtful, but is, according to the Bible, inadequate, since it needs just one more witness. The law of God covering this subject reads: "One witness shall not rise up against a man for any iniquity, or for any sin, in any sin that he sinneth; at the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall the matter be established." (Deut. 19: 15). According to Mat. 18: 16 this law was sanctioned by our Saviour, and reaffirmed by Paul, (11. Cor. 13:1). A careful study of the Anti Nicene Fathers will further show that it was carefully observed by the primitive Church. Hence, according to the highest authority we have, the testimony of a single anonymous witness establishes nothing. It is somewhat surprising that God's holy law should be thus ignored by those of Luther's opponents who accuse him of breaking God's law!

Majunke doubtless realized that he could not expect an enlightened, cultured and critical age to accept conclusions based upon a dubious story and entirely unscriptural, hence he endeavors to carry convictions to the hearts of his readers by adding to his treatise a chapter on: "Die Gemüths Stimmung Luther's gegen das Ende Seines Lebens." In this he labors hard to show the condition of Luther's mind toward the end of his life, which condition he claims was brought about through the ap-

parent failure of reformatory efforts, his troubles at Wittenberg and in his own family. This mental condition, he says, so alarmed his friends that they employed a special servant to watch him continually. (L.L. p. 52) Now, since according to Majunke's psychological argument a servant was continually with Luther to protect him when alone, it is somewhat difficult to understand how he could have been found as stated by some of his opponents. The specially appointed servant instead of carrying conviction makes the case even more doubtful and mysterious. Inasmuch as this servant was always with Luther whilst alone, and inasmuch as, according to Luther's opponents, Luther must have been drinking pretty freely before he returned to his room where he is supposed to have been found dead, may not this very servant, who was alone with him then and there, for some reason, or consideration have murdered him and then to cover his crime have placed him in the position in which some of his opponents' claim he was found! And may not this very servant, who was always with Luther whilst alone, be the anonymous servant, who in 1592 first disclosed to Bozius, or his friends, how the great heresiarch died? Considering the age in which Luther lived, the attitude of some of his opponents and the ban under which he was, Majunke's psychological chapter, which was intended to carry conviction and justify his unscriptural condemnation of Luther, argues far more in favor of murder than of suicide.

Thus we see the fallacy and self-destructiveness of the arguments brought against Luther as a translator of the sacred Scriptures and concerning his death. Whilst his defamers are unable to maintain their position and are invariably dislodged by their own guns, Luther has remained unscathed and perfectly secure in his feste Burg.

---

#### REMARKS.

The Rev. Dr. Spaeth said:—

J. A. Bengel, that eminently sober and well balanced Suabian theologian gave it as his honest conviction, that after Christ no one, not even the Apostles had to bear so many calumnies as Luther. (Post Christum nemo tot calumnias ferre quam

Lutherus debuit, neque ipsi Apostoli.) These slanders come, on the one side, from the Romanists. Their coarseness and open perversion of historical facts are of such a character that they may be considered as being beneath our notice, though the bold aggressiveness with which they are constantly repeated may now and then call for a manly protest. But there is another class of defamers of Luther whose attacks upon his character are more subtle and refined and consequently more calculated to do real mischief. I might characterize them in a general way as Erasmians, admirers of the great humanist Erasmus who show that in proportion as a man is inclined to exalt Erasmus he will degrade Luther, and that those who worship Erasmus as a hero are unfit to do justice to the character and life work of Martin Luther. This class is common among modern writers and lecturers in England. One of them, Augustine Birrell, in an article "Down the Rhine", published in the Century Magazine, December, 1900, went out of his way to defame Luther in statements like these, "that no Catholic controversialist would have any difficulty in culling passages from the writings of the Reformer which are filthy enough. Henry VIII and Martin Luther are not ideal sponsors of a new religion, they were both masters of billingsgate and the least saintly of men." I called the attention of my friend Professor Rob. Ellis Thompson, D. D., principal of the Philadelphia High School, to this article. He is a Presbyterian, and as such may be supposed to be perfectly impartial and unbiased in his judgment, while, at the same time, he has few equals, even among our own theologians, as a student of Luther. Dr. Thompson protested against Mr. Birrell's statements in a letter to the editor of the Century Magazine from which I am permitted to quote: "Mr. Birrell, like his countrymen generally, knows little or nothing of Luther at first hand. Of all Protestant countries England has the fewest of what I may call Lutherists. The celebration of the fourth centenary of his birth in 1883 produced in England not a single respectable work on the subject.—Mr. Froude's stylish essay and Mr. Baine's made-to-order biography being only apparent exceptions. Those English Christians who care for Luther are content to take

him at second hand, and very much Frenchified, out of the pages of Merle d'Aubigne. Those who dislike him are content with the quotations from his works in the pages of Roman Catholic Controversialists. From indications in Mr. Birrell's article, I must infer that he has tried to strike an average by combining these admirable sources of information.

Once for all permit me to deny that any Catholic controversialist "has no difficulty in culling from the writings of the Reformer passages which are filthy enough." The only attempts to produce such quotations that I have seen, professed to derive them from one of two sources. One of these is his sermons on marriage, which controversialists are fond of describing as too coarse for quotation. Archdeacon Hare says that in no one of Luther's four sermons on marriage is there anything to warrant any such censure. And this, I think, will be the judgment of any fair-minded reader who actually reads them. They are couched in very plain speech, as was the fashion of that century and of the next, of Henry Smith, Jeremy Taylor, and other good theologians who had occasion to discuss such questions. But they are not filthy, and no man who had not a very great reverence for marriage could have written any one of them.

