

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1859.

ART. I.—THE SYNOD AT FREDERICK.

The first Christian Synod was held A. D. 50, twenty years after the resurrection of the Lord and the founding of the Church, in the city of Jerusalem, for the purpose of settling an important doctrinal and disciplinary controversy concerning the relation of the Mosaic law to the Gentile converts, or the principle whether faith in Christ alone, or faith *and* circumcision, *i. e.*, the observance of the ceremonial law, were necessary to salvation. The Synod was no secret caucus, but an open deliberative assembly; no exclusive hierarchical body, but republican in the best sense of the term. It included, besides the apostles, also the elders and brethren who are expressly mentioned by the inspired historian, even at the final decision.* There was "much disputing," *πολλη συζητησις*, on that occasion: party stood against party, congregation against congregation, the Gentile converts against the Jewish believers, and even the apostles, though not identified with the extreme factions, were at first at issue on the points of controversy, as we must infer from the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians. But they were animated by the spirit of their Master; they were equally zealous for the spread of his kingdom and the unity among believers; the Holy Ghost moved upon the face of the agitated waves; the very dispute and free discussion elicited truth, exposed error,

* Acts xv. 6, 7, 12, 13, 23.

strengthened conviction, urged on to a settlement of the difficulty, and the meeting ended in harmony and peace, by the unanimous adoption of a compromise, which satisfied the just claims of both parties, without sacrificing the great principle of the saving power of a living faith in Christ Jesus our Lord.

The synodical form of government, though not expressly enjoined by divine command, is, therefore, evidently sanctioned by apostolic practice. In the course of time, Synods or Councils were regularly convened either annually or semi-annually in the various provinces, and became the highest organs of legislation in the ancient Church, for the settlement of doctrinal, ritual and disciplinary controversies. We meet them first under this character in Asia Minor, Greece, and in North Africa, about the middle of the second century, in the disputes concerning the Montanistic movement and the time and manner of observing Easter. The meetings were public, and the people of the surrounding community made their influence felt. In the time of Cyprian, as we learn from his own epistles, presbyters, confessors and prominent laymen took an active part besides the presiding bishops. At the Synod of Carthage A. D. 256, which decided against the validity of heretical baptism, there were present eighty-seven bishops, a large number of priests and deacons, and "*maxima pars plebis*," as Cyprian reports. In the Synods concerning the restoration of those who had denied Christ during the persecution from fear of death, Cyprian convened, besides the bishops, his clergy, the confessors, and "*laicos stantes*," i. e., laymen in good and regular standing. Nor was this practice confined to North Africa. It prevailed in Syria, at the Synods assembled for the trial and deposition of the unworthy bishop, Paul at Samosata, A. D. 264-269, and in Spain, at the Council of Elvira A. D. 305. The famous Origen of Alexandria, though merely a presbyter, was the leading spirit of two Arabian Synods and there convinced bishop Beryllus of Bostra of his christological error. Even the Roman clergy, in their letter to Cyprian about the mid-

dle of the third century, speak of a common synodical consultation of the bishops with the priests, deacons, confessors, and laymen in good standing. Athanasius, though at that time only an archdeacon of the bishop of Alexandria, took a prominent part in the first œcumenical Council at Nice, A. D. 325, and the refutation of the Arian heresy. Professor Hefele of Tübingen, a Roman Catholic divine and disciple of the illustrious Möhler, in his learned history of Councils, admits these facts, but maintains that the bishops only had a vote in the ecclesiastical assemblies. But in several councils of the ante-Nicene age, the presbyters and deacons subscribed their names to the acts and conclusions after those of the bishops, as may be seen from the first volume of Harduin's Collections. This subscription has no proper sense except on the ground of their recognition as regular members of the body.

It is true, however, that this republican and popular element gradually disappeared with the development of the hierachical principle. After the Council of Nice in 325, bishops alone had seat and voice, and the priests appear merely as secretaries, or advisers, or representatives of their bishops. The bishops, moreover, did not act as the representatives of their churches, nor in the name of the body of the believers, as in the first three centuries, but in their own divine right as the successors of the apostles, and as constituting exclusively the *ecclesia docens*. This hierarchical feature characterizes all the Councils of the middle ages, and the Councils of the Greek and Roman Church to this day. The papal system, as all systems of centralized government, is constitutionally and instinctively averse to deliberative assemblies and freedom of discussion, and tolerates Synods only as advisory or executive bodies for the purpose of giving solemn sanction to decrees emanating from the seat of power. Hence the popes did all they could, first to prevent, and afterwards to break up the reformatory Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basel, in the fifteenth century; and every body knows how long they resisted, in spite of their repeated promises, the urgent de-

mands, and how often they disappointed the expectations, of a general Council for the settlement of the great Protestant controversy of the sixteenth century. Since the Council of Trent, which was brought to a close in 1564, twenty years after its first session, the Roman Church has held no general Synod, except in 1854, and this was merely a convention of bishops summoned by the present pope for the sole purpose, not of discussing, but of approving and proclaiming the papal decree concerning the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin as a binding article of the Roman Catholic faith.

It is the general merit of the Protestant Reformation, in opposition to the exclusive hierarchical principle of Romanism, which identifies the Church with a special priesthood, culminating in the pope, to have brought out the principle of the general priesthood of believers, and to have proclaimed the right of the Christian people in the government and discipline of the Church, by a regular orderly representation. It is the particular merit of the Reformed Church, as distinct from the Lutheran, to have carried this principle into practice, by reviving, in a modified form, the primitive office of elders and deacons, and by establishing a local congregational and general synodical government on a popular, we might say, republican basis. If the Roman Church has been called the Church of priests, and the Lutheran Church, the Church of theologians, the Reformed Church must be called the Church of the people, or of the congregation. But the Reformed confession asserts the rights of the people, not in a disorderly and pseudo-democratic sense, which would lead to mobocracy and anarchy; but by way of a legitimate representation and in connection with a strict discipline which makes the eligibility to church offices and the right of voting dependent upon the good and regular standing of the members. It is only on the basis of such Christian discipline that the Reformed principle can thrive and succeed. Hence the great stress laid upon this point already by Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Bucer, Bullinger, and more fully by Farel, Calvin, Beza, John de Lasky and Knox.

The first Protestant Synod was held in February, 1528, at Berne in Switzerland, the mother-land of the Reformed communion.* In several cantons regular annual or semi-

* The high Church Episcopal "*Church Journal*" of New York for Nov. 3, sees fit to ridicule Reformed Synods without bishops. In noticing the article of the Rev. H. Harbaugh on Synods, in the last number of the *Mercersburg Review*, it says:

"The *Mercersburg Review* opens with an article on Reformed Synods, which is to us dreary in the extreme. The history of the rise and varieties of Presbyterian Synods, at Berne, in Geneva, in France, in various parts of Germany and the Low countries, in Scotland and England and America, among the "Reformed" and the "Lutherans,"—all this is wearisome to mind and heart. Which comes nearest to the pure "Presbyterian ideal," is a matter of comparative indifference to us. The question is settled for us on the first page. "The first Synod in the Reformed sense," it tells us, "was beyond doubt the one held at Berne, February 13, 1528." That will do for the first "Synod" held *without Bishops*. It is also "beyond doubt" that the first Synod *with Bishops*—and also with "elders and brethren"—was held in Jerusalem, in the year of Grace 52: and such Synods continue to be held, to this day. A careful reader of the article, however, will find many incidental proofs of the vast superiority of the Church's system, and can reckon up the heavy toll paid to the truth, by the floundering and tanglings and perpetual changings of error. . . . It is not among such specimens of ecclesiastical *felo de se* (i. e., Reformed Churches without Protestant Episcopal Diocesans), such accephalous organizations, that we are to look for the Church of the Future in America!"

We have no controversy with the Episcopal Church, which we sincerely esteem and love for its standards, its ministers and membership, its important mission and salutary, conservative influence among the various Christian denominations of this country. But to the writer of the above specimen of modest and charitable criticism, we feel strongly tempted, in reply, to address the following questions:

1. Who were the Protestant Episcopal Diocesans in the apostolic Council at Jerusalem, A. D. 52 (or rather 50) ?
2. Where are the inspired apostles, evangelists and prophets in the Diocesan and Triennial General Conventions of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America ?
3. What has become of the Convocations of the Church of England since 1717 ?
4. How many wives had Henry VIII, the first "supreme head" of the Episcopal Church of England, and what did he do with them ?
5. How many beaux had Elizabeth, the first "supreme governor" of the Church of England ?
6. How often did Crammer, the first archbishop of the Protestant Church of England, abjure his faith ?
7. How much was the Reformation of England and its earliest standard divines indebted to Luther, Melancthon, Zwingli, Calvin, Bullinger, Bucer, Fagius, Peter Martyr, and other Lutheran, German, and Swiss Reformers ?
8. Who helped to frame the Thirty Nine Articles and the Common Prayer

annual Synods were instituted, with or without lay delegation, yet always under the general control of the civil government, as may be expected from the union of Church and State, which there prevails as well as in Germany. But there has never been a *general* Synod of the Reformed Churches of Switzerland, each canton having its own independent ecclesiastical organization. This is certainly a defect. The evangelical portion of the Swiss ministers have indeed held for several years past an annual Conference for the discussion of important theological and practical questions. But this Pastoral Conference is altogether free and has no official character nor legislative authority. I was highly delighted by the interesting discussions and fraternal intermingling of such a meeting at Basel in 1854, but greatly surprised, at the same time, that so few of the members seemed to have any desire for a general consolidation of the Swiss Churches in one organic body, and that even the worthy President, Dr. Hagenbach, the Church historian, discouraged any tendency in this direction. Since that time, however, the idea of a general legislative Synod has made some progress.*

In Germany pastoral conferences of a similar character have been held since the revival of evangelical religion, especially in Württemberg and in Prussia. The largest

Book in the age of Edward and Elizabeth, according to the testimony of your own Burnet?

9. What has become of Newman, Manning, Wilberforce, and many others, who but a few years ago were lauded and commended by just such men as the editors of the "Church Journal," as the brightest ornaments and soundest divines of the same Church of England?

10. What special claims have the Onderdonks, Doanes and Ives, of this country, to be regarded as the successors of the holy apostles?

Until the "Church Journal" satisfactorily answers these questions, which might easily be multiplied, we take the liberty of giving its editors the advice: Sweep before your own door; mind the eleventh commandment; be humble, and learn as your fathers did, for nothing befits you so well.

