

THE
MERCERSBURG QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1857.

ART. I.—THE EVANGELICAL CHURCH DIET OF GERMANY.

THE German Evangelical Church Diet has now been in existence since 1848, and become one of the most important and encouraging facts in the history of modern Protestantism. A condensed account of its origin, history, influence and prospects, based upon the official reports of its proceedings, as they were published from year to year, upon personal observations made at its seventh meeting at Frankfort on the Maine, and upon intercourse and correspondence with its founders and leading members, must be both interesting and instructive to those who wish to become fully acquainted with the present state of theology and religion in the land of the Reformation.

The Kirchentag, or Church Diet, is a free association of pious professors, ministers and laymen of Protestant Germany, for the discussion of the religious and ecclesiastical questions of the day, and for the promotion of the interests of practical Christianity, embraced under the term *Inner Mission*. It meets annually in one of the leading cities of Germany, and is at present by far the largest and most respectable representation of evangelical Christianity in that country. Its doctrinal basis is the Bible, as explained by the ecumenical symbols and the evangelical confessions of the sixteenth century. It comprehends thus far four protestant denominations, the Lutheran, German Reformed, United Evangelical (a union of the former two), and the Moravian brotherhood, and holds intercourse at the same

ART. VI.—THE STATE CHURCH SYSTEM IN EUROPE.

Ueber christliche Toleranz. Ein Vortrag gehalten im Evangelischen Verein zu Berlin am 29. März 1855, von *Friedrich Julius Stahl.* Berlin, 1855.

Die Zeichen der Zeit. Briefe an Freunde über die Gewissensfreiheit und das Recht der christlichen Gemeinde. Von *Christian Carl Josias Bunsen.* Leipzig. 2 Bändchen. 3 Aufl. 1855.

Wider Bunsen. Von *Stahl.* Berl. 3 Aufl. 1856.

Für Bunsen wider Stahl. Die neusten Bewegungen und Streitigkeiten auf dem Kirchlichen Gebiete. Von *Dr. Dan. Shenkel.* Darmstadt. 1856.

Bunsen und Dornier. Eine Streitschrift wider falsch berühmten Protestantismus. Von *Dr. W. F. Besser.* Schwerin. 1856.

THE works above quoted, which furnish us the occasion for the present article, discuss, from opposite stand-points and in a representative manner, one of the most important questions which now agitates public opinion in Germany, the question of religious toleration and religious freedom.

The glory of America is a free Christianity, independent of the secular government and supported by the voluntary contributions of a free people. This is one of the greatest facts in modern history. Its significance can only be fully estimated by a careful comparison with the State-churches of Europe, over which it makes a gigantic progress. Whatever be the defects and inconveniences of the separation of Church and State, they are less numerous and serious than the troubles and difficulties which continually grow out of their union, to both parties. Our self-sustaining and self-governing Christianity calls to mind the heroic period of the Church, with the important difference, however, that in the first three centuries she had to maintain her existence not only without the support, but in spite of the hatred and bloody persecution of the Roman empire, while in our republic she enjoys the friendship and

outward protection of the civil government, to which she in turn imparts moral strength and stability; so that the two powers are really a benefit and indirect support to each other, without unsettling their distinct boundaries and getting into continual collisions by mutual interference. Body and soul, no doubt, belong together and constitute one man; but the body is not the soul, nor is the soul the body; each has its peculiar members, faculties and functions; it is much more important that the soul should enjoy freedom and independence than the body; and if one must rule over the other, this right belongs naturally to the spiritual and immortal part of man. To the perfect kingdom of God there will be no two powers, but Christ will rule King of nations as he now rules King of saints in his Church. But in the present order of things we must "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's : and unto God the things that are God's," without confounding the one with the other.

Great Britain, although still maintaining two different ecclesiastical establishments, Episcopacy in England and Presbyterianism in Scotland, and thus holding to the theory of the union of Church and State, carries the practice of religious toleration and liberty almost as far as the United States, and the heroic sacrifices of the Free Church of Scotland furnish even a more striking illustration of the vitality and power of the voluntary system, than any of our American denominations.