The other source is Luther's Table-Talk. This was published twenty years after his death from notes made by some dozen of his friends, without any revision on his part, and with some very manifest mistakes as to his meaning. It is not one of his "writings," and therefore cannot be one of the sources from which Mr. Birrell's Roman Catholic controversialists "have no difficulty in extracting filthy passages." There are some places in the book in which Luther speaks in language which it is impossible not to regret; but they are very few and they are never the coarseness of a libidinous mind. They represent not so much the man, as his peasant birth and his monkish training. He had no love for the things which defile the mind, and his pure life as a house-father and a Christian were such as showed him worthy of the reverence with which nearly all Germany and millions in our country regard him.

To combine him and Henry VIII as "sponsors for a new

religion" shows that Mr. Birrell knows nothing about Luther that is worth the knowing. Luther had no new religion to preach. He took his stand on the Catechism taught him in his youth,—meaning the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments. He did not put a book into the place of the Church, as Mr. Birrell thinks. He put God into the place which the Church had usurped. He did not preach "the right of private judgment" or any other of the formulas of later British Protestantism. He did not undervalue the Church and its Sacraments, and he spent a large part of his strength in fighting those who wanted to rend the Church into fragments by their "private judgment," and to reduce the sacraments to empty forms. He did not set himself up as his own Pope or anybody's Pope. He had such faith in the living presence of Christ, in His Word and Sacraments, that he felt no need of a Pope. Loyalty to that authority, not self-will, was the note of his character. He did not even choose his path as a Reformer. He was brought to begin the work by his sense of his duty to his "Beichtkinder" in Wittenberg. He was driven on from step to step largely by his adversaries. He did not leave the communion of the Church of Rome, but was cast out of it, just as was Doellinger in our own day, because he could not and would not do what his conscience condemned.

There is no man alive who is better qualified by breadth of sympathy and just discrimination to do justice to Luther than is Mr. Birrell, if he will but acquaint himself with the man. He will then recognize in Luther's intense faith, his heroic loyalty to the truth, his tenderness to the troubled and the tempted, his breadth of sympathy with all that is good in humanity, his poetic achievement as the founder of German Hymnology, his love of little children, his interest in nature, especially the birds, his kindly relations with all classes around him, his incessant labor for the welfare of the churches, and of their members, and his deep humility, the explanation of that marvellous charm which has made him the spiritual guide of millions of devout Christians. He will find in Luther a character both grander and finer than John Wesley, and perhaps he will discover why it was that it was through hearing

Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans read in the Moravian Church, that Wesley attained to spiritual peace and became the doer of the good works recorded in his "Journal."

---

#### REMARKS ON THE CONFERENCE AND ITS WORK.

The Rev. Dr. L. E. Albert said:—

That the results of the Conference could not but be beneficial. *First.* They were stimulating. The papers read were of a highly intellectual character, and stirred up the thinking powers to activity. They refreshed the mind with great truths, and fixed them anew upon the memory. They gave in many cases a new insight into what was familiar, and taught anew their power and correctness. *Secondly.* They were calculated to produce a *spirit of unity*. It could not be otherwise, since in the great essentials, there was found to be, a substantial agreement. Brethren who had misunderstood one another, from misconceptions of their true position, were surprised to find, that they stood upon the same basis, and were animated by the same lofty motives. By everything that was said and done, all were convinced of a nearness both in doctrine and practice, and were disposed to exercise a larger charity. *Thirdly.* *They provoked a greater Church love.* A just feeling of pride for the grand Church, with which we were connected, was evidently enkindled by the proceedings of the Conference. The estimation in which God's Word was held was eminently conspicuous. The great stress laid upon the Bible as the source of supreme authority, was very manifest. The great doctrine of the Atonement, through a Crucified Savior was clearly upheld and defended. The Sacraments, as means of grace were prominently set forth and advocated. And to all was added the necessity of a truly Christian life, to him who was a true believer. All felt that it was an honor to belong to a church with such a faith, and a privilege as well as a duty to extend her power and her influence.

---

The Rev. Dr. Holloway, said:—

I have much enjoyed this conference. It has been a precious

season to me. It is a prophecy of great good to our beloved church. We owe a great debt to the committee, and lasting thanks to the essayists for giving us such excellent papers. I never heard any better.

When I entered on my first pastorate in Maryland a member of my church asked me, "Are you an old, or a new Lutheran?" My reply was, "I am neither; I am a Lutheran." I am convinced now as I was then, that this is the true position. I have never had occasion to recede from it. I was ordained by the mother Synod in Reading, Pa., and have served churches in both general bodies, the General Synod and General Council, and never had my Lutheranism questioned.

I thank God for this day, for what my eyes have seen and my ears have heard. I rejoice with you all, dear brethren, in the coming together of our glorious church, and in the better understanding of one another. We are all brethren, and of the same household of faith. Let us strive to be better Christians, and we shall all be still better Lutherans.

---

The Rev. A. Aaron said:—

This convention is marked by extra high character. We have listened to elaborate and learned papers on topics common to us all and have discussed them in harmonious and sound spirit. Now we must continue these ecumenical conventions; they shall lead us to great results. We want to finally form a general body of the Lutheran Church in America. This seems a bold statement, yet is true. In the depths of our hearts we long for such a state and let us not give up until we have accomplished the great work. This, however, takes long time, unfeigned work, and much wisdom from on high. The unification must not be done at the expense of our fundamental principles. Those we dare not alter and in this respect let there be no compromise. Let the adiaphora, though so hard to properly define, find their place. The somewhat poorer sections will eventually become more conservative and slowly grasp the unaltered truths to which these meetings greatly encourage. I have lately observed a gradual increase of orthodoxy both in theory and practice in many places. As a



missionary I see the weakness of our church in solving many local, financial and even ecclesiastical questions, because of our not understanding each other. The strength in unity shall further our home and foreign mission. We shall be recognized as a Church in America, while we are now largely looked upon as merely some few congregations, though we in fact are one of the largest churches in this land and on the globe. National and language problems are solved and may the Luther-bosom gather home and embrace its children.