*We just learn from Hagenbach's *Kirchenblatt fuer die Reformirte Schweiz*, for Sept. 2, 1858, that the principle topic of discussion at the last Pastoral Conference held at Aarau, in August, 1858, was the "closer union of the Swiss Reformed Church. To what extent and in what respect is it desirable? What can the Pastoral Conference do towards its promotion?"

and most influential body of this kind is the German Evangelical Church Diet, which convenes annually since 1848, and consists of pious ministers and laymen of the Evangelical, Lutheran and Reformed Churches. These free conferences have nothing to do with church government or other business matters ; they are strictly spiritual and devotional in their character, and, therefore, very interesting, refreshing and edifying. But the very idea of a Synod in the Reformed, as well as in the old Catholic sense, includes legislative and judicial functions.

The Synodical system in Europe was most fully matured in the Reformed Churches of France, the Wupperthal, the lower Rhine, Holland and Scotland. It is impossible to calculate the amount of influence for good, which has proceeded from these assemblies, upon the pastors and people under their charge. If the Wupperthal in Prussia, if Holland, especially in former days, and if Scotland have been, and are still so highly distinguished by the general intelligence, ecclesiastical order and religious life among the people, it is to be attributed, in a great measure, to their presbyterian and synodical form of government.

Yet after all, the great principle of ecclesiastical self-government, and, therefore, the true idea of a Synod, is not and cannot be fully realized in any of the Protestant Churches of Europe, as long as they are united with the secular power, and hold to the Erastian or Cæsaro-papal doctrine, that the head of the State is also the head of the Church within his dominion. It is characteristic, that a commissioner of the crown and a layman generally presides over these ecclesiastical meetings, even the assemblies of the Kirk of Scotland. Their decisions must be confirmed by government before they can pass into laws, and these governments, as matters now stand in Europe, are of such a mixed character as to religious profession, that a variety of interests, altogether foreign perhaps to those of any particular denomination, must be consulted in granting or refusing the necessary sanction.

In this respect the Churches of America are in advance

of their mother churches in Europe. Here the Church and the State are separated, although by no means hostile to each other as in the ante-Nicene age. Each power manages its own affairs independent of the other. The Church enjoys the protection of the State for its property and free exercise of its discipline and its worship; while the State is continually receiving the incalculable benefit of the moral power which emanates from the Church upon its own citizens. This peaceful separation has been brought about without design and calculation of men, by Providence itself in the irresistible course of events. The necessary result of it is, the voluntary principle in the support of religion and the self-government of the Church. The civil and political self-government, on which the constitution of the United States rests, is itself a result of the Reformation, and more particularly of the Reformed principle; while in turn, the privilege of religious freedom can now be fully enjoyed on the basis of, and in connection with, civil and political freedom.

In America then, we see the principle of ecclesiastical self-government fully established, but under different forms, in the different denominations. The constitution and polity of the Old School Presbyterian, the Dutch Reformed, and the German or Evangelical Reformed Churches are strictly presbyterian and synodical, each congregation having its local self-government in the consistory, i. e., the pastor with the elders and deacons; each district being united under the Presbytery or Classis; and the whole body being governed by the general Synod as the highest legislative and judicial tribunal. The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States has, in addition to its episcopal supervision, its annual diocesan and its triennial General Conventions or Synods with lay representation and full legislative powers. The Methodist Episcopal Church differs from the other Protestant denominations by excluding the lay element from its Conferences. The Congregational or Independent Churches of New England have a full congregational self-government, but to the exclusion of a

higher tribunal, and allow only advisory power to their Associations and Consociations. The General Assembly of the New School Presbyterian Church, since 1840, and the General Synod of the Lutheran Church in the United States, organized in 1820, but embracing as yet only a portion of this denomination, are likewise deprived of legislative authority and function, which is ceded to the particular or district Synods. They thus occupy a middle ground between Presbyterianism and Congregationalism.

The German Reformed Church in this country was first organized as a Synod in the city of Philadelphia, A. D. 1747, one year before the Lutheran, and has since that time held one hundred and twelve regular annual meetings exclusive of special Synods. As is customary with all the leading ecclesiastical bodies of the country, an abstract or summary of the proceedings is printed every year for the use of the ministers and elders under its care.* But these Minutes of Synod are simply a dry skeleton, a *caput mortuum* of the actual life which animates these meetings. The names of delegates and advisory members, the various committees and their reports as far as adopted, the results and resolutions arrived at, are faithfully recorded; but the speeches, the debates and the entire process through which the Synod passes until it reaches those results, are left out. We are far from finding fault with this custom; full official reports of all the transactions and speeches, like the reports of all the sessions of our civil legislatures and of the Federal Congress, would form too large and expensive volumes for practical use and embrace a great deal that is merely of local or transient interest or not worth recording at all.

* Is it not time now for our Synod, or its officers, or some other member well acquainted with its history, to take into consideration the propriety of preparing a full and well arranged digest of all our Synodical Minutes, with running titles and full alphabetical indexes for convenient reference? Such an epitome might be brought within the compass of one or two moderate volumes and could be much easier prepared now, than twenty or fifty years hence, when the preparation of a work of the kind will be a practical necessity. The O. S. Presbyterian Church has recently been provided with such a digest, which is said to be of incalculable use to its members

Still it is desirable to have, besides these indispensable official Minutes, graphic life-pictures of the several Synods, presenting their inner history and progress from year to year. Such sketches might be furnished annually by the editors of our church papers or other members of the Synod, and would form important material for the future historian.

The "Princeton Review and Biblical Repertory" is in the habit of giving an annual review of the more important transactions of the General Assembly of the Old School Presbyterian Church. Without pledging ourselves to a similar task for the "Mercersburg Review," and without the least disposition to sit in critical judgment over the actions of our own Synod, we propose in this article merely to give our personal recollections and impressions of the last annual meeting, with such occasional remarks as the nature of the different subjects may suggest.

It has been our privilege to attend either as delegate, or more frequently as advisory member, thirteen annual meetings of our Synod in part or in full, that is, every one except two, since our arrival in this country in 1844. We have always enjoyed them heartily as feasts of Christian friendship and fraternal consultation on the sacred interests of the Church. We never returned home without being spiritually refreshed and encouraged to labor in its service. We always felt, that, indifference to these annual gatherings of brethren, betrays an alienation of feeling from the Church itself and is inconsistent with our most solemn vows and duties as its ordained ministers. It is true, that, besides the strictly spiritual interests, there is always a considerable amount of mere business and technical formality, that claims the attention and takes up the time of such assemblies. But this is unavoidable in a country like this, where the Church has to manage her own affairs temporal and spiritual, and all that can be reasonably expected and desired is, that financial and other external business matters should be so managed and matured by the committees in their private sessions, that little else would be left for

Synod but to adopt the reports; while all the more important spiritual topics should be fully and freely discussed, for the benefit of the attending laity, as well as the ministry. We must admit that our Church is as yet considerably behind some of the leading denominations of the land as regards liberality and efficiency in carrying forward the benevolent enterprises of the day. But almost every Synod reports a progress in the right direction, and every step in advance is a stimulus to increased activity for the future. And as regards ability of discussion, and parliamentary tact and general interest of the topics brought under consideration, the German Reformed Synod, if we take into consideration its limited extent, its peculiar difficulties, and comparatively recent awakening to its proper work and mission, is, in our humble opinion, and as far as we are able to judge from our own observation, inferior to no ecclesiastical assembly in the land.

But the crowning feature of our Synod, which makes its sessions so delightful and refreshing, is the genial flow of soul and the spirit of brotherly love and kindness, or if we may say so that German *Gemüthlichkeit*, which has thus far uniformly animated and controlled its membership, English as well as German, in their public and private intercourse, even amidst and after the most exciting controversies and debates. Ministers and elders meet and part as Christian brethren and friends, and are always ready to forgive and forget any offences which weak and sinful human nature may have committed in the heat of excitement. The Synod has within the last ten or twenty years passed through the storms of what may be termed almost a theological revolution, and yet—thanks to an overruling Providence and the spirit of Christian charity and moderation—it is now more firmly and deeply united and consolidated than ever. Even those ministers, who, in consequence of these theological controversies and for motives best known to themselves, have been temporarily alienated from the general movement of the Church, or have left it altogether, must in honesty confess, that they have been treat-

ed with marked liberality, kindness and indulgence, and that they would have been permitted at any time to resume their former position of influence and trust. This is especially exemplified in Synod's course towards the North Carolina Classis, which bids fair to end in a permanent reunion, only strengthened and deepened by a temporary alienation.

The last meeting of the Synod, held at Frederick city, Md., between the nineteenth and twenty-eighth of October, 1858, was an important, interesting and delightful one. The English Reformed congregation of the beautiful city of Frederick, the second for wealth and commerce in the State of Maryland, is perhaps the largest and richest in the German Reformed Church and might take the lead in all its general movements and benevolent operations. It is also one of the oldest in the denomination, and probably the oldest in the place. For when the indefatigable missionary, Rev. Michael Schlatter, from St. Gall, in Switzerland, visited the town in 1748, he found there already a new church in the course of erection, and a large congregation.* It possesses, since 1849, a new, tasteful and very comfortable house of worship in the centre of the town and opposite the venerable old church, where the second congregation, com-

* In his Journal Schlatter gives the following interesting account of his services in that place, a hundred and ten years ago: "When I was preparing myself for the first prayer, and saw the tears of the spiritually hungry souls roll down over their cheeks, my heart was singularly moved and enkindled with love, so that I fell upon my knees, in which the whole congregation followed me, and with much love and holy desire, I commended the house and congregation to the Triune God, and wrestled for a blessing from the Lord upon them. After the sermon, I administered the Holy Supper to ninety-seven members, baptized several aged persons and children, and married three betrothed couple, and installed new elders and deacons—all of which was done with the greatest propriety of deportment, deep reverence, much enlivening of heart, and to general edification. It is a great advantage to this congregation that they have the best schoolmaster that I have met with in America" (Mr. Schley, the ancestor of the several families of that name, who is said to have built the first house in Frederick, which was still standing three or four years ago.) "He spares neither labor nor pains in instructing the young and edifying the congregation according to his ability, by means of singing and reading the word of God and printed sermons on every Lord's day."