But on the Continent of Europe such a thing as a free, self-supporting and self-governing Church is hardly known, and exists only in the form of small dissenting sects, which bear no comparison in numerical strength and importance with the dissenting bodies of England and Scotland. In Germany, Austria, Russia, Sweden, Denmark, Italy, Spain, and even in France and in Switzerland, the public religion is interwoven with the State by ten thousand time-honored ties, which it seems impossible to dissolve without endangering the very existence of the Church.

The Roman Catholic Church, it is true, has always as-

serted in principle her supremacy and freedom over against the secular government, which she aims to control and make subservient to her interests, wherever she has the power. By her centralised organization, visible unity, imposing hierarchy and despotic influence over the masses of her membership, she succeeded also in practice to maintain a certain independence, although in constant conflict with Cæsar even in the days of her highest power in the Middle Ages. But, in the first place, Romanism claims only liberty for itself, and denies it, wherever it can, to every other form of religion, on the false assumption that it alone is the true Church, and every dissent from it, a dangerous and damnable error. In the second place, by its hierarchical spirit and overbearing conduct towards the State, of which some of the greatest popes, as Gregory III., spoke in most contemptuous language, as if it was the result of ambition, conquest, rapine and violence simply, and not a divine institution clothed with divine authority, it roused a reaction of the secular power and the spirit of nationality so closely connected with it. Hence, even on its own territory, Romanism is greatly cramped by jealous governments. Gallicanism, which asserts a half way freedom from foreign authority at the expense of domestic liberty, or in other words, substitutes servility to the State for servility to the Pope, still exists legally in France, and is constantly acted upon in Italy, Spain and South America. In Austria the Roman Church was made altogether subservient to the State under the semi-infidel Joseph II., and placed under all sorts of restrictions, which were only recently removed by the famous Concordat of 1855. The future must reveal whether the absolute papacy will improve the morals and promote the prosperity of that empire. Catholicism to this day is nowhere so free from State-control and interference, as in Protestant England (the ecclesiastical titles' bill notwithstanding), and in the United States.

As to Protestantism in Germany, and on the Continent generally, it is almost entirely supported and ruled by the State, and this has a natural tendency to secularize religion

as much as possible and to convert it into a sort of moral police. Fortunately this can never be done fully. For Christianity exerts its indestructible power under all forms of government, and is free and independent in spirit, even where its body, the Church, groans in chains.

The dependent condition of Protestantism dates from the Reformation, which, in Germany, as well as in Switzerland, Denmark, England, and Scotland, proceeded on the hypothesis of the union of Church and State, or even on the Erastian principle of the supremacy of the temporal power, or the territorialistic maxim, *cujus regio ejus religio*. The Protestant princes and magistrates secularized the old Catholic Church-property, and in return assumed the support of the Church out of the public treasury, together with the supreme authority over it. The continental reformers, especially Melancthon, often complained of their avarice and usurpation of episcopal and papal authority. But they were in part themselves to be blamed for it, by confiding the execution of reform to secular hands, and their successors made a theory out of a fact. According to the old Lutheran doctrine, which is still in force practically all over Germany and Scandinavia, the head of the State is at the same time the head or *summus episcopus* of the Church within his territory, and has the right to fill the ecclesiastical offices, to issue new hymn books, liturgies, or even confessions, under certain restrictions, and to superintend not only the external, but to a very considerable extent, also, the internal affairs of religion.

Strange bishops indeed, who never studied theology, nor would ever think of preaching, or of administering the sacraments, and yet claim and exercise supreme authority over the religion of their subjects! Still more strange, if this supreme governor of the Church is a boy, like Edward VI., or a lady, like Queen Elizabeth, or Victoria of England, or a Romanist, like the King of Saxony, the King of Bavaria, and the emperor of Austria, or a notorious adulterer, like the present King of Würtemberg, or a professed infidel, like Frederick II., of Prussia!