---

The Rev. Dr. Bauslin said:—

I have heard with pleasure the remarks of Dr. Luther Albert, who might now be called one of the fathers in the ministry of the General Synod. The sentiments he had expressed were certainly reflective of the best life and sentiment of the body he represented. If the speaker might say a word for the men of his own generation it would be this— that in his judgment, it did not become men who were under fifty years of age yet, to spend their energies in magnifying differences and partisanship that had their origin and were fostered most in the church in this country, when they were little boys. It was even less becoming yet in younger men and something not to be expected. In this the future was full of hope for the practical life and work of the Church. The speaker expressed himself as delighted with the spirit, the ability of the papers read and the happy correspondence of the views maintained.

---

The Rev. Dr. Harpster said:

He thought one thing was pretty evident all through the meetings of the Conference, and that was that no one seemed to think of any organic union of the different bodies represented here except as something of the very remote future. No one seemed concerned about that, and he did not know that it was a matter of much concern; certainly not of immediate concern. But what was of concern, and immediate, too, was that there should be full and fraternal cooperation among Lutherans along all lines of Christian work. And that concern, he thought, was manifest in these meetings from begin-

ning to end. If it were not for the very palpable difference in surroundings, he could almost imagine himself back in their Lutheran Conference in India. Perhaps the brethren did not know that for the last half dozen years the General Synod, the General Council, the Hermannsburg and the Schleswig-Holstein Lutheran missionaries of the Telugu country had been holding annual meetings to discuss common interests. If Danes, Swedes, Germans, Russians, Canadians and Americans can stand together on a Lutheran platform, it ought not be so great a feat here. You could not persuade him that this Conference did not betoken good things for the two missions in India. Organic union might also seem remote there, but it seemed to him not impossible. Certainly something could be done in the way of economical mission administration by a closer connection between the two missions. If a relation could be brought about which, whilst enlarging the sphere of usefulness of both missions, would, at the same time, be in the interests of a greater economy, it would seem a manifest duty to try to bring it about. This would be well worth while looking into on the part of the church and the Boards.

---

The Rev. S. D. Daugherty said:—

*Mr. Chairman and Brethren:* It is with pleasure I express my appreciation of this Conference of Lutherans. With some others on the floor of this convention, I had certain prejudices and misgivings to contend with before we convened, but the warmth of brotherly love and the common interests revealed here have entirely dispelled these.

I have been especially interested in the missionary addresses by the brethren from the South, West, and East, representing the three great branches of our Lutheran Church in this Conference. They have shown us our common heritage in this country and how the fields are white unto the harvest.

We are more and more convinced as the light of the truth reveals the situation that the work of evangelization among the masses—especially this great middle class—is the work of the Lutheran Church.

This is the day of our opportunity. The multitudes in our great cities especially, are waiting for us. The Master is urging us with the assurance that He has all power for this work, and that He will be with us even unto its consummation. Shall we quit ourselves like men, and do with our might what our hands find to do? If so, our beloved Church will soon take her place, her rightful place, in the work of redeeming this world.

It may be a long while before we shall be organically bound together, but is it not high time that we work in the bonds of love with one Lord, one faith, and one baptism in common. May we not still hope for closer fellowship in love and service?

## Register of Names.

The following list of names is a register of those clergymen who were present, as complete as, under the circumstances, could be obtained, also of the students, deaconesses, laymen and laywomen whose names were handed to the secretaries:

### CLERGYMEN.

Aaron, A. . . . .	Passaic, N. J.
Albert, Charles, S., D. D., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Albert, L. E., D. D., . . . . .	Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.
Alleman, H. C., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Altpeter, Peter, . . . . .	Catawissa, Pa.
Apple, U. E., . . . . .	Red Lion, Pa.
Barber, William F., . . . . .	Rondout, N. Y.
Bare, W. F., . . . . .	Dallastown, Pa.
Bauer, Victor J., . . . . .	Summit Hill, Pa.
Baum, Frederick J., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Baum, William M., Jr., . . . . .	Canajoharie, N. Y.
Bauslin, Prof. D. H., D. D., . . . . .	Springfield, Ohio.
Beck, A. R. . . . .	Rightwell, S. C.
Becker, James L., . . . . .	Lansdale, Pa.
Beistel, F. S., . . . . .	Jeanette, Pa.
Bell, Ezra K., D. D., . . . . .	Baltimore, Md.
Berkemeier, G. C., D. D., . . . . .	Mt. Vernon, N. Y.
Bertolet, U. S. G., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Bielinski, R. C. G., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Blomgren, Carl, . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Bond, William F., . . . . .	Town City, Pa.
Bowers, J. C., . . . . .	Washington, D. C.
Brownmiller, E. S., D. D., . . . . .	Reading, Pa.
Brugel, G. A., . . . . .	Philipsburg, N. J.
Busby, L. E., D. D., . . . . .	Salisbury, N. C.
Butler, C. H., . . . . .	Washington, D. C.
Cassaday, E. R. . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Clay, Prof. A. T., Ph. D., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Cooper, F. E., . . . . .	South Bethlehem, Pa.