See Mr. Harbaugh's *Life and Labors of Rev. Michael Schlatter, &c.*, Phila. 1857, p. 176 and 177 Comp., also Dr. Zacharias' centenary discourse, preached at the consecration of the new German Reformed church in Frederick in 1849.

posed altogether of Germans, hold divine service. The Synod, which never met there since the last twenty-three or four years, was entertained with true Southern hospitality, and guests and hosts parted with the kindest feelings of mutual gratitude and deep regret at the shortness of their social intercourse. The unusually and uninterruptedly fine weather, the clear skies, the balmy air, the mild sun of that most delightful American season, the Indian summer, when nature before its long winter sleep once more shines forth in all its smiling beauty, contributed not a little to the pleasure of the meeting. The sessions as well as the devotional services in the morning and evening were largely attended by an intelligent and attentive congregation, including many Lutherans, Presbyterians and Episcopalians: Able and impressive sermons were delivered in both languages every evening and on Sunday, on the ministry, on the happy lot of the Christian, on marriage, on the imitation of Christ and obedience to his call, on the kingdom of heaven, on the judgment day, on the atonement, on the holy communion, &c., besides several short and pointed missionary addresses at the anniversary of the Home Missionary Society. The pulpits of most of the other churches were likewise filled by members of Synod.

A new feature in this Synod was the setting apart of two afternoon sessions for free discussion on the important topics of pastoral visitation, catechetical instruction and family religion, which elicited a number of animated, interesting and edifying speeches and attracted a large audience of ladies and gentlemen from different denominations. It is to be hoped, that this precedent may be followed in future meetings of the Synod, especially during the early part of the session, before the regular business of the standing committees can be properly matured. We are sure, that such discussions on theological or practical subjects of general interest, will make the Synodical meetings more profitable both to the ministers and to the community where they are held.

The greater part of the time of the business sessions was occupied, as usual, with the discussion and adoption of the reports of the standing committees, on minutes of Synod, on minutes of Classis, on overtures, on correspondence with sister churches, on examination, licensure and ordination, on the state of religion and statistical reports, on the Theological Seminary, on foreign and domestic missions, on finances, on nominations and on publication. But besides these, several other topics of considerable importance came before Synod either in the form of appeals, or of reports of special committees. These topics were partly of a delicate and controversial nature and elicited a good deal of exciting discussion, which, it must be humbly admitted, was not altogether free from personalities. Even at the last session several resolutions were offered, which threatened to prolong the meeting and to throw it into agitation and confusion. But they were happily disposed of or postponed, and as the meeting drew to a close, the troubled seas became calm and serene, a feeling of solemnity filled the minds and hearts of members, and the Synod wound up at last in peace and harmony, in prayer and praise to the great Head of the Church militant on earth. Such a close always vividly reminds one of the innumerable assembly of the Church triumphant in heaven, when all the questions of time will be settled in the light of eternity, when war and strife will be swallowed up in victory and peace, and when separation will give place to never-ending union around the throne of glory.

We now propose to take up some of the more important topics, which claimed the attention of last Synod, for short notice as far as they may be of interest to the general reader of the Review.

THE TRIENNIAL GENERAL SYNOD.

This topic, although it came up at a late hour of the session and could not be fully discussed, is one of the most important, as it involves a change in the constitution or

organic law of the Church. For this reason it was sent down to the several Classes for action at their annual meetings in spring.

The German Reformed Church is now sufficiently large to call for such a change in its polity, as will provide for a full and regular representative union of its various sections. At present, the Eastern and Western Synods, although living under the same constitution and using the same doctrinal and ritual standards, are very loosely united by the simple exchange of one delegate at their annual meetings. In the year 1844, a Triennial Convention was formed, which originally embraced also the Dutch Reformed Church, with the view to constitute a closer bond of union and to carry on more efficiently the work of missions, especially in the destitute fields of the West. When the Dutch Church saw fit to withdraw, the two sections of the German Church were more closely drawn together, and the Convention was held between them every third year. The last one met at Winchester, Virginia, in October 1856, and proposed several important suggestions to the respective Synods for consideration. Among these was the plan of merging the Triennial Convention into a regular Triennial General Synod with full legislative power. For, as the Triennial Convention was merely an advisory body and consisted only of a small number of delegates, it could not be expected to accomplish much and to carry out the purpose, contemplated in its original formation. That a closer union between the two Synods should exist, is now generally felt in the West as well as in the East. The plan above alluded to was, therefore, favorably received by both Synods, and will no doubt be carried into effect at no distant day in some form or other.

But now the question arises: Shall we not at once originate a General Assembly after the fashion of the Old School Presbyterian Church, which should meet annually and transact the general business of the Church as the highest legislative and judicial tribunal, to which the separate Synods shall be subordinate? This plan meets with no

favor thus far among us. Too much centralization is always dangerous to freedom in the Church as well as in the State. Large deliberative bodies are expensive and apt to become unwieldy, cumbersome and unmanageable. The idea as proposed by the Convention at Winchester and more fully matured by the committee appointed for the purpose, is rather to save the relative independence of the two Synods, and to provide simply for a General Synod which is to meet every three years only, in some central locality, to take the place of the separate synodical meetings for that year, and to transact the business of both jointly, without constituting thereby a higher judicatory.

The only serious difficulty in the way is the double amount of business, which would thus come before that body and would perhaps require more time than the delegate would be willing or able to spend. It strikes us, that it will be necessary to leave all sectional, subordinate matters with the separate Synods as heretofore, and to limit the business of the Triennial Synod to general questions and enterprises of the Church, which affect the constitution, or relate to the preparation and publication of the standard works of the Church, such as the catechism, liturgy, hymn books, Sunday-school books, &c., also the home and foreign missionary cause, the correspondence with sister churches, especially those in Europe, and disputes which might arise between the several Synods. In this way the Triennial Synod, owing to the character of its business and the larger number of its delegates, would after all become, if not a higher judicatory strictly so called, yet a more important body than either of the separate Synods.

But it is impossible and useless at present to speculate about the precise character of this contemplated assembly. It will gradually define itself at the hand of actual experience. Life produces its own forms, and the soul shapes the body. It is never wise to legislate too much and too far ahead. Let the future take care of itself. God rules history, also the history of the German Reformed Church

in the United States, and this should be enough to inspire us with faith and confidence in the future.

We have no doubt, that the several Classes will adopt the general principle here involved and agree to try the experiment, which can do no harm. In this case the first Triennial Synod would convene, God willing, in the year 1860, and the second in the year 1863. The latter year should be celebrated, as the third centennial of the Heidelberg Catechism, by some noble movement for the benefit of the Church at large, and by the preparation of a standard critical edition of that excellent Catechism in the German, Latin and English languages.

CHANGE OF NAME.

The report on the Triennial General Synod proposes also a double change of name, the one relating to the two Synods, the other to the Church at large.

The first had been suggested already by the Triennial Convention at Winchester, and can be made without difficulty. The Eastern Synod is now officially called the "Synod of the German Reformed Church in the United States" (originally "of North America," was added), the Western, the "Synod of the German Reformed Church of Ohio and adjacent States." The former title is too comprehensive, the latter too inconvenient. At present the common distinction of "Eastern" and "Western" Synod would answer all purposes. But this may not be the case in a few years. For, if the German Reformed Church is to progress on the principle of historical development, as we hope and trust she may, we will have in the course of time Synods of the East, of the South, of Western Pennsylvania, of Ohio, of Indiana, of Illinois, of Iowa, of Wisconsin, etc. This matter will have to be settled by the first General Synod in 1860, according to the state of things which may then exist.

The second change is of a more difficult and critical character. It is proposed to substitute for the comparatively recent name "*German Reformed Church*," the original name "*Evangelical Reformed Church*" as our general denom-

inational title. On this subject a special committee was appointed by the Synod of Allentown in 1857, which recommended to the Synod of Frederick, to send this subject down to the Classes for their consideration. The Western Synod has already committed itself in favor of the change, and the Synod at Allentown has so far done the same, in ordering the new German Hymn book to be called "Gesangbuch der Evangelisch-Reformirten Kirche," etc. It is thought that the latter title, besides being older and more appropriate in itself, would suit the present condition of the Church much better, since a large portion of it has ceased to be German, and become altogether English as far as the language is concerned, and would be more favorable to its extension in a prevailing English country like ours. But great caution is necessary, before we can think of making this change general and embodying it in our Constitution. Indeed we are by no means settled in our mind as to its propriety and desirableness. The Dutch Reformed Church, a few years ago, attempted a similar change for similar reasons, but saw fit, after mature deliberation, to abide by its old title.

Theoretically and historically considered, the problem could be easily solved. It is an indisputable fact, that the proposed name, *Evangelical Reformed*, or *Reformed* without any addition, is the original historical name of the Church, and is uniformly used in the ancient and modern catechisms, liturgies and hymn books in Germany and Switzerland,* and in our own American hymn books† except the

*We will give here the titles of a few of the more recent German Reformed hymn books, as specimens to prove this fact:

"Auserlesene Psalmen und Geistliche Lieder fuer die *evangelisch-reformirte Kirche* des Kantons Schaffhausen. Schaffhausen, 1841."

"Auserlesene Psalmen und Geistliche Lieder fuer die *evangelisch-reformirte Kirche* des Kantons Aargau. Aarau, 1844."

"Gesangbuch fuer die *evangelisch-reformirte Kirche* des Kantons Zürich. Zürich, 1853."

"*Evangelisches Gesangbuch fuer Kirche, Schule und Haus* in Basel-Stadt und Basel-Land. Basel 1854."

"*Reformirtes Gesangbuch*. Elberfeld, 1853."

The same is the case with the Liturgies of the various cantons of Switzerland and the different sections of the Reformed Church in Germany.

† For instance, the one printed at Germantown (our copy gives no date), and the one printed in Sumneytown, which is still used in Philadelphia and many congregations of East Pennsylvania.

last, and in the charters of several of our congregations, both German and English. In Europe people never speak of a *German* Reformed Church, but of the *Reformed* Church simply, or of the Reformed Church of Germany, of Switzerland, of France, of Holland, of England, of Scotland, etc. The term *German* Reformed is evidently of American origin and was introduced at a time when the whole Church used the German language, and with the view to distinguish her from the surrounding English Reformed or Calvinistic denominations, and also from the Dutch Reformed Church, with which it was so closely connected in its early history. The latter fact accounts for the German official title “*Die hoch-deutsch-Reformirte Kirche*, which still figures on the title-page of our German Minutes of Synod. It was evidently chosen with reference to the Dutch Church as the *nieder-deutsch-Reformirte Kirche*. But this is a very singular terminology. In Germany itself, the distinction between *hoch-deutsch* and *nieder-deutsch* is by no means equivalent to the distinction between *German* and *Dutch* or *Hollaendisch*, and is not used in an ecclesiastical sense at all, but simply with reference to the two dialects of the German language, the one spoken in the Southern, the other in the Northern parts of Germany. The term *hoch-deutsch* ought, therefore, to be dropped from the Minutes at once, and the simple *deutsch* substituted for it, as altogether sufficient and in fact already generally current in the Church.