It is true, there have been not a few wicked popes in Rome, fox-hunting bishops in England, and infidel professors of theology in Germany. But one inconsistency does not justify another. And then we have to do here with a false principle, and not simply with anomalous exceptions. It is equally true, on the other side, that there have been Protestant princes, from the elector Frederic the Wise to King Frederic William IV., who were nursing fathers to the Church, and exercised their spiritual authority in the fear of God and to the promotion of the best interests of religion. But this only shows what we observed above, that the life of Christianity will reveal itself under all outward organizations, and in spite of them, and proves nothing for a form of government which places the highest spiritual authority into secular hands and gives bad princes as much power for the destruction of the Church, as it enables good monarchs to build it up. Bishops and priests have at times made good generals and statesmen, especially in the Middle Ages. But no sensible man would infer from these exceptions, that the clergy should be trusted with the management of the army, the finances, the police, and the foreign affairs. No body will deny that a truly Christian government is a source of infinite blessing to a people. But how few governments, alas! deserve that name? A few years ago the world saw Protestant England and Roman Catholic France fight arm in arm with the Turks against another nominally Christian power. The same government of England, which supports Christianity at home, appropriates from ten to twelve thousand dollars annually to the idolatry of Juggernaut in India, and patronizes an institution for the training of Mohammedan priests in Calcutta. "If they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry." Of such governments, or misgovernments, as Naples, Spain and Mexico, whose shame is all over the world, we will only say with Dante, "Look on and pass."

Of the many evils which are almost unavoidably connected with the State Church system as it exists in Germany,

and all over the continent of Europe, Catholic as well as Protestant, we will mention only a few.

First, it prevents the free and full development of the duty and virtue of Christian liberality and benevolence. While in our country hundreds of churches are built annually, there are hardly more churches in Germany and France now than there were in the Middle Ages. Even in cities, where the population almost doubled itself within the present century, as Paris, Vienna, Berlin and Hamburg, there has been very little or no progress in this direction. The State spends many millions, in some cases, as in Austria and Prussia, one half of its income upon the army, and treats the Church with a step-motherly hand. To build houses of public worship by private contributions, is almost an impossibility. The people are accustomed to look to the government for the supply of all their spiritual wants, and hardly think of devoting a portion of their means to the support of the Gospel at home. It is true, they have to support it nevertheless indirectly by the payment of compulsory taxes. But these are poorly calculated to promote the love and attachment to the Church amongst the large mass of merely nominal members. Pious persons regard it as their duty, of course, to promote the cause of foreign missions and other benevolent enterprises, for which the State makes no provision. But England alone contributes larger sums annually for Missions, for Bible and Tract distribution, than the whole Continent, Catholics and Protestants put together. For liberality in one direction naturally begets liberality in every other. I heard some of the best men in Germany express the deliberate conviction, that if the people had to provide for the maintenance of public worship, as in the United States, they would starve out, or dismiss at least one half of their ministers. This would probably be the immediate effect, and in the many cases of rationalistic and indifferent ministers who would suffer most, their loss would be rather a gain to the Church. But gradually the evil would rectify itself. Necessity is the mother of invention. The people would soon find out the

priceless value and absolute necessity of religion, as they did in France after the excesses of the revolution, and would respect and love the Church more than they ever did before. For man feels a special interest in that which depends in some measure upon his own will and sacrifice, and where his money is, there is his heart also. Many pious Germans, who never dreamed of giving any thing for the support of religion in their native land beyond their pennies on Sundays, and the perquisites for the extra services of the clergyman, after emigrating to America become in a few years quite liberal in proportion to their means, and prosper the more for it. For liberality to Christ's kingdom never yet made a man poor.