Daugherty, S. D., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Dietterich, J. E., . . . . .	Flourtown, Pa.
Dingman, Edwin, . . . . .	West Hoboken, N. J.
Doerr, Frederic, . . . . .	Wilmington, Del.
Dozer, Charles E., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Droch, George., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Dunbar, W. H., D. D., . . . . .	Baltimore, Md.
Early, J. W., . . . . .	Reading, Pa.
Enders, G. W., D. D., . . . . .	York, Pa.
Erb, J. S., . . . . .	Slatington, Pa.
Fastnacht, A. G., . . . . .	York, Pa.
Fegley, W. O., . . . . .	Trappe, Pa.
Fichthorn, A. S., . . . . .	Norristown, Pa.
Finch, Herbert, . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Fischer, C. G., . . . . .	Elizabeth, N. J.
Fischer, O. W., . . . . .	Tamaqua, Pa.
Fisher, W. E., D. D., . . . . .	Shamokin, Pa.
Flick, H. H., . . . . .	Manchester, Md.
Fluck, J. F. C., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Fry, Charles L., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Fry, F. F., . . . . .	Rochester, N. Y.
Fry, Prof., Jacob, D. D., . . . . .	Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
Gable, Z. H., . . . . .	Reading, Pa.
Gebert, George, . . . . .	Tamaqua, Pa.
Geissinger, D. H., D. D., . . . . .	Pittsburg, Pa.
Goedel, Carl, . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Hafer, L. B., . . . . .	Friesburg, N. J.
Hall, J. A., D. D., . . . . .	Canton, Ohio.
Hamma, M. W., D. D., . . . . .	Washington, D. C.
Hancher, A. D. R., . . . . .	Staunton, Va.
Hancher, George B., Ph. D., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Harms, J. H., . . . . .	Harrisburg, Pa.
Harpster, J. H., D. D., . . . . .	Guntur, India.
Hartman, A. S., D. D., . . . . .	Baltimore, Md.
Hartman, J. F., D. D., . . . . .	La. Fayette Hill, Pa.
Hasskarl, G. C. H., Ph. D., D. C. L., . . . . .	Philadelphia.
Hay, C. E., D. D., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Heffner, W. C., . . . . .	Fayetteville, Pa.

Heissler, J. J., . . . . .	Trenton, N. J.
Hirzel, C. J., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Hoffman, I. C., . . . . .	Chester, Pa.
Holloway, H. C., D. D., . . . . .	Bellefonte, Pa.
Holman, S. A., D. D., . . . . .	Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
Hoover, D. S., . . . . .	Spring City, Pa.
Horn, E. T., D. D., . . . . .	Reading, Pa.
Hoshour, E. E., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Hudson, W. G., . . . . .	Catasauqua, Pa.
Huntzinger, F. K., . . . . .	Reading, Pa.
Ibach, W. O., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Jacobs, Charles M., . . . . .	North Wales, Pa.
Jacobs, Prof. H. E., D. D., L. L. D.,	Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
Jefferis, E. F., . . . . .	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Keever, E. F., . . . . .	Boston, Mass.
Kercher, G. A., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Kenling, E. J., . . . . .	Weatherly, Pa.
Killing, E. B., . . . . .	Trenton, N. J.
Knubel, F. H., . . . . .	New York, N. Y.
Kramlich, J. F., . . . . .	Royersford, Pa.
Kraff, F. C., . . . . .	Elizabeth, N. J.
Krechting, J. P., D. D., . . . . .	New Germantown, N. J.
Kuder, C. F., . . . . .	Marietta, Pa.
Kuhlman, Luther, D. D., . . . . .	Frederick, Md.
Kump, W. A., . . . . .	Bridgeton, N. J.
Kuntz, J. J., . . . . .	Freeland, Pa.
Kunzman, J. C., D. D., . . . . .	Greensburg, Pa.
Kuntz, I. B., . . . . .	Pottstown, Pa.
Laird, Samuel, D. D., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Lambert, J. F., . . . . .	Catassauqua, Pa.
Laury, P. A., . . . . .	Perkasie, Pa.
Leibensperger, A. W., . . . . .	Lititz, Pa.
Lemcke, F. C. E., . . . . .	Rochester, Pa.
Longaker, F. C., . . . . .	Newport, Ky.
Loos, G. C., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
McClanahan, C. W., . . . . .	Strasburg, Pa.
MacIntoch, A. B., . . . . .	Bethlehem, Pa.
Mackenzie, D. L., . . . . .	Lykens, Pa.

Main, J. H., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Manhart, F. P., D. D., . . . . .	Baltimore, Md.
Marks, C. A., . . . . .	Richmond, Va.
Matthews, G. B., . . . . .	Lancaster, Pa.
Miller, C. Armand, . . . . .	New York, N. Y.
Miller, F., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Miller, G. W., D. D., . . . . .	Baltimore, Md.
Miller, L. G. M., D. D., . . . . .	Roanoke, Va.
Moser, D. M., . . . . .	Schuylkill Haven, Pa.
Moser, Prof. J. C., D. D., . . . . .	Hickory, N. C.
Nickel, W., . . . . .	Applebachsville, Pa.
Nidecker, J. E., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Oberholtzer, H. M., . . . . .	Troy, N. Y.
Ohl, J. F., Mus. D., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Ort, Prof. S. A., D. D., L. L. D., . . . . .	Springfield, Ohio.
Paulson, S., . . . . .	New Rochelle, N. Y.
Pfatteicher, E., Ph. D., . . . . .	Kutztown, Pa.
Pflueger, A. P., . . . . .	Ringtown, Pa.
Pfluger, O. E., . . . . .	Elizabethville, Pa.
Raker, J. H., . . . . .	Topton, Pa.
Rees, G. C., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Reiter, D. H., . . . . .	Richland, Centre, Pa.
Repass, Prof. S. A., D. D., . . . . .	Allentown, Pa.
Richard, J. W., D. D., . . . . .	Gettysburg, Pa.
Richard, J. H., . . . . .	Ardmore, Pa.
Richard, M. G., . . . . .	Ambler, Pa.
Richards, H. B., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Riser, Y. von A., . . . . .	Waynesboro, Va.
Rupp, U. S. G., . . . . .	Baltimore, Md.
Ruthrauff, Prof. J. M., D. D., . . . . .	Springfield, Ohio.
Sandt, C. M., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Sandt, G. W., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Schantz, F. J. F., D. D., . . . . .	Myerstown, Pa.
Scheffer, J. A., . . . . .	Allentown, Pa.
Schindel, J. J., . . . . .	Allentown, Pa.
Schmauk, T. E., D. D., . . . . .	Lebanon, Pa.
Schmidt, N. F., . . . . .	Schwenksville, Pa.