But the question assumes a different aspect, if we view it in its practical bearing. The title *Deutsch Reformirt*, and *German Reformed*, however unusual it may sound to the European ear, has become historical and to some extent necessary in America. It was not arbitrarily invented, but grew out of the peculiar relations of our country, for reasons similar to those which led to changes in the titles of other ecclesiastical bodies, which derive their origin from Europe. For the use of the simple title *Reformed*, which, in itself considered, is decidedly the best, even without the addition of *Evangelical*, would imply on our part an improper and intolerable presumption in a land, where we

are surrounded by all the other branches of the Reformed family from Holland, England and Scotland. The Presbyterian, Dutch Reformed and Protestant Episcopal Churches are as much Reformed, in the proper historical sense of the word, and as much Evangelical, too, as we are. It is true, that the title *German* does not apply any more to a large, and, we may say, the most active and influential part of our Church, if we mean by it the exclusive use of the German *language*. But it still designates the national origin of our Church, which cannot be altered by any Synodical legislation, and of which no one need be ashamed. On the contrary, the more our Church has grown within the last twenty years in intelligence and proper self-respect, the more has she learned to honor and cherish her historical connection with the classical soil of the Reformation and of modern Protestant learning and literature. For the same reason the titles of the largest denominations in Christendom, the Greek Catholic and the Roman Catholic, might be objected to, since the Greek and Latin languages are by no means exclusively used in them. And finally, it should be remembered, that the change of name might possibly invalidate our titles to our church property, including the endowment funds of the Seminaries and Colleges, which are chartered as *German* Reformed institutions.

The matter should, therefore, be very carefully investigated in all its legal as well as religious aspects, before Synod takes final action on it. We are not opposed to the change as far as the German title is concerned, since *Reformirt* and *Evangelisch-Reformirt* are decidedly more natural and familiar to the German and Swiss ear than *Deutsch Reformirt*, and could not be misunderstood, since no other *German* denomination of this country calls itself *Reformirt*. Our main difficulty is with the change of the English title, in view of its denominational surroundings and legal obstacles. Unless these objections can be satisfactorily removed, the change of name should not be made.

THE NORTH CAROLINA CLASSIS.

This Classis is composed chiefly of descendants of German Reformed families, who emigrated South from the Eastern Counties of Pennsylvania, but it has long since become entirely English. It numbers several large and substantial charges and able and zealous ministers; but it lies almost too far from the heart of the Church to keep full pace with all its general movements and enterprises. For reasons connected with the theology taught at Mercersburg, it has for several years past kept aloof from the Synod and ceased to send its annual delegation. Attempts were even made to connect it with the Dutch Reformed, and with the Old School Presbyterian Church, but without effect. The Synod, in the spirit of true Christian charity, sent first a pastoral letter, and afterwards, at the suggestion of the Winchester Triennial Convention, a personal delegation to the Classis, kindly admonishing them to return to their former connection.

This movement promises to be crowned with complete success. It was made to appear, from a full and satisfactory report of Synod's Commissioner, who discharged his trust with prudence and discretion, that there is no disposition whatever on the part of the ministers and people of that Classis to separate from the Church of their Fathers, and to give up the time-honored standards of its doctrine and discipline. The suspension of the ecclesiastical intercourse must, therefore, in great part, be attributed to certain misunderstandings. Two ministers of the North Carolina Classis, who were educated at Mercersburg, but are supposed to have taken the lead in the movements hostile to Synod, were sent as Commissioners to the meeting at Frederick; they regularly attended its sessions to the close, and expressed, in appropriate addresses, their attachment to the German Reformed Church, their sense of gratitude for the kind treatment they had received, and the sincere hope and wish to see the former relations fully restored. They will, of course, favorably report to their Classis on the result of their commission, and, unless some new obsta-

cle should be thrown in the way, we may confidently expect, that this distant part of the Church will be represented again by regular delegates at the next annual meeting of Synod at Harrisburg.

The Classis of North Carolina has in its midst a classical academy, advantageously located and chartered as a regular College, which, under proper management, is said to have very fair prospects of success, in view of the absence of other collegiate schools in that district, and the anxiety of the people to have their children educated without sending them to the North. Upon this literary institution must necessarily rest the hope of the Church in that section of the country, and if it should extend much further in the adjoining States, as we hope it may, the best plan would be in the end to constitute it into a separate district Synod of the South. What they need most at present, is an efficient principal of their infant College, and an accession of pious, well-trained and energetic ministers. We hope that some of our young men will direct their attention to that promising field of labor.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH SISTER CHURCHES.

The Synod of the German Reformed Church in the United States has made repeated efforts during the last thirty years, to establish a regular correspondence with the Mother Churches of Germany and Switzerland, from a natural and praiseworthy desire to promote the cause of Christian union, and, with the assistance of our European brethren, to carry on more successfully the missionary operations among the thousands of German immigrants, who are annually thrown to our shores and seek a permanent home in our vast country! The first earnest effort of this kind was the mission of the late Mr. Reily, in 1823. He went to Europe in person as agent for the newly founded Theological Seminary, collected a considerable sum of money and a library, and awakened a deep interest for the welfare of the German churches in this country, even among the most

prominent divines of that day, as the celebrated Drs. Schleiermacher, Neander, De Wette, Lücke, Nitzsch, Ullmann, etc. Unfortunately, the connection was soon broken off, and the occasional letters of Synod sent abroad remained mostly unanswered. The cause of the failure is to be found, however, not so much in the want of a proper regard and interest on the part of our foreign brethren, as in the great distance, the peculiar relations of the European Churches to the respective governments, which deprive them of independent ecclesiastical action, in the want of necessary information of both parties respecting their condition and wants, and especially in the want of a personal representative abroad.

During the last years, however, the German Churches, their theology and literature, have become better known to us, and we have become better known to them, and in proportion to this knowledge, the mutual sympathy and interest has increased. The growing emigration, too, awakened the more active among the Christians in Europe to a lively sense of their spiritual duty to these emigrants, and a number of societies were formed from time to time at Elberfeld and Langenberg, (under the fostering care of a most excellent, wealthy and liberal member of the Reformed Church, the late Mr. Colman, of Langenberg, and several others,) at Basel, Bremen, Berlin, etc., for the purpose of sending out pious ministers to the destitute German field in America.

In the year 1843, our Synod ventured on a new personal delegation to Germany, consisting of the late venerable Dr. Hoffeditz (whose name will ever be dear to the writer) and the Rev. Dr. Schneck. It forms the first effective link of a more intimate union, whose effects have been felt more or less ever since, although the original and immediate object of the mission, to secure the services of the celebrated Dr. F. W. Krummacher, then at Elberfeld, for the German theological professorship at Mercersburg, was not attained. It is well known, that the King of Prussia showed his interest in the German Reformed Church of America

at that time by a liberal and unostentatious donation, sufficiently large to defray the travelling expenses of the delegation and the removal expenses of the professor elect. Dr. Krummacker established a periodical, the *Polibotter*, with the express purpose of exciting and promoting an active interest among the German Christians for their brethren in America. The Prussian Church Government seriously entertained the idea of sending to the German emigrants, missionaries, who might either remain or return after a number of years with the advantage of an American experience. The attention of the *Dow-Großknecht* in Berlin, i. e., those candidates who enjoy the benefit of a stipend for travelling in foreign lands, and then labor for some years as assistant ministers at the cathedral of the Prussian capital, was directed to this country, and one of them, a brother of the distinguished Dr. Hengstenberg, actually visited our German Churches in 1845, with the view to inquire into their spiritual condition and wants. Unfortunately, the official report of that polished and amiable, but somewhat aristocratic gentleman, on the state of American Christianity, was of such a nature as to cool down the interest awakened, and discourage others from following his example. Had the report, as published in a long series of articles in Hengstenberg's *Evangelical Church Gazette*, and translated with comments for the "*Messenger*" by Dr. Nevin, been more hopeful, we would probably have had an unbroken series of living representatives of the fatherland among us, and both parties would have reaped the benefit of such a connection. For Germany might learn as much from American Christianity, as America from German theology.

In 1854, the connection was revived under a new form. The German Evangelical Church Diet, which was founded in the memorable revolutionary year 1848, and has been since that time the most complete, commanding and influential annual representation of the best part of German Protestant Christianity, entered, during its seventh meeting at Frankfurt on the Main, into a regular correspondence with the

German Churches, and more particularly with the German Reformed Church of the United States. Our Synod was represented at the meeting in Frankfort by a personal delegate, then again by three regular delegates at the Diet of Lübeck in 1856, and by one delegate at the Diet of Hamburg in 1858. Owing to this living representation, and other reasons, the correspondence has been regularly carried on, and is duly noticed in the annual transactions of that body, and also more at length in the official report of its activity in the large field of Inner Mission, 1857, p. 70-80, where our Synod and its relations to Germany are spoken of in the most respectful and fraternal terms. The standing President of the Church Diet, Dr. von Bethmann Hollweg, a nobleman of princely fortune, and what is better, a distinguished scholar and statesman, now a member of the Prussian Cabinet,* and what is best of all, a most earnest, humble and devout Christian, has manifested from the beginning the deepest interest in this relation, which is the more to be appreciated as he is not a member of the Reformed, but of the Evangelical Church of Prussia. This correspondence has had already a happy effect, and forms an interesting chapter in the history of our Church. It proclaims the union of faith and love, which still binds the vital Christianity of Germany to its offspring in this country in spite of the intervening ocean; it brought us into felt contact with the movements, trials and progress of the former; it made us better known among our brethren abroad; and it promises to end in the establishment of a permanent *personal* link between the two parties, in case the Theological Tutorship scheme, as adopted at the last meeting of Synod, should go into successful practical operation, as we hope and trust it may.

For the correspondence itself, we must refer the reader to the Minutes of Synod and the transactions of the Church

* According to the latest news from Prussia, the Prince Regent, in reconstructing his Cabinet on the 3d of November, has appointed Dr. von Bethmann Hollweg Minister of Cultus and Public Instruction, which gives him the supreme control of the Ecclesiastical Affairs and the Universities of Prussia.