Secondly, the State-control of the Church keeps the latter in a state of continual pupilage, and prevents the development of the truly Protestant idea of the general priesthood and kingship of believers. If Luther complained in his day of the incapacity of the congregations to govern themselves and to furnish material for elders and deacons, after the apostolic model, the cause may be found in Romanism, which kept the people in absolute submission to a particular priesthood. But if the same complaint is repeated in our days by high ecclesiastical dignitaries in Prussia, Saxony and Würtemberg, and urged as an argument against the introduction of the Presbyterian form of government, it amounts to a serious charge against Protestantism, which in three hundred years should have been able to train its population to true freedom and self-government. It is true, where the Reformed element prevails, as in Westphalia and on the Rhine, especially in the Wap-perthal, there is more or less congregational life and activity as we have it in America. But in the strictly Lutheran sections of Germany the congregations are generally almost as passive as in the Roman Church, and have not even a voice in the election of their own pastors. Hence the German emigrants to this country are generally so inferior to native Americans in all matters of church government and discipline. They will all rule in the consistory,

and no one can rule, because they were never taught it at home, and were only expected to be ruled. Individual and congregational self-government must be gradually acquired like every other science and art. No body ever learned to swim by keeping on the dry land. More recently some progress has been made in Prussia and Württemberg in the right direction, by the introduction of responsible congregational lay-officers to assist the minister in his duties, but it will take some time until the system is fairly in operation.

Thirdly, the close connection of the secular and spiritual power makes the latter responsible for all the faults of the former, exposes the Church to a great deal of undeserved popular dissatisfaction and hatred, leads to a profanation of the sacraments, makes discipline almost impossible, and tends to beget hypocrisy and infidelity. For religion is a free thing which can never be forced. Compulsion in this delicate matter has generally the opposite effect. State-churchism can impose upon its subjects the external marks of religion, like so many ready-made regimentals on the soldiers, but it cannot correct the hearts, or restrain the conscience, and control the inward conviction, which is free all over the civilized world. It, therefore, fills the Church with a most incoherent and heterogeneous membership, from the highest piety and straitest orthodoxy to the grossest immorality and unblushing infidelity. A great statesman recently said, that the enforcement of a rigid scriptural discipline would result in the expulsion from the Church of three fourths of her membership as decided infidels. This is especially, alas! the case in nominally Catholic France.

It is, unfortunately, only too true, that thousands and millions of nominal Christians in Europe, both Protestant and Catholic, disgrace their baptismal and confirmation vows, and care less for religion than pious heathen, and yet all their children must be baptized on the hypocritical profession of the parents or sponsors. It is only too true, that an amount of hostility exists there to Christianity and the Church, which is unknown in the United States, or even in England. The European infidels, revolutionists and anarchists, if they had the power, would not only dis-

solve the union of Church and State, but destroy the Church altogether, which they hate as the supposed back-bone of all political despotism. It is to be feared that another outbreak, like that of 1848, would repeat the mad acts of the first French revolution which abolished the Christian religion and expelled or guillotined its ministers.

This is the very reason why the great majority of pious and conservative people in Germany cling to the existing order of things. They regard the overthrow of State-churchism as an infidel project, that means really the annihilation of Christianity, and they look only to the immediate results, which, no doubt, would be disastrous enough.

But the whole system of State-churchism is now thoroughly undermined in public opinion, and will, in all probability, gradually give way partly under its own operation, partly in consequence of the direct and indirect influence of the example of England and the United States upon the Continent, and especially upon Germany.

The Parliament of Frankfort, in 1848, proclaimed full liberty of religion and irreligion, and a complete emancipation of the State and the school from the Church and Christianity. This radical measure, to judge from the speeches of some of its chief supporters, as Vogt, the atheist and materialist, proceeded far more from hatred, than from love to the Church, and looked not so much to the freedom of religion, as to the freedom of irreligion. But it remained on paper with the other acts of that assembly, and with the triumph of the reaction, the ecclesiastical establishments became stronger, apparently, than they were before 1848, but only apparently.