Schnur, G. H., . . . . .	Chillicothe, Ohio.
Schuchard, C. B., . . . . .	Roxboro, Pa.
Seabrook, W. L., . . . . .	Newberry, S. C.
Seegers, J. C., . . . . .	Easton, Pa.
Seiss, J. A., D. D., L.L. D., L. H. D., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Shearer, J. F., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Shindle, H. C., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Sibole, E., D. D., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Siebolt, H. D. E., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Sieger, P. G., . . . . .	Lancaster, Pa.
Singmaster, Prof. J. A., D. D., . . . . .	Gettysburg, Pa.
Smith, J. W., . . . . .	Ephrata, Pa.
Smith, L. L., . . . . .	Strasburg, Va.
Snyder, C. C., . . . . .	Centre Square, Pa.
Spaeth, Prof. A., D. D., . . . . .	Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
Spaeth, H. D., . . . . .	Albany, N. Y.
Spieker, C. G., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Spieker, Prof. G. F., D. D., . . . . .	Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
Stall, S., D. D., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Stopp, S. A. B., . . . . .	Doylestown, Pa.
Steadach, P. Z., . . . . .	Easton, Pa.
Streamer, C. R., . . . . .	Lionville, Pa.
Stump, J., . . . . .	Philipsburg, Pa.
Tilp, C. H., . . . . .	Ft. Washington, Pa.
Tollefsen, I., . . . . .	Port Richmond, N. Y.
Trafford, E. H., . . . . .	Kimberton, Pa.
Tressel, E. L. S., . . . . .	Baltimore, Md.
Trexler, S. G., . . . . .	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Umbenhen, J. H., . . . . .	Pottsville, Pa.
Valentine, M. H., D. D., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Voigt, A. G., D. D., . . . . .	Wilmington, N. C.
Waage, O. F., . . . . .	Pennsburg, Pa.
Wagner, A. E., Ph. D., . . . . .	Altoona, Pa.
Weidelich, J. H., . . . . .	Sellersville, Pa.
Weicksel, F. A., . . . . .	Numidia, Pa.
Weidley, J., . . . . .	Pittsburg, Pa.
Weigle, E. D., D. D., . . . . .	Mechanicsburg, Pa.
Weiskotten, C. P., . . . . .	Manayunk, Philadelphia, Pa.



- Weller, H. A., . . . . .Orwigsburg, Pa.
- Wenner, G. U., D. D., . . . . .New York, N. Y.
- Wessinger, E. L., . . . . .Shiremanstown, Pa.
- White, C. G., . . . . .Chambersburg, Pa.
- Wischan, F., D. D., . . . . .Philadelphia, Pa.
- Young, J., D. D., . . . . .New York, N. Y.
- Ziegenfus, S. A., D. D., . . . .Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Zweizig, M. L., . . . . .Leechburg, Pa.

STUDENTS OF THEOLOGY.

- Berg, J., . . . . .Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Blomgren, C. A., . . . . .Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Boettger, E. H., . . . . .Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Clausen, F. B., . . . . .Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Cooper, W. P., . . . . .Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Cronshore, H. J., . . . . .Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Kline, W. H., . . . . .Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Olson, O. N., . . . . .Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Paul, F. I., . . . . .Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Seashore, A. T., . . . . .Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Telleen, M., . . . . .Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Trump, S. S., . . . . .Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Wessinger, D. B., . . . . .Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.

DEACONESSSES.

- Albright, Sister Alla, . . . . . Baltimore, Md.
- Bowe, Sister Regena, . . . . . Baltimore, Md.
- Christ, Sister Jennie, . . . . . Baltimore, Md.
- Steinman, Sister Magdalena, . . . . . Philadelphia, Pa.

In addition quite a number of sisters from the Mary J. Drexel Motherhouse, Philadelphia, were present, whose names were not handed to the Secretaries.

LAYMEN.

- Albrecht, N. C., . . . . . Philadelphia, Pa.
- Baetes, H., . . . . . Philadelphia, Pa.
- Bentz, C. G., . . . . . Lebanon, Pa.
- Burkhardt, W. H., . . . . . Philadelphia, Pa.
- Chiquoine, A. D., . . . . . Philadelphia, Pa.
- Cooper, J. E., . . . . . Winchester, Va.
- Degraw, J. T., . . . . . Darby, Pa.

Dreher, Prof. J. D., Ph. D., . . . . .	Roanoke College, Salem, Va.
Eilert, E. F., . . . . .	New York, N. Y.
Finley, J. G., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Guthrod, C. F., . . . . .	New Haven, Conn.
Hartranft, F. A., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Hengerer, William, . . . . .	Buffalo, N. Y.
Immell, J. M., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Kunkle, B. S., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Miller, E. A., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Miller, J. F., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Miller, W. J., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Moore, J. W., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Moser, J. D., . . . . .	Conshohocken, Pa.
Opp, Charles B., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Runyon, I. S., . . . . .	New York, N. Y.
Schlechter, J. W., . . . . .	Conshohocken, Pa.
Smith, C. J., . . . . .	Strasburg, Va.
Snyder, J. W., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Staake, W. H., Esq., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Stine, L. K., M. D., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Wischkaemper, R., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Zehnder, J. A., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.