Diet. The last Synodical letter was accompanied by a translation of the service for the reception of immigrants from our new Liturgy, which had been prepared in response to a recently introduced custom in several German churches of a solemn dismissal of emigrants by divine service. But we regret to say, that this particular form does not meet the expectations of our friends in Berlin. They object to it, and very properly too, that it is more adapted to the reception of strangers than brethren of the same faith. It ought to contain a distinct recognition of the community of origin and faith. But this will no doubt be attended to in the final revision of the new Liturgy.

The Synod of Allentown, in 1857, resolved also very properly to open a correspondence with the Reformed Conference of Germany, which was expected to meet this year at Elberfeld, and the Reformed Pastoral Conference of Switzerland, which held its last annual meeting in August at Aarau. Committees were appointed for the purpose, who discharged their duty in connection with some brethren of the Western Synod, and laid a copy of their appropriate and affectionate letters before Synod, which were ordered to be incorporated in the Minutes. But for some cause or other, no reply has been received as yet. The letter to Germany was probably misdirected, and the letter to the Swiss Conference, sent to the care of Dr. Hagenbach, seems unfortunately to have miscarried, if we are to judge from the report of the late Conference in Hagenbach's *Reformirte Kirchenblatt*, where no notice is taken of such a letter at all. But we have not yet received the full official report, which is sent to us every year by a friend at Basel. We are confident, from personal knowledge of many Swiss ministers, that a letter from Synod, if received in due time, would have been responded to in the kindest spirit. But it is very difficult to carry on such a correspondence at such a distance, without an occasional exchange of a personal delegate, who acts as a living mediator between the two parties. For this reason, also, among many others, the establishment of a Theological Tutorship is very de-

sirable, as it is intended not only to benefit directly our Seminary, but also to form a perpetual and living bond of union between our Church and the German Churches of Europe.

THE THEOLOGICAL TUTORSHIP.

The character of this new scheme to enlarge the usefulness and to increase the efficiency of our Theological Institution, will best appear from the following report of the Committee which had been appointed by the Synod of the preceding year:

The immediate occasion of the Tutorship, to which the consideration of Synod at its last annual meeting was directed by the Classis of Mercersburg, is the generous offer of Dr. von Bethmann Hollweg, President of the German Evangelical Church Diet, first made in a more general way, and afterwards especially tendered to our own body, to establish a fund of two thousand Prussian dollars, the interest of which shall aid in sustaining a pious young divine of the German Church in America as a student at the Universities of Germany, with the view to qualify him more fully for the position of a theological teacher in our Seminary.

By way of response to this offer of a noble and distinguished friend in Europe, and by way of reviving, at the same time, the effort of the Alumni Association of our Seminary to found a third Professorship, we recommend the establishment of a *Theological Tutorship*, the nature and object of which will appear from the following particulars:

1. The object of the Tutorship is to increase the teaching force of the Seminary, and to raise the standard of theological education among the students; to be a school for the training of professors in our institutions; and to serve, at the same time, as a perpetual and living bond of union between our Church and the mother Churches of Germany.

2. The Tutorship contemplates the employment and support of a regular succession of two young men, graduates of our literary and theological institutions, and distinguished for diligence, scholarship and Christian character, who shall be simultaneously engaged, the one in completing his theological and general literary education in Europe, the other in teaching, as assistant professor, such branches in our Seminary as may be assigned him, with his own consent, by the Faculty and the Board of Visitors under the sanction and approbation of Synod.

3. Every two years the Board of Visitors of the Theological Seminary, on consultation with the Faculty, shall recommend to Synod one of the graduates of the Seminary duly qualified, and willing to assume the requisite conditions as a candidate for the first term of the Tutorship, who, if elected by Synod, shall visit Europe for two years with the view to prosecute and complete his studies under the general direction of the Faculty in one or more of the principal Universities of Germany and Switzerland.

4. On the return of the first incumbent of the Tutorship from Europe, the Synod, on recommendation of the Board of Visitors, shall elect him Tutor in the Seminary for a period of two years, after which time, the second incumbent on his return shall in like manner succeed him as teaching tutor; and thus a regular succession of travelling and teaching Tutors shall be kept up biennially, as long as the plan may be perpetuated.

5. Before a young man can be appointed for the first period of his Tutorship and be entitled to its benefits, he must submit to an examination before the Board of Visitors in all the branches taught in the Seminary, and sign a written pledge, to be recorded by the Board, that he will faithfully comply with the following conditions: first, to prosecute his studies in the Universities of Europe for two years under the general direction and advice of the Faculty; secondly, to send either to the Faculty or to the Synod, an annual report on the progress of his studies and the state of theology and religion in the old world, especially in the land of our forefathers; thirdly, after his return, to engage, with the consent of Synod and its Board of Visitors, in the active duties of teaching in the Seminary, under the direction of the Faculty and the Board, for a period of two years; and finally, at the expiration of his term of office, to enter the work of the ministry in the German Reformed Church.

6. If, for any reason, the regular biennial succession, as above described, be interrupted, the teaching tutor may be reelected at the expiration of his term of office for another term of two years; the acceptance of the new appointment, however, to be at his own option.

7. The travelling incumbent of the Tutorship shall receive towards his support during his absence in Europe the sum of at least two hundred dollars annually from the Treasurer of the Board of Trustees of the Seminary, and, in addition to it, the annual proceeds of the Bethmann Hollweg-Fund for the time being, provided that the benevolent donor, as we have reason to believe, from the renewal of his offer in a recent letter to Synod, be willing to agree to this arrangement under the present scheme.

8. The teaching incumbent shall receive from the Board of Trustees, the annual salary of four hundred dollars, or more, as the proceeds of the fund may justify, to be paid in like manner as the salary of the Professors. He shall also be entitled to the free use of two rooms in the Seminary building, where he is expected to reside.

9. To provide for this additional annual expenditure of six hundred dollars, and before the scheme can go into full operation, there shall be created a fund of not less than ten thousand dollars, to be called the *Fund of the Theological Tutorship*, and to be safely invested at legal interest by the Board of Trustees of the Seminary, and held by them in trust for Synod.

10. If, from any cause, the proceeds of the Tutorship Fund, either in whole or in part, should not be required for its legitimate objects, then the proceeds or surplus, as the case may be, shall be either added to the endowment fund until it be equal in amount to a regular professoral fund, with a view to increase the annual appropriation to the two Tutors, hereafter to be elected, or to be applied to the benefit of the Seminary Library.

11. If the entire scheme of the Theological Tutorship should at any time and for any cause, be given up, or superseded, then the Tutorship Fund shall

either be merged into a Fund for a new regular Professorship in the Seminary, or the annual proceeds of it be devoted in equal shares to the cause of Beneficiary Education and the increase of the Library of the Theological Seminary.

12. In case the Western Synod should see fit to establish a similar Tutorship in her Seminary, the Eastern Synod shall give her the right to one-half of the annual proceeds of the Bethmann Hollweg-Fund, and of any other funds which may be contributed towards it by European friends for the general benefit of the German Reformed Church.

These are the outlines of the Theological Tutorship plan as far as your committee have been able to mature it.

If our Church is to keep pace with the progress of the age and the leading Christian denominations, she cannot long be contented with the present inadequate teaching force of the Seminary, and must aim at a full and complete faculty, which requires at least four professors for the various branches of theology, exegetical, historical, systematic, and practical. The duties of teachers, like those of preachers and public speakers generally, are the same for a small as for a large audience, and even more arduous, because less encouraging. An increase of the faculty would also be one of the surest means to increase the number of students and consequently of ministers for the growing wants of our Church.

The adoption and execution of the Tutorship scheme would be an important step towards this end, and it would answer substantially the purpose of a third Professorship at considerably less expense, and thus secure the object at which the Alumni Association of the Seminary has been aiming for several years. But, in addition to this, it would afford many of our rising ministers a rare opportunity of adding to their American training the invaluable advantages of a European visit and education in the first Universities of the world, and under the patronage of some of the leading men in the Churches of Germany. It would have a tendency to promote generally among our students and ministers a higher grade of scholarship, and so far greatly to raise the standing and efficiency of the Church. It would increase the number of ministers, from whom a choice may be made by the proper authorities to fill the vacant professorships in our literary and theological institutions. It would infuse new life from time to time into our Seminary, and keep it in constant contact with the progress of theological science and literature of Europe. And finally, it would be a permanent practical fruit of the fraternal correspondence of our Synod with the Churches of the fatherland recently established, and perpetuate the union between them by a living chain of delegates and representatives of our Church to Germany.

In conclusion, your committee would remark, that, having received discretionary powers from the last Synod to take preparatory steps towards raising the necessary subscriptions, they intended at first to address a circular to twenty or more individuals in the Church, who might be able and willing either to give or to raise \$500 each towards the establishment of such a Tutorship, and thus bring their scheme before Synod with a reasonable prospect of speedy success. But, in view of the continued financial pressure of the country, they thought it best to refrain from the attempt at present, and

to leave it altogether with Synod to devise a suitable plan for raising the necessary fund in case she see fit to resolve upon the establishment of a Theological Tutorship, or upon some other scheme that will permanently increase the efficiency and enlarge the usefulness of the Seminary.

The adoption of the report gave rise to an interesting discussion, which brought out the views and feelings of Synod concerning the movement. One of the reporters appointed by Synod has furnished a clear account of the speeches made, for the "German Reformed Messenger" of November 17, from which we beg leave to transfer the principal part:

"Dr. Gerhart said he would like to see the first part, whether it be regarded in the light of a preamble, or an item, adopted with a view to bring up the general question as to whether the Synod should enter into the arrangement at all.

Rev. J. C. Bucher. Did not the Synod at Allentown determine upon going into this matter?

The President replied, that Synod regarded it favorably, as the appointment of the Committee showed, but did nothing positively. The subject was open for discussion, and any action could be taken that was now thought best.

Dr. Gerhart. Synod's action last year implied a general committal in favor of the general object aimed at. There is nothing in the present report, if adopted, that binds the Church to go forward immediately. Before the plan can go into effect, and a single young man be sent to Germany to prepare himself for the Theological Tutorship, a fund must be established. Let steps be taken for the raising of this fund, and Synod will be ready, if not now, in future, to carry out the plan as drawn up by the Committee, and presented in the report before us.

Elder Rodenmayer. I should like to hear something said, in the first place, pointing out the necessity of a Theological Tutorship.