The new Constitution of Prussia, adopted in 1850, declares, in clear terms, the freedom of the Churches from the State, and the independence of civil and political rights upon the religious profession, but in a manner altogether respectful to religion, and far more cautious and moderate than the abortive act of the Frankfort Assembly. This amounts in principle to a separation of Church and State, although it is not carried out in practice. The reactionary

party, headed by von Gerlach and Stahl, both men of commanding genius and unblemished moral and religious character, made an attempt recently to erase from article twelve of the *Verfassungsurkunde* the clause which puts all religionists on civil and political equality. The principal object was to exclude the Jews from such equality with the Christians. But a motion to that effect, proposed by Legationsrath Wagner, the editor of the "Kreuzzeitung," (and strange to say, himself a dissenter from the State-religion, an Irvingite), was not supported by the government and defeated in the second Chamber (Feb., 1856).

The constitutional guarantee of religious freedom, both public and private, and of ecclesiastical self-government, still stands in Prussia, and the only question seems to be as to the time and best method of its gradual actualization.

We are now prepared to understand and to judge of the merits of the famous Bunsen—Stahl—controversy on religious freedom and toleration, which has excited so much attention recently in Germany, and gives us a clear insight into the present state of parties with reference to this important subject.

It originated with a very able address of Prof. Stahl on Christian Toleration, delivered before a large and highly intelligent audience (the Prussian court was also represented in part) in the Evangelical Association of Berlin, March 29, 1855.

Here the distinguished jurist starts with the assertion, that the religion of the Old and New Testament is essentially exclusive and intolerant over against all false religion. Christianity claims to be the only and universal religion in the world, the only way of salvation, and can, therefore, not be indifferent towards any form of error which deprives God of his honor, and endangers the salvation of man. Under this view Christianity is diametrically opposed to the modern theory of toleration as proclaimed by Voltaire, in France, Frederic II., in Prussia, and Jefferson, in America, which places all creeds and forms of religion, Christian, Jewish, Mohamedan and heathen, on a perfect equality, and

rests, therefore, on complete indifference or downright infidelity. The heathen Pilate, and Lessing's Nathan the Wise, may skeptically ask, "What is truth?" But Christ says, "I am the truth." Here the cardinal virtue of the Christian is not indifference to truth, but unswerving devotion to truth, zeal for the glory of God and the propagation of his kingdom for the salvation of the whole world.

Nevertheless, Stahl continues, Christianity includes a tolerance far deeper than ever entered into the breast of man before. This tolerance rests on that love and charity which beareth all things and hopeth all things; on that humility, which, in the consciousness of its own sin, abstains from judging the neighbor; on that high appreciation of the image of God in man; and finally on the patient resignation to the fact that God has reserved the separation of the wheat from the tares to the last judgment. All this is perfectly compatible with the strictest and most faithful adherence to the divine truth.

But what is now the practical duty of a Christian State to dissenters? Here Stahl draws a sharp line of distinction between the Anglo-American, and what he regards the true German theory. The German evangelical toleration consists in the preservation of the Church, i. e., an established national State-Church, with the recognition of the children of God in all confessions and sects, in their individual capacity. The toleration of the English dissenters and of the Evangelical Alliance places itself essentially on the principle of independency, is a virtual surrender of the idea of the Church in its organic capacity, and places all evangelical confessions and sects on a perfectly civil and religious equality, so that the distinction between Church and sect disappears altogether. And yet this theory which proclaims toleration to all Protestant sects, is intolerant against Romanism, and maintains towards it generally the uncompromising hostility of old Puritanism, as if it was no part of Christianity at all. Stahl admits that this English theory is making considerable progress in Germany, and urges on to a general Protestant war against the Romish Church.

But the true mission of German Protestantism is a higher one, the unity of the Church, not a confederation of sects. Whether this Church shall be Lutheran, or Reformed, or United Evangelical, is a difficult question to be solved by the German Protestantism itself, but the result in any case will be a united Church, and not an indefinite number of coördinate sects. The sound tendency is to unity and harmony, not to division and distraction. The German Protestantism can never recognize the evangelical sects as such, but only individual members of them as brethren in Christ, not because, but in spite of their sectarian connection. It may concede to them the free exercise of their religion, but not the liberty of propagandism to the injury of the Church. The concession in every particular case must be decided by the State, and this has no reason to be especially liberal towards domestic disturbers and foreign propagandists.