## LAYWOMEN.

Beck, Miss C. A., . . . . .	Centre Square, Pa.
Benbow, Mrs. William, . . . . .	Reading, Pa.
Bixler, Mrs. W. H., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Donning, Mrs., . . . . .	Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
Fry, Miss Jennie, . . . . .	Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
Fry, Miss Mary, . . . . .	Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
Harpster, Mrs. J. H., . . . . .	Guntur, India.
Hoch, Mrs. A., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Jacobs, Mrs. H. E., . . . . .	Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
Miller, Mrs. W. J., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Miller, Miss Adaline G., . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Miller, Miss M. Helen, . . . . .	Philadelphia, Pa.
Rittenhouse, Mrs. R., . . . . .	Norristown, Pa.
Showalter, Miss Mary, . . . . .	Norristown, Pa.

## Index of Subjects.

Aaron . . . . .	192
American People, The . . . . .	139
Anderdon's "Luther" . . . . .	253 ff.
Anthropology . . . . .	56
Arians . . . . .	32
Anti-Nicene Fathers . . . . .	264
Apostles, custom of . . . . .	151
Apology . . . . .	30
Atonement, doctrine of . . . . .	38
Atlanta, Ga. . . . .	187
Augsburg Confession . . . . .	30
" acceptance of, the test . . . . .	30
" on Justification . . . . .	47, 51, 54, 55, 59.
" on Baptism . . . . .	101, 103
Augustin . . . . .	154
Austria . . . . .	143
" Protestants in . . . . .	144
" schools in . . . . .	145
" lay-workers in . . . . .	146
Authority, human or Divine . . . . .	8
"Away from Rome" . . . . .	145
Baptismal Regeneration . . . . .	98
Baptism . . . . .	101
" Christian, defined . . . . .	101
" subjects of . . . . .	102
" of infants . . . . .	103
" mode of . . . . .	105
Beginnings . . . . .	26
Beguine sisterhoods . . . . .	134
Bible, translation of . . . . .	253
Birrel, Augustine . . . . .	266
Bishops, Lutheran . . . . .	239, 245
Bishop Von Scheele . . . . .	239, 247

Bohemia . . . . .	145
"    and Luther . . . . .	145
Boniface . . . . .	154
Bozius on Luther's death . . . . .	262
Conference expenses . . . . .	2
Brotherhood, universal . . . . .	136
"    Another desirable . . . . .	22
"    purpose, scope and character . . . . .	25
Canvass for subscribers . . . . .	22
Catechism . . . . .	30
Centralization . . . . .	250
Charity, systematic . . . . .	133
"    the work of . . . . .	269 ff.
Chemnitz on Justification . . . . .	48
Christian man, The . . . . .	122
Christian Liberty . . . . .	121
Christ, the perfect High Priest . . . . .	197
"    the person of . . . . .	199
Christo-centric Theology . . . . .	90
Christian experience . . . . .	42
Church, The . . . . .	29
"    prophetic office of . . . . .	137
"    organization . . . . .	80
"    nurseries of . . . . .	139
"    doctrine of . . . . .	73
Church polity, problems of . . . . .	234
"    purpose of . . . . .	234
"    Lutheran . . . . .	235
"    Augsburg Confession on . . . . .	251
Church Government . . . . .	235
"    "    forms of . . . . .	235
"    "    Lutheran . . . . .	235
Church and State . . . . .	242
Church Councils . . . . .	81
Cities . . . . .	172
Cooperation . . . . .	189
Colleges, stronger needed . . . . .	181
Confederation . . . . .	15

Confessions, on Justification . . . . .	47
"    on Baptism . . . . .	101
"    on the Lord's Supper . . . . .	106
Congregational authority . . . . .	236, 243
"    polity . . . . .	243
Consubstantiation . . . . .	110, 112
"    a variable term . . . . .	116, 117
"    history of the term . . . . .	118
Common service . . . . .	26
Communicatio idiomatum . . . . .	227
Council of Trent . . . . .	49, . . . . . 256
Creed tinkering . . . . .	10
Criticism, unfair method . . . . .	8
"    of the Scripture . . . . .	9
Criticisms of the Holy Scriptures . . . . .	223, 230, 232
"    newspapers and . . . . .	231
Dark Ages . . . . .	6, 7
Deaconess Boards . . . . .	26
Deaconess Work . . . . .	131
"    American conditions . . . . .	137 ff
"    in the General Synod . . . . .	142-143
Deaconesses,	
"    in the primitive church . . . . .	131 ff
"    of the present day . . . . .	132
"    not evangelists . . . . .	137
"    and hospital nursing . . . . .	142
"    and parish work . . . . .	142
"    proper sphere of . . . . .	143
"    duties and relations of . . . . .	143
"    "consecrated" . . . . .	143
Defamers of Luther . . . . .	252 ff.
Differences . . . . .	28
Dispassionate discussion . . . . .	117
Doctrine, definition of . . . . .	100
Doctrine of the Sacraments . . . . .	100
Doctrinal position . . . . .	29
"    no change intended . . . . .	30
Dogmaticians on Justification . . . . .	48