Rev. S. H. Reid. I hope Dr. Schaff will give us some light on the subject, so that any difficulty existing in our minds may be removed, and the wants of the Seminary, in this direction, be understood.

Rev. J. H. Derr. The establishment of such a Tutorship is necessary. The plan proposed and carried out, would be of incalculable advantage to our Church, as well as to the general interests of Theology in our country. It may be thought by some, that our two Professors are fully competent to the task of instructing all who are preparing themselves for the Gospel ministry. But we ought to expect something more from them than mere teaching. In the sphere of Church History, much more could be done by our worthy Professor, in the way of following up with additional volumes, the one already published. The German Reformed Church has no work on Theology, or Exegesis, at all answering our purposes or mission as a denomination, by any of our Professors or ministers. Such a Tutorship would open the way for the preparation of such works. But if our Professors are con-

fined all the time to the mere routine of instruction from the desk, they will have no time to write books, which would reflect credit on our Church, and be of great benefit to the ministry.

Rev. J. C. Bucher. The plan proposed by the Committee strikes me very favorably. I am pleased with it, and shall vote for it. For thirty years efforts have been made to effect a closer union and establish a correspondence between our Church and the mother country. This will be the most practical way of doing it. The sooner we show those generous friends in Europe, that we appreciate their kind offers, the better. For this reason, as well as the one given by Brother Derr, I am strongly in favor of the adoption of the plan proposed.

Rev. H. Harbaugh called for a second reading of the first paragraphs, so that the whole might be well understood, and Synod be prepared to adopt all that follows.

Dr. Schaff read the report a second time.

Rev. J. C. Bucher. I remember that, thirty years ago, there was an offer made, through our deceased brother Reily, to educate and train some of our young men in one of the German Universities. The demand at that time for ministers was so great that none could be spared. It was felt then, that that was the only way to revive and cherish the affection which ought to exist between our Church and the Church of Germany. The German Reformed Church has cut itself loose from American Theology. I am heartily glad of it. Let us cultivate a deeper knowledge of German Theology. The best way of doing this, is, to have one of our young men, in a course of training abroad, as proposed by your Committee.

Dr. Gerhart. This is a matter of great importance. The Theological Seminary was established in 1825. The German Reformed Church placed one Professor over it, and went forward in that way as long as she could. As soon as the Church felt able, an associate was appointed. Our wants increased, and we have had since Dr. Schaff came to this country two Professors in our Theological Seminary. In 1825, we had in the whole Church eighty ministers—now we have three hundred and fifty. We are growing and increasing as a denomination, and the Seminary must grow also. Two Professors will not be sufficient—a third, and soon a fourth Professorship will have to be filled. It has been well said that we need works on Church History, Theology, Exegesis, &c., for which the life and times will qualify our Professors. We need a class of persons from whom to select our Professors. Our Collegiate and Theological course is not sufficient to prepare men for this post. This is felt most sensibly by those who have been called to these important posts, and must now make up their deficiency as they best can. Dr. Mayer stated to me, that he had continually to go back and supply the deficiency of his early training. For a long time the Church had to look abroad for Professors to serve in her Institutions. When we established our College, we had to go abroad. Dr. Rauch, a ripe German scholar, was then providentially among us. He was chosen, first as Principal of the High School at York, and then advanced to the post of first President of Marshall College. When we needed a Professor of Mathematics, of Natural Sciences, of the Languages, we had to go abroad—away to New England. The tendency of all this was to Puritanize the Church. This state of things continued till Dr.

Nevin effected a change. And even he was called from the Presbyterian Church to the Theological Chair. In this case there was a venture, but we knew not the depth of character of the man of our choice, and the influence he would exert upon us to bring us back to a full comprehension of our true position as a Church. Yet we must say, there is always a risk in taking men from other Churches. It is only within the last few years that we have called our own men. This proposal of von Bethmann Hollweg meets a want which has been deeply felt, and will qualify our own men for any position in the gift of the Church. Drs. Wolf and Schaff will not live forever. Let these posts become vacant, and we will be sensible of the difficulty of filling them. Let some of our most talented young men spend two years in a foreign University, and then two more as Tutors in the Seminary, and then send them forth into the field of the ministry. The objection is urged, with much plausibility, that this high training would disqualify them for the simple work of the ministry. But it is not the well-educated man, who is bombastic, mystical and obscure. All is made to turn upon his spiritual character. The more learning a truly devout man has, the better will he be prepared to discharge his pastoral duties. And from these the Church could then select those who are to follow our present Professors. I cannot forbear to remind Synod, that other Churches have been acting on this very plan. Dr. Hodge spent some years in a course of preparation in Europe. Prof. Noah Porter, of New England, was in Europe for some time. I might refer to others. And what is remarkable is, that our Presbyterian and New England brethren have been passing by Edinburg and Oxford, and going to the Universities of Germany. We Germans are as good as the English. We have just as much, if not more, right to the advantages afforded by the German Universities. Our sons have a full right to the very best culture that can be obtained in these Institutions.

Rev. H. Harbaugh. I am strongly in favor of this whole movement, especially after hearing the report read a second time. That report is so well guarded. Although I had some difficulties, they are now removed. I like the course laid down—two years in the University and then two more in the Tutorship. Some minds develop rapidly—others become inflated—this is the danger, and hence much prayer is needed on the part of young men for humility. I was delighted with the manner in which this very thing is guarded in the report. It is not likely that we would be much deceived. We have every reason to believe that the person, who would receive and obtain the encouragement of the Church to go abroad, would be a good, worthy and humble man. With this donation from Europe, we can lay the foundation for the whole scheme. We are greatly deficient. We need to keep up union and intercourse with the fatherland. We need to cultivate the most intimate relations with our brethren abroad. Time was when this land lay far off from us. We are now better acquainted. But this must increase. We must put processes in motion for further advances. Had we some of our young men at the Universities, we would keep posted. One of our greatest duties is the internal mission—the spreading of light. We undervalue too much the necessity of thoroughly educated men. We must have them. They will act as models. It is said

“A thing of beauty is a joy forever.”

God knew what he was doing when he made the mountains. There the streams come from, that flow through our valleys. What the mountain is in the sphere of nature, that the truly educated man is in the kingdom of grace. Because the scheme is so well defined and guarded, we can have no hesitancy in adopting the report. Let us go forward in the name of God.

Rev. S. H. Reid. So far as the object aimed at is concerned, I sympathise fully with it, and can endorse every sentiment of the brother from Lancaster. I feel, however, persuaded that the brethren have taken a one-sided view—the most pleasing view, by far. They have not touched any of the difficulties. We may adopt this report, as we have done other plans and schemes, but is it not the most consummate folly for Synod to devise measures and raise expectations which can never be realized? The first question before us is—Is the object aimed at practicable under all the circumstances? Can it be carried out? You want ten thousand dollars in hard cash. You must have it on interest. I ask, where is this endowment to come from, in the midst of the pressure which is felt all around us—all over the country? Would not our Church regard us as a set of crazy men, were we to make such an attempt as the plan proposed calls for? The report may indeed be adopted. But it must be with the condition—*If the money can be raised*. If not, it must go the way of a thousand other reports—fall to the ground. The say-members ought to be consulted. Let us have an expression of their sentiments on this important subject. We see the mountains, with the cooling streams flowing down their sides. All nice and beautiful enough. We may even long to drink of those streams, but here's the difficulty, can we get at them? So in the case before us. Is the plan practicable? Can all this be actualized?

Rev. J. H. Derr. The ears of the brother, who has just taken his seat, have not been very sharp, and his mind exceedingly dull of comprehension, or he would have heard and understood that the scheme was not to be carried out at once. Even as it regards the *hard cash* needed, there is no impracticability—the report is particularly guarded on this point; it may take time to raise the means, and only when this is done, will the plan be carried out. The idea is to adopt it, and then work at it as we have opportunity.

Elder Rickenbaugh. This does not create an absolute debt. If the money is raised, it will go into practice. We have men in the Church, who may devise liberal things, and give us the funds required. If we do not aim high, we will not shoot high.

Rev. J. C. Bucher. I am sorry for the remarks made, calculated to discourage our eldership. The issue has been raised as to its practicability. The report itself is provisional and conditional. In my experience, I have never found much difficulty in raising money for a real, living, needful enterprise. I would rather raise ten thousand dollars for some living reality, than one thousand dollars for brick and mortar. That is something dead, and hence the difficulty. There are wealthy men enough in the Church, who, if they understood this scheme, would generously come forward and give, and thus follow the example of our noble friend in Germany. But if we stop at the threshold, because we see a lion in the way, and sit down paralyzed with fear, we shall never accomplish anything. Let us at least commence the

foundation, and roll in one stone after another—let us gather the material, and in a few years the structure will rise. As it regards the scarcity of young men, that should be no obstacle. How many will it require? Only one every two years. We can certainly spare a young man of approved piety every two years, for such an important object.

Rev. S. H. Reid. All I have heard only confirms me the more in what I have said. If it is practicable, then go forward. But it will be a shame—a burning shame to adopt the report, and then go home, forget all about it, and make no exertions to carry it out. The brother from Mifflinburg is very sanguine of success. Tell me, how will the brethren in Europe look upon us, if we fail? Have we thought of that?

Elder Griffith. This matter should not be put off. Now is the time for action. I do not look upon this plan in any other light, than as perfectly feasible. I have listened attentively, but have not heard a single argument to induce me to vote against it. Strong and weighty reasons have been advanced, why we should embark in the enterprize of establishing a Theological Tutorship. The scheme is based upon the generous offer of a most worthy man, and Christian gentleman in Germany—Bethmann von Hollweg. I had the pleasure of forming his acquaintance in my foreign tour. He is a whole-souled man, and feels a warm interest in our Church. He is willing to do any thing to facilitate and advance our interest in this country. This is a kind offer, and if accepted, may be the means of opening the avenue for other gifts to flow over to us. We must either accept or reject this offer, and inform our European brethren of the result. In travelling through Europe, I met with young men from different countries going to the Universities of Germany. By sending some of our talented and pious students across the waters, we would give character to our Church. I cannot see that the adoption of the report will involve the Church in any difficulty, or trouble. If so, I would say, away with it. I believe that the amount required can easily and readily be made up, if not this year, before a great while. If the proper appeal be made to wealthy merchants and others in the Church, the means, in due time, will be at hand. It is now time to make preparation for this very movement. I would feel mortified after the offer that has been made, if we should reject the report.