Nor can the Protestantism of Germany, according to Stahl, engage in a passionate war against Romanism, but must maintain its historical position, which includes a bond of union with, as well as protest against, the Catholic Church before and after the Reformation. It looks to a final union of the Lutheran, Reformed, and Roman Catholic Churches, (what becomes of the Greek communion?) and this is the highest and the most comprehensive form of true toleration and catholicity, not in the Romish sense of uniformity, but in the sense of fulness and totality. It means the ultimate comprehension of the three great confessions, into which Christendom is now divided, into one indissoluble economy of the kingdom of God, to which this separate mission prepares the way. The Roman Church has the particular mission to represent the visible unity and historical continuity of Christianity up to the apostolic age. The Reformed Church is distinguished for its deep fear of God, its energetic faith, its missionary zeal, and tries to build up a world of Christian institutions on the basis of the holy congregation of the believers. The Lutheran Church has the mission to unfold the deepest mysteries of faith and to

show the harmony and interpenetration of the divine and human, the spiritual and natural in the person of Christ and in his sacrament. These peculiar charismata must all be preserved and taken up into the final constitution of the Church. The expectation of such a Church, concludes Stahl, which is elevated above all earthly confessions, and yet their completion in harmony, makes us truly tolerant, not in the indifference, but in the faithfulness to the divine truth and to the particular Church in which we were born, and to which we are sworn.

These are the views of Stahl. There is undoubtedly much truth in them, if we look to the final end of the Church, which is certainly not a mere friendship and brotherhood of sects, but one flock under one shepherd, an organic unity of all believers, one holy catholic kingdom of Christ, that shall include every thing that is true and good and beautiful in the various branches and periods of Church history. But this very end can be best attained by the freest development of Christianity and all its energies, and not by any mechanical square-and-rule-system which only retards its true progress. Stahl confounds the Jewish standpoint with the spirit of the New Testament, in which not one single passage can be found in favor of any compulsion in matters of mere conscience and religion, and he does great injustice to several branches of Protestantism which have as good a mission to fulfil as Romanism and Lutheranism. Yet we would not justify, on that account, the sarcastic severity with which Cheyalier Dr. Bunsen, formerly Prussian Ambassador at London, now residing near Heidelberg, has attacked these views in his "Signs of the Times," 1855. He regards Stahl's tract on Christian toleration as a conceited plea for confessional intolerance, which would justify in principle the most bloody persecutions of the Romish Church. He takes up the pen for religious liberty against all intolerance, whether it proceeds from Romanism or Protestantism. His views may be reduced to the following points:

- 1.) The absolutism of the State has strengthened the absolutism of the hierarchy.

2.) Protestantism has never developed itself vigorously and taken root in the people, except where it produced civil liberty as the necessary fruit of ecclesiastical reform. This development is found only in the bosom of the Reformed Churches, and not in the Lutheran.

3.) Civil liberty has succeeded only on the basis of self-government, and this is impossible without liberty of conscience. Freedom rests on the congregation, and this again on personal religious self-determination.

4.) The hierarchy claims freedom of conscience only for itself, and instinctively opposes it in others.

5.) Religious freedom has never yet led to political revolution, but its suppression has.

6.) Intolerance and persecution have never blessed either government or people; but they are the greatest curse to a Protestant government, because they involve an inner contradiction.

With all this, Bunsen still holds to the union of Church and State, and especially to the Prussian establishment, and simply pleads for the fullest toleration of all religious dissenters, provided only they do not violate the laws of the State, or of public morality. His position, therefore, is substantially English, and not American, although he speaks with high regard of the United States, particularly of the influence of Puritanism on civil and religious liberty. But we regret that our esteemed friend has mixed up, with his noble and spirited defence of religious freedom, a good deal of theological liberalism and latitudinarianism, which would be rejected as unsound and dangerous, both in England and in this country. He makes too little account of confessions and creeds, and spreads the mantle of union so far, that Luther, Lessing, Göthe and Hegel may dwell under it in peace, and commune at the same table of the Lord.