Douay version.....	256
Dutch Lutherans.....	237
Expenses of Conference.....	2
Ecclesiasticism.....	8
Experimental religion.....	12
Eisenkolb, Dr. Anton.....	146
Episcopal power.....	241
Evang. Bund.....	148
Ecumenical Conference.....	167
Faith, Infant.....	104, 113
Faith and works.....	71
Female Diaconate.....	131 ff.
"Filled with the spirit".....	97
Fliedner.....	135
Foreign Missions.....	149 ff.
" a native ministry.....	149 ff.
" the law of growth.....	150
" custom of the Apostles.....	151
" converts.....	152
" foreign influence.....	157
" native workers.....	158
" The Home Boards.....	159
" of the United Synod.....	159
Form of Concord on Justification.....	48
" on the Word of God.....	62
Flat Top coal fields.....	185
Free Church.....	141
Freedom, from the law.....	125
Fundamental doctrines permanent.....	9
Galatians, Commentary on.....	40, 41, 44
General Synod.....	25
General Council.....	25
" Sunday School methods.....	206
General Bodies.....	25
"General", meaning of.....	25
German Lutherans.....	337
Gerhard on Justification.....	49

German Philadelphia Conference . . . . .	148
God's Holiness . . . . .	193
Government, self preservation of . . . . .	234
God, hiding Himself . . . . .	143
Halle . . . . .	237
Harnack . . . . .	228
" and the Word of God . . . . .	93, 229
Hindu catechists . . . . .	151
Historic Lutheran Basis . . . . .	15
High Priest . . . . .	192
"Heart of the Law, A" . . . . .	125
Hospital nursing . . . . .	141
Holy Spirit, The . . . . .	90
" Place in Luth. Theol. . . . .	90
" and the Means of Grace . . . . .	92, 98
" and the Word of God . . . . .	93
" an unscriptural view . . . . .	94
" and Baptism . . . . .	95
" "Filled with" . . . . .	97
Home Mission Fields . . . . .	168 ff.
" East . . . . .	168
" the great comission . . . . .	168
" difficulties . . . . .	170
" General Council . . . . .	171
" extent of . . . . .	171
" need in cities . . . . .	173
" statistics . . . . .	174, 178
" pastors and . . . . .	175
" West . . . . .	176
" extent of . . . . .	176
" its settlers Lutheran . . . . .	177
" more ministers needed . . . . .	180
" Colleges and . . . . .	181
" South . . . . .	182
" its extent . . . . .	183
" Flat Top coal field . . . . .	185
" United Synod . . . . .	186, 189

" Cooperation needed...	189
Humanitarianism...	137
Iceland, Church of . . . . .	31
Infant Baptism...	103
" reason for...	103
" objections to...	103
" answer to objections...	103
Infant faith... . . . .	104, 113, 119
" discussed at Wittenberg... . . . .	119
International Sunday School Lessons. . . . .	221
" shall the doctrine stand... . . . .	230
Japan... . . . .	159
Japanese Lutheran Church... . . . .	159
Jerome... . . . .	258
Jesuits... . . . .	144
Joseph II... . . . .	144
Justification by Faith... . . . .	32
" the doctrine of the O. T... . . . .	32
" Smalcald Articles on... . . . .	40
" the doctrine in its relations... . . . .	42
" in relation to the work of Christ... . . . .	51
" in relation to the Holy Spirit. . . . .	54
" in relation to the Trinity... . . . .	50
" in relation to Anthropology... . . . .	56
" in relation to the Means of Grace... . . . .	59
" in relation to the Christian life... . . . .	66
" in relation to the doctrines of the Church... . . . .	73
Justification God's act... . . . .	42
" the Theological conception of... . . . .	43
" salvation... . . . .	44
" Luther on . . . . .	44, 45, 50
" Melancthon... . . . .	45, 46, 51
" the confessions on... . . . .	47
" Dogmaticians on... . . . .	48
" and Regeneration... . . . .	67
Justifying Faith, Thomasius on... . . . .	62
Kaiserwerth... . . . .	135, 141



Kenosis . . . . .	227
Kinship of Lutherans . . . . .	26
Kumamoto . . . . .	160
Language Question . . . . .	140, 175
Lay-workers . . . . .	146
Leipzig . . . . .	28
Levites . . . . .	192
Limitations of Christian Liberty . . . . .	126
Liberty, Christian . . . . .	121
Love, necessary . . . . .	30
Loyola . . . . .	250
Luther on Justification . . . . .	44
Luther on the Word of God . . . . .	61
Luther and the Word of God . . . . .	8
Luther and the Holy Spirit . . . . .	99
Luther on vows . . . . .	135
Luther on Christian Liberty . . . . .	126
Luther, a man of action . . . . .	138
Luther on the Teacher . . . . .	218
Luther, defamers of . . . . .	228, 252 ff.
Luther's translation of the Bible . . . . .	253
Luther and the Apocrypha . . . . .	254
Luther's Death and Burial . . . . .	258 ff.
Luther's Table Talk . . . . .	267
Lutheran Church.	
"    bishops . . . . .	239, 247, 259
"    Mission on to the 20th Century . . . . .	5
"    and God's word . . . . .	8, 11
"    and fundamental Christian doctrines . . . . .	9
"    Divine sentiment in . . . . .	12
"    and experimental religion . . . . .	12
"    unity . . . . .	13 ff., 26, 27
"    providential call of . . . . .	16
"    union . . . . .	26
"    cooperation . . . . .	26
"    and the Higher criticism . . . . .	111
"    and constructive theology . . . . .	200
"    unity against negative criticism . . . . .	231