Rev. S. H. Reid. That is the way to talk. And it comes from the right man. Very well! Go ahead!

After this general discussion, the report was taken up, item by item, and unanimously adopted. The Committee was continued, with instructions to carry out, if possible, the plan suggested by them for securing the endowment of the Tutorship. They intend accordingly to issue an appeal to that effect to the ministers and a number of wealthy and liberal members, hoping that it will meet with a prompt and hearty response. The question now is: Can twenty individuals be found in our communion, who are willing

to give, or to raise in their charges and among their friends, the sum of \$500 each—only one-fourth of the offer of Dr. von Bethmann Hollweg, who never was in America, and is not even a member of the German Reformed Church—payable in three or five annual installments, with interest, say from October 1st, 1859, for such a noble and useful enterprise? If any one can suggest to the chairman or another member of the Committee a more practicable plan for raising the necessary funds, the suggestion should be made without delay, and shall receive proper attention. So much is certain, that Synod, after having given the Tutorship scheme such a full and hearty sanction, should feel in honor bound to carry it into practical effect. A failure of the movement, from want of liberality, would be injurious to her reputation at home and abroad.

If the endowment can be but half effected during the present Synodical year, the Synod at Harrisburg might proceed to elect the first Tutor, (who should be an ordained minister, enjoying already the general confidence of the Church, and able to give more weight to the scheme at home and abroad,) and send him to Europe for two years, during which time the other half of the endowment might be raised for the support of the teaching Tutor. We are disposed to believe that the Tutorship should be continued, even if the Seminary should ever reach, as we hope it may, a full organization of four or five Professors, like the Old School Presbyterian Seminaries at Princeton, Alleghany, Danville and Columbia, the New School Presbyterian Seminary at New York and Auburn, the Congregational Seminaries at Andover, the General Episcopal Seminary at New York, the Dutch Reformed Seminary at New Brunswick, and almost every respectable Seminary in the country. For, as stated in the report, the Tutorship, like the office of the *Repetenten* in Tübingen, the *Domcandidatenstift* at Berlin, and the *Fellowships* at Oxford and Cambridge, answers several important objects which can not be reached by the regular professorships.

REMOVAL OF THE SEMINARY.

When the question of removing the Literary Institutions to a more central and accessible location was first agitated in 1849, it was understood that the Seminary should go with the College. But for important reasons, the former was left to remain at Mercersburg, where it has ample accommodations in the way of buildings; and where, amidst severe trials and determined opposition from without and within, it acquired its present reputation and standing among the Theological Institutions of America. Even if it should be removed, the name and associations of its retired, healthy and beautiful birthplace will be dear to its alumni, and can never be erased from the history of the German Reformed Church in this country. The main, and perhaps the only weighty objection to its present location, is the difficulty of access and several literary and social disadvantages connected with the same, which will probably never be fully removed, even if certain railroad projects should be carried out.

The question of removal came before Synod by way of request from Lancaster Classis, in whose territory Marshall College has within the last five years found a new and permanent home. But it was evidently not ripe for action, and hence a committee was appointed to inquire into all its legal and pecuniary aspects, and to report to the next annual meeting. It seems to be generally felt at present that, however desirable the removal of the Seminary may be, both for its own sake and for the sake of the College at Lancaster, it should not take place except with the amicable consent of the Mercersburg community, and with a certain prospect of obtaining an equivalent for the loss which may be sustained in the transfer or sale of the Seminary buildings. In the further progress of this affair, we do not wish to take any active part, but we shall cheerfully acquiesce in any action Synod may see fit to take, after a careful consideration of all the interests involved in the case.

THE NEW LITURGY.

The new Liturgy has now been before the Church for about a year, as a provisional and tentative production. Synod has taken no action on it at all, and the book has not yet come before it in proper form, and may not for some time to come. But, at the request of the East Pennsylvania Classis, one step was taken at the last meeting, which indirectly commits it to the book as a provisional production, without giving it its sanction as the ultimate standard of the Church. We mean the appointment of a committee for the translation of the Liturgy in full, (with the exception, of course, of the hymnological appendix) into the German language, that the German membership might have an equal opportunity of examining and using it as the English. This is no more than right and just to a large portion of the Church, and especially to the oldest Classis. The committee is judiciously selected, and includes several able and respected ministers of European and American birth and training. We sincerely wish them success, and hope they may not only translate, but also publish the book in a neat and decent form during the present Synodical year. The only objection urged against the motion, was the expense of publication. But it was stated that the German portion of the Church is even more anxious to obtain the book than the English, and if the German ministers take the proper steps, as many of them will do no doubt, to circulate it as a *family* prayer book in their charges, it may possibly sell more-extensively than the English. For every pious German family desires a prayer book next to the Bible and hymn book, and it is reasonable to suppose, that they would greatly prefer one from their own Church to similar works of other denominations.

This action of Synod is an unmistakable indication that the new Liturgy is silently and surely gaining ground in the Church, and meets its approbation, at least as to its general plan and principal services, to a larger extent than we had expected. This does not exclude, of course, the pros-

pect of a revision and modification in unessential features. When the book first came out, it was violently assailed, with more zeal than knowledge, from some quarters * in the pages of the "Messenger." But the opposition seems to have exhausted itself, so as to supersede the necessity of a defense. Some portions of the book were used during Synod, at the communion and ordination of two candidates, and seem to have made a deep and solemn impression. It might be proper, also, to state, that the defendant in the Mount Washington appeal case did not take ground, as had been expected by several brethren, against the Liturgy itself, but simply against its introduction at a particular church at the present time, on the ground of inexpediency. As to the book itself, he expressly stated that he esteemed it more highly now than he did a year ago, and habitually used it in his family.

Perhaps in another year or two the way may be prepared for Synod to take some direct and definite action on this book. But even in this case the work of final revision may still require several years more, until it can be adopted and enjoined as a standard of public and private worship. Nothing can be lost by delay in such an important matter. In the mean time, the ministers have all the liberty they can possibly desire; they may use the provisional book entire, or in part, or not at all, as their own judgment and inclination, and a just regard to the wishes of their respective consistories and congregations, may suggest. The apprehension of discrepancy and confusion is entirely unfounded; as there is less of it now than there was before, when about half a dozen English and German Liturgies were made use of in various parts of the Church, where now the new Liturgy has taken the place.

* The opposition came mainly from one and the same source under three different signatures. It is but just to state, however, that the good brother in question is in the *habit* of changing his signature—not his style, and had no intention to make a false impression upon the readers. His objection, too, was mainly directed to the Litany and to the first regular Sunday service, which, however, is expressly left optional in the rubric, which he seems to have overlooked.

THE NEW GERMAN HYMN BOOK.

In the year 1841, the Synod ordered the preparation of a new German Hymn Book, which appeared already in the following year at Chambersburg. This book may be superior to its American predecessors and cotemporaries, and is, upon the whole, as good as any other German American collection, excepting the more recent one of the Lutheran Synod of Pennsylvania, prepared by Dr. Demme, in 1849, on the basis of the new hymn book of Würtemberg. The compilers certainly did the best they could under the circumstances; and deserve the thanks of the Church for their labor of love. But the undertaking itself was decidedly premature. For at that time the great hymnological reform movement had hardly begun in Germany, and had not yet reached this country, where there was no hymnological library of any account, and no opportunity for proper hymnological training. Even the new Lutheran hymn book of 1849, although the best heretofore published in the United States, appeared a few years too soon for its own good; for it embodies all the defects and errors of the Würtemberg hymn book of 1842, and of the first edition of Knapp's *Liederschatz*, (now entirely superseded by the second edition of 1850,) and none of the results of the progress made within the last ten years in this department. Hence it hardly presents a single one of the ancient classical hymns, not even those of Luther, in the original form, but with all sorts of unnecessary and even hurtful abridgments and mutilations.

Owing to a variety of objections, which we do not wish to specify, the Chambersburg collection, like the Liturgy of the late venerable Dr. Mayer, could never work its way into general favor, nor supersede altogether its predecessors and rivals. Hence there are at present, probably, not less than half a dozen German hymn books in use in the various sections of the German Reformed Church in America; the old one, published by Mr. Benner, (a Lutheran,) at Sunnyside, and enriched with an appendix by the Rev. Dr. Mann, and the so-called *Gemeinschaftliche Gesangbuch*, (which,

in itself considered, is absolutely below criticism, but was likewise enriched some time ago with an appendix from some unknown hands,) still hold their place in the greater part of East Pennsylvania, while other congregations, especially in the West, use imported hymn books from Germany, (as the new and excellent Reformed hymn book of Elberfeld, or that of Schaffhausen,) or the recent collection of the Dutch Reformed Church, prepared by Rev. Mr. Guldin, and published with the tunes in very fine style, or the new Lutheran hymn book (as is the case even with the German Reformed St. John's congregation at Chambersburg).

To make an end to this confusion, and to secure a work that should be adapted to the present state of scientific hymnology in Germany, and to the practical wants of the Church in this country, the Synod, which convened at Chambersburg in 1855; finally yielded to the often repeated request of the East Pennsylvania Classis, and appointed a committee to prepare a new hymn book. The Western Synod heartily fell in with the movement, and was represented by one of its ablest and worthiest German ministers. The committee included men who had paid considerable attention to the subject of hymnology long before, and had closely followed the recent efforts of the revived Churches of Germany, to wrest these invaluable treasures of devotion from the profane hands of rationalists and sentimental pseudo-reformers, and to restore them to the people in their original purity, unction and vigor, with such changes only as are demanded by the laws of grammar, the improvement in taste and a just regard to practical use. They have been more or less at work since their appointment, agreed upon the critical principles, matured a general plan, which was adopted by the Synod at Allentown, and completed their labors during the last year. They reported accordingly to the Synod at Frederick, that the manuscript was ready for the press, that they had already made preparatory arrangements with Messrs M. Kieffer & Co., at Chambersburg, for its publication, and requested Synod

simply to settle definitely the terms of publication with that printing firm, which claims the exclusive and unconditional right of publishing all the Synodical works, both present and prospective, authoritative and provisional, in virtue of a contract entered into in 1849, and extending to 1863.