Hence the orthodox party denounced Bunsen, forgetful of his former services to evangelical religion, in the strongest terms. Hengstenberg, in his *Vorwort* to 1856, treats his book as perfectly worthless, filled only with idle wind,

calls the author an apostate, charges him with radicalism, and pantheism, applies to him the passage of the unclean spirit, who returns with seven others worse than himself, and compares his Christian phrases with the kiss of the traitor! This is strong enough in all conscience. Leo handled him with equal severity. Stahl wrote a lengthy reply, *Wider Bunsen*, which his admirers and sympathizers regard as a complete extinguisher, and it must be admitted, that as a logical reasoner and skilful dialectician, he is superior to the more brilliant Bunsen, exposes many weak points very successfully and fortifies his own position in regard to toleration and the union apparently with more consistency, on the basis of State-churchism.

But the general principle of religious liberty found a most hearty response throughout Germany, and the celebrated ex-diplomatist has suddenly become one of the most popular men, and that, too, in circles where he was formerly disliked for his religious views. Public opinion pointed him out already as the future minister of public worship in Prussia. The "*Protestantische Kirchenzeitung*" of Berlin boldly declared (1856. N. 7): "The liberty of conscience is a power of the present age, an idea which takes hold with divine irresistibility of all hearts and of all nations, from which no man and no state can escape for any length of time." But not only the liberal and radical organs of the press, but even decidedly evangelical divines, as Dr. Dorner, and Dr. Schenkel, have openly come out for Bunsen and against Stahl and Hengstenberg.

Still others, who have mixed in the controversy, take middle ground between the two extremes. So Dr. Krummacher, who wishes the established Church and the union kept up on decidedly orthodox, though less exclusive ground than Stahl, but asks, at the same time, full toleration for such sects as the Baptists, whom the latter despises as mere disturbers, and favors the Evangelical Alliance.

This seems to be also the position of the King of Prussia, who was formerly an intimate friend of Bunsen. He feels painfully the responsible weight of the ecclesiastical

supremacy of the crown, and declared once openly, he wished the time would soon come, when he could place it back into the proper hands and let the Church manage her own affairs independent upon, and yet in friendly harmony with the State. Although he heard Stahl's famous speech, and allows his small but powerful party a large share in the present management of the Church and the State, he expressed himself nevertheless on several occasions decidedly opposed to all persecution for religious opinion's sake, and has even extended a cordial invitation to the Evangelical Alliance, whose professed object is the promotion of religious liberty throughout the world, to meet at Berlin in 1857. This, too, is a sign of the times.

Mercersburg, Dec., 1856.

P. S.

“ODD-FELLOWSHIP EXAMINED IN THE LIGHT OF SCRIPTURE AND REASON, BY REV. JOSEPH T. COOPER, D. D.”, re-examined according to the Word of God, and official Documents of the Order, by a member of Harmony Lodge, No. 16, I. O. O. F. Higgins & Perkenpine, Philadelphia. 1856. 172 pp.

AN earnest, well-written book, which seems, to use a familiar proverb, to aim at killing two birds with one stone. Ostensibly a defense, as the title imports, of the Order of Odd-Fellowship against the charges alleged by Rev. Dr. Cooper in a series of published Lectures, which in fact it also really is, in great measure at least, the book, nevertheless, crosses its arms, Isaac-like, and lays its right hand on Christ and His Church, vindicating their infinitely superior claims whenever, in the author's judgment, they come in conflict with any prevailing practices of Odd-Fellowship. Those portions of the Documents which enjoin faith in God and the duty of religious worship, though in a defective manner, he interprets from his own point of Christian observation, rather than in the light of the Documents themselves, objectively considered. This feature, however, must give peculiar interest to the work, especially in the eyes of truly Christian men who belong to the Order.

The merits of the question at issue between Rev. Dr. Cooper and the author, are comprehended in the more general question relating to the consistency of any secret Order, as organized and prevailing at the present day, with the nature, claims and resources of the Church of Jesus Christ. Into the discussion