Luther's slanderers.....	267
Luther's loyalty to God's Word.....	268
Lutheran character.....	30 ff.
Lutheran Literature.....	88
Lutheran polity flexible.....	238
Lutheran statistics.....	171 ff., 178
Lutheran Theology.....	90
"    and the Holy Spirit.....	90
"    Christocentric.....	90
Lutherans in the West.....	177
Luther League.....	83, 87
Lutheranism.....	31
"    real strength of.....	31
"    Golden Age of.....	99
Lord's Supper, The.....	106
Majunke.....	259 ff.
Mariolatry.....	133
Marriage.....	131
Marburg.....	28
Memorial, Rev. W. M. Baum, D. D.....	23
Means of Grace.....	60, 63, 98
Melanchthon.....	45
Method of the Apostles.....	151
Mission economics.....	150
Mission policy.....	150
Motherhouses.....	136, 142
Monachism.....	133
Muhlenberg.....	25, 237
Negative Criticism.....	231
Newberry, S. C.....	185
Newport News, Va.....	187
Neuendettelsau.....	135, 141
Norfolk, Va.....	187
Norway, Church of.....	31
Objections to Young Peoples' Societies.....	83
Opening Service.....	5
Opening Sermon.....	5

Opening Address . . . . .	25
Organization . . . . .	250
Organizations in the Church . . . . .	81
Parochial Schools . . . . .	214
Parliament, Austrain . . . . .	146
Permanence of doctrines . . . . .	9
Pelagianism . . . . .	46
Persecution of Lutherans . . . . .	144
Pilgrim Fathers . . . . .	135
Priesthood of believers . . . . .	190
Priesthood, Old Testament . . . . .	191, 193
"    in Egypt . . . . .	192
"    of Christ . . . . .	197
"    New Testament . . . . .	201
Predestination . . . . .	47
Protestantism, principles of . . . . .	6
"    the fundamental principle of . . . . .	31
Proceedings of Conference . . . . .	17
"    publication of . . . . .	22
Prague, Lutherans in . . . . .	144
Puritan deaconess, a . . . . .	135
Problems of Church polity . . . . .	234 ff.
"    is change practicable . . . . .	235, 239
Polity, Lutheran, how to strengthen . . . . .	244
Quenstedt on Justification . . . . .	49
Raikes, Robert . . . . .	201
Rajahmunary . . . . .	151, 158
Reaction against the superficial . . . . .	13
Realism of fundamental doctrines . . . . .	9
Reading courses . . . . .	88
Real Presence, doctrine of . . . . .	108, 109
Regeneration and Incarnation . . . . .	122
Reception, Social union . . . . .	18
Religion, of education . . . . .	11
Results of the Conference . . . . .	269 ff.
Ritschl . . . . .	228
Rohrbacher on Luther . . . . .	255
Roman Catholic Church . . . . .	140

"    in Austria... ..	144
"    disgust for... ..	145
"    in Bohemia... ..	147
Reformation... .. 4..	201
Sacrament, defined... ..	100
"Sacramental religion"... ..	93
Sacraments, as Means of Grace... ..	114
"    Lutheran doctrine misunderstood..	114
"    doctrine of... ..	100
"    from a pastor's point of view... ..	116
Self preservation and government... ..	234
Scripture, the Holy... ..	222
"    attitude of the Lutheran Church... ..	222 ff.
"    bold assumption... ..	224, 225
"    Igorance .....	224, 226
"    Calm Security... ..	224, 226, 228
"    determining principles... ..	226
"    normative authority... ..	228
"    criticism... ..	223, 230
Sunday School methods... ..	202
Sunday School apparatus... ..	205
Sunday Schools, power for good... ..	209
"    the name .....	211
"    relation to the Church... ..	211
"    singing in... ..	212
"    libraries... ..	212
"    subject matter of teaching... ..	212
"    system of graded lessons... ..	213
"    fundamental needs... ..	213
"    the mission of... ..	213
"    the teacher... ..	214, 219
"    the pastor, and .....	215
"    more time needed in... ..	221
"    discipline of inadequate... ..	209
Sachs, Hans... ..	149
Saga, Japan... ..	159
Sex influence... ..	131
"Second blessing"... ..	96

Sisterhoods . . . . .	136
Smalcald articles . . . . .	40, 47
Spires . . . . .	31
State Church . . . . .	141
St. Patrick . . . . .	154
South, the . . . . .	182
" growth in population . . . . .	183
" causes of growth . . . . .	184
" mineral growth . . . . .	184
" invites capital and labor . . . . .	185
" increase in factories . . . . .	185
" its fertile soil . . . . .	186
" United Synod in	
Sovereignty of Congregations . . . . .	243
Swedish Lutherans . . . . .	236
Synodical missionaries . . . . .	246
Ten Commandments . . . . .	190
Theology, Lutheran . . . . .	90
Theological system diverging . . . . .	90
Theological Seminaries . . . . .	139
" and Sunday Schools . . . . .	216
Traied nurse, the . . . . .	141
Trans-substantiation . . . . .	109
Translation of the Bible . . . . .	253
Toleration, edict of . . . . .	144
Unity of the Church . . . . .	13, 74
United Synod . . . . .	186
Unitarians . . . . .	32
Universal brotherhood . . . . .	136
Universal priesthood . . . . .	191, 196
Von Scheele, Bishop . . . . .	329, 247
Vulgate . . . . .	256
Vows, Luther on . . . . .	135
Vows, Luther on . . . . .	13:
Wedewer . . . . .	257
Word of God . . . . .	8, 11, 60
Word, the written and the Personal . . . . .	227, 229
Works, Faith and . . . . .	71

Woman, her proper place. . . . .	131
" in America. . . . .	142
" in Church work. . . . .	160ff.
" in politics. . . . .	162
" and man. . . . .	163
" as deaconess. . . . .	165
Xavier, Francis. . . . .	155
Young People's Societies. . . . .	79
Zenana Workers. . . . .	166