Of the merits of the work, we are not the judges. But, as the chairman of the committee, we will state, by way of description and information, that the new collection embraces about five hundred classical hymns, of all ages of the Church, including metrical translations of select Psalms, the best Greek and Latin hymns of the ancient Church, the original German hymns of the Reformation period; and the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries—representing the Lutheran, Reformed, Evangelical and Moravian Churches; also, old or new translations of a number of favorite English hymns of Watts, Cowper, Newton, Wesley, Heber and Montgomery. The rich treasures of German Reformed hymnology, of a Joachim Neander, Lampe, Tersteegen, Lavater, Adolf and Fred. W. Krummacher, J. P. Lange and Meta Heusser, were much more largely drawn upon than is the case in most German hymn books, especially, also, in the recent *Eisenacher Entwurf*, where the Lutheran element unduly predominates, and where, among one hundred and fifty hymns, only four of Reformed authors have been found worthy of a place. Several newly published and unpublished hymns of Mrs. Dr. Meta Heusser, of Zürich, who is acknowledged by Knapp, Koch, and other competent judges, to be the most gifted, and the most deeply spiritual female poet of the German tongue, will be found a valuable accession, and will become, in a short time, generally popular, as her sublime resurrection hymn: “Lamm des gelitten, and Löwe der siegreich gerungen,” embodied in the new Württemberg hymn book, has become already. The text has been taken from the best sources, and as much as possible in its original purity, without any unnecessary alterations and abridgments. This has been by far the most difficult part of the labor. Great attention

has also been bestowed upon a clear, simple, yet logical and complete arrangement, which combines the order of the Apostles' Creed, and the order of the ecclesiastical year. Under each division and subdivision, the hymns are arranged in chronological order (a new feature), so that the reader can trace the unbroken current of piety and devotion from the sweet singers of Israel through the age of martyrs and confessors, the twilight of the middle ages, to the period of the Reformation, and down through the various evangelical denominations to the revived faith and sacred poetry of the present generation. The several hymns are furnished with the name of the author, and the date of their composition, or first publication, as far as this could be ascertained, which, in many cases, has been an exceedingly troublesome and perplexing task. There will be added, also, an alphabetical list of the principal hymn writers, with biographical notices, a list of the tunes, the usual indexes, and perhaps, also, a hymnological introduction. The committee have used the best scientific and popular hymnological works of Bunsen, Daniel, Knapp, Koch, Lange, Stier, Wackernagel, Stip, Raumer, Schirks, etc., and a large collection of ancient and modern German and Swiss hymn books, although in the critical part of their labor, they had often to regret the want of a hymnological library—such as that of Berlin, or that of Wernigerode, in possession of the Stolberg family.

Yet, with all the time and labor bestowed upon this work, the committee are too well aware of the intrinsic difficulty of the task, and the existing conflict of opinions and tastes, as to order, arrangement, number, and the critical restoration of the text, to expect that it will at once give general satisfaction. They offered, therefore, the work, as is usual in such cases in Germany, simply as a *provisional* book for the present (as an *Entwurf*), like the new Liturgy, until the book is sufficiently tried by actual use to enable Synod intelligently to pass final judgment upon it as an authoritative standard of the Church.

Had the new hymn book been left to seek its own way

into the public without any interference, like the new Liturgy was permitted to do—and there is certainly no good reason for making a distinction between them in respect to this point—it would probably have left the press by this time, in good and creditable style, without any cost to Synod, not even for the expenses incurred in its preparation, and with a reasonable prospect of yielding it an annual bonus for beneficiary education, or some other benevolent enterprise of the Church East and West. But the general controversy on the relation of Synod to the Printing Establishment at Chambersburg, with which this innocent book was reluctantly, though inevitably, mixed up, in consequence of a Synodical resolution of 1857, could not be settled at the last meeting of Synod, and was referred to the next annual meeting. Consequently, the publication of the book was arrested, and made to depend upon the future settlement of a foreign question. But as the committee were anxious to have this devotional work disconnected from any further complication with a purely legal and financial controversy and its uncertain issues, they asked and obtained leave to withhold the manuscript, and to be discharged as a committee.

This result will be very unsatisfactory to those numerous German ministers and congregations, who have for years past been anxiously looking forward to a new German hymn book. But we cannot help it, and must make the best of the case, mindful of the old German proverb: *Aufgeschoben ist nicht aufgehoben*. As matters now stand, the Chambersburg hymn book is still the authorized book of the Church. The new hymn book may be published, indeed, at any time, yet not as the work of the German Reformed Church, either authoritative or provisional, nor even as the work of a Synodical committee, which, as such, is dissolved, but simply as a private production and on private responsibility. The Synod, however, at whose order and for whose benefit the book was prepared, can call it up, either as manuscript or as a printed volume, whenever she chooses, and take such action on it as she may see fit.

The authors, whenever requested to do so, will cheerfully place their work at her disposal, provided only that the controversy alluded to be first adjusted on general grounds, without any further reference to the German hymn book.

OTHER TOPICS OF DISCUSSION.

A variety of other important questions and items of business were brought before the Synod of Frederick, which, from want of time and space, we can only briefly notice in conclusion. We may, however, refer the reader, who feels more particularly interested in them, to the full and carefully prepared articles of official reporters, which have for several weeks past appeared in the "German Reformed Messenger," and which, for the first time, supply the defect of which we complained of in the beginning of this article, more than one half of which was written before we found out that Synod had appointed special reporters.

1. The Mt. WASHINGTON APPEAL CASE occupied a large share of attention, and elicited much animated discussion. It was, unfortunately, mixed up with a series of personal difficulties and irrelevant issues, but involved mainly the important question of the extent of clerical authority, and the right of an ordained minister to administer the sealing ordinances of the Church outside of a regular organization. This question was ably discussed on both sides, and will be brought up again at the next meeting of Synod. The appeal itself was fortunately withdrawn, and Synod thus released from the necessity of voting against the appellants, or against the defendants, and in either case unwillingly to injure such a useful and flourishing institution as the Female Seminary at Mt. Washington, Md.

2. The PRINTING ESTABLISHMENT controversy, concerning the relation of Synod to the firm of M. Kieffer & Co., with reference to new publications, or the exact meaning of the article in the contract between Synod and said company, which provides that the "*Synod shall give all its print-*

ing into the hands of the firm." The committee brought in two reports, which took opposite views on this subject. Leaving out subordinate issues, such as the difference between present and prospective, and between authoritative and provisional publications of Synod, the controversy turned mainly on the following questions: first, whether the article in dispute is to be understood absolutely and unconditionally, or as subject to those general laws and principles which regulate the book trade; secondly, whether the article supersedes the necessity of separate contracts and excludes Synod from making or asking any terms, or whether each book makes its own contract according to its inner merits and commercial prospects, since books evidently differ in both respects, and since Messrs. M. Kieffer & Co. themselves publish the different Synodical books on different terms, assuming all the risk in the case of the hymn books and catechisms, half the risk and half the profit in the case of the "Lord's Portion," and no risk at all in the case of the Minutes of Synod; thirdly, whether it is unreasonable for Synod to ask any bonus for an old or new book, in view of the fact of her being half owner, in prospect, of the entire property and profits of the establishment, and in view of the past financial embarrassments under which the present firm originally assumed its management, or whether Synod, in furnishing a new and profitable book, and thus increasing the productive capital of the firm, is not entitled to a legal percentage, as much so as any other author for his own work, or as the members of the firm themselves are justly entitled to the annual interest accruing from their pecuniary investment in the establishment; and finally, whether it is a wise policy for Synod to permit all its share of the profits to be invested in the real property and working capital of the establishment, since it is in a solvent and flourishing condition, or to insist now on that other article of the contract, which provides for the annual distribution of the net proceeds between the two partners. Synod saw fit to postpone action on this controversy, and to refer it to a new committee,

with instructions to report at the next annual meeting. It is to be hoped that this committee may agree upon a plan which will maintain the rights of Synod, and the independence and dignity of literary labor, without injuring the Printing Establishment, or discouraging its present faithful and efficient managers, and which will thus prevent any future collision in the publication of the German Liturgy, the Child's Catechism, and other prospective, provisional or authoritative works of Synod.

3. The old question of the **VALIDITY OF HERETICAL BAPTISM**, and the reception of schismatic congregations into regular communion with the Church. This was satisfactorily disposed of to meet a certain case within the limits of the Goshenhoppen Classis.

4. The **HOME MISSIONARY OPERATIONS**, in spite of many discouragements, are enlarging every year, especially in the far West, and call upon the increased activity of the Church in providing not only the necessary funds, but also the necessary *men* to take charge of the destitute fields of labor.

5. The question of providing for a **SHORTER COURSE OF STUDY**, in or out of the Seminary, for persons of limited means or advanced age, and with the view to increase the number of laborers for the home missionary field. This important item was likewise referred to the next Synod for action.

6. The appointment of a committee to prepare a plan for a regular series of **DENOMINATIONAL PUBLICATIONS**, translated and original, for general circulation among our people, which, it must be confessed, are not yet a reading people to the same extent as could be desired. It is to be hoped that a Church Literature; which speaks to their mind and heart in their own familiar sounds, will tend greatly to stir them up, and to make them more intelligent, zealous and efficient in every good cause. The Western enterprise, of establishing a denominational *Sunday School* paper, was likewise encouraged for the same reason.

6. The **APPOINTMENT OF EDITORS** of our Church papers,

an associate editor of the "Messenger," and an editor of of the "Kirchen Zeitung." In both cases the election fell upon the right men, and was made unanimous.

From the variety and importance of these various topics, which were brought to the notice of the Synod at Frederick city, it is evident that the German Reformed Church is still proceeding on the theory of historical development, and has a great amount of work before it. In view of this fact, we ought to rejoice and to go toward with new courage and devotion in the name of the Lord, doing His will, and laboring in His holy service, until He calls us from the Church militant on earth to the Church triumphant in heaven.

Mercersburg, Nov. 20, 1858.

P. S.

ART. II.—THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM—ITS FORMATION AND FIRST INTRODUCTION IN THE PALATINATE.

Two names have been applied to the catechism before us; and under both these names it is frequently referred to in history. It is often called the Palatinate Catechism, because it was prepared in the Palatinate for its churches and schools, and was in that country first introduced and used. It is called more generally the Heidelberg Catechism, from the celebrated city of Heidelberg, on the Neckar, where it was composed by its learned and pious authors, where it was first laid before a national Synod and by it examined and approved, and where also it was first printed and published.

The Heidelberg Catechism owes its existence to the zeal and piety of Frederick III., Elector of the Palatinate, with great propriety surnamed "The Pious." He succeeded the Lutheran, Otto Henry, who died in 1559, and in 1560 espoused the Reformed faith. The Prince, as well as his subjects in the Palatinate, had been Lutheran, but at